

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Governing diversity, experiencing difference

The politics of belonging in ethnically diverse places

Hoekstra, M.S.

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Other version

License

Other

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hoekstra, M. S. (2017). *Governing diversity, experiencing difference: The politics of belonging in ethnically diverse places*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

References

- Aalbers, M.B. (2011). The revanchist renewal of yesterday's city of tomorrow. *Antipode*, 43(5), 1696-1724. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00817.x
- Aalbers, M.B., Van Gent, W.P.C., and Pinkster, F.M. (2011). Comparing deconcentrating poverty policies in the United States and the Netherlands: A critical reply to Stal and Zuberi. *Cities*, 28(3), 260-264. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2010.08.003
- Alba, R. (2005). Bright vs. blurred boundaries: Second-generation assimilation and exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1), 20-49. doi:10.1080/0141987042000280003
- Albiez, S., Castro, N., Jüssen, L., and Youkhana, E. (2011). *Ethnicity, citizenship and belonging: Practices, theory and spatial dimensions*. Madrid: Iberoamericana.
- Alexander, M. (2003). Local policies toward migrants as an expression of host-stranger relations: A proposed typology. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(3), 411-430. doi:10.1080/13691830305610
- Alexander, M. (2007). *Cities and labour migration: Comparing policy responses in Amsterdam, Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv*. Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Allen, J., and Cars, G. (2001). Multiculturalism and governing neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2195-2209. doi:10.1080/00420980120087126
- Allport, G.W. (1979). *The nature of prejudice: 25th anniversary edition*. Reading, MA: Basic Books.
- Ambrosini, M., and Boccagni, P. (2015). Urban multiculturalism beyond the 'backlash': New discourses and different practices in immigrant policies across European Cities. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 36(1), 35-53. doi:10.1080/07256868.2014.990362
- Amin, A. (2002). Ethnicity and the multicultural city: Living with diversity. *Environment and Planning A*, 34(6), 959-980. doi:10.1068/a3537
- Amin, A. (2005). Local community on trial. *Economy and Society*, 34(4), 612-633. doi:10.1080/03085140500277211
- Amin, A., and Thrift, N. (2002). Cities and ethnicities: Introduction. *Ethnicities*, 2(3), 291-300. doi:10.1177/14687968020020030101
- Amsterdam (2003). *Erbij horen en meedoen: Uitgangspunten voor integratie in de gemeente Amsterdam* [Belonging and participating: General principles for integration in the municipality of Amsterdam].

- Amsterdam (2004). *Aanbiedingsbrief diversiteits- en integratiemonitor* [Letter regarding the diversity and integration monitor].
- Amsterdam (2005). *Actieplan wij Amsterdammers* [Action plan 'we, residents of Amsterdam'].
- Amsterdam (2006a). *Mensen maken Amsterdam: Het programma akkoord 2006-2010* [People make Amsterdam: Programme agreement 2006-2010].
- Amsterdam (2006b). *Wij Amsterdammers II: Investeren in mensen en grenzen* [We, residents of Amsterdam II: Investing in people and boundaries]
- Amsterdam (2010). *Kiezen voor de stad. Programakkoord 2010-2014* [Choosing the city. Programme agreement 2010-2014].
- Amsterdam (2011a). *Vluchtelingen in Amsterdam. Beleidsvoornemens voor de periode 2011-2014* [Refugees in Amsterdam. Policy proposals for the 2011-2014 period].
- Amsterdam (2011b). *Beleidsbrief burgerschap en diversiteit: Geen burgerschap zonder hoffelijkheid* [White paper citizenship and diversity: No citizenship without civility].
- Amsterdam (2012). *Vervolgbrief Amsterdams burgerschap* [Follow-up paper Amsterdam citizenship].
- Amsterdam (2013a). *Initiatiefvoorstel "vermijd de woorden allochtoon en autochtoon in officiële publicaties van de gemeente Amsterdam": Bestuurlijke reactie* [Initiative proposal "avoid the words allochthonous and autochthonous in official publications of the Amsterdam municipality": Reaction of the administration].
- Amsterdam (2013b). *Educatie werkt! Amsterdams beleid voor volwasseneneducatie 2013-2015* [Education works! Amsterdam policy for adult education 2013-2015].
- Amsterdam New-West. (2012). *Focusaanpak 2013-2014* [Focus approach 2013-2014].
- Amsterdam Southeast (2011) *Projectplan buurtambassadeur* [Project plan neighbourhood ambassador].
- Andersson, R., and Musterd, S. (2005). Area-based policies: A critical appraisal. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 96(4), 377-389. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9663.2005.00470.x
- Anghel, R.G. (2015). Migration in differentiated localities: Changing statuses and ethnic relations in a multi-ethnic locality in Transylvania, Romania. *Population, Space and Place*, 22(4), 356-366. doi:10.1002/psp.1925

- Anthias, F. (2013). Moving beyond the Janus face of integration and diversity discourses: Towards an intersectional framing. *The Sociological Review*, 61(2), 323-343. doi:10.1111/1467-954X.12001
- Antonsich, M. (2010). Searching for belonging – An analytical framework. *Geography Compass*, 4(6), 644–659. doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00317.x
- Askins, K. (2016). Emotional citizenry: Everyday geographies of befriending, belonging and intercultural encounter. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geography*, 41(4), 515-527. doi:10.1111/tran.12135
- Askins, K., and Pain, R. (2011). Contact zones: Participation, materiality, and the messiness of interaction. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29(5), 803-821. doi:10.1068/d11109
- Atkinson, R. (2000). Narratives of policy: The construction of urban problems and urban policy in the official discourse of British government 1968-1998. *Critical Social Policy*, 20(2), 211-232. doi:10.1177/026101830002000202
- Atkinson, R. (2008). European urban policies and the neighbourhood: An overview. *Proceedings of the ICE - Urban Design and Planning*, 161(3), 115–122. doi:10.1680/udap.2008.161.3.115
- August, M. (2014). Negotiating social mix in Toronto's first public housing redevelopment: Power, space and social control in Don Mount Court. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4), 1160-1180. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12127
- Bak Jørgensen, M. (2012). The diverging logics of integration policy-making at national and city level. *International Migration Review*, 46(1), 244–278. doi:10.1111/j.1747-7379.2012.00886.x
- Balkenhol, M. (2011). Emplacing slavery: Roots, monuments and politics of belonging in the Netherlands. *African Diaspora*, 4(2), 135-162. doi:10.1163/187254611X606337
- Barbehön, M., and Münch, S. (2016). The 'distinctiveness of cities' and distinctions in cities: Boundaries of belonging in comparative perspective. *Urban Research & Practice*, 9(1), 37-55. doi:10.1080/17535069.2015.1037342
- Barbehön, M., Münch, S., Gehring, P., Grossmann, A., Haus, M., and Heinelt, H. (2015). Urban problem discourses: Understanding the distinctiveness of cities. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 38(2), 236-251. doi:10.1111/juaf.12206
- Barnes, M., Newman, J., Knops, A., and Sullivan, H. (2003). Constituting 'the public' in public participation. *Public Administration*, 81(2), 379–399. doi:10.1111/1467-9299.00352

- Bauböck, R. (2003). Reinventing urban citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(2), 139-160. doi:10.1080/1362102032000065946
- Bell, V. (1999). Performativity and belonging: An introduction. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 16(2), 1-10. doi:10.1177/02632769922050511
- Benson, M., and Jackson, E. (2013). Place-making and place maintenance: Performativity, place and belonging among the middle classes. *Sociology*, 47(4), 793-809. doi:10.1177/0038038512454350
- Bertossi, C., and Duyvendak, J.W. (2012). National models of immigrant integration: The costs for comparative research. *Comparative European Politics*, 10(3), 237-247. doi:10.1057/cep.2012.10
- Bijlmermeer Renovation Planning Office [Projectbureau Vernieuwing Bijlmermeer] (2014). *De vernieuwing van de Bijlmermeer: Achtergronden en ontwikkelingen* [The renovation of the Bijlmermeer: Backgrounds and developments].
- Bloch, B., and Dreher, T. (2009). Resentment and reluctance: Working with everyday diversity and everyday racism in Southern Sydney. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 30(2), 193-209. doi:10.1080/07256860902766982
- Blokland, T., and Nast, J. (2014). From public familiarity to comfort zone: The relevance of absent ties for belonging in Berlin's mixed neighbourhoods. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4), 1142-1159. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12126
- Blumer, H. (1954). What is wrong with social theory? *American Sociological Review*, 19(1), 3-10. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2088165
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. London: Blackwell.
- Broekhuizen, J., and Van Wonderen, R. (2012). *Samenleven met verschillen: Signaleren van spanningen en versterken van vertrouwen in Amsterdamse buurten* [Living together with differences: Signalling tensions and strengthening trust in Amsterdam neighbourhoods]. Verwey-Jonker Instituut.
- Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Caponio, T., and Borkert, M. (2010). *The local dimension of migration policymaking*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Castles, S. (1995). How nation-states respond to immigration and ethnic diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 21(3), 293-308. doi:10.1080/1369183X.1995.9976493

- Chimienti, M., and Van Liempt, I. (2015). Super-diversity and the art of living in ethnically concentrated urban areas. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 22(1), 19-35. doi:10.1080/1070289X.2014.924414
- City of Vienna. (2012-2013). Open Government Data. <https://open.wien.gv.at/site/open-data/>
- Clayton, J. (2009). Thinking spatially: Towards an everyday understanding of inter-ethnic relations. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 10(4), 481-98. doi:10.1080/14649360902853288
- Coaffee, J., and Healey, P. (2003). 'My voice: My place': Tracking transformations in urban governance. *Urban Studies*, 40(10), 1979-1999. doi:10.1080/0042098032000116077
- Cochrane, A. (2007). *Understanding urban policy: A critical approach*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Conradson, D. (2003). Doing organisational space: Practices of voluntary welfare in the city. *Environment and Planning A*, 35(11), 1975-1992. doi:10.1068/a3584
- Cornwall, A. (2004). Introduction: New democratic spaces? The politics and dynamics of institutionalised participation. *IDS Bulletin*, 35(2), 1-10. doi:10.1111/j.1759-5436.2004.tb00115.x
- Cornwall, A. (2008). 'Unpacking 'participation': Models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43(3), 269-83. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsn010
- Crowley, J. (1999). The politics of belonging: Some theoretical considerations. In A. Geddes and A. Favell (Eds.) *The politics of belonging: Migrants and minorities in contemporary Europe* (pp. 14-41). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Crul, M. (2016). Super-diversity vs. assimilation: How complex diversity in majority-minority cities challenges the assumptions of assimilation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(1), 54-68. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2015.1061425
- Crul, M., Schneider, J., and Lelie, F. (2013). *Superdiverseit: Een nieuwe visie op integratie* [Super-diversity: A new vision on integration]. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Davidson, J., Bondi, L., and Smith, M. (Eds.) (2005). *Emotional geographies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- De Graauw, E., and Vermeulen, F. (2016). Cities and the politics of immigrant integration: A comparison of Berlin, Amsterdam, New York City, and San Francisco. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(6), 989-1012. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126089

- De Koning, A. (2015). 'This neighbourhood deserves an espresso bar too': Neoliberalism, racialization, and urban policy. *Antipode*, 47(5), 1203-1223. doi:10.1111/anti.12150
- De Koning, A., Jaffe, R., and Koster, M. (2015). Citizenship agendas in and beyond the nation-state: (En)countering framings of the good citizen. *Citizenship Studies*, 19(2), 121-127. doi:10.1080/13621025.2015.1005940
- De Wilde, M. (2015). *Brave new neighbourhood: Affective citizenship in Dutch territorial governance*. Doctoral dissertation, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- De Wilde, M., and Duyvendak, J.W. (2016). Engineering community spirit: The pre-figurative politics of affective citizenship in Dutch local governance. *Citizenship Studies*, 20(8), 973-993. doi:10.1080/13621025.2016.1229194
- De Wilde, M., and Franssen, T. (2014). Verloren en gevonden in kwantificatie: Het dubbelleven van een index in de Amsterdamse wijkapak [Lost and found in quantification: the double life of an index in the Amsterdam neighbourhood policy]. *Sociologie*, 10(3), 260-282.
- De Wilde, M., Hurenkamp, M., and Tonkens, E. (2014). Flexible relations, frail contacts and failing demands: How community groups and local institutions interact in local governance in the Netherlands. *Urban Studies*, 51(16), 3365-3382. doi:10.1177/0042098013519832
- De Zwart, F., and Poppelaars, C. (2007). Redistribution and ethnic diversity in the Netherlands: Accommodation, denial and replacement. *Acta Sociologica*, 50(4), 387-399. doi:10.1177/0001699307083980
- Dekker, K., and Van Kempen, R. (2009). Participation, social cohesion and the challenges in the governance process: An analysis of a post-World War II neighbourhood in the Netherlands. *European Planning Studies*, 17(1), 109-130. doi:10.1080/09654310802514011
- Dekker, K., Völker, B., Lelieveldt, H., and Torenvlied, R. (2010). Civic engagement in urban neighborhoods: Does the network of civic organizations influence participation in neighborhood projects? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 32(5), 609-632. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9906.2010.00524.x
- Devadason, R. (2010). Cosmopolitanism, geographical imaginaries and belonging in North London. *Urban Studies*, 47(14), 2945-2963. doi:10.1177/0042098009360228
- DeVerteuil, G. (2014). Does the punitive need the supportive? A sympathetic critique of current grammars of urban injustice. *Antipode*, 46(4), 874-893. doi:10.1111/anti.12001

- Dikeç, M. (2007). Space, governmentality, and the geographies of French urban policy. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 14(4), 277-289. doi:10.1177/0969776407081162
- Dukes, M.J.M. (2007). *Place, positioning and European urban policy discourse: Examples of politics of scale in 'Brussels' and the Netherlands*. Doctoral dissertation, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Dukes, T., and Musterd, S. (2012). Towards social cohesion: Bridging national integration rhetoric and local practice: The case of the Netherlands. *Urban Studies*, 49(9), 1981-1997. doi:10.1177/0042098012444889
- Dinham, A. (2007). Raising expectations or dashing hopes? Well-being and participation in disadvantaged areas. *Community Development Journal*, 42(2), 181-193. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsi110
- Diprose, R. (2008). 'Where' your people from, girl?: Belonging to race, gender, and place Beneath Clouds. *Differences – A journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 19(3), 28-58. doi:10.1215/10407391-2008-009
- Dixon, J., and Durrheim, K. (2000). Displacing place identity: A discursive approach to locating self and other. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(1), 27-44. doi:10.1348/014466600164318
- Dixon, J., and Durrheim, K. (2004). Dislocating identity: Desegregation and the transformation of place. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 24(4), 455-473. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2004.09.004
- Duyvendak, J.W. (2011). *The politics of home: Belonging and nostalgia in Western Europe and the United States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Duyvendak, J.W., Reinders, L., and Wekker, F. (2016). Homing the Dutch. *Home Cultures*, 13(2), 87-100. doi:10.1080/17406315.2016.1190584
- Eade, J., and Mele, C. (2002). Understanding the city. In J. Eade and C. Mele (Eds.) *Understanding the city: Contemporary and future perspectives* (pp. 3-23). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eizaguirre, S., Pradel, M., Terrones, A., Martinez-Celorrio, X., and García, M. (2012). Multilevel governance and social cohesion: Bringing back conflict in citizenship practices. *Urban Studies*, 49(9), 1999–2016. doi:10.1177/0042098012444890
- Entzinger, H. (2006). Changing the rules while the game is on: From multiculturalism to assimilation in the Netherlands. In M. Bodemann and G. Yurdakul (Eds.) *Migration, citizenship, ethnos: Incorporation regimes in Germany, Western Europe and North America* (pp. 121-144). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Etzioni, A. (1995). *The spirit of community: Rights, responsibilities and the communitarian agenda*. London: Fontana Press.
- Faist, T. (2009). Diversity – A new mode of incorporation? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(1), 171-190. doi:10.1080/01419870802483650
- Fassman, H., and Hatz, G. (2012). *Urban renewal in Vienna*. https://www.academia.edu/189782/Urban_Renewal_in_Vienna
- Favell, A. (2000). *Philosophies of integration: Immigration and the idea of citizenship in France and Britain*. Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Fenster, T. (2005). Gender and the city: The different formations of belonging. In L. Nelson and J. Seager (Eds.) *A companion to feminist geography* (pp. 242-257). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fincher, R., and Iveson, K. (2008). *Planning and diversity in the city: Redistribution, recognition and encounter*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Finney, N., and Jivraj, S. (2013). Ethnic group population change and neighbourhood belonging. *Urban Studies*, 50(16), 3323-3341. doi:10.1177/0042098013482497
- Fischer, F. (2003). *Reframing public policy: Discursive politics and deliberative practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Florida, R. (2003). Cities and the creative class. *City & Community*, 2(1), 3-19. doi:10.1111/1540-6040.00034
- Foner, N. (2007). How exceptional is New York? Migration and multiculturalism in the empire city. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 999-1023. doi:10.1080/01419870701599440
- Fortier, A. (1999). Re-membering places and the performance of belonging(s). *Theory, Culture & Society*, 16(2), 41-64. doi:10.1177/02632769922050548
- Fortier, A.M. (2007). Too close for comfort: Loving thy neighbour and the management of multicultural intimacies. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 25(1), 104-119. doi:10.1068/d2404
- Fortier, A. (2010). Proximity by design? Affective citizenship and the management of unease. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(1), 17-30. doi:10.1080/13621020903466258
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1994 [1980]). *Dits et écrits 1954-1988 – IV 1980-1988*. Paris: Gallimard.

- Franz, Y. (2015). Designing social living labs in urban research. *info*, 17(4), 53-66. doi:10.1108/info-01-2015-0008
- Fraser, J.C. (2004). Beyond gentrification: Mobilizing communities and claiming space. *Urban Geography*, 25(5), 437-457. doi:10.2747/0272-3638.25.5.437
- Freeman, G.P. (2004). Immigrant incorporation in Western democracies. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 945-969. doi:10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00225.x
- Galster, G. (2001). On the nature of neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2111-2124. doi:10.1080/00420980120087072
- García, M. (2006). Citizenship practices and urban governance in European cities. *Urban Studies*, 43(4), 745-765. doi:10.1080/00420980600597491
- Gerring, J. (2001). *Social Science Methodology. A Criterial Framework*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Geschiere, P. (2009). *The perils of belonging: Autochthony, citizenship, and exclusion in Africa and Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gilbert, L. (2009). Immigration as local politics: Re-bordering immigration and multiculturalism through deterrence and incapacitation. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33(1), 26-42. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2009.00838.x
- Grillo, R. (2007). An excess of alterity? Debating difference in a multicultural society. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 979-998. doi:10.1080/01419870701599424
- Hajer, M. (1995). *The politics of environmental discourse: Ecological modernization and the policy process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haldrup, M., Koefoed, L., and Simonsen, K. (2006). Practical orientalism – bodies, everyday life and the construction of otherness. *Geografiska Annaler*, 88B(2), 173-184. doi:10.1111/j.0435-3684.2006.00213.x
- Ho, E.L-E. (2009). Constituting citizenship through the emotions: Singaporean transmigrants in London. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 99(4), 788-804. doi:10.1080/00045600903102857
- Hochstenbach, C., and Van Gent, W.P.C. (2015). An anatomy of gentrification processes: Variegating causes of neighbourhood change. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(7), 1480-1501. doi:10.1177/0308518X15595771
- Hoekstra, M. (2015). Diverse cities and good citizenship: How local governments in the Netherlands recast national integration discourse. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(10), 1798-1814. doi:10.1080/01419870.2015.1015585

- Hoekstra, M.S., and Dahlvik, J. (2017). Neighbourhood participation in super-diverse contexts: Comparing Amsterdam and Vienna. Unpublished manuscript.
- hooks, b. (2008). *Belonging: A culture of place*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Horton, J., and Kraftl, P. (2009). What (else) matters? Policy contexts, emotional geographies. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(12), 2984-3002. doi:10.1068/a41362
- Hoymann, M., and Faricy, C. (2009). It takes a village: A test of the creative class, social capital, and human capital theory. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(3), 311-333. doi:10.1177/1078087408321496
- Jackson, L., Harris, C., and Valentine, G. (2017). Rethinking concepts of the strange and the stranger. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 18(1), 1-15. doi:10.1080/14649365.2016.1247192
- Jones, P.S. (2003). Urban regeneration's poisoned chalice: Is there an impasse in (community) participation-based policy? *Urban Studies*, 40(3), 581-601. doi:10.1080/0042098032000053932
- Joppke, C. (2007). Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 30(1), 1-22. doi:10.1080/01402380601019613
- Joppke, C., and Morawska, E. (Eds.) (2014). *Towards assimilation and citizenship: Immigrants in liberal nation-states*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Joseph, M. (2002). *Against the romance of community*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jupp, E. (2008). The feeling of participation: Everyday spaces and urban change. *Geoforum*, 39(1), 331-343. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2007.07.007
- Jupp, E. (2013). 'I feel more at home here than in my own community': Approaching the emotional geographies of neighbourhood policy. *Critical Social Policy*, 33(3), 532-553. doi:10.1177/0261018313479011
- Kadi, J., and Musterd, S. (2015). Housing for the poor in a neo-liberalising just city: Still affordable, but increasingly inaccessible. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 106(3), 246-262. doi:10.1111/tesg.12101
- Kährik, A. (2006). Tackling social exclusion in European neighbourhoods: Experiences and lessons from the NEHOM project. *GeoJournal*, 67(1), 9-25. doi:10.1007/s10708-006-9004-5
- Kearns, A. and Parkinson, M. (2001). The significance of neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2103-2110. doi:10.1080/00420980120087063

- Kirk, K.M. (2010). A tale of two cities: The implementation of Dutch civic integration policy in Amsterdam and Utrecht. Paper presented at the Dutch/Flemish Politicologenmaal, May 27-28, Leuven, Belgium.
- Kesby, M. (2007). Spatialising participatory approaches: The contribution of geography to a mature debate. *Environment and Planning A*, 39(12), 2813–2831. doi:10.1068/a38326
- Kloosterman, R., and Priemus, H. (2001). The Hague – A dual city? Causes and policy responses: An introduction. *Built Environment*, 27(3), 167-175. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23288412>
- Kobayashi, A., Preston, V., and Murnaghan, A.M. (2011). Place, affect, and transnationalism through the voices of Hong Kong immigrants to Canada. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12(8), 871-888. doi:10.1080/14649365.2011.624191
- Koefoed, L., and Simonsen, K. (2011). 'The stranger', the city and the nation: On the possibilities of identification and belonging. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 18(4), 343-357. doi:10.1177/0969776411399343
- Kokx, A., and Van Kempen, R. (2010). A fact is a fact, but perception is reality: Stakeholders' perceptions and urban policies in the process of urban restructuring. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 28(2), 335–348. doi:10.1068/c0932
- Kos, S., Maussen, M., and Doomernik, J. (2015). Policies of exclusion and practices of inclusion: How municipal governments negotiate asylum policies in the Netherlands. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 4(3), 354-374. doi:10.1080/21622671.2015.1024719
- Koster, M. (2014). Bridging the gap in the Dutch participation society: New spaces of governance, brokers, and informal politics. *Etnofoor*, 26(2), 49-64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43264059>
- Koster, M. (2015). Citizenship agendas, urban governance and social housing in the Netherlands: An assemblage approach. *Citizenship Studies*, 19(2), 214-228. doi:10.1080/13621025.2015.1005951
- Kullberg, J., Vervoort, M., and Dagevos, J. (2009). *Goede buren kun je niet kopen: Over de woonconcentratie en woonpositie van niet-westerse allochtonen in Nederland* [Good neighbours are not for sale: On the residential concentration and housing position of non-western allochthones in the Netherlands]. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Kusenbach, M. (2008). A hierarchy of urban communities: Observations on the nested character of place. *City & Community*, 7(3), 225-249. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6040.2008.00259.x

- Lamont, M., and Aksartova, S. (2002). Ordinary cosmopolitanisms: Strategies for bridging racial boundaries among working-class men. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(4), 1-25. doi:10.1177/0263276402019004001
- Lamont, M., and Molnár, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28(1), 167-195. www.jstor.org/stable/3069239
- Laurier, E., and Philo, C. (2006). Cold shoulders and napkins handed: Gestures of responsibility. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 31(2), 193-207. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3804381
- Lavoie, C. (2012). Race, power and social action in neighborhood community organizing: Reproducing and resisting the social construction of the other. *Journal of Community Practice*, 20, 241-259. doi:10.1080/10705422.2012.700277
- Lawson, V., and Elwood, S. (2014). Encountering poverty: Space, class, and poverty politics. *Antipode*, 46(1), 209-228. doi:10.1111/anti.12030
- Leach, N. (2002). Belonging: Towards a theory of identification with space. In J. Hillier and E. Rooksby (Eds.) *Habitus: A sense of place* (pp. 281-298). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Leitner, H. (2012). Spaces of encounters: Immigration, race, class, and the politics of belonging in small-town America. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 102(4), 828-846. doi:10.1080/00045608.2011.601204
- Leitner, H., and Ehrkamp, P. (2006). Rethinking immigration and citizenship: New spaces of migrant transnationalism and belonging. *Environment and Planning A*, 38(9), 1591-1597. doi:10.1068/a37409
- Leitner, H., Sheppard, E., and Sziarto, K.M. (2008). The spatialities of contentious politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 33(2), 157-172. doi:10.1111/j.1475-5661.2008.00293.x
- Lewis, O. (1969). Culture of poverty. In D.P. Moynihan (Ed.) *On understanding poverty: Perspectives from the social sciences* (pp. 187-220). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Lindner, R. (2006). The Gestalt of the urban imaginary. *European Studies: A Journal of European Culture, History and Politics*, 23(1), 35-42.
- Löw, M. (2013). The city as experiential space: The production of shared meaning. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(3), 894-908. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12022
- Lowndes, V., and Sullivan, H. (2008). How low can you go? Rationales and challenges for neighbourhood governance. *Public Administration*, 86(1), 53-74. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9299.2007.00696.x

- Lucassen, L. (2004). Migrantenorganisaties vroeger en nu: Een inleiding [Migrant associations past and present: An introduction]. In L. Lucassen (Ed.) *Amsterdamer worden: Migranten, hun organisaties en inburgering, 1600-2000* [Becoming an Amsterdamer: Migrants, their organizations and civic integration, 1600-2000] (pp. 9-22). Amsterdam: Vossiuspers UvA, Amsterdam.
- Madden, D.J. (2014). Neighborhood as spatial project: Making the urban order on the downtown Brooklyn waterfront. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(2), 471-497. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12068
- Mahnig, H. (2004). The politics of minority-majority relations: How immigrant policies developed in Paris, Berlin and Zurich. In R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello, and S. Vertovec (Eds.) *Citizenship in European cities* (pp. 17-37). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Makoni, S.B. (2012). A critique of language, languaging and supervernacular. *Muitas Vozes*, 1(2), 189-199. doi:10.5212/MuitasVozes.v1i2.0003
- Marinetto, M. (2003). Who wants to be an active citizen? The politics and practice of community involvement. *Sociology*, 37(1), 103-120. doi:10.1177/0038038503037001390
- Martin, D.G. (2003a). 'Place-framing' as place-making: Constituting a neighborhood for organizing and activism. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 93(3), 730-750. doi:10.1111/1467-8306.9303011
- Martin, D.G. (2003b). Enacting neighborhood. *Urban Geography*, 24(5), 361-385. doi:10.2747/0272-3638.24.5.361
- Matejskova, T., and Leitner, H. (2011). Urban encounters with difference: The contact hypothesis and immigrant integration projects in Eastern Berlin. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12(7), 717-741. doi:10.1080/14649365.2011.610234
- Mathers, J., Parry, J., and Jones, S. (2008). Exploring resident (non-)participation in the UK New Deal for Communities regeneration programme. *Urban Studies*, 45(3), 591-606. doi:10.1177/0042098007087336
- Mauss, M. (2002 [1950]). *The gift: The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies*. London: Routledge.
- May, J. (1996). Globalization and the politics of place: Place and identity in an inner London neighbourhood. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 21(1), 194-215. doi:10.2307/622933
- May, V., and Muir, S. (2015). Everyday belonging and ageing: Place and generational change. *Sociological Research Online*, 20(1), 1-11. doi:10.5153/sro.3555

- Mee, K. (2009). A space to care, a space of care: Public housing, belonging, and care in inner Newcastle, Australia. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(4), 842-858. doi:10.1068/a40197
- Mee, K., and Wright, S. (2009). Geographies of belonging. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(4), 772-779. doi:10.1068/a41364
- Mele, C. (2000). The materiality of urban discourse: Rational planning in the restructuring of the early twentieth-century ghetto. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(5), 628-648. doi:10.1177/10780870022184570
- Mepschen, P. (2012). Gewone mensen. Populisme en het discours van verdringing in Amsterdam Nieuw West [Ordinary people. Populism and the discourse of displacement in Amsterdam New West]. *Sociologie*, 8(1), 66-83.
- Mepschen, P.J.H. (2016). *Everyday autochthony: Difference, discontent and the politics of home in Amsterdam*. Doctoral dissertation, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Mepschen, P., Duyvendak, J.W., and Tonkens, E.H. (2010). Sexual politics, orientalism and multicultural citizenship in the Netherlands. *Sociology*, 44(5), 962-979. doi:10.1177/0038038510375740
- Miciukiewicz, K., Moulaert, F., Novy, A., Musterd, S., and Hillier, J. (2012). Introduction: Problematising urban social cohesion: A transdisciplinary endeavour. *Urban Studies*, 49(9), 1855-1872. doi:10.1177/0042098012444877
- Ministry of the Interior (2011). *Integratie, binding, burgerschap* [Integration, connection, citizenship].
- Morley, D. (2001). Belongings: Place, space and identity in a mediated world. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 4(4), 425-448. doi:10.1177/136754940100400404
- Morrison, N. (2003). Neighbourhoods and social cohesion: Experiences from Europe. *International Planning Studies*, 8(2), 115-38. doi:10.1080/13563470305154
- Mouritsen, P. (2008). Political responses to cultural conflict: Reflections on the ambiguities of the civic turn. In P. Mouritsen and K.E. Jørgensen *Constituting communities* (pp. 1-30). London: Palgrave.
- Musterd, S. (forthcoming). Amsterdam. In A.M. Orum (Ed.) *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Musterd, S. (2014). Public housing for whom? Experiences in an era of mature neoliberalism: The Netherlands and Amsterdam. *Housing Studies*, 29(4), 467-484. doi:10.1080/02673037.2013.873393

- Musterd, S., and Murie, A. (2010). The idea of the creative or knowledge-based city. In S. Musterd and A. Murie (Eds.) *Making competitive cities* (pp. 17-33). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Musterd, S., and Van Kempen, R. (2009). Segregation and housing of minority ethnic groups in Western European cities. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 100(4), 559-566. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9663.2009.00558.x
- Neal, S., Bennett, K., Cochrane, A., and Mohan, G. (2013). Living multiculture: Understanding the new spatial and social relations of ethnicity and multiculture in England. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 31(2), 308-323. doi:10.1068/c11263r
- Nelson, L., and Hiemstra, N. (2008). Latino immigrants and the renegotiation of place and belonging in small town America. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 9(3), 319-342. doi:10.1080/14649360801990538
- Newman, J., and Tonkens, E. (2011). *Participation, responsibility and choice: Summoning the active citizen in Western European welfare states*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Nicholls, W., and Uitermark, J. (2013). Post-multicultural cities: A comparison of minority politics in Amsterdam and Los Angeles, 1970-2010. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(10), 1555-1575. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2013.833686
- Nijman, J. (1999). Cultural globalization and the identity of place: The reconstruction of Amsterdam. *Cultural Geographies*, 6(2), 146-164. doi:10.1177/096746089900600202
- Noble, G. (2009). Everyday cosmopolitanism and the labour of intercultural community. In A. Wise and S. Velayutham (Eds.) *Everyday multiculturalism* (pp. 46-65). Hounds mills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- OIS Amsterdam. (2014). Amsterdamse Armoedemonitor 2013 [Amsterdam poverty monitor 2013].
- OIS Amsterdam. (2016). www.ois.amsterdam.nl.
- Osborne, T., and Rose, N. (1999). Governing cities: Notes on the spatialisation of virtue. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 17(6), 737-760. doi:10.1068/d170737
- Peck, J. (2005). Struggling with the creative class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4), 740-770. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2005.00620.x

- Peck, J. (2012). Recreative city: Amsterdam, vehicular ideas and the adaptive spaces of creativity policy. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36(3), 462-485. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2011.01071.x.
- Pemberton, S., and Phillimore, J. (2016). Migrant place-making in super-diverse neighbourhoods: Moving beyond ethno-national approaches. *Urban Studies*, online first. doi:10.1177/0042098016656988
- Penninx, R. (2009). Decentralising integration policies: Managing migration in cities, regions and localities. Policy Network. http://www.policy-network.net/publications_detail.aspx?ID=3450
- Penninx, R., and Martiniello, M. (2004). Integration processes and policies. State of the art and lessons. In R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello, and S. Vertovec (Eds.) *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies* (pp. 139-165). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Penninx, R., Kraal, K., Martiniello, M., and Vertovec, S. (2004). *Citizenship in European cities: Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Però, D. (2013). Migrants, cohesion and the cultural politics of the state: Critical perspectives on the management of diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(8), 1241-1259. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2013.787511
- Pettigrew, T.F., and Tropp, L.R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(6), 922-934. doi:10.1002/ejsp.504
- Phillips, D., Athwal, B., Robinson, D., and Harrison, M. (2014). Towards intercultural engagement: Building shared visions of neighbourhood and community in an era of new migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(1), 42-59. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2013.782146
- Phillips, D., and Robinson, D. (2015). Reflections on migration, community, and place. *Population, Space and Place*, 21(5), 409-420. doi:10.1002/psp.1911
- Phillips, L., and Jørgensen, M. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.
- Pierce, J., Martin, D.G., and Murphy, J.T. (2011). Relational place-making: The networked politics of place. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 36(1), 54-70. doi:10.1111/j.1475-5661.2010.00411.x
- Pinkster, F.M. (2016). Narratives of neighbourhood change and loss of belonging in an urban garden village. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 17(7), 871-891. doi:10.1080/14649365.2016.1139169

- Poppelaars, C., and Scholten, P. (2008). Two worlds apart: The divergence of national and local immigrant integration policies in the Netherlands. *Administration & Society*, 40(4), 335-357. doi:10.1177/0095399708317172
- Prezworski, A., and Teune, H. (1970). *The logic of comparative social inquiry*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Prins, B. (2002). The nerve to break taboos: New realism in the Dutch discourse on multiculturalism. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 3(3), 363-379. doi:10.1007/s12134-002-1020-9
- Probyn, E. (1996). *Outside belongings*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Putnam, R.D. (2007). *E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century*. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137-170. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9477.2007.00176.x
- Raco, M. (2009). From expectations to aspirations: State modernisation, urban policy, and the existential politics of welfare in the UK. *Political Geography*, 28(7), 436-444. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2009.10.009
- Raco, M., and Imrie, R. (2000). Governmentality and rights and responsibilities in urban policy. *Environment and Planning A*, 32(12), 2187-2204. doi:10.1068/a3365
- Richardson, T., and Jensen, O.J. (2003). Lining discourse and space: Towards a cultural sociology of space in analysing spatial policy discourses. *Urban Studies*, 40(1), 7-22. doi:10.1080/00420980220080131
- Robertson, S., and Colic-Peisker, V. (2015). Policy narratives versus everyday geographies: Perceptions of changing local space in Melbourne's diverse North. *City & Community*, 14(1), 68-86. doi:10.1111/cico.12098
- Robinson, D. (2005). The search for community cohesion: Key themes and dominant concepts of the public policy agenda. *Urban Studies*, 42(8), 1411-1427. doi:10.1080/00420980500150755
- Robinson, D. (2010). The neighbourhood effects of new immigration. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(10), 2451-2466. doi:10.1068/a4364
- Robinson, F., Shaw, K., and Davidson, G. (2005). 'On the side of the angels': Community involvement in the governance of neighbourhood renewal. *Local Economy*, 20(1), 13-26. doi:10.1080/0269094042000313584
- Savage, M., Bagnall, G., and Longhurst, B. (2005). *Globalization and belonging*. London: Sage.
- Savini, F., and Dembski, S. (2016). Manufacturing the creative city: Symbols and politics of Amsterdam North. *Cities*, 55, 139-147. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2016.02.013

- Scheffer, P. (2000). *Het multiculturele drama* [The multicultural drama]. *NRC Handelsblad*, January 29.
- Schiller, M. (2017). The implementation trap: The local level and diversity policies. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83(2), 267-282. doi:10.1177/0020852315590204
- Schinkel, W. (2010). The virtualization of citizenship. *Critical Sociology*, 36(2), 265-283. doi:10.1177/0896920509357506
- Schinkel, W. (2013). The imagination of 'society' in measurements of immigrant integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(7), 1142-1161. doi:10.1080/01419870.2013.783709
- Schinkel, W., and Van Houdt, F. (2010). The double helix of cultural assimilationism and neo-liberalism: Citizenship in contemporary governmentality. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61(4), 696-715. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2010.01337.x
- Schmidt, G. (2011). 'Grounded' politics: Manifesting Muslim identity as a political factor and localized identity in Copenhagen. *Ethnicities*, 12(5), 603-622. doi:10.1177/1468796811432839
- Scholten, P. (2013a). The multilevel governance of migrant integration: A multilevel governance perspective on Dutch migrant integration policies. In U. Korkut, G. Bucken-Knapp, A. McGarry, J. Hinnfors, and H. Drake (Eds.) *The discourses and politics of migration in Europe* (pp. 151-170). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Scholten, P.W.A. (2013b). Agenda dynamics and the multi-level governance of intractable policy controversies: The case of migrant integration policies in the Netherlands. *Policy Sciences*, 46(3), 217-236. doi:10.1007/s11077-012-9170-x.
- Scholten, P., and Van Breugel, I. (Eds.) (2018). *Mainstreaming integration governance. New trends in migrant integration policies in Europe*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Schrover, M., and Schinkel, W. (2013). Introduction: The language of inclusion and exclusion in the context of immigration and integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(7), 1123-1141. doi:10.1080/01419870.2013.783711
- Schwartz-Shea, P., and Yanow, D. (2012). *Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes*. London: Routledge.
- Secor, A. (2004). "There is an Istanbul that belongs to me": Citizenship, space and identity in the city. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 94(2), 352-368. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8306.2004.09402012.x
- Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text, and interaction*. London: Sage.

- Smets, P. (2006). Living apart or together? Multiculturalism at a neighbourhood level. *Community Development Journal*, 41(3), 293–306. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsi070
- Smets, P., and Den Uyl, M. (2008). The complex role of ethnicity in urban mixing: A study of two deprived neighbourhoods in Amsterdam. *Urban Studies*, 45(7), 1439-1460. doi:10.1177/0042098008090683
- Sniderman, P.M., and Hagendoorn, L. (2007). *When ways of life collide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Soja, E. (2000). *Postmetropolis: Critical studies of cities and regions*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sorensen, A. (2009). Neighborhood streets as meaningful spaces: Claiming rights to shared spaces in Tokyo. *City & Society*, 21(2), 207-229. doi:10.1111/j.1548-44X.2009.01022.x
- Staeheli, L.A., and Mitchell, D. (2009). Place, politics of. In N. Thrift and R. Kitchin (Eds.) *International encyclopaedia of human geography* (pp. 185-192). Elsevier.
- Statistik Austria. (2011). Census statistics Austria. http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/menschen_und_gesellschaft/bevoelkerung/volkszaehlungen_registerzaehlungen_abgestimmte_erwerbsstatistik/index.html
- Statistics Netherlands (2016). www.cbs.nl.
- Taylor, M. (2007). Community participation in the real world: Opportunities and pitfalls in new governance spaces. *Urban Studies*, 44(2), 297–317. doi:10.1080/00420980601074987
- Teernstra, A.B., and Pinkster, F.M. (2015). Participation in neighbourhood regeneration: Achievements of residents in a Dutch disadvantaged neighbourhood. *Urban Research & Practice*, 9(1), 1-24. doi:10.1080/17535069.2015.1045931
- Tersteeg, A.K., and Pinkster, F.M. (2016). 'Us up here and them down there': How design, management, and neighbourhood facilities shape social distance in a mixed-tenure housing development. *Urban Affairs Review*, 52(2), 751-779. doi:10.1177/1078087415601221
- The Hague (2005a). *Zo wij iets zijn, zijn wij Hagenaars. Initiatief voorstel integratiebeleid* [If we are to be anything, we are residents of The Hague. Initiative proposal integration policy].
- The Hague (2005b). *Programma interculturalisatie en diversiteit* [Programme interculturalization and diversity].
- The Hague (2006). *Mee doen: Coalitieakkoord 2006-2010* [Joining in: Coalition agreement 2006-2010].

- The Hague (2010). *Aan de slag! Coalitieakkoord 2010-2014* [To work! Coalition agreement 2010-2014].
- The Hague (2011). *Verschillend verleden, één toekomst. Hoofdlijnen integratiebeleid 2011-2014* [Differing pasts, one future. Integration policy 2011-2014, main directions].
- The Hague (2012a). *Kandidatuur culturele hoofdstad van Europa Den Haag 2018* [Candidacy for cultural capital of Europe The Hague 2018].
- The Hague (2012b). *Voortgangsrapportage integratiebeleid* [Integration policy, progress report].
- The Hague in Figures [Den Haag in Cijfers] (2014). www.denhaag.buurtmonitor.nl.
- The Hague in Figures [Den Haag in Cijfers] (2016). www.denhaag.buurtmonitor.nl.
- Trudeau, D. (2006). Politics of belonging in the construction of landscapes: Place-making, boundary-drawing and exclusion. *Cultural Geographies*, 13(3), 421-443. doi:10.1191/1474474006eu366oa
- Turner, A. (2009). Bottom-up community development: Reality or rhetoric? The example of the Kingsmead Kabin in East London. *Community Development Journal*, 44(2), 230-247. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsm047
- Uitermark, J. (2009). An *in memoriam* for the just city of Amsterdam. *City*, 13(2-3), 347-361. doi:10.1080/13604810902982813
- Uitermark, J. (2014). Integration and control: The governing of urban marginality in Western Europe. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4), 1418-1436. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12069
- Uitermark, J., and Duyvendak, J.W. (2008). Citizen participation in a mediated age: Neighbourhood governance in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(1), 114-134. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2007.00743.x
- Uitermark, J., and Gielen, A. (2010). Islam in the spotlight: The mediatisation of politics in an Amsterdam neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 47(6), 1325-1342. doi:10.1177/0042098010362807
- Uitermark, J., Rossi, U., and Van Houtum, H. (2005). Reinventing multiculturalism: Urban citizenship and the negotiation of ethnic diversity in Amsterdam. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(3), 622-640. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2005.00614.x
- Valentine, G. (2007). Theorizing and researching intersectionality: A challenge for feminist geography. *The Professional Geographer*, 59(1), 10-21. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9272.2007.00587.x

- Valentine, G. (2008). Living with difference: Reflections on geographies of encounter. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(3), 323-337. doi:10.1177/0309133308089372
- Valentine, G., and Sadgrove, J. (2012). Lived difference: A narrative account of spatiotemporal processes of social differentiation. *Environment and Planning A*, 44(9), 2049-2063. doi:10.1068/a44491
- Van der Graaf, P.F. (2009). *Out of place? Emotional ties to the neighbourhood in urban renewal in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom*. Doctoral dissertation, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Van der Haar, M., and Yanow, D. (2011). Allochtoon als metafoor en categorie: Over de handelingsimplicaties van beleidstaal [Allochthon as metaphor and category: About the implications of policy language for policy practice]. *Beleid en Maatschappij*, 38(2), 160-178. http://www.boomlemmatijdschriften.nl/tijdschrift/benm/2011/2/benm_1389-0069_2011_038_002_003.pdf
- Van der Meer, T., and Tolsma, J. (2014). Ethnic diversity and its effects on social cohesion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40(1), 459-478. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043309
- Van der Welle, I.C. (2011). *Flexibele burgers? Amsterdamse jongvolwassenen over lokale en nationale identiteiten* [Flexible citizens? Young adults in Amsterdam on local and national identities]. Doctoral dissertation, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1997). Political discourse and racism: Describing others in Western parliaments. In S.H. Riggins (Ed.) *The language and politics of exclusion: Others in discourse* (pp. 31-46). London: Sage.
- Van Eijk, G. (2010). Exclusionary politics are not just about the 'neoliberal city': A critique of theories of urban revanchism and the case of Rotterdam. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(4), 820-834. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.00944.x
- Van Gent, W.P.C., Boterman, W.R., and Hoekstra, M.S. (2016) *State-sponsored gentrification or social regeneration? Symbolic politics and neighborhood intervention in an Amsterdam working class neighborhood*. Centre for Urban Studies Working Paper.
- Van Gent, W.P.C., and Jaffe, R. (2017) Normalizing urban inequality: Cinematic imaginaries of difference in postcolonial Amsterdam. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 18(4), 553-572. doi:10.1080/14649365.2016.1197303

- Van Gent, W.P.C., and Musterd, S. (2013). Unintended effects of urban and housing policies on integration: "White" discontent in the Dutch city. *Geography Research Forum*, 33, 64-90.
- Van Gent, W.P.C., and Musterd, S. (2016). Class, migrants, and the European city: Spatial impacts of structural changes in early twenty-first century Amsterdam. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(6), 893-912. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126092.
- Van Gent, W.P.C., Musterd, S., and Ostendorf, W. (2009a). Disentangling neighbourhood problems: Area-based interventions in Western European cities. *Urban Research & Practice*, 2(1), 53-67. doi:10.1080/17535060902727066
- Van Gent, W.P.C., Musterd, S., and Ostendorf, W.J.M. (2009b). Bridging the social divide? Reflections on current Dutch neighbourhood policy. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24(3), 357-368. doi:10.1007/s10901-009-9144-2
- Van Reekum, R., and Duyvendak, J.W. (2012). Running from our shadows: The performative impact of policy diagnoses in Dutch debates on immigrant integration. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 46(5), 445-466. doi:10.1080/0031322X.2012.718164
- Vasta, E. (2007). From ethnic minorities to ethnic majority policy: Multiculturalism and the shift to assimilation in the Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(5), 713-740. doi:10.1080/01419870701491770
- Verkaaik, O. (2010). The cachet dilemma: Ritual and agency in New Dutch nationalism. *American Ethnologist*, 37(1), 69-82. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1425.2010.01242.x
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054. doi:10.1080/01419870701599465
- Vertovec, S. (2012). "Diversity" and the social imaginary. *European Journal of Sociology*, 53(3), 287-312. doi:10.1017/S000397561200015X
- Vertovec, S., and Wessendorf, S. (Eds.) (2010). *The multiculturalism backlash: European discourses and practices*. London: Routledge.
- Vervoort, M., Flap, H., and Dagevos, J. (2011). The ethnic composition of the neighbourhood and ethnic minorities' social contacts: Three unresolved issues. *European Sociological Review*, 27(5), 586-605. doi:10.1093/esr/jcq029
- Vranken, J. (2005). Changing forms of solidarity: Urban development programs in Europe. In Y. Kazepov (Ed.) *Cities of Europe: Changing contexts, local arrangements, and the challenge to urban cohesion* (pp. 255-277). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- VROM Ministry (2007). *Integratielijst 2007-2011: Zorg dat je erbij hoort!* [White Paper on integration 2007-2011: Make sure you're a part of it!]
- VROM Ministry (2009). *Integratiebrief* [Integration letter]
- VROM Ministry (2010). *Betrokkenheid loont: Succesvol samenwerken met nieuwe Nederlanders in de wijk* [Involvement pays off: Working successfully with new Dutch in the neighbourhood]. www.rijksoverheid.nl/bestanden/documenten-en-publicaties/brochures/2010/11/26/betrokkenheid-loont-in-de-wijk/betrokkenheid-loont.pdf
- Wacquant, L.J.D. (1996). The rise of advanced marginality: Notes on its nature and implications. *Acta Sociologica*, 39(2), 121-139. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4194814>
- Walker, K., and Leitner, H. (2011). The variegated landscape of local immigration policies in the United States. *Urban Geography*, 32(2), 156-178. doi:10.2747/0272-3638.32.2.156
- Watson, S. (2009). The magic of the marketplace: Sociality in a neglected public space. *Urban Studies*, 46(8), 1577-1591. doi:10.1177/0042098009105506
- Watt, P. (2009). Living in an oasis: Middle-class disaffiliation and selective belonging in an English suburb. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(12), 2874-2892. doi:10.1068/a41120
- Wessendorf, S. (2013). Commonplace diversity and the 'ethos of mixing': Perceptions of difference in a London neighbourhood. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 20(4), 407-422. doi:10.1080/1070289X.2013.822374
- Williams, A., Cloke, P., May, J., and Goodwin, M. (2016). Contested space: the contradictory political dynamics of food banking in the UK. *Environment and Planning A*, 48(11), 2291-2316. doi:10.1177/0308518X16658292
- Williams, C.C. (2005). Cultivating community self-help in deprived urban neighborhoods. *City & Community*, 4(2), 171-188. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6040.2005.00110.x
- Wilson, H.F. (2011). Passing propinquities in the multicultural city: The everyday encounters of bus passengering. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(3), 634-649. doi:10.1068/a43354
- Wilson, H.F. (2015). An urban laboratory for the multicultural nation? *Ethnicities*, 15(4), 586-604. doi:10.1177/1468796815577703
- Wilson, H.F. (2017). On geography and encounter: Bodies, borders, difference. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41(4), 451-471. doi:10.1177/0309132516645958

- Wimmer, A., and Glick-Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks*, 2(4), 301-334. doi:10.1111/1471-0374.00043
- Wise, A. (2004). *Contact zones: Experiences of cultural diversity and rapid neighbourhood change among Anglo-Celtic and long term elderly residents in Ashfield*. Sydney: Centre for Research on Social Inclusion, Macquarie University.
- Wise, A. (2010). Sensuous multiculturalism: Emotional landscapes of inter-ethnic living in Australian suburbia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(6), 917-937. doi:10.1080/13691831003643355
- Wise, A., and Velayutham, S. (Eds.) (2009). *Everyday Multiculturalism*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wood, N., and Waite, L. (2011). Editorial: Scales of belonging. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 4(4), 201-202. doi:10.1016/j.emospa.2011.06.005
- Wood, P., and Landry, C. (2007). *The intercultural city: Planning for diversity advantage*. London, Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- Yanow, D. (2007). Interpretation in policy analysis: On methods and practice. *Critical Policy Studies*, 1(1), 110-122. doi:10.1080/19460171.2007.9518511
- Yanow, D., and Van der Haar, M. (2013). People out of place: Allochthony and autochthony in the Netherlands' identity discourse – Metaphors and categories in action. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 16(2), 227-261. doi:10.1057/jird.2012.13
- Yeoh, B.S.A., and Willis, K. (2005). Singaporean and British transmigrants in China and the cultural politics of contact zones. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(2), 269-285. doi:10.1080/1369183042000339927
- Young, I.M. (2011 [1990]). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 40(3), 197-214. doi:10.1080/00313220600769331
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2007). Intersectionality, citizenship and contemporary politics of belonging. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 10(4), 561-574. doi:10.1080/13698230701660220
- Yuval-Davis, N., Anthias, F., and Koffman, E. (2006). Secure borders and safe haven and the gendered politics of belonging: Beyond social cohesion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(3), 513-535. doi:10.1080/0141987042000337867

I. Overview articles dissertation

This dissertation is based on five articles with the following references:

1. Hoekstra, M. (2015). Diverse cities and good citizenship: How local governments in the Netherlands recast national integration discourse. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(10), 1798-1814. doi:10.1080/01419870.2015.1015585
2. Hoekstra, M.S. (2017). Governing difference in the city: Urban imaginaries and the policy practice of migrant incorporation. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, online first. doi:10.1080/21622671.2017.1306456
3. Hoekstra, M.S. and Dahlvik, J. Neighbourhood participation in super-diverse contexts: Comparing Amsterdam and Vienna. *Article submitted for publication in international peer reviewed journal*.
4. Hoekstra, M.S. and Pinkster, F.M. (2017). 'We want to be there for everyone': Imagined spaces of encounter and the politics of place in a super-diverse neighbourhood. *Social and Cultural Geography*, online first. doi:10.1080/14649365.2017.1356362
5. Hoekstra, M.S. Creating good citizens? The governance of neighbourhood community and how residents encounter 'civilizing' policies. *Article submitted for publication in international peer reviewed journal*.

The majority of the work for these articles has been conducted by the first author, who was responsible for the (Dutch) fieldwork, the analysis of the data, and most of the writing. Julia Dahlvik was responsible for the fieldwork in Vienna and the analysis of the Viennese data. Both co-authors provided input on the research design and theoretical framings and contributed to the writing and editing of the chapters. Fenne Pinkster also provided general guidance of the PhD trajectory.

II. Overview of analysed policy documents

City	Year	Title in Dutch	Title in English
Amsterdam	2003	Erbij horen en meedoen: Uitgangspunten voor integratie in de gemeente Amsterdam	Belonging and participating: General principles for integration in the municipality of Amsterdam
Amsterdam	2004	Aanbiedingsbrief diversiteits- en integratiemonitor	Letter regarding the diversity and integration monitor
Amsterdam	2005	Actieplan "Wij Amsterdammers"	Actionplan "We, residents of Amsterdam"
Amsterdam	2006	Wij Amsterdammers II: Investeren in mensen en grenzen	We, residents of Amsterdam II: Investing in people and boundaries
Amsterdam	2006	Mensen maken Amsterdam: Het programma akkoord 2006-2010	People make Amsterdam: Programme agreement 2006-2010
Amsterdam	2010	Kiezen voor de stad. Programma-akkoord 2010-2014	Choosing the city. Programme agreement 2010-2014
Amsterdam	2011	Vluchtelingen in Amsterdam. Beleidsvoornemens voor de periode 2011-2014	Refugees in Amsterdam. Policy proposals for the 2011-2014 period
Amsterdam	2011	Beleidsbrief burgerschap en diversiteit: Geen burgerschap zonder hoffelijkheid	White paper on citizenship and diversity: No citizenship without civility
Amsterdam	2012	Vervolgbrief Amsterdams burgerschap	Follow-up letter on Amsterdam citizenship
Amsterdam	2012	Amsterdam is er klaar mee. Beleid anti-discriminatie 2012-2014	Amsterdam has had enough. Anti-discrimination policy 2012-2014
Amsterdam	2013	Initiatiefvoorstel "vermijd de woorden allochtoon en autochtoon in officiële publicaties van de gemeente Amsterdam: Bestuurlijke reactie	Initiative proposal "avoid the words allochthonous and autochthonous in official publications of the Amsterdam municipality": Reaction of the administration
Amsterdam	2013	Educatie werkt! Amsterdams beleid voor volwasseneneducatie 2013-2015	Education works! Amsterdam policy for adult education 2013-2015
The Hague	2005	Programma interculturalisatie en diversiteit	Interculturalization and diversity programme
The Hague	2005	Zo wij iets zijn, zijn wij Hagaars. Initiatiefvoorstel integratiebeleid	If we are to be anything, we are residents of The Hague. Initiative proposal integration policy
The Hague	2006	Mee doen: Coalitieakkoord 2006-2010	Joining in: Coalition agreement 2006-2010
The Hague	2006	Samen stad zijn. Burgers maken het verschil! Beleidskader burgerschap	Being the city together. Citizens make the difference! White paper on citizenship

The Hague	2010	Aan de slag! Coalitieakkoord 2010-2014	To work! Coalition agreement 2010-2014
The Hague	2011	Verschillend verleden, één toekomst. Hoofdlijnen integratiebeleid 2011-2014	Differing pasts, one future. Integration policy 2011-2014, main directions
The Hague	2011	Plan van aanpak discriminatiebestrijding 2011-2014	Plan of action for combating discrimination 2011-2014
The Hague	2011	Emancipatie 2.0	Emancipation 2.0
The Hague	2012	Voortgangsrapportage integratiebeleid	Integration policy, progress report
The Hague	2012	Voortgangsrapportage EU-arbeidsmigratie	EU labour migration, progress report
The Hague	2012	Kandidatuur culturele hoofdstad van Europa Den Haag 2018	Candidacy for cultural capital of Europe The Hague 2018

III. Topic list interviews policy actors

The following item list was used during the interviews with policy actors. The item list functioned as a jump-off point for in-depth discussion and emphasis was given to specific items depending on the professional role of the interviewee. Therefore, not all interviewees answered all questions and not all interviews were conducted in the same order.

Section	Items
Introduction	Introduction of the research Permission to make tape recording
Professional background	Role within organization
Urban problems	Main issues city faces Issues regarding diversity/integration Issues regarding spatial aspects (e.g. segregation)
Policy content	Overview of current diversity/integration policy Policy aims and objectives History of policy/previous policies Connections/disconnections to previous policies Connections/disconnections to national policies
Policy organization	Actors involved within municipality Actors involved outside municipality
Policy implementation	Projects associated with diversity/integration policy Target group selection and rationale Spatial dimension of implementation Evaluation procedures
Relations between governmental scales	Relations with city districts Relations with national government Relations with other (urban, national) actors
Policy Evaluation	Positive points/successful aspects Negative points/remaining challenges Availability of resources Media policy and media attention Public opinion Evaluation of relations with other relevant organizations
Neighbourhood policy content	Overview of current neighbourhood policy Policy aims History of policy/previous policies Connections/disconnections to previous policies Relation to diversity/integration policy

Neighbourhood policy organization	Actors involved within municipality Actors involved outside municipality Resident participation Evaluation of policy
Vision of the future	Expected future developments Hoped for future developments
Other	Other remarks

IV. Topic list interviews neighbourhood residents

The following item list was used during the interviews with neighbourhood residents, which were conducted by the primary researcher and four student assistants. The interviews were preceded by a standard introduction of the research and the interview procedure.

Introduction

As you know, our research project is about your neighbourhood. I will ask some questions about how long you've lived in this neighbourhood, how you feel about the neighbourhood, your daily life, and things that are organized in the neighbourhood. Of course, this is different for everyone, and these differences between residents are what interests us. There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in your opinion and your personal experiences. (If necessary: reassure respondents that it does not matter if they do not know many people in the neighbourhood, or do not spend a lot of time in the neighbourhood).

Of course, you will remain anonymous and everything you tell us will be confidential. (If necessary: explain we will not use people's names and attempt to make sure that statements cannot be traced back to interviewees). If there are any questions that you'd rather not answer, this is absolutely fine.

The interview will take around an hour. Before we start, I would like to ask you if it's OK to record this conversation. In that way, it's easier for me to talk to you. (If necessary: explain that the tape will only be used for transcribing the interview. If the respondent does not give permission, ask if it is OK to take notes). Before we begin, do you have any questions?

Topic	Items
Neighbourhood description	Length of residence and reason for moving to the neighbourhood First impression of the neighbourhood Comparison to other neighbourhoods/previous places of residence Neighbourhood reputation Changes over time
Neighbourhood diversity	Description of neighbourhood residents Differences between residents Contacts between residents Tensions between residents
Place attachment	Sense of belonging Positive and negative aspects of the neighbourhood Willingness to move Time spent in neighbourhood/daily trajectories Favourite places/places that are avoided
Social embeddedness	Social contacts in the neighbourhood Contacts with direct neighbours Social contacts outside the neighbourhood Diversity of contacts (same/different to self) People/groups that are avoided
Participation	Known organizations/initiatives Participation in initiatives (which/why/why not) Contribution of initiatives to the neighbourhood Benefits of initiatives to self Willingness to become active in neighbourhood Good if others become active in the neighbourhood
Personal characteristics	(if not mentioned before) Age Educational background Occupation Household composition Ethnic/racial/national background (self-identified)
Conclusion	Any other questions/remarks? Any other residents who might be willing to participate? (if not done before, give contact details to respondent)

V. Characteristics of interviewed neighbourhood residents

District	North		New-West		Southeast	
No. of interviewees	27		32		34	
Gender	16	women	17	women	23	women
	11	men	15	men	11	men
Age	1	18-25 years old	5	18-25 years old	3	18-25 years old
	13	25-50 years old	17	25-50 years old	20	25-50 years old
	13	50 and older	10	50 and older	11	50 and older
Ethnicity ¹	13	Dutch	13	Dutch	7	Dutch
	4	Moroccan	5	Moroccan	6	Surinamese
	3	Turkish	5	Turkish	4	Ghanaian
	2	Surinamese	2	Antillean	2	Afghan
	5	Other (American, Austrian, Indian, Senegalese, Thai)	2	Afghan	2	Dominican
			5	Other (Bulgarian, Italian-Dutch, Peruvian, Somalian, Surinamese)	13	Other (Algerian, Antillean, Austrian, Brazilian, Chinese, Iranian, Jordanian, Pakistani-English, Polish, Portuguese, Somalian, Sudanese, Tibetan)
Duration of residence	2	0-5 years	12	0-5 years	4	0-5 years
	6	5-10 years	5	5-10 years	11	5-10 years
	3	10-20 years	5	10-20 years	12	10-20 years
	16	20 years or more	10	20 years or more	7	20 years or more
Occupation status	11	employed ²	10	employed	11	employed
	11	not employed	13	not employed	18	not employed
	4	retired	4	retired	4	retired
	1	student	5	student	1	student

34 Self-identified

35 Including self-employed and part-time employed

Household composition	12	with partner and children	10	with partner and children	8	with partner and children
	6	with partner	4	with partner	6	with partner
	8	single	9	single	6	single
	1	single parent	2	single parent	11	single parent
			3	with other family members	4	with other family members
			4	student household		
Participation	12	participants	14	participants	13	participants
	15	non-participants	18	non-participants	21	non-participants



Summary

Governing diversity, experiencing difference: The politics of belonging in ethnically diverse places

Introduction

This dissertation is concerned with the formulation of Dutch urban discourses on diversity and belonging, their implementation through social policy interventions in ethnically diverse and deprived neighbourhoods, and the influence of such interventions on local experiences of difference and belonging. When belonging is defined as the affective relationship between individuals and their environment, and the politics of belonging as the (discursive) mobilization of such relationships for purposes of inclusion or exclusion, questions arise regarding the interaction between emotional and political aspects of belonging at different levels of scale, and how these can be – and are – influenced by ethnic diversity in particular.

In the Netherlands, diversity relating to migrant background has become broadly perceived as impeding the belonging of particularly the ‘native’ population, spurring a concern with migrants’ cultural assimilation and social cohesion and participation. Urban policies focus in particular on ethnically diverse and socioeconomically deprived neighbourhoods. In these neighbourhoods, policy interventions create local places where residents can meet and participate together in order to prevent alienation and stimulate a shared sense of belonging. However, studies on how residents encounter difference and experience belonging in their everyday lives show a wide range of possible outcomes: from neighbourhoods where diversity has become an unremarkable part of everyday life to intense competition over the use of neighbourhood spaces and local place identity. These findings point to the importance of analysing how particular cities and neighbourhoods produce particular experiences of (not)belonging, and how these local experiences relate to wider power relations and inequalities.

Research questions

The empirical chapters 2 to 6 together address the main research question:

How does the governance of diversity through urban and neighbourhood policies influence residents’ lived experiences of difference and belonging?

This question was divided into three sub-questions:

1. How does diversity feature in municipal discourses of belonging, and how does this relate to national policy discourses?
2. How are municipal discourses of belonging translated into policy interventions in ethnically diverse and deprived neighbourhoods?
3. How do neighbourhood policy interventions in the form of social cohesion projects influence residents' experience of difference and their neighbourhood belonging?

Chapter 2 addresses the first sub-question, chapter 3 addresses the second sub-question, and chapters 4, 5, and 6 address the third sub-question.

Research methodology

The design of the research was that of the (multiple) comparative case study. In the first part of the research, migrant policy discourses and policy practices in the Dutch cities of Amsterdam and The Hague were compared. These two cities were selected because they are both large and nationally prominent cities, in which a (small) majority of the population are first- or second generation migrants. However, diversity is valued rather positively in Amsterdam policy discourse, while in The Hague it is problematized much more. The comparative analysis is based on policy documents and semi-structured interviews with policy actors in both cities.

Within Amsterdam, three neighbourhoods were selected for an in-depth analysis of the influence of policy interventions on residents' experience of difference and belonging. The three case study neighbourhoods differ in terms of their resident population (all are highly diverse, but their ethnic composition varies), their built environment, and their location. All three neighbourhoods participated in the main area-based urban policies implemented in Amsterdam over the 2008-2014 period. The analysis is based on semi-structured interviews with 93 residents in total – both residents who participated in selected policy interventions and non-participants – and participant observation within spaces of selected policy interventions and in the broader neighbourhood. In addition, 26 'neighbourhood experts' were interviewed and policy documents and media reports were analysed.

Part I. Governing diversity: Comparing urban politics of belonging

Chapter 2: Diverse cities and good citizenship: How local governments in the Netherlands recast the national integration discourse

Chapter 2 investigates the relationship between national and urban discourses of belonging in the form of policies on migrant incorporation. Policy discourse at the Dutch national level focuses on migrants' cultural assimilation. Amsterdam and The Hague both depart from this exclusionary narrative. Diversity and urban citizenship are central to the discourses of these cities. The chapter demonstrates that in Amsterdam, diversity is conceptualized as positive and of (economic) value to the city. Urban citizenship is presented as an inclusive identity category that offers opportunities for a shared identification with the city, independent of one's ethnic or national background. In The Hague in contrast, diversity is viewed more negatively and migrants are exhorted to integrate into urban society. Urban citizenship in The Hague is more concerned with the duties of (in particular migrant) residents than with shared rights.

Chapter 3: Governing difference in the city: Urban imaginaries and the policy practice of migrant incorporation

Chapter 3 examines how urban policy actors in Amsterdam and The Hague organize policy practice according to their understanding of the diverse city. Despite an overarching policy discourse, policy practices are found to be rather fragmented. Nevertheless, in both cities a distinctive approach can be identified based on city-specific imaginaries or tacitly shared imaginations about the place of migrants in the urban community. These imaginaries influence which policy problems are identified and which solutions are considered appropriate and feasible. In Amsterdam, the city's self-understanding as self-evidently diverse yet spatially undivided contributes to an approach where diversity is celebrated at the city level, while it is viewed as unremarkable at the neighbourhood level. In contrast, in The Hague ethnic and income segregation are viewed as major problems. Achieving integration requires paying attention to group-specific policy needs both at the level of the city and in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods.

Part II. Experiencing difference: Policy interventions and neighbourhood belonging

Chapter 4: Neighbourhood participation in super-diverse contexts: Comparing Amsterdam and Vienna

Chapter 4 compares a Viennese and an Amsterdam neighbourhood in order to explore the influence of the national and urban institutional context on neighbourhood policies and subsequently on the design of local spaces of encounter. The chapter asks how residents experience local spaces of encounter and how this influences their experience of the neighbourhood. The findings show that there is a mismatch between the aims of local policies on the one hand and the experiences of residents on the other hand. Whereas neighbourhood policies seek to create ‘thick’ forms of community – and design local projects accordingly – residents find that neighbourhood interventions mostly result in increased superficial, fleeting contacts. These contacts are experienced positively as they contribute to public familiarity and thereby strengthen residents’ neighbourhood belonging. More sustained encounters on the other hand run the risk of generating conflicts between residents – which occurs when residents organize along lines of ethnicity or language and thereby exclude others – and between residents and professionals, when volunteers demand more (including financial) recognition from institutional partners than these are willing or able to give.

Chapter 5: ‘We want to be there for everyone’: Imagined spaces of encounter and the politics of place in a super-diverse neighbourhood

Chapter 5 investigates how residents’ neighbourhood belonging is informed by competing claims on a neighbourhood centre. This centre was intended as an inclusive facility but is not experienced as such in practice. Residents’ attachments to the centre are formed along intersecting lines of ethnicity, class, gender, and religion, and shifted over time as a result of funding decisions by the local government. Residents’ claims on the centre are also indirectly about who can determine the neighbourhood’s changing place identity (which has shifted from white working-class area to multicultural and deprived to standing on the brink of gentrification). Therefore, their encounters in and around the centre also affect their sense of belonging to the wider neighbourhood. Governing institutions thus help shape these informal politics of place in this neighbourhood. Through their assessment of which resident groups are best positioned to organize inclusive activities, given the neighbourhood’s changing character, they implement their own vision for the area’s future.

Chapter 6: Creating good citizens? The governance of neighbourhood community and how residents encounter 'civilizing' policies

Chapter 6 asks how policy notions of active citizenship correspond to residents' emotional geographies. While policy interventions target residents' presumed alienation from each other and 'mainstream' white middle class society, the findings demonstrate that residents do experience a sense of neighbourhood belonging based on their appreciation of diversity and their engagement in informal practices of social support. However, these activities fall short of the more 'thick' forms of community that are prescribed by urban policies. Staff responsible for carrying out policy interventions mediate different citizenship conceptions by creating personal relations with participants. These relationships resulted in empathetic and reciprocal interactions which helped turn the space of the neighbourhood intervention into a place of care and support. However, the personal and emotional character of these encounters sometimes also worked to reinforce dominant interpretations of 'good' citizenship, as staff on the ground judged participants based on whether they display 'appropriate' motivations and demeanour.

Conclusion and discussion

This dissertation has shown how formations of belonging are constituted through place. Chapter 1 introduced the concept of belonging and situated the research within the literature on (local) integration policies and urban governance as well as within studies on residents' encounters with difference and sense of belonging. Chapters 2 and 3 analysed the divergence of urban discourses of belonging in Amsterdam and The Hague from the Dutch national discourse and provided insight into their local specificity as well as their translation into policy practice. Chapters 4 to 6 provided insight into the influence of local policy interventions on residents' lived experiences of difference and their neighbourhood belonging. These chapters also demonstrated how material and social neighbourhood contexts shape formations of belonging.

Taken together, the findings show how the politics of belonging is influenced by particular place characteristics. Urban politics of belonging are co-constituted through imaginaries of the urban community and interactions in local spaces of encounter are influenced by local place identities as well as broader neighbourhood developments. Furthermore, the dissertation contributes to knowledge about how residents experience difference in ethnically diverse places. Residents' sense of belonging was found to be affected by the ethnic and physical characteristics of the neighbourhood, its place history and identity, and the actions of local

governing officials. Finally, it is argued that local policy interventions should be seen as political acts as they sanction particular forms of belonging while ignoring or overwriting others, resulting in (new) divisions between residents. In addition, these interventions should be placed in a broader perspective that takes into account inequalities stemming from economic and political processes at higher spatial scales.

Returning to the question of belonging and its political possibilities, it is concluded that although belonging is often considered a more progressive alternative to identity and identity politics, the experience of belonging to a particular place is always structured by broader socio-political imaginaries and power relations which confine the ways in which belonging can be experienced. This is arguably the reason that – as this dissertation has shown – attempts to formulate more inclusive politics of belonging remain dependent on the delineation of an Other who belongs less, and neighbourhood belonging is primarily experienced in contrast to situations and places where one does not belong.

Samenvatting

Diversiteit besturen en ervaren: De politiek van thuisgevoel en thuishoren³⁶ op etnisch diverse plekken

Inleiding

Dit proefschrift gaat over Nederlandse stedelijke discoursen over diversiteit en thuisgevoel, de implementatie van deze discoursen door middel van sociale beleidsinterventies in etnisch diverse en gedepriveerde buurten, en de invloed van dergelijke interventies op lokale ervaringen van thuisgevoel in de buurt. Thuisgevoel wordt hier gedefinieerd als de affectieve relatie tussen individuen en hun omgeving, en de politiek van zich thuis voelen als de (discursive) mobilisering van thuisgevoel om insluiting of uitsluiting van bepaalde groepen te bewerkstelligen. Deze definitie roept vragen op over hoe de emotionele en politieke aspecten van thuis voelen op verschillende schaalniveaus zich tot elkaar verhouden, en hoe deze (kunnen) worden beïnvloed door met name etnische diversiteit.

In Nederland wordt migratie-gerelateerde diversiteit algemeen gezien als belemmerend voor het thuisgevoel van met name de 'oorspronkelijke' bevolking. De bezorgdheid hierover leidt tot beleidsmaatregelen die de culturele assimilatie van migranten stimuleren evenals de sociale cohesie en participatie van burgers in het algemeen. Deze inspanningen richten zich met name op etnisch diverse en sociaaleconomisch gedepriveerde buurten. Beleidsinterventies in deze buurten in de vorm van plekken waar bewoners elkaar kunnen ontmoeten en samen kunnen participeren zouden vervreemding voorkomen en zorgen voor een gedeeld thuisgevoel. Wetenschappelijke studies naar hoe bewoners diversiteit ervaren in hun dagelijks leven en hoe dit hun thuisgevoel beïnvloedt, laten echter een breed scala aan mogelijke uitkomsten zien: van buurten waar diversiteit een weinig opmerkelijk onderdeel van het dagelijks leven is geworden tot buurten waar intense competitie tussen groepen bewoners over lokale identiteit en het gebruik van gedeelde plekken in de buurt plaatsvindt. Deze tegenstrijdige bevindingen wijzen op het belang van een analyse die laat zien hoe lokale ervaringen van thuisgevoel (of het ontbreken hiervan) ontstaan in de specifieke context van steden en buurten en hoe deze ervaringen worden gevormd door bredere machtsrelaties en ongelijkheden.

36 Dit proefschrift gebruikt het Engelse concept *belonging*. Dit concept omvat zowel het gevoel ergens thuis te zijn (thuis voelen) als het gevoel ergens te moeten of mogen zijn (thuishoren). De interactie van deze twee dimensies staat centraal in dit onderzoek.

Onderzoeksvragen

De empirische hoofdstukken 2 tot en met 6 bespreken samen de overkoepelende onderzoeksvraag:

Hoe beïnvloedt het besturen van diversiteit door middel van stedelijk en buurtbeleid de geleefde ervaringen van bewoners ten aanzien van diversiteit en thuisgevoel?

Deze vraag is onderverdeeld in drie deelvragen:

1. Welke rol speelt diversiteit in gemeentelijke discoursen van thuisgevoel en hoe verhouden deze discoursen zich tot het nationale beleidsdiscours?
2. Hoe worden gemeentelijke discoursen van thuisgevoel vertaald naar beleidsinterventies in etnisch diverse en gedepreiveerde buurten?
3. Hoe beïnvloeden beleidsinterventies in de buurt in de vorm van sociale cohesieprojecten de ervaring van diversiteit door bewoners en hun thuisgevoel in de buurt?

De eerste deelvraag wordt besproken in hoofdstuk 2. De tweede deelvraag wordt besproken in hoofdstuk 3, en de derde deelvraag komt aan bod in de hoofdstukken 4, 5 en 6.

Onderzoeksmethodiek

Het onderzoek is ontworpen als (meervoudige) vergelijkende case study. In het eerste deel van het onderzoek worden beleidsdiscoursen over migranten en de beleidspraktijk in de Nederlandse steden Amsterdam en Den Haag vergeleken. Deze steden zijn geselecteerd omdat ze beide groot en nationaal prominent zijn, en omdat een (kleine) meerderheid van de bevolking in beide steden bestaat uit eerste- en tweedegeneratie migranten. Diversiteit wordt echter tamelijk positief gewaardeerd in Amsterdam, terwijl het in Den Haag veel meer geproblematiseerd wordt. De vergelijkende analyse is gebaseerd op beleidsdocumenten en semigestructureerde interviews met beleidsactoren in beide steden.

In Amsterdam zijn drie buurten geselecteerd voor een diepgaande analyse naar de invloed van beleidsinterventies op hoe bewoners diversiteit en thuisgevoel ervaren. De drie geselecteerde buurten hebben een verschillende bevolkingssamenstelling (alle drie zijn ze heel divers, maar de etnische compositie verschilt). Tevens verschillen ze wat betreft hun bebouwde omgeving en hun locatie in de stad. Alle drie de buurten vormden het onderwerp van de belangrijkste gebiedsgerichte beleidsmaatregelen

die in Amsterdam zijn geïmplementeerd in de periode 2008-2014. De analyse is gebaseerd op semigestructureerde interviews met in totaal 93 bewoners – zowel bewoners die participeerden in de geselecteerde beleidsinterventies als bewoners die niet participeerden – en op participerende observatie bij beleidsinterventies en in de bredere buurt. Daarnaast zijn 26 ‘buurtxperts’ geïnterviewd en zijn beleidsdocumenten en mediaverslagen geanalyseerd.

Deel I. Het besturen van diversiteit: Een vergelijking tussen twee varianten van stedelijke politiek met betrekking tot thuis voelen

Hoofdstuk 2: Diverse steden en goed burgerschap: Hoe lokale Nederlandse overheden het nationale integratiediscours omvormen

In hoofdstuk 2 wordt de relatie tussen nationale en stedelijke discourses over thuis voelen onderzocht. Het gaat hierbij om verschillen in beleid dat gericht is op de incorporatie van migranten, en specifiek over hoe de concepten diversiteit en (stedelijk) burgerschap hierbij worden gebruikt. Terwijl op het nationale niveau in Nederland de nadruk ligt op de culturele assimilatie van migranten, wijken zowel Amsterdam als Den Haag in hun beleidsdiscoursen af van dit uitsluitende narratief. Dit hoofdstuk laat zien dat diversiteit in Amsterdam wordt geconceptualiseerd als positief en van (economische) waarde voor de stad. Stadsburgerschap wordt gepresenteerd als inclusieve identiteitscategorie, die mogelijkheden biedt voor een gedeelde identificatie met de stad, los van etnische of nationale achtergrond. In Den Haag daarentegen wordt diversiteit meer negatief bezien en worden migranten aangespoord te integreren in de Haagse samenleving. Stadsburgerschap gaat dan ook in grotere mate over de plichten die bewoners, en met name migranten, hebben ten opzichte van de overheid dan over hun rechten.

Hoofdstuk 3: Het besturen van stedelijke diversiteit: Verbeeldingen van de stad en de beleidspraktijk rond de incorporatie van migranten

In hoofdstuk 3 wordt gekeken naar stedelijke beleidsactoren en hoe zij de beleidspraktijk organiseren. In het hoofdstuk wordt geconstateerd dat ondanks een overkoepelend lokaal beleidsdiscours de beleidspraktijk in Amsterdam en Den Haag gefragmenteerd is. Desalniettemin kan in beide steden een kenmerkende aanpak worden geïdentificeerd die is gebaseerd op stad-specifieke verbeeldingen van de stad. Deze verbeeldingen bestaan uit ideeën over het karakter van de stad in verleden, heden en toekomst. Toegepast op migratiebeleid gaat het dan over stilzwijgend gedeelde ideeën over de plek die migranten in de stedelijke gemeenschap (kunnen)

innemen. Deze verbeeldingen beïnvloeden welke beleidsproblemen worden geconstateerd en welke oplossingen voor deze problemen geschikt en haalbaar worden geacht. In Amsterdam draagt het zelfbeeld van de stad als vanzelfsprekend divers maar toch (ruimtelijk) ongedeeld bij aan een aanpak waarbij diversiteit op het niveau van de stad wordt gevierd, terwijl het op het niveau van de buurt niet wordt gezien als een relevant beleidsobject. In Den Haag daarentegen worden etnische en inkomenssegregatie gezien als belangrijke problemen. Om integratie te bewerkstelligen, moet aandacht worden gegeven aan de specifieke beleidsbehoeften van etnische groepen, zowel op stedelijk niveau als in etnisch diverse buurten.

Deel II. Het ervaren van diversiteit: Beleidsinterventies en thuisgevoel in de buurt

Hoofdstuk 4: Buurtparticipatie in super-diverse contexten: Een vergelijking tussen Amsterdam en Wenen

In hoofdstuk 4 worden een Weense en een Amsterdamse buurt vergeleken. Het doel van deze vergelijking is een verkennung van de rol die de stedelijke en nationale beleidscontext speelt bij het vaststellen van buurtbeleid en het vervolgens ontwerpen van lokale ontmoetingsplekken. In dit hoofdstuk wordt onderzocht hoe bewoners lokale ontmoetingsplekken ervaren en hoe hun interacties op deze plekken hun ervaring van de buurt beïnvloeden. De bevindingen laten zien dat er een mismatch is tussen de beleidsdoelen van de lokale overheid enerzijds en de ervaringen van bewoners anderzijds. Terwijl buurtbeleid als doel heeft om hechte gemeenschapsvormen te creëren – en lokale projecten met dit doel te ontwerpen – ervaren bewoners met name een toename in oppervlakkige en vluchtlige contacten. Deze contacten resulteren in meer publieke familiariteit in de buurt en versterken hierdoor het thuisgevoel van bewoners. Contacten die diepgaander zijn daarentegen dragen het risico in zich dat er conflicten ontstaan tussen bewoners – wanneer verschillende bewonergroepen zich organiseren op basis van etniciteit of taal en hierdoor anderen uitsluiten – en tussen bewoners en professionals, wanneer vrijwilligers meer (financiële) erkenning eisen van hun institutionele partners dan deze bereid of in staat zijn te geven.

Hoofdstuk 5: ‘We willen er voor iedereen zijn’: Veronderstelde ontmoetingsplekken en plaatsgebonden politiek in een super-diverse buurt

In hoofdstuk 5 wordt onderzocht hoe het thuisgevoel van buurtbewoners wordt beïnvloed door de concurrerende aanspraken die verschillende groeperingen leggen

op een specifiek buurtcentrum. Dit buurtcentrum was bedoeld als een inclusieve faciliteit, maar dit wordt in de praktijk niet als zodanig ervaren. De gehechtheid van bewoners aan het centrum wordt bepaald door hun etniciteit, klasse, gender en religie, en door combinaties van deze kenmerken, en veranderde door de jaren heen als gevolg van subsidiebeslissingen van de lokale overheid. De aanspraken van bewoners op het centrum gaan indirect ook over wie de veranderende identiteit van de buurt mag bepalen. Deze identiteit veranderde door de jaren heen van een witte arbeidersbuurt naar multicultureel en gedepriveerd naar beginnende gentrificatie. Om deze reden beïnvloeden interacties in en rondom het centrum ook het thuisgevoel van bewoners in de bredere buurt. Overheidsinstanties geven mede vorm aan deze informele plaatsgebonden politiek in de buurt. Door hun beslissingen over welke bewonersgroepen het best gepositioneerd zijn om inclusieve activiteiten te organiseren, die plaatsvinden tegen de achtergrond van het veranderende karakter van de buurt, implementeren ze hun eigen visie op de toekomst van de buurt.

Hoofdstuk 6: Het creëren van goede burgers? Het bestuur van de buurt als gemeenschap en hoe bewoners in contact komen met ‘beschavend’ beleid

In hoofdstuk 6 wordt de vraag gesteld hoe beleidsideeën over actief burgerschap zich verhouden tot de emotionele geografieën van bewoners. Terwijl beleidsinterventies zich richten op de veronderstelde vervreemding van bewoners van elkaar en van de ‘mainstream’ witte middenklasse-samenleving, laten de bevindingen in dit hoofdstuk zien dat bewoners zich wel degelijk thuis voelen in de buurt. Dit thuisgevoel is gebaseerd op hun waardering voor de diversiteit van de buurt en hun betrokkenheid bij informele netwerken die sociale ondersteuning bieden. Deze activiteiten voldoen echter niet aan de meer hechte vormen van gemeenschap die als wenselijk wordt beoordeeld en waarvan het ontbreken wordt vastgesteld in stedelijk beleid. Buurtwerkers die betrokken zijn bij lokale beleidsinterventies – met name het buurtcentrum – staan tussen deze verschillende opvattingen over burgerschap in. Tijdens hun activiteiten creëren ze persoonlijke relaties met deelnemers. Deze relaties kunnen resulteren in empathische en gelijkwaardige interacties, waardoor de ruimte van de buurinterventie een plaats kan worden waar zorg en steun geboden wordt. Maar het persoonlijke en emotionele karakter van deze ontmoetingen kan soms ook dominante interpretaties van ‘goed’ burgerschap versterken, aangezien buurtwerkers de deelnemers beoordelen op basis van de impliciete beoordeling of zij de gewenste motivaties en ‘correct’ gedrag vertonen.

Conclusie en discussie

Dit proefschrift heeft laten zien hoe thuisgevoel wordt gevormd door de plaats waar men zich bevindt. Stedelijke en buurtcontext beïnvloeden zo hoe thuisgevoel wordt ervaren. Hoofdstuk 1 introduceerde het concept thuisgevoel en situeerde het onderzoek in de literatuur over (lokaal) integratiebeleid en stedelijk bestuur, evenals in studies naar de ontmoetingen van bewoners met ‘anderen’ en hun thuisgevoel. In de hoofdstukken 2 en 3 is geanalyseerd hoe stedelijke discoursen van thuisgevoel in Amsterdam en Den Haag afwijken van het Nederlandse nationale discours. In deze hoofdstukken is het locatie-specifieke karakter van deze discoursen inzichtelijk gemaakt evenals hun vertaling naar de beleidspraktijk. Hoofdstukken 4 tot en met 6 bespraken de invloed van lokale beleidsinterventies op de geleefde ervaringen van diversiteit en thuisgevoel in de buurt. Deze hoofdstukken lieten ook zien hoe ervaringen van je (niet) thuis voelen beïnvloed worden door de materiële en sociale kenmerken van de buurt.

De bevindingen in dit proefschrift laten zien dat de politiek van thuisgevoel wordt beïnvloed door specifieke plaatsgebonden kenmerken. Dit proefschrift laat zien dat de stedelijke politiek van thuisgevoel mede wordt vormgegeven door verbeeldingen van de stedelijke gemeenschap en dat interacties in lokale ontmoetingsplekken worden beïnvloed door de identiteit van de buurt en door bredere ontwikkelingen. Daarnaast draagt dit proefschrift bij aan kennis over hoe bewoners van etnisch diverse plekken diversiteit ervaren. Het thuisgevoel van bewoners wordt beïnvloed door de etnische en fysieke kenmerken van de buurt, de buurtgeschiedenis en – identiteit en de handelswijze van lokale ambtenaren. Ten slotte wordt gesteld dat lokale beleidsinterventies gezien moeten worden als politieke ingrepen, omdat ze bepaalde vormen van thuisgevoel sanctioneren terwijl andere worden genegeerd of overschreven. Op deze manier kunnen lokale beleidsinterventies leiden tot het ontstaan van (nieuwe) scheidslijnen tussen bewoners. Bovendien moeten deze interventies in een breder perspectief worden geplaatst, waarbij ook rekening wordt gehouden met ongelijkwaardigheid tussen bewoners die voortkomt uit economische en politieke processen die plaatsvinden op hogere schaalniveaus.

Terugkerend naar de vraag wat de politieke mogelijkheden van thuisgevoel zijn, kan worden geconcludeerd dat hoewel thuisgevoel vaak wordt beschouwd als een progressiever alternatief voor identiteit en identiteitspolitiek, de ervaring van je thuis voelen en thuishoren op een specifieke plek altijd wordt gevormd door bredere sociaal-politieke denkbeelden en machtsrelaties die de manieren waarop dit thuisgevoel kan worden ervaren, beperken. Dit is wellicht de reden – zoals dit proefschrift heeft laten

zien – dat pogingen om te komen tot een meer inclusieve politiek van thuisgevoel afhankelijk blijven van het aanwijzen van een Ander die ergens minder thuis hoort, en dat thuisgevoel in de buurt voornamelijk wordt ervaren in de vergelijking met andere situaties en plaatsen waar men zich niet thuis voelt.