



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Soulmates: Reinvention of ethnic identification among higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch

Slootman, M.W.

Publication date

2014

Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Slootman, M. W. (2014). *Soulmates: Reinvention of ethnic identification among higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch*. [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.

5. 'Am I Dutch? Yes. Am I Moroccan? Yes.' Two dimensions of self- identification explored

How do second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch climbers identify in terms of ethnic and national labels? And what does feeling 'Moroccan', 'Turkish' and 'Dutch' mean to them?

In the previous chapter we read that in the Netherlands an integration discourse gained ground that increasingly demanded immigrants to assimilate in sociocultural terms. This included an emotional identification with the Netherlands, which is often formulated to be in opposition to identification as 'Moroccan' or 'Turkish'. In chapter 2, we have read that such groupist views also occasionally slip into academic studies, often unintentionally. As I explained, in these groupist views, identification with someone's ethnicity is 'assumed to be an automatic instance of retention' (Gans 1997: 881), or even seen as an automatic consequence of 'cultural stuff' and a cohesive ethnic community. Therefore, like in the Dutch integration discourse, ethnic identification is often assumed to threaten one's incorporation into the society of residence. As an illustration, I mentioned the Dutch discussion about double nationalities in 2012, which was rooted in the fear that having a double nationality suppresses 'loyalty' to Dutch society and hampers 'integration'. This fear is based on 'thick' and comprehensive notions of identification and culture, and on the view that ethnic and national orientations are mutually exclusive. How accurate is this assumption that ethnic and national identifications reflect a broader sociocultural orientation? In other words, how accurate is the assumption that identification with a specific label reflects a certain content?

In this chapter I analyze to what extent this is the case among the higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch. I first focus on their identifications. Do the second generation climbers that I study identify with the ethnic labels at all, or did their ethnic identification wane throughout their climbs? How accurate is the assumption that ethnic identification threatens their national identification? I then study what it means when they identify as 'Moroccan' or

‘Turkish’, or as ‘Dutch’. To what extent does identification with a label reflect a broader sociocultural content?

Let us look at some expressions of ethnic and national identifications in the in-depth interviews:

Am I Dutch: Yes. Am I Moroccan: Yes. I think I’m even more Dutch than Moroccan. But I have elements of both. (Imane)

(...) whereas inside, I feel like a Dutch Moroccan, both. (Ahmed)

Marieke: Do you think of yourself as – do you feel ‘Dutch’?

Karim: Yes.

Marieke: Are you ‘Dutch’?

Karim: Yes.

Marieke: AND ‘Moroccan’?

Karim: Yes.

Marieke: More... or less...?

Karim: Less. Less. Less Moroccan. I am ALSO Moroccan. But less. Uh... I don’t want to be called Moroccan anymore, actually. Let’s just say I’m a critical Dutchman.

I think I’m, well... (coughs) – in my way of thinking, I’m sixty percent Dutch, and I can’t let go of that forty percent (...) Because when I am in Turkey I feel REALLY Dutch. But when I am here, I CANNOT say I feel REALLY Turkish. (...) So, I think that is why I make the Turkish part smaller. (Esra)

All participants expressed, either spontaneously or in response to explicit questions, that they feel Moroccan or Turkish. Also, they said they feel Dutch. Some described these identifications in hierarchical terms, while others did not. Only Nathalie stated that she solely identifies with the Dutch label, which is partly related to her mixed ethnic background:

Marieke: And earlier, you said – uh...: ‘I am Dutch’. You are – When I ask you about your ethnicity: then you say you are Dutch?

Nathalie: Yes. Yes, absolutely. I have a Moroccan father and a Dutch – um – Polish mother.

Marieke: And you would never consider calling yourself Moroccan?

Nathalie: No.

Marieke: Or Polish?

Nathalie: No – yes, exactly! That’s also another thing... What are you then? Moroccan or Polish? No.

It is hard to compare the participants’ identifications with each other because no absolute measures were used in the in-depth interviews to assess the strength of

these identifications. The TIES data offers this possibility. Based on the TIES data, we can study how larger selections of higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch report on their ethnic and national identifications in a structured survey. We can analyze for a larger group to what extent ethnic and national identifications are combined, and test the assumption that the two dimensions are zero-sum. We can also study whether differences exist between the higher educated Moroccan and Turkish Dutch, and between men and women, and if higher educated differ from lower educated. This will be discussed in the first part of the chapter, which focuses on the levels of identification among the TIES respondents (5.1).

In the second and third part of the chapter, I explore the relation between label and content. I explore what it means if people identify as Moroccan or Turkish, based on the TIES data (5.2) and on the in-depth interviews (5.3). I explore to what extent it is true that identification with the ethnic label reflects a broader sociocultural co-ethnic orientation, or even reflects an orientation towards an internally coherent, bounded 'Moroccan' or 'Turkish' culture. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the findings, reflecting on the adequacy of objectivist views, as they dominate in the Dutch discourse and occur in scholastic literature, to capture phenomena such as ethnic and national identifications (5.4).

5.1 Identification with the ethnic and national labels

As we have read in chapter 2, theories on immigrant incorporation vary in the relevance and role they attach to ethnic identification. Classical models depart from the idea that ethnic identification becomes less relevant throughout processes of incorporation. Segmented assimilation argues that upwards mobility does not preclude ethnic identification, as for many, a co-ethnic orientation provides crucial resources for their mobility. I start the exploration of my empirical data with an analysis of the strength of ethnic identification among higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch. I also analyze to what extent ethnic identification is combined with identification with the national label 'Dutch'. Are these two dimensions zero-sum? In the quotes above, we already saw that in the in-depth interviews, nearly all participants identified in ethnic terms. We also saw that in these cases, this was always combined with them 'feeling Dutch'. Is this indicative for a larger group? How do ethnic background, gender and education levels influence the levels of ethnic and national identification?

Although the participants of the in-depth interviews are university educated, the selection for the statistical analyses also contains TIES respondents with higher vocational education (*HBO*) (see table 5.1) to ensure a large enough selection.

This is also why the selection of higher educated ('HE') respondents includes both respondents who have completed their degrees at these levels of education and respondents who are currently enrolled in higher education. Considering the composition of the TIES data, the TIES respondents are generally younger than the participants of the in-depth interviews, who are all over 30 years old. The statistical analyses only include respondents whose parents are *both* born in Morocco or Turkey, to avoid discussions on the effect of having a mixed ethnic background. It turns out that having a mixed ethnic background significantly influences one's ethnic identification (see Appendix C, tables 1 and 2). This is not surprising because for people with mixed ethnic backgrounds, their Moroccan or Turkish origins are only half of their ethnic stories, as Nathalie's quote illustrated. The effect of a mixed ethnic background is not a theme of this study.

**Table 5.1 Composition of sample higher educated respondents¹
(in % of the total ethnic category)**

	Mor	Tur	CG
Total Higher Educated (N) (=100%)	123	125	308
Male (%)	46	54	47
Female (%)	54	46	53
Higher vocational (HBO) (%)	75	72	47
University (%)	25	28	53
Still in school (%)	76	65	41
Finished (with diploma) (%)	24	35	59
Age <30 (%)	92	81	61
Age 30+ (%)	8	19	39
Average age	23.4	24.9	27.8

1) Only respondents with mono-ethnic backgrounds; excluded are 13 Moroccan and 7 Turkish Dutch higher educated respondents with mixed ethnic backgrounds.

'CG' = Control group, consisting of ethnic Dutch respondents. Higher educated = HBO+.

Source: TIES survey for the Netherlands, 2007, NIDI and IMES


Levels of ethnic and national identification

The TIES questionnaire contained several questions about one's affiliation with certain labels. The questions that relate to ethnic and national identification are: 'To what extent do you feel Moroccan/ Turkish?' and 'To what extent do you feel Dutch?' The answering options ranged from not at all/very weak (value: 1) to very strong (value: 5). The results for the three ethnic categories in the survey are displayed in table 5.2. As we do not know what the answers meant to the individual respondents, I do not attach broader meanings to the answers given to

'Am I Dutch? Yes. Am I Moroccan? Yes.'
Two dimensions of self-identification explored

these questions on identification. The answers are solely seen as expressions of affiliations with a certain label.

Table 5.2 Strength of identification with ethnic and national labels (HE, per ethnic category)¹



1) Only HE respondents with mono-ethnic backgrounds. HE=higher educated (HBO+)
Source: TIES survey for the Netherlands, 2007, NIDI and IMES

The first observation is that the higher educated Moroccan and Turkish Dutch more strongly identify with their ethnic labels than with the Dutch label. Among both groups, around eighty percent have a strong affiliation with the ethnic label, whereas around forty percent feel strongly Dutch. The respondents' affiliations with the ethnic label do not differ between the Moroccan and Turkish Dutch ($\gamma = -.041$; $p = .713$).ⁱ The strength of ethnic identification among the second generation respondents is nearly equal to the control group's identification as Dutch. As for the latter, the label Dutch does not only refer to their country of residence but also to their ethnicity, we can say that ethnic identifications are roughly equally strong for all three ethnic groups.

The second observation is that the higher educated second generation respondents identify relatively weakly with the label Dutch. Not only is their affiliation with the Dutch label weaker than their ethnic identification, but their affiliation with the label Dutch is also much weaker than the affiliation of the ethnic Dutch respondents. This applies to both the Moroccan Dutch respondents ($\gamma = .634$, $p < .005$) and the Turkish Dutch respondents ($\gamma = .688$, $p < .005$). Moroccans identify slightly stronger as Dutch than Turkish Dutch, but this difference is not significant ($\gamma = .105$, $p = .300$). This does not mean that their identifications as Dutch overall are weak, as around 40% of the Moroccan and Turkish participants indicated that they feel Dutch to a strong extent and roughly three-quarters feel Dutch in a neutral or strong way.

In addition, the data shows that these identifications among the higher educated do not significantly differ from the lower educated. That means that the difference in sociocultural orientation between lower and higher educated individuals as described in the previous chapter is not reflected in the identifications with the ethnic and national label. Although the higher educated participants (HBO+) identify slightly weaker with their ethnic labels than the lower educated TIES respondents, these differences are only small and are not significant (see table 5.3). Among both the lower and higher educated Moroccan Dutch, 82% have strong ethnic identifications. For the Turkish Dutch, these percentages among the lower and higher educated are 81% and 78%. In their identifications with the Dutch label, the differences are even smaller.

Table 5.3 Differences between higher (HBO+) and lower educated Moroccan and Turkish Dutch (per ethnic category)¹

Ident. with	Edu (HBO+ or lower)	1 Not/very weak	2 Weak	3 Neutral	4 Strong	5 Very strong	N (=100%)	Mean	Gamma (p)	
Mor	Ethnic label	lower	2%	2%	13%	37%	45%	231	4.2	-.163 (.085)
		HBO+	2%	3%	14%	48%	34%	107	4.1	
	NL label	lower	11%	10%	39%	26%	14%	237	3.2	.029 (.731)
		HBO+	8%	11%	36%	35%	9%	110	3.3	
Tur	Ethnic label	lower	2%	3%	15%	31%	50%	255	4.2	-.143 (.121)
		HBO+	5%	3%	15%	37%	41%	111	4.1	
	NL label	lower	11%	13%	39%	28%	9%	247	3.1	.015 (.864)
		HBO+	8%	18%	34%	32%	7%	111	3.1	
CG	NL label	lower	2%	2%	15%	39%	42%	168	4.2	.035 (.661)
	HBO+	1%	3%	16%	42%	39%	296	4.1		

1) Only respondents with mono-ethnic backgrounds

Source: TIES survey for the Netherlands, 2007, NIDI and IMES

**Table 5.4 Combinations of ethnic and national identification¹
(in % of the total higher educated ethnic selection)**

	Mor (N=104)	... with Dutch label			Tur (N=109)	... with Dutch label		
		Weak	Neutral	Strong		Weak	Neutral	Strong
... with ethnic label	Weak ²	2%	0%	3%	Weak	5%	0%	2%
	Neutral	0%	10%	4%	Neutral	4%	7%	5%
	Strong	17%	26%	38%	Strong	17%	27%	34%

1) Only HE respondents with mono-ethnic backgrounds. HE=higher educated (HBO+)

2) 'Weak' includes 'not at all', 'very weak' and 'weak'; 'Strong' includes 'strong' and 'very strong'

Source: TIES survey for the Netherlands, 2007, NIDI and IMES

Furthermore, a strong identification as Moroccan or Turkish does not preclude identification as Dutch (see table 5.4). Roughly 75% of the higher educated second generation combine a neutral to strong ethnic and a neutral to strong

national identification. Around a third of the second generation higher educated respondents even combined a strong ethnic identification with a strong identification as Dutch. There is no significant correlation between ethnic and national identifications, either among Moroccan Dutch ($r = -.067$, $p = .497$) or Turkish Dutch higher educated respondents ($r = .153$, $p = .113$).

Gender and education

Regarding the identification with the ethnic label, the large majority of the higher educated second generation is in unison. Over two thirds of both ethnic categories (very) strongly identify with the ethnic label. However, this still means that one third identifies with the ethnic label less strongly. Around five percent do not identify with their ethnicity at all or only identify with it weakly. Regarding identification as 'Dutch', both groups show even more variation. In both groups, around forty percent identify as Dutch (very) strongly, around a third take a neutral position. 19% of the higher educated Moroccan Dutch and 26% of the higher educated Turkish Dutch feel weakly or not at all Dutch. Do gender and education level explain these variations within the two ethnic categories of higher educated respondents?

Gender and the difference between HBO and university do not explain these variations. Male respondents, again focusing on the higher educated with mono-ethnic backgrounds, identify similarly to female respondents, in all ethnic categories (see Appendix C, table 3). Differences between men and women in their levels of identification with the ethnic and national labels are small and not significant. Furthermore, no significant differences exist between the identifications of the HBO-educated and the university educated respondents (see Appendix C, table 4).

Summary: identification with the ethnic and national labels

This section explored the identifications of higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch TIES respondents, focusing on how strongly these respondents affiliate with the labels 'Moroccan', 'Turkish' and 'Dutch'. Respondents with a mixed ethnic background were excluded from the analysis. The answers to the questions "To what extent do you feel Moroccan/Turkish?" and "To what extent do you feel Dutch?" lead to several conclusions:

1. The higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch identify relatively strongly with the ethnic labels. Their ethnic identifications are stronger than their identifications as Dutch. All three ethnic groups have similar levels of ethnic identification; which for the ethnic Dutch is identification as 'Dutch'. The ethnic identification among the higher educated is not significantly lower than for lower educated respondents.

2. The higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch identify relatively weakly with the label 'Dutch'; this identification is much weaker than how they identify in ethnic terms and much weaker than the control group's identification as Dutch. However, for a large majority, their identification as Dutch is not weak. The higher educated respondents do not significantly stronger identify as Dutch than the lower educated respondents.
3. Ethnic and national identifications are not zero-sum in character. Many of the higher educated second generation respondents combine a neutral or even (very) strong identification on one dimension with a neutral or (very) strong identification on the other dimension.
4. Variations among the higher educated second generation respondents with mono-ethnic backgrounds cannot be explained by ethnicity (Moroccan versus Turkish), gender or education level (HBO versus university).

The findings that are based on the TIES data match the participants' expressions in the in-depth interviews. All participants mentioned that they feel Moroccan or Turkish; except for Nathalie, who has a mixed ethnic background. In addition, all participants indicated that they also feel Dutch.

The results of this section raise some questions. Apparently, that higher educated on average have a weaker sociocultural co-ethnic orientation, as shown in the previous chapter, does not mean that they also identify weaker with the ethnic label. The same applies to the Moroccan and Turkish Dutch. Apparently, that the Turkish Dutch have a stronger co-ethnic orientation and the Moroccan Dutch are more strongly oriented towards the broader Dutch society is not reflected in a stronger ethnic identification for the higher educated Turkish Dutch, nor for a stronger identification as Dutch for the higher educated Moroccan Dutch. (Elsewhere, I have shown this also applies to larger selections of TIES respondents, which include lower educated) (Slootman 2012). In the two next sections, I explore what it means when individuals identify with the ethnic labels, based on the TIES data (5.2) and the data of the in-depth interviews (5.3).

5.2 Label and content among the TIES respondents

What does it mean when individuals identify with the labels 'Moroccan' and 'Turkish'? Does identification as 'Moroccan' or 'Turkish' reflect a broader sociocultural orientation, an embedding in an internally homogeneous, externally bounded culture, what Barth calls 'cultural stuff'? In the light of these questions, it is interesting to compare the higher educated Moroccan and Turkish Dutch. Given the stronger co-ethnic sociocultural orientation of the higher educated

Turkish Dutch, based on the idea that identification reflects sociocultural content, it would stand to reason that higher educated members of its second generation identify *more strongly* with their ethnic label than the Moroccan Dutch. However, as we saw above, the TIES data reveal *no difference* between higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch ($\gamma = -.041, p = .713$). When asked about their self-identification with the ethnic labels, higher educated members of the Moroccan and Turkish Dutch second generations respond similarly, whereas in the realm of sociocultural practices, Moroccan Dutch are less oriented towards their ethnic group. Can this difference teach us more about the meaning(s) of ethnic identification?

Before I analyze the relationship between the identification with ethnic labels and sociocultural 'stuff' among the higher educated Moroccan and Turkish Dutch, I first describe the variables that are used as indicators of these sociocultural orientations. I selected variables from the TIES database that can be seen as indications of a co-ethnic orientation: an orientation towards co-ethnics, towards practices that are associated with the 'Moroccan' or 'Turkish' culture and towards Morocco or Turkey. These variables resemble most of the indicators that Phinney identified as the most widely used indicators of ethnic identity, which are language, friendship, social organizations, religion, cultural traditions and politics; all express some sort of 'involvement in the social life and cultural practices of one's ethnic group' (1990: 505). Based on the in-depth interviews, I added three variables on morality to this selection. As we will see in section 5.3, some participants described their identifications in terms of mentality. The additional variables are an attempt to include the component of mentality in the quantitative analysis. These three variables reflect three aspects of a 'progressive' attitude. In line with the definition of Dutch identity in terms of progressive standards (described in chapter 4), many of the participants see more progressive norms as central to 'the' Dutch culture and as antipodal to 'the' Moroccan/Turkish culture. In total, 17 variables were selected for this analysis, organized into four themes (see table 5.5).

Analysis on these selected variables shows that, in support of the data presented in chapter 4, also for most of these variables, the higher educated Turkish Dutch TIES respondents on average have a stronger sociocultural co-ethnic orientation than the higher educated Moroccan Dutch respondents, which is reversed for religious variables (see Appendix C, tables 5a and 5b). Also, the higher educated have a less strong co-ethnic orientation than the lower educated second generation respondents, for both ethnic categories (Appendix C, tables 6a, 6b, 7a and 7b). Among the higher educated, gender does not significantly influence the co-ethnic orientations. In both ethnic categories, the differences between men and women are small and for most variables not significant (Appendix C, tables 8a, 8b, 9a and 9b). Again, the respondents with a mixed ethnic background were

excluded from these analyses, as this dimension affects one's co-ethnic social and cultural orientation but falls outside the scope of this book (see Appendix C, tables 10a and 10b).

Table 5.5 Variables selected as indicators of a sociocultural co-ethnic orientation

a. General co-ethnic practices

- Watching co-ethnic television channels
- Going out to places where second generation youths gather
- Number of visits to Morocco or Turkey in the last five years
- Participation in activities of co-ethnic oriented organizations

b. Language and social network

- Dutch language skills¹ (speaking, writing and reading)
- Skills in the language of parents¹ (speaking, writing and reading)
- Frequency of use of parental language (versus Dutch) with siblings, friends & partners
- Ethnicity of one's three best friends. Are they co-ethnic?
- Ethnicity of one's partner. Is he/she co-ethnic?

c. Religiosity

- Religious identification. 'To what extent do you feel Muslim?'
- The role that religion plays for someone as a person¹ (personal importance of religion, thinking about religion, and seeing oneself as a 'real' Muslim)
- Religious behavior¹ (fasting, eating halal, visiting the mosque)
- Wearing a headscarf (only for female respondents)
- Political religious norms¹ (the idea that religion should be represented in politics and society, and religion should be the ultimate political authority)
- Religious identification. 'To what extent do you feel Muslim?'

d. Progressive norms (are negatively associated with a co-ethnic orientation)

- Premarital sex for women is accepted
- Abortion for medical reasons is accepted
- Gender equality¹ (importance of education for women, appreciation of women working outside of the house when raising little children and valuing women in leadership positions).

1) Latent variable, composited of manifest variables using principal components analysis (PCA).
Source: TIES survey for the Netherlands, 2007, NIDI and IMES

Ethnic identification reflecting 'cultural stuff'?

The following section unravels the associations between identification-with-ethnic-labels and sociocultural practices. The findings are discussed per theme: (a) general co-ethnic practices, (b) language and social network, (c) religiosity, and (d) progressive norms. For each theme, I first assess how the various sociocultural practices correlate with each other and form coherent wholes and successively examine the correlations between these variables and the identification with the ethnic labels.

a. General co-ethnic practices

Analyzing the coherence between the four variables included in this theme reveals that three of the six correlations are significant for the higher educated Turkish Dutch (see table 5.6). For example, those who watch Turkish channels more often also slightly more often attend parties frequented by second generation youths and take part in activities organized by Turkish-oriented organizations more frequently. Note that even though these associations are significant, the correlations are only weak, as the coefficients are all below .30. ⁱⁱ This means that those who watch Turkish television channels very frequently do not always also visit Turkey very frequently. At most, there is a slight tendency for those who watch Turkish television more often to also visit Turkey slightly more frequently. Among the higher educated Moroccan Dutch, these four practices show no significant inter-correlations.

An examination of the association between the co-ethnic practices and ethnic identification reveals that among the higher educated Turkish Dutch, two of the four practices are significantly correlated with ethnic identification. For the Moroccan Dutch, this correlation is significant for only one of the practices. Again, these correlations are not strong, with coefficients all below .30.

Table 5.6 Intercorrelations between general co-ethnic practices and ethnic identification (HE)¹

	TV	Out	Visit	Org
Moroccan Dutch				
Watching co-ethnic television	–			
Going-out with 2 nd gen	ns	–		
Visits to Turkey/Morocco	ns	ns	–	
Co-ethnic organizations	ns	ns	ns	–
Identification with ethnic label	ns	.25***	ns	Ns
Turkish Dutch				
Watching co-ethnic television	–			
Going-out with 2 nd gen	.20**	–		
Visits to Turkey/Morocco	ns	.26***	–	
Co-ethnic organizations	.27**	ns	ns	–
Identification with ethnic label	.22***	.28***	ns	ns

* p < 0.10 (2-tailed); ** p < 0.05 (2-tailed); *** p < 0.01 level (2-tailed) (all shaded gray)

1) Only respondents with mono-ethnic backgrounds. HE=higher educated (HBO+)

Source: TIES survey for the Netherlands, 2007, NIDI and IMES

b. Language and social network

Looking at the inter-correlations between the variables on language and social network, we see that the variables show more coherence among higher educated Turkish Dutch than among higher educated Moroccan Dutch (see table 5.7). Also, for the Turkish Dutch, more variables correlate with ethnic identification. For example, those who have more best friends with Turkish backgrounds are more likely to speak Turkish more often, have slightly better Turkish language skills and slightly worse Dutch skills, and feel slightly more 'Turkish'. These correlations are weak to moderate. Among the Moroccan Dutch, ethnic identification is not significantly associated with these variables. Feeling Moroccan is only significantly correlated to Dutch language skills, surprisingly in a positive way – albeit only weakly.

Table 5.7 Intercorrelations between language, social network and ethnic identification (HE)¹

	Skills NL	Skills T/M	Use T/M	Coethn friends	Coethn partner
Moroccan Dutch					
Skills Dutch language	–				
Skills language parents	ns	–			
Use of language parents	ns	.63***	–		
Co-ethnic best friends	ns	ns	ns	–	
Co-ethnic partner	ns	.47**	.45**	ns	–
Identification with ethnic label	.18*	ns	ns	ns	ns
Turkish Dutch					
Skills Dutch language	–				
Skills language parents	.21**	–			
Use of language parents	-.23*	.45***	–		
Co-ethnic best friends	-.17*	.19**	.49***	–	
Co-ethnic partner	ns	ns	.32*	ns	–
Identification with ethnic label	ns	.35***	.25*	.19**	ns

* p < 0.10 (2-tailed); ** p < 0.05 (2-tailed); *** p < 0.01 level (2-tailed) (all shaded gray)

1) Only respondents with mono-ethnic backgrounds. HE=higher educated (HBO+)

Source: TIES survey for the Netherlands, 2007, NIDI and IMES

c. Religiosity

Among both the higher educated Moroccan and Turkish Dutch, the religiosity variables show strong coherence which each other, having correlation coefficients exceeding .50 (see table 5.8). For the Turkish Dutch, religiosity in all respects – except for wearing a headscarf – significantly correlates with feeling Turkish. Among the Moroccan Dutch, the correlation between religious aspects and ethnic identification is slightly weaker. For them, ethnic identification is also

'Am I Dutch? Yes. Am I Moroccan? Yes.'
Two dimensions of self-identification explored

positively correlated with stronger religiosity, but this relates more to emotional than behavioral aspects.

Table 5.8 Intercorrelations between religiosity variables and ethnic identification (HE)¹

	Muslim label	Personal role	Behavior	Head scarf	Political norms
Moroccan Dutch					
Identification with Muslim label	–				
Personal role of religion	.55***	–			
Religious behavior	.58***	.70***	–		
Headscarf (women)	.35***	.32**	.48***	–	
Political religious norms	.19**	.34***	.37**	ns	–
Identification with ethnic label	.41***	.29***	ns	ns	ns
Turkish Dutch					
Identification with Muslim label	–				
Personal role of religion	.66***	–			
Religious behavior	.63***	.63***	–		
Headscarf (women)	.37**	.46***	.61***	–	
Political religious norms	.42***	.44***	.40***	.35**	–
Identification with ethnic label	.61***	.48***	.33**	ns	.18*

* p < 0.10 (2-tailed); ** p < 0.05 (2-tailed); *** p < 0.01 level (2-tailed) (all shaded gray)

1) Only respondents with mono-ethnic backgrounds. HE=higher educated (HBO+)

Source: TIES survey for the Netherlands, 2007, NIDI and IMES

Table 5.9 Intercorrelations between norms and ethnic identification (HE)¹

	Premari- tal sex	Abor- tion	Gender equality
Moroccan Dutch			
Premarital sex for women	–		
Abortion (medical reasons)	.43***	–	
Gender equality	ns	ns	–
Identification with ethnic label	ns	ns	ns
Turkish Dutch			
Premarital sex for women	–		
Abortion (medical reasons)	.42***	–	
Gender equality	.26***	.39***	–
Identification with ethnic label	-.18*	-.20**	ns

* p < 0.10 (2-tailed); ** p < 0.05 (2-tailed); *** p < 0.01 level (2-tailed) (all shaded gray)

1) Only respondents with a mono-ethnic background. HE=higher educated (HBO+)

Source: TIES survey for the Netherlands, 2007, NIDI and IMES

d. Progressive norms

The analysis of the three progressive norms reveals a similar picture (see table 5.9). Again, for the higher educated Turkish Dutch, the three variables form a moderately coherent whole, whereas among the higher educated Moroccan Dutch, this coherence is largely absent. For the Turkish Dutch, ethnic identification is negatively correlated with a permissive attitude regarding premarital sex for women and regarding abortion, but for the higher educated Moroccan Dutch, ethnic identification is not associated with these norms.

Synthesis

Among the higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch TIES respondents, no strong correlation exists between identifications with the labels 'Turkish' and 'Moroccan' and sociocultural 'stuff'. When someone identifies more strongly with the ethnic label than someone else, this does not automatically mean he also has a stronger co-ethnic orientation with regard to specific practices and attitudes. This particularly applies to the Moroccan Dutch respondents. A stronger identification with the Moroccan label hardly correlates with the variables included in the analysis. Religious identification is the only variable that at least moderately correlates with the identification as Moroccan. The observation that identification with an ethnic label does not always reflect sociocultural content supports the findings of studies on other groups in other contexts, such as ethnic minority groups in Britain (Modood 1997) and Chinese Dutch in the Netherlands (Verkuyten and Kwa 1996).

The lack of strong associations among most sociocultural variables indicates that there is no such thing as an entirely shared and homogeneous culture. Of the four sub-themes, only religious 'stuff' can be said to form a relatively strongly coherent whole. Language and social network correlate moderately at most, while there is little coherence among the other co-ethnic practices and the progressive norms. This means that there is much more sociocultural diversity among the (higher educated) second generation than is generally assumed in the integration debate. The ideas, prominent in the Dutch integration discourse and implicit in some scholastic literature, that socio-cultural practices form coherent sets, that there is 'a Moroccan culture' and 'a Turkish culture' and that people are either totally oriented towards their ethnic culture or 'Dutch' culture, thus do not reflect reality; these ideas appeared particularly inaccurate among the Moroccan Dutch.

For the higher educated Turkish Dutch, the picture is somewhat different than for the higher educated Moroccan Dutch. The Turkish Dutch have a stronger co-ethnic orientation, and feeling Turkish does reflect a set of (moderately) cohesive sociocultural practices. A stronger identification with the Turkish label tends to correspond with (slightly) stronger co-ethnic and religious orientations and (slightly) less progressive norms. The meaning of ethnic identification differs

between the Turkish and Moroccan Dutch. Identification with the Turkish label, more than the identification with the Moroccan label, is an indication of a broader co-ethnic orientation. In other words: identification as Turkish is relatively 'thick', whereas identification as Moroccan is relatively 'thin'. I have shown elsewhere that these conclusions do not only apply to the higher educated but also apply to a larger selection of Moroccan and Turkish Dutch TIES respondents, including the lower educated (Slotman 2012).

The findings show that a groupist perspective is inaccurate to describe people's identifications and their broader sociocultural orientations. Identification with an ethnic label does not necessarily reflect a broader sociocultural orientation, let alone a coherent, bounded culture. Differences between the ethnic categories exist, but do not convey the full story. Large variations exist within certain categories, both between subsections (such as education level and having a mixed ethnic background), and between individuals. These analyses exemplify a more explorative use of statistical methods.

5.3 Label and content among the interview participants

We have seen that ethnic identification does not necessarily reflect a broader sociocultural orientation, at least with regard to the chosen indicators in the TIES database. The question remains: What does it mean when individuals identify in ethnic terms? Let us now turn to the in-depth interviews. How did the higher educated participants describe what it means to them to feel Moroccan or Turkish? What elements did they mention in their descriptions?

Whereas in the case of the quantitative, structured data, identification with the ethnic labels is easy to separate from identification with the label Dutch, these two dimensions are difficult to disentangle in the in-depth interviews. Accounts of feeling Moroccan or Turkish are interwoven with narratives of feeling Dutch. Descriptions of feeling Dutch are important for understanding what it means for someone to feel (more or less) Moroccan or Turkish – and vice versa. Leaving out these reflections on feeling Dutch would distort the descriptions of feeling Turkish or Moroccan. In this section, I explore what participants mean when they say they feel Moroccan, Turkish or Dutch.

The participants gave varying descriptions of their identifications (partly in response to explicit questions about what feeling Moroccan or Turkish means for them), with different levels of substantiveness. For example, let us compare the (somewhat condensed) self-descriptions of Karim, Imane, Berkant and Adem. We first look at Karim, who described what being Dutch means for him, explaining

why he does not feel strongly Moroccan. He mainly referred to some basic 'Dutch' mentality:

Marieke: What does it mean for you, being Dutch...? As far as this can be described...

Karim: Umm... I... – Let's say: it is a way of thinking. I somehow THINK Dutch, do you know what I mean? In my head, my thoughts have Dutch words. (...) I DID read large amounts of Dutch books, you know. That sort of becomes your 'heritage'. Um... Umm.... It is not that I celebrate Queensday, you know, but it is just the fact that I am Dutch... Yes, I feel I grew up Dutch – It is hard to explain. It is just that I THINK in Dutch; speak in Dutch. I also feel I have a very Dutch way of thinking. Quite... let's say... rational.

Marieke: In contrast with 'Moroccan'?

Karim: Yes. I think – less dogmas or something. In my view, everybody has to make his own choices, you know. So... well, I also have that 'phony tolerance' in me, you know. (...) So, I don't have these... dogmas. I'm more like: why would you, people in the mosques, be bothered about others?? Others that do not even visit the mosque, you know (laughs). Those people are no threat at all! Why judge them...? (...) I've always told my wife: 'Morocco is not my country', you know. The Netherlands is my country.

Imane listed her 'Dutch' and 'Moroccan' attributes. Like Karim, she referred to mentality, but she also discussed more tangible practices and the lack of a practical and emotional connection with Morocco.

But I have elements of both. My Dutch elements are for example: I can be pretty blunt; I am down to earth. In general, I feel I understand the Dutch quite well. My Moroccan elements are: I am a Muslim, although I have shaped this my own, personal way. And I love Moroccan food.

(...) Look, I was born here, and I haven't been to Morocco very often, and I don't even have really good memories about it. Although... I haven't been there for three years now, and I have started to miss things a bit. Although 'missing' might be too strong a word. Like the colors and smells, and a specific feeling... But I could never live and work there. Furthermore, well... obviously I speak Dutch; and Berber; and Moroccan Arabic. (Imane)

In describing his double affiliation, Berkant also referred to the emotional relation with the countries. Furthermore, he distinguished particular domains in which he feels more Turkish and in which he feels more Dutch.

The thing is... I've also lived in Turkey... I find – Every time when I arrive in Turkey, I think: 'Great!' The first days are always great. And every time I come back, here in the Netherlands, that feels great as well.

(...) There are separate 'domains'. For example music; Turkish music REALLY moves me; it makes me feel really good. My emotional domain is very Turkish, just as the more personal domain. I have been raised like that. I am not a distant person: when someone

'Am I Dutch? Yes. Am I Moroccan? Yes.'
Two dimensions of self-identification explored

is at the door at six o'clock, I don't say: 'I am watching the news or I am having dinner, can you return later?'. We are inclusionary, I am very Turkish in this way, and I feel good about it. Regarding the business element, I am very Dutch. I am very formal, I can easily separate work and private life. I am the boss here. Look, the Turkish are really – the emotional side – it is hard for them to separate.

(...) Obviously, in some respects, I'm really more Turkish. That is, with emotions, sensitivity, passion. It is like that with – uh – soccer-teams... I love wearing orange to a Dutch soccer game as much as I enjoy watching Turkish matches. But the funny thing is, when Turkey wins, this affects me more. Maybe because the emotions are deeper; the Dutch side is always somewhat more formal. The emotions are just slightly different. But that's also – maybe I stretch it too far now... It also has to do with your family, with your roots... How can I say this... – The older you get, the more important your family becomes. It is just this feeling, because your parents – because when I visit my parents, this is my Turkish family; with Turkish traditions. (Berkant)

In emphasizing his Dutchness, Adem primarily referred to his practical involvement in Dutch society.

Marieke: And you for yourself? Do you feel Dutch?

Adem: I feel, I do MORE than enough for THIS country, more than the average Dutch person. And I would defend this country MORE than enough. And I DO. So, when THIS is the condition for being Dutch, I am Dutch for one thousand percent. When you refer to the situation of the Netherlands, or the neighborhood where you live, or the Dutch economy... – then I find it really important that the Netherlands is doing well. Because THAT's where I live. THAT's where my children will live. (...) I find it much more IMPORTANT that the Netherlands flourishes than Turkey. My own surroundings are most important. Clearly... Dutch in the sense of interests... community... um... atmosphere, and quality of life... in THAT sense I am Dutch. But when you talk about Dutch culture, then I'm not.

Marieke: In your... way of living... you feel Turkish...?

Adem: Well, that depends on what you call Turkish... Or Islamic... Or Islamic-Turkish or Turkish-Islamic... (...) Well, you don't need to ADAPT to the Dutch culture. But you should be informed about society, and you should participate, and understand what happens around here, and why. You don't have to deny or hide your own identity. No, you should stand up for it, that's my opinion!... But when you say: Dutch culture... No, that's not who I am. I – umm... What IS Dutch culture?? Wooden shoes? I could easily wear wooden shoes, if you like. I have no problems with that. Um..., but when you say: partying and drinking and that kind of stuff, when that's Dutch, then I am definitely not Dutch. But I do go out once and a while, I do go on holidays, I do attend parties, etcetera. I also have barbecues. If THAT is Dutch...: Yes, I DO that.

These accounts show that self-descriptions somewhat vary between participants. The participants referred to various components to describe what 'feeling Moroccan', 'feeling Turkish' and 'feeling Dutch' means for them. However, a

limited number of themes emerge from the participants' self-descriptions, of which some themes pop up frequently, whereas others are mentioned less often.

One of the themes mentioned most often is the theme of *mentality*. In describing their Dutch side, Karim and Imane both referred to ways of thinking, to a deep level of understanding. They mentioned their down-to-earth mentality and directness, even the 'phony tolerance' (or indifference), which they identify as truly 'Dutch' inclinations. In many interviews, individuality and independence were mentioned as attributes that participants really valued, which for them marked their Dutchness. For many, having liberal values and being accustomed to the (relative) absence of bureaucracy makes them realize how Dutch they feel, which they became particularly aware of when they were in Morocco or Turkey. Several participants brought up their appreciation of social cohesion, emotions, warmth and hospitality as typical expressions of their ethnic sides.

The theme of mentality frequently emerged in the interviews, among all categories of participants (Moroccan- and Turkish-Dutch, male and female). It was most often mentioned in descriptions of feeling Dutch and feeling Turkish; only once did a participant mention it when describing feeling Moroccan. It is also frequently used to describe why one *less* strongly identifies as Moroccan or Turkish. Berkant's account shows that aspects of mentality can be used simultaneously to explain feeling more and less Dutch and more and less Turkish. He used aspects of mentality to describe how he feels more Dutch (his formal business attitude) and more Turkish (his hospitality and emotionality), and also how he does not feel fully Turkish (he is not 'emotional' in the professional sphere). The emergence of this theme as a central component of identification-content led to my inclusion of the 'progressive norms' variables in the quantitative analyses.

Language was also repeatedly mentioned in the in-depth interviews. Apparently, not only one's fluency accounts for its importance, but also the instrumental role of language. In the interviews with the Moroccan Dutch respondents, language was mostly mentioned as an illustration of Dutchness or as an example that one does not feel fully Moroccan. For example, Nathalie's inability to speak the language of her Moroccan father is one of the reasons that she does not feel at home in Morocco, and this makes her feel less Moroccan. Like most of the other participants, Ahmed dreams and thinks in Dutch. His limited knowledge of the language of his parents means that he cannot express his deepest feelings in the Moroccan language, and this constrained his access to information about his Moroccan background. Karim not only explained that he thinks in the Dutch language but also suggested that thinking-in-Dutch for him is related to Dutch-ways-of-thinking. Furthermore, he feels closely connected to the Dutch heritage because he has always read Dutch books. This shows how language can strongly

relate to mentality. When Turkish Dutch participants mentioned language, it always referred to Turkish and was used to describe Turkish affiliations. The difference between the Moroccan and Turkish Dutch participants is that the Moroccan Dutch were more familiar with the Dutch language. In line with the results of the statistical analyses, the Moroccan Dutch interview participants generally spoke Dutch with their siblings and their co-ethnic peers, while this was not the case for the Turkish Dutch participants. The broad usage of Dutch among the Moroccan Dutch might explain the distinct role of language in the accounts of the Moroccan and Turkish Dutch. Additionally, it could clarify why in the TIES data feeling Moroccan only correlates with the parental language, whereas feeling Turkish (moderate) correlates with both the parental language and the Dutch language.

When participants described their 'Dutch' and 'ethnic' sides, they occasionally mentioned the *bond with the countries*, both in emotional and practical respects; this was the case for Moroccan and Turkish Dutch, and for men and women. The quotes of Imane, Karim and Berkant show that they reflected on their relations to Morocco and Turkey. In reflecting on her ethnic side, Imane pondered about not visiting Morocco frequently and considered how she could never live and work there. Karim stated that Morocco 'is not my country'. Nathalie explained that the countries of her parents, Morocco and Poland, are not where she feels at home.

Nathalie: (...) I'm just Dutch. I feel REALLY Dutch!

Marieke: What does that mean? Can you describe it?

Nathalie: Well... It means that this is my home.. I would not KNOW how to behave... – look, there is one country – no, there are two countries where my family lives. And... yes... I occasionally go there on holiday... But it is not my home. – I don't understand the language...

In describing his Dutchness, Hicham reflected on the emotional bond he feels with the Netherlands.

Look at me: I am very loyal to the Netherlands. It is even that I somewhat feel like a sissy – I don't go on a transfer for a year or do a project abroad, because of the risk that I'll miss the Netherlands. Not only family, but that I'll just miss the Netherlands. It's also loyalty to small things, things you value in the Netherlands – (Hicham)

References to Morocco are made in a negative sense, to describe that one does not feel fully Moroccan. References to Turkey are generally more positive. Berkant explained that he feels at home both in Turkey and in the Netherlands, affirming his double identification. Adem's quote illustrated that the attachment with the Netherlands can also be rather practical. The Netherlands is important to him because it is the country where he lives, the society he contributes to and the place where his children's future lies. The lack of a (strong) correlation

between ethnic identification and the frequency of visits to Morocco or Turkey in the quantitative data might indicate that emotional bonds are not necessarily related to visiting the country in practice.

Like the quantitative analyses, the interviews reveal a strong association between feeling *Muslim* and feeling Moroccan and Turkish. Religion was never mentioned in relation to Dutchness, in either a positive or negative way. While some participants explicitly separate the religious and ethnic dimension and emphasize the prominence of their Muslim identification over their identification as Moroccan or Turkish, most participants describe religion as an aspect of their ethnicity and mention ethnicity and religiosity in one breath. Even those who do not feel (strongly) religious identify as Muslim because of their Moroccan or Turkish backgrounds. They would never feel (or say) they are not Muslim. The entwinement of religion with their parental culture makes them participate in some religious traditions, like Mustapha explains:

Later, I came to see religion as part of your culture again, like – it's just part of Moroccan culture. Some aspects are simply inescapable. You can't really say: I'm not a Muslim, I don't do Islam; because then you actually lose part of your identity. Because some things, like for example the Ramadan, or certain holidays – these are Islamic, but closely bound to culture. (Mustapha)

Specific *cultural practices* were mentioned in descriptions of feeling more or less Dutch, Turkish or Moroccan on only several occasions. The low frequency is surprising, considering the emphasis on 'ethnic involvement' in much of the research that Phinney evaluated (1990). This explains the qualitative findings that show that the 'general co-ethnic practices' are not – or are only weakly – correlated with ethnic identification. When such practices are mentioned in their self-descriptions, participants do not stress participation as much as emotional attachment. When participants describe feeling Turkish or Moroccan, they mention a love of Moroccan food, feeling deeply touched by Turkish music, or becoming (extra) fanatic when a Turkish football team plays. Many of the participants do not drink alcohol. This makes some feel 'less Dutch', whereas for others this not a relevant issue.

Occasionally, the theme of *birth and descent* popped up. The fact that one is born in the Netherlands is mentioned once or twice to describe that one feels Dutch. In describing her Dutchness, Imane referred to the fact that she was born here. Karim hates being addressed as Moroccan considering the fact that he was not born and raised in Morocco. Contrastingly, that his parents are from Turkey makes Berkant say he feels Turkish.

In the literature, *knowledge* is presented as another component of ethnic identification (Verkuyten 2005: 198-199). This theme pops up only sporadically in the interviews, most explicitly in the interview with Ahmed. Ahmed explains that his prior lack of knowledge about Morocco used to contribute to his relatively weak identification as Moroccan. For Esra, knowledge about the Turkish and Kurdish political situation heightened her orientation towards Turkey and the Kurdish people. When knowledge is mentioned, it is mentioned as *cause for* increasing ethnic identification rather than as a *component of* identification.

What did not pop up in participants' descriptions of their self-identifications is the *social network* (besides the family). According to Phinney, 'friendship' is regarded as a component of identification in many studies, which is why it is included in the quantitative analyses. However, in the in-depth interviews, friends are not mentioned in the descriptions of ethnic or Dutch identifications. The social environment is not absent from the interviews, but it is brought up as a reason why someone identifies in a certain way rather than as a component of identification. Ahmed mentions that his rather strong 'white' identification is the result of the primarily 'white' social environment of his childhood, youth and student time.

Synthesis

This section has shown how descriptions of feeling Moroccan, Turkish and Dutch vary between participants. Their descriptions not only vary in the components mentioned but also in thickness or substantiveness. It is clear that self-identification with the ethnic and national labels means different things for different people. Nevertheless, from the descriptions also various patterns can be distilled. The identifications were described in terms of mentality, language, bonds with the countries, religiosity, certain practices, birth and descent. The first three themes are most central in the participants' descriptions, as they were most frequently mentioned and emphasized and discussed more emotionally with the most detail. Religiosity was not always explicitly mentioned, but for many it is an inherent component of being Moroccan or Turkish. I will also briefly reflect on the relationship between ethnicity and religiosity in the next chapter. Knowledge and social network were mentioned as causes of certain identifications rather than aspects of identification. The descriptions vary in 'depth' or 'thickness'. Some describe their identifications in deeper and 'thicker' terms, in terms of mentality and emotions. Others describe their identifications primarily in more superficial, more instrumental and factual terms, such as residence, descent or holiday visits.

iii

The descriptions clarify why the combination of ethnic identification and identification as Dutch does not pose any problems for the participants; why

these dimensions of identification are not essentially zero-sum for them. For example, it is possible to describe both one's Dutch side in 'thick' terms of mentality (for example one's down to earth character and directness) as well as one's ethnic side (for example the level of interpersonal warmth and emotions). Even though the participants label most individual behaviors, attitudes and inclinations as cultural traits and describe these as either inherently 'Dutch' or inherently 'Moroccan' or 'Turkish', this does not apply to them as a person. As individuals, they are not one-or-the-other. Most of them combine traits that they associate with both sides. They do so in two ways: First, they combine non-conflicting traits ('Dutch' directness, 'Turkish' hospitality, or a love for 'Moroccan' food). Second, they combine traits in different domains (in the professional domain, one can feel really Dutch and value a certain personal distance whereas in the emotional domain or in raising one's children, one can feel really Turkish and value interpersonal involvement). The fact that traits are defined in oppositional ways, as being either inherently 'Dutch' or 'Moroccan/Turkish', explains why descriptions of feeling Moroccan or Turkish and feeling Dutch cannot be easily disentangled. Remarks about 'Dutch' traits feature in descriptions of feeling more or less 'Moroccan' or 'Turkish' and vice versa.

Despite the differences between individuals, these findings seem to support the idea that Moroccan and Turkish Dutch identify with their ethnicity in different ways. Even though both Moroccan Dutch and Turkish Dutch participants describe feeling Dutch in terms of mentality and positive emotions relating to living in the Netherlands, the descriptions of their ethnic identifications differ. Turkish Dutch participants describe feeling Turkish in more intrinsic terms of mentality and emotions, whereas Moroccan Dutch hardly mention these intrinsic components when they describe feeling Moroccan. For Turkish-Dutch participants, Turkey and the Turkish language play a larger and more positive role than Morocco and Moroccan languages do for the Moroccan-Dutch participants.^{iv} This suggests that identification as Turkish is more substantive for the Turkish Dutch participants than identification as Moroccan is for the Moroccan Dutch. Although the large variation and small sample make these findings tentative, they are interesting because of their resonance with the quantitative findings.

Considering the gendered ideas on being a 'typical' or 'good' Moroccan or Turk, it is surprising that no clear differences appear in how men and women describe their identifications. For example, both men and women give attitudinal and emotional descriptions, and within both categories, varying significance is attached to their parental country. This echoes the quantitative findings, which also reveal hardly any differences between men and women.

5.4 Summary and reflection

Neither the TIES data nor the in-depth interviews support the idea that ethnic identification is weak for the higher educated second generation. Higher educated second generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch do not differ from the lower educated second generation categories in how strongly they identify with the labels 'Moroccan' and 'Turkish'. Their ethnic identifications are relatively strong, surpassing the level of their identification with the label 'Dutch'. This does not mean that their identification as Dutch is weak. Only a small minority of the selected TIES respondents identify as Dutch weakly or not at all, and the descriptions of feeling Dutch in the in-depth interviews are relatively 'thick'. A great majority, of both the TIES respondents and the interview participants, combine a neutral or strong identification on both the ethnic and national dimensions.

Yet, it remains ambivalent what a strong ethnic identification means for these individuals. The TIES data show that ethnic identification does not necessarily reflect coherent sociocultural content. Whereas ethnic identification reflects a moderately cohesive set of sociocultural orientations and is relatively 'thick' among the higher educated Turkish Dutch, this is not the case among the Moroccan Dutch. This suggests that identification as Moroccan is relatively 'thin'. The descriptions in the in-depth interviews reveal a similar difference, since overall the descriptions of feeling Turkish are 'thicker' than the descriptions of feeling Moroccan. However, this does not mean that Moroccan Dutch consider their ethnic identity to be less relevant. 'Thin' and 'thick', as I use them here, refer to the volume and depth of the content, and we have seen they do not necessarily coincide with the association with the ethnic label. It appears that generic assumptions about the content of identification – as might be implicitly suggested by the use of 'ethnic' identification and 'national' identification – are inaccurate. A strong 'ethnic' identification does not always imply a strong orientation towards the birth country of parents, and strong 'national' identification does not always imply a strong bond with the nation of residence.

Based on these findings, we can conclude that an objectivist view is inadequate to capture the phenomena of ethnic and national identification. The essentialist idea that certain identifications in essence are mutually exclusive, or zero sum in character, is proven wrong. Furthermore, the essentialist idea that a strong affiliation with an ethnic label necessarily reflects coherent content, a predestined coherent set of sociocultural practices, is greatly nuanced. Large variations exist, both on the level of (ethnic) categories, as well as on the level of (educational) subsections, and on the level of the individuals. In particular, the case of the Moroccan Dutch shows that identification with the ethnic label does not necessarily reflect sociocultural content. Obviously, besides a strong, broader

co-ethnic sociocultural orientation, there are other reasons for ethnic identification, which will be explored in the next chapters.

Analytical and methodological reflection

This chapter demonstrates the relevance of a consistent distinction between self-identification-with-a-label and identification-content. It shows that identification with a certain label (for example calling oneself a Moroccan, feeling Turkish, or saying one is Dutch) does not always reflect a certain content (which may be watching Turkish television, praying, or speaking Dutch language with one's friends). A systematic distinction between label and content enables us to problematize and analyze affiliation with a mere label in relation to possible content.

This chapter illustrates how quantitative and qualitative methods can complement each other. While the quantitative analyses helped us to assess the breadth of a phenomenon and to compare categories and subsets, the descriptions from the in-depth interviews helped us to interpret the quantitative findings. The unstructured descriptions of the identification content help us understand why the statistical findings hardly (in the case of the Moroccan Dutch) or only moderately (in the case of the Turkish Dutch) explain what ethnic identifications mean to the respondents. Part of the reason is that many aspects that were brought forward by the interview participants, particularly emotional and evaluative aspects, are not included in the statistical analyses. The personal descriptions focused more on how one *values* certain habits whereas the selected variables of the TIES survey focused on the *occurrence* of practices and attitudes.

The findings of this chapter warn us to not take expressions of ethnic or national identification, as straightforward indications of broader sociocultural orientations, whether in more-structured or less-structured approaches. The findings also warn against framing identifications, for example in questionnaires but also in reporting, in a way that implies a zero-sum character; for example, when answering-categories to the question 'Do you feel more Moroccan or Dutch inside?' range from 'completely Dutch' to 'completely Moroccan', without providing an option for indicating that one feels both completely Dutch and Moroccan.^v

The static and contextual character of identification

How identification is discussed in this chapter suggests that individuals have stable ethnic and national orientations. Questions such as 'To what extent do you feel...?' appear to reflect the notion that identifications are stable and constant. This makes that results based on structured surveys often seem to imply that people's identifications are autonomous and static. At the same time, in many of the in-depth interviews (despite my own reluctance, as I explained in chapter 3),

I asked the respondents similar questions. From these interviews, it appeared that also when people are asked in less-structured ways how they feel in ethnic and national terms, they respond as if they have a stable identification that applies to them in general. Most participants answered the questions using straightforward terms to describe their feeling 'Moroccan, 'Turkish', or 'Dutch', and did not challenge the question.

This suggests that they experience their ethnic and national identifications as static and unproblematic givens – after all, if identifications are experienced as variable and contextual, we would expect the participants to be unable or unwilling to talk about their identifications in static terms. In the following chapters, I show this is only partly the case. In their reflections on their affiliations with the ethnic and national labels, participants often mentioned the influence of the context and developments over time. In chapter 6 and 7, I will explore the contextual and temporal aspects of identification, and the relationship between more stable and more contextual views of ethnic identification.