

Rotterdam
August 1, 2017

***National-local governance of refugee integration:
a comparison across policy domains in The Netherlands***

Rick Ypma
Governance of Migration and Diversity, Public Administration
Master Thesis

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	3
II. Theoretical Framework.....	9
Governance configurations.....	9
Explanatory mechanisms.....	11
III. Research design.....	13
Methodology.....	14
Terminology.....	15
IV. Context: Integration policymaking in The Netherlands.....	18
V. Embedded Case Studies.....	22
Civic integration.....	22
Housing.....	23
Labor market.....	26
VI. Comparative Analysis.....	31
VII. Conclusion.....	39
Limitations.....	44
Future research.....	45
Bibliography.....	46
Appendix.....	50

I. Introduction

This thesis investigates to what extent national and local level governance of refugee integration in the Netherlands differs across policy domains. As such, it aims to identify whether there is a causal relationship between domain-specific variables and the configuration of national-local governance. To approach this inquiry, a comparative analysis examines national-local governance in three key policy domains: civic integration, housing and the labor market. These domains target the socio-cultural, residential and economic integration of refugees, respectively. The analytical framework builds on existing theoretical models and explanatory mechanisms for national-local governance relations introduced by previous studies. The goal is to consider the implications for understanding the local dimension of refugee integration governance, and how domain-specific variables can be amended to improve local governance effectiveness. This second step is not within the scope of this research, however. The main research question is limited to investigate whether national-local governance configurations differ across policy domains, and if this variation can be explained by domain-specific variables. The following sub-questions assist to unpack this inquiry:

- What national and local level governance configuration can be identified in each domain?
- Are governance configurations similar or different across policy domains?
- What variables can be identified in each domain that can help explain these findings?

The focus on national-local governance is inspired by growing interest in the European migration research community for the 'local dimension' of immigrant and integration policymaking. A promising body of knowledge has accrued considerable evidence of a 'local turn' in which subnational governments are increasingly relevant to both the formulation *and* implementation of immigrant and integration policies (Penninx et al: 2004; Poppelaars and Scholten: 2008; Glick Schiller and Çağlar: 2009; Jørgensen: 2012; Dekker et al: 2015). This interest first emerged in the 1990s when reforms in public management included in many countries the decentralization of immigrant and integration governance to subnational governments (Alexander: 2003; Geddes and Scholten: 2016). This institutional change coincided with an increasing realization in the research community of the weakness of state-centric approaches to understanding integration policymaking. Post-war

conceptions had traditionally framed European states' integration policies and attitudes into national 'models', because it was assumed that nation-states' country-specific historical, economic and ideological contexts determined 'national' policy positions, and that a coherent top-down policymaking and implementation process could be identified (Alexander: 2003; Borkert and Caponio: 2010, 15). Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002) refer to this as 'methodological nationalism'.

The research community has since repeatedly demonstrated the increasing irrelevance of the nation-state in integration policymaking. Essentially, the argument is that singular national models cannot capture the complexity of countries' integration policy frameworks, and thus oversimplify reality (Alexander: 2003; Bowen: 2007; Favell: 2010; Borkert and Caponio: 2010; Entzinger and Scholten: 2014). This simplification impedes empirical analysis and theory-building. Beyond the country context, international developments such as globalization and transnationalism transcend the traditional boundary of the nation-state's societal and cultural identity (Favell: 2010, 377). European local governments themselves have also adopted a more active stance in their efforts to manage integration (Borkert and Caponio: 2010). The 2006 *Integrating Cities* and 2016 *Solidarity Cities* initiatives are but two examples of how European city governments have organized to exchange knowledge and experience in the fields of immigrant and refugee integration, respectively (EUROCITIES: 2015, 2016).

Evidence of a local turn is yet principally based on single- and cross-country comparisons of policymaking in European cities. In fact, what is striking in the literature is the almost exclusive focus on large and iconic cities, and an apparent disregard for smaller or rural municipalities. At this city-level, researchers have generally examined either top-down local implementation practices or bottom-up policy municipal policy interventions (Borkert and Caponio: 2010). As existing knowledge is largely deducted from empirical research in cities, it would, therefore, perhaps be more appropriate to refer to a 'city turn' in integration policymaking. To stick with the popular discourse, this thesis, nonetheless, uses the terms local and national turn to refer to shifts in public policymaking and management powers either down or up the vertical structure of refugee integration governance.

In response to increased interest in the local dimension, a more recent and smaller group of researchers finds evidence to the contrary. They claim that, in fact, at least in some policy domains, a 'national turn' is taking place, with national level governments keeping or

taking back integration policymaking discretion (Emilsson: 2015; Gebhardt: 2016). This thesis builds on this new direction of research by expanding the analysis to a comparison of three policy domains, and into the governance area of refugee integration. This is a novel project, as previous studies focus exclusively on immigrant integration policymaking, and only recently consider the effect of specific policy domains on the development of a local dimension. Second, the most crucial integration challenge posed to European integration policymakers and practitioners today lies with the incorporation of large numbers of refugees.

The Netherlands is selected as the country case for this comparative study because the country faces a large group of recently arrived refugees who are expected to stay for at least five years with a temporary residence permit. Most refugees arrived after 2013, when a rapid increase in the number of new arrivals took place as the Syrian civil war deteriorated and mixed migration flows from the African continent simultaneously increased, especially after the collapse of the Libyan state. In 2013, there were a total of 9.838 first instance asylum applications (VluchtelingenWerk Nederland 2016, 6). In 2014 and 2015, this shot up to 21.811 and 43.093 applications, respectively. By the end of 2015, the year of the European refugee 'crisis', the country hosted 88.536 refugees and 28.051 asylum seekers awaiting a decision about their status (Ibid, 2). In 2016, the number of arrivals decreased again after the EU-Turkey deal, but there were still a total of 18.171 new applications (VluchtelingenWerk Nederland: 2017). The most common countries of origin are Syria, Afghanistan, Eritrea, Iraq and Iran.

Such large numbers of non-European asylum migrants have put the national and local reception and integration arrangements under significant pressure. Dutch society and politics have also been impacted, with fierce debates at the national and local level about how many refugees should be allowed in, and how they should be integrated. Furthermore, it is expected that in many cases refugees may apply for permanent residence and eventually will become eligible for Dutch citizenship. Simultaneously, recent research finds that the socioeconomic integration of previous asylum migrants who arrived in the late 1990s has been poor (WODC: 2017). Additionally, the Dutch approach to civic integration was shown to produce low passing-rates for the mandatory exam, especially among asylum migrants (Court of Audit: 2017). These circumstances generate a significant 'integration challenge' that needs to be approached effectively.

Respectively, in March 2017, the directors of five important advisory committees to the Dutch government addressed a letter to the formateur in which they called for the acceleration and intensification of refugee participation in Dutch society (SER: 2017). The directors point to the permanency of the refugee challenge, systematic problems in social and labor market integration as well as volatility in public opinion. Accordingly, they advise the incoming government to adopt a long-term perspective, and specifically appeal for improved employment-matching, access to education, and better facilitation of the local pragmatism demonstrated by municipalities and civil society. While the joint coordination of this call is unique in recent years, the content of the letter is essentially a repetition of previous findings and recommendations. For instance, the Advisory Committee on Migration Affairs (ACVZ), one of the 2017 signatories, found in 2013 that “most of the aliens in [asylum seeker] reception facilities are between 18 and 45 years old, which can be regarded as the most productive period in a person’s life,” but that development of personal and labor market skills was not actively encouraged by the Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers (COA) (ACVZ: 2013, 81). This finding was concluded to be the result of cutbacks in spending on socio-cultural activities for adult asylum seekers after the 2008 financial recession. Labor market participation of asylum seekers was severely hollowed-out, which the ACVZ considered a significant loss to the success of subsequent refugee integration measures.

Subsequently in 2015, the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) published a policy brief that questioned “how [to] accelerate the process of integration of [refugee] permit holders” (Engbersen et al: 2015, 3). This question came in response to the finding that only “one in three permit holders between the ages of 15 and 64 [...] have a paid job and [that] many are permanently dependent on social assistance benefits” (Ibid). To improve this situation, the WRR recommended two key policy changes: 1) extra efforts to identify the labor market potential of refugees and improve job matching; and 2) more emphasis on dual approaches “in which language acquisition, schooling, securing housing and finding work occur simultaneously rather than sequentially” (Ibid). The WRR also concluded that due to a predicted continuation of migration to Europe and “changes in the EU’s asylum policy and the possibility of more stringent asylum policies in the neighboring countries” that the Netherlands should invest in measures that accelerate refugee integration (Ibid, 7).

To successfully address the Dutch refugee integration challenge in the coming years, it is essential to evaluate the effectiveness of existing governance arrangements. Part of this effort is to understand how local governments can contribute most effectively in different integration policy domains. Both the WRR (2015: 38) and the ACVZ (2017: 3), for instance, advocate for a greater local role in Dutch refugee integration governance to stimulate better policy assessments, more pragmatic solutions and tailor-made approaches. Based on the Dutch refugee distribution key, it is also the large municipalities that bear the brunt of the integration challenge. Additionally, the cities and 'commuting zones' together host up to 85% of the country's immigrants (Nabielek et al.: 2016, 10). Dutch local governments should thus be considered as crucial members in the governance network for refugee integration. The optimal allocation of national and local policymaking and administrative capacities is, therefore, an essential step towards improving the prospects of the group of refugees that arrived after 2013.

The comparative analysis of national-local governance in three policy domains finds that domain-specific variables strongly determine the type of configuration that is in place. For instance, while political factors appear to have stimulated a shift to more national-local coordination in the housing domain, the opposite is the case in civic integration. In the labor market domain, the absence of a specific national policy arrangement for refugees left a governance vacuum that local governments appear to fill pragmatically in response to local problem agendas. The comparative analysis also shows that national-local governance can be contradictory and disjointed, and that domain-specific changes in national-local governance can spill-over into other domains. These findings have significant implications for understanding the development of a local dimension in refugee integration policymaking. The paper concludes that the local dimension does not develop uniformly and evenly through an independent bottom-up process, but rather, is dependent on policy domain-specific national-local governance configurations. As such, future research on the local dimension must consider the impact of domain-specific variables on the development of local immigrant and integration governance.

Lastly, this research is inspired by a broader project on refugee integration that was conducted by the Erasmus University in Rotterdam, the Netherlands in the first half of 2017. Commissioned by the Dutch Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, this project examined national refugee integration strategies in a selected number of West-European

countries. The desk research conducted for the Dutch case study and preliminary findings on national-local governance presented an avenue for further assessment of differences in multi-level governance across policy domains.

The structure of the paper is as follows. The next chapter introduces the theoretical framework that guides the comparative analysis. Chapter three presents the research design, methodology and terminology. Chapter four contextualizes the analysis with a case study of integration and asylum policymaking in the Netherlands. The following chapter five examines national-local governance in each policy domain. Chapter six analyzes the findings. The final chapter discusses the results and implications, and presents concluding remarks, limitations, and avenues for future research.

II. Theoretical framework

To examine whether national and local level governance of refugee integration differs across policy domains, the research builds on recent empirical research and theoretical models of multi-level governance in immigrant and integration policymaking. This framework enables the comparative analysis to identify variations in national-local governance that are dependent on domain-specific variables. Additional explanatory mechanisms are added to the framework to create an analytical entry-point into explaining what domain-specific variables contribute to this variation.

Governance configurations

The main theoretical model that informs the analysis of governance configurations is that developed by Scholten (2015) who presents a framework of four ideal types of national-local relations. The first, 'centralist' type, captures a hierarchical top-down relation, in which local policies are forced to reflect national policy directives. This configuration can be identified by a centralized administrative structure that controls integration policy coordination and implementation, and dedicated ministers or departments at the national level. If this configuration is in place in one of the policy domains, then we should expect limited local governance of refugee integration. The second 'localist' type constructs a bottom-up process in which integration policies are shaped by specific local circumstances. Local governments are not restricted to the implementation of national policy, but can also actively formulate their own policies in response to contextual factors and political agendas. Additionally, they may engage in horizontal policy learning processes in which they share knowledge. The localist type thus implies a divergence between national and local integration policies. It also creates room for local-local divergence or convergence. Applied to this research, the localist configuration entails that if there are contextual factors that create a local agenda for refugee integration, then municipalities can be expected to formulate specific policies that may diverge from the national level as well as other local governments. On the other hand, it may also lead to local policy convergence across municipalities, if these are subject to similar contextual factors.

The third ideal type, multi-level governance (MLG), considers a process of joint coordination between multiple levels of government. There is no particular hierarchy in this

configuration, as actors from different levels meet and interact in ‘vertical venues’ that facilitate joint policymaking. Such venues can be dedicated forums or networks that are accessible to actors from all involved levels. The MLG configuration determines that refugee integration policies are a negotiated outcome of national and local interaction. The fourth type, decoupling, captures a governance configuration that is the opposite. Multi-level coordination is severely disconnected and possibly even absent or contradictory. In this case, national and local refugee integration policies are significantly divergent or non-existent, with negative impacts on the governance outcome.

Scholten’s framework can be merged with that of Dekker et al. (2015), who focus on the city-level dimension of immigrant integration policymaking in an analysis of Rotterdam, Berlin and Malmö. Dekker et al. identify three dimensions of local policymaking. The first, labelled the national models thesis, captures vertical policy coherence as the local level reflects the national integration model in an institutionalized structure of top-down governance. In this configuration, local policies can thus be expected to reflect the national philosophy on refugee integration. Secondly, Dekker et al. ‘localist’ thesis expects that specific local problem situations and political and economic circumstances shape local integration policies. Thus, refugee integration policies will reflect local contextual factors, and differ across municipalities. They may also be decoupled from the national level and produce “policy contradictions or policy conflict” (Ibid, 5). The third ‘local dimension’, hypothesizes that decentralized governance produces local policy convergence across localities and countries due to a universal local proximity to integration issues. For instance, other literature indicates that because local governments are more directly confronted by immigrant groups and organizations, they are likely to be more accommodative than national level policy (Stotijn and Vermeulen: 2013). In practice, this ‘local pragmatism’ entails the adaptation of existing, possibly national level, policies or the formulation of new refugee integration measures (Dagevos and Odé: 2016). Another possibility is that local governments actually react more exclusionary to immigrant groups than the national level (Mahnig: 2004; Uitermark et al: 2017). This is also referred to as ‘local conservatism’.

Lastly, Dekker et al. refer to a secondary localist thesis that is merged with Scholten’s decoupled configuration. To avoid further duplication, this paper also combines Scholten’s and Dekker et al. centralist and national thesis into a single ‘centralist’ as well as the localist configuration and thesis into one ‘localist’. Additionally, it argues that Scholten’s

operationalization of joint national-local policy coordination as ‘multi-level governance’ requires reconceptualization. Multi-level governance can occur at various vertical and horizontal levels, and is not limited to the specific national-local dimension that is investigated in this study. Therefore, the MLG configuration is reinterpreted as ‘complementarist’ governance of refugee integration. This interpretation aims to convey that national and local governments complement one another in policymaking and implementation. The various governance configurations tested in this study are presented in *table 1*.

Explanatory Mechanisms

This spectrum of configurations can be unpacked with various explanatory mechanisms that may determine national-local policy governance. These mechanisms can be seen as pushing the configuration into either the national or local direction on the spectrum. Jorgensen (2012) finds that different opportunity structures, policy frames and institutional logics can lead to national and local policy divergence. Another set of mechanisms are tested by Emilsson (2015), who uses a compliance model to show that national government can use coercive, economic and normative power instruments to influence local policymaking. Lastly, Glick Schiller and Çağlar (2009) find that city-branding, city scale, ‘urban rescaling’, and neoliberal restructuring all can affect the type of national-local interaction that dominates between a central government and a particular city. Lastly, Scholten (2012) finds that local contextual factors may cause local governments to frame policy solutions to address immigrant and integration challenges differently from the national level.

These mechanisms are conceptualized as a set of potential, but non-exhaustive, variables that may explain differences in national-local configurations across domains. Based on this theoretical framework, the analysis aims to investigate whether there are domain-specific national, local or contextual variables that determine a particular configuration of national-local governance. If this is the case, then the research expects that the local dimension is impacted differently in each of the three policy domains.

Table 2: Governance configurations and explanatory mechanisms

Governance configuration	Description	Explanatory mechanisms
Centralist	A centralized structure determines that local policies reflect the national level.	Compliance (coercive, economic, normative power); centralization; horizontal policy learning; assimilationist turn; national turn; national models
Localist	Contextual factors shape municipal refugee integration policies.	City-branding; neoliberal restructuring; local historical, political, social, economic context; decentralization; horizontal policy learning; local turn; 'local pragmatism'
Local dimension	Policymaking in different municipalities converges, and diverges from the national level.	Horizontal policy learning; knowledge exchange networks; 'local pragmatism'; local turn; policy framing
Complementarist	National and local integration policies are formulated in a structured process of dialogue and deliberation.	Multi-level governance; 'crisis'; vertical venues
Decoupled	National and local policies are vertically and/or horizontally disconnected and may even contradict one another.	Decentralization; market governance; policy conflicts; policy ineffectiveness

III. Research Design

To examine similarities and/or differences in governance configurations across policy domains, the research adopts a comparative case study design. The three domains of refugee integration that are selected are: civic, housing and the labor market. These domains target the socio-cultural, residential and economic integration of refugees, and were selected because they are assumed to reflect a variety of national-local governance configurations. The civic domain is expected to be inherently dependent on conceptions of citizenship, and thus strongly influenced by national political agendas and demonstrate a centralist configuration. The housing domain, on the contrary, is expected to demonstrate a dominant local dimension because municipalities are more immediately faced with challenges in this domain due to its decentralized character. The labor market domain is expected to show a mix of centralist and localist configurations because labor market policies are generally based on notions of active participation that are developed at the national level, but local governments face the negative aspects of unemployed refugees.

In the comparative design, the three policy domains are conceptualized as embedded case studies in the same country case study. They are operationalized as specific policymaking areas in which both national and local governments produce policy outcomes that target the socio-cultural, residential and economic integration of refugees. The units of analysis are thus national and local policies that are selected based on their prominence in the preliminary literature review. This includes most national policies in each domain, but due to the significant proliferation of local policies, the local dimension can only be covered to a limited extent.

Based on a most-similar-systems approach, the analysis assumes that the three domains have been subject to similar political, economic and social factors at the country level. This approach allows the control of such contextual variables, while simultaneously it enables the identification of domain-specific variables that may impact governance configurations. The most-similar-systems-design thus allows the comparative analysis to examine whether the development of a local dimension is domain-specific. If the analysis points out that there are indeed differences in governance configurations across policy domains, then that implies that domain-specific variables matter in the production of local governance in refugee integration policymaking.

Methodology

To adequately research and analyze the three policy domains in terms of national-local governance configurations, the paper employs several qualitative research methods. To begin with, a review of existing literature investigates the extent of national and local governance in each domain. To answer the research questions, a qualitative content analysis identifies domain-specific governance configurations, and any related rational, political, institutional or constructivist causal variables. The literature includes government policy briefs and communication documents, academic research articles, and policy evaluation reports. Such sources are widely available since the refugee influx start in 2013.

To expand the analysis beyond findings from the literature, an online survey is distributed to a variety of actors in the policy process. These include, first, regional coordinators part of a new country-wide labor market screening and matching project within the Divosa framework. Divosa is an organization of project leaders in the social policy sector. The regional coordinators, who are often municipal employees as well, act between local governments and the COA to improve the labor market integration of permit holders. The second group of survey participants are account-managers in the OTAV (*OndersteuningsTeam Asielzoekers en Vergunninghouders*) support framework. These account-managers act as dedicated mediators between local governments and ministries at the national level to improve policy effectiveness in all domains. Lastly, at the municipal level, a number of dedicated project managers for permit holders also responded to the survey. In the municipalities of Tilburg and Leiden, for instance, these are the local project leaders for refugee integration. The selection of municipalities and experts is conducted partly according to the literature review, and publicly available contact information. Especially larger municipalities that have displayed pragmatism in one or more integration domains, for example Utrecht, were nominated for the research. Smaller municipalities are underrepresented. This creates a bias towards cities, which is a shortcoming that is generally present in research into the local dimension of integration policymaking. Additionally, national level actors were not systematically included in the survey because of time constraints. Importantly, the survey aims to qualitatively corroborate findings from the literature, and is not used to make quantitative statistical suggestions. The response rate was also too low for the survey to be statistically representative. Nevertheless, the total 16

responses produced some identifiable patterns across domains. See *table 1* for a list of included regional and local experts and their respective localities.

Finally, a focus group with three policy actors for the region The Hague (*Stadsgewest Haaglanden*) was conducted to gain access to more in-depth information. This meeting lasted around 40 minutes and included the municipality’s project manager for permit holders, the regional coordinator in the health care support framework (*Ondersteuningsprogramma Gezondheid Statushouders*) and a senior policymaker for education, culture, welfare and integration. The results from this focus group also function to further explain what domain-specific variables influence governance configurations in the civic, housing and labor market integration domains.

Table 1: Survey respondents

Expert	Municipality/Region
Project leader	Tilburg
OTAV account-manager at the Ministry of Interior and Kingdom Relations (BZK)	Noord-Holland, Utrecht and Flevoland
Regional coordinator	Rijk van Nijmegen
OTAV account-manager	Noord-Brabant and Limburg
Regional coordinator	Twente
Regional coordinator	Midden-Brabant
Regional coordinator	Food Valley
Senior Advisor / Project leader	Utrecht
Project leader	Leiden
Project leader Screening & Matching	Regional labor market Gorinchem
Regional coordinator	Zaanstreek-Waterland

Terminology

A brief discussion must elaborate on various key concepts. First, the target group: refugees. Refugees are migrants who formerly had the status of asylum seekers, but who received a positive asylum decision, and were thus legally recognized by the Netherlands as in need of humanitarian protection. The Netherlands provides this status, and the

accompanying temporary residence permit, based on different legal categories of protection. In general, the asylum seeker and refugee statuses are grouped into the single immigrant category 'asylum migrants', to point out that the primary reason for migration was asylum, and not, for instance, labor or family reunification. This paper focuses exclusively on policies that target the socio-cultural, residential and economic integration refugees, but because some of these measures extend to asylum seekers as well, they are sometimes included in the discussion. In general this is not the case, however, as refugees have a different legal status and, therefore, are subject to different policies. In the Dutch policy discourse, refugees are usually called 'status holders' or 'permit holders', which refers to their temporary residence permit, and clearly identifies the legal entitlements and obligations that are coupled to this residency status. To stay in line with this discourse, the paper refers to refugees as 'permit holders', though some deviations occur when necessary. Most permit holders in the Netherlands are housed in a municipality, while a minority remains in Asylum Seeker Centers (AZCs) to await permanent accommodation. Consequently, some policies extend into the AZCs where they target permit holders, but not asylum seekers.

Second, it is important to clarify that each governance configuration captures an ideal-type of national-local governance. Configurations can, therefore, be conceptualized as points on a continuous spectrum that runs from strict national top-down to purely local bottom-up refugee integration policymaking. Between these ideal-types there are points of overlap. To unpack this spectrum, it is useful to briefly recall the governance concept. This concept interprets public policymaking as a structured process of negotiation and corroboration among interdependent actors, either in government or outside it, that each have different institutionalized powers, legitimacy and values (Colebatch: 2009, 64). With this analytical perspective in mind, the public efforts at national and local level that are intended to promote refugee integration are interpreted as outcomes of a dynamic and interdependent process. The comparative analysis thus adopts a broad perspective on public efforts for refugee integration. It includes both the policymaking and implementation responsibilities, as well as specific programs and structures that are intended to facilitate the socio-cultural, residential and economic integration of refugees at each level of government.

This links to the literature on local and national turns. Researchers generally describe these shifts in governance configurations as either an increase in dominance in integration

policymaking for the local or national government. For instance, Emilsson (2015: 2) describes the local turn as “local governments [increase] their significance as integration policy actors.” Then Scholten and Penninx (2016: 91) go more in-depth, “local governments, large cities in particular, [...] becoming increasingly entrepreneurial in developing their own integration philosophies and policies.” Considering the opposite, national turn, Emilsson (2015: 2) offers, “governments [...] [increase] their control and local influence and thereby [limit] the possibilities for local governments to formulate their own integration policies.” In general, the literature appears to approach the local and national turns as mutually exclusive power shifts either down or up the integration governance hierarchy. If linked to the governance concept set out above, these shifts can be seen as the outcomes of a structure process of negotiation and corroboration between the local and national levels, respectively. To understand these vertical governance dynamics is the point of this research.

IV. Context: Integration policymaking in The Netherlands

This chapter introduces the country case of the Netherlands to contextualize the subsequent comparative analysis of the three permit holder integration domains. It provides an overview of the development of national and local integration policies to demonstrate how the national-local governance framework developed over time. As Dutch integration policy has been largely mainstreamed, the discussion goes beyond policies specifically targeted at refugees and includes immigrant integration policymaking. The second part introduces the current governance structure in place to manage refugee integration.

The Netherlands long denied its identity as a country of immigration, even though migration has been an essential aspect of the country's political, economic and social institutions for centuries. The Dutch established various colonies in Latin America and South-East Asia, and there was considerable migration between within the Empire. After World War II and decolonization, large groups of Dutch settlers, as well as Indonesians, Moluccans, Dutch Antilleans and Surinamese arrived between the 1950s and 1980s. There was no deliberate integration policy for these immigrants from the former colonies. The groups were expected to assimilate into Dutch society without recognition of their specific ethnic or colonial backgrounds (Geddes and Scholten: 2016, 103). Starting in the 1960s and early 1970s, the Dutch government began to recruit temporary labor from abroad to help rebuild the country's booming post-war economy. It actively pursued bilateral recruitment agreements with especially Mediterranean countries. Especially Turkish guest workers arrived in large numbers. These policies came to an end after the 1973 oil crisis that impacted the country's economy. Foreign labor was not needed anymore, and it was expected that the guest workers would emigrate. By the late 1970s, however, it became clear that this would not be the case, and thus gradually the country accepted its status as a country of immigration. At this point, the government formulated the first national integration policy.

The Ethnic Minorities Policy of the 1980s was based on a multicultural approach to immigrant integration. It included a policy consultation structure to engage with migrant organizations, provided for state-funded mother-tongue and cultural education programs (Ibid, 114). The goal was cultural emancipation as opposed to return migration, and the creation of a multi-ethnic Dutch society. The participation of different ethnic minorities and

immigrant groups was perceived to be essential for social cohesion and political stability. Throughout the 1980s a wide range of policies were enacted with the idea to level the socioeconomic and political playing fields for natives and non-natives. This period did not last, however, as an economic recession the mid-1980s added pressure on the Dutch welfare state and led to austerity reforms. Simultaneously, the political and social debate became more critical of the multicultural approach. Many observers pointed to a lack of socio-cultural integration by immigrant groups, ethnic segregation, and the deterioration of key Dutch values (Ibid, 116).

By the early 1990s, the Netherlands had definitely arrived at the start of a strong assimilationist turn. Welfare state reforms included retrenchment and a shift towards activation policies. Welfare entitlements were increasingly coupled to individuals' labor market participation, and due to widespread criticism of the Ethnic Minorities Policy, it was decided to extend this approach to immigrants (Ibid). As such, the multicultural policy with group-specific measures was gradually abandoned and replaced with a citizenship approach that emphasized the immigrants' individual responsibility to participate. This philosophy was formalized in the 1994 Integration policy that targeted socioeconomic integration in the key domains of housing, education and employment. Cultural emancipation was largely abandoned as a public responsibility (Ibid). To implement this new approach, local governments became more involved to monitor immigrant groups' integration.

The assimilationist turn continued as successive governments enacted more restrictive policies throughout the 1990s and 2000s. Most prominently, this includes the consistent strengthening of civic integration. First introduced in 1994 as part of the national integration policy, it was amended in 1998 to make participation mandatory (Ibid, 108). In the early 2000s, growing discontent over the perceived failure of multiculturalism and social problems with especially Muslim immigrant groups were compounded by the terrorist attacks on 9/11, and the murders of populist politician Pim Fortuyn and filmmaker Theo van Gogh in 2002 and 2004, respectively. Public debate became increasingly anti-immigrant, which was later picked up by Geert Wilder's populist party in 2006, and generally reaffirmed calls to further restrict immigration and integration. The 'Integration New Style' of this period introduced a shift back to socio-cultural integration and further strengthened the principles of citizenship and individual responsibility. A renewed emphasis on the Dutch language, culture, society and history was included in the pre-entry civic test introduced in

2006 for potential immigrants to complete in their country of origin. In 2007, a mandatory post-entry exam was added for all Third Country Nationals (TCNs). Completion of the latter exam was initially linked to permanent residency, and in 2010 amended to be passed in order to become eligible for Dutch citizenship (Ibid, 108). With the latest reform in 2013, newcomers became individually responsible to find and finance their civic integration classes and exam (Court of Audit: 2017).

Alongside the assimilationist turn, the early 2010s saw the emergence of an additional policy agenda to 'mainstream' integration, a process that Collet et al. (2014: 2) describe as "efforts to abandon target-group specific policy measures and to coordinate integration measures as integral parts of generic policies in domains like education, housing and labor." In line with the emphasis on individual responsibility, mainstreaming also responded to increasing super-diversity in Dutch cities and the 2008 financial recession that necessitated cutbacks in public spending (Dagevos and Odé: 2016). Within this new paradigm, specific budgets and policies that targeted particular immigrant groups were abandoned or embedded in generic policies that applied to all newcomers or Dutch citizens (Dagevos, Huinder and Odé: 2013). This process occurred, for instance, with immigrant-specific education, housing and employment policies. Geddes and Scholten (2016: 119) point out that as a result "immigrant integration gradually disappeared as a separate policy domain at the national level," while immigration policy remained strongly centralized. In practice, mainstreaming continued the trend towards decentralization that had started in the 1990s as the role of local governments increased because generic policies were generally coordinated at that level (Ibid, 120; Entzinger and Scholten: 2014, 372).

Around the same time, it also became increasingly evident that local governments pursued different immigrant agendas and formulated integration policies that diverged significantly from other municipalities and the national level (Poppelaars and Scholten: 2008; Scholten: 2013). Poppelaars and Scholten (2008: 2), for instance, find that during the assimilationist turn, "local policy implementation [was] characterized by precisely such [group-specific] approaches, which have proven to be remarkably resilient, reflecting the accommodative approach [...] that had prevailed until the 1990s." In practice, local level mainstreaming of integration policy, therefore, has occurred at an uneven pace (Huinder: 2013). Some municipalities, such as Amsterdam, maintain a multiculturalism-oriented approach with specific policy measures, while others even went ahead of the national level

in the turn toward mainstreaming (Ibid). One important reason is that cities add specific measures to generic policies when necessary, a process that is referred to as 'local pragmatism' (Huinders: 2013). It has become more difficult for municipalities to receive national funding for specific policies, however, so these are usually funded locally (Dagevos and Odé: 2016, 14). Cities have also influenced recent debate at the national level, after they successfully argued that the increase in immigration by EU nationals from especially Poland and the Balkans demands a renewed examination of specific integration policies (Geddes and Scholten: 2016, 121).

Today, the official understanding of immigrant integration revolves around the ideas of active participation and self-reliance (Regeerakkoord VVD-PvDA: 2012, 30). The government expects that all newcomers, including asylum migrants, actively make use of the available integration measures, and assumes that through participation, immigrants can acquire the knowledge and skills needed to achieve social and economic independence. These requirements are particularly Dutch language proficiency, knowledge of Dutch society, and paid employment (Ibid). Active participation and socioeconomic independence thus form the core of becoming Dutch. From a policy perspective, the measures in place for refugee integration are largely generic that apply to all TCNs or Dutch citizens, though this differs per domain and municipality.

V. Embedded Case Studies: Three Policy Domains

Civic integration

In the civic domain, the governance configuration is a mixed of top-down and bottom-up policymaking. It consists of the Civic Integration Law (*Wet inburgering*) reformed in 2013 and the 2017 Participation Statement (*Participatieverklaring*). Both are formulated at the national level, and are generic, they apply to all Third Country Nationals (TCNs), but provide some specific measures that target asylum migrants. Municipalities are mainly involved in policy implementation, however, to considerably different degrees in each policy.

First, from a national perspective, the 2013 Civic Integration Law may be seen as the core of today's Dutch integration policy framework. In fact, some even go as far as to consider it the only significant integration policy (De Lange et al. 2017, 57). It consists of a mandatory three-year program for permit holders that includes civic orientation and language classes, and since 2015, labor market orientation activities (Court of Audit: 2017). Permit holders are individually responsible to register for at a school or choose self-study. At the end of the three-year period, a mandatory exam must be passed, or otherwise permit holders can face sanctions such as fines and even be restricted from Dutch citizenship. In practice, these sanctions are rarely implemented (Klaver: 2016, 18; Court of Audit: 2017, 25).

The three-year program rests on a strongly centralized governance structure with the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment responsible for policymaking and funding to the municipalities, COA and the Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs (DUO). These latter two actors are independent public agencies tasked with policy implementation (Court of Audit: 2017, 8). Since 2013, DUO is tasked with the distribution of course-information to candidates as well as ordering sanctions, which previously was the mandate of local governments. For permit holders without personal resources, DUO also maintains a dedicated budget to provide loans of a maximum €10.000,- per participant that must be spent at certified schools (Ibid, 5). In 2012, a rule was added that the loan is annulled when the permit holder successfully completes the exam within the three-year period. Today, municipalities are only expected to offer social counselling services to permit holders. In practice, this is generally executed by the Dutch Council for Refugees and other social organizations (Klaver: 2016, 17). The 2013 reform also substantially outsourced the provision of preparatory courses to private schools, alongside the regional education centers (ROCs).

Second, there is the Participation Statement that was added specifically for permit holders in January 2016, and then later expanded to apply to all newcomers in early 2017. This component adds a requirement for newcomers to sign a mandatory declaration of participation and attend a related practical workshop (Odé et al. 2016). The measure reintroduces a significant role for the municipalities, as these are responsible for the implementation of both measures. They are tasked with enforcing the statement component and provide the workshop that was designed by ProDemos, an education institute focusing on democracy and the rule of law. Additionally, municipalities are encouraged to these national components to local activities. These local activities primarily take place within the context of the practical assistance for which municipalities received extra funding in late 2015, as mentioned above. Odé et al. (2016) find that some of the common activities are, first, intake assessments of candidates' language skills, background and potential problem-areas. Second, group activities that such as job interview trainings, visits to local companies. These activities can also be linked to the civic integration program through language courses and buddies, as well as information about and assistance in finding and registering for civic integration courses (Ibid, 10). Lastly, municipalities can introduce permit holders to local sports, volunteering and cultural activities. This includes, for instance, visits to local initiatives and thematic group sessions on health care, parenting and other practical matters.

Housing

Housing is characterized by both national and local policies. The Ministry of Interior and Kingdom Relations is responsible for policymaking, and the Ministry of Justice and Security minds the temporary reception of asylum seekers in COA's AZCs. Municipalities carry the task to accommodate permit holders in permanent housing (Bestuursakkoord Verhoogde Asielinstroom: 2015, 2). Housing associations have also played a crucial role in the provision of accommodation since the early months in 2015 (Blok: 2015). The distribution of permit holders is announced twice a year, in April and October, when the Secretary of State for Security and Justice publishes the national number of permit holders to be accommodated by municipalities in the coming six months (*nationale taakstelling*). This estimate is based on the number of asylum seekers and permit holders in AZCs, and the

expected influx of new asylum and family migrants (“Taakstelling - Opnieuw Thuis,” 2017). The minister of Interior and Kingdom Relations then sends a letter to each municipality with the local number of permit holders to be accommodated (*lokale taakstelling*). This local number is based on the municipality’s population size, though in the near future local labor market will also be taken into consideration (Klaver: 2016, 12; AZCV 2017, 50). In practice, there are already some initiatives that aim to improve employment matching during the relocation procedure, see below.

The 2014 Housing Act stipulates that municipalities are obligated to accept all permit holders that they are designated by the Ministry of Interior and Kingdom Relations. If municipalities are not able to meet this obligation, unprocessed permit holders are added to requirements for the next half year. In case of long-term or unacceptable delays, the provincial government is legally entitled to step in and take over from a municipality (Bestuursakkoord Verhoogde Asielinstroom: 2015, 7). In the first six months of 2016, municipalities were expected to house 23.372 permit holders (“Land in beeld - Opnieuw Thuis,” 2017). In the first half of 2017, the designated number had fallen to 13.000 permit holders. Due to the difficulty of finding adequate housing in many municipalities, these expectations are often not met. The 13.000 permit holders to be housed in the first half of 2017, are, for instance, complemented by an additional 6.082 unprocessed permit holders who are still in the AZCs (Ibid).

In general, the outflow process from AZC to municipal housing can take up three months, with 10 weeks required to find a suitable dwelling (Klaver et al. 2015, 7). The challenge is partly due to the heterogeneous character of the current newcomers, many of whom are unaccompanied minors and large families who require a particular type of accommodation (Klaver: 2016). In October 2015, government enacted the temporary Municipal Self-Care Arrangement (*Gemeentelijk Zelf Zorg Arrangement*) (GZZA) to target this transition and alleviate the growing population in AZCs. In order to avoid a need for more reception centers across the country, the GZZA instead expanded the mandate of municipalities so that permit holders could be moved into basic temporary accommodation in the municipalities rather than stay in the AZC (VNG: 2015, 3). Subsequently, when permanent housing was found they would be relocated again. Klaver et al. (2015: 5) find that a majority of municipalities did not encounter structural problems in doing so in 2015. Most were able to find adequate accommodation in the regular housing stock with the assistance

of housing associations. As such, despite the rapid increase of new arrivals, the Dutch Council for Refugees finds that at the end of 2015, 83% of the designated 20.147 permit holders had been accommodated (VluchtelingenWerk Nederland: 2016, 21).

In early 2016, it became evident that the accommodation system was no longer able to cope with a continuing influx. A number of municipalities reported that they could not provide accommodation in the form of regular housing anymore (Klaver et al. 2015). Social housing stocks were under pressure by the large number of permit holders who enjoyed priority status under the 2014 Housing Act. The influx threatened to displace other priority groups such as the elderly and homeless from access to low-cost housing. Klaver et al. (2015, 5-6) find that some municipalities reported to have 11-12% of social housing stocks occupied by priority groups, while housing associations ordinarily aim to keep this at 6%. In April 2016, government responded by revising the 2014 Housing Act to annul the priority status of permit holders (“Kabinet schrapt automatische voorrang statushouders bij toewijzing huurwoning - Rijksoverheid,” 2016). This change removed the obligation for municipalities to give priority to permit holders, and allowed them to decide locally whether to do so or not.

This response was part of package of special measures enacted by government to address critical problems in the housing area. These measures were presented in the November 2015 Implementation Agreement and include, most significantly, the declaration by government, municipalities and housing associations to create an additional 14.000 accommodation spaces for permit holders on top of the existing regular housing stock (Bestuursakkoord Verhoogde Asielinstroom: 2015, 5). The measure was designed to expand on the GZZA to further improve the outflow from AZCs. At the time this was a major bottleneck to the integration of 16.027 permit holders awaiting municipal housing (Klaver et al. 2015, 5). The realization was to happen on the short-term and the accommodation was to be particularly small-scale and sufficiently dispersed. To stimulate a quick implementation, government initiated a temporary compensation scheme for landlords who offered accommodation to permit holders. The rationale was that landlords who housed permit holders did a service to the general economic wellbeing (DAEB) (*‘dienst van algemeen economisch belang’*). The scheme is accessible to all types of landlords, such as municipalities, housing associations, as well as commercial actors. The compensation amounted to €6.250,- per accommodated permit holder (Ibid). The scheme was implemented in February 2016 and is active for five years.

Another temporary measure enacted by government to alleviate the housing shortage was a second legislative reform to initiate the Municipal Acceleration Arrangement (GVA) (*Gemeentelijk versnellingsarrangement*) on January 1, 2016 (Ibid, 5). The GVA replaced the GZZA and gave municipalities more room to find temporary accommodation in case they could not immediately provide adequate permanent housing. These temporary dwellings were allowed to be basic, and could be occupied for a maximum of 24 months after the permit holder received his/her residency status (Ibid, 6). In practice, this duration was divided between the time spent in an AZC and a temporary GVA accommodation. Government further assisted municipalities with a compensation of €50,- per adult per week and 25,- per child per week for permit holders staying in GVA accommodation.

Three additional smaller measures include the renting out of government buildings to municipalities for the housing of permit holders. This would be possible for a period of 10 years. A second legislative reform expanded the ability of housing associations to refurbish existing buildings to create accommodation. Housing associations are allowed to invest a maximum of €10.000,- per permit holder to do so (Ibid). Thirdly, government invested an extra €10 million to expand the successful 'BRP-street' (*Basisregistratie Persoonsgegevens*) model that accelerates permit holders' registration to the AZCs and thereby relieves municipalities of additional cumbersome intake procedures.

Labor market

The labor market domain contains also contains a mix of national and local policies. At the national level, it is a clear example of a generic approach to refugee integration. There is no specific labor market policy that targets this group. Permit holders receive full access to the Dutch labor market as soon as they receive a residence permit, on which it is noted that the holder does not require a work permit (*tewerkstellingsvergunning*) as is the case for asylum seekers, for example (De Lange: 2016, 180). As such, based on the national philosophy of active participation and individual self-reliance, permit holders are expected to find employment by themselves, just like Dutch citizens. If permit holders are unemployed, they are also entitled to request social assistance benefits at their municipality. These benefits are coupled to decentralized generic labor market activation policies under the Participation Act (*Participatiewet*) (VNG: 2016, 4). Permit holders, are thus, like other Dutch

citizens, obligated to participate in any labor market activation programs that a municipality offers them. This is also called the 'work first' approach. Permit holders are additionally required to demonstrate efforts to acquire Dutch language skills as part of the re-integration trainings. In case permit holders fail to participate, the municipality is mandated to sanction them, for example, by reducing the social assistance benefit (Ibid). This policy structure thus creates considerable room for local governments to engage with permit holders in this domain, by offering them labor market activation measures and possibly sanctioning non-participants.

Local governments are also incentivized to actively formulate such policies because social assistance benefits for permit holders are financed from decentralized municipal budgets. In light of the estimates that more than 60% of today's Syrian permit holders are unemployed and on social assistance, this is a financial significant burden for municipalities to bear (Dagevos and Odé: 2016). Additionally, local public opinion is negatively impacted by these characteristics. While the national government allocated additional funds to the municipalities in November 2015, specifically for the Participation Statement component, this remains far below the expected total costs for municipal budgets in the medium- and long-term (source). This situation creates strong incentives for municipalities to formulate specific labor market policies for permit holders. This incentive is further compounded by the large number of new arrivals. These factors have produced extraordinary policy innovation by municipalities in this domain. It is at this point that local pragmatism become clearly distinguishable in the Dutch case. Razenberg and de Gruijter (2017: 3) find that because of a shared sense of urgency, more than half of Dutch municipalities developed local labor market integration measures. Usually municipalities select existing generic re-integration measures and adapt these to permit holders. Additionally, they create new targeted measures to accelerate the integration. Tailor-made and integrated programs are essential according to the municipalities. These are based on permit holders' individual backgrounds and ambitions, and usually include activities to improve Dutch language proficiency and knowledge of the labor market (Ibid, 4). Integrated programs also aim to create dual approaches to integration, with labor market and civic integration taking place at the same time, for instance. The remainder of this section presents some exemplary local approaches.

The municipality of Amsterdam has developed a comprehensive case-management program that indicates enhances oversight of refugees' backgrounds and accelerated integration. It includes coaching on participation, employment, education, language and health care, and is implemented by dedicated case managers with a lower caseload than usual (Razenberg and de Gruijter: 2017: 2). This load is still 50 permit holders per caseworker, but significantly less than the ordinary 250. After the initial assessment, the caseworker and refugee construct a personalized integration plan that aims to guide the refugee into education or employment. Caseworkers actively try to get to know the refugees they work with, and hence provide highly personalized assistance. This includes joining participants to job interviews, or meeting them at home. After special guidance for three to six months, the refugees are incorporated into either the generic youth or activation trajectory, and receive a new caseworker (Ibid). It is vital that this transition runs smoothly. Lastly, the caseworkers have a variety of measures at their disposal, such as job trainings, visits at local employers, and vocational language courses (Ibid). The municipality also coordinates closely with other actors. First, they have located the caseworkers together with job hunters, and representatives of the Dutch Council of Refugees in the same building. Second, they developed cooperation from employers to provide vacancies that are tailored to refugee job candidates. Third, there are arrangement with the local civic integration service providers to be more flexible with their courses. If refugees have found employment, such courses should also be available at more suitable times.

The city of Eindhoven also aims to accelerate labor market access, but follows a more sequenced approach than Amsterdam. In this southern city, the municipality has built close cooperation with the COA and local employers to assess asylum seeker and refugee labor market potential and streamline job matching. At the local AZC, the COA assesses prior skills and background, and also developed a 'job desk' (*banenbalie*) that is opened one hour per week for any employment-related questions (Razenberg and de Gruijter: 2017, 2). At this desk, applicants' expectations are also addressed, for instance, by informing them that their prior skills may not be fully recognized by Dutch employers (Ibid, 3). Employment assistance has thus been intensified at the AZC, which the COA is content with as it complements their general goal to improve employment chances. The COA then transmits all relevant information directly to a municipal account-manager. Before this situation, permit holder-specific labor market assessments were non-existent at the municipality (Ibid). The account

manager is specifically hired to link the employment information with matching job vacancies. As the manager originates from the municipality's economic department, she is well-known to a network of local businesses and companies, and is well-placed to identify demands and open vacancies. Additionally, because the manager is positioned within the municipal framework, she is effectively able to identify all available active labor market policies (ALMPs) and call for adaptations for the new target group. This embedded nature of a specialized manager is highlighted as a promising practice. The pilot in 2015 initially focused on high-skilled individuals with technical experience, reflecting needs of the local labor market. Language requirements for target group were also made more flexible, as English proficiency is often enough in this sector. Subsequently, in 2016 and 2017, the project has been expanded to lower-skilled individuals. For this target group the municipality aims to create more opportunities for internships, vocational apprenticeships, employment activation, as well as education (Ibid).

Utrecht has also implemented its own approach. The emphasis is on education and employment, and it is coordinated with employers and the Dutch Council for Refugees (Razenberg and de Gruijter: 2017, 2). The municipality first discusses with local stakeholders and a job matcher about the available job opportunities in the area. Then a select group of refugees take the NOA-assessment that provides input data for the planning of an individual trajectory. In 2017, more activities for asylum seekers included entrepreneurial trainings, and support to find internships, education or language classes. The municipality is in discussion with the Council to also move the NOA-assessment into the local AZC. It estimates that 60% to 70% of refugees can complete the assessment independently (Ibid, 4).

Utrecht has outsourced the job-matching responsibility to private organizations that are already embedded within a network of employers, and find that it is easier to enlist small companies, social entrepreneurs, multicultural employers, and non-profits. Additionally, employers can 'language vouchers', or subsidies, for the employment of refugees who do not fully master the Dutch language. Some specific trajectories have been created for occupations that many refugees have experience in, for instance, teacher, barber or pharmacist. This is done in coordination with education institutes and employers to provide occupation-specific training courses. Language-internships include work placements that focus more on learning the language than performing specific tasks. The aim is also to facilitate trial placements to reduce employer uncertainty about refugee employees. Lastly,

the municipality organizes meet and greets and company visits for the target group. In the end, these programs are strongly dependent on the willingness of local employers to get involved. Utrecht also aims to increase its governance in the civic integration domain, which normally is the responsibility of the Council. It is important for refugees to choose language schooling based on the timeslots in which the civic courses are available, and they need help with this. In addition, the municipality pressures the language schools to inform them about refugees' progress in civic integration.

VI. Comparative Analysis

The embedded case studies demonstrate marked differences in national-local governance configurations in the three policy domains, despite the identical country context. In the civic domain, there has been a dramatic shift away from local governance to a centralized implementation structure and ‘laissez faire’ approach. Recently, the 2017 Participation Statement may signal a reversal of this centralist configuration. The housing domain is also structured as a centralist configuration, but in 2015 saw the emergence of various vertical venues that indicate a complementarist relationship. In the labor market domain, there is a lack of targeted national policies, but the local dimension is extraordinarily active in this regard. This chapter presents a comparative analysis of these findings. The following *table 3* displays the main findings for each policy domain.

Table 3: Main findings in each integration policy domain

Governance	Civic	Housing	Labor market
National	- 2013 Civic Integration Act that emphasizes permit holders’ individual responsibility to participate. - 2017 Participation Statement that requires permit holders to sign a document of participation and increases the assistance municipalities can provide.	- 2014 Housing Act that strongly centralizes permit holder allocation across municipalities. - 2015 Implementation Agreement that provided targeted policy measures and additional freedom to municipalities to create new housing options for permit holders.	- 2003 Participation Act that provides municipalities with a generic budget to fund labor market re-integration measures.
Local	Local activity has been limited to a facilitative role since 2013. It can provide practical assistance to permit holders. The 2017 Participation Statement component adds more room for local guidance of permit holders during the civic integration program.	Substantial local freedom to find temporary and permanent accommodation for permit holders. Significant experimentation with different types of housing such as mixed living.	Substantial local policymaking within the framework of the Participation Act. Large cities have designed different types of integrated approaches. Significant local divergence because of contextual factors.
Configuration	Centralist/decoupled	Centralist/ complementarist	Localist/ complementarist/local dimension

The civic domain stands out in the Dutch case with a distinctly centralist governance configuration. The most recent reform in 2013 dramatically curtailed local governance, while the municipalities had previously been a central player in the management of civic integration courses, exams and sanctions. Today, policymaking in this domain is concentrated at the national level, and implementation occurs within a centralized structure supported by specialized public agencies. This configuration can be explained by looking at the citizenship philosophy that was gradually normalized in national level policy discourse, in addition to the 2008 financial recession that led to new waves of cutbacks after 2011. As the literature review indicates, this pattern of national level policy debates and budget cuts can, in fact, be traced back to the inception of the first civic integration programs in the Netherlands in the 1990s. At that time, as part of wider welfare state retrenchment and activation policy reforms, group-specific integration policies were replaced with generic policies that applied to all Dutch citizens. The citizenship model was frequently strengthened by the national cabinet in the years thereafter, with added performance-based measures implemented to emphasize newcomers' individual responsibility to integrate in Dutch society (Geddes and Scholten: 2016, 108). The centralist configuration in this policy domain is, therefore, strongly grounded in a political discourse, which has produced policy outcomes that were found to be ineffective already in 2007, however.

In response to evidence that newcomers were not starting their civic integration program, cabinet implemented the Deltaplan that provided additional funding and a wider mandate to local governments to offer free language and civic courses and personal coaching to all newcomers. In 2009, this was further amended to become an obligation for municipalities to make this offer to all asylum permit holders (Court of Audit: 2017, 11; Klaver: 2016, 17). Newcomers were expected to demonstrate a willingness to participate and could be sanctioned if they failed to do so. Municipalities were perceived by the national level as key players in the successful implementation of civic integration policy, and thus, received an expanded role in those. Between 2011 and 2013, however, cutbacks reduced municipal spending on civic integration from €300 million to less than €150 million, and any provisions for structural municipal involvement were subsequently annulled (Court of Audit: 2017, 18). The 2013 reform presented an ultimatum to the individual responsibility of newcomers to proceed through the civic integration program. In practice, however, municipal actors continued to assist permit holders.

A decoupled configuration thus emerges as of 2014, for instance, when it was estimated that 51% and 29% of permit holders found their courses with the assistance of either the Dutch Council for Refugees or municipalities, respectively (Ibid, 30). Others (55%) received help from family or friends. In 2017, it was further indicated that newcomers often do not know how to find an adequate school or are overwhelmed by the wide range of private actors who advertise their courses (Court of Audit: 2017). In a comparison of exam passing rates, the Court of Audit found that 49% of family migrants successfully finished the civic integration program, as opposed to only 30% of asylum migrants (Court of Audit: 2017, 28). National efforts to centralize the civic domain and strengthen individual responsibility had apparently failed to achieve both of these goals. First, municipalities had continued to provide assistance, and, second, especially asylum migrants found it difficult to orient themselves in the highly marketized setting of civic integration courses. On the one hand, these findings demonstrate that municipal practices do not follow national policy reform instantaneously, and that they reacted in a pragmatic manner when there was a clear need for assistance to newcomers. Simultaneously, the local dimension diverges from the national model that emphasizes individual responsibility and self-reliance, as municipalities directly ‘intruded’ on newcomers’ independence by assisting them to find suitable courses. Clearly, while the 2013 reform aimed to centralized governance, both decoupled and localist configurations emerged and persisted.

Recent policy changes appear to shift governance back to the local level. In November 2015, the Implementation Agreement increased funding for municipalities’ efforts to provide social counseling from €1000,- to €2370,- per permit holder, and since early 2017, these funds also serve to finance additional local activities within the framework of the Participation Statement (Bestuursakkoord: 2015, 7). The Statement is now scheduled to become a mandatory component in the civic integration program of all newcomers, which will further increase the municipalities’ responsibility to implement it (“Ook Eerste Kamer voor participatieverklaring nieuwkomers - Rijksoverheid,” 2017). Additional funding to accompany this greater mandate has, however, not yet been announced. The embedded case study points out that the effectiveness of the Statement in practice differs per municipality.

This shift back to the local level suggests that the national citizenship approach is partly rhetorical, as it does not fully reflect current local *and* national policy. There is by now

considerable divergence between national and local practices with regards to newcomers' practical individual responsibility. Additionally, in contradiction to the national model of self-reliance, the national government appears to condone municipal assistance within the Participation Statement. On the other hand, the centralist structure still limits the extent to which local governments can effectively design such activities. These limitations clearly emerged in responses to the survey and in the focus group.

In general, survey respondents considered national politics to be the primary factor that determines local governance in the civic domain. For instance, one OTAV account-manager noted that the centralist configuration did not allow municipalities to adopt a proactive role, and that this often results in a loss of efforts and investments. Participants in the focus group expressed that the Participation Statement did not provide municipalities with many explicit tools to provide activities. Although they appreciated the greater municipal role to implement the new component, the content was to be added locally, and it was not always clear what was expected by the national level. There was especially ambiguity about the extent to which permit holders were to remain self-reliant, and the provision of municipal guidance towards specific course-providers, for instance. In particular, all participants were anticipative of the incoming Dutch cabinet, that at the time of writing is still under formation. The respondents confidently expected a policy change in the civic domain, especially after the Court of Audit's assessment in February 2017, but expressed uncertainty over the direction of this shift. This direction depended, according to them, on the political nature of the new government, which could either shift more to the left, or to the right, of the spectrum. A Divosa regional coordinator indicated that further empowerment of local governments could be expected to simultaneously improve integration efforts in the education and labor market domains. Clearly, municipal actors consider national politics to be a strong causal factor in the governance of civic integration. The new Participation Statement provided a greater local role, but remains problematic in terms of content and funding.

In contrast to national-local governance of civic integration, the housing domain is characterized by various vertical venues that facilitate complementarist governance in the provision of temporary and permanent accommodation to permit holders. This complementary governance is actually based on a centralist configuration that determines the allocation of permit holders to municipalities in a top-down procedure. The vertical

venues typical to the housing domain result mainly from national and local frame alignment during the crisis in 2015, when accommodation was the primary concern of both national and local governments. At the national level, there are Platform Opnieuw Thuis and *A Home Away From Home* where municipalities and national actors can point out challenges and exchange promising practices. There are also the periodical National and Regional Platforms that were established with the November 2015 Implementation Agreement which facilitate multi-level policy coordination. While these Platforms are open to topics in all domains, they are primarily geared towards the housing domain (ACVZ: 2017). Survey respondents expressed mixed reviews of the ability to communicate productively with the national level in these venues. While vertical venues were open for regular consultation, municipal concerns were not often translated into concrete policy change. One respondent noted that while municipalities are in contact with the relevant national actors, policy change generally takes too long to enable effective local governance.

The emergence of a complementarist configuration with the 2015 Implementation Agreement has several explanations. First and foremost, the need to accommodate newcomers was the first challenge of the entire integration process (Blok: 2015). The rapid influx in late 2015 required additional emergency accommodation such as temporary reception centers, as well as permanent AZCs, and regular housing for permit holders in the municipalities. While municipalities actually experienced few problems to accommodate permit holders in 2015, there were many instances of local citizens opposing the often ad hoc establishment of AZCs in their areas (“Opvang asielzoekers roept lokaal ook weerstand op,” NOS, 2015). There were also increasing fears that permit holders would displace the elderly and other vulnerable groups in the social housing sector (“Huurwoningen schaarser door meer vluchtelingen,” NOS, 2015). The general expectation at the time was that additional policy measures were necessary to relief this situation, especially in face of a continuing influx. To avoid the emergence of a political debacle at both the national and local levels of government, the Implementation Agreement of November 2015 reacted to both such political and social pressures. This indicates frame alignment between the two levels of government, which is evident in the Agreement itself. The additional policy measures gave municipalities more freedom to find and create new types of accommodation for permit holders, thus shifting governance into a more dominant local dimension. On the other hand, the national level retains its mandate to allocate permit holders to

municipalities. Local governments have some freedom to disperse permit holders among themselves in their region, but are obliged to accept all permit holders designated to them by the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations.

Third, permit holders' labor market integration is, like the civic domain, also strongly influenced by the national citizenship philosophy. Permit holders are formally expected to find employment by themselves, on the same terms as other immigrants and Dutch citizens. They can make use of the same generic national labor market (re)integration programs that apply to these other groups. The embedded case study indicates, however, that governance in this domain, again, contradicts this philosophy in practice. It is shared by both levels of government, and while there are elements of both centralist and decoupled governance, it is by and large dominated by an innovative local dimension that aims to expedite permit holders' economic integration with targeted policy measures. First, the centralist configuration emerges with the national generic policy approach that is based on the citizenship philosophy, but which simultaneously provides opportunities for local innovation because the implementation structure is primarily decentralized. Additionally, the citizenship philosophy is apparently substantially rhetorical also in this domain, as the national government has not actively constrained local activities.' On the other hand, it has also not actively supported local governments' efforts. The second decoupled configuration can thus be identified as municipalities often contradict the national philosophy, and have been extraordinarily active in designing specific policy interventions that target permit holders' labor market integration.

The main explanation for the proactive stance of municipalities is the divergence in problem-agendas between the national and local level. This divergence is caused by the structure of Dutch social assistance budgets, which are decentralized to the municipalities. The financial consequences of unemployed permit holders are thus primarily a burden to local governments, and not the national level. Local governments as a result have a strong incentive to improve permit holders' employment rates, and have designed specific labor market policies within the generic national framework of the Participation Act. This is a clear example of decoupled governance, as well as an 'intractable policy controversy' because national and local policy agendas are clearly in conflict (Scholten: 2012). The divergence in problem-agendas cannot be expected to disappear with the decentralized structure of social

assistance budgets, but still local governments are formally required to implement only generic policies that are ineffective to permit holders' economic integration.

This explanation helps to identify whether local innovation in the labor market domain exemplifies a tendency of local governments to be more accommodative to immigrants, as some authors find (Stotijn and Vermeulen: 2013; Dagevos and Odé: 2016). In terms of the incentive to avoid a heavy financial burden on local social assistance budgets, the multicultural philosophy appears to play a minor role, though some municipalities such as Amsterdam may either rhetorically or modestly include this in their policy innovation. On the other hand, in general, the evident local innovation clearly contradicts the notion of an exclusionary, local conservative approach to newcomers (Mahnig: 2004; Uitermark et al. 2017). Local governance does not actively exclude permit holders. Rather, it aims to avoid the emergence of political and economic problems because of large numbers of unemployed permit holders, and responds in a pragmatic manner with target policy measures. Local politics in this domain trumps the national imperative. The result is that as municipalities face a common challenge, a distinct local dimension has emerged in which governance converges on similar local interventions that specifically address the labor market integration needs of permit holders.

Participants in the focus group emphasized that policymaking in this domain, which occurs within the Participation Act, is, however, not an easy task. They agreed that in The Hague it is always a politically risky decision to divert funds to (re)integration measures that specifically target permit holders. For instance, when the municipality announced in June 2017 that it was planning to create 50 apprenticeship places within its administration specifically for permit holders, the local right-wing PVV branch immediately responded in opposition on Twitter and called for a municipal council debate on the issue. This example demonstrates that local governments face the problematic reality that "making immigrant policies means designing [programs] for minorities living under majority rule," as put by Mahnig (2004: 18). The problem is that within the Participation Act, municipalities receive a set budget for generic labor market (re)integration policymaking that is supposed to provide for all residents. Opposition politicians can thus easily frame the creation of specific measures for permit holders as a zero-sum situation in which benefits for permit holders are always at the expense of unemployed Dutch natives. The project manager concluded that

the Participation Act had not significantly increased the municipality's ability to create specific policy measures for permit holders.

Survey respondents also indicate that the labor market domain has a strong local dimension, and identified local politics as the most important mechanism. In fact, more than two thirds of the respondents characterized governance in this domain to be primarily a bottom-up process. Other identified factors included national politics, local public opinion and financial and institutional constraints. Interestingly, the respondents considered national-local policies to be both coherent and contradictory at the same time, which indicates divergence across municipalities. Two respondents explain that local governments work together to improve both vertical and horizontal policy coherence, but that the current 'regulations' don't always facilitate this. Centralist directives appear to hinder local policy innovation, but also the development of the local policy converge.

VII. Conclusion

This paper investigated to what extent different refugee integration policy domains produce distinct configurations of national-local governance. It did so with an application of the governance concept and theoretical models on national-local policymaking and implementation arrangements. Previous studies examined national-local migrant integration policymaking converge and/or diverge across cities and countries (Scholten 2015; Dekker et al. 2015). This study contributed to existing knowledge with a comparative analysis of such governance configurations across policy domains. As such, it aimed to examine whether local governance is subject to variables that are confined to specific domains. With an expanded focus that included three policy domains, the analysis shows that the structure of national-local governance is indeed dependent on domain-specific variables, and varies accordingly. This implies that local governance does not develop uniformly across domains, but rather is contingent on unique domain-specific variables that cause it to emerge unevenly and irregularly: the local dimension is particularly prominent in some policy domains, but marginal in others. In the civic domain, the main domain-specific variable that appears to explain national-local governance is the political agenda of national citizenship and the individualized responsibility to participate. This agenda has marginalized local governance in recent years. In the housing domain, acute shortages of accommodation produced a domain-specific emergency situation that influenced national-local frame alignment and a shift to complementary governance. In the labor market domain, a domain-specific divergence in national and local governments' problem-framing of permit holders' unemployment led to the development of a distinct local dimension.

These findings illustrate that national-local governance is dependent on domain-specific variables, and that any examination of the local dimension in refugee integration governance should consider the complex dynamics that individual policy domains have to offer. These implications can be expanded to immigrant integration governance in general, particularly because the analysis was substantially based on such generic policies. It suggests that regardless of whether governance is specific to refugees or to immigrants in general, national-local governance differs per policy domain. Additionally, the explanatory mechanisms identified in the analysis diverge significantly from those found in existing literature, which indicates that domain-specific analyses can reveal more in-depth

explanations for the development of particular national-local governance configurations. Analyses that do not include different policy domains risk generalizing the importance of such mechanisms, while these, in reality, may apply to only one domain. The following sections discuss the implications of these results.

First, the comparative analysis demonstrates that domain-specific variables can explain the development of diverging governance configurations across policy domains. This finding deconstructs the notion of national-local governance as a uniform structure across integration policy domains. The governance structure is rather dependent on factors that are unique to each domain, and therefore develop in different directions. In the civic domain, a political agenda at the national level has led to a gradual centralization of the governance of permit holders' socio-cultural integration. This is a process that has developed since the 1990s, and shows how domain-specific change can be path-dependent and is highly relevant to understanding the local dimension. In the civic domain, by 2013, local governance was formally marginalized because permit holders were expected to be self-reliant within the citizenship model. In practice, however, municipalities have continued to provide assistance to newcomers.

The citizenship philosophy also emerges in the labor market domain, but, a second crucial domain-specific variable interacts there to produce a different outcome. The decentralized structure of social assistance budgets presents a significant incentive for local policy innovation, and is rooted in a local problem-agenda that is unmatched by other domains. In relation to the explanatory mechanisms introduced above, these findings indicate that while a centralist configuration aims to install a top-down hierarchical policy structure, both institutional logics, in the form of the decentralized budgets, and diverging contextual factors and problem-frames can counteract to produce contradictory national-local governance outcomes. These outcomes additionally diverge across the civic and labor market domains because of domain-specific variables.

Second, domain-specific variables can cause national-local governance configurations to develop unevenly, either through rapid or gradual change. First, an example of rapid domain-specific change is found in the housing domain. Here, the standard centralist configuration was supplemented with dedicated vertical venues and additional measures to enhance the ability of local governments to produce novel types of accommodation for permit holders. This development was rooted in the need for a coordinated response to the

emergency situation of late 2015, when the accommodation of both asylum seekers and permit holders became a bottleneck. Especially the 'outflow' of permit holders from AZCs to permanent housing in the municipalities was found to affect the entire integration strategy. The fact that the need for accommodation is a key first phase in the entire integration process thus resulted in an early emergence of the 'housing challenge' on the purview and political agendas of policymakers at both levels of government, and frame alignment in this domain evidently shifted the relationship into a complementarist configuration. This complementarist agreement was formalized in the Implementation Agreement of November 2015. In comparison, governance issues associated with the civic and labor market integration of permit holders were not salient at that time. This situation changed during throughout 2016 and early 2017, when the housing challenge steadily subsided and was replaced by the integration challenge.

These dynamics indicate that governance configurations are dependent on the *timing* of domain-specific variables, in this case the sequential emergence of, first, the housing, and consequentially, the integration challenges of refugee integration onto the public policy agenda. The saliency of these challenges differs, leading to asynchronous development of national-local governance across the domains. Furthermore, if we take timing into consideration, it may be assumed that configurations can, in fact, be short-lived as national and local problem frames shift to new challenges. The uniquely complementarist structure that emerged in the housing domain could, therefore, steadily return to the centralist configuration that was in place before the 2015 influx. The notion of path-dependency suggests the contrary, however, as local governments gather expertise on finding novel types of accommodation, and thus establish a new degree of autonomy in this regard. Additionally, the Implementation Agreement proposes to develop the complementarist arrangement into a permanent national-local coordination structure. In any case, the explanatory mechanism for complementarist governance in the housing domain, frame alignment, appears to be highly unique circumstance because it was prompted by an emergency that is unlikely to occur again. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that in emergency scenarios various levels of government will find benefits in effective coordination and complementarist governance.

The second type of domain-specific change occurs more gradually, and can be identified in the civic integration domain. While efforts to emphasize the citizenship

philosophy and centralize policy implementation have reduced local governance, the Participation Statement indicates a return to formal municipal autonomy after more than three years of marginalization. This return may be in response to national frame alignment in terms of realizing the ineffectiveness of requiring self-reliance of especially asylum migrants, and a move to designate a greater role for municipalities to assist them. It may also be a short-term response to the increased influx of refugees, as opposed to the years before 2013, and thus the greater immediacy for effective governance in this domain.

In relation to the emergence of complementarist governance in the housing domain, a similar shift may be underway in the civic and labor market domains as the integration of permit holders replaces the earlier housing challenge (ACVZ: 2017b). If national and local problem frames converge sufficiently in these domains as well, it may be anticipated that a complementarist configuration will develop here too. Currently, both domains remain characterized by centralist and decoupled governance. The Participation Statement may signal a shift towards complementarity in the civic domain, as local governments receive more autonomy to come up with specific activities within that component's framework. When the Participation Statement becomes a mandatory component in the civic integration of every newcomer, additional funding to municipalities would be a logical supplement to their expanded mandate. It would also significantly decentralize policymaking and implementation in the domain, with a turn to a localist configuration as local governments design activities that match their permit holders with local education and labor opportunities. In the labor market domain, an increasing incentive at the national level to support local governance is more difficult to predict. The cabinet may maintain its current generic approach because municipalities have already demonstrated extraordinary innovation in this domain, and the political and economic costs to marginalize them through centralization efforts would be significant. Besides, it remains highly delicate to support specific labor market policy measures for permit holders at the national level.

Third, the analysis shows that governance configurations can interact across domains. This indicates a type of decoupled governance, as domain-specific configurations interact and interfere with one another across policy domains. Conventional conceptualizations of decoupled governance do not specify this dimension. A crucial example of this disjointed governance can be identified between the civic and labor market domains. In the latter domain, the generic national policy structure does not effectively

address the aforementioned local problem agenda: municipalities are faced with large numbers of permit holders who are likely to depend on social assistance benefits for years to come. In response, municipalities have demonstrated extraordinary policy innovation to fill this centralist 'policy vacuum', but importantly, these local policy measures do not aim only to stimulate permit holder employment. Instead, they are often designed as integrated approaches that include programs and activities to improve permit holders' socio-cultural integration as well. Local innovation thus contravenes the national generic agenda in both the labor *and* civic domains, producing contradictory policy messages to permit holders and the Dutch public. On the one hand, they are expected to be self-reliant and independent in their integration, while on the other hand, some local governments offer them comprehensive packages that stretch across the socio-cultural and economic integration domains.

The strategy of local governments to adopt broad measures within the framework of the Participation Act that go beyond the basic goal to incorporate permit holders economically can be explained by both the absence of specific labor market programs offered by the national government, as well as the termination of local authority in the civic domain. Municipal actors appear to realize that permit holders need integrated assistance, and since they cannot offer this in the civic domain, have constructed such approaches within the Participation Act. These findings suggest that the configuration of national-local governance is not limited to specific domains, but may also have causal effects across domains. It also shows that municipalities will respond pragmatically to local problems, even though in doing so they contradict and decouple their responses from national agendas. In general, this situation testifies to the relative weakness of the national centralist governance structure as well as the citizenship philosophy in both the civic and labor market domains. The former seems to be relatively powerless to restrict pragmatic deviations at the local level, and the latter is significantly ineffective in practice, but predominant in national policy debates. In general, multi-level governance in these two domains could be much more effective if the national level would align itself with local knowledge and policy practices.

Fourth, the results indicate that the local dimension can be rooted in a variety of mechanisms that do not always need to be bottom-up processes. Local innovation as shown in the labor market domain is both the outcome of local problem agendas *and* the lack of a specific approach at the national level. Consequently, the local dimension became

significantly decoupled from the national agenda. Another example of such as top-down mechanism for local innovation can be identified in the housing domain, but here the national government complemented local governments' struggles to accommodate permit holders. The outcome was that local governance did not contradict national governance, because the national level accommodated it with additional freedom. The local dimension is thus not limited to circumstances at the local level, but can also develop in reaction to national level developments. In general, it can be expected that with every policy reform at the national level, local governments will react in unforeseen ways. Additionally, practical change lags behind formal policy change, as the continued local assistance to permit holders during their civic integration demonstrates. As all findings indicate, the refugee 'crisis' produced significant challenges especially for local governments, and that these have responded pragmatically, regardless of whether their innovation contradicted national agendas. It seems to suggest that the real spearhead of policy innovation for refugee integration is to be found at the local level, and that the national government is mainly in a position to stimulate or constrain such local activities.

Limitations

There are several aspects that limit the generalizability of these research findings. First, the selection of policies in the embedded case studies was not randomized, and not all policies or activities were included. The embedded case studies are, therefore, not fully representative and do not give a complete picture of the configuration of national-local governance in each domain. Furthermore, the analysis focused on governance of refugee integration, but as indicated above, policies that apply to this group are often generic, and thus are not specifically designed for permit holders. Due to this generic character of the Dutch integration policy regime, the configurations identified in each domain do not strictly represent national-local governance of refugee integration, but also capture generic immigrant integration governance.

A third limitation concerns the survey. Throughout the dissemination process, it became evident that many respondents were reluctant to get involved in the project. This is primarily because they are relevant actors in a highly popular research topic, and are frequently approached by students and academics for their input. The focus group

participants clearly expressed this reality. The response rate to the survey was limited and is not significantly representative of either national, regional or local level actors. The survey was ultimately used to primarily support the research qualitatively.

Future research

The conclusions of this comparative analysis of national-local governance across three policy domains of refugee integration in the Netherlands indicate a need for more precise investigations of the local dimension in both immigrant and refugee integration policymaking. A monolithic designation of a local or national turn fails to capture the complex dynamics that occur within and across policy domains. This gap becomes obvious when an analysis goes beyond the comparison of different cities, and instead adopts a comparative approach to national-local governance in specific domains within one country. This can be expanded in the future to cross-domain studies in two or more cities, to examine whether national-local governance in those contexts is similar or different within specific domains. This could produce additional knowledge on the role of local contexts in influencing the outcome of national-local governance.

Continuing, the notion of the local turn remains valid as a generalized description of the increasing activity of subnational governments in integration policymaking, but loses value after an examination of national-local governance across multiple domains. Comparable to the study of national models, the migration research community may unwittingly engage in another self-fulfilling discourse as the uncritical application of the local, or national, turn concepts risks to conceal essential domain-specific mechanisms that influence national or local governance. This points to the need to develop an analytical framework that allows for more exact investigation of national-local governance within and across integration policy domains.

Bibliography

ACVZ. (2013). Verloren tijd: Advies over dagbesteding in the opvang voor vreemdelingen. The Hague: ACVZ.

ACVZ. (2017). Pieken en dalen: Naar een duurzaam systeem voor opvang van asielzoekers en huisvesting en integratie van vergunninghouders. The Hague: ACVZ.

ACVZ. (2017b). Vluchtelingen: van opvang naar volwaardige participatie. The Hague: AVCZ.

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.

Court of Audit (2017). Inburgering: Eerste resultaten van de Wet inburgering 2013. The Hague: Court of Audit.

Bauböck, R. (2003). Reinventing Urban Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(2), 139-160.

Bertossi, C. (2011). National Models of Integration in Europe: A Comparative and Critical Analysis. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(12), 1561-1580.

Blok, S. A. (2015). Brief van de minister voor wonen en rijksdienst. The Hague: Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal.

Bommes, M., & Radtke, F. O. (1996). Migration into big cities and small towns - an uneven process with limited need for multiculturalism. *The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 9(1), 75-86.

Bretell, C. B. (2003). Bringing the City Back In: Cities as Contexts for Immigrant Incorporation. In N. Foner (Ed.), *American Arrivals: Anthropology Engages the New Immigration* (163-196). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Brubaker, R. (2001). The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), 531-548.

Caponio, T. & Borkert, M. (Eds.). (2010). *The Local Dimension of Migration Policymaking*. IMISCOE Reports. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Coello, L., Dagevos, J., Huinder, C., van der Leun, J., & Odé, A. (2013). Het minderhedenbeleid voorbij: Motieven en gevolgen. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Collet, E., Petrovic, M., & Scholten, P. (2014). Mainstreaming Migrant Integration: Beyond the assimilationist turn in European policies. IMISCOE Conference Paper 2014. Rotterdam: Erasmus University.

Colebatch, H.K. (2009). Governance as a conceptual development in the analysis of policy. *Critical Policy Studies*, 3(1), 58-67.

Dekker, R., Emilsson, H., Krieger, B., & Scholten, P. (2015). A Local Dimension of Integration Policies? A Comparative Study of Berlin, Malmö, and Rotterdam. *International Migration Review*, 49(3), 633-658.

De Lange, T., Besselsen, E., Rahouti, S., & Rijken, C. (2017). Van azc naar een baan: De Nederlandse regelgeving over en praktijk van arbeidsmarkt van Auditintegratie van vluchtelingen. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Engbersen, G., Dagevos, J., Jennissen, R., Bakker, L., & Leerkes, A., with the assistance of Klaver, J., & Odé, A. (2015). *No time to lose: from reception to integration of asylum migrants*, WRR-Policy Brief 4. The Hague: WRR.

Entzinger, H., & Scholten, P. (2014). Model of immigrant integration? Between national and local integration policies. In M. Martiniello & J. Rath (Eds.), *An Introduction to Immigrant Incorporation Studies: European Perspectives* (371-388). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Emilsson, H. (2015). A national turn of local integration policy: multi-level governance dynamics in Denmark and Sweden. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 3(7), 1-16.

EUROCITIES (2015). Statement on asylum in cities.

EUROCITIES (2016). Refugee Reception and Integration in Cities.

Favell, A. (2010). Integration and nations: the nation-state and research on immigrants in Western Europe. In M. Martiniello & J. Rath (Eds.), *Selected Studies in International Migration and Immigration Incorporation* (371-404). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Gebhardt, D. (2016). When the state takes over: civic integration programmes and the role of cities in immigrant integration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(5), 742-758.

Geddes, A., & Scholten, P. (2016). *The Politics of Migration & Immigration in Europe*. N. Aguilera (Ed.). London: Sage.

Glick Schiller, N., & Çağlar, A. (2009). Towards a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies: Migrant Incorporation and City Scale. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(2), 177-202.

Jørgensen, M. B. (2012). The Diverging Logics of Integration Policy Making at National and City Level. *International Migration Review*, 46(1), 244-278.

- Klaver, J., Mallee, L., Odé, A., & Smit, W. (2015). De integratie van statushouders op lokaal niveau: belemmeringen en oplossingen. Amsterdam: Regioplan.
- Klaver, J. (2016). Local responses to the refugee crisis in the Netherlands: Reception and integration. Warsaw: Institute of Public Affairs.
- 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: immigrants, local politics and integration policies* (17-37). London: Ashgate.
- Maliepaard, M., Witkamp, B., & Jennissen, R. (2017). Een kwestie van tijd? De integratie van asielmigranten: een cohortonderzoek. The Hague: WODC.
- Nabielek K. et al. (2016), Cities in Europe. The Hague: PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency.
- Nicholls, W. J., & Uitermark, J. (2016). Migrant cities: place, power, and voice in the era of super diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(6), 877-892.
- Poppelaars, C., & Scholten, P. (2008). Two Worlds Apart: The Divergence of National and Local Immigrant Integration Policies in the Netherlands. *Administration and Society* 40(4), 335-357.
- Qvist, M. (2015). Activation Reform and Inter-Agency Co-Operation - Local Consequences of Mixed Modes of Governance in Sweden. *Social Policy & Administration*, 50(1), 19-38.
- Razenberg, I., & de Gruijter, M. (2016). Rapportage: De rol van gemeenten bij arbeidsparticipatie van vluchtelingen: inspirerende voorbeelden. Utrecht: Verwey-Jonker Instituut.
- Razenberg, I., & de Gruijter, M. (2016). Vluchtelingen aan het werk: Enquête onder gemeenten over arbeidstoeleiding van statushouders. Utrecht: Verwey-Jonker Instituut.
- Samers, M. (2010). Migration. New York: Routledge.
- Scholten, P. (2012). 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.
- Scholten, P. (2015). Between National Models and Multi-Level Decoupling: The Pursuit of Multi-Level Governance in Dutch and UK Policies Towards Migrant Incorporation. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 17(4), 973-994.
- Scholten, P., & Penninx, R. (2016). The Multilevel Governance of Migration and Integration. In B. Garcés-Masareñas and R. Penninx (eds.), *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe* (91-108). IMISCOE Research Series: Springer.

SER. (2016). Nieuwe wegen naar een meer succesvolle arbeidsmarktintegratie van vluchtelingen. The Hague: SER.

Uitermark, J., Hochstenbach, C., & van Gent, W. (2017). The statistical politics of exceptional territories. *Political Geography*, 57, 60-70.

Van der Leun, J. (2006). Excluding illegal migrants in The Netherlands: Between national policies and local implementation. *West European Politics*, 29(2), 310-326.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054.

VNG. (2016). Factsheet: Integratie en participatie voor gemeenten.

VNG. (2017). OTAV-Factsheet: Voorbeelden uit plannen van aanpak participatieverklaringstraject. Rijksoverheid.

VluchtelingenWerk Nederland (2016). Vluchtelingen in getallen 2016. Amsterdam: VluchtelingenWerk Nederland.

Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks*, 2(4), 301-334.

Websites

<http://www.ahomeawayfromhome.nl/>

<https://www.coa.nl/>

<http://nos.nl/>

<https://www.opnieuwthuis.nl/>

<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/>

<https://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/>

<https://vng.nl/onderwerpenindex/asiel/asielbeleid-en-integratie>

<http://www.werkwijzervluchtelingen.nl/>

<https://www.zichtopdevreemdelingenketen.nl/>

Appendix

Survey

These are the questions included in the survey. They also inquire about the education domain, which was later dropped from the research scope. Additionally, these questions come from the survey that was designed for regional actors such as the Divosa coordinators and the OTAV account-managers. Therefore, the questions ask about municipalities in the respondent's region. A second survey was designed for municipal actors, and had slightly reformulated questions in that regard.

1. Wat is uw functie en voor welke regio bent u actief?

Functie (optioneel)	<input type="text"/>
Regio	<input type="text"/>

(What is your function and for which region are you active?).

2. Hoe ziet u de samenwerking tussen gemeenten in uw regio en de overheid?

	Van bovenaf gestuurd	Van onderop gestuurd	Complementair
Huisvesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inburgering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Onderwijs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arbeidsmarkt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Toelichting (optioneel)

(How do you consider the cooperation between municipalities in your region and the central government? For each domain: top-down/bottom-up/complementary).

3. Hoe ziet u de afstemming tussen gemeentelijk beleid in uw regio en dat van de overheid?

	Aansluitend	Onsamenhangend	Tegenstrijdig
Huisvesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inburgering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Onderwijs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arbeidsmarkt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Toelichting (optioneel)

(How do you consider the coordination between municipal policy in your region and that of the national government? Per domain: complementary/decoupled/contradictory).

4. Welke factoren beïnvloeden de vier beleidsgebieden in uw regio het sterkst?

	Financieel (bezuiniging/begroting)	Nationale politiek	Lokale politiek	Lokale publieke opinie	Structurele beperkingen (juridisch/institutioneel)	Wetenschappelijk onderzoek	Gemeentelijk imago (bijvoorbeeld 'city- branding')
Huisvesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Inburgering	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Onderwijs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arbeidsmarkt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Andere belangrijke factoren

(What factors influence the four policy domains in your region the most? Per domain: financial; national politics; local politics; local public opinion; structural constraints (legal/institutional); scientific research; municipal image (for example 'city-branding').

5. Hoe vaak is het mogelijk voor gemeenten in uw regio om belemmeringen of oplossingen constructief te delen met de overheid?

(How often is it possible for municipalities in your region to share constraints and solutions with the national government?).

6. Wanneer gemeenten in uw regio beperkingen of oplossingen aankaarten bij de overheid, heeft dat dan ook concrete gevolgen?

	Ja, bijvoorbeeld	Soms, dat ligt dan aan	Nee, want
Huisvesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inburgering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Onderwijs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arbeidsmarkt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Kunt u één of meer van uw antwoorden toelichten?

(When municipalities in your region address constraints and solutions with the national government, does that then produce an effective response? Per domain: Yes, for example/Sometimes, that depends on/No, because).