Undocumented 'Amsterdammers'

A research on the sensemaking of policy bureaucrats and policymakers upon the participation of undocumented migrants in the 'inclusive city'.

Thesis

Master Public Administration - Governance of Migration and Diversity, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam

Anna van Gelder

Student number: 513502

First reader: Maria Schiller

Second reader: Zeynep Kasli

09-08-2019

27103 words

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank my lovely boyfriend Alex, my father Jan Willem and my mother Moniek for their (emotional) support during the writing of this thesis.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my first reader Maria Schiller and second reader Zeynep Kasli for their guidance during this process.

Last but not least, I would like to thank all the respondents from the municipality of Amsterdam who were willing to participate in this research, as well as willing to reflect on their policy with a welcoming and open attitude.

Abstract

This case study focuses upon the specific case of the Amsterdam' policy "Uitvoeringsplan 24-uursopvang ongedocumenteerden", published during the end of 2018. The policy is a specific plan of the municipality of Amsterdam for the sheltering and guidance of the undocumented migrants in the city. The plan focuses on temporality: the undocumented migrant is taken into the programme for a maximum of 1,5 years. During this time will be established what the future-perspective of the migrant will be. A future that could either be in the Netherlands after a juridical revision of the asylum claim, or a return to the home country. Furthermore, as the policy is part of the broader political picture of *the inclusive city*, the participation of migrants in the city is a strong aim of the policy as well (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018, p.24). This raises the question: how can those who are possibly only temporarily permitted in the city, and refused to be recognised by the state to begin with, participate in and be part of the inclusive city?

As this research aims to understand what meaning the policymakers and policy bureaucrats give to this policy story, as well as how they explain this both to the researcher and to themselves, I ask the question:

"*How do policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the (temporary) participation of undocumented migrants in the inclusive city?*"

Following from 12 in-depth, qualitative interviews with both policymakers and policy bureaucrats involved in this policy, this research firstly explains that the respondents made sense of the participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city by seeing participation as a means to reach the main goal of the plan: creating a future perspective for the undocumented migrant. However, the meaning of the inclusive city in combination with this policy was more difficult to make sense of. Firstly, as the inclusive city represented a broader vision of the municipality, and not specifically just for this policy, the policymakers and policy bureaucrats had difficulty creating a shared understanding of the concept. Furthermore, due to the given definition of the inclusive city as the acknowledgement of the migrant as a group that is part of the city, together with the focus of the plan upon a temporal residence of the individual undocumented migrant in that identity, frictions in the story can be found. The membership of the undocumented migrant to the city seems to exist in a sort of middle-ground, making it difficult for the policymakers and policy bureaucrats to make sense of this relation. Therefore, this research is meant as a moment of reflection for the respondents, as well as a call for further research, upon the complex relationship between the undocumented migrant and the city and the materialisation of this relation into policy.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

"This a historically charged topic between the state and municipalities. In the vision of the state, this is about a group of people who do not have right to residence. For municipalities the public order is most important"– Secretary of state Harbers, about the special municipal services for undocumented migrants (Meijer, 2018b)

In 2018, the problems that undocumented migrants encounter during their residence in the city of Amsterdam were highlighted by demonstrations of the action group 'We Are Here', causing societal unrest (NU.nl, 2018). This increased societal attention together with a considerably leftist new municipal board after the local elections, the issue of installing a more effective policy for undocumented migrants became part of the local coalition agreement (GroenLinks Amsterdam, 2018; Isitman, 2018). In this agreement, the municipality of Amsterdam decided to expand their services for irregular migrants (GroenLinks, D66, PvdA and SP, 2018), resulting in the policy-proposal "Uitvoeringsplan 24-uursopvang ongedocumenteerden" following the end of 2018. The policy is said to be part of the municipality's overall narrative of *the inclusive city*. Its renewed focus aims to find a sustainable solution for the migrants, either in the Netherlands or elsewhere, depending on their legal possibilities. The undocumented migrants will live in 24-hours shelters for a maximum duration of 1,5 years and are during that period obliged to explore the future possibilities together with a case manager and juridical support. In practice, this means that a considerable, but unclear, number of migrants will possibly have to return to their sending countries (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018; Dirks, 2018). Furthermore, as the policy is part of the broader political picture of *the inclusive city*, the participation of migrants in the city is a strong aim of the policy as well. (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018, p.24).

In the first place, the decision to expand the services for undocumented migrants by the municipality seemed to create tensions with the national government as this group of people is seen to have no right of residence, let alone inclusion into the city. However, a few months after the Amsterdam' policy proposal, the national government created a new policy to tackle the local problems in different municipalities as well. The government decided to work together with the municipalities and installed a pilot policy called 'Landelijke vreemdelingen voorzieningen' (LVV) with according budget for appointed participating municipalities to ensure the 'order' in these cities (Meijer, 2018b). As the main goal of the policy of the municipality was largely similar to the national pilot policy, Amsterdam was designated as one of the pilot cities (Groot Wassink, 2019). However, the cities' focus upon participation and especially inclusion seems to differ from the national policy-frame (Interview policy bureaucrat 5). This raises the question:

how can those who are possibly only temporarily permitted in the city, and refused to be recognised by the state to begin with, participate and be part of the inclusive city?

As explained, there is a clear focus upon temporality in the plan: the migrants can join the programme for 1,5 years in which the migrant is invited to participate in the (inclusive) city to work on their future. A future that would either be in the Netherlands after a juridical revision of the asylum claim, or a return to the home-country (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018; Dirks, 2018). However, how participation and the inclusive city is defined exactly in relation to the undocumented migrant does not become clear from the plan (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018). Looking at definitions from multiple scholars, inclusion is often seen as the outcome of not being excluded from participating or engaging in the multiple domains of a society (Cameron, 2006; Rawal, 2008; Gaventa, 1998; Aasland and Fløtten, 2001). Thus, the fact that a considerable group of undocumented migrants will only be allowed to participate temporarily in the city due to the lack of legal possibilities, seems to theoretically oppose the idea of inclusivity.

Besides the temporal focus of the policy, another tension can be noticed in the plan as well. The idea that the migrant is invited to participate in the city as part of the broader plan of an inclusive city, following Sassen (2002) and Jacobson (1996), seems to theoretically create a tension between the national and local – Amsterdam - level. As the nation-state is based upon the idea of a nation of which membership and belonging is formed by the frames of the state, the local level policies inviting the migrant to participate and hinting towards some sort of inclusion, therefore, seems to go against the exact premise that the nation-state is built upon (Sassen, 2002; Jacobson, 1996; Castels, de Haas and Miller, 2014). On the other hand, a new development in the Netherlands can be found in which, the state - the government - recognises the need for municipalities to react to those claims upon the local level, for the sake of 'order' and therefore agrees to facilitate the local services, even without recognizing the right of residence of this group (Meijer, 2018b). The question resides what participation and inclusion than exactly would entail for the undocumented migrant.

To understand how policymakers and policy bureaucrats deal with the possible tensions surrounding the undocumented migrant, temporality, participation and the inclusive city, this research will analyse how policymakers and policy bureaucrats 'make sense' of this problem when they explain the policy surrounding undocumented migrants to the public, to the researcher, but especially to themselves. I expect that there will be a lot of obstacles and tensions found in the policy-story which will make it difficult for the policymakers and policy bureaucrats to 'make sense' of this part of the plan. Following theoretical understandings upon sensemaking

- as (will be) elaborated upon in the theoretical framework -, Weick (1995) and Schwandt (2005) explain that the sensemaking in organisations often gets clouded due to a routinized organisational vocabulary that prevents a deeper understanding of new information. As the municipality states itself to be an inclusive organisation (GroenLinks, D66, PvdA and SP, 2018), I expect that this 'organisational vocabulary' that could be grounded in the concept of the inclusive city, has clouded a deeper understanding of what this inclusive city and participation might theoretically entail for the migrant and its relation towards the city.

Deriving from the above questions and expectations, this research asks the following question:

"*How do policymakers and policy-bureaucrats make sense of the (temporary) participation of undocumented migrants in the inclusive city?*"

The focus upon participation and inclusion of the policy in relation to the undocumented migrants seems to fit into a broader theoretical debate upon how the undocumented migrant relates towards the city, as well new insights upon the creation of local pathways by 'those who not belong' to obtain a form of membership to the polity (Staeheli, 2003; Sassen, 2002; Varsanyi, 2006). However, the specific views of the policymakers themselves on this form of urban inclusion or urban citizenship has yet to be researched (Hoekstra, 2015). Furthermore, the specific problem of the local participation and inclusivity of undocumented migrants, especially in combination with the extra factor of localised temporality, has not yet seemed to be researched as such. Following the aforementioned raised questions as well as the theoretical debate upon this topic thus far, the aim of this explorative study is to get an in-depth understanding of how policy bureaucrats and policymakers make sense of the possibly temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in 'the inclusive city': Amsterdam. The research tries to contribute to existing literature upon local participation and temporal inclusion of undocumented migrants as well as urban sensemaking of migrant-based problems by policy bureaucrats and policymakers. I will do this firstly by understanding what both participation and the inclusive city in this plan entails for the undocumented migrant. Secondly, this research tries to grasp how policymakers and bureaucrats deal with and make sense of these problems, and how this temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city might possibly be realised. Lastly, beyond the aim of grasping this question, the aim of this study is to provide reflective insights and recommendations upon the plan for the population itself.

This research will start with an theoretical overview of who the policymaker and policy bureaucrat exactly are. After the population is defined, firstly the concept of participation in

relation to the undocumented migrant will be explored. Subsequently, the concept of the inclusive city will be unravelled by firstly defining social inclusion and conceptualising what, according to this definition, the inclusive city would mean for the undocumented migrant. Thereafter, a different understanding of inclusion based upon theories on local membership, or urban citizenship will be explored, as well as defining what the inclusive city might entail based upon these understandings. Then, a small overview will be given of theories surrounding temporality in relation to the undocumented migrant. After the methodological section, an analysis of the findings will be given, proceeding the discussion and the conclusion.

2. Theoretical framework

To be able to understand the sensemaking of the policymaker and the policy bureaucrats in relation to this plan, firstly will be defined who the policymakers and the policy bureaucrat are, and how they relate to each other. When this is defined, the relation between the inclusive city, participation and undocumented migrants will be unravelled. Firstly, the concept 'participation' will be defined. Moreover, the different definitions of inclusion, and with that the inclusive city, will be analysed by dividing the concept into two different theoretical interpretations, the latter linked to newer theoretical understandings of local citizenship. Both concepts will be theoretically linked to undocumented migrants in particular. Accordingly, a definition of the inclusive city for undocumented migrants will be given based understandings of this concept. Furthermore, a brief overview will be given on theories surrounding undocumented migrants, inclusion and temporality. Lastly, the concept of sensemaking will be further explained.

2.1. Governance and policymaking

In this section, the profession of the 'policy bureaucrat' will be analysed, specifically in relation to their political colleague: the policymaker.

2.1.1. Policy bureaucrats

The profession of the Dutch policy bureaucrat and the development of their role in the political sphere has long been part of both the academic and societal debate (Jansen, Janssen and Kwakkelstein, 2014). According to the online 'Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek' – general Dutch dictionary - a policy bureaucrat "*is occupied with preparing, and together with others, deciding on the policy itself*" (ANW, 2019). According to 't Hart (2014) for the 'classical bureaucrat' this task, and its relation with the political sphere, was during the 20th century distinctly framed and defined. The government was the political decision-maker, who 'told' society what to do. With that, societal wicked problems that came on the political agenda, and

their proposed policies by its policymakers, were often treated as technical issues that could be measured and solved by a rational, and politically neutral bureaucratic apparatus. Therefore, 'servitude' and neutrality were one of the biggest professional values that policy bureaucrats were appointed (t Hart, 2014).

Fast forward to the 21st century, the professional values of the bureaucrat and its relation towards the political sphere is less clear. In a study by Wilmink (2014) on professionalism amongst bureaucrats working at a Dutch Ministry comes forward that the bureaucrats felt highly unsure about the core values of their profession. However, they still recognised the idea that the bureaucracy should serve the political sphere with value-free services and information as their highest professional value (Wilmink, 2014). On the other hand, the bureaucrats felt that appreciation and the use of their own personal experiences, expertise and knowledge were important as well. This, in a way paradoxical, pairing of professional values, explains the increased insecurity in both society an academia on whether the classical value-free relation within a changing political 'network' society still exists (Wilmink, 2014). *"The classical bureaucratic values, such as loyalty, neutrality and continuity, become increasingly submissive towards political sensitivity"* (Bekker, 2014, in Wilmink, 2014, p.38-39) is one of the statements upon the changing profession. According to 't Hart (2014), the classical relation between politics and bureaucracy and its accompanying skills alone is not sufficient anymore, and the bureaucrat needs different, additional skills and values. This new need of professional core values is due to the expanding involvement of civil society in Dutch politics and political decision-making. During the end of the 20th century, governmental political decisions gradually developed from being 'told', to being 'sold' and eventually were even negotiated. Society became gradually more and more included in political decision making: a shift from government to governance ('T Hart, 2014; Hoppe & Jeliazkova, 2006). *"Public policy can no longer be accurately described as a government focused activity, aiming at the regulation of civil society and markets by bureaucratic public organizations that make policies and manage policy programs in close interaction with, but in sharply defined task differentiation from and accountability to elected politicians"* (Hoppe & Jeliazkova, 2006, p.54). Governance, therefore, goes beyond government: the role of the state depends per case and is part of a broader network of non-governmental actors that together forms a governance network in which rules are defined (Kjaer, 2004; Colebatch, 2009). With this increasing power of various societal actors, according to 't Hart (2014) 'The bureaucrat 3.0', needs more space to interact with civil society, bringing in more ideas and knowledge from the ground into the policy, and managing multiple actors. This

development resonates to the second need of the bureaucrats as defined in the research by Wilmink (2014) that respondents wanted to be acknowledged in their knowledge and expertise.

Therefore, according to these theories, the difference between the political 'policy-maker' and the policy bureaucrats would be less clear than 'classically' would be defined. Current developments might ask the bureaucrat to engage more with civil society, and be therefore more involved in the policy definition process by sharing their own experiences and knowledge as well beyond the policy frames as given by the policymakers.

1.2 Participation

To understand how policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city, the next section will give an overview of how participation is thus far defined in theory. Furthermore, a theoretical overview will be given of what this participation then entails for the undocumented migrant.

2.2.1 Participation beyond obstacles

In the policy-plan is focused upon the participation of the undocumented migrant. However, the plan is unclear about how participation actually can be defined[1] (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018). After a small literature review, it becomes clear that participation is, just as in the plan, often not explicitly defined in the literature. However, an insight into what participation might entail and how this relates towards inclusion might give a deeper understanding of what this participation for the undocumented migrant entails.

According to Law (2002) - who tried to define the concept by looking into its meaning from the originating Latin as well as the English vocabulary - the essence of the word participation can be understood by the central concept of "[..] *involvement or sharing, particularly in an activity"*(Law, 2002, p.641). However, as the undocumented migrant is seen as formally not belonging, the migrant can face multiple obstacles to be able to be involved in certain activities, in other words: to participate in that society (Hellgren, 2014; Coutin, 1999; Varsanyi, 2006; Bloch, 2013). An illustrating example of this is political participation. The main tool of political participation – voting - is often, with little exemption, only allowed for legal residents of that society (de Graauw, 2014; Beckman, 2013). However, Deth et al. (2007, in Cinalli & Ciugni, 2011) argue that it is important to look beyond the classical dichotomy in terms of either to participate or to not participate at all, and to take into account the multiple ways a migrant can in fact participate. They mention multiple pathways for political

---

[1] A full overview of this can be found in the chapter 3.1. 'case'

participation, such as protesting or engaging in activities of political parties (Deth et al., 2007, in Cinalli & Ciugni, 2011). Furthermore, looking into social participation, according to a research by Varsanyi (2006), the social participation of approximately 10 million undocumented migrants in the United States of America is an everyday reality: they buy their groceries, engage in sport activities, their children go to school and they themselves engage with people from the communities they live in. Moreover, whilst often multiple formal barriers are installed in countries towards the labour of non-legal residents, in practice undocumented migrants do participate in the labour market by working in the irregular labour circuit (Bloch, 2013).

Participation can thus be seen as *engaging in activities that spread multiple life domains*. These activities can according to above researches mostly be divided in political, social and labour/educational participation. The undocumented migrant formally encounters multiple barriers in their participation, but this does not by any means mean that the migrants do not participate: multiple pathways towards social, political and labour/educational participation can be found.

Deriving from these theories I expect that it the policymakers and policy bureaucrats will struggle to find formal means of participation in the multiple life domains, especially in that of political and labour participation as formal barriers often can be found to the participation of undocumented migrants in those domains. Therefore, I expect these formal forms of participation to fall into the social domain, such as organised clubs or activities with others. This, however, does not mean that the migrants do not participate on their own, but that it is difficult for the municipality to legally arrange formal means of participation for this group.

Now that is defined what participation for the undocumented might entail, the next part will go deeper into the possible meaning of the inclusive city in relation to the undocumented migrant. As two varying theoretical perspectives can be found upon what inclusion in the city might entail for undocumented migrant, two definitions of the inclusive city will be given.

2.3. Defining the inclusive city: to participate or to not participate

In the first perspective in the literature surrounding inclusion, the undocumented migrant and the city, inclusion is defined by the ability of the undocumented migrant to participate in the city. Firstly, this definition of inclusion will be explained, followed by its relation to the undocumented migrant and the city. Based upon these explanations the first definition of the inclusive city will be articulated.

2.3.1. Participation in the inclusive city

A literature review by Rawal (2008) argues that thus far 'social inclusion' as an alone-standing concept has not profoundly been defined in the literature. According to Cameron (2006), the concept is often seen in relation to its counterpart – social exclusion – creating an indirect or implied understanding of the concept of social inclusion.

"Frequently, for example, it appears in invocations of 'normal' social expectation/participation or, more commonly, 'mainstream' applied to various things that people are understood to be excluded from: labour market, economy, society, culture, citizenship, etc. [..]. As this implies, social inclusion is most commonly defined only negatively - as whatever is not socially excluded" (Carmeron, 2006, p.397).

Therefore, when social inclusion is the taken for granted counterpart of social exclusion, the question rises how then exactly social exclusion is defined. An earlier research by Gaventa (1998) uses a broader definition of the concept by de Haan (1997) *"the process through which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society within which they live"*(De Haan, 1997, page unknown, in Gaventa, 1998, p. 51). However, to be able to empirically research and analyse how social exclusion interacts with ethnicity, Aasland and Fløtten (2001) have tried to establish the most important 'life arenas' that according to the authors can be seen as the proxies for social exclusion: "*(1) exclusion from formal citizenship rights; (2) exclusion from the labour market; (3) exclusion from participation in civil society; and (4) exclusion from social arenas*" (Aasland and Fløtten, 2001, p.1028).

According to Gaventa (1998), the way that participation intervenes with social exclusion can be defined in two ways. The first way comes forth in the definition by de Haan (1997, in Gaventa, 1998): if you are constrained in your participation you are excluded, and therefore, the more you are able to fully participate in a society, the more included you are. The possibility to participate is then seen as the factor that *determines* either your social inclusion or exclusion. The second way that participation interacts with social exclusion, is more of a supporting relationship. Participation does not determine in- or exclusion, but can be seen as a coping mechanism. "*Participation is seen as a vehicle to enable the excluded to act more effectively to address the problems which they face*" (Gaventa, 1998, p.51). Aasland and Fløtten (2001) seem to agree with the first relation between social exclusion and participation in relation to their defined life arenas: "*Participation in all these arenas would suggest that people are not socially excluded*" (p.1028), but point out that it is not an either/or relation: different degrees and indicators need to be taken into account as well. Aasland and Fløtten (2001) explain this more

profoundly in their analysis of the life arena of citizenship rights. Even though scholars see the lack of formal citizenship rights as a form of exclusion in itself, this does not have to mean that those whom it concerns are fully socially excluded from the society or political entity that they are in (Aasland and Fløtten, 2001).

The above example concerning lacking formal citizenship rights is - of course - the case for the undocumented migrant. A research by Hellgren (2014) upon citizenship claim-making by undocumented migrants in Sweden and Spain, agrees with the ambiguous reality of social exclusion in relation to undocumented migrants: *"Lacking formal rights in a highly formalised society may lead to complete social exclusion, whereas there may be more channels for inclusion and participation when informal contacts and forms of employment are widespread"* (Hellgren, 2014, p.1178). According to Coutin (1999), when there is no formal inclusion, the undocumented migrant can still acquire other informal forms of social membership formed by participation, of which the most prevailing: work. In the case of political inclusion of the undocumented migrant, Beckman (2013) analyses that it is certainly difficult to reach full political inclusion, with voting rights and all, as long as restrictive border systems and the statuses of illegality upon undocumented migrants reside (Beckman, 2013). However, as mentioned before, there are multiple ways to participate politically, such as by protesting, according to Deth et al. (2007, in Cinalli & Ciugni, 2011). Therefore, political or democratic inclusion of undocumented migrants, following this line of thought, can exist, however not fully, as participation is not an either/or story (Deth et al., 2007, in Cinalli & Ciugni, 2011).

Therefore, according to the above scholars, the inclusion of the undocumented migrant in the society can be measured by its possibility to participate beyond the lack of formal inclusion. *Deriving from this, an inclusive city would be a city in which the migrant can participate as much as possible, beyond their lack of formal inclusion.*

An illustration of such a city can be found in a study by Varsanyi (2006) upon the incorporation of undocumented migrants into American states and cities. As explained, the social participation of the undocumented migrant is an everyday reality in these cities. According to Varsanyi (2006), due to lack of a changed course of action from the federal government to that reality, the cities and states formed local policies to be able to react to this reality and enhance pathways to participation of these migrants, such as opening up the ability to receive a driver's license as an undocumented migrant (Varsanyi, 2006). Therefore, these cases could in this reading seen as 'inclusive cities' as well.

2.4. Defining the inclusive city: the recognition of urban membership

Beyond the conceptualisation of the inclusive city as a city in which the undocumented migrant can participate as much possible, the inclusive city can be understood from another theoretical perspective as well. According to a newer focus in the literature, the city can be seen as the locality in which ideas of inclusion, membership and even citizenship itself are challenged, changed or shaken by the mere presence as well as the active rights-claiming of undocumented migrants (Sassen, 2002, Hellgren, 2014, Varsanyi, 2006, and so on). Cities' evolving recognition of this locality-based membership and inclusion of undocumented migrants is by some authors (Varsanyi, 2006, Bhimiji, 2014; Gebhardt, 2016, and others) conceptualised as 'urban citizenship'. In the next section, firstly, a theoretical overview will be given upon how undocumented migrants actively and unconsciously change understandings of membership in the city. Subsequently will be explained how this urban-based membership or urban citizenship is recognised in the city. Based upon this second understanding of the inclusion of the undocumented migrant in the city, the second definition of 'the inclusive city' will be given.

2.4.1. Inclusion and citizenship claim-making in the city

Based upon theories by Sassen (2002), Hellgren (2014), and Varsanyi (2006) and so on, the city is a place where institutional understandings of membership and even citizenship are contested. Following this reading, the inclusive city is not just a place to participate as well as the battleground for "*the actions of individuals, social groups and institutions as part of an ongoing pursuit for inclusion*"(Staeheli, 2003, p. 101). This is underlined by Nordling, Sager and Söderman (2017) in relation to the undocumented migrant as well, stating that these processes should not just be seen as the pursuit for inclusion as well as altering of how membership, and its main premise – citizenship -, can be seen: *"We read the struggles of undocumented migrants and their allies as such acts – carrying the potential to alter the overall understanding of processes of inclusion and exclusion"* (Nordling, Sager and Söderman, 2017, p. 712). According to Hellgren (2014), undocumented migrants contest ideas upon membership - who is part of the entity and who is not - both inherently in their identity as undocumented immigrants, as well as actively. This contesting of ideas of membership and inclusion can first and foremost be seen "*in the very condition of being an undocumented migrant who transgresses legal boundaries to participate, and to some degree integrate, in a society without formal citizenship or residence permits*" (Hellgren, 2014 p.1178). Moreover, migrants actively contest these ideas, for example, by protesting for more rights (Hellgren, 2014). According to Sassen (2002), the city is the place where undocumented migrants and supporters often have come to mobilise, and thus where the struggles for belonging and membership often play out. According to Sassen (2002), this

mobilisation of otherwise groups with little power comes forth out of processes of globalisation. In these processes, the nation-state as the determinant of membership losing force, together with cities gaining more economic-political weight, the city develops itself as the strategic cite in which claims upon citizenship play out. Isin (2009) seems to agree with Sassen (2002) conceptualises these protests or mobilisations to become included and gain certain rights as 'acts of citizenship', and argues that these acts can play out on multiple sites, of which the city. Staeheli (2003) follows this description as well. According to the author's literature analysis, citizenship goes beyond a legal status. Citizenship is about belonging, being *included* in a political community. Citizenship is, therefore, not ought to be seen as just a static status, but a process, in how an individual of groups feels included or is included in the political community. As this pursuit for inclusion can play out on different geographical levels, the author argues that citizenship should be looked at beyond just the traditional national framework, and can manifest itself both locally and globally. The author argues however that a substantial amount of scholars see the processes of belonging and inclusion play out at the local level, in other words, the city. The author takes this as a point of departure: "*As demonstrated in these papers, the spaces of citizenship extend beyond the sites of government into the neighbourhood, the workplace, public spaces such as streets and parks, and the home. Thus the struggles and practices of citizenship are powerfully shaped and conditioned by spatial relationships and the geography of the city*" (Staeheli, 2003, p.99). This local formation of citizenship is by some scholars defined as "urban citizenship" (Varsanyi, 2006, Baubock, 2003). According to these scholars, urban citizenship is not confined by national boundaries, but is based upon new pathways of claim-making to membership or inclusion on the local level (Sassen, 2002; Varsanyi, 2006). This membership is not determined by and granted upon formal national arrangements, but *".. the mere fact of presence and residence in a city or state [province]"* (Varsanyi, 2006, p.244). Therefore, Bhimji (2014) comes to the following conclusion: "*The undocumented immigrants' persistent and repetitive performances of belonging and membership as well as their struggles to challenge legislations and shift power dynamics within the city needs to be understood as urban citizenship*" (p.21).

2.4.2. Pathways of urban membership recognition

Bhimiji's (2014), as well as Varsyani's (2006), theoretical connection between urban citizenship and undocumented migrants is part of a newer understanding of the concept of urban citizenship. More normative understandings of this new theoretical vison have called for recognition of citizenship beyond the nation state either a form of transnational or cosmopolitan democracy (Baubock, 2003; Staeheli, 2003; Varsanyi, 2006). As the nation-state is based upon the idea of a

nation of which membership and belonging is formed by the frames of the state, urban citizenship seems to go against the exact premise that the nation-state is built upon (Sassen, 2002; Jacobson, 1996; Castles, de Haas and Miller, 2014).

Whereas urban citizenship has long been discussed, normative accounts upon urban citizenship often have taken for granted the idea that everyone "*at the very least, has formal access to citizenship rights*"(Varsanyi, 2006, p.230). The case of undocumented migrants, and how their legal status constraints their pathways to claim-making upon membership in any shape or form, has therefore long been overlooked at (Bosniak, 2000; Varsanyi, 2006). According to Gebhardt (2016), contemporary scholars have thus far defined two possible pathways for undocumented migrants to accumulate a recognised 'membership of the urban polity' (p.849) of which local rights and services are granted upon. Based upon these understandings of recognised membership the second definition of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city can be formulated.

The first pathway, according to Gebhardt (2016) is based upon *presence*: the recognition of membership is then based upon the mere fact that these migrants are present in the city and are seen as a vulnerable group that needs to be acted upon. Therefore, the recognition of these migrants is coming forth out of an idea of emergency or threat and is usually justified within a human rights discourse. Therefore, their recognition and partial granting of certain rights are often temporary and improvised, as they are more seen to be a humanitarian problem than an actual stable part of the city. As an illustration Gebhardt (2016) therefore mentions the sanctuary city movement, as well as the Dutch 'bed-bad-brood' (bed, bath, bread) shelters (Gebhardt, 2016). This statement is in line with Jacobson's (1996) analysis of the increased confinement of nation-states to human rights laws, due to the global expansion of a human rights regime along with the ability of the individual to make claims against the state-based upon these human rights. Jacobson (1996) argues that transnational migration has eradicated the vacuum of the 'people' making the granting of rights more and more towards residence instead of being part of the citizenry. As the sole sovereignty of the state to rule over the people therefore eradicates, Jacobson (1996) argues that states have therefore more and more become to rely on, and become subordinate to, human rights law. Sassen (2002) explains that these global interdependency processes such as the creation of a human rights regime resulting in a loss of sovereign power of the nation-state, together with the mobilisation of people who are strengthened by this loss (such as 'stateless' people), materialise in global cities. The global city is the local outcome where the global rescaling becomes vivid, as new understandings of citizenship are formed by the claiming of rights based upon presence in the city alone (Sassen, 2002). Global processes, especially the

development of a global human rights regime, therefore, result in a local recognition of citizenship-rights claiming by undocumented migrants based upon their presence in the city.

The second recognition of membership, according to Gebhardt (2016), is based upon *residency*. This idea entails that the city has its own systems and institutions of membership based solely upon residency in the city: the city is responsible for all residents in its boundaries, non-national or not. Deriving from this, this form of recognition can be seen as a more stable form as these rights are institutionalised and granted to all during their residence in the city. Undocumented migrants, therefore, do not have to become visible on the (local) political and international agenda to be recognised, as is the case in the first form of membership, but can fall back to the local membership institutions and systems that are in place once they can prove their residency (Gebhardt, 2016). Gebhardt (2016) argues that this pathway has been mainly explained more normative, futuristic accounts of urban citizenship, such as Baubock's (2003) cosmopolitan democracy. However, Varsanyi (2006) has analysed four examples of local citizenship-rights for undocumented migrants in the United States and found recognition of membership based upon residency in for example the granting of local voting rights to all residents in certain cities. Therefore, Varsanyi (2006) concluded the following: *".. these policies represent a de facto consent for the formal membership of these individuals"* (p.240). Varsanyi (2006) argues that even though undocumented migrants are from a government perspective not allowed in the US, due to little enforcement, cities and states had the leeway to create appropriate policies to manage a growing group of undocumented migrants. Due to the installed local policies that are eligible for everybody inside these local territories, these groups are provided with partial membership based upon local residence (Varsanyi, 2006).

We can thus identify two differing local pathways towards membership, using Gebhardt's (2016) distinction between *presence* and *residence*. The former recognition comes forth out of a form of emergency: the recognised presence of the group is often seen as a humanitarian problem on which is reacted by a city with a temporary, improvised granting of certain rights or services. The latter follows from a different principle, namely recognition based upon residency. This recognition is more of stable form as it is embedded in institutions, rules, regulations and policy, and counts for all residents of the polity. The undocumented migrant does therefore not have to be visibly and politically present as a 'humanitarian emergency' for this recognition of this membership, but this recognition is embedded in their local residency itself. Both forms - one more institutionalised, the other more based upon temporality - however, lead to partial recognition of membership based on locality (Gebhardt, 2016). Following this analysis, *the inclusive city is thus a city in which the membership of undocumented migrants to the city is*

recognised by the granting of certain rights and/or services based upon a recognition of their 'residency' or their 'presence'.

2.5. Temporal inclusion and the undocumented migrant

One of the main defined tensions that seems to occur in the policy-plan is that of temporality and the inclusive city. As the inclusive city can be interpreted in multiple ways, as explained above, it is yet to see how policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of this tension. The recognition of membership based upon presence as explained by Gebhardt (2016) comes close to relation between inclusion and membership based upon temporality. However, the relation is not profoundly explained. Therefore, the next section will try to grasp the relation between temporality and inclusion, linked to the undocumented migrant.

2.5.1 Theoretical understandings of temporal inclusion

A clear analysis upon temporality and ex- or inclusion can be found in research on guest-worker programs in West-European states that formally lasted until 1973 (Koopmans and Statham, 2000). According to Koopmans and Statham (2000), guest-workers were often encouraged to retain their own social or cultural ties, as a way to enhance their focus upon a temporal residence and to make sure the migrants would return eventually to their sending countries. Based on this temporality, people were excluded from political rights. However, the story changed as the guest-workers found pathways to gain a non-temporary right of residence. According to the authors, from a post-nationalist reading, this could due to international laws as well as internal and external pressure. The migrants were granted political rights and therefore included, as Koopmans and Statham (2000) notice: "*no democratic state can uphold for very long a situation in which a significant percentage of the permanently resident population is excluded from political rights*" (p.36). Following this analysis, one can argue that temporality could be used as a legitimisation to exclusion, while stasis followed inclusion.

According to Hallett (2014), a different kind of policy in which undocumented labour migrant are temporarily granted multiple rights does not have to resemble inclusion as well. Hallett (2014) researches the 'Temporary Protected Status' (TPS) in the United States' immigration law with the case of the Salvadorian migrants. The author argues that even though they temporarily were granted more rights, of which a temporarily free-of-deportation-period during the upholding of this status, the migrants were simultaneously defined as 'nonmigrants' as well, meaning they had no pathway towards residency or citizenship. Even though in practice, according to the author, the migrant could reside for decades in the country with this Temporary Protected Status, the migrant would still not be eligible for residence due to the temporary-based

framing of the law. Therefore according to Hallett (2014): "*More than legally scaffolding the social inclusion of such migrants where they are living, it simply temporarily censures their removal*" (p.9).

Following these readings, temporal inclusion even with the granting of multiple rights, can in the end still be seen as a form of exclusion, when the right to a legal pathway towards residency or citizenship to end this temporality is still missing.

2.6. Sensemaking

This research tries to unravel what meaning policymakers and policy bureaucrats have given towards the temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city, and how they explain this story of tensions: to the researcher, to others, but most importantly to themselves. To grasp this question, this research uses the concept of sensemaking.

2.6.1. Sensemaking in the organisational literature

Sensemaking, a concept traditionally used in organisational research and coined by Weick (1995), can be defined as a meaning-making process: the retrospective, often collective, materialisation of meaning and circumstances into words to be able to turn these into action (Weick, Sutcliffe and Obstfeld, 2005). Or, as perhaps put more simply: *"a 'process' that includes the use of prior knowledge to assign meaning to new information"* (Schwandt, 2005, p.182). Once an actor has given meaning towards this new information, the actor materialises – in other words, explains - this meaning-making with words. Sense has been made of the new information and action can follow. In other words: "[*S]ensemaking is a way station on the road to a consensually constructed, coordinated system of action*" (Taylor & Van Every, 2000, p. 275 as cited in Weick, Sutcliffe and Obstfeld, 2005, p. 409).

2.6.2. Sensemaking as part of the policy process

Due to this focus upon meaning-making and the materialisation of this meaning into words and explanations, the concept of sensemaking lends itself towards public administration theories as well. Barzelay and Jacobsen (2009) explain on the basis of the influential policy-making theory of Jones and Baumgartner (2007) where Weick's (1995) sensemaking-theory would come into the policy-process. Jones and Baumgartner's (2007) analyse policies as a form of institutionalised stasis. Those who have the policy monopoly try to maintain this policy stasis based upon certain interests, such as the inability to change numerous policies at once. However, when the people who would like to change the policy gain more and more momentum, or

positive feedback, the policy-vacuum breaks, conceptualised by the authors as the punctuated equilibrium. Jones and Baumgartner's (2007) theory is therefore useful to understand how policy reforms come about, as well as why they often do not come about (Jones and Baumgartner, 2007; Barzelay & Jacobsen, 2009). However, according to Barzelay and Jacobsen (2009): "*their account glosses over how actors make sense of the interruption in the flow of experience brought on by reform decisions and of the stream of new cues they encounter in the implementation process*" (p.321). This moment of change, a reform to which new meanings have to be assigned to, is the moment where sensemaking comes into the process (Barzelay and Jacobson, 2009; Weick, 1995). The sensemaking of this reform occurs in multiple parts of the policy cycle. Beyond the sensemaking in the creation of the policy during the agenda-setting, the formulation and decision-making-steps of the policy process (Weick, 1995; Howlett, Ramesh and Perl, 2009), sensemaking happens in the implementation process as well. According to Spillane, Reiser and Reimer (2002), those who implement the policy make sense of the policy message as they unconsciously and consciously give meaning to the policy message based upon their own experiences and interpretations as well as fitting this meaning towards the reality that lies in front of them.

Following this analysis, in the case of the Amsterdam policy, sense was made at the moment new policy frames were installed, as well as during the further filling in of those frames, and as expected, will still happen during the implementation process. However, as explained, this research does not try to grasp the on the ground implementation of this plan, neither does the research look at how the frames of the policy came about or how these frames came onto the political agenda. The research is about that period in between, difficult to pin-point but somewhere around the formulation- and decision making process, in which the different (contradicting) elements of the inclusive city and participation were put in the plan and how policymakers and policy-bureaucrats give meaning to all these elements as part of one coherent story. How do policymakers and policy-bureaucrats explain this policy-story to the public and to the researcher? But perhaps more interestingly: how do they explain this story of undocumented migrants, temporality, participation and the inclusive city to themselves? How do they make sense of the question of tensions that seems to be interwoven in their plan? These questions about this period in-between are thus grasped in the concept of 'sensemaking'.

2.6.3. The process of sensemaking and the veil of 'organizational vocabulary'

How does this sensemaking then come about? According to Weick (1995), as explained, sensemaking happens when there is a moment of uncertainty about the meaning of an

occurrence, event or in this case: a policy reform. According to Schwandt (2005), this moment acts as a cue to signify that meaning has to be made of a situation or occurrence. Beyond these cues stemming from uncertainty, two other components interact that form the process of sensemaking. A crucial component is a prior meaning-framework "*that includes a set of elements, rules, or values that have served as a guide to understanding*" (Schwandt, 2005, p. 182), and lastly a link between the newly encountered information and the previous framework. Through the interaction of these three components – through this sensemaking - a new framework of meaning is established. A framework that is materialised into words and explanations (Schwandt, 2005). Sensemaking is thus not just a dilemma, but a puzzle of meaning to which new pieces are continuously added, that are continuously changing the whole puzzle itself. In the case of policymaking, policy frames and different aspects that have to be established can already be in place, but are further filled in and altered by the sensemaking of these different frames and aspects altogether. Thus, "*sense-making is not a simple decoding of the policy message; in general, the process of comprehension is an active process of interpretation that draws on the individual's rich knowledge base of understandings, beliefs, and attitudes*" (Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002, p.391). However, according to Schwandt (2015), how professionals operationalise or materialise their sensemaking into words is often influenced by "organizational vocabularies" as coined by Weick (1995). This vocabulary exists in the ideology, paradigms and goals of the organisation, as well as the language that is used in meetings, in policies as well as is in non-formal meetings. This particular synchrony of understandings supports the overall functioning of the organisation (Schwandt, 2005; Weick, 1995). However, "*when the information is inconsistent with the current vocabularies, individuals experience a sense of dissonance that requires an examination of the present framework's assumptions*" (Schwandt, 2005, p.186). Ultimately the organizational vocabularies would be changed. However, according to Schwandt (2005), this vocabulary can also prevent those who try to make sense of new information from adjusting the installed frame. The embedded nature of this vocabulary into organisational routines can block cues that ask for new meanings, and mask discrepancies in certain stories. Tensions or discrepancies in stories are then blurred with "a cloak of 'routines'" (Schwandt, 2005, p.187) instead of an adjustment of the current meaning-framework. According to the scholar, this is something that organisations should be aware of and try to stay away from as "*people may habitually assign inappropriate meanings to contextual cues (and endure failure) to preserve the existing framework and associated collective norms*" (Schwandt, 2005, p.187). Furthermore, Spillane, Reiser and Reimer (2002) explained that those who implement the policy make sense of it as well. According to Tummers, Bekkers, and Steijn,

(2009), once those public professionals do not fully understand the policy that they are implementing, policy alienation can occur. This can according to the scholars be seen as a cognitive disconnection from the policy that could result in a different implementation of the policy than was meant by the policymakers (Tummers, Bekkers, and Steijn, 2009).

Schwandt (2005), however, does not define this process surrounding organisational vocabulary and its relation towards sensemaking. I argue that this prevention of adjusting of the installed frame by this organisational vocabulary is, in fact, sensemaking. As this organisational vocabulary still gives meaning to new information or a new situation, but clouds a possible frame adjustment, it can be seen as a dimension of sensemaking, which in this research will be defined as 'clouded sensemaking'. The sensemaking based upon the three elements as explained by Schwandt (2005) that provides an opportunity to adjust the given meaning, will in this research be defined as the dimension of 'adaptive sensemaking'. Thus, the dimensions 'clouded' sensemaking and 'adaptive' sensemaking together form the concept of sensemaking: *the process of meaning-making and the materialisation of this meaning into words.*

Sensemaking thus grasps the core of interest of this research: what meaning has been given towards concepts such as the inclusive city and participation in the context of the undocumented migrants, and how do the policy bureaucrats explain the existence of these, seemingly in tensions concepts, into one policy framework? Following Schwandt (2015) one can state that the fact that these seemingly contradicting elements have been put together in the policy suggests that the policy bureaucrats and policymakers were driven by this "organisational vocabulary" and that this vocabulary clouded the sensemaking of this question. As the municipality states itself to be an inclusive organisation (GroenLinks, D66, PvdA and SP, 2018), it could be that this aim and image clouded the sensemaking of the integration of both inclusivity and temporality as part of one framework. In other words, the mentioning of the inclusive city in the plan portrays this image and aim of the municipality, but the meaning of the inclusive city might have lost power in the process. Thus, following these theories, the policymakers would make sense of the temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city by using routinized vocabulary that prevented them to actually unravel the meaning of the inclusive city as part of this plan at all. Thus, a clouded form of sensemaking may have taken place.

3. Methods

3.1. Case

The specific case that I have analysed is the policymakers and policy-bureaucrats involved in the (further) development of the policy-plan: "Uitvoeringsplan 24-uursopvang ongedocumenteerden" (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018). In the section 'sampling', this population will be explained more elaborately.

The policy plan itself consists of plans to provide '24-hours' services (as opposed to earlier strictly night-services, with the exemption of wintertime), of which most importantly temporal housing and the providing of a 'case manager' to plan out the future possibilities of the migrant. The latter is a centre part of the plan as the services are meant to be temporary with a maximum of 1,5 years and are used to establish whether the migrant can stay due to a positive revision of their asylum-claim, or eventually should leave the Netherlands (because there is no other future-perspective possible). The policy plan states to be developed out of 'humanitarian necessity' (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018, p.36). However, what attracts the main interest of this research is the focus upon participation in the plan as well as the policy being framed in the broader perspective of the inclusive city. Participation is according to the plan *"an important aspect of the plan for a future perspective"* (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018, p. 27). The plan explains that participation can enhance overall feelings of self-esteem and agency or create a form of personal development and thus might help to create a future perspective for the migrant. However, how this participation programme will be further elaborated upon does not become clear in the text. Only the introduction of this paragraph mentions a vague introduction of participation: *"be meaningfully active, be active, relax and learn"* (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018, p.27), but does not specify this further. According to the plan, there are a lot of juridical obstacles towards the participation of the migrants and therefore more research will be done surrounding the participation-possibilities of the group as well as creating an overview of what already is offered by NGOs. What is explained, however, is in what light this participation programme is established. The main context seems to be the mentioned benefices participation might bring towards the overall plan of creating a future perspective. Moreover – to our interest- the plan mentions in its 'starting points' of the chapter on guidance and participation: "*we want to be an inclusive city, this counts for undocumented migrants as well*" (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018, p. 24). The connection of the inclusive city and participation is only briefly mentioned in brackets, in the following sentence: "[participation] *makes that people are more a part of Amsterdam (inclusive city)*" (p.27). In general, the inclusive city is not defined in the plan, and is only mentioned 'casually' or 'in-between sentences' such as in the introductory paragraph: *"It will be*

researched [..] how Amsterdam, as an inclusive city, can be involved in giving these people a warm welcome" (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018, p.7).

As explained, due to the theoretically supposed tensions between the participation of those who do not belong, as well as the inclusive city and temporality, this research asks the question:

"*How do policymakers make sense of the (temporary) participation of undocumented migrants in the inclusive city?***"**

This research thus tries to grasp the process in which the different (contradicting) elements of the inclusive city and participation were put in the plan (either because of political pressure or due to their own understandings) and what meaning policymakers and policy-bureaucrats have given towards these elements altogether. How do they explain this meaning-making, not only to this research, but especially to themselves?

3.2 Research questions and expectations

As previously explained, the main research question of this thesis is:

"*How do policymakers make sense of the (temporary) participation of undocumented migrants in the inclusive city?***"**

Following this question, in this research two sub-questions are defined to be able to unravel the main question.

3.2.1 Sub question 1

"How do policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the participation of the undocumented migrant?"

As the theoretical overview has shown, participation can prevail in multiple domains such as social participation, political participation, labour and educational participation. However, research in the theoretical framework, as well as the policy plan itself, has pointed out that there are numerous obstacles to the participation of the undocumented migrant. This is especially the case for formal forms of participation such as voting, or legal work (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018; Hellgren, 2014; Coutin, 1999; Bloch, 2013; Varsanyi, 2006). The research expects that there will be multiple obstacles, such as national laws, to the formal participation of undocumented arranged by the municipality. Especially in the domains of political and labour participation as formal barriers often can be found to the participation of undocumented migrants in those domains. I thus expect that the meaning given by the policymakers and policy

bureaucrats to participation for the undocumented migrant will be narrow, mostly signifying participation in the social domain.

3.2.2. Sub question 2

"*How do policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the inclusive city in relation to the undocumented migrant?*"

As explained in the theoretical framework, the concept of the inclusive city can be theoretically grasped in two ways: one based upon theories surrounding inclusion and participation, the other based upon theories surrounding urban membership. Deriving from this, this research has tried to capture the definition of the inclusive city, as is further explained in the operationalisation. Following the first theoretical understanding of the inclusive city framed by amongst others Cameron, (2006), Rawal, (2008), Gaventa, (1998) and Aasland and Fløtten, (2001), this concept would entail a city in which an undocumented migrant can participate as much as possible. However, as explained in the first sub-question, this participation is likely difficult to install as the formal pathways towards participation are often little to none. The second definition based upon theories surrounding urban membership would entail some form of (political)membership of the city, touching upon theoretically newer ideas of urban citizenship (Varsanyi, 2006; Gebhardt, 2016: Bhimji, 2014). As the nation-state is based upon the idea of a nation of which membership and belonging is formed by the frames of the state, the locality-based membership seems to be in friction with the exact premise that the nation-state is built upon (Sassen, 2002; Jacobson, 1996; Castles, de Haas and Miller, 2014). Furthermore, following the brief theoretical overview of understandings of temporal inclusion Hallett (20104) argues that this temporal inclusive membership without any pathways to formal and permanent inclusion can, in the end, be seen as no inclusion at all. As the municipality states itself to be an inclusive organisation (GroenLinks, D66, PvdA and SP, 2018), together with the multiple challenges of the inclusive city in relation to the undocumented migrant, the research follows theories on sensemaking by Weick (1995) and Schwandt (2005) and expects that the inclusive city is an 'organisational vocabulary' that clouded the tensions in the story of the policy plan.

3.2.3 Overall expectations

As explained in both the introduction, theoretical framework and the above expectations, multiple tensions can be found in the story of the temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city. I thus expect the policymakers and policy bureaucrats to make sense of the temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city by firstly adjusting the meaning of this participation towards what is practically and temporally possible,

instead of a broader more ideological understanding of this participation. Furthermore, as explained, I expect that the inclusive city can be considered to be 'organisational vocabulary'. As the clouded sensemaking that stems from this vocabulary masks the discrepancies in the story and as the inclusive city seems to be a concept that is more broadly used instead of specifically defined for this policy, I expect that the policymakers and policy bureaucrats have trouble making sense of what the temporal participation in the inclusive city will then actually mean in relation the undocumented migrant.

3.3. Operationalisation

To be able to explore the research question, the main concepts of this research firstly need to be operationalised.

The first concept is that of 'participation'. The definition used in this research is based upon Law's (2002) definition: "*involvement or sharing, particularly in an activity*"(p.641). Furthermore, this research recognises that participation is not an either/or question (Deth et al. 2007, in Cinalli & Ciugni, 2011), and can happen in multiple life domains. Therefore, the definition of participation that will be used in this research is: "*the engaging in activities that spread multiple life domains*". This concept can be divided into the dimensions 'political participation', 'social participation', and 'labour and educational participation'. The dimension 'political participation' is explained by Deth et al. (2007, in Cinalli & Ciugni, 2011) as the formal arrangements such as voting, but in the case of (undocumented) migrants often seen as protesting or engaging in activities of a political party. The dimension 'social participation' is explained by Varsanyi (2006) as engaging in everyday activities as well as social relations. The dimension 'labour participation' is explained by Bloch (2013) as education and work, in the case of the undocumented migrants often irregular labour.

The second concept is the 'inclusive city'. Following the literature, the inclusive city can be understood or defined from two varying perspectives. The first definition derives from understandings of social inclusion and social exclusion which is determined by someone's ability to participate in society (Cameron, 2006; Gaventa, 1998; Aasland and Fløtten, 2001). Deriving from this, the inclusive city can be defined as *a city in which the undocumented migrant can participate as much as possible, beyond their lack of formal inclusion.* Another perspective of the literature portrays the inclusion of migrants in the city as them gaining membership with according (partial) services and rights, or even altering the conditions and definitions upon that membership in the city (Nordling, Sager and Söderman, 2017; Hellgren, 2014; Staeheli, 2003). By some authors (Varsanyi, 2006; Bhimji, 2014) this can be defined as 'urban citizenship:

recognized (partial) membership to the city-based upon *"...the mere fact of presence and residence in a city or state [province]"* (Varsanyi, 2006, p. 244). In this reading the inclusive city would entail: *a city in which the membership of undocumented migrants to the city is recognised by the granting of certain rights and/or services based upon a recognition of their locality.* Following this conceptual definition, according to Gebhardt's analysis (2016), two dimensions upon this recognition can be found: 'local membership recognition upon residence' and 'local membership recognition upon presence'. Indicators for the first dimension based upon research from Gebhardt (2016) and Varsanyi (2006) would be: 'membership based upon residence in the city', 'rights and services embedded in local policy, institutions, rules' and 'stable form of membership'. Indicators for the second dimension, based upon Sassen (2002), Jacobson (1996) and Gebhardt (2016) are 'membership out of emergency', 'based upon a human rights discourse' and 'temporal and improvised'.

The third concept is that of sensemaking. In this research, sensemaking is defined as: *the process of meaning-making, and the materialisation of this meaning into words* (Weick, Sutcliffe and Obstfeld, 2005; Schwandt, 2005). Following the theories, two dimensions came forward: 'adaptive sensemaking' and 'clouded sensemaking'. The dimension 'adaptive sensemaking', as explained by Schwandt (2005) consists of the indicators: 'moment of uncertainty as a cue to adjust meaning', 'a prior meaning framework', and 'a link between the new information and the prior meaning framework'. The other dimension is 'clouded sensemaking', which, as explained by Schwandt (2005) and Weick (1995) consists of the indicator 'organisational vocabulary' that due to routines clouds the meaning given to the new situation.

3.4. Research design

This research analyses how policymakers and policy bureaucrats involved in the policy plan of the municipality of Amsterdam for undocumented migrants make sense of the participation of undocumented migrants in the inclusive city. As these policymakers and policy bureaucrats are part of a bounded research unit - namely only those who are involved in the development of this specific plan- this research makes use of a singular case study design. The design facilitates an in-depth understanding of this group, whilst the design simultaneously makes the researcher able to make an addition to more broader theories and understandings surrounding inclusive cities, and the position of undocumented migrants in this friction field (Braster, 2000).

3.5. Methods

Following the research design, this research tries to gain a deep understanding of how policymakers and bureaucrats themselves make sense of the problem surrounding temporality,

the inclusive city and undocumented migrants. Therefore, the aim of this research asks for a profound understanding of their own insights and explanations surrounding these themes. Simultaneously, no research seems to have been conducted on this specific plan. Furthermore, the sensemaking of policy bureaucrats and policymakers on the specific tension field of temporality, the inclusive city and the formally facilitated participation of the undocumented migrant has yet to be researched as well. Therefore, this research makes use of exploratory, qualitative, semi-structured interviews to obtain this insight in their sensemaking of the problem. This method allows for flexibility during the research conducting process, meaning that the questions can be shaped and altered during the process. This iterative working method, therefore, facilitates the explorative research, as during this process can be searched for the most fruitful questions and phrasings to reach the aimed understanding of the study, as well as theoretical saturation. Furthermore, the semi-structured interviews provide the needed space to grasp the insights and definitions of the topic by the respondents themselves, as well as the room for a more exploratory style of interviewing (Bryman, 2012). However, as this research wants to answer a specific question, the theme of the interview will not be completely open for the respondent to decide. To ensure that the interviews are able to answer the research question and provide to the aim of this research, an interview guide with open questions and topics will be made.

During the interviews, the conversations have been recorded and were transcribed later on. After the transcription, the interviews have been coded in an online program (Atlas.ti) in order to analyse the data. This coding has been done according to the method of 'grounded theory'. Grounded theory, coined by Corbin and Strauss (1990) asks for an inductive analysis method. The analysis of this research started with open coding of the data. In this process the transcripts are filtered for relevant and non-relevant information, of which the relevant information is coded per quote or snippet of text. After, as well as during, the open coding, codes who are quite similar are merged, and the codes who are relevantly different but are falling in the same categories are put into groups. This process has been carried out until all the codes fitted in at least in one group. These groups, therefore, portray the most occurring and emphasised themes and concepts of the interviews. An overview of these codes can be found in the appendix chapter. At the last phase, the data was coded selectively: links, relations and hierarchies between the groups were established. Through this process, the research is enabled to create concepts and theories following these concepts deriving from the data (Corbin and Strauss, 1990; Braster, 2000).

As the design of the research is exploratory, and an iterative approach is used during the whole research process, the coding already started during the end of the interview process. In this way, an overview was created of the findings from the interviews thus far, whilst still keeping the ability to alter interview questions due to new findings or questions deriving from the coding. Furthermore, new theoretical understandings that did not come to mind before the collection of the data have been added during the data collection and analysis as well once new findings ask for more theoretical understandings (Braster, 2000; Bryman, 2012). In this way, this exploratory research is sufficiently theoretically underlined, as well as reflectively guided to reach the core question and understanding of the defined problem: "*How do policymakers make sense of the (temporary) participation of undocumented migrants in the inclusive city?*"

3.6. Sampling

During the interviews, both policymakers, as well as policy bureaucrats, have been interviewed. During the start of the research it was not exactly clear of how many people the population existed. A policy advisor that I spoke to in advance of the data collection, agreed to be my gatekeeper. She told me that in total eight policy bureaucrats creation of the policy, and that she would connect me to them. Later in the research it also became clear who could be seen as the policymakers: the alderman, Groot Wassink, who is part of a board group with two district chairman (of the East and New-west of Amsterdam) who work on the policy surrounding the undocumented migrant, and the political assistant of the alderman.

I was able to speak to all eight policy bureaucrats, as well as the alderman, a district chairman of the East of Amsterdam and the political assistant of the alderman, who are in this research seen as the policymakers. Therefore, almost the full population[2] has been interviewed. Furthermore, to get a better understanding of the broader context that this specific policy-plan is part of, an interview was held with the policy bureaucrat of the team 'democratisation' as well. The interviews were all held at the offices of the policy-bureaucrats and policymakers themselves. The duration of the conversations, were mostly around 50 minutes per interview, but varied between 30 to 70 minutes. All respondents signed the informed consent form, and agreed that their occupation and organisation (in this case the municipality of Amsterdam) could be mentioned in the research. For the board and the political assistant is difficult to anonymise their interviews because of their special, 'one-person'-functions. The eight policy bureaucrats will be anonymised, and will be mentioned as policy bureaucrat 1, policy bureaucrat 2, and so on.

---

[2] Only missing one chairman

3.7. Aim of the study

The aim of this study to get an in depth understanding of how policy bureaucrats and policymakers make sense of the possibly temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in 'the inclusive city': Amsterdam. Expecting that the focus on the participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city is in tension with the main focus upon temporality of the plan, first and foremost will be tried to understood what both participation and the inclusive city in this plan entails for the undocumented migrant. Furthermore, this research tries to grasp how policymakers and bureaucrats deal with and make sense of these problems, and how this temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city might possibly be realised. Lastly, beyond the aim of grasping this question, the aim of this study is to provide reflective insights and recommendations upon the plan for the population itself. Moreover, the research tries to contribute to existing literature upon local participation and temporal inclusion of undocumented migrants as well as urban sensemaking of migrant-based problems by policy bureaucrats and policymakers.

3.8. Ethical considerations

As the respondent participated in the interviews based upon their profession – either policy bureaucrat or policymakers –, the safeguarding of their professionality should be taken into account. The policy bureaucrats will therefore be anonymised as much as possible, (with the policymakers this is less possible) and the findings will only be portrayed to answer the raised question surrounding the migrants, by no means to portray internal organisational problems. Furthermore, according to my gatekeeper (Policy bureaucrat 1) the case and policies on undocumented migrants in Amsterdam is a substantively mediatised topic. Therefore, based upon both vulnerabilities, it is of substantial importance to create an accurate display of the data that is given to the researcher. This tried to be done as much as possible by recording and transcribing the data instead of taking notes, and by using a inductive qualitative analysis method to be able to let the data 'speak for itself'.

3.8.1. Reflection upon the position of the researcher

Following a popular quote that is amongst others used in the second wave feminist liberation movement 'the personal is political' (Hanisch, 2006), I, as student that studies Governance of Migration and Diversity, together with as my own private investments in the topic of the local incorporations of migrants in my hometown city Amsterdam, am not free of (politically loaded) personal values upon the topic. Being aware upon my own personal opinion upon this topic, I have tried to be reflective upon my position as a researcher throughout the research. Questions about

my own involvement and insights on the topic of undocumented migrants during the interviews have I tried to answer truthfully, but only at the end at the interview to not create a certain bias. I have tried to install myself coming from a point of interest, rather than a political point of reasoning going into the research. However, this does not mean that this research is fully unbiased, as research is in the social sciences, especially with qualitative analysis, is a display of how the researcher understands, sees and frames the topic (Bryman, 2012). I have tried to stay aware of this during the research process, and have tried to display my findings as in depth and all-compassing as possible.

4. Context

Before starting with the analysis, the next part will give an overview of the findings illustrating the full context of the policy of the city of Amsterdam on undocumented migrants. In the next section both the local context of the policy and the national context will be explained, as well as the intertwinement of these.

To enable the research to give an in-depth illustration of the context of the policy, the research used both (news)articles as well as data from interviews to write the analysis chapter, and sometimes the two types of sources are combined to get a full overview. Therefore in the next chapter both the articles as well as the interviews will be mentioned in brackets, following the referencing of the respondents as mentioned above.

4.1. Amsterdam: a local policy

Since 2014, a policy for special services for undocumented migrants in the municipality was adopted in Amsterdam (Willems, 2014). This does not mean that before 2014 undocumented migrants did not receive any aid from the municipality, but that they were not seen as a special group before that time, and were perceived to be part of the larger group of 'regular' homeless persons (Policy bureaucrat 3; Policy bureaucrat 5). However, after the statement by the European Committee of Social Rights of the Council of Europe (ECSR) in 2014 that municipalities should at least provide 'sober' services for undocumented migrants, specific attention was paid to this group. This resulted in a specific policy called 'bed-bad-brood' (bed, bath and bread) in the municipality. A specific night shelter was opened that provided meals and sanitary facilities as well (Willems, 2014). The policy came mostly forth out of humanitarian considerations by the labour party (PvdA), the ruling party at the time. The party spoke about a social minimum, saying that people should at least not sleep in the streets, but in shelters (At5, 2015). However, the policy was received with a lot of questions by other left wing parties, especially GroenLinks,

saying that these services were temporary solutions and lacked any future prospects for the group of migrants (Policy bureaucrat 3). With the formation of a new, leftist municipal board, including amongst others Groenlinks, after the local elections of 2018, the issue of more effective shelter for undocumented migrants became part of the local coalition agreement. The policy became based on a broader focus on the future prospects (either in the Netherlands or elsewhere) of the migrants (GroenLinks Amsterdam, 2018; Isitman, 2018). The framework of the policy, consisting of 24-hourshelters as well as the focus on a future perspective, was included in the coalition agreement (GroenLinks, D66, PvdA and SP, 2018). Based on the coalition agreement, the policy was further filled in by the policy bureaucrats as well as the board. The policy bureaucrats organised project-days to talk with NGOs, the ministry and a few undocumented migrants to further fill in the plan. The services to the migrants were broadened: smaller shelters with more agency for the undocumented migrants as well as juridical guidance and case-managers were included in the plan. This guidance as well as the residency in the shelter is however temporary. A maximum duration of 1.5 years was determined, during which the person is obliged to look at his or her future possibilities either in the city (as part of a legal previsioning of the granting of a residence permit), in the country of origin or in a third country. The bare social minimum provided previously by the 'bed-bad-brood' (bed, bath, bread) shelters therefore was replaced by a more temporal service (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018; GroenLinks, D66, PvdA and SP, 2018). Furthermore, a renewed focus upon participation as part of the broader vision of the inclusive city became part of the policy. This focus partly resulted from the vision of the alderman (Interview alderman), as well based from the wishes of the NGO's and the migrants themselves for more possibilities to participate (Policy bureaucrat 11, Political assistant).

After political approval for the plan, the municipality made an open call on civil society to implement the plan, as the municipality intended to completely outsource the providing of services to this group (Policy bureaucrat 1). Civil society would be funded and monitored by the municipality, making those who would implement the policy a mixture of a street-level bureaucrat and a 'normal' NGO employee. At the time of writing, the municipality is arranging neighbourhood-based meeting in which citizens are informed about the plans of the municipality to install living facilities in their neighbourhood. As the policy is currently in a transition period, the new plan will start from July 2019 (Policy bureaucrat 1; Gemeente Amsterdam, 2018).

4.2. The national background

Traditionally, the Dutch government has declined any governmental support for undocumented migrants. However, political debates surrounding the topic sparked up in 2015 when the human rights organisation 'Raad van Europa' (Council of Europe) ruled that the Netherlands was not

meeting European standards on the facilitation of irregular asylum seekers. This was after the 2014 establishment of ground rules for minimal facilities for undocumented migrants by the European Comittee of Social Rights of Europe of the Council of Europe (ECSR), which argued that everyone being present on European grounds should have at least have their basic needs facilitated. This European pressure led to strong differences between the ruling parties VVD (liberals) and PvdA (Labour), finally resulting in a compromise of 'sober', temporary facilities in a limited number of designated municipalities (Nu.nl, 2015). To arrange these plans, secretary of state Dijkhoff had to negotiate with municipalities to let them change their local policies towards one nationally shared policy. The negotiations around these policies lasted 1.5 years and did not come to a joint conclusion. According to the secretary of state, the municipalities stuck to much with their own views, making a compromise impossible. This resulted in threats by Dijkhoff to close the municipal shelters (Couzy, 2016). However, this threat was not realised as new elections were held and the problem was left for the new cabinet to decide upon. In the end, practically nothing changed for the municipality of Amsterdam as they had never received any specific funding for those facilities in the first place (ANP, 2016; Couzy, 2016). With the formation of a new cabinet after the national elections in March 2017, the leftist parties in the parliament lobbied for a new plan for a national policy to tackle the problems surrounding undocumented migrants (Meijer, 2018; Meijer, 2018b). This was after the European Court of Justice ruled that the European member states in fact could set certain conditions for the provision of services, such as shelter, to undocumented migrants. This meant that the state now could provide services to meet the basic needs of undocumented migrants under the premise that they would participate in their return to a country of origin (Kas, 2016).

In the coalition agreement of the new cabinet which was formed in 2017, new plans for providing these basic services were made, with a bigger focus on future prospects. The new secretary of state, Halbers, started new negotiations with the municipalities, and this time came to a compromise. The pilot 'LVV' (Landelijke Vreemdelingen Voorzieningen) started, in which 5 municipalities were appointed to shelter undocumented migrants for 5 years, with budgets and monitoring provided by the government, under the condition that shelters in other municipalities would close (Meijer, 2018; Meijer, 2018b).

4.3. A partly shared policy

The plan of the municipality was already written before Amsterdam became a pilot-municipality of the LVV project. As the plan, due to past negotiations, was largely similar to the pilot, the policy did not have to be altered and was integrated into the pilot (Groot Wassink, 2019; Policy bureaucrat 3). However, a relevant difference between the Amsterdam plan and the pilot is the

extra focus of the municipality on inclusivity and participation, beyond the shared focus of future prospects for the migrants. As the policy was approved, and made part of the pilot, the alderman felt the freedom to implement the policy as this is outlined in the policy plan. During the pilot the municipality will closely monitor for the pilot how these new plans turned out, and report this back to the national pilot-programme (Policy bureaucrat 5; Alderman).

5. Analysis

Before explaining the structure of the analysis, a few notes have to be taken into account. As explained in the methodology section, nearly the full population has been interviewed. In the next section the eight policy bureaucrats will be anonymised, and will be mentioned as policy bureaucrat 1, policy bureaucrat 2, and so on. The political assistant, alderman, district chairman and the bureaucrat 'democratisation' will be called as such. Furthermore, it is important to remind the reader that the framing of the research questions has been iterative as well as an explorative process. Some question such as: "Is the undocumented migrant an Amsterdammer?" have turned out to be key questions in the research, but were not asked to all respondents during the research. As explained, the process of finding the 'right' interview-questions was an iterative process, and the questions were therefore adapted during the process to fit the analysis. Therefore, I have made clear in the portrayal of the results when a question was added later in the process.

The analysis of the interviews will be divided in multiple parts. First and foremost, I will analyse the relation between the policy bureaucrat and the policymaker to get a deeper understanding of the population. Secondly, the goal of the policy-plan 'Uitvoeringsplan 24-uursopvang ongedocumenteerden' will be analysed. I will explain how the idea of participation is part of the goal of this policy. Moreover, I will delineate how the respondents relate the participation of undocumented migrants towards inclusion, and what then the inclusive city means for this group. Furthermore, I will explain the views of the respondents upon the theorised tension between inclusion and temporality, especially due to outside actors. Lastly, the research tries to grasp how the policy bureaucrats and makers understand the relationship between the migrant and the city by asking the question: is the undocumented migrant an Amsterdammer?

5.1. The relation between the policymaker and the policy bureaucrat

To understand how policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the policy plan, at first it is important to understand what their position within the policy-chain is, as well as their relation to each other. Based upon this small analysis, an expectation will be made upon whether or not both 'groups' differ in their sensemaking and will be treated in this research as one homogenous

group, or two differing groups, accordingly. To enable the research to give an in-depth illustration of the population, the research for only this part of the used both (news)articles as well as data from interviews to and sometimes combines the two to get a full overview. Therefore in the next chapter both the article as well as the interviews will be mentioned in brackets.

As explained, changing the policy for undocumented migrants has long been an important topic for the Green left party GroenLinks, Therefore, when this party became the biggest party in Amsterdam after the elections, a new framework for the municipal policy on undocumented migrants was taken into the coalition-agreement. The alderman who was assigned this specific dossier, together his political assistant and two district chairman representing the overall districts, would be the main 'policymakers' from this point on, with the alderman having the political responsibility over the policy (Policy bureaucrat 3, Political assistant; GroenLinks Amsterdam, 2018; Isitman, 2018).

After the agreement, the alderman assigned a working group of policy-bureaucrats to further fill in the framework of the policy and turn it into a working-plan. This plan was made after multiple meetings of the bureaucrats with other involved parties, of which the ministry, NGO, volunteers and of course the undocumented migrants themselves. After the meetings the working-group made a provisional plan and sent this to the alderman. After small alterations of the alderman and his accordance, the plan was shared by the working-group with the involved parties, in which their feedback was processed by the bureaucrats again. Now that the plan is published, the bureaucrats are working on finding the shelters, as well as informing the neighbourhood about the municipalities' plans. Furthermore, they have opened subsidising questions for civil society to fulfil the services as planned by the municipalities, as the municipality wants to outsource the implementation of the policy as much as possible (Policy bureaucrat 1; Policy bureaucrat 3). This part can even be seen as the third point of detailing of the policy, as the NGO's have space to fill in these services even further along the lines that are established in the plan.

According to this small description of how the policy was made, and further defined, it becomes clear that the policy-bureaucrat needs to follow the frames as installed by the alderman and its advisor, but still has a lot of room to fit specific angles and ideas in. This follows the analysis by 't Hart (2014) stating that the policy bureaucrat comes closer to politics and decision-making due to a renewed focus upon governance and the inclusion of civil society in decision making. Therefore, I will treat those working on the policy as one population and expect no

major difference between the policy advisor and the policy bureaucrats in their sensemaking of the questions surrounding participation, the inclusive city and temporality.

5.2 The aim of the policy, and the role of participation in this story

The first part of the policy that I will analyse is the focus on participation in the plan. In the theoretical framework participation is defined as the *engaging in activities that spread multiple life domains*. I expect the undocumented migrant to already participate in the city of Amsterdam, following theories from, amongst others, Varsanyi (2006) and Bloch (2013). However, I do simultaneously expect that the policymakers and bureaucrats will have difficulties finding *formal* means of participation in the multiple life domains, especially in the political- and labour-domain, as formal barriers often can be found against the participation of undocumented migrants (Hellgren, 2014; Coutin, 1999; Varsanyi, 2006; Bloch, 2013). Therefore, in the next part of the analysis I will answer the following sub-question: *"How do policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the participation of the undocumented migrant?"*

5.2.1. The informal participation of the undocumented migrant

Multiple respondents acknowledged that the undocumented migrants often already participate in the city as they do so by living their everyday life. They explained this by giving examples of this participation such as them buying groceries, bringing their children to school (a right until the age of 18), and by possibly participating in sports. Furthermore, multiple respondents explained that they were well aware that the undocumented migrants participated in 'zwart werk' (unreported employment) as well. Policy bureaucrat 2 explains:

"*You have got people who actually built a complete live for themselves. They engage in unreported employment, have a created a network around them, participate in volunteering work, actually multiple things*" (Code 3:53).

This everyday partitioning in the city as illustrated by policy bureaucrat 2 and explained by multiple other respondents, resonates with Vasanyi's (2006) illustration of the American cities in which undocumented migrants live their everyday life. Furthermore, the engagement of undocumented migrants in irregular work, and thus their participation in the labour-domain, is a reality that is pointed out by Bloch (2013) as well.

The respondents explained, however, that the undocumented migrants who can fully provide for themselves are often not the ones who are part of the programme. These 'invisible' residents are often labour-migrants who have become 'undocumented' by surpassing the maximum time of residence that was given with their working-permit. The undocumented

migrants that do come on the radar of the municipality, because they are not able to completely provide for themselves and are thus in need of help, are often asylum-seekers whose claims for asylum have not been recognised. However, the bureaucrats explained that they do not follow these strict categories in the plan: those who are undocumented and in need of help can apply for this programme and will hopefully receive services as soon as possible. However, even though these migrants ask for help from the municipality, this does not mean they do not participate at all. This follows Deth et al. (2007, in Cinalli & Ciugni, 2011) in their analysis that participation is not an either/or story, but can be seen as a continuum.

Thus, the explanations given by the respondents fit the expectation of this research that the undocumented migrant already participates in the city. As the respondents explain that the municipality tries to support the participation of the undocumented migrant in the city during the programme, the next section will explain why this is an important part of the plan, and what this formal participation then entails according to the policy bureaucrat and policymaker.

5.2.2 Creating a future perspective

The concept of participation is, as explained by the policymakers and policy bureaucrats, deeply ingrained in the overall aim of the policy. To get a deeper understanding of what this specific definition of participation might entail, first and foremost the policy-goal and the reason behind this goal will be further explained.

The goal of the policy was mostly described as the aim to provide the migrant with a 'future-perspective'. Policy bureaucrat 4: "*The goal is to get as many people as possible out of illegality because they think that that's not a humane way of living. You actually want that people either live here legally, or legally in another country.*" (Code 5:18) What policy bureaucrat 4 illustrates, and what the respondents mean by this, is that the respondents want to give the migrant clarity upon where their future legal residence possibilities: either in the Netherlands, the sending country or a so-called third country. This clarity upon their future possibilities would first and foremost be given to the migrants by specifically assigned juridical guidance. The guidance would start with a revision of the asylum request of the migrant by juridical experts. Once the juridical experts would state that the migrant would have a chance to obtain a residence permit after a revision of their request, a juridical procedure would start with the aim to let the migrant reside in the city legally. If the experts would argue that the migrant would not have a chance to obtain a positive revision of their asylum-request, the migrant would be advised to start on a different kind of guidance in which they would be guided to return to their origin, or if not possible, to a third country. Besides this guidance, in this aim of creating a

future perspective, a big role for the agency of the migrants themselves was installed. They were the ones who needed to make decisions after the advice that would be given to them, and also had to think about a possible plan for both possibilities.

The focus in the plan upon creating a future perspective is based upon the vision of ruling party GroenLinks, as well as recent research by Profacto and Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (2018), that the 'standing still' of the undocumented migrants, unsure about any future, is bad for their wellbeing. According to both the research as well as the policymakers, people need rest and stability and support to be able to start thinking about their future. This is why the mass, secured night- and winter-shelters were replaced in the plan by smaller all-day shelters in which the migrant could take more agency over their daily live. Policy bureaucrat 4 on the reason why the policymaker wanted to change the policy:

"*The current alderman says that we have to make sure that people have some sort of stability and tranquillity in their lives. That they have to have the space to work on a future. As long as you're just moving from the one spot to another to have shelter or food then you do not have space and time to really think about your future. And you can bring that tranquillity by, amongst others, a 24-hours shelter.*" (Code 5:12)

Thus, the respondents concluded that all-day shelters instead of only the evening shelters were of substantial importance. However, according to the respondents, this sheltering needs to be with prerequisites, in this case with a maximum of 1,5 years, as people otherwise might not find the incentive to actually start working on their future. They explained that they were afraid that if there would be a permanent shelter as a sort of safety net alongside to this programme, people – in a sort of survival mode – would just go for this safety net, as they had difficulties thinking further into the future due to their insecure existence in the city. The insecure existence that the plan thus actually wanted to overcome. By taking away this extra safety net, and by creating the incentive for the migrants to start thinking about their future due to this temporality, the migrants would be stimulated to create an understanding of what the next step in their lives could be. If the migrant really did not want to participate in the programme, they explained that they would not force them to, but that the municipality then would not be involved in helping them or sheltering them anymore. They explained that they created these requirements as they truly believed that overcoming this state of 'standing still' and insecurity would substantially improve the lives of the migrants. According to the policymakers and policy bureaucrats this focus on a 'future perspective', thus, comes forth from a humanitarian vision:

Policy bureaucrat 6- "*The board of counsellors wants to shelter the undocumented migrants out of humanitarian considerations, and that they also want to guide them to a sustainable perspective.*" (code 7:3 & 7:4).

The policy bureaucrats explained that the former policy, however, was based upon humanitarian considerations as well. According to the policymakers, the former college even saw the permanent (meaning without prerequisites) night-sheltering of the undocumented migrants as 'a humanitarian minimum' but provided little further support or focus on future possibilities. Thus, following sensemaking-theories by Schwandt (2005) and Weick (1995), the meaning framework surrounding what can be considered a humanitarian policy in relation to the undocumented migrant, has changed. Due to the new information received from research as well as the vision of GroenLinks that is brought into the policy process due to their instalment in the college, the permanent sheltering was no longer seen as a humanitarian solution. The meaning framework surrounding a humane policy now shifted to a focus on the future, accommodated by temporal sheltering and services. Sense was thus made of all new information, creating a new understanding of a humanitarian policy.

Beyond the humanitarian reasoning behind the new all-day shelters as part of the broader picture of the creating of a future perspective, this new form of housing could also be explained more pragmatically. The policymakers argued that when people were not hanging on the streets all day, and generally felt more empowered, it would also benefit the general order of the city. Furthermore, the political assistant argued that keeping the shelters open instead of installing them in the winter and then breaking them back down in the summer would in the end even be more cost-efficient. However, the main reason behind the instalment of this new policy was ultimately still this new-formed humanitarian reasoning.

5.2.3. Participating for a future perspective

Juridical guidance, rest and stability in the form of new shelters were not the only tools installed to help the migrant work towards a new future: participation was seen as an important aspect of the plan as well. According to the respondents, the migrants needed to be activated again: some of them had been in the city for years, in a sort of survival mode, unable to foresee a plan for the future. Participating by learning a certain skill or language would motivate them and give them the confidence to start thinking about and preparing for the future either in the Netherlands, or in another country.

However, the first tensions became apparent in their story: whilst the bureaucrats and policymakers often used education and jobs as examples of forms of participation that would

emancipate the migrant, they also noted that a lot of forms of work and education were prohibited from non-national citizens. Beyond the general law that prohibits people to work without right of residence or prohibits formal forms of education after the age of 18, a new law called 'Wmo 2015' also withheld non-nationals from other forms of work such as 'dagbesteding' (roughly translated as daily activities, meant to activate the person) and guided work. Some respondents, therefore, noted that the municipality was in negotiation with the government to allow for certain forms of work or education for the undocumented migrants. Others argued that inventive ideas had to be thought of to find ways for migrants to participate. Examples of this were participation-programmes from citizen initiatives and existing NGO parties who had more freedom to provide the migrants with language courses, activities and so on. Furthermore, the alderman explained that he was looking if there would be any possibilities for the undocumented migrants to participate in the programmes that initially were installed for permit-holders.

Following these accounts, as expected and theorised by Hellgren, (2014), Countin, (1999), Varsanyi, (2006), Bloch, (2013) and others, multiple barriers can be found towards the formal participation of the undocumented migrant in the city, having the policymakers and policy bureaucrats to resort to other organisations to install more participation-options. What this participation then might entail will be further discussed in the following section.

5.2.4. A narrow definition of participation

The policymakers and policy bureaucrats have explained that multiple barriers for the formal participation of the undocumented in the political and labour domain can be found. What then this participation of undocumented migrants as explained in the policy plan could actually entail was sometimes difficult to grasp. First and foremost, according to the respondents, participation had to cater this focus upon a future perspective. Most bureaucrats and policymakers refrained from exactly filling in what participation would mean for the migrant as it would depend per person and their future possibilities. Furthermore, they explained that they outsourced the participation-programme to local NGO's and that it was left up to these organisations to decide together with the migrant which participation-steps had to be taken, as long is served the goal of creating this future perspective. Policy bureaucrat 8 illustrates this by explaining the broad request they had sent out for NGO's to fill in:

Policy bureaucrat 8: "*Yes also, in that case, we have asked out our question quite broadly. So it's not like we're saying how it should be. However, does it contribute to that future perspective?*" (Code 10:14)

However, when the policymakers or policy bureaucrats did give concrete examples of formal participation-options, the possibilities mostly stayed in the social domain. They gave examples of activities such as engaging in workshops, or activities arranged by civil society or NGO's. Furthermore, social engagement with other people was encouraged.

Policy bureaucrat 8: "*Uh.. Oh well, I think that it is important that you indeed are in contact with other parts of the city, other people, local residents, but also for a part other undocumented migrants.. so that you are not isolated. That you're on your own, alone..*" (Code 10:27)

As policy bureaucrat 8 explained, (social) participation would benefit their overall wellbeing. Furthermore, the policy bureaucrats explained that social contact might support the migrant to gain the confidence to reclaim agency over their future. They saw no tensions in the fact that some participants only would be able to participate temporarily in the city. They explained that the aim of the policy was based upon a certain ideological understanding of what can be seen as humane. They learned from the earlier policy that this unending in-between-period in which the migrants have little chance to participate in the society and have little understanding of what their future might entail, can be seen as problematic. According to the respondents, participation might help the undocumented migrant to feel enabled to create a perspective on the future and thus escape this standing still period: either by already starting to 'integrate' into the city, or by learning certain (social) skills that will give the courage and the activation to return to the home country. Therefore, it was not seen as a problem that this participation would only be temporarily, as long as it suited the future-perspective-path that the migrant is on.

Furthermore, the social participation of the undocumented migrant did serve another goal of the policy as well. Whilst the respondent explained that the engagement with Dutch people should not be forced, as actively engaging with other people or organising encounters was not something that was asked from 'normal' citizens as well, it was seen as a nice 'extra'. They hoped that the social encounters between the migrants and the Amsterdammers, even more preferably their neighbours, would create a better connection with the neighbourhood and perhaps an overall more positive image of the public on the group of undocumented migrants. They explained that inhabitants from the areas in which shelters for migrants possibly would be installed, had a quite negative reaction towards the possible sheltering of the migrants and that they voiced a lot of concerns. Probably out of fear of the unknown, was argued, or out of fear for the possible mental problems of these migrants due to their situation, were often heard as an argument. Therefore, making sure that the neighbourhood would be okay with the undocumented migrants moving into the area, creating a 'soft landing' is seen as an integral part of the plan.

This soft landing consists of delimiting possible friction-makers such as noise pollution, as well as arranging some contact with the neighbours and the migrants when wished for.

Thus, as expected, participation seemed to entail mostly participation in just the social domain. This outcome thus differs from the definition created according to the theoretical framework: "*the engaging in activities that spread multiple live domains*". However, following Deth et al. (2007, in Cinalli & Ciugni, 2011) is important to remember that participation should not be seen as either/or story, but as a continuum. Furthermore, this (partial) participation is not explicitly defined but is seen as a means to achieve these future perspectives as these are the main driver of the policy.

5.2.5. Making sense of the participation of the undocumented migrant

To answer the sub-question: "*How do policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the participation of the undocumented migrant?*", the respondents explained that participation was aimed to serve the broader goal of creating a future perspective for the migrant either in the Netherlands or in the sending countries. This relation was based upon how they made sense of what a humane policy would be: whereas continuous shelter was at first seen as humane or even the bare minimum, due to the new information given to the policy bureaucrats and policymakers based upon research and the ideological vision of the ruling parties, now temporal activation and supporting the migrant towards a future perspective was understood as more humane. Based upon this sensemaking of a humane policy, sense was made of participation as part of the plan as well: it did not matter that the participation of the undocumented migrant would only be temporal, or partial (due to formal restrictions), as long as it served the main goal of benefiting to the future perspective of the migrant. They saw participation such as engaging in language courses and social contact, but also engagement with the neighbourhood in general, as activating and empowering. However, as they do recognise that other forms of participation would benefit this goal even further, the municipality is still in negotiation with the government to create more participation-possibilities for this group. Lastly, beyond participation serving the main goal of the policy, participation could also help to avoid possible conflict. More general social contact with 'Amsterdammers' as a form of participation was thus encouraged.

5.3. Inclusivity, (participation) and the inclusive city

In the next part, I will try to create a deeper understanding of what meaning the respondents have given to the concept of the inclusive city. Following the theoretical framework, the first understanding what of the inclusive city could entail is a city in which an undocumented migrant can participate as much as possible (see Cameron, 2006; Rawal, 2008; Gaventa, 1998; Aasland

and Fløtten, 2001). However, as explained above, only a narrow understanding of the participation of the undocumented is reachable. The second theorised definition would entail some form of (political)membership of the city, touching upon theoretically newer ideas of urban citizenship or membership (Varsanyi, 2006; Gebhardt, 2016: Bhimji, 2014). As the nation-state is based upon the idea of a nation of which membership and belonging is formed by the frames of the state, the locality-based membership, therefore, seems to go against the exact premise that the nation-state is built upon (Sassen, 2002; Jacobson, 1996; Castels, de Haas and Miller, 2014). Furthermore, following the small theoretical overview of understandings of temporal inclusion, Hallett (2014) argues that this only temporal inclusive membership without any pathways to formal inclusion can be ultimately seen as exclusion as well.

As the municipality states itself to be an inclusive organisation (GroenLinks, D66, PvdA and SP, 2018), together with the multiple challenges of the theorised meaning of the inclusive city in relation to the undocumented migrant, the research follows the theories upon (clouded) sensemaking by Weick (1995) and Schwandt (2005) and expects that the concept of the inclusive city is an 'organisational vocabulary' that has clouded the tensions in, and thus the meaning-making of - this story of the policy plan.

In the next section I will firstly explain the difficulties and tensions the respondents encountered whilst pinpointing the meaning of the inclusive city. Then, I will give a more in-depth analysis of the two parts of the definition given by the respondents: firstly surrounding participation as part of the inclusive city, secondly the acknowledgement of the undocumented migrant as part of the city. Lastly, I will summarise the findings and answer the sub-question: "*How do policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the inclusive city in relation to the undocumented migrant?*"

5.3.1. Uncertainty about the inclusive city

Whereas the aim of the policy could be answered without much doubt or hesitance, as well as and the role of participation could be quite easily explained by the policy bureaucrats and policymakers following the main goal of the policy, the idea of the migrant being part of the inclusive city seemed more difficult for the respondents to cope with. The policy bureaucrats and policymakers often explained the meaning of the inclusive city, especially in relation to the migrant, from a personal framing of the concept rather than that they felt confident upon how the policymakers meant this concept:

Policy bureaucrat 8: *"Oh yes.. That uhm.. That would for me then.. Oh well indeed be that everybody takes into account the kind of limited possibilities that somebody possesses. These*

people are limited in their possibilities because they can't work or anything like that, but then you have to put in work to make sure they still can participate. So also.. that's is my a few my thoughts. I do not think that's the official board policy actually. Or actually, I do not know that for sure." (Code 10:25)

Policy bureaucrat 5: *"Yes so, That's what I don't know.. I can imagine my own images with that. Everybody inside our borders belongs to us, and we have a duty to take care of them and we want that everybody participates."* (Code 6:37)

This doubt, however, was underlined by the alderman as well as he explained that multiple definitions could be given towards the meaning of the inclusive city. When the policy bureaucrats and policymakers did try to explain the inclusive city, they did not explain it as much as a pragmatic goal that could help the migrant, as they did with the topic of participation, but as more of an overall vision of the municipality on the city. The inclusive city was seen by the respondents as an ideological, ambitious understanding of the municipality on how people *should live together* in Amsterdam that echoed in multiple domains and policies. Therefore, the alderman explained that he found it important that the 'inclusive city' would be part of the plan.

Above explanations about the uncertainty of especially the policy bureaucrats about the meaning of the inclusive city, the description of the inclusive city as being part of a broader ideological framing of what the city according to municipality should be like, together with the wish of the alderman to bring the concept in the plan, seems to resemble the clouded sensemaking as hypothesised in this research. Instead of having a clear understanding of the inclusive city entails, the inclusive city seems to resemble a certain signifier of the image and ideological understanding of the municipality – in other words - an organizational vocabulary (Weick, 1995; Schwandt, 2005).

5.3.2. Tensions in the organizational vocabulary

Even though the respondents felt unsure about the precise meaning of the inclusive city and seemed to portray clouded sensemaking of the concept, most respondents still tried to explain this concept. They argued that the inclusive city could be seen as a place in which all people could 'act along' and develop themselves (*meedoen*) – in other words - participate. Furthermore, more specifically in relation to the undocumented migrant, they saw the inclusive city as a city that recognised their presence in the city as well. As the inclusive city was seen as a place in which all persons had to live peacefully together, and together had to 'make something out of it', they felt that the city thus was responsible for the wellbeing of the undocumented migrants during their presence as well. The respondents saw inclusion as a bigger idea upon how people

should live together, but how to exactly define and explain this in relation to the plan was difficult.

What stands out is that both theorised definitions of the inclusive city come back in this explanation. The acknowledgement of the migrants being part of the city reflects in theories upon urban membership/citizenship of amongst others, Varsanyi (2006), Gebhardt (2016) and Bhimji (2014). Simultaneously, the focus upon participation resonates with the upon inclusion and participation-based theories of, amongst others, Cameron, (2006), Gaventa (1998) and Aasland and Fløtten (2001). However, the respondents explained that they were aware of certain tensions in their definitions. In the case of the 'acting along' in the inclusive city, they stated that they had to be aware of the temporality attached to this participation. The participation had to resonate with the future possibility, instead of a form of participation that would make them as included or part of the city as possible:

Policy bureaucrat 3: "*Yes I have a personal opinion and a college opinion. Look the college always talks about the inclusive city, and everybody has to make it work together. However, if people are going back, then I think that it is nice if they during that time lively peacefully together with others. Then you don't have to put in a lot of work in them becoming part of the city or of the community or should learn Dutch.. These kinds of things. That clashes.*" (Code 4:40)

Thus, what the policy bureaucrat explains is that the understanding of the inclusive city in which the undocumented migrant can participate should not outrun the main goal of creating a clear vision upon what the future for the migrant would entail.

For the other part of the definition of the inclusive city, tensions were explained as well. As they explained that the inclusive city entailed that they acknowledged the presence of the migrants and acted upon this by providing these services, the relation between the migrant and the city became blurry according to policy bureaucrat 4:

Policy bureaucrat 4: "I*t's about acknowledging their presence and what you can offer them. [..] But if you offer people too much then they [formal and non-formal citizens] come closer and closer together, and what does that passport even mean then?*" (Code 5:60)

Furthermore, the element of this possibly only temporal acknowledgement made it difficult to connect the inclusive city to the undocumented migrant according to the respondents.

The fact that the policymakers and policy bureaucrats were able to pinpoint the certain tensions in the story of the inclusive city and the temporality of the undocumented migrant is an

interesting finding. Theories by Weick (1995) and Schwandt (2005) on, in this research conceptualised as, clouded sensemaking namely suggests that this organisational vocabulary would blur the cues to a certain tensions in a story. However, following the above accounts, it seems like the respondents were to a certain extent still aware of these cues, but decided to use this organisation vocabulary of the inclusive city either way.

The next sections of the analysis will go deeper into the sensemaking of the inclusive city, by dividing the definition into two sections and by connecting those to the theory.

5.3.3. The inclusive city: 'acting along'

As explained above, the explanation of the inclusive city as a city in which the undocumented migrant can participate resonates with theories of, amongst others, Rawal (2008), Cameron (2006), Aasland and Fløtten (2001) and Gaventa (1998) surrounding the connection between participation and inclusion. However, only a narrow understanding of the participation of the undocumented migrant is reachable due to the formal obstacles that face this group. Therefore, the next section will go deeper into the meaning-making behind this definition.

The fact that the respondents defined the inclusive city in terms of participation can be seen as an interesting finding, as participation in itself was explained to mainly serve the focus upon a future perspective and was substantially referred less to it possibly being a broader ideological idea. However, when the respondents explained the meaning of inclusion and the inclusive city, they often did, in fact, refer to participation:

Policy bureaucrat 6: "*Well inclusion is that right now we see that they can't participate. So I for one see that it is beneficial, even though if it is only temporary, that they come in touch with at least that they are part of the neighbourhood and the community even though it is temporary.*" (Code 7:21) .

What policy bureaucrat 6 portrays here is that participation can be seen as the determinant of inclusion: when you can not participate, you are excluded, thus the more you can participate the more included you are. Respondents argued that restricting people from participation in daily life could be seen as a form of exclusion that would not benefit anybody. Following these explanations, I would argue that that these respondents saw inclusion, just as analysed by Rawal (2008) and Cameron (2006), as the opposite of exclusion: the less excluded the migrants are from participation in the city, the more included they are. Furthermore, this underscores Gaventa's (1998) first theorised understanding of the relation between participation and inclusion that understands participation to be the determinant of inclusion.

However, what this participation entailed that would lead to this inclusion could only be narrowly defined by the respondents. Due to pre-mentioned formal barriers towards the participation of the migrant, examples of participation and inclusion were only placed in the social domain. The participants explained that it was partly in light of the aim for an inclusive city why the shelters were made smaller and more divided over multiple neighbourhoods in the plan. It was seen as a way to acknowledge the fact that they actually are present in the city, not to 'put them away'. Furthermore, the respondents argued that the shelters might provide the migrant with a possibility to be able to participate in the neighbourhood and connect with other people. According to some policymakers, the perspective of an inclusive city thus asks for an open attitude of people, a shared responsibility to 'make something of the city' together. The plan thus did not just ask something of the migrants, as well as the other citizens, as policy bureaucrat 2 explains the wish of the alderman for the neighbourhood to connect with the migrants:

Policy bureaucrat 2*: "He [the alderman] also really wants that the inhabitants will join such a guidance-commission so that various initiatives will be organised by the undocumented migrants themselves together with the neighbourhood. That's what the alderman finds of great importance."* (Code 3:84)

However, some policy bureaucrats called this focus on connection a considerable ambition, as they saw a discrepancy between the goal and to how the neighbourhoods had reacted thus far. In the neighbourhood-meetings arranged for the inhabitants of the neighbourhoods in which the migrants would possibly come to reside in, as explained, numerous inhabitants reacted negatively to the undocumented migrants. The respondents explained that if they wanted to make sure the migrants would live peacefully in these neighbourhoods then at least this negative opinion should be turned into a neutral one. However, inclusion would be an extra step: it would mean creating a positive relationship between the neighbourhood and the migrant in which both groups could mean something to each other.

As the inclusion-goal thus not only implicitly asked something from the migrants but from the 'neighbours' as well, to reach this 'inclusive city' in terms of connection seemed quite difficult to the bureaucrats. Beyond the negative reactions, the policy bureaucrats argued that the municipality was not in the place to tell people – both migrants and the neighbours – to connect. The policy bureaucrats and policymakers could stimulate this by appointing the NGO's to focus upon creating at least peaceful relation between the groups, but they could in no way force it. They could only hope for connections to be made.

Thus with participation as the determinant for inclusion, and with participation only possible in the social domain, this specific understanding of inclusion would be quite difficult to obtain as it asked something of both the migrant and the Amsterdammer on which the plan would not have control.

5.3.3.1 Inclusion as an instrument

Beyond the problematics of how this specific understanding of inclusion could be realised, the acknowledged tension of temporal inclusion made it even more difficult to explain the inclusive city in terms of participation. Because, as theorised by Hallett (2014), if you can participate only temporally are you then really included? The mentioned tensions resulted in the policymakers and policy-bureaucrats having to navigate this field by being aware of these obstacles and by focusing upon their abilities. They took on the problem of inclusion and temporality by focussing mainly upon making them included and letting them participate in the city as much as possible during their residence. However, the respondents once again underlined that this participation should always focus upon the fitting future perspective. Based upon this thought should be acted, instead of actions based upon 'an inclusion dream'. Following these explanations of the respondents, a certain hierarchy of goals can be found. The goal first and foremost is seen as creating a future perspective, and the inclusion of migrants can be used to serve this goal but is not understood as a goal on its own:

 "Yes well along the lines of this policy I think it means that you can participate in a city or a city in which you reside that it also really ads to your own wellbeing. Uhm so inclusion means than some sort of participation in what is happening in the city. [..]. And not just adding to how you're feeling at that moment in time, that at least, but as well that you feel a sense of space to think about your future. [..] Because that's harder I think then when you already actively participating in on something." (2:107 & 2:110)

Once the respondents got deeper into their story on the relation between participation, the migrant and the inclusive city, it became clear that in relation to the policy-goal they did not see participation as the determinant of participation, but as a means for the undocumented migrant to overcome their identity existing of exclusions. By participating, the migrant could work on their 'future-perspective', which could enable them to alter this excluded identity into either a citizen in Amsterdam or into a citizen of another country. This vision on participation thus resonates the second understanding of the relation between inclusion and participation by Gaventa (1998, p.51): *"Participation is seen as a vehicle to enable the excluded to act more effectively to*

address the problems which they face". Inclusion in this story is mostly used by the policy bureaucrats and policymakers as a supporting ideology. The plan lets the migrants participate in the city to overcome their identity of 'the excluded', thus the plan can be seen as inclusive. This resonates in the statement of the alderman surrounding the inclusive city: "*So offering this perspective, that is where inclusivity comes in*" (Code 12:2). Even though the participation of these undocumented migrants could only happen in the social domain, the respondents still thought it would help them creating a future where they would be included, either in the Netherlands or in another country. That this participation of the undocumented migrant then would only be temporal fitted the goal: it was supposed to be only temporal because they wanted to make sure they would overcome their excluded identity, and be able to fully participate in the city, or elsewhere. As illustrated by the alderman:

"*So yes you can see a discrepancy in that a temporal sheltering might take away this perspective [and the participation] again, but the goal is, of course, to find that perspective during that period*" (Code 12:3)

By always first focusing upon the main goal and what could be achieved, and second upon this inclusive city, the definition of inclusion could be framed and defined by the bureaucrats afterwards by what was pragmatically possible. In this way, the definition of inclusion, and with that the inclusive city, could be coloured in by the bureaucrats later. Following their explanations, I analyse a different meaning than that they on the first hand had given: the inclusive city was thus not ought to be seen as a city where everybody is permanently included, but as a city that would help people to overcome their exclusions.

This focus on temporality and this narrow understanding of inclusion and participation does not mean that there can no deeper inclusion-aspirations be found in relation to the undocumented migrants. Policy bureaucrats often used the example of the GroenLinks initiative of a local passport for undocumented migrants to represent this. However, they explained that this initiative needed a lot of research as it was probably difficult to realise due to national constraints. Moreover, the political assistant explained that it would be a wish of GroenLinks to make the migrants more politically included as well by for example letting them vote in local elections. However, she explained that these plans were not so welcomed by other parties. However, all these proposals are no reality yet, and if they were, these proposals still had to follow the main aim of this policy.

Thus, by focusing upon the main goal of the plan, and by adjusting the meaning of inclusion to this main goal and its possibilities, the policy bureaucrats and policymakers were able to make sense of the meaning of the inclusive city in relation to undocumented migrants.

5.3.4. The inclusive city: membership and acknowledgement

The second part of the explanation of the inclusive city given by the respondents, is focused upon the recognition of the undocumented migrant as part of the city. Thus, as explained, this definition can theoretically be linked towards the research upon local-level membership and urban citizenship (Varsanyi, 2006; Gebhardt, 2016: Bhimji, 2014). As the nation-state is based upon the idea of a nation of which membership and belonging is formed by the frames of the state, the locality—based membership, seems to go against the exact premise that the nation-state is built upon (Sassen, 2002; Jacobson, 1996; Castels, de Haas and Miller, 2014). Furthermore, it could be that this acknowledgment of membership is only temporal, as the chance exists that the undocumented migrant has to leave the country – and the city – after the programme. Following the brief theoretical overview of understandings of temporal inclusion, Hallett (2014) argues that this only temporal inclusive membership without any pathways to formal inclusion can be ultimately seen as exclusion. Expecting that this temporal acknowledgment of membership is difficult to make sense of, the next section will go deeper into how the policymakers and policy bureaucrats understand or make sense of this membership to the city.

As explained, first and foremost, the presence of the migrant and their membership to the city was recognised by the respondents. The migrant, according to the respondents, is seen as part of the city because they already participate in the city, and have been for a while. Only one policy bureaucrat focused upon the idea that the group could be mostly seen as a humanitarian problem, even though part of the city, that should be acted upon by for example making sure they would not sleep on the street. The other respondents mostly focused upon the active partitioning and even their previous contribution of the migrants to the city. This active partitioning of the migrant in the city would not change due to the new policy, but would be possibly more enhanced due to the focus of expanding the participation-possibilities of the migrant, their new-found agency of their daily life in the shelters, and by giving them a small amount money to go out and buy their daily necessities. As the municipal policy acknowledged the existence and partitioning of undocumented migrants in society and mostly focused upon living peacefully together, according to some policy bureaucrats and policymakers a mentionable difference could be found in the systematic way of thinking in which the government looked at the migrants and the more practical view of the municipality. As the government's' main priority with this new pilot policy would be to make sure that people were guided to leave the country,

the focus of the municipality was more on peacefully living together and to make sure people - as long as they were present in the city - would be part of the city as well. This resonates with the findings of Varsyani (2006) about the different perspectives between governments and municipalities upon the matter, as the existence of the undocumented migrant for some cities is an everyday local reality. The respondents emphasised however that the inclusion of the undocumented migrant in that identity would only be temporal. The main goal of the plan was still to provide the migrant with a clear perspective of the future: either with a residence permit in Amsterdam or a return to the country of origin.

District chairman: *The dilemma stays, however, that it [the inclusion] has to fit within the most realistic plan for the future. If people have a serious chance upon residing here, because something went really wrong with a procedure, it [inclusion] will help. If people just will not or barely have that chance, is it just the best to work on the future. So you can set inclusivity as a goal, but then it's good for nobody. So I think that you have to start working on your future from a feeling of welcomingness and warmth, but with a realistic image. Otherwise, you're, in my opinion, setting the wrong goals. We should not just [think] from a sort of inclusivity dream, because I think that would not really help the group with a very minor chance not any more.* (Code 11:52)

Thus, as the district chairman explains here, inclusion should not be seen as the main goal but as a way to treat the undocumented migrant during their presence in the city. Due to the mentioned humanitarian considerations, an only temporal inclusion of the undocumented migrant in that identity was still be seen as the main aim. The focus upon temporality, the humanitarian reasoning behind the policy, as well as the way that the group of undocumented migrants resurfaced the public agenda, namely by protests, suggest a recognition of membership based upon presence, as theorised by Gebhardt (2016). This form of recognition has a more temporal character, based upon a political and societal recognition of the group as a humanitarian emergency, that needs a quick solution.

However, hints of the other form of recognition as theorised by Gebhardt (2016) could be found in the plan as well. The recognition of membership based upon residence is more of a stable form of membership as it is institutionalised in the rules, regulations, policies of the city. Furthermore, this form of membership is meant for all residents inside of the 'borders' of the city (Gebhardt, 2016). In the interviews, this reflects mostly in the political wishes by ruling party GroenLinks, explained by the political assistant. Providing the undocumented migrants with local voting rights based upon residence, as well as a local passport to enable undocumented

migrants to use locale facilities are initiatives that fit into this perspective. However, not all ruling parties agree with these ideas and governmental obstacles seem to block such locality-based rights. Making these initiatives thus far more utopian than reality.

Following the above accounts, an acknowledgement of membership based upon presence can be found. Even though mentioned wishes from ruling party GroenLinks linger to a more institutionalised form of membership, this is, due to multiple obstacles, not yet the reality. The next section will go deeper what this recognition of membership together with the focus of temporality in the policy means for the relation between the migrant and the city.

5.3.4.1. The relation

Whilst the respondents acknowledged the undocumented migrant to be a part of the city, how the policy bureaucrats and policymakers saw this relation, however, varied. This difference became highly visible in the answers on the question whether the undocumented migrants could be seen as Amsterdammers, as the before-mentioned tensions of temporality, inclusion, and 'illegality' came more to the surface in this question. Answers were divided. According to policy bureaucrat 3, the undocumented migrants who would only be here temporally and eventually had to return to their home country were not exactly the new Amsterdammers:

"But I am not the kind of type that says that all undocumented migrants already are the new Amsterdammers [..]. Because I think that you complicate it then. Because we are actually saying we do not have a solution for you, you have to go back. We want to help you with that but we won't push you, but we hope that after a while you will understand that that might be better for you." (Code 4:42)

The district chairman had another vision:

"*Formally you're not an Amsterdammer. I think that you should make people feel like an Amsterdammer as much as possible. Because this is the place where they are living and working now. When people are productive for the city than we all benefit from that, but we have to stay realistic."* (Code 11:50 & 11:51)

Policy bureaucrat 3 explains that seeing these migrants as the new Amsterdammers would overcomplicate their relation to the city as there would be a reasonable chance they would not be able to stay here. This seems to go against the position of the district chairman. He, on the other hand, argues that is for the wellbeing of both the migrant and the city to integrate everybody into the city. Answers thus seem to be divided on the one hand in a fear of the respondents for the undocumented migrant to get confused about their position in the city, especially when it is clear

that they would not be able to legally reside in the city. On the other hand, respondents explained that it is in the benefit of the migrant to feel a part of the place where one is living, even if it is temporary. An increase in the overall wellbeing of the migrant could in the end even result in the migrant being able to take more agency over lives. To avoid these tensions, policy bureaucrat 8 answered that if the migrant saw themselves as an Amsterdammer than (s)he would too. The fact that there were such different, as well as insecurely answered responses towards these questions is an interesting finding, especially as the alderman answered this question with a full "yes". The responses seem to portray a missing overall consensus about the relationship between the migrant and the city.

One policy bureaucrat tried to make sense of the temporal inclusion and its meaning for the relation of the migrant with the city by focusing upon the group. The respondent acknowledged the friction between the temporality of residence of the individual and the focus on inclusion as well but explained that even though the individual might stay here temporarily, the group of 'undocumented migrants' itself was not expected to leave the city anytime soon. One of the main points of the policy that illustrates this, is that the plan expects there to be a continuous in- and outflux of people: once people would either return to their sending countries or receive a residence permit, a new spot in both the shelter and the programme would open for another migrant. This does mean that there will be a waiting list of migrants who are awaiting an opening and need to rely on NGO's for shelter in the meantime. The bureaucrats acknowledged that this is not ideal as the main aim of the policy was to get the people of the streets but stated that they needed to have some form of limited capacity. Furthermore, they explained that the new policy is actually more open for newly arriving migrants compared to the old shelter which could be full without anything changing for several years. Therefore, as the policy expected that the group instead of the individual would be a stable presence in the city, policy bureaucrat 7 argued that the group needed to be permanently included in the city as well. Whilst other respondents did not explicitly mention this more group-based inclusion, they did, in fact, mention the long-term aspects of the policy. This long-term focus could be found in the instalment of new shelters that were expected to be inhabited by undocumented migrants by multiple years. Focussing upon a good 'landing' is in this story not only beneficial for the current undocumented migrants, but also for the new inhabitants to come. However, how then the neighbourhood will react in 1,5 years to these 'newcomers' of possibly completely different countries and cultures, had to be closely monitored by the implementing parties. According to the political assistant, continuous customization of services was necessary and expected in the implementation.

Following the above analysis, the policy does seem to go a little further in its recognition than only a recognition of membership based upon presence, as coined by Gebhardt (2016). The individual undocumented migrant will indeed only be temporarily part of the city in that 'identity': the migrant either returns to the sending country or becomes a permit holder. However, the undocumented migrant as a group of people is, as explained, recognised to be a more permanent part of the city:

Policy bureaucrat 7: "*For the start, it's about the inclusion of the individual, but for the group as such too. Because the individual might be here temporary, but the group being here will surpass a much longer time*"(Code 8:43)

Thus, one can argue, these services, as well as the group itself, become a more institutionalised part of the city. As policy bureaucrat 4 notices:

"I*t's about acknowledging their presence and what you can offer them. [..] But if you offer people to much then they [formal and non-formal citizens] come closer and closer together, and what does that passport even mean then?"* (Code 5:60)

What policy bureaucrat 4 with this quote illustrates is the altering of relations between who belongs in the city and who does not, as the undocumented migrant seems to come closer to the 'legal citizen' due to the services that will be provided. Thus, the materialised recognition of the migrant as part of the city in the form of this policy and the questions that this creates, resonates with theories by Sassen (2002), Hellgren (2014), Varsanyi (2006), Staeheli (2003), explaining how the presence of the undocumented migrant disrupts former understandings of membership, inclusion and belonging. However, at the same time, the temporal inclusion of the undocumented as an individual is strongly emphasized. This temporal inclusion in a way resembles the analysis by Hallett (2014) on the 'Temporary Protected Status' in the US migration law. Those with a TPS were temporarily granted certain rights, but at the same time were omitted from pathways to become a citizen, and thus were awaiting exclusion. Therefore, the scholar asks the question, to what extent are you then actually included? This question can be asked for this plan as well: once you know as an undocumented migrant that the revision of your asylum-claim will not be positive, how can you then still be included in the city? With this question another difficulty comes forward: the municipality is not the one to decide who is a citizen, and who is not. Even though the migrants might be recognised in their membership of the city, the plan cannot guarantee any rights based upon this: the plan is a local policy and thus not the sovereign power upon this matter. As the alderman explains "*What we can do is try to make the circumstances as*

positive as possible, but it is of course a national policy, and that can be quite frustrating sometimes" (Code 12:5).

The recognition of membership thus seems to exist in a sort of middle-ground: as a group, the undocumented migrant becomes more institutionally recognised as a member of the city, whilst as an individual, the migrant is being persuaded to either become a complete citizen of that same polity, or no member at all. This can be analysed as a paradox: on the one side the institutional recognition of the group that lures towards an urban-based membership beyond the national framework can be found in the policy, whilst on the other side the individual of that group is only able to exist in a split identity divided between a national citizen or a non-national alien: a dichotomy that is simultaneously countered by the local policy itself.

This paradox seems to make it difficult for the policymakers and the policy bureaucrats to really, profoundly make sense of the relation between the migrant and the city. This analysis can be used to explain why it was so difficult for the respondents to answer the question of whether the migrant can be seen as an Amsterdammer, and why the answers were so ambiguous. Whilst the plan indirectly institutionalises the relation of the undocumented migrant to the city, at the same time the goal of the plan directly changes this relationship in either a complete inclusion or none at all. Thus, in this 'time-out' of 1,5 years, the relation of the undocumented migrant to the city is recognised as well as simultaneously altered: creating an in-between situation that is both for the city, and - can be expected - for the migrant hard to define.

Following this analysis, it can be summarised that the policy bureaucrats and policymakers see the migrant part of the city, as they are present and even active in the city, something that is tried to be acknowledged and facilitated by the new policy. However, the difficulty of the acknowledgement of the group by the policy, combined with the only temporal inclusion of the undocumented does seem put a strain on the combined meaning-making of the relation between the city and the migrant.

5.3.5. Making sense of the inclusive city

Before I will start with the conclusion, I will briefly answer the second sub-question: "*How do policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the inclusive city in relation to the undocumented migrant?*". First of all the sensemaking firstly seems based upon 'organisational vocabulary', in this research theorised as clouded sensemaking, as the inclusive city is seen as a broader ideological representation of the city as a whole. However, the respondents were able to pinpoint the possible tensions between inclusion and the temporal focus of the plan. Moving around these tensions they still tried to define the inclusive city: a city in which the

undocumented migrant can participate and their presence is acknowledged. This participation is seen as a means for the undocumented to deal with its identity that consists of exclusions. Through participation, the migrant can create a future perspective, and change this identity either to a citizen in the Netherlands after a juridical revision of the asylum claim, or to a citizen in the home country or a third country. The acknowledgement of the undocumented migrant that is part of the definition of the inclusive city is more difficult to connect to the broader policy as it underlines the migrants being an institutionalised part of the city, whilst the policy itself at the same times focuses on the only temporal presence of the migrant. Creating a middle ground that is difficult for both the policymakers and policy bureaucrats to make sense of.

6. Conclusion

This research has tried to grasp what meaning policymakers and policy bureaucrats assign to the integration of both participation, temporality and the inclusive city in Amsterdam's new policy concerning the undocumented migrant. This is an interesting and complex story, seemingly full of tensions and paradoxes. How do these 'policymakers' explain this story when asked? But more importantly: how do they explain this story to themselves? In this conclusion chapter I will reflect on these questions by answering the main research question of this research:

 "*How do policymakers and policy-bureaucrats make sense of the (temporary) participation of undocumented migrants in the inclusive city?*"

To answer this question, I will firstly return to what meaning the respondents have given to the concept of participation of the undocumented migrant. Whilst the theory explains that there are multiple ways one can participate in a society - with the undocumented migrant being no exception - the pathways towards formal participation for this group are limited, both according to the theory and the respondents. The respondents thus had to resort to a more narrow definition of participation based upon examples mainly related to the social domain, such as social engagement with the neighbourhood. This type of participation is seen by them as more than 'just' participation. It is meant to cater a broader goal: to create a 'future-perspective' for the migrant. Participation could help giving the migrants their agency back over their life, as well as the confidence and skills to either return to the sending country, or integrate into the city. This 'future perspective' is now seen as the main aim of the policy.

Whereas unconditional but sober night-sheltering of the undocumented migrant was first seen as the 'humanitarian minimum', a different meaning-framework is created around the understanding of humane policies by the policymakers and policy bureaucrats due to new

perspectives introduced by the new ruling party GroenLinks as well as by recent research. They now understand this 'endless standing-still period' that is facilitated by the former unconditional night shelters to be bad for the wellbeing of the person. The focus on a future perspective, that is supported by extra services that came hand in hand with the condition of temporality, now *made sense*. Due to this new understanding, the respondents could navigate through both the narrow participation-options created by formal boundaries, as well as through the temporality of this participation: as it served a broader goal that was understood to emerge from humanitarian considerations.

Whilst the participation of the undocumented migrants could be relatively easily made sense of, the meaning of the concept of the inclusive city was more difficult for the respondents to explain. This came as little surprise, as the theory already identified tensions between the definition of the inclusive city and the focus on temporality. The bureaucrats and the policymakers, as well as the alderman, pointed out that the concept of 'the inclusive city' was included in the new policy on undocumented migrants as it articulated the broader vision of the municipality upon how people in the city should live together. However, what this vision exactly entailed, often remained doubtful. The 'inclusive city' thus seems to be a form of 'organizational vocabulary, a certain routinized understanding of norms, values and goals that clouds an explicit re-evaluating of the meaning framework (Weick, 1995; Schwandt, 2005).

It is, however, significant that especially the bureaucrats were able to point out the tensions in the story of the inclusive city in relation to the possibly only temporal acceptance of the undocumented migrant. Tensions, that according to sensemaking-theory as explained by Schwandt (2005) would be clouded by this routinized 'organisational vocabulary' as well.

The respondents in general defined the inclusive city as *a city in which the migrant can participate and is acknowledged.* As expected, they saw at first reading a friction between the possibility of only temporal residence of the migrant and the focus on participation as part of the inclusive city. Because, as theorised by Hallett (2014), if you can participate only temporarily, are you then really included? Thus, the relation between participation and inclusion could be understood as a friction when participation was seen as the determinant of inclusion, as explained in theoretical framework by Aasland and Fløtten (2001) and Gaventa (1998). However, by understanding participation as a means for the migrants to cope with their identity formed by exclusions, the respondents were able to make sense of this apparent contradiction. By participating, the migrants are expected to work on their 'future-perspective', which could enable them to alter their excluded identity into becoming either a citizen in Amsterdam or

becoming a citizen of another country. This vision on participation thus resonates the second understanding of the relation between inclusion and participation by Gaventa (1998, p.51): "*Participation is seen as a vehicle to enable the excluded to act more effectively to address the problems which they face*". The inclusive city, according to this reasoning, could then be seen as a city in which the undocumented could participate to address the problems of their identity as undocumented migrants with the aim to change their identity into either being a citizen of that city or into being a citizen of the sending country. Thus, instead of following the definition that they at first hand gave of the inclusive city as a city where everybody is included, the policy bureaucrats and policymakers actually framed the inclusive city as a city that would help people to overcome their exclusions.

Thus, by firstly focusing upon the main goal and what could reasonably be achieved, and secondly, by treating participation as a means to and not as a determinant of inclusion, the definition of inclusion and the inclusive city could be framed in accordance with what actually could be seen as possible.

Whilst sense could be made of the temporal participation of the undocumented migrant reflected in the concept of the inclusive city, both the services provided as a result of the policy and the concept of the inclusive city itself, acknowledged and institutionalised the presence of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city. This made it difficult for the respondents to create a harmonious story about the relation between the migrant and the city. It is my analysis that this is due to the paradox that can be found in the acknowledgement of the existence of undocumented migrants: on the one hand the institutional recognition of the group by the municipal policy lures towards an urban-based membership beyond the national framework, while on the other hand the individual migrant is only able to exist in a split identity divided between being a national citizen and a non-national alien: a dichotomy that is simultaneously countered by the local policy itself. As explained, whilst the policy indirectly institutionalises the relation of the undocumented migrant with the city, at the same time the policy directly changes this relationship in either a complete inclusion or none at all. This raises the question inspired by research by Hallett (2014): once you know as an undocumented migrant that the revision of your asylum-claim will not be positive, how can you then still be included in the city? The difficulty lays in the fact that the municipality is not the one to decide who is a citizen or not. Even though the migrants might be recognised in their membership of the city community, the policy can not guarantee them any rights.

This apparent paradox in the local policy, together with the lack of authority to actually decide who is to become a new citizen and who is not, seems to make it difficult for the policymakers and the policy bureaucrats to really, profoundly make sense of the relation between the migrant and the city. Thus, in this 'time-out' of 1.5 years, the relation of the undocumented migrant with the city is recognised as well as simultaneously altered: creating an in-between situation that is hard to define, both for the city and - probably - for the migrant.

Thus, to answer the research question: "*How do policymakers and policy-bureaucrats make sense of the (temporary) participation of undocumented migrants in the inclusive city?*" is that the respondents made sense of the participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city by focusing upon the main goal of the policy: creating a future perspective for the undocumented migrant. As this goal was encouraged by the new understanding of what a humane policy for the undocumented migrant would be, the respondents were able to make sense of both the narrow and temporal understanding of participation in this story. The participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city is not meant to resemble an inclusion of the migrant in the city, but is intended to enable the migrant to cope with his exclusion-based identity.

However, what is more difficult to grasp is that the policy indirectly alters the relationship between the undocumented migrant and the city. Even though the main goal of the policy can be summarised as temporality, 'the undocumented migrant' becomes an institutionalised member of the city itself due to the acknowledgement of the migrant as part of the city that echoes in the provided definition of the inclusive city, together with the materialisation of this acknowledgement into direct services and policies. At the same time, the individual migrant can only be temporarily part of the city in that identity, as this person will inevitably either become either a citizen or no citizen at all. Furthermore, which of these identities will prevail, is not up to the city to decide. Thus whilst the inclusive city might bring this paradoxical acknowledgement of membership more to the surface, the question is not only how the respondents make sense of the inclusive city as part of the policy, but what this policy means to that inclusive city: is the undocumented migrant an Amsterdammer or not?

7. Policy recommendations

The questions surrounding Amsterdam's policy plan on undocumented migrants in relation to the inclusive city, participation and temporality are complex, as the inclusive city seams to make explicit what is already happing without this concept being mentioned: an institutionalisation of

the undocumented migrant as part of the city. An interesting finding, but what can we take from this? With these policy recommendations I aim my suggestions directly at the policymakers and policy bureaucrats involved.

1. *Be aware of 'organisational vocabulary'*
Organisational vocabulary with routinized understandings, as explained by Weick (1995) and Schwandt (2005) can cloud the sensemaking of policies. It tends to mask certain discrepancies in the story and dismisses the cues to create or adjust meanings on the basis of new information. Be aware of such vocabularies, such as in this case "the inclusive city", and stay reflective on the meaning of the words that are used in the policy.

2. *Re-evaluate the meaning of the inclusive city*
This recommendation follows from the first one. The meaning of "the inclusive city" concept is not clear to all the policymakers involved, and it seems to create certain tensions in the overall policy-story. Therefore, my recommendation is to re-evaluate the meaning of 'the inclusive city' to create a shared understanding of this concept and its relation to the policy. Clouded sensemaking can lead to the clouding of cues that ask for a re-evaluation of a particular meaning framework, once new information creates discrepancies (Weick, 1995; Schwandt, 2005). However, despite of this clouded sensemaking, the respondents were still able to pinpoint the tensions in the story. This recognition of tensions can be seen as the first moment of awareness. Discussing these tensions with each other could be the next step to a shared understanding of the 'inclusive city' concept.

3. *Create a shared understanding of the relation between the undocumented migrant and the city*
A third recommendation is to try to create an understanding of the relationship between the migrant and the city. Even beyond the concept of the inclusive city, that implies the acknowledgement of the undocumented migrant as part of the city, the policy itself seems to materialise and thus institutionalise the migrant as being part of the city. However, what this, in the end, means for the relation between the city and the migrants is answered incoherently. The question "is the undocumented migrant an Amsterdammer?" received a full yes from the alderman, but a lot of doubt from the bureaucrats. It can be seen as a difficult question, due to the paradoxical momentum that the undocumented migrant seems to be in during this time-out period of 1.5 years. It is not the goal of this

research, nor my aim, to suggest a new policy. However, I do recommend you to reflect together on this relationship between migrant and city, to create a shared understanding. The people who will implement the policy have tomake sense of the policy as well. They run the risk of becoming cognitively disconnected from the policy, as explained by Tummers, Bekkers, and Steijn, (2009), due to a lack of understanding. As this disconnection might result in a different implementation than what was meant in the policy, the shared understanding of the relation between the city and the migrant can be seen as quite important. Especially in the light of the policy's goal to provide the migrant with a coherent story, I highly recommend this (r)evaluation of both the concept of the inclusive city, and of the relation between the migrant and this city.

8. Discussion

This research has tried to make a contribution to a theoretical understanding of the local participation and inclusion of undocumented migrants in the city, in combination with the extra factor of temporality. Furthermore, the research has connected the organisational concept 'sensemaking' to the policy process, in this case by analysing how policymakers and policy bureaucrats make sense of the specific story of the temporal participation of the undocumented migrant in the inclusive city. This constitutes a specific angle to look at urban membership that had yet to be researched (Hoekstra, 2015).

First and foremost, this research can be seen as a plea for the continuation of the use of the concept of sensemaking in research to create an in-depth understanding of the policy-story, as well as to understand how the creators of the policy explain this story. Whilst the concept sensemaking has only scarcely been used in public administration theory, I have understood the concept in this case-study to be helpful to grasp questions surrounding discrepancies, as well as uncertainties in the policy story. Especially the dimension of 'clouded sensemaking', as I have called the explanation of Weick (1995) and Schwandt (2005) as to how organisational vocabulary can influence the sensemaking process, can be seen as a concept that can be further used and elaborated upon in future research. Whilst Schwandt (2005) explains that this organisational vocabulary has the tendency to cloud any recognition of discrepancies in a story, this research has shown that this 'organisational vocabulary' with its tensions and misinterpretations can appear in a policy, while at the same time the policy bureaucrats are still able to recognise these tensions. I thus argue that multiple levels of this clouded sensemaking can exist through which not only cues for discrepancies are clouded, but which also makes it possible that tensions, although actually recognised, still end up in the policy. More research can

thus be done on the use and sensemaking of these organisational vocabularies in the decision-making process.

Secondly, this research has tried to contribute to newer understandings on the inclusion of undocumented migrants theorised as urban citizenship or urban membership. Especially the theory as explained by Gebhardt (2016) on the two possible local pathways to the acknowledgement of urban membership, based upon either presence or residence, has been important to get a deeper understanding of the relation between the undocumented migrant and the city of Amsterdam. However, the case study has shown that the undocumented migrants seem to exist in a sort of middle ground between membership based upon presence and membership based upon residence. As a group, the undocumented migrants becomes more institutionally recognised as members of the city, whilst as an individual, the migrant only faces two options: to either become a complete citizen, or no member of the city at all. I expect that this paradox of an temporal acknowledgement of the individual together with an institutionalised recognition of the group, as materialised in this policy, is not specific for Amsterdam, but is occurring at more locations where migrants are present, and are provided with local services. As Sassen (2002), Hellgren (2014), Varsanyi (2006), and others have explained the power of the undocumented migrant to challenge, shake or even change institutionalised ideas about inclusion, membership and even citizenship, I highly recommend more research to further make sense of this 'in-between' situation. The perspective of the undocumented migrants themselves on this position could be an important starting point.

Lastly, apart from the aim of this research to create more understanding on sensemaking, inclusivity, temporality, and the undocumented migrant, the aim of this study is to provide reflective insights and recommendations regarding the Amsterdam policy itself. As this research focused upon the sensemaking of the policymakers and the policy bureaucrats of their policy, I refrain from making suggestions to alter their policy. I, however, do hope that this research can be used by the researched population to reflect on the policy and its prospective implementation. As the aim of the municipality is to create more clarity for the migrant, I think that this research makes a societal contribution by creating awareness amongst the population about the discrepancies in the story, to prevent confusion for both those who will implement the policy, as well as for the migrants involved in the programme.

8.1 Limitations

This research has tried to create an in-depth understanding of the sensemaking of policy bureaucrats and policymakers regarding the temporal participation of the undocumented migrant

in the inclusive city. I have tried to get an in-depth understanding by speaking to my complete population, minus one policymaker. For full representation, this interview would have been valuable as well, especially as there are significantly fewer policymakers than policy bureaucrats. Furthermore, it has been quite an effort to create the right questions to ask, that on the one hand would not guide the respondents too much, but on the other hand, would break down the barrier of policy- and politically-correct answers to get an in-depth understanding of their sensemaking. Sometimes it was difficult to get deeper understandings of their sensemaking once they answered questions by saying they were not sure, for example in response to the questions on the inclusive city. Therefore, more inventive research measures such as certain forms of participative observation during their meetings could have helped to get a different perspective on their sensemaking, beyond the sensemaking they explain in the interviews.

9. Bibliography

't Hart, P. (2014). Ambtelijk Vakmanschap 3.0: Zoektocht naar het handwerk van de overheidsmanager. *NSOB.*

Aasland, A., & Fløtten, T. (2001). Ethnicity and social exclusion in Estonia and Latvia. *Europe-Asia Studies*, *53*(7), 1023-1049.

ANP (2016, the 21st of November). Amsterdam zet opvang voort ondanks mislukt bed-bad-broodakkord. *Het Parool*. Retrieved from: https://www.parool.nl/nieuws/amsterdam-zet-opvang-voort-ondanks-mislukt-bed-bad-broodakkoord~ba09d83e/

ANW (2019). Beleidsambtenaar. *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek.* Retrieved from: http://anw.inl.nl/article/beleidsambtenaar

AT5 (2015, the 22nd of May). Van der Laan: Amsterdam zal altijd bed, bad, brood blijven bieden. *AT5*. Retrieved from: https://www.at5.nl/artikelen/143420/burgemeester_amsterdam_zal_altijd_bed_bad_brood_bieden

Barzelay, M., & Jacobsen, A. S. (2009). Theorizing implementation of public management policy reforms: A case study of strategic planning and programming in the European Commission. *Governance*, *22*(2), 319-334.

Baubock, R. (2003). Reinventing urban citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, *7*(2), 139-160.

Beckman, L. (2013). Irregular migration and democracy: the case for inclusion. *Citizenship Studies*, *17*(1), 48-60.

Bhimji, F. (2014). Undocumented Immigrants' Performances and Claims of Urban Citizenship in Los Angeles. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *35*(1), 18-33.

Bloch, A. (2013). The labour market experiences and strategies of young undocumented migrants. *Work, Employment and Society*, *27*(2), 272-287.

Bosniak, L. (2000). Universal citizenship and the problem of alienage. *Northwestern University Law Review*, *94*(3).

Braster, J.F.A. (2000). *De kern van casestudy's.* Van Gorcum & Comp: Assen.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press: Oxford.

Cameron, A. (2006). Geographies of welfare and exclusion: social inclusion and exception. *Progress in Human Geography*, *30*(3), 396-404.

Castles, S., de Haas, h. & Miller, M.J. (2014) *The Age of Migration*. Palgrave Macmillan: London.

Cinalli, M., & Giugni, M. (2011). Institutional opportunities, discursive opportunities and the political participation of migrants in European cities. In *Social capital, political participation and migration in Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan: London.

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

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, *13*(1), 3-21.

Coutin, S. B. (1999). Denationalization, inclusion, and exclusion: negotiating the boundaries of belonging. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, *7*(585).

Couzy, M. (2016, the 21st of November). Onderhandeling over bed-bad-brood strand. *Het Parool.* Retrieved from: https://www.parool.nl/nieuws/onderhandeling-over-bed-bad-brood-strandt~bdd5169c/

De Graauw, E. (2014). Municipal ID cards for undocumented immigrants: Local bureaucratic membership in a federal system. *Politics & Society*, *42*(3), 309-330.

Dirks, B. (2018, the 12th of December). Amsterdam krijgt 24-uursopvang voor vijfhonderd uitgeprocedeerde asielzoekers. *Volkskrant.* Retrieved from: https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/amsterdam-krijgt-24-uursopvang-voor-vijfhonderd-uitgeprocedeerde-asielzoekers~b469a32d/

Gaventa, J. (1998). Poverty, participation and social exclusion in North and South. *IDS bulletin*, *29*(1), 50-57.

Gebhardt, D. (2016). Re-thinking urban citizenship for immigrants from a policy perspective: the case of Barcelona. *Citizenship Studies*, *20*(6-7), 846-866.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2018, the 11th of December). Uitvoeringsplan 24-uursopvang ongedocumenteerden. *Gemeente Amsterdam.*

GroenLinks Amsterdam (2018). Waarom we ongedocumenteerden gaan opvangen. *GroenLinks Amsterdam*. Retrieved from: https://amsterdam.groenlinks.nl/opvang

GroenLinks, D66, PvdA and SP (2018, May). Een nieuwe lente en een nieuw geluid. Coalitieakkoord Groen Links/D66/PVDA/SP. *Gemeente Amsterdam.* Retrieved from: https://www.amsterdam.nl/bestuur-organisatie/volg-beleid/coalitieakkoord-2018/

Groot Wassink, R. (2019, the 15th of February). Deelname aan de pilot LVV (Landelijke Vreemdelingen Voorziening) en samenwerkingsafspraken DT&V Dublin claimanten [Raadsbrief]. Retrieved from: https://www.amsterdam.nl/bestuur-organisatie/college/wethouder/rutger-groot-wassink/persberichten/amsterdam-sluit-0/

Hallett, M. C. (2014). Temporary protection, enduring contradiction: The contested and contradictory meanings of temporary immigration status. *Law & Social Inquiry*, *39*(3), 621-642.

Hanisch, C. (2006; 1969). The personal is political. Introduction. *Carol Hanisch.* Retrieved from: http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/PIP.html

Hellgren, Z. (2014). Negotiating the boundaries of social membership: Undocumented migrant claims-making in Sweden and Spain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *40*(8), 1175-1191.

Hoekstra, M. (2015). Diverse cities and good citizenship: How local governments in the Netherlands recast national integration discourse. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *38*(10), 1798-1814.

Hoppe, R., & Jeliazkova, M. (2006). How policy workers define their job: A Netherlands case study. In Colebatch, H. K. (ed). *The work of policy: An international survey*. Lexington Books: Oxford.

Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2009). *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems* (Vol. 3). Oxford university press: Oxford.

Isin, E. F. (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity*, *29*(1), 367-388.

Isitman, E. (2018, the 24th of May). Coalitie presenteert 'kneiterlinks' akkoord: dit zijn de speerpunten. *Elsevier*. Retrieved from: https://www.elsevierweekblad.nl/nederland/achtergrond/2018/05/coalitie-presenteert-kneiterlinks-akkoord-dit-zijn-de-speerpunten-617874/

Jacobson, D. (1996). *Rights across borders: Immigration and the decline of citizenship*. Brill: Leiden.

Jansen, T., Janssen, L. and Kwakkelstein, T. (2014). De ambtenaar als professional. *BoomBestuurskunde, 4.*

Kas, A (2016, the 28th of July). Europees Hof: Voorwaarden aan opvang mag. *NRC*. Retrieved from: https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2016/07/28/europees-hof-voorwaarden-aan-opvang-vreemdelingen-mag-a1513711

Kjaer, M. (2004). *Governance*. Polity Press: Cambridge.

Koopmans, R., & Statham, S. (2000). Migration and Ethnic Relations as a Field of Political Contention: An Opportunity Structure Approach. In Koopmans, R. & Statham, S. (Eds.), *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Law, M. (2002). Participation in the occupations of everyday life. *The American journal of occupational therapy*, *56*(6), 640-649.

Meijer, R. (2018, the 28th of November). Bed, bad, brood: na drie jaar steggelen heeft de VVD haar harde lijn verzacht. *Volkskrant*. Retrieved from: https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/bed-bad-brood-na-drie-jaar-steggelen-heeft-de-vvd-haar-harde-lijn-verzacht~b9236c40/

Meijer, R. (2018, the 29th of November). Landelijke opvang moet discussie tussen Rijk en gemeenten over bed, bad, brood beslechten. *Volkskrant.* Retrieved from: https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/landelijke-opvang-moet-discussie-tussen-rijk-en-gemeenten-over-bed-bad-brood-beslechten~bea54b7d/

Nordling, V., Sager, M., & Söderman, E. (2017). From citizenship to mobile commons: reflections on the local struggles of undocumented migrants in the city of Malmö, Sweden. *Citizenship Studies*, *21*(6), 710-726.

Nu.nl (2015, the 23rd of May). Hoe 'bed, bad, brood' de coalitie dreigde te splijten. *Nu.nl*. Retrieved from: https://www.nu.nl/dvn/4032012/bed-bad-brood-coalitie-dreigde-splijten.html

NU.nl (2018, the 28th of April). Honderden mensen demonstreren met vluchtelingen We Are Here. Retrieved from: https://www.nu.nl/amsterdam/5243213/honderden-mensen-demonstreren-met-vluchtelingen-we-are-here.html

Profacto & Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (2018, april). Onderdak en opvang door Rijk en gemeenten van vertrekplichtige vreemdelingen en de invloed daarvan op terugkeer. *WODC*. Retrieved from: https://www.wodc.nl/binaries/2882_Volledige_Tekst_tcm28-325328.pdf

Rawal, N. (2008). Social inclusion and exclusion: A review. *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, *2*, 161-180.

Sassen, S. (2002). Towards post-national and denationalized citizenship. In Isin, E. F. & Turner, B. E. (eds). *Handbook of citizenship studies*. Sage: London.

Schwandt, D. R. (2005). When managers become philosophers: Integrating learning with sensemaking. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *4*(2), 176-192.

Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. Review of educational research, 72(3), 387-431.

Staeheli, L. A. (2003). Cities and citizenship. *Urban Geography*, *24*(2), 97-102.

True, J. L., Jones, B. D. and Baumgartner, F. R. (2007). Punctuated Equilibrium Theory: Explaining Stability and Change in Public Policy-Making. In: Sabatier, P. (ed.). *Theories of the Policy Process.* Westview Press: Boulder.

Tummers, L., G., Bekkers, V., J., J., M., and Steijn, A., J. (2009). Policy Alienation of Public Professionals: Application in a New Public Management Context. *Public Management Review* 11(5): 685–706

Varsanyi, M. W. (2006). Interrogating "urban citizenship" vis-à-vis undocumented migration. *Citizenship Studies*, *10*(2), 229-249.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations (Vol. 3).* Sage: Thousand Oaks.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science, 16*(4), 409-421.

Willems, M. (2014, the 17th of December). Uitspraak: Amsterdam moet asielzoekers bed, bad en brood bieden. *NRC*. Retrieved from: https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2014/12/17/uitspraak-amsterdam-moet-asielzoekers-bed-bad-en-brood-bieden-a1420194

Wilmink, H. (2014). Verder op weg naar een professie voor de beleidsambtenaar? *BoomBestuurskunde, 4*(23).

10. Appendix

10.1 Interview guide

This interview guide is an example of the questions I have asked during the interviews. As explained, the research is a qualitative, inductive research. Therefore, the interview-questions were left quite open, but was still guided towards the sensemaking of the respondents surrounding the temporal participation of the migrant in the inclusive city. Furthermore, I have altered and developed the questions during the interview-process, as well as fitted the questions towards the occupation of the respondent.

Introduction to the topic

Story on what the research will be about. Explain the informed consent form.

Introductory questions on who they are: what is their occupation and how did they and up at this project?

Questions about the policy (based on citizenship pathways)

1. How did the development of this policy start?
2. On what grounds do you make this policy/ what is the reason?
3. What is the aim of the policy?

Questions about the process

1. Can you describe how the policy-plan was developed?
2. To what extend was there room for input of the migrants themselves, other organisations as well as your own expertise in the plan?
3. How did participation and the inclusive city become part of the plan?

Questions about participation and the inclusive city

1. What does participation mean for the undocumented migrant: what is formally possible?
2. What does the inclusive city mean, and especially in relation to the undocumented migrant?
3. How does this inclusive city relate towards temporality?

Questions about the relationship between the migrants and the city

1. How would you explain the (formal) relation between the migrant and the city?
2. To what extent can the migrant be seen as a part of the city
3. Is the undocumented migrant an Amsterdammer?

10.2. Coding scheme

Axial coding	Open coding[3]
Goal of the plan	- Focus on a future perspective - Out of humanitarian considerations
Participation	- Obstacles towards participation - Participation aimed to serve main goal - Meaning participation in relation to the undocumented migrant - Tensions temporal participation
The inclusive city	- Meaning inclusion - Meaning inclusive city in relation to the undocumented migrant - Relation between the migrant and the city - Tension temporality and inclusive city
Sensemaking	- Clouded sensemaking - Adaptive sensemaking
Background to the plan	- Development of the plan - Political background to the plan - The Amsterdam policy in relation to national policies

---

[3] Most 'open coding' are divided in even smaller codes. To remain the overview for the reader, these are not displayed.