

ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM

Erasmus School of Economics

Bachelor Thesis Economics and Business Economics

The effect of different types of information on
attitudes towards refugees

Name	Leah Grooff
Student number	482610
Supervisor	Francesco Capozza
Second assessor	Vahid Moghani
Date	25-07-2020

The views stated in this thesis are those of the author and not necessarily those of the supervisor, second assessor, Erasmus School of Economics or Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Abstract

In order to investigate the relationship between different types of emotional and rational information and the change in attitudes towards refugees, I conducted an online randomised control trial. The results of 176 participants show that encouraging emotional based information leads to a higher willingness to donate, which indicates a positive change in attitude towards refugees. This type of information induces several positive and negative emotions which affect the donation behavior. It is important to minimise the lack of information in order to encourage people to engage in refugee programmes and to improve the integration of refugees in the Netherlands. The results from this paper help to find a way to change people's attitude towards refugees positively.

Table of Content

Introduction	4
Experimental design	9
<i>Description of the sample</i>	9
<i>Main experiment</i>	9
Results	13
<i>Descriptive statistics</i>	13
<i>Regressions</i>	16
<i>General findings</i>	19
<i>Effect on donation</i>	20
<i>Effect on emotions</i>	23
Discussion	25
Conclusion	29
Reference list	32
Appendix	35

Introduction

In recent years, European countries have witnessed a surge in refugees, coming from countries in war such as Afghanistan, Syria and Lebanon. As a consequence of the increasing number of refugees coming to Europe, tensions rise among the borders and among the political top leaders in the EU. The EU-Turkey deal, made in 2016, was for the EU politically convenient and at the same time financially and politically desirable for Turkey. But soon after the agreement was made, tensions between the EU and Turkey flared on various issues. Recently, Turkish president Erdogan announced he was 'opening the doors to Europe' because of the 3.7 million refugees that stranded in Turkey, while the EU is not doing its share (BBC, 2020).

The present complicated situation for Europe has a notable impact on national politics. Although political parties and politicians who have addressed their concerns have gained support in the last few years, voters are most often not fully informed and do not know the actual facts (Blinder, 2015). For example, people tend to overestimate the number of immigrants in their country (Citrin & Sides, 2008). The fact that people are misinformed is disturbing because misinformation easily leads to unsubstantiated attitudes towards refugees. Consequently, this can lead to tensions between refugees and the local citizens in a country. Knowing that the number of refugees is only rising (Statistics Explained, 2020), we can expect that tensions also increase. For this reason, it is important to obtain a better understanding of how people form and change their attitudes towards refugees.

Existing literature shows that information plays an important role for individuals to form their attitude towards immigrants in general. Information regarding refugees can be provided in two different types of appeals: rational and emotional appeals. It is important to make a distinction between these two. These terms I use can be compared to the commercial terms for these types of appeals. In a marketing setting, rational based appeals focus on the rational thinking process of the consumer. The benefits and the functional needs of a brand or product have an important role in forming the appeal. On the other hand, emotional based appeals mainly target the emotions of the consumer by focusing on the psychological and social needs of the consumer. The aim is to induce feelings and bring into play an affection mechanism that will eventually motivate consumers to purchase the product (Kotler &

Armstrong, 2008). For this research this means that the rational based information consists of only facts regarding refugees and the emotional based information takes the form of a story about a refugee. Where the rational based information only tries inform the reader by providing some relevant information about refugees, emotional based information tries to elicits specific emotions.

Literature about the effect of rational based information on people's attitudes shows very mixed effects. Blinder (2015) argues that individuals base their attitude towards immigrants on the picture they have in their mind rather than on actual facts. Hopkins, Sides and Citrin (2019) investigate the consequences of providing correct information about the prevalence of minorities, with a focus on immigrants, in the US. They find that receiving accurate information about the prevalence of immigrants does reduce the average estimate of the size of the immigrant population. Nevertheless, they argue that correct information has little impact on attitudes towards immigrants. Grigorieff, Roth and Ubfal (2018) elaborate on this work by providing their participants with a more comprehensive information treatment. They conclude that people change their attitude when they receive rational pro-immigrant information: they donate significantly more money to a charity organization. However, they do not become less worried about immigrants in general.

To encourage people to engage in refugee programmes and to find the most effective way to reduce the lack of information regarding refugees, it is necessary to shed light on firstly how people form their attitude towards refugees and secondly how rational information compared to emotionally loaded content influences this attitude. Consequently, the central question to investigate in this thesis is: how do people process rational based information compared to emotional based information and how does this change their attitude towards refugees?

An often-used method to measure someone's attitude towards immigrants or refugees, is by measuring people's willingness to donate money to a pro-refugee organisation. On average, each household in The Netherlands donated 216 euros in 2018 and this number is increasing every year (Bekkers, Gouwenberg & Schuyt, 2020). But what factors trigger donation behavior? Socio economic and demographic features such as sex, age, the level of education, and income all influence donating behaviour (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). While women tend to donate more often a small amount of money, men donate more money

overall. In addition, in a lot of studies age is stated as a factor that makes people become more generous over time. Furthermore, the level of education and the income of a household have both a direct and positive effect on charity donations (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). Next to these socio economic and demographic features, involvement in religious organizations and extended social networks increase the likelihood of pro-social behaviour and charity donations as well (Wiepking & Maas, 2009). So, the choice to make a donation is not made by only the consideration of the cost and personality features, but it is also strongly influenced by the situation in which charitable behavior is presented. People who join a network in which the standard of charitable giving is high, tend to act according to this standard (Barman, 2007; Lindahl & Conley, 2002). Moreover, donors are likely to receive social and psychological benefits from donating money, for example enhanced self-esteem, feelings of joy or warm glow and increased social status (Ribar & Wilhelm, 2002).

Next to socio economic and demographic features, emotional status also influences donation behavior. Various research proves that a positive mood leads to a greater level of altruism. For example, there is a positive correlation between the level of happiness and volunteering, charity giving and other forms of pro-socially oriented behavior (Anik, Aknin, Norton & Dunn, 2009). However, Huber, Van Boven, and McGraw (2011) state that negative emotions, due to an unpleasant or upsetting experience, can lead to positive behavioural responses as well. For example, people are more likely to donate money to those whose suffering is relatively more upsetting than to those whose suffering is relatively less upsetting. This kind of appeal is often used by charity organisations, although the effect of this type of appeal on public engagement is still questioned for the long term (Hudson, Van Heerde-Hudson, Dasandi & Gaines, 2016). Negative emotions can, however, also trigger negative behavioural responses. By inducing emotions such as guilt and shame, 'shock effect' appeals try to make us realise the failure to acknowledge our historical and personal participation in human suffering (Chouliaraki, 2010). This triggers our emotions and tries to turn it into action. The resistance to this 'shock effect' appeal reflects in two more reactions: the 'bystander' effect and the 'boomerang' effect. The bystander effect leads to a feeling of powerlessness: the situation is hopeless, and people don't want to be confronted with it. The boomerang effect refers to the indignation of people, because of the unpleasant emotional experience

triggered by these appeals (Cohen, 2013). By these two risks, the effect of an appeal for public action can ultimately undermine the appeal instead of stimulating it.

There also seems to be a relation between someone's willingness to donate and how personally people are attracted to an appeal. Hudson et al. (2016) show that when people are faced with a single, identifiable victim, they are more likely to donate than when they are faced with a large number of anonymous victims. Now, this single victim has more power and stimulates the 'modal imagination' of the donor: the skill to recognise in the suffering of others a shared quality of humanity that is absent in the 'shock effect' appeals. The individual victim appeal also gives the donor some sort of power, by showing how a single action may lead to change (Chouliaraki, 2010). Kogut and Ritov (2005) state that when appeals describe victims in detail, people experience greater emotional distress than when a more general description or no description is used. This kind of appeals will elicit emotions such as pity and guilt, which can lead to positive donation behavior.

To investigate the effect of emotional based information on the willingness to donate, I distinguish two different types: encouraging emotional based information and discouraging emotional based information. The encouraging appeals are meant to convince people to help or donate by showing information that elicits positive emotions such as hope and solidarity, but also negative emotions such as pity and guilt. A story that brings refugees in a bad light can be used as discouraging emotional based information. This information will only induce negative emotions such as anger and disgust. Logically this kind of information is barely used by charity organisations and almost no research is done about this type of information. Nevertheless, it might be interesting to study which of these two emotional based appeals has a stronger effect.

In order to answer the research question, a randomised experiment is conducted. People's attitude is manipulated by either encouraging emotional based information regarding refugees, discouraging emotional based information regarding refugees, rational based information regarding refugees or a text that has nothing to do with refugees. After this, the participants are asked to answer questions about their current emotional status and they are asked how much percent of the 10 euros they are able to win by participating in this experiment they are willing to donate to a pro-refugee charity. The mechanism to test is

whether participant's attitude and emotional status change after the treatment and in which way. And in turn, how this will affect their willingness to make a donation. Based on the findings of already existing literature, the hypotheses are formulated as follows:

H1. Participant's willingness to donate is significantly higher for participants who are provided with encouraging emotional based information.

H2. Discouraging emotional based information has a stronger effect on people's willingness to donate than encouraging emotional based information.

H3. Emotional based information induces significantly greater emotional responses than rational based information.

This research elaborates on the work of Grigorieff et al. (2018). I provide different treatments to measure the influence of different types of information on the attitude of the participants. While Grigorieff et al. (2018) focus on only rational based information, I focus on both rational based and emotional based information. In this way, I get a better understanding of what influences people's attitudes the most and what impact different appeals have on public engagement with global crisis and development. Moreover, I focus on a specific group of immigrants, namely refugees, while they focus on immigrants in general.

This research also contributes to the existing work of Hudson et al. (2016) in several respects. In their research, they focus on how different encouraging emotional based information leads to different emotional responses by asking how much money they are willing to donate to a charity organisation and what emotions they feel when they see the emotional loaded content. Next to encouraging emotional loaded content, I also focus on discouraging emotional loaded content and rational based information in order to investigate how people react to different types of emotions. Furthermore, in the research of Hudson et al. (2016) there is no focus on the general knowledge of the participants regarding the topic of the appeal. While they focus on finding the best marketing strategy to trigger donation behavior, I focus on how different types of information, in which there is no request for donations, affects people's willingness to donate.

Additionally, most of the existing literature in this research area focuses on one specific country: most of the time The United States or The United Kingdom. By focussing on only Dutch citizens, I contribute to the already existing literature.

This paper is structured as follows. First of all, I provide a description of the survey sample and I explain how I reached all the participants. Then, I describe in detail how the experiment is structured. The findings of the experiment are described in the results. I firstly provide the descriptive statistics and the baseline study, in order to check whether randomisation worked. After that I show the results. I especially focus on the effect on donation and the effect on emotions. This is followed by a discussion, before offering some concluding remarks in the conclusion.

Experimental design

Description of the sample

I conduct this experiment using a sample of 176 participants. The experiment was run in May 2020. The target group is wide because there are only two requirements: the participant must be 18 years or older and the participant must be a Dutch citizen. Because only Dutch citizen may participate, I decided to provide the survey in Dutch. This makes it easier, especially for the elderly and less educated participants, to understand all the questions and information provided. This ensures a higher quality of the data collected.

The responses were collected through different social platforms. I have used WhatsApp to contact people on a personal level. Some of them also forwarded the survey link into their personal groups, which caused to have a relatively mixed group of participants from different places, with different ages, different levels of education and different employment conditions. This means that the variation within the sample is sufficient. Next to WhatsApp, I used Facebook and LinkedIn in order to reach even more people, especially focusing on adults and professionals.

For each treatment I aspired to collect at least 30 responses. This is the minimum to ensure that there are no demographic differences between the four groups, and thus to make the experiment valid. Eventually, I was able to collect a total of 176 responses, 44 for each group. There is no need to delete any observations as there were no major outliers or inappropriate responses.

Main experiment

In order to answer the research question “How do people process rational based information compared to emotional based information and how does this change their

attitude towards refugees?”, I analyse the data of a survey made using the program Qualtrics. This survey consists of five parts and the whole survey can be found in the Appendix. In short, the experiment is structured as follows. Firstly, six statements regarding refugees are presented, followed by a question how much they already donate to charities annually, and how often they are in contact with refugees. After this, seven statistical based questions are asked. Then, the participant is randomly assigned to one of the three treatment groups or to the control group. After reading the corresponding text, the participant is asked to what extent they feel several emotions. This is followed by the question how much percent of the €10 they are able to win, they are willing to donate to a pro-refugee charity of their own choice. In the end of the survey, some general demographic questions are asked.

Now I will describe the survey in detail. First of all, six statements are presented and participants have to fill in to what extent they agree with the statements. The statements are as follows: (i) I am worried about the current refugee crisis, (ii) the Covid-19 virus makes me even more worried about the current situation of refugees, (iii) I am worried about the high number of asylum seekers in The Netherlands, (iv) I think The Netherlands has to allow more asylum seekers, (v) refugees have a negative impact on the Dutch culture, and (vi) refugees are competitors in the labour market. The outcomes enable me to obtain a reasonable image of the current attitude of the participant towards refugees.

After this, participants have to fill in how much money they annually donate to any kind of charity organisation. There might be a relation between the amount of money participants donate annually and the amount they are willing to donate in this experiment. For example, people who are used to donate money, will have a higher willingness to donate in this experiment than people who are not used to donate money to charity organisations. Or it can go the other way around: because someone is already donating, they don't feel bad not donating in this experiment. The same applies to the question how often participants are in contact with refugees. There might be a relation between this regularity and their attitudes towards them.

In the next part of the survey, seven statistical based questions are asked regarding some basic facts about refugees. The questions are as follows: (i) What percentage of the Dutch population, living in the Netherlands, have a non-Western migration background? (ii) How many asylum applications (first asylum applications and follow-up travellers) were made

in 2019 in the Netherlands? (iii) What percentage of asylum applications were accepted in The Netherlands in 2018? (iv) What percentage of asylum applications were denied in The Netherlands in 2018?; (v) What percentage of Syrian refugees, living in The Netherlands, has graduated from a university or a university of applied sciences? (vi) What is the employment rate among status holders, 30 months after receiving a residence permit in the Netherlands? (vii) What percentage of the status holders in The Netherlands have passed the integration exam within 5 years?

The answers to these questions are important to obtain an overall understanding of the general knowledge regarding refugees of the participants. Information of prior beliefs is not often obtained in related studies. Thus, it can lead to some interesting findings. For example, there might be a relation between people's knowledge and interest regarding this topic. Moreover, a relation between someone's knowledge or interest can be related to the amount of money someone is willing to donate. A time restriction of forty seconds per question was added for these seven questions to avoid the possibility of checking answers on the internet.

Participants are then randomly assigned to one of the three treatment groups or the control group. Participants are asked to carefully read a story of approximately 350 words or to carefully read eight facts regarding refugees. To measure how long it takes participants to read the text, a timer is put on this part of the survey. A potential Ostrich effect can be measured by this provided information. An Ostrich effect occurs when the participant "puts the head in the sand" by avoiding additional information given adverse prior news (Karlsson, Loewenstein & Seppi, 2009). It might be that some of the participants do not want to be aware of the actual facts and stories regarding refugees, because they assume the information is unpleasant. In this case, they will not or barely read the provided information.

The story shown to the control group is about a completely irrelevant topic: the Dutch European Championship of '88. This text is chosen because it does not influence participants attitude towards immigrants, and I expect that their emotional status does not change due to reading this text. Moreover, by providing a text to the control group, I eliminate the possibility that reading a text in general has an effect on the participants.

The encouraging emotional based text is about a Syrian refugee who came to The Netherlands three years ago, when he was 18 years old. If he did not leave the country, he had to serve the national army and that means risking his life. When he arrived in The

Netherlands, he was lonely and worried about his family back in Syria and about his own future. He continues about how he got used to living in an asylum centre and he slowly made friends. Then he tells about his life right now. He successfully studies to become a civil engineer and he volunteers in asylum centres. He organises activities focusing on the children living there. This personal story was published by a Dutch NGO focusing on helping refugees, called VluchtelingenWerk Nederland.

The discouraging emotional based text is about an Afghan refugee who raped an 18 year old girl in the store he used to work in Amsterdam. Some details about the rape are told, but the newspaper article focuses on the fact that the rapist received a reduced prison sentence than usual for these cases. The judge sentenced him to only 20 months in prison because he would lose his residence permit under the normal sentence of 24 months. The facts that his pregnant wife just settled in The Netherlands and that he had never been convicted before, were reasons for the judge to lower his sentence. This led to a great deal of anger and commotion from the side of the victim, her lawyer and outsiders. This story was published in the newspaper Metro Nieuws.

The rational based text consists of eight facts. Such as, half of the refugees in the world is a child; Since 2014, over 10.000 refugees drowned in the Mediterranean Sea; Two third of all refugees in the world come from only 5 countries. The facts are completely objective. All facts are found on the website of UNHCR.

After all the participants have read one of the four described texts, I ask them to what extent they feel the following emotions: luck, hope, happiness, solidarity, anger, guilt, pity, and disgust. This might give interesting insights of how different types of information influence someone's emotional status. Logically, the question that follows is how many percent of 10 euro the participant is willing to donate to a charity organisation, in case they win the 10 euro that will be randomly given to one of the participants after the survey is closed. To make sure that the charity where the money will go to is not the reason that people are not or less willing to donate, participants can choose from a list of four pro-refugees organisations. To be able to reach the person who won the 10 euro, participants have the option to fill in their email-address. I randomly give the price to one of all those who indicated that they do not want to donate the full amount of money and also filled in their email-address, and those who indicated they want to donate the full amount of money. So, those who indicated that they

do not want to donate the full amount of money but did not fill in their email-address, cannot win the price.

In the last part of the survey, participants have to fill in five basic personal questions regarding their gender, age, province of living, education level and employment condition. I use this information to have a general overview of the sample and of course to check whether the randomisation worked. Lastly, I show the answers to the statistical based questions of the second part of the survey. A timer is also set on this page, to check whether participants are interested in increasing their knowledge about this topic or not.

Results

Descriptive statistics

After collecting the data, I analyse it using the program Stata. First of all, I delete the variables that are not relevant for this experiment: first click, last click and the number of clicks are deleted for the statistical based questions and for the four treatments because they are not relevant. From the timing variables, only the variable 'page submit' is left in order to check how much time participants spent answering the statistical based questions and reading the text in the treatment. Then I check whether all participants meet the features required to participate.

After this, I generate the variable Treatment with value 0, 1, 2, or 3. The control group is the reference group with value 0. The comparison groups encouraging emotional based, discouraging emotional based, and rational based treatment have value 1, 2, and 3, respectively. I also generate a dummy variable for gender, where female is the reference group with value 0 and male is the comparison group with value 1.

Because the sample consists of only 176 respondents, I cluster some of the variables. For the place of residence, I separate The Netherlands in two parts: living inside the Randstad or outside the Randstad. The Randstad is a Dutch term for the agglomeration of cities spread over Noord-Holland, Zuid-Holland and Utrecht. According to CBS (2019), 65 percent of the non-Western immigrants in The Netherlands are living in the Randstad, whereas overall, 45 percent of the Dutch population is living in the Randstad. This means that the density of non-Western immigrants is relatively high in these three provinces. For this reason, it might be

interesting to compare these two parts of The Netherlands. The dummy variable I generate has the value 1 if the participant is living in the Randstad. If the participant lives outside the Randstad, he or she belongs to the reference group with value 0. I cluster age in groups where group 0 is the reference group, with age of 18 to 24. Group 1 consists of the ages 25 to 34, group 2 of 35 to 44, group 3 of 45 to 54, group 4 of 55 to 64, group 5 of 65 and older, and group 6 preferred not to say. For the highest completed level of education, the reference group is high school with value 0. I cluster Intermediate Vocational Education and Higher Vocational Education together with value 1. Value 2 is Bachelor degree and value 3 is the cluster of Master degree and PhD. I do the same for the employment condition, with value 0 for student and not working, value 1 for student and working, value 2 for part-time working, value 3 for full-time working, and value 4 for not employed. I also make a dummy variable for the question whether the participant is already donating money to a charity organisation annually or not, with value 1 for donating annually and with value 0 for not donating annually. Regarding the question how often participants are annually in **contact with refugees**, I cluster never and rarely in one group with value 0, a few times a year and monthly with value 1, and weekly and daily with value 2.

Lastly, in order to obtain a better understanding of the general knowledge of the participants regarding refugees, I make dummy variables to check how often the questions are answered correctly and how often they were underestimated and overestimated. In the experiment, 7 statistical based questions were asked regarding refugees. In order to measure the correctness, I provide a range of 5 percentage points to the percentage questions and a range of 20 percent for the absolute number question. I also make the variable "Total of correct answers" which has value 0 if none of the questions is answered correctly, value 1 if only one of the questions is answered correctly, value 2 if two of the questions is answered correctly, value 3 if three of the questions is answered correctly, and value 4 if four of the questions is answered correctly.

The analysis starts with the descriptive statistics to obtain an overall image of the sample. This includes the mean in absolute numbers or in proportions, the standard deviation, and the minimum and maximum value. The means for gender, region of residence, education level, employment condition, whether someone is already donating to charities and how often someone is in contact with a refugee, are presented as proportions. The age is in years, the

total of correct answers of the 7 statistical based questions is in absolute numbers and the time spend reading the text for every treatment is presented in seconds. The characteristics of the whole sample of the 176 participants are described in Table 1.

Table 1.

Descriptive statistics for the entire sample.

Variable	Mean/Proportion	Standard Deviation	Min	Max
Gender – Male	0.318		0	1
Gender – Female	0.682		0	1
Age	29.954	14.876	19	71
Residence – inside Randstad	0.756		0	1
Residence – outside Randstad	0.244		0	1
Highest education level – High school	0.290			
Highest education level – intermediate / higher vocational education	0.233		0	1
Highest education level – University Bachelor	0.278		0	1
Highest education level – University Master and PhD	0.199		0	1
Employment condition – Student without job	0.165		0	1
Employment condition – Student with job	0.489		0	1
Employment condition – Part-time job	0.080		0	1
Employment condition – Full-time job	0.176		0	1
Employment condition – not employed	0.09		0	1
Already donating regularly	0.631		0	1
Rarely or never in contact with a refugee	0.710		0	1
Sometimes in contact with a refugee	0.233		0	1
Often in contact with a refugee	0.057		0	1
Total of correct answers	1.460	1.180	0	4
Time – Control group	68.098	48.009	2.227	220.938
Time – Encouraging emotional Treatment	86.271	151.789	2.763	1029.744
Time – Discouraging emotional Treatment	87.506	42.436	1.353	179.524
Time – Rational Treatment	30.902	16.233	2.521	85.562
Observations	176			

Note. All outcomes are rounded to three decimal places.

In Table 1 can be seen that there is a higher proportion of females compared to males in the sample, namely 68 percent is female. The average age in the sample is 30 years old. The

highest level of education someone is graduated from is pretty spread over all categories. Moreover, 76 percent lives in the Randstad. In general, 63 percent of the participants is donating any amount of money to a charity annually. Furthermore, more than two third of the sample is never or rarely in contact with refugees. Approximately one quarter is sometimes in contact with refugees and only 5 percent of the participants is often in contact with refugees. Approximately only 1.46 of the 7 statistical based questions are answered correctly. The average time participants took to read the text in treatment 3, about 30 seconds, can be explained by the fact that this treatment consists of only 8 sentences instead of approximately 350 words for the other treatments and the control group. Also, the average time of the control group is about 20 seconds lower than for encouraging and discouraging emotional based information group. This might be due to the fact that people already know something about the subject given to the control group.

Regressions

Even though Qualtrics enabled me to distribute treatments randomly between participants, I am aware of the possibility that there may still be randomly generated imbalances between the four groups. For this reason, a baseline study is done and can be found in the Appendix, Table A1. Several regressions are run on the same dummy variables (X) as for the descriptive statistics. The proportion or mean value and the p-value per variable per treatment are presented. The regression run is as follows.

Equation 1.

$$X_i = \text{Mean } X + \sum_{j=1}^3 \gamma_j (\text{Treatment Group } ij) + \varepsilon_i$$

Where the outcome variable X signifies the mean or proportion for the variable X. X signifies the variables gender, age, region of residence, education level, employment condition, whether someone is already donating to charities, how often someone is in contact with a refugee and how many of the statistical based questions are answered correctly. The independent variable treatment group is a dummy variable, for which holds that the value is 1 if participant i belongs to the corresponding cluster. ε_i is the error term.

The baseline study shows that randomisation does not work perfectly. There are some deviations in the characteristics of the participants between different treatment groups. The variable regarding how often the participant is in contact with refugees, the variable regarding the employment condition and the variable regarding the total number of correctly answered statistical based questions are significantly different between the four groups. Therefore, I control for these three variables in the following regressions.

To measure a change in attitude towards immigrants, I run several regressions. The main regression is the effect of the four different treatments on the percentage of money participants are willing to donate. This is an important regression, because it answers the first hypothesis in which I state that participant's willingness to donate is significantly higher for participants who are provided with encouraging emotional based information. Because the willingness to donate is probably not only affected by the treatment, I will also include other variables that may affect the willingness to donate. Next to the three variables I control for, I include the gender, the age, the place of residence, the education level and whether the participant is already donation to charity organisations annually. Firstly, I run this regression for the whole sample. However, to ensure that participants really read the text, I run another regression only selecting the observations where the time taken to read the provided text was a realistic number. The regression looks as follows.

Equation 2.

Willingness to donate i

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \alpha + \beta (\text{Male } i) + \delta (\text{Residence } i) + \sum_{q=1}^6 c_q (\text{Age } iq) \\
&+ \sum_{f=1}^3 \theta_f (\text{Education Level } if) + \sum_{k=1}^4 \tau_k (\text{Employment Condition } ik) \\
&+ \mu (\text{Already Donating } i) + \sum_{\lambda=1}^2 \rho_\lambda (\text{Contact } i\lambda) \\
&+ \sum_{x=1}^4 \sigma_x (\text{Correctly Answered Questions } ix) + \sum_{j=1}^3 \gamma_j (\text{Treatment Group } ij) \\
&+ \varepsilon_i
\end{aligned}$$

Where the outcome variable Willingness to donate signifies the percentage of money people are willing to donate in case they win the 10 euros from the lottery. The independent variables are all dummy variables, for which holds that the value is 1 if participant i belongs to the corresponding cluster. ε_i is the error term.

Next to that, I investigate what factors trigger eight different emotions. The most important factor to investigate is the treatment variable. However, again it might be interesting to investigate what other factors affect the emotions of participants. The regression run is as follows.

Equation 3.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Emotion } X_i = & \alpha + \beta (\text{Male } i) + \delta (\text{Residence } i) + \sum_{q=1}^6 c_q (\text{Age } iq) \\
 & + \sum_{f=1}^3 \theta_f (\text{Education Level } if) + \sum_{k=1}^4 \tau_k (\text{Employment Condition } ik) \\
 & + \mu (\text{Already Donating } i) + \sum_{\lambda=1}^2 \rho_\lambda (\text{Contact } i\lambda) \\
 & + \sum_{x=1}^4 \sigma_x (\text{Correctly Answered Questions } ix) + \sum_{j=1}^3 \gamma_j (\text{Treatment Group } ij) \\
 & + \varepsilon_i
 \end{aligned}$$

Where the outcome variable Emotion X signifies to what extent participants feel the emotion X. X signifies the emotions luck, hope, happiness, solidarity, anger, guilt, pity and disgust. The independent variables are all dummy variables, for which holds that the value is 1 if participant i belongs to the corresponding cluster. ε_i is the error term.

Next to these main regressions I run in order to answer the research question, I also want to obtain an overall understanding of the general attitude participants had before undergoing the treatment. To do this, I summarise the result of the six statements presented in the beginning of the experiment. In order to obtain a better understanding about how much people know about refugees, I also analyse the seven statistical based questions.

General findings

In order to obtain a better understanding of the general attitude of Dutch citizen towards immigrants, I start the experiment with six statements. Participants had to choose one of the following options for every single statement: strongly disagree, slightly disagree, neutral, slightly agree, strongly agree. The results can be found in the Appendix, Table A2 and Table A3. From this, I can conclude the following. Overall, people are slightly concerned about the current refugee crisis in the EU and the current Covid-19 virus makes people only a little bit more concerned. The statement 'I am concerned of the high amount of asylum seekers in The Netherlands' is on average considered as 'neutral'. The same answer is considered for the statement 'The Netherlands has to accept more refugees.' People slightly disagree with the statement 'refugees living in The Netherlands have a negative impact on the Dutch culture.' Moreover, people are not concerned that refugees compete with them on the labour market. The standard deviations are all around 1.00. Only the statement regarding the covid-19 virus has a standard deviation that is a bit higher, namely 1.422. This means that in general, the differences of opinion between the participants are small. There are no significant differences between the three treatment groups and the control group.

The results regarding participant's general knowledge about refugees can be found in the Appendix, Table A4. I find that more than half of the participants overestimate the number of immigrants in their country. However, also more than half of the participants tend to underestimate the number of asylum requests done in The Netherlands in 2019. Almost half of the participants overestimate the number of requests that is accepted, and thus, more than half of the participants underestimate the number of requests that is denied. Moreover, the percentage of refugees that is graduated from a university or a university of applied sciences is overestimated and the percentage of refugees living for over 30 months in The Netherlands, is very much overestimated. Lastly, the number of refugees that passed the Dutch integration exam within five years is also overestimated by more than half of the participants.

Another interesting finding is that, on average, only 20 percent of the questions were answered correctly. The maximum number of correctly answered question per observation is equal to four. No significant relation is found between the number of correct answers and the willingness to donate.

Effect on donation

An important question in the experiment is how much the participant is willing to donate to a pro-immigrant charity of their choice. One of the first questions in the survey is whether the participant is already donating money to charities annually or not and if yes, what amount. I find that 63 percent of the sample group is already donating money to at least one charity every year. However, in this experiment, 79 percent is willing to donate at least 1 percent of the 10 euro's they might win. The average amount they are willing to donate is 6.53 euros.

In order to confirm the first hypothesis, I measure the effect of different treatments on the question how much percent of the 10 euros the participant might win, they are willing to donate. Because there might be other factors that influence the willingness to donate, I include these factors in the regression as well. The regression is shown in Equation 2.

Table 2.

Linear regression for the relationship between several variables and the willingness to donate.

Variable	Willingness to donate (whole sample)	Willingness to donate (adapted sample)
Gender – Male	1.76 (7.36)	7.33 (9.61)
Place of residence - Randstad	17.12** (8.01)	4.63 (10.17)
Age – 25-34 years old	-11.76 (9.11)	-8.57 (11.23)
Age – 35-44 years old	24.94 (32.13)	34.20 (33.34)
Age – 45-54 years old	21.89 (19.58)	26.15 (24.98)
Age – 55-64 years old	19.08 (18.03)	30.78 (21.75)
Age – 65 and above years old	10.09 (18.08)	32.82 (31.88)
Age – Prefer not to say	20.58 (32.00)	51.52 (54.18)
Education level – Intermediate / higher vocational education	18.71* (11.03)	26.38** (13.20)
Education level – University Bachelor	20.54** (8.54)	31.65*** (10.91)
Education level – University Master, PhD, Other	20.49* (11.75)	36.11** (14.64)
Employment condition - Student with job	13.71 (9.16)	21.83* (11.99)

Variable	Willingness to donate (whole sample)	Willingness to donate (adapted sample)
Employment condition – Part-time Job	17.08 (18.23)	20.99 (21.23)
Employment condition – Full-time Job	19.54 (13.38)	19.42 (17.13)
Employment condition – Not working, other	29.66 (18.49)	12.67 (32.41)
Already donating annually	-6.09 (7.22)	-17.58* (9.36)
Sometimes in contact with refugees	-8.03 (8.00)	-7.56 (9.97)
Often in contact with refugees	16.33 (14.84)	14.91 (21.39)
Total of correct answers is equal to 1	-9.47 (8.64)	0.07 (10.36)
Total of correct answers is equal to 2	3.08 (9.78)	15.75 (11.80)
Total of correct answers is equal to 3	-3.42 (10.16)	3.07 (12.18)
Total of correct answers is equal to 4	-11.37 (16.40)	14.92 (23.21)
Encouraging emotional Treatment	11.84 (9.34)	22.54* (12.01)
Discouraging emotional Treatment	3.63 (9.13)	7.95 (11.13)
Rational Treatment	5.07 (9.32)	8.84 (11.36)
Constant	25.89* (13.14)	14.37 (17.41)
Observations	176	120
R-squared	0.23	0.30

Note. Significance levels: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$; Standard errors are in parentheses; All outcomes are rounded to two decimal places; The outcome variable ‘Willingness to donate (whole sample)’ signifies the percentage of money people are willing to donate in case they win the 10 euros from the lottery; The outcome variable ‘Willingness to donate (adapted sample)’ signifies the same, only the sample is adapted.

The outcome of the first regression in Table 2, including the whole sample, shows that participants in the encouraging emotional based treatment donate approximately 11.84 percentage points more money than the participants in the control group. For the discouraging group this is 3.63 percentage points and for the rational based information group this is 5.07 percentage points. However, none of these outcomes are significant and thus cannot be interpreted.

Why the original sample does not show any significant effect of the treatment on donation behavior, can be explained by the fact that not every participant reads the text

provided in the treatment properly. To be sure that participants really read the text, I now only select the observations where the time taken to read the provided text is a realistic number. For the control group, the encouraging and discouraging emotional based texts, I therefore delete all the observations who took less than 50 seconds to read the text. For the rational based texts, I draw the line at 25 seconds, because this text consists of only 8 sentences. I believe these numbers of seconds are a realistic minimum to read the text properly. For this adapted sample of 120 observations, I run the same regression again and the outcomes can be found in the column "Willingness to donate (adapted sample)" in Table 2. Now, the encouraging and discouraging emotional based group and the rational based group increase the donation compared to the control group by 22.54, 7.95 and 8.84 percentage points respectively. What is interesting, is that the outcome for the encouraging emotional based treatment is significant. This means that when someone reads encouraging emotional based appeals, they are willing to donate 22.54 percentage points more money to a pro-refugee charity than when they are not provided with this type of appeal. Thus, I can conclude that encouraging emotional based information does have a positive effect on the amount of money someone is willing to donate. By this result, the first hypothesis is approved.

I reject the second hypothesis, stating that discouraging emotional based information has a stronger effect on people's willingness to donate than the encouraging emotional based information. First of all, I expect to find a negative effect of the participants provided with discouraging emotional based information on the willingness to donate. In other words, I expect that people who read the discouraging emotional based text, are less likely to donate than the average. In fact, as shown in Table 2, the discouraging emotional based information group is willing to donate 7.95 percentage points more compared to the control group. Secondly, this effect of 7.95 percentage points is not as strong as the effect of treatment group 1, namely 22.54 percentage points. However, this result cannot be interpreted as it is not significant. For this reason, I have to reject the second hypothesis.

Next to the effect of different sorts of information, I also want to know whether there are other factors effecting the willingness to donate money to a pro-refugee charity. Based on Equation 2 and shown in Table 2, I find several significant results. I believe it is better to look at the adapted sample only, because the reliability that the treatment is read successfully is higher for the adapted sample. For this reason, I only focus on the adapted sample from

now on. I find that all the education levels influence the donation behavior significantly. Moreover, students with a job do now significantly donate 21.83 percentage points more and people who already donate money annually donate significantly 17.58 percentage points less. In order to check whether there arises an Ostrich effect, I look at the 56 participants who spent less seconds than the time that is considered as sufficient to properly read the text. I find no significant differences for the participants who belong to this group.

Effect on emotions

The results in Table 3 and 4 show the effect of the treatments on the extent participants feel certain emotions on a scale of 0-10, as described in Equation 3. I identify four positive emotions: luck, hope, happiness, and solidarity, shown in Table 3. I also identify four negative emotions: anger, guilt, pity, and disgust, shown in Table 4.

The main point to investigate is the effect of the treatments on different emotions. Again, however, there might be other factors that affect the emotional status. Therefore, I include several variables in order to obtain a better overall understanding of what factors influence the emotions. An overview of all findings can be found in the Appendix, Table A5 and Table A6. The main findings are presented below in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3.

Linear regression for the relationship between treatment and positive emotions.

Variable	Luck	Hope	Happiness	Solidarity
Encouraging emotional Treatment	0.85 (0.60)	1.14** (0.52)	0.71 (0.61)	1.26** (0.58)
Discouraging emotional Treatment	-3.06*** (0.56)	-2.45*** (0.49)	-3.30*** (0.56)	-2.62*** (0.54)
Rational Treatment	-0.10 (0.57)	-0.95* (0.50)	-0.89 (0.57)	0.12 (0.55)
Constant	6.75*** (0.87)	6.62*** (0.76)	7.26*** (0.88)	6.19*** (0.85)
Observations	120	120	120	120
R-squared	0.53	0.54	0.53	0.54

Note. Significance levels: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$; Standard errors are in parentheses; All outcomes are rounded to two decimal places; The outcomes are on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 signifies “I don’t feel this emotion at all” and 10 signifies “I completely feel this emotion.”

Table 4.

Linear regression for the relationship between treatment and negative emotions.

Variable	Anger	Guilt	Pity	Disgust
Encouraging emotional Treatment	0.98 (0.69)	1.56** (0.66)	2.54*** (0.68)	-0.57 (0.65)
Discouraging emotional Treatment	3.77*** (0.64)	2.22*** (0.61)	3.70*** (0.63)	4.39*** (0.60)
Rational Treatment	2.70*** (0.66)	2.31*** (0.63)	4.73*** (0.65)	1.41** (0.62)
Constant	2.44** (1.01)	2.17** (0.96)	3.15*** (0.99)	2.40** (0.94)
Observations	120	120	120	120
R-squared	0.42	0.37	0.47	0.59

Note. Significance levels: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$; Standard errors are in parentheses; All outcomes are rounded to two decimal places; The outcomes are on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 signifies “I don’t feel this emotion at all” and 10 signifies “I completely feel this emotion.”

Regarding positive emotions, I find that encouraging emotional based information significantly increases hope and solidarity. Discouraging emotional based information significantly decreases all the positive emotions. Rational based information only significantly decreases hope. Moreover, the effects of the significant outcomes are greater for the emotional based groups than for the rational based group. For example, the effect of the treatment on to what extent the participants feel hopeful is 1.14 and 2.45 for the encouraging and discouraging emotional based information groups respectively, compared to 0.95 for the rational based information group. Thus, for positive emotions I can conclude that emotional based information induces significantly greater emotional responses than rational based information. This corroborates the third hypothesis.

Regarding negative emotions, the results are different. Encouraging emotional based information significantly increases guilt and pity. Discouraging emotional based information

significantly increases all the negative emotions. Rational based information also significantly increases all the negative emotions. When looking at the significant effects in the rational based treatment, I find that for pity and guilt the effects are greater than for both emotional based groups. For example, the effect of the treatment on to what extent the participants feel guilty is approximately 2.31 for the rational based group, compared to 1.56 and 2.22 for encouraging and discouraging emotional based group respectively. This means that, regarding the negative emotions, the third hypothesis is rejected. The rational based information induces significantly greater emotions than emotional based information for some of the negative emotions.

Discussion

In order to answer the research question “How do people process rational based information compared to emotional based information and how does this change their attitude towards refugees?” I investigate the effect of different types of information on several emotions and the willingness to donate to a pro-refugee charity.

In order to measure a change in attitude, I firstly need information about people’s attitude towards refugees before they undergo the treatment. I do this by asking to what extent they agree to certain statements regarding refugees and by asking some statistical based questions. I find that people in The Netherlands are slightly concerned about the current refugee crisis. However, people do not have a strong opinion about the number of refugees in The Netherlands and whether The Netherlands has to accept more refugees or not. Refugees are not considered to have a negative impact on the Dutch culture, nor are they considered as competition on the labour market. The standard are deviations are all about 1.00, only the statements regarding the Covid-19 virus is a bit higher. This means that there are no major disagreements between the participants. Thus, I can conclude that the participants have no strong opinion or concern about refugees, let alone they are necessarily against refugees in The Netherlands.

Regarding the general knowledge about refugees, I find that only 20 percent of the questions are answered correctly. This result corroborates with what Blinder (2015) states: people are misinformed and do not know the actual facts. For example, the statement that people tend to overestimate the number of immigrants in their country (Citrin & Sides, 2008),

also applies to my research. This shows that the results regarding the general knowledge of the participants in this experiment are in line with the results from already existing literature.

I hypothesise that participant's willingness to donate is significantly higher for participants who are provided with encouraging emotional based information. To support this claim, I find that participants who are provided with this type of information donate on average 22.54 percentage points more money than people not provided with this information. This result is statistically significant, and thus the first hypothesis is approved. This is an answer to the second part of the research question: encouraging emotional based information changes people's attitude in a way that they become more willing to donate money to a pro-refugee charity. This is a positive change. However, I only find this result after eliminating all the observations which took less than 50 seconds for the control, encouraging and discouraging emotional based groups to read the text, and 25 seconds for the rational based group. This cause that only 120 of the 176 observations are included in the regression leading to this result. This makes sense, since the eliminated observations did not spend a realistic number of seconds to read the text properly, so they might affect the results in a wrong way.

The second hypothesis, stating that discouraging emotional based information has a stronger effect on people's willingness to donate than the encouraging emotional based information, is rejected. I expect that discouraging emotional based information would lead to a negative effect on donation and that the effect would be greater than the effect of encouraging emotional information. On top of the fact that both expectations are not met, the discouraging treatment effect on the willingness to donate is not significant, and thus cannot be interpreted. Also, I do not find any significant results of the rational based treatment on the willingness to donate.

Encouraging emotional based information changes someone's attitude towards refugees positively. This can be explained by how people process the information. This is the first part of the research question. I find that encouraging emotional based information leads to a higher extend of the positive emotions hope and solidarity and to a higher extend of the negative emotions guilt and pity. This means that someone's attitude changes positively when people have the access to information that induces these four emotions. This main result is in line with Hudson et al., (2016) and Huber et al., (2011): inducing negative emotions such as

guilt and pity do have a positive effect on donation behavior. Moreover, this result also partly corresponds to the findings of Chouliaraki (2010) and Kogut and Ritov (2005). They state that when people are provided with accurate information or when appeals describe an individual victim in detail, it is assumable that they are more willing to donate to pro-refugee organisations than when no relevant information is provided. Describing an individual victim in detail is exactly what I have done in the encouraging emotional based treatment. However, this is also done in the discouraging emotional based treatment, and there I find no significant result on the donation behavior. Moreover, providing people with accurate information, as done in the rational treatment, similarly leads to no significant differences on donation behavior in this research. Grigorieff et al., (2018), however, also find that people who receive rational based information about immigrants changes their attitude accordingly. I cannot draw the same conclusion. This might be due to the fact that Grigorieff et al., (2018) have a sample size almost seven times greater than the sample size of this research. Also, they have three different experiments, of which one is a large-scale cross-country experiment. Because of this, the internal as well as the external validity is high. In this research, the external validity is low. Another explanation might be that the participants in the experiment of Grigorieff et al., (2018), who are in the rational based information treatment, received the answers to statistical based questions which are asked just before. This is in contrast to what I do: I provide eight unrelated facts about refugees to the rational based group. Consequently, participants in the experiment of Grigorieff et al., (2018) feel more engaged in reading the corresponding answers, since they actively have to think about it.

One more reason why I do not find significant differences in donation behavior for the rational based and for the discouraging emotional based treatment, can be explained by different emotions that arise when reading the text. Regarding the discouraging emotional based information, all results are significant. The participants report lower for all positive emotions and higher for all negative emotions. Regarding the rational based information group, participants report higher for all negative emotions as well, and they only report lower for the positive emotion hope. These findings for both types of information induce the bystander effect: people have the feeling that the situation is hopeless and people don't want to be confronted with it. This makes them feel bad and therefore they only feel negative emotions coming up (Cohen, 2013). The effect of these types of appeals can eventually discourage people to take action. This seems to be a logical response for the rational based

treatment group, because the information they receive was very direct and probably shocking. However, for the discouraging group the bystander effect seems less logical.

The results regarding the effect of the treatments on positive emotions corroborate the third hypothesis, stating that emotional based information induces significantly greater emotional responses than rational based information. However, regarding the effect of the treatments on negative emotions, the hypothesis is rejected. For positive emotions, I find more and also stronger effects for both the emotional based treatments than for the rational based treatment. In contrast, for negative emotions I find more and sometimes stronger significant results in the rational treatment than in the encouraging emotional treatment.

An explanation for these contradictory results might be because a personal text, as used for the encouraging emotional group, can be interpreted in different ways. Some people look at it optimistically and feel positive emotions when they read that a refugee is happy and successful in The Netherlands right now. However, some other people look at it more pessimistically, and are more focused on the sad reason that the boy had to flee and felt lonely in the Netherlands for a long time. This leads to different emotions. However, regarding the rational based information, people interpret the information more or less in the same way, because they receive the information in a really direct way. Another reason why rational based information induces more emotions than encouraging emotional based information, is that some emotions are easier to manipulate. If I assume that it is easier to manipulate someone's emotions in a negative way than in a positive way, then the failure to prove the hypothesis can be explained.

Besides the effect of the treatment on donation behavior, I find that the education level influences the donation behavior positively and that students with a job do significantly donate 21.83 percentage points more. These results can be explained by the fact that people with an intermediate or higher vocational education degree, a bachelor's degree or a master's degree have finished their studies and thus, probably have a well-paid job. Also, students with a job are more likely to afford to donate. This might lead to a higher willingness to donate. Moreover, people who already donate money annually, donate significantly 17.58 percentage points less in this experiment. This may be because people who donate annually already, will not feel guilty if they do not donate right now.

Based on these findings, I can recommend pro-refugee organisations to use a marketing strategy in which the provided appeal is encouraging, emotional based. I would suggest that the appeal should consist of a single person who tells a personal, successful story. This type of appeal induces several positive and negative emotions, which lead to positive donation behavior. However, in order to obtain the expected results, the organisation must have a target group that corresponds to the sample I have used: relatively young, studying people living in the Randstad. Furthermore, the organisation must be careful to not induce too much negative emotions, as the bystander effect might arise.

Conclusion

Knowing that the number of refugees coming to the EU is only rising (Statistics Explained, 2020), the refugee crisis is only becoming a bigger problem. This situation has a notable impact on the national politics. Although political parties and politicians who have addressed their concerns have gained support in the last few years, voters are often not fully informed and do not know the actual facts (Blinder, 2015). A lot of research is done in order to understand how people's attitude towards refugees is formed and how it can be influenced. However, comparing emotional based information and rational based information, and investigating both types of information on both the emotional status and donation behavior, is never done before in The Netherlands. This is a relevant subject to study, because it is important to know what factors can positively change the attitude of Dutch people in order to improve the current situation of refugees in The Netherlands. This can be done by charity organisations for example. When people are encouraged to engage in refugee programmes and when they are more willing to donate to pro-refugee organisations, charities can achieve more in the field of integration and welfare of refugees. Besides, in order to reduce tensions in the EU, the problem of a lack of information or incorrect information regarding refugees must be solved.

The major goal of this experiment is to measure a change in attitude towards refugees. In order to do this, I conduct an online randomised control trial. The sample consist of 176 observations, what is sufficient for this investigation. Based on existing literature, I formulate three hypotheses. As formulated in the first hypothesis, I find that the encouraging emotional

based information affects someone's attitude towards refugees positively. People who are provided with this type of information donate significantly more money than people not provided with information. The second hypothesis is rejected by these findings: discouraging emotional based information does not have a significant stronger effect on people's willingness to donate than the encouraging emotional based information. Furthermore, when looking at the effect on emotions, I can conclude two different things. Regarding positive emotions, emotional based information induces significantly greater emotional responses than rational based information. This corroborates the third hypothesis. However, regarding negative emotions, rational based information induces significantly greater emotions than emotional based information for some of the negative emotions. Thus, regarding negative emotions, the third hypothesis is rejected.

Although this research gives some interesting insights, there are some limitations. Despite that the experimental survey design provides high internal validity, there are shortcomings in terms of the external validity. The descriptive statistics shows that the participants are not fully representative for the whole country. The average age of the participants is low, approximately 30 years old. Moreover, in this experiment, about three quarters of the participants is living in the Randstad. This is not representative for the whole population, in which only about 45 percent lives in the Randstad.

Moreover, the sample size can be questioned. Although I was able to receive 14 respondents more for each group than aimed, the sample size is still not considered as sufficient. I only find one significant result for the main regression, the effect of the treatment groups on the willingness to donate. I suppose that, when doing the same experiment using a larger sample size, more significant results will be found.

Last of all, the donation behavior can be criticised. What might influence the participants, is the fact that they only have a small chance to win the 10 euros from the lottery. Moreover, they will only know whether they win or not, after they have to decide how much they are willing to donate. Because of this, people will not have the feeling that they donate part of "their" money to a pro-refugee charity. I expect that the willingness to donate will be lower than in this experiment, when people really have to donate the money out of their own pocket. The fact that about 63 percent of the participants donates some money annually, compared to 79 percent in this experiment, shows that people are acting more generous in this experiment than they really are. Moreover, 10 euros is for most people in The Netherlands

not that much money. If the lottery price was higher, about 100 euros, people would act different. Thus, in order to shed light about attitudes towards immigrants, the participants should all receive a small amount of money when participating or the lottery price has to be higher.

Further research needs to be done to obtain a better understanding of people's attitude towards refugees. The interaction effect between different types of information and the different positive and negative emotions can be tested by a mediation analysis. Although a lot of research is done in order to gain better insight of the effect of eliciting different emotions on motivation and donation behavior, the effects are still not completely clear. For example, the effect of anger is still not fully identified. Moreover, it should be investigated whether the sources providing the relevant information affect how people adapt their behavior regarding refugees. For example, does someone listen more carefully to a politician, the media or maybe to refugees themselves? These questions must be answered in order to counteract wrong attitudes towards refugees due to misinformation.

Reference list

Anik, L., Aknin, L. B., Norton, M. I., & Dunn, E. W. (2009). Feeling good about giving: The benefits (and costs) of self-interested charitable behavior. *Harvard Business School Marketing Unit Working Paper*, (10-012).

Barman, E. (2007). An institutional approach to donor control: From dyadic ties to a field-level analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(5), 1416-1457.

BBC. (07-03-2020). Greece migrant crisis: Refugee centre ablaze as tensions rise. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-51781394>

Bekkers, R., Schuyt, T. N. M., & Gouwenberg, B. M. (2020). Geven in Nederland 2020. *Stichting Lenthe*.

Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, 40(5), 924-973.

Blinder, S. (2015). Imagined immigration: The impact of different meanings of 'immigrants' in public opinion and policy debates in Britain. *Political Studies*, 63(1), 80-100.

CBS. (09-08-2019). Bevolking; leeftijd, migratieachtergrond, geslacht en regio, 1 januari. Retrieved from: <https://opendata.cbs.nl/#/CBS/nl/dataset/37713/table?dl=3C89C>

Chouliaraki, L. (2010). Post-humanitarianism: Humanitarian communication beyond a politics of pity. *International journal of cultural studies*, 13(2), 107-126.

Citrin, J. and Sides, J. (2008). Immigration and the Imagined Community in Europe and the United States. *Political Studies*, 56(1):33–56.

Cohen, Stanley. 2013. *States of denial: Knowing about atrocities and suffering*.

Grigorieff, A., Roth, C., & Ubfal, D. (2018). Does information change attitudes towards immigrants? Representative evidence from survey experiments. *Representative Evidence from Survey Experiments (March 10, 2018)*.

Hopkins, D. J., Sides, J., & Citrin, J. (2019). The muted consequences of correct information about immigration. *The Journal of Politics, 81(1)*, 315-320.

Huber, M., Van Boven, L., & McGraw, A. P. (2011). External and Internal Influences on Emotion Based Donation Decisions. *The science of giving: Experimental approaches to the study of charity*.

Hudson, D., Van Heerde-Hudson, J., Dasandi, N., & Gaines, N. S. (2016). Emotional pathways to engagement with global poverty: An experimental analysis. *Princeton: Princeton University*.

Karlsson, N., Loewenstein, G., & Seppi, D. (2009). The ostrich effect: Selective attention to information. *Journal of Risk and uncertainty, 38(2)*, 95-115.

Kirchler, M., Huber, J., Stefan, M., & Sutter, M. (2016). Market design and moral behavior. *Management Science, 62(9)*, 2615-2625.

Kogut, T., & Ritov, I. (2005). The “identified victim” effect: An identified group, or just a single individual? *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 18(3)*, 157-167.

Kotler, P. and Armstrong, G. 2008. *Principles of marketing* , 12th ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lindahl, W. E., & Conley, A. T. (2002). Literaturschoe review: Philanthropic fundraising. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 13(1)*, 91-91.

Ribar, D. C., & Wilhelm, M. O. (2002). Altruistic and joy-of-giving motivations in charitable behavior. *Journal of political Economy, 110(2)*, 425-457.

Statistics Explained. (2020, March 16). Asylum statistics. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum_statistics#Number_of_asylum_applicants:_increase_in_2019

Wiepking, P., & Maas, I. (2009). Resources that make you generous: Effects of social and human resources on charitable giving. *Social Forces*, 87(4), 1973-1995.

Zafar, B. (2008). An Experimental Investigation of Why Individuals Conform. SSRN Electronic Journal. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1346428

Appendix

Table A1.
Baseline study.

Variable	Encouraging emotional treatment	p-value	Discouraging emotional treatment	p-value	Rational based treatment	p-value	Control group
Gender – male	0.227	0.174	0.341	0.820	0.341	0.820	0.364
Gender – female	0.773	0.174	0.659	0.820	0.659	0.820	0.636
Age	30.159	0.706	29.905	0.652	28.386	0.352	31.364
Residence – Inside Randstad	0.795	0.326	0.750	0.623	0.773	0.462	0.705
Residence – Outside Randstad	0.205	0.326	0.250	0.623	0.227	0.462	0.295
Education level – High school	0.250	0.641	0.250	0.641	0.364	0.485	0.295
Education level – intermediate / higher vocational education	0.273	0.617	0.273	0.617	0.159	0.453	0.227
Education level – University Bachelor	0.273	0.814	0.273	0.814	0.273	0.814	0.295
Education level – University Master, PhD and other	0.205	0.792	0.205	0.792	0.205	0.792	0.182
Employment condition – Student without job	0.114	0.044**	0.182	0.249	0.091	0.022**	0.273
Employment condition – Student with job	0.523	0.086	0.455	0.282	0.636	0.006***	0.341
Employment condition – Part-time job	0.068	0.435	0.091	0.696	0.045	0.242	0.114
Employment condition – Full-time job	0.205	0.782	0.136	0.580	0.182	1.000	0.182
Employment condition – Not employed, other	0.091	1.000	0.137	0.462	0.046	0.462	0.091
Donating money regularly	0.591	0.662	0.682	0.662	0.612	0.827	0.636
Rarely or never in contact with a refugee	0.523	0.032**	0.750	0.810	0.841	0.231	0.727
Sometimes in contact with a refugee	0.341	0.445	0.227	0.610	0.091	0.043**	0.273
Often in contact with a refugee	0.136	0.006***	0.0227	0.641	0.068	0.163	0.000
Total of correct answers is equal to 0	0.205	0.089*	0.250	0.224	0.205	0.089*	0.364
Total of correct answers is equal to 1	0.250	0.818	0.318	0.645	0.364	0.357	0.273
Total of correct answers is equal to 2	0.227	0.608	0.273	0.305	0.182	1.000	0.182
Total of correct answers is equal to 3	0.227	0.583	0.112	0.411	0.205	0.784	0.182
Total of correct answers is equal to 4	0.091	0.042**	0.045	0.307	0.045	0.307	0.000
Observations	44		44		44		44

Note. Significance levels: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$; Standard errors are in parentheses; All outcomes are rounded to three decimal places.

Table A2.

Linear regression between the relationship between the treatment and to what extent participants agree to statements regarding refugees.

Statement	Mean encouraging emotional treatment	p-value	Mean discouraging emotional treatment	p-value	Mean rational treatment	p-value	Mean control group
I am worried about the current refugee crisis	3.773	0.928	3.432	0.653	3.273	0.282	3.545
The Covid-19 virus makes me even more worried about the current situation of refugees	3.409	0.333	3.045	0.823	3.091	0.941	3.114
I am worried about the high number of asylum seekers in The Netherlands	2.727	0.929	2.955	0.422	3.000	0.327	2.750
I think The Netherlands has to allow more asylum seekers	3.205	0.647	3.114	0.927	3.069	0.927	3.091
Refugees have a negative impact on the Dutch culture	2.000	0.189	2.341	0.840	2.500	0.363	2.295
Refugees are competitors in the labour market	1.614	1.000	1.682	0.705	1.773	0.377	1.614
Observations	44		44		44		44

Note. Significance levels: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$; Standard errors are in parentheses; All outcomes are rounded to three decimal places; The outcomes are on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 signifies strongly disagree and 5 signifies strongly agree.

Table A3.

To what extent participants agree to statement regarding refugees.

Statement	Mean	Standard deviation	min	max
I am worried about the current refugee crisis	3.455	1.180	1	5
The Covid-19 virus makes me even more worried about the current situation of refugees	3.165	1.422	1	5
I am worried about the high number of asylum seekers in The Netherlands	2.858	1.189	1	5
I think The Netherlands has to allow more asylum seekers	3.119	1.153	1	5
Refugees have a negative impact on the Dutch culture	2.284	1.058	1	5
Refugees are competitors in the labour market	1.670	0.838	1	5
Observations	176			

Note. All outcomes are rounded to three decimal places; The outcomes are on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 signifies strongly disagree and 5 signifies strongly agree.

Table A4.

Summary of the answers to the statistical based questions.

Question	The answer is	Proportion	min	max
What percentage of the Dutch population, living in the Netherlands, have a non-Western migration background?	Correct	0.318	0	1
	Underestimated	0.102	0	1
	Overestimated	0.580	0	1
How many asylum applications (first asylum applications and follow-up travellers) were made in 2019 in the Netherlands?	Correct	0.102	0	1
	Underestimated	0.586	0	1
	Overestimated	0.313	0	1
What percentage of asylum applications were accepted in The Netherlands in 2018?	Correct	0.278	0	1
	Underestimated	0.284	0	1
	Overestimated	0.438	0	1
What percentage of asylum applications were denied in The Netherlands in 2018?	Correct	0.290	0	1
	Underestimated	0.506	0	1
	Overestimated	0.205	0	1
What percentage of Syrian refugees, living in The Netherlands, has graduated from a university or a university of applied sciences?	Correct	0.159	0	1
	Underestimated	0.233	0	1
	Overestimated	0.608	0	1
What is the employment rate among status holders, 30 months after receiving a residence permit in the Netherlands?	Correct	0.091	0	1
	Underestimated	0.022	0	1
	Overestimated	0.886	0	1
What percentage of the status holders in The Netherlands have passed the integration exam within 5 years?	Correct	0.148	0	1
	Underestimated	0.330	0	1
	Overestimated	0.523	0	1
Observations		176		

Table A5.

Linear regression for the relationship between several variables and positive emotions.

Variable	Luck	Hope	Happiness	Solidarity
Gender – Male	0.93* (0.48)	0.80* (0.42)	0.75 (0.49)	0.67 (0.47)
Place of residence - Randstad	2.02* (0.51)	0.86* (0.44)	0.85 (0.51)	0.93* (0.49)
Age – 25-34 years old	-0.85 (0.56)	-0.45 (0.49)	-0.68 (0.57)	-0.72 (0.55)
Age – 35-44 years old	2.15 (1.67)	1.00 (1.46)	0.73 (1.69)	1.82 (1.63)
Age – 45-54 years old	1.77 (1.25)	1.19 (1.09)	1.23 (1.26)	-0.24 (1.22)
Age – 55-64 years old	1.10 (1.09)	1.62 (0.95)	0.45 (1.10)	0.27 (1.06)
Age – 65 and above years old	1.39 (1.60)	2.09 (1.39)	0.81 (1.61)	0.13 (1.55)
Age – Prefer not to say	-2.00 (2.71)	-1.61 (2.36)	-2.32 (2.74)	-2.95 (2.64)
Education level – intermediate / higher vocational education	0.35 (0.66)	0.54 (0.58)	0.25 (0.67)	0.93 (0.64)
Education level – University Bachelor	0.30 (0.55)	0.46 (0.48)	0.03 (0.55)	0.57 (0.53)
Education level – University Master, PhD, Other	0.30 (0.73)	0.94 (0.64)	0.09 (0.74)	0.28 (0.71)
Employment condition - Student with job	-0.61 (0.60)	-0.34 (0.52)	-0.94 (0.61)	-0.90 (0.58)
Employment condition – Part-time Job	-1.58 (1.06)	-1.31 (0.93)	-1.49 (1.07)	-0.91 (1.03)
Employment condition – Full-time Job	-1.33 (0.86)	-1.08 (0.75)	-0.90 (0.87)	-0.69 (0.83)
Employment condition – Not working, other	-2.07 (1.62)	-3.09** (1.41)	-2.01 (1.64)	-2.35 (1.58)
Already donating annually	-0.61 (0.47)	-0.63 (0.41)	-0.37 (0.47)	-0.09 (0.46)
Sometimes in contact with refugees	0.04 (0.50)	0.10 (0.43)	0.03 (0.50)	0.83* (0.49)
Often in contact with refugees	2.02* (1.07)	1.15 (0.93)	2.26** (1.08)	2.18** (1.04)
Total of correct answers is equal to 1	-0.36 (0.52)	-0.23 (0.45)	-0.36 (0.52)	-0.04 (0.50)

Variable	Luck	Hope	Happiness	Solidarity
Total of correct answers is equal to 2	-1.25** (0.59)	-0.82 (0.51)	-1.46** (0.60)	-0.87 (0.57)
Total of correct answers is equal to 3	-1.45** (0.61)	-1.37** (0.53)	-1.42** (0.62)	-0.70 (0.59)
Total of correct answers is equal to 4	0.27 (1.16)	0.10 (1.01)	0.51 (1.17)	1.75 (1.13)
Encouraging emotional based information	0.85 (0.60)	1.14** (0.52)	0.71 (0.61)	1.26** (0.58)
Discouraging emotional based information	-3.06*** (0.56)	-2.45*** (0.49)	-3.30*** (0.56)	-2.62*** (0.54)
Rational based information	-0.10 (0.57)	-0.95* (0.50)	-0.89 (0.57)	0.12 (0.55)
Constant	6.75*** (0.87)	6.62*** (0.76)	7.26*** (0.88)	6.19*** (0.85)
Observations	120	120	120	120
R-squared	0.53	0.54	0.53	0.54

Note. Significance levels: * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, ***p<0.01; Standard errors are in parentheses; All outcomes are rounded to two decimal places; The outcomes are on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 signifies “I don’t feel this emotion at all” and 10 signifies “I completely feel this emotion.”

Table A6.

Linear regression for the relationship between several variables and negative emotions.

Variable	Anger	Guilt	Pity	Disgust
Gender – Male	-0.98* (0.56)	-0.98* (0.53)	0.28 (0.55)	-0.73 (0.52)
Place of residence - Randstad	-1.09* (0.59)	-0.49 (0.56)	-0.92 (0.58)	-0.66 (0.55)
Age – 25-34 years old	-0.12 (0.65)	0.25 (0.62)	-0.34 (0.64)	1.19* (0.61)
Age – 35-44 years old	-0.94 (1.93)	5.19*** (1.84)	0.86 (1.90)	0.53 (1.81)
Age – 45-54 years old	0.15 (1.44)	0.82 (1.38)	-1.63 (1.42)	0.42 (1.35)
Age – 55-64 years old	0.00 (1.26)	1.88 (1.20)	0.15 (1.23)	1.32 (1.18)
Age – 65 and above years old	2.79 (1.84)	4.18** (1.76)	0.00 (1.81)	1.17 (1.73)
Age – Prefer not to say	5.94* (3.13)	4.15 (2.98)	-4.69 (4.08)	4.77 (2.93)
Education level - intermediate / higher vocational education	-0.72 (0.76)	-0.27 (0.73)	-0.29 (0.75)	-0.96 (0.71)
Education level – University Bachelor	0.70 (0.63)	-0.21 (0.60)	1.00 (0.62)	-0.69 (0.59)
Education level – University Master, PhD, Other	-0.52 (0.85)	0.18 (0.81)	-0.30 (0.83)	-0.41 (0.79)
Employment condition - Student with job	0.33 (0.69)	-0.43 (0.66)	-0.32 (0.68)	0.37 (0.65)
Employment condition – Part-time Job	0.67 (1.23)	-2.90** (1.17)	1.23 (1.21)	-0.89 (1.15)
Employment condition – Full-time Job	0.64 (0.99)	-1.82* (0.94)	-0.36 (0.97)	-0.50 (0.93)
Employment condition – Not working, other	-1.91 (1.87)	-3.71** (1.79)	0.10 (1.84)	-0.01 (1.75)
Already donating annually	-0.36 (0.54)	0.12 (0.52)	-0.48 (0.53)	0.26 (0.51)
Sometimes in contact with refugees	0.70 (0.58)	-0.09 (0.55)	1.63*** (0.57)	0.23 (0.54)
Often in contact with refugees	0.90 (1.23)	1.76 (1.18)	1.23 (1.21)	-1.32 (1.16)
Total of correct answers is equal to 1	-0.06 (0.60)	0.81 (0.57)	-0.57 (0.59)	-0.18 (0.56)

Variable	Anger	Guilt	Pity	Disgust
Total of correct answers is equal to 2	1.16* (0.68)	1.25* (0.65)	0.17 (0.67)	0.54 (0.64)
Total of correct answers is equal to 3	0.72 (0.70)	0.84 (0.67)	-0.47 (0.69)	-0.59 (0.66)
Total of correct answers is equal to 4	1.60 (1.34)	1.58 (1.28)	-1.11 (1.32)	-1.27 (1.26)
Encouraging emotional based information	0.98 (0.69)	1.56** (0.66)	2.54*** (0.68)	-0.57 (0.65)
Discouraging emotional based information	3.77*** (0.64)	2.22*** (0.61)	3.70*** (0.63)	4.39*** (0.60)
Rational based information	2.70*** (0.66)	2.31*** (0.63)	4.73*** (0.65)	1.41** (0.62)
Constant	2.44** (1.01)	2.17** (0.96)	3.15*** (0.99)	2.40** (0.94)
Observations	120	120	120	120
R-squared	0.42	0.37	0.47	0.59

Note. Significance levels: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$; Standard errors are in parentheses; All outcomes are rounded to two decimal places; The outcomes are on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 signifies “I don’t feel this emotion at all” and 10 signifies “I completely feel this emotion.”

Full survey



Beste deelnemer,

Heel fijn dat u bereid bent deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek! Hartelijk dank hiervoor.

Dit onderzoek is onderdeel van mijn bachelor thesis voor de opleiding Economie en Bedrijfseconomie aan de Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam. De onderzoeksgegevens zijn geheel vertrouwelijk en worden niet ter beschikking gesteld aan derden. Dit is een onderzoek gericht op Nederland. Het is daarom een voorwaarde dat u een Nederlandse identiteit heeft.

Onder alle deelnemers wordt een geldbedrag van €10 verloot. De vragenlijst duurt ongeveer 5 minuten.

Succes!

Ik heb bovenstaande tekst gelezen en ga hiermee akkoord.



Dear participant,

Thank you for participating in this research. I really appreciate it.

This research is part of my bachelor thesis regarding the Economics and Business Economics Program at Erasmus University Rotterdam. The research data is is completely confidential and will not be provided to third parties.

This is an investigation aimed at the Netherlands. Therefore, it is a requirement that you have a Dutch identity.

A cash prize of € 10 will be randomly given to one of the participants.

The questionnaire takes about 5 minutes.

Good luck!

Geef uw mening over de volgende stellingen.

	Helemaal niet mee eens	Enigszins niet mee eens	Neutraal	Enigszins mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
Ik maak mij zorgen om de huidige vluchtelingencrisis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Het Covid-19 virus leidt ertoe dat ik mij meer zorgen ga maken over de huidige situatie waarin vluchtelingen zich bevinden	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik maak mij zorgen over het hoge aantal asielzoekers in Nederland	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik ben van mening dat Nederland meer vluchtelingen moeten toelaten	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vluchtelingen hebben een negatieve impact op de Nederlandse cultuur	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik zie vluchtelingen als concurrentie op de arbeidsmarkt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Please give your opinion on the following statements

- I am worried about the current refugee crisis
- The Covid-19 virus makes me even more worried about the current situation of refugees
- I am worried about the high number of asylum seekers in The Netherlands
- I think The Netherlands has to allow more asylum seekers
- Refugees have a negative impact on the Dutch culture
- Refugees are competitors in the labour market.

Scale:

- Strongly disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Neutral
- Slightly agree
- Strongly agree



Doneert u geld aan een goed doel of liefdadigheidsinstelling?

- Nee
- Ja, tussen de €1 en €50 per jaar
- Ja, tussen de €51 en €100 per jaar
- Ja, tussen de €101 en €250 per jaar
- Ja, meer dan €250 per jaar
- Ja, maar ik zeg liever niet hoeveel
- Ik weet het niet / zeg ik liever niet

Do you donate to a charity?

- No
- Yes, between €1 and €50 per year
- Yes, between €51 and €100 per year
- Yes, between €101 and €250 per year
- Yes, over €250 per year
- I don't know / I prefer not to say

Hoe vaak komt u in contact met een vluchteling?

- Nooit
- Zelden
- Een paar keer per jaar
- Maandelijks
- Wekelijks
- Dagelijks
- Ik woon samen met een vluchteling
- Anders, namelijk:
- Ik weet het niet / zeg ik liever niet

How often are you in contact with a refugee?

- Never
- Rarely
- A couple of times per year
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily
- I live together with a refugee
- Other, namely:
- I don't know / I prefer not to say

In het geval van een paar keer per jaar, maandelijks, wekelijks, dagelijks: kunt u dit toelichten?

In case of a couple of times per year, monthly, weekly, daily: can you explain?



De volgende vragen hebben betrekking op uw kennis over vluchtelingen in Nederland. Het is de bedoeling dat u deze vragen zo goed mogelijk probeert te beantwoorden, volledig naar eigen kennis en gevoel. Het gaat dus om wat u denkt, of het goed of fout is, is niet van belang. Vul dus altijd een antwoord in. Er is een tijdrestrictie van 40 seconde per vraag toegepast. Klik op het pijltje om door te gaan.



The following questions are related to your general knowledge about refugees in the Netherlands. It is the intention that you try to answer these questions as good as possible, completely according to your own knowledge. It is important to fill in whatever *you* think, whether it is right or wrong is not important. So, always fill in an answer.

A time restriction of 40 seconds per question has been applied. Click on the arrow to continue.



**Hoeveel procent van de Nederlanders, woonachtig in Nederland, heeft een niet-Westerse migratieachtergrond?
(Tot niet-Westers behoren mensen afkomstig uit Afrika, Azië (exclusief Indonesië & Japan), Latijns-Amerika en Turkije)**



What percentage of the Dutch population, living in the Netherlands, have a non-Western migration background?

(Non-Western includes people from Africa, Asia (excluding Indonesia & Japan), Latin America and Turkey)



Hoeveel asielaanvragen (eerste asielverzoeken en nareizigers) zijn er in 2019 in Nederland gedaan?



How many asylum applications (first asylum applications and follow-up travellers) were made in 2019 in the Netherlands?



Hoeveel procent van de asielaanvragen in Nederland in 2018 is geaccepteerd?



What percentage of asylum applications were accepted in The Netherlands in 2018?



Hoeveel procent van de asielaanvragen in Nederland in 2018 is afgewezen?



What percentage of asylum applications were denied in The Netherlands in 2018?



Hoeveel procent van de Syrische vluchtelingen, woonachtig in Nederland, heeft een HBO of WO opleiding afgerond?



What percentage of Syrian refugees, living in The Netherlands, has graduated from a university or a university of applied sciences?



Wat is het werkgelegenheidspercentage onder statushouders, 30 maanden na het ontvangen van een verblijfsvergunning in Nederland?

(Een statushouder is iemand die een tijdelijke verblijfsvergunning heeft)



What is the employment rate among status holders, 30 months after receiving a residence permit in the Netherlands?

(A status holder is someone who has a temporary residence permit)



Hoeveel procent van de Nederlandse statushouders heeft het inburgeringsexamen binnen 5 jaar gehaald?



What percentage of the status holders in The Netherlands have passed the integration exam within 5 years?

Control group



Graag wil ik u nu vragen de volgende tekst aandachtig te lezen.

EK VOETBAL 1988: NEDERLAND WORDT EUROPEES KAMPIOEN

Op 25 juni 1988 speelt het Nederlands elftal de finale van het EK Voetbal tegen de Sovjet-Unie. Nederland wint de wedstrijd en wordt voor het eerst Europees kampioen.

De eindronde in Duitsland

Het EK 1988 werd gespeeld in de Bondsrepubliek Duitsland (of West-Duitsland). In totaal namen er acht landen deel aan het toernooi, verdeeld over twee poules. Groep A bestond uit West-Duitsland, Italië, Denemarken en Spanje. Groep B omvatte Nederland, Ierland, Engeland en de Sovjet-Unie. In de openingswedstrijd van het toernooi speelden de favorieten West-Duitsland en Italië gelijk. Spanje en Denemarken werden vrij gemakkelijk verslagen, waardoor de favorieten door konden naar de halve finales. In groep B speelde Nederland voor het eerst op het toernooi tegen de Sovjet-Unie. Oranje was sterk en goed op dreef, maar kwam niet langs de sterke verdediging van de Sovjets. Nederland verloor de wedstrijd met 0-1. Gelukkig wist Nederland daarna Engeland te verslaan. De wedstrijd tegen Ierland werd ter nauwer nood gewonnen door een gelukkige kopbal van Wim Kieft. Nederland kon zich gaan opmaken voor de belangrijke wedstrijd tegen West-Duitsland.

Nederland tegen West-Duitsland

De eerste halve finale tussen Nederland en West-Duitsland is legendarisch. Voor de Nederlanders was dit een beladen wedstrijd. Ze hadden namelijk in 1974 van West-Duitsland verloren in de finale van het WK. Men noemt dit sindsdien een 'nationaal trauma'. Nederland genas van het trauma en won met 2-1. Er werd feestgevierd alsof de finale van het EK al gewonnen was. De echte finale tegen de Sovjet-Unie moest echter nog gespeeld worden.

Nederland tegen de Sovjet-Unie

Nederland was in een stemming om te winnen en dat lukte ook. Met een kopbal van Gullit en een magnifiek doelpunt van Van Basten werd het 2-0. Het werd nog even spannend toen de keeper Van Breukelen een overtreding maakte, waardoor de Sovjet-Unie nog een penalty mocht nemen. Gelukkig maakte Van Breukelen zijn fout goed en stopte de bal. Nederland werd zo Europees Kampioen.

(Bron: Isgeschiedenis)



I would now like to ask you to read the following text carefully.

EUROPEAN CHAMPIONSHIP FOOTBALL 1988: THE NETHERLANDS BECOMES EUROPEAN CHAMPION

On June 25, 1988, the Dutch national team plays the final of the European Football Championship against the Soviet Union. The Netherlands wins the competition and becomes European champion for the first time.

The final round in Germany

The 1988 European Championship was played in the Federal Republic of Germany (or West Germany). In total, eight countries participated in the tournament, divided into two groups.

Group A consisted of West Germany, Italy, Denmark and Spain. Group B included the Netherlands, Ireland, England and the Soviet Union. In the opening game of the tournament, favourites West Germany and Italy played a draw. Spain and Denmark were pretty easily defeated, allowing the favourites to advance to the semi-finals. In group B, the Netherlands played for the first time at the tournament against the Soviet Union. The Netherlands was playing strong but did not pass the strong defence of the Soviets. The Netherlands lost the game 0-1. Fortunately, the Netherlands managed to beat England after that. The game against Ireland was won by a goal from Wim Kieft. The Netherlands could prepare for the important match against West Germany.

The Netherlands against West Germany

The first semi-final between the Netherlands and West Germany is legendary. This was a fraught game for the Dutch. They had lost to West Germany in the final of the World Cup in 1974. It has since been called a "national trauma". The Netherlands healed from the trauma and won 2-1. It was celebrated as if the final of the European Championship had already been won. However, the real final against the Soviet Union was yet to be played.

The Netherlands against the Soviet Union

The Netherlands was in a mood to win and it did. With a header from Gullit and a magnificent goal from Van Basten, it was 2-0. It got exciting when goalkeeper Van Breukelen made a foul, which allowed the Soviet Union to take a penalty. Luckily, Van Breukelen corrected his mistake and stopped the ball. The Netherlands thus became European Champion.

(Source: Isgeschiedenis)

Encouraging emotional based information



Graag wil ik u nu vragen de volgende tekst aandachtig te lezen.

STUDEREN OF HET LEGER IN

Je zou het niet zeggen als je hem Nederlands hoort praten, maar Hasan is pas 3,5 jaar in Nederland. Op 18-jarige leeftijd vluchtte hij met zijn oom naar Nederland om aan de levensgevaarlijke dienstplicht te ontsnappen. Zijn vader, moeder, broertje en zusje bleven achter. "Het is oorlog in Syrië. Veel jongens die achttien werden moesten het leger in. Daarom besloot ik om Syrië te verlaten."

"Het leven in het asielzoekerscentrum vond ik heel moeilijk"

"Ik verbleef in het tijdelijke asielzoekerscentrum De Koepel in Arnhem. Het gebouw was pas net in gebruik genomen als asielzoekerscentrum. Vooral in het begin was er echt niets te doen. Hele dagen en nachten zat ik op mijn kamer, ik maakte mij heel veel zorgen over thuis, maar ook over mijn toekomst. Zal ik mogen blijven?"

Na een poosje kwamen er steeds vaker mensen uit de buurt langs in het asielzoekerscentrum. Ze brachten spullen of nodigden ons uit om te komen eten. Ook mochten we in de buurt helpen met klussen, zoals werken in de tuin of het verzorgingstehuis in de buurt. De afleiding en het contact met Nederlanders was heel waardevol. Als dank organiseerden wij een diner voor alle buurtbewoners. Met sommige van hen ben ik nu, twee jaar later, nog steeds bevriend.

Inmiddels woon ik in Arnhem en ik begin dit najaar aan het tweede jaar van de studie Civiele Techniek op de Hogeschool van Arnhem. Mijn propedeuse heb ik nu op zak, daar ben ik zo blij mee! Toch ben ik nog steeds regelmatig in een asielzoekerscentrum te vinden: als vrijwilliger organiseer ik er activiteiten voor vluchtelingenkinderen. Ook ben ik meegeweest als vrijwilliger tijdens de Kindervakantieweken. Ik weet als geen ander hoeveel die afleiding en aandacht voor de kinderen betekent."

Zelf initiatief nemen

"Nederlanders nemen over het algemeen wel weinig initiatief om je te leren kennen, maar als je zelf een stap zet reageert bijna iedereen positief. Waarschijnlijk denken ze dat ik heel anders ben, omdat ik uit een ander land kom. Maar ik denk echt van niet. Voor mij is iedereen gewoon hetzelfde. Contact tussen vluchtelingen en Nederlanders is heel belangrijk. Daarom vind ik ook de Open azc dag zo leuk! Ik hoop dat er veel mensen komen."

(Bron: Vluchtelingenwerk)



I would now like to ask you to read the following text carefully.

STUDY OR ARMY

You wouldn't say it when you heard him speak Dutch, but Hasan has only been in The Netherlands for 3.5 years. At the age of 18, he fled together with his uncle to the Netherlands to escape life-threatening obligatory military service. His father, mother, brother and sister

were left behind. "It is war in Syria. Many boys who turned eighteen had to join the army. That's why I decided to leave Syria. "

"Living in the asylum seekers centre was very difficult"

"I stayed in the temporary asylum seekers centre De Koepel in Arnhem. The building recently opened for asylum seekers. Especially in the beginning there was really nothing to do. I spent days and nights in my room, I was very worried about home, but also about my future, will I be allowed to stay?

After a while, more and more people from the neighbourhood came to the asylum seekers' center. They brought stuff or invited us to dinner. We were also allowed to do some small tasks in the neighbourhood, such as working in the garden or the nursing home in the area. The distraction and contact with the Dutch were very valuable. To thank them, we organized a dinner for all local residents. Two years later, I am still friends with some of them.

I now live in Arnhem and I will start the second year of my Civil Engineering studies at Arnhem University of Applied Sciences this autumn. I now have my propaedeutic phase, I am so happy with it! Nevertheless, I can still be found regularly in an asylum seekers' center: as a volunteer I organize activities for refugee children. I also volunteered during the Children's Holiday Weeks. I know better than anyone how much that distraction and attention to the children means."

Take the initiative yourself

"In general, the Dutch do not take much initiative to get to know you, but if you take a step yourself, almost everyone reacts positively. They probably think that I am very different, because I come from another country. But I really don't think so Everyone is just the same for me. Contact between refugees and Dutch people is very important. That is why I also enjoy the Open AZC day! I hope that many people will come. "

(Source: Vluchtelingenwerk)

Discouraging emotional based information



Graag wil ik u nu vragen de volgende tekst aandachtig te lezen.

VLUCHTELING KRIJGT LAGERE STRAF VOOR VERKRACHTING

Een achttienjarig slachtoffer werd twee jaar geleden in een winkel aan de Amsterdamse Nieuwendijk verkracht door een Afghaanse vluchteling. Deze Zaman S. (toen 36) kreeg afgelopen 18 juli een lagere straf opgelegd dan gebruikelijk is. De reden hiervoor zou zijn dat hij anders zijn verblijfsvergunning zou kwijtraken.

Het schijnt dat de rechtbank rekening hield met het feit dat S. In Nederland zijn leven aan het opbouwen was, dat de verkrachting twee jaar geleden plaatsvond, dat de verdachte nooit eerder in Nederland is veroordeeld, en met zijn uit Afghanistan overgekomen zwangere vrouw. Op grond hiervan besloot de rechtbank niet mee te gaan met de 24 maanden gevangenisstraf van de Officier van Justitie.

Woest

De vader van het slachtoffer is woest en vindt de straf veel te mild. „Hier is geen recht gedaan. Ik word hier zo boos over. Verblijfsvergunning afpakken en het land uitgooien, zou ik zeggen. Misschien is dit in zijn land normaal, maar hier niet.”

Het verweer van S. - dat de seks met het meisje vrijwillig was - geloofde de rechtbank niet. De rechtbank acht het onwaarschijnlijk dat het meisje uit vrije wil seks had met een veel oudere man die ze nooit eerder had gezien.

De verkrachting vond plaats in het magazijn van de winkel was S. werkte. Het slachtoffer was aan het winkelen voor een tas toen S. Haar betastte, haar dwong hem oraal te bevredigen en haar uiteindelijk verkrachtte. S. Is veroordeeld tot twintig maanden cel.

Ophef

Richard Korver, advocaat van het meisje, is van mening dat het verliezen van een verblijfsvergunning in een geval als deze geen overweging mag zijn. „Deze man staat in ons land straks, onbehandeld en korter gestraft dan wanneer hij geen verblijfsvergunning had, weer op straat. De gevoelens van onveiligheid die het meisje door het misdrijf kreeg, zijn door deze uitspraak eerder versterkt dan verminderd.”

Inmiddels is ook in politiek Den Haag ophef ontstaan over de zaak. Regeringspartij VVD wil opheldering van het ministerie van Justitie en Veiligheid. Volgens de rechtbank was het „niet de bedoeling” dat de straf leidt tot „verregaande vreemdelingenrechtelijke consequenties.”

Ook andere partijen reageren geschokt. „Dit is met geen pen te beschrijven”, twittert Geert Wilders. „Het Nederland van Mark Rutte is zoek.” Thierry Baudet twittert: „Ik ben niet boos, ik ben woest.”

(Bron: Metro nieuws)



I would now like to ask you to read the following text carefully.

REFUGEE GETS LOWER PENALTY FOR RAPE

An eighteen-year-old victim was raped by an Afghan refugee in a store on Nieuwendijk in Amsterdam two years ago. On the 18th of July, the rapist, Zaman S. (then 36 years old),

received a lower sentence than usual. The reason for this would be that he would otherwise lose his residence permit.

It seems that the court took into account the fact that S. was building up his life in The Netherlands, that the rape took place two years ago, that the suspect has never been convicted in the Netherlands, and that his pregnant wife just came over from Afghanistan. Because of these arguments, the court decided not to give him the Public Prosecutor's 24-month sentence.

Fierce

The victim's father is furious and finds the punishment far too mild. "No justice has been done here. I get so angry about this. I would say, take his residence permit and expel him from the country. Maybe this is normal in his country, but not here."

S.'s defence - that sex with the girl was voluntary - was not believed by the court. The court finds it unlikely that the girl had free will sex with a much older man she had never seen before. The rape took place in the store's warehouse where S. worked. The victim was shopping for a bag when S. touched her, forced her to satisfy him orally, and eventually raped her. S. is sentenced to 20 months in prison.

Fuss

Richard Korver, the girl's lawyer, believes that losing a residence permit in a case like this should not be a consideration. "This man will be back on the street in our country, untreated and earlier than allowed by the law than if he did not have a residence permit. The feelings of insecurity that the girl got through the crime have been strengthened rather than diminished by this statement."

Meanwhile, there has also been a fuss about this case in political The Hague. VVD government party wants clarification from the Ministry of Justice and Security. According to the court, it was "not the intention" that the sentence lead to "far-reaching consequences under immigration law."

Other parties are also shocked. "This is hard to describe," tweeted Geert Wilders. "Mark Rutte's Netherlands is missing." Thierry Baudet tweeted: "I'm not angry, I'm furious."

Rational based information

(Source: Metro Nieuws)



Graag wil ik u nu vragen de volgende feiten aandachtig te lezen.

- 1. Sinds 2014 zijn er meer dan 10.000 vluchtelingen verdronken in de Middellandse Zee.*
- 2. Op dit moment zijn er 11,7 miljoen mensen uit Syrië die hun huis hebben moeten verlaten. Dit is meer dan de helft van de Syrische bevolking.*
- 3. Over de hele wereld raken er elke dag 37.000 mensen ontheemd.*
- 4. Meer dan 12 miljoen mensen in Syrië hebben geen toegang tot schoon drinkwater en meer dan 9 miljoen hebben onvoldoende te eten.*
- 5. Twee derde van alle vluchtelingen in de wereld komt uit slechts 5 landen.*
- 6. Aan meer dan 90% van de wereldwijde hervestigingsbehoeften is niet voldaan.*
- 7. Één op de twee vluchtelingen is kind.*
- 8. De meeste vluchtelingen zijn afkomstig uit Syrië, gevolgd door Afghanistan en Zuid-Soedan.*

(Bron: UNHCR)



I would now like to ask you to read the following facts carefully.

1. Since 2014, more than 10,000 refugees have drowned in the Mediterranean Sea.
2. Currently, 11.7 million people from Syria had to leave their homes. This is more than half of the Syrian population.
3. Around the world, 37,000 people are displaced every day.
4. More than 12 million people in Syria do not have access to clean drinking water and more than 9 million have insufficient food.
5. Two thirds of all refugees in the world come from only 5 countries.
6. More than 90% of global resettlement needs are not met.
7. One in two refugees is a child.
8. Most of the refugees are from Syria, followed by Afghanistan and South Sudan.

(Source: UNHCR)



Op een schaal van 0-10, hoe goed kunt u zich nu vinden in de volgende emoties?

Geluk

Totaal niet					neutraal						Volledig
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Hoop

Totaal niet					Neutraal						Volledig
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Blijdschap

Totaal niet					Neutraal						Volledig
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Solidariteit

Totaal niet					Neutraal						Volledig
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Woede

Totaal niet					Neutraal						Volledig
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Schuld

Totaal niet					Neutraal						Volledig
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Medelijden

Totaal niet					Neutraal						Volledig
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Afkeer

Totaal niet					Neutraal						Volledig
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



On a scale of 0 to 10, to what extent can you relate to the following emotions?

- Luck
- Hope
- Happiness
- Solidarity
- Anger
- Guilt
- Pity
- Disgust

Where 0 is completely not; 5 is neutral, 10 is completely.



Zoals eerder is verteld, wordt onder alle deelnemers €10 verloot. Stel, u wint deze €10. Hoeveel procent van dit bedrag zou u dan aan een organisatie die zich inzet voor vluchtelingen willen doneren?

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Ik doneer ... procent van mijn €10

Aan welke van onderstaande organisaties zou u het bedrag tussen de €0 en €10 willen doneren?

- VluchtelingenWerk Nederland. Deze organisatie behartigt de belangen van vluchtelingen en asielzoekers in Nederland, vanaf het moment van binnenkomst tot en met de integratie in de Nederlandse samenleving.
- Stichting voor Vluchtelingen-Studenten UAF. UAF begeleidt met hulp van donateurs en fondsen hoger opgeleide vluchtelingen bij hun studie en het vinden van een passende baan. UAF biedt vluchtelingen de kans om hun talenten in Nederland te ontwikkelen.
- Internationale Organisatie voor Migratie (IOM). De IOM is een intergouvernementele organisatie die ordelijke en humane migratie bevordert. De IOM richt zich op internationale samenwerking en het uitvoeren van initiatieven op het gebied van migratie en op het geven van humanitaire hulp aan migranten in nood.
- Stichting Vluchteling. Stichting Vluchteling zet zich voor de opvang en begeleiding van vluchtelingen en ontheemden in vooral Afrika, Azië en het Midden-Oosten. Bij acute nood zorgt Stichting Vluchteling voor directe hulp. Ook ondersteunt de stichting bij de terugkeer van vluchtelingen.
- Het is mij om het even.
- Ik heb aangegeven geen geld (€0) te willen doneren.
- Ik weet het niet.



As mentioned before, € 10 will be raffled among all participants. Suppose you win the € 10. What percentage of this amount would you like to donate to an organization that works for refugees?

I donate Percentage of the €10 I might win.

To which of the following charities would you like to donate the amount between the €0 and €10?

- VluchtelingenWerk Nederland (Refugee Work The Netherlands). This organisation represents the interests of refugees and asylum seekers in the Netherlands, from the moment of entry to integration into Dutch society.
- Stichting voor Vluchtelingen-Studenten UAF (Foundation for Refugee Students UAF). UAF supports, with the help of donors and funds, higher educated refugees in their studies and finding a suitable job. UAF offers refugees the opportunity to develop their talents in the Netherlands.
- Internationale Organisatie voor Migratie (IOM) (International Organisation for Migration (IOM)). The IOM is an intergovernmental organization that promotes orderly and humane migration. The IOM focuses on international cooperation and the implementation of initiatives in the field of migration and the provision of humanitarian aid to migrants in need.
- Stichting Vluchteling (Refugee Foundation). Stichting Vluchteling is committed to the reception and guidance of refugees and displaced persons, especially in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. In an emergency, Stichting Vluchteling provides immediate help. The foundation also supports the return of refugees.
- I makes no difference to me.
- I have indicated that I do not want to donate money (€0).
- I don't know.



Zoals eerder is verteld, wordt onder alle deelnemers één persoon willekeurig gekozen als de winnaar van de €10. Dit bedrag, minus het bedrag wat is de persoon bereid is te doneren aan een van de liefdadigheidsinstellingen, zal dan ook daadwerkelijk aan deze winnaar geschonken worden in de vorm van een tegoedbon.

Om dit mogelijk te maken moet er natuurlijk een manier zijn om de winnaar te benaderen.

Wilt u kans maken op €10 minus uw donatie, vul dan alstublieft hieronder uw e-mailadres in.

Heeft u aangegeven 100% van de €10 te doneren, dan hoeft u uw e-mailadres niet in te vullen. Het bedrag zal dan rechtstreeks worden overgemaakt naar de gekozen organisatie.

U bent echter niet verplicht om uw e-mailadres in te vullen.

E-mailadres:

De winnaar zal willekeurig gekozen worden uit alle deelnemers die hun e-mailadres hebben ingevuld én alle deelnemers die hebben aangegeven bereid zijn €10 te doneren.

De winnaar wint dus een tegoedbon ter waarde van €10 minus de aangegeven donatie.



As mentioned before, among all participants, one person is randomly chosen as the winner of the € 10. This amount, minus the amount the person is willing to donate to the charity of their choice, will actually be given to this winner in the form of a voucher.

To make this possible there must of course be a way to approach the winner.

If you want to win € 10 minus your donation, please enter your email address below.

If you have indicated that you donate 100% of the € 10, you do not need to enter your e-mail address. The amount will then be transferred directly to the chosen organization.

However, you are not obliged to enter your email address.

e-mail address:

The winner will be chosen at random from all participants who have entered their e-mail address and all participants who have indicated that they are willing to donate € 10.

The winner therefore wins a voucher worth € 10 minus the indicated donation.



Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man
- Vrouw
- Anders

What is your gender?

- Man
- Woman
- Other

Wat is uw leeftijd?

What is your age?

In welke provincie woont u?

- Drenthe
- Flevoland
- Friesland
- Gelderland
- Groningen
- Limburg
- Noord-Brabant
- Noord-Holland
- Overijssel
- Utrecht
- Zeeland
- Zuid-Holland
- Ik woon tijdelijk in het buitenland

In which province do you live?

- Drenthe
- Flevoland
- Friesland
- Gelderland
- Groningen
- Limburg
- Noord-Brabant
- Noord-Holland
- Overijssel
- Utrecht
- Zeeland
- Zuid-Holland
- I live abroad temporarily

Wat is uw hoogst afgeronde opleidingsniveau?

- Voortgezet Onderwijs
- MBO
- HBO
- WO Bachelor
- WO Master
- PhD
- Anders, namelijk:

What is your highest completed level of education?

- High school
- Intermediate Vocational Education
- Higher Vocational Education
- University Bachelor
- University Master
- PhD
- Other, namely: ...

Wat is uw huidige werksituatie?

- Scholier
- Student, zonder baan
- Student, met (bij)baan
- Part-time baan
- Full-time baan
- Werkloos
- Gepensioneerd
- Anders, namelijk:

What is your current working situation?

- Pupil (high school)
- Student, without job
- Student, with job
- Part-time job
- Full-time job
- Unemployed
- Retired
- Other, namely: ...

Als laatste wil ik u graag voorzien van de juiste antwoorden op de eerder gestelde vragen. Dit is puur voor uw eigen interesse. Klik na het lezen op het pijltje om uw antwoorden te versturen.

1. Hoeveel procent van de Nederlanders, woonachtig in Nederland, heeft een niet-Westerse migratieachtergrond?

Antwoord: 11%

2. Hoeveel asielaanvragen (eerste asielverzoeken en nareizigers) zijn er in 2019 in Nederland gedaan?

Antwoord: 25 265

3. Hoeveel procent van de asielaanvragen in Nederland in 2018 is ingewilligd?

Antwoord: 35%

4. Hoeveel procent van de asielaanvragen in Nederland in 2018 is afgewezen?

Antwoord: 65%

5. Hoeveel procent van de Syrische vluchtelingen, woonachtig in Nederland, heeft een HBO of WO opleiding afgerond?

Antwoord: 21%

6. Wat is het werkgelegenheidspercentage onder statushouders, 30 maanden na het ontvangen van een verblijfsvergunning in Nederland?

Antwoord: 11%

7. Hoeveel procent van de Nederlandse statushouders heeft het inburgeringsexamen binnen 5 jaar gehaald?

Antwoord: 58%

(Bronnen: CBS, SER, VluchtelingenWerk Nederland)

Klik op het pijltje om uw antwoorden te versturen.

Finally, I would like to provide you the correct answers to the previously asked questions. This is purely for your own interest. After reading, click the arrow to send your answers.

1. What percentage of the Dutch, living in the Netherlands, have a non-Western migration background?

Answer: 11%

2. How many asylum applications (first asylum applications and follow-up travellers) were made in the Netherlands in 2019?

Answer: 25 265

3. What percentage of asylum applications in the Netherlands were accepted in 2018?

Answer: 35%

4. What percentage of asylum applications in the Netherlands were rejected in 2018?

Answer: 65%

5. What percentage of the Syrian refugees, living in the Netherlands, has graduated from university (of applied sciences)

Answer: 21%

6. What is the employment rate among permit holders, 30 months after receiving a residence permit in the Netherlands?

Answer: 11%

7. What percentage of Dutch status holders have passed the integration exam within 5 years?

Answer: 58%

(Sources: CBS, SER, Dutch Council for Refugees)

[Click on the arrow to send your answers.](#)