

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY, MASTER INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Migration Education Policies in the Netherlands

Factors and actors that influence a shift in migration education policies [1970 – 2016]

H.M. Fleers

Name Supervisor: Prof. Dr. M. Schrover

Student number: 1043420

Programme: International Studies

Date: August 2016

Word count: 11 090 (excluding bibliography)

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction 2

 1.1 Research question 2

 1.2 Theoretical framework..... 2

 1.3 Historiography 5

 1.4 Method & Material 7

Chapter 2: Background information 9

Chapter 3: Analysis 1..... 16

Chapter 4: Analysis 2..... 20

Chapter 5: Analysis 3..... 23

Chapter 6: Conclusion 27

Bibliography 29

Appendix A..... 35

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Research question

The number of asylum seekers under the age of 18 in the Netherlands has increased over time. In 2007, 2,415 migrants under the age of 18 sought asylum and in 2015, 10,595 migrants sought asylum (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2016). Based on international treaties (Universal declaration of Human Rights and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural rights), asylum seekers under the age of 18, have a right to education. The Dutch government, especially the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science is responsible for this education in the Netherlands. In October 2015, Minister Jet Bussemaker (PvdA) and State Secretary Sander Dekker (VVD) informed the Dutch Parliament about the status of education for asylum seekers (Kamerbrief over onderwijs aan asielzoekers, 2015). In this letter they state: ‘the developments and influx of asylum seekers is unpredictable and therefore we have to act adequately to acute developments and signals from within the field’ (pp. 1). They point out that the migration education policy should be adjusted and adapted to the situation. However, the question remains: are there also other factors that influence ‘radical shifts’ in migration education policies? This research seeks explanations from different areas of studies: history, psychology, sociology, international relations, political science and public administration and aims to answer the following research question:

‘How, why and by whom (factors and actors) has the Dutch migration education policy been formulated over time to the way it is now [1970-2016]?’

It contributes to the field of education policy, by not just describing the policy, but revealing the factors that influence the formation of the Dutch education policy over time [1970 – 2016] and offers new insights for future Dutch education policy responses to the current migration crisis.

1.2 Theoretical framework

On the basis of scientific research seven factors have been identified that can influence or even change existing policies. Seven hypotheses have been formulated.

International rules and regulations. First of all, it could be argued that international rules and regulations have an impact on the policy making process because they will affect state behaviour (Checkel- 2007; Cortell & Davis- 1996). However, some international rules will resonate in the domestic political discourse while others do not. It depends on the

domestic legitimacy of the norm and the domestic context within which the policy debate transpires, whether it will change policies (Cortell & Davis, 2000). Most importantly, the Netherlands has to act concerning certain international rules and regulations within the area of migration education and therefore it will have an impact on the domestic migration education policy formulation.

Changes in migration. Secondly, changes in migration have an impact on the policy making process. Policymakers will adjust their policies, taking into account the number and status – guest workers or refugees - of migrants coming to the Netherlands. However, policies often fail to achieve their declared objectives, because migration is a social dynamic process and it is hard to determine in advance how many migrants will arrive (Castles, 2004). Castles (2004) thereby gives an example of German policymakers who thought that guest workers would eventually return to their home countries, whenever employment opportunities would decline. However this was not the case: the workers brought in their families and stayed for the long term and therefore German policymakers adjusted their policies. Lucassen & Köbben (1992) argue likewise that the Dutch government adjusted their policies towards their expectations about the length of time that migrants would stay. De Haas & Natter (2015) found that recent immigration levels do have an important impact on the restrictiveness of migration policies. As a result, the Dutch government will redefine her policy, whenever a change in migration occurs.

Political landscape. Thirdly, the political landscape is an important factor and is able to change existing policies or formulate new policies. The political orientation of the government - left wing or right wing - , is important for the direction of the policy. Right wing parties in the Netherlands will lobby for a more ‘sober policy’¹ than the left wing parties. However, it is hard to make this causal direction, because there is not a clear relation between the political orientation of governments and the restrictiveness of migration policies (De Haas & Natter, 2015). There are also other factors like political parties, interest groups, social movement organizations and public opinion that are able to change policies (Burstein & Linon, 2002). Saskia Bonjour (2009) gives an overview of recent literature concerning the interaction between Parliament, cabinet and civil servants in the decision-making process on policy-output and argues that the dynamics of decision-making processes are becoming more and more complex nowadays. She states that the literature is mixed and contradictory about the impact of civil servants and politics (Bonjour, 2009). Especially in the field of family

¹ Sober policy: Only highly necessary services will be provided by the government

migration, civil servants had an influential role in 1950s and 1960s and the Parliament became more involved during the 1970s and 1980s. Since the 1990s, family migration became a highly salient electoral issue, and therefore political parties became dominant actors in the decision-making process (Bonjour, 2009). Summarizing, the political landscape will have an important impact on the formulation of new policies concerning migration education. If the government is mainly 'left-centered', there will be more facilities for migrant children coming to the Netherlands. Whenever the government is mainly 'right-oriented', only the 'highly-necessary' services will be provided by the government.

Path dependency. Fourth, this research takes a closer look at path dependency. It could be argued that historical developments in policies are important for policymakers today and therefore path dependency leads to reluctance to changing policies (Peters, 1999). Alink (2006) examines the relationship between institutional crises, especially in the domain of immigration in the Netherlands and Germany, and possible reforms. She discovered that crisis does not inevitably lead to reform in policies. Especially institutionalized structures like the government are difficult to change and therefore regular decision-making procedures often remain in place. All things considered, path dependency will have an impact on the development of migration education policies. Many policies will be built upon existing policies, and therefore they will probably not change that much.

Research and Reports. Fifth, research and reports will have an impact on policy-making-processes. Scholarly works and publications are able to change the terms of the debate on a given issue (Almeida & Bascolo, 2006). Independent organizations, like NGOs, can also influence policies (Bebbington & Hickey, 2008). As a result research and reports will have an impact (concerning a specific direction) on the development of migration education policies.

Geopolitics and reciprocity. Sixth, geopolitics will have an impact on the policy-making-process. Dutch policies are influenced by the decisions of other European countries and by the European Union. The European Union may be regarded as a regime, a network of rules, norms and procedures, which regulate behaviour and try to control the results of behaviour (O'Neill- 1996; Krasner- 1999). European states are strongly interdependent when it comes to regulating mass migration flows and policies of neighboring countries have an impact on the direction of migration flows (Alink, Boin & 't Hart, 2001). As has been seen, geopolitics/reciprocity will influence the migration education policy. The Netherlands will take a look at the way other countries create their policies.

Costs/Benefits. Finally, consideration on costs and benefits is an important factor influencing the policy. Cost-benefit analyses are fundamental to government decision-making and often used to make decisions (Mishan & Quah, 2007). Also the economic situation (like economic growth and unemployment rate) are important factors to consider in changing the restrictiveness of migration policies (Castles, 2004). Thus the government will take a closer look at the costs and the benefits whenever a certain change in policy is made. This cost/benefit analysis will have an impact on the migration education policy formation.

This thesis assumes that these seven factors will have an impact on shifts in migration education policies over time [1970 – 2016].

1.3 Historiography

This section describes the most important work of academics in the field on migration education.

Linguists, educational- and social scientists. In the 1960s and 1970s sociologists and anthropologists started to do research concerning migration and integration. However, until 1974 there was no academic work on migration education. This topic gained interest in 1974, in response to the growing number of migrant children in the Netherlands. The main academic work in this period focused on examples of other countries already experimenting with bicultural education systems (Lucassen & Köbben, 1992). During this time important reports of the The Council of Europe² and UNESCO³ were published, which argued in favour of bicultural education systems. In the 1980s and 1985s most of the research was commissioned by the government to improve the position of ethnic minorities (Lucassen & Köbben, 1992). During this time reports were published by scientific advisory committees, such as the Scientific Council for Government Policy⁴ (WRR, 1979, 1989, 2001) and the Advisory Committee on Research relating to Ethnic Minorities (ACOM, 1979, 1982). Most literature was related to policy making, there was a strong institutionalized research-policy nexus (Penninx, Garcés-Masareñas & Scholten, 2005). Expansive growth of this study area took place in 1990s. Education involving home language has been an extremely controversial subject in the Netherlands and can be roughly divided into two camps. On one side, there are

² The Council of Europe: the continent's leading human rights organization. It includes 47 member states, 28 of which are members of the European Union.

³ UNESCO: United Nations educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: encourages international peace and universal respect for human rights by promoting collaboration among nations.

⁴ Scientific Council for Government Policy/Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (WRR called in Dutch): an independent advisory body for government policy. The task of the WRR is: 'to advise the government on issues that are of great importance to society' (WRR, 2016).

linguists who argue that home language is necessary for developing an adequate command of Dutch (Extra, 2001, 2002, 2004). On the other side, there are the educationalists and sociologists who argue in favour of learning the Dutch language immediately, without learning their home language (Driessen, 1990, 2012, 2013) (Driessen & van der Grinten, 1994). Important reports were still written, related to policy making during this time. Most advice for the government was critical towards existing policies: concerning the ‘Education in Living Ethnic Languages policy’⁵ (Onderwijsraad⁶, 2001a), regarding the system of weighted funding⁷ (Onderwijsraad, 2001b, 2001c, 2002, 2005a, 2005b) and with respect to the quality of migration education (Onderwijsinspectie⁸, 2014a, 2014b). The research of Penn (2009) was positive about the early childhood education policy⁹, because investment in early school years would lead to substantial economic returns. The report of the Parliamentary Committee Blok (Commissie Blok, 2004) gives a detailed overview of migration education policy from the 1970s till 2004. Especially since late 1990s, there is a rapid growth of international research concerning migration education (Penninx, 2013). The Sirius network is a European Policy Network studying and proposing ways for EU countries to address the needs for special education of children and young people with a migrant background (Sirius Education Migration- 2016). It launches papers with examples of good practices on matters like migrant education and community inclusion (Sacramento, 2015). There are more networks and researchers that have published reports especially for policy-makers (Heckmann- 2008, Nusche- 2009; Shewbrige, Kim, Wurzburg & Hostens- 2010).

Historians. There are several historians that analyze the way migration education policies changed over time. Lucassen & Köbben (1992) give a broad overview of migration education policies (1951- 1991) and critically analyze the impact of research on this policy-making process. They discovered that research was mainly used to legitimize the policies of the Dutch government. Bouras (2012) takes a closer look at the way the Dutch government changed her migration education policy (1960 – 2010) especially regarding Moroccan migrants. She argues that the Dutch government maintained using ‘Minority Language and Culture

⁵ Education in Living Ethnic Languages/ Onderwijs allochtonen levende talen (OALT in Dutch): policy focused on the important place of the home language of the migrants within the school system.

⁶ Education Council of the Netherlands / Onderwijsraad (in Dutch). The Education Council is an independent governmental advisory body which advises the Minister, Parliament and local authorities.

⁷ System of weighted funding / gewichtenregeling (in Dutch): policy focused on categories of students that deserve additional weights and therefore receive extra money

⁸ Dutch Inspectorate of Education / Onderwijsinspectie (in Dutch): is responsible for the inspection and review of schools and educational institutions

⁹ Early Childhood Education policy/ Voor- en vroegschoolse educatie (VVE in Dutch)

teaching-regulation'¹⁰ as their policy, although the justification for this policy -first remigration, later integration - changed over time. Obdeijn & Schrover (2008) give a detailed overview of immigration and emigration in the Netherlands from 1550 onwards and is mainly focused on the legislation and integration issues during this time (Obdeijn & Schrover, 2008).

This thesis will add value to the existing literature on two important points. First of all, a substantial part of the contemporary literature concerning migration education relates to policy-making, it advises policymakers or evaluates certain policies. However, only a relatively modest part of the literature analyses the process that has led to these policies (Penninx, Garcés-Mascareñas & Scholten, 2005). Therefore, this thesis will take a closer look at the process, and especially the actors and factors involved, and how this led to certain policies. Secondly, literature concerning the policy-making processes mainly looked at one specific factor, whereas this research evaluates the decision making process, looking at seven interdisciplinary factors.

1.4 Method & Material

This research makes use of oral historic interviews. Generally, secondary literature alone lacks important information and oral history interviews are able to preserve important insights - like background and personal information - that would otherwise not be captured (Everett, 1992). The interviewee is asked to reflect upon specific events or periods in the past, making this method somewhat more detailed and explicit in force (Bryman, 2004). However, it is important to keep epistemological and ontological issues in mind. The main problem with this method is the possibility of bias introduced by loss of memory or blackouts (Grele, 1998). It could also be argued that the presence of the interviewer, will have an impact on the interviewee. The fact that the interviewee knows that he or she is being observed, may make him or her behave less naturally (Bryman, 2004). Interviewees may also be unwilling to honestly discuss mistakes or errors (Everett, 1992). However, these biases may themselves constitute important data for the interviewer's consideration. It is of extreme importance for the interviewer to examine and weigh all evidence and use sources carefully in the preparation of historic interviews (Everett, 1992).

For the recruitment of respondents I used contacts from my internship with the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. I asked for policymakers who had worked there on the topic of migration education since 1970s/1980s, because then I would know for certain

¹⁰ Minority language and culture teaching / Onderwijs eigen taal en cultuur (OETC in Dutch) policy focused on the important place of the own language and culture of the migrants within the school system

they had experienced a shift in migration education policies. Eventually I found five policymakers through snowball sampling (table 1: respondents). The interviews were conducted from March until April 2016. All took one hour and were recorded and typed afterwards. Eventually I decided to cluster the output of the interviews on three policies that the Dutch government used to address educational disadvantages. These policies have changed over time. In the analyses (Chapter 3,4 and 5), I will address the changes within the OETC-regulation (Chapter 3), the developments within the system of weighted funding , compensation programmes and VVE programmes (Chapter 4) and the shift in the education policy towards the asylum seekers nowadays (Chapter 5).

Table 1: Respondents

Name	Working at the Ministry of Education, Culture & Science since	Function concerning migration education
Cees Buis	1978	Senior policy advisor: department of primary education
Harry Swarts	1995	Programme manager (since October 2015): department of primary education. Works on education programmes concerning the influx of current asylum seekers
Fons Dingelstad	1984	Director of the direction primary education
Carla de Koning	2002	Policy advisor: department of primary education. Has worked on the weight funding programmes, compensation programmes and early school education.
Monique Göbbels	2001	Senior policy advisor: department of primary education. Currently account manager for schools, municipalities and gives information on the funding-system (concerning education for asylum seekers).

Chapter 2: Background information

This chapter gives an overview of Dutch migration education policies from 1970 – 2016 and also address the seven factors identified that are able to change policies: international rules and regulations, changes in migration, political landscape, path dependency, research and reports, geopolitics and reciprocity and costs and benefits.

The 1945s – 1960s: influx of Dutch East Indian people

The first important migration flow occurred in 1945, when the Dutch East Indies became independent. Between 1946 and 1958, 400,000 Dutch Indian people came to the Netherlands. They were seen as repatriates, even though two thirds were not even born in the Netherlands. The Dutch language was not new to them, and these people were familiar with the Dutch history, culture and education systems (Obdeijn & Schrover, 2008). First, the Dutch government believed that their migration was temporary, and therefore the children got education in separate classes until 1951. However, from 1951 onwards, the children from Dutch Indian families had to adapt to the Dutch education system, there were no separate education systems for them anymore (Lucassen & Köbben, 1992).

In 1948, the United Nations established the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (The United Nations, 1948) and Article 26 states: ‘Everyone has the right to education’. In 1950, the Netherlands also ratified the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR, 1950). Article 2 of Protocol 1 states that people all have access to education and that people are free to choose a stream of education including religious or private education.

The 1960s-1970s: the return idea

The second important migration flow occurred during the '60s and '70s. War reconstruction had led to labour shortages in various sectors and the Netherlands were looking for cheap labour forces. Recruitment agreements were set up with Italy (1949), Spain (1961), Greece (1962), Portugal (1963), Turkey (1964) and Morocco (1969) and between 1964 and 1966 65,000 mainly male guest workers arrived in the Netherlands (Obdeijn & Schrover, 2008). The Dutch government assumed that all immigrants would return home once work was accomplished and therefore funded and stimulated cultural activities and initiatives to foster the cultural identity and maintain the ties with the country of origin (Bouras, 2012). There were only a few guest workers children' during this time. The Ministry of Education did not want to facilitate special migration education systems, and therefore most foreign children

kept going to regular Dutch education systems (Lucassen & Köbben, 1992). During the 1960s Spanish and Italian embassies and migrants set up schools to educate their children in their own language and culture (Spanish or Italian) on Wednesday afternoons and Saturday mornings (Bouras, 2012). The Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work¹¹ started financing these education systems of immigrant children from 1970s onwards. Migrant education was now taught during regular school hours. For a long time the Ministry of Education and Sciences dissociated herself from the minority language and culture teaching – policy (OETC called in Dutch). In 1972, the Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of CRM and Ministry of Education and Sciences founded an interdepartmental committee to develop a clear vision for the OETC policy together. The Ministry of CRM was the most important advocate of migrant education during that time. The Ministry of Education did not facilitate or finance these initiatives, because the civil servants worried that bicultural education would lead to ghetto formation and educational deficits (Bouras, 2012). Eventually a compromise was reached by the Ministries and they decided to offer migrant education only for the children of those guest workers expected to return to their home countries. The children that were expected to stay in the Netherlands, had to integrate into the Dutch education system. In the beginning these classes were small because there were not that many guest workers' children yet (Bouras, 2012). In 1973 the oil crisis broke out and the unemployment rate increased sharply and workers lost their jobs. Consequently foreign labour recruitment stopped in 1973. However, the number of guest workers continued to rise as a result of the introduction of family reunification (1974). Many women and children arrived in the Netherlands and this caused pressure on facilities like housing, health and education issues. Especially with regard to education facilities many problems arose. Eventually the Ministry of Education and Sciences started realizing, it was important to facilitate education for the Moroccan and Turkish children in the 'own language and culture', because whenever the guest workers would go back, they would still be able to speak their own language and know their culture. In 1974 the Ministry officially put in place the so called 'OETC-regulation' and from now on it was possible to follow this lessons during regular school hours. The interdepartmental committee promised to pay extra attention to the content of bi-cultural education and also promised to facilitate more educational material and qualified teachers (Bouras, 2012). The OETC-regulation was mainly focused on the Turkish and Moroccan migrant children (Driessen, Jungbluth & Louvenberg, 1987). Policymakers still hoped the

¹¹ Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work / Ministerie van Cultuur, Recreatie & Maatschappelijk werk (Ministry CRM)

migrants would return and re-migrate to their home country (Cushner, 1998). There was also an influx of Surinam people during this time. After Suriname became independent in 1975, 140,000 Surinam people came to the Netherlands. However, the Dutch language was not new to them, and therefore the Dutch government did not facilitate extra educational facilities. Surinamese and Antillean children were not entitled to OETC (Driessen, Jungbluth & Louvenberg, 1987).

It is interesting to note that during this time, international organizations, like Council of Europe, UNESCO and government representatives from Turkey and Morocco were important because they started to put emphasis on maintaining ‘own cultural identity’ (Lucassen & Köbben, 1992). In 1976, the Council of Europe published a recommendation on the education and cultural development of migrants (Council of Europe, 1976). They argued that member states should provide immigrant children with education in their own language and culture.

The 1980s: minority policy

In the 1980s the Netherlands was suffering from an economic crisis. Academic literature has shown that such a crisis can lead to policy reforms (Castles- 2004; Alink- 2006). The Dutch government had to cut the budget and mid 1980s the government decided that subsidies for migrant organizations would be reduced (Bouras- 2012; Schrover- 2010). However, migrants from principally Turkey and Morocco were seen as more problematic and therefore more in need of support than others (Schrover, 2010). In practice this meant that Turks and Moroccans could still count on the subsidies from the government for organizing cultural activities (Bouras, 2012). In 1979, the WRR published a report about the government policy on ethnic minorities (WRR, 1979). In this report the WRR stated that the government policy on ethnic minorities had traditionally been based on the temporary nature of their residence in the Netherlands. However the WRR argues, that this temporariness is a fiction, and they recommend a policy aimed at securing equal participation in Dutch society for ethnic minorities (WRR, 1979).

Pais (VVD), Dutch Minister of Education between 1977 and 1981, sustained focus on the importance of the ‘own language and culture’ of cultural minorities in the Dutch educational system. However, the policy objective changed, in the knowledge that the migrants would stay in the Netherlands. The OETC policy objective changed from ‘encouraging re-migration’ to ‘encouraging integration’. Pais’s successor, Minister Van Kemenade (PvdA Minister of Education and Science from 1981 – 1982) was reluctant about

the OETC-policy, which focused on the importance of safeguarding the cultural identity of migrants, and argued that this would retard the integration process. After the cabinet's fall in 1982, Van Kemenade did not return to his post, so criticism on the OETC policy silenced. Leijenhorst (CDA State Secretary of Education from 1982 – 1986) succeeded and eventually ensured the legal basis for the 'OETC-regulation' (1982) (Lucassen & Köbben, 1992). The OETC-regulation was implemented to promote a positive self-image, decrease the gap between home and school and contribute to intercultural education. Maintaining the migrants' own culture was thus seen as more important than possible educational deficits in the school careers of migrant children (Bouras, 2012). There were some important bottlenecks, however, concerning the implementation of the OETC-regulation. There was a huge shortage of qualified teachers and learning materials. Therefore the Ministry of Education and Sciences started to recruit suitable candidates from Morocco itself. In 1983 an important but contested cultural convention was signed with Morocco (Wet- en regelgeving, 1983). There were a lot of critical voices amongst political parties about the purpose of this cultural convention and especially about the influence the Moroccan government would have, concerning the recruitment of Moroccan teachers. In 1982, Herman Obdeijn was appointed as educational attaché in Rabat (Bouras, 2012). He was responsible for the recruitment of Moroccan teachers. However, this was very hard in practice. First of all, the Moroccan government was suspicious and was concerned that the Dutch government would 'indoctrinate' the Moroccan children. And secondly, the larger cities in the Netherlands did not want to cooperate with Herman Obdeijn because they wanted to do the recruiting themselves.

The OETC-regulation eventually received legal basis in Augustus 1985. In practice, the OETC-regulation did not work as intended. Teachers were running from one school to another, there were too many pupils and classes were taught in Arabic. This was problematic because most children only spoke the Berber language. Even though there were a lot of critical voices, it was difficult to eliminate the policy after it had been introduced (Bouras, 2012). Ginjaar-Maas (VVD State Secretary Education and Science 1986 – 1989) kept focusing on the importance of the OETC-regulation. Wallage (PvdA State Secretary Education and Sciences 1989 – 1994) did the same, he argued that it was important to keep focusing on the 'own language and culture' (Lucassen & Köbben, 1992). It is worth mentioning that in 1989, the United Nations established the Convention on the rights of the Child (The United Nations, 1989), stating that each child has the right to education and that primary education should be free. The Netherlands ratified this convention in 1995 and now has to report on their education policy to the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the

Child (United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, 2016) every five years.

The Dutch government put high value on equality, especially on not allowing groups to lag behind. For many years the Dutch government had primarily been concerned about Dutch students whose parents had limited schooling and income. However, with the influx of immigrants in the Netherlands in the 1960s and 1970s the concern expanded, to include the children of immigrants (Ladd & Fiske, 2010). In 1973, Minister Van Kemenade (PvdA, Minister Education and Science from 1973 – 1977) implemented the first stimulation-regulations, which ensured that schools with children from guest workers' families got extra funding for those children that had indicated a return to their home country (Vink, 2008). Minister Wim Deetman (CDA, Minister of Education and Science from 1982 – 1989) had to cut budgets during his term and therefore decided to tighten the system of weighted funding (Vink, 2008). In 1985 the government decided to address educational disadvantages with two major categories of students that deserved additional weights and therefore received extra money: Dutch parents (0.25) and immigrant parents (0.9) with low levels of education (Ladd & Fiske, 2010). It was the first time that the weight for ethnicity was used in the system (Vink, 2008). This approach remained unchanged from 1985 to 2006. The system of weighted funding has maintained consistently strong support from all major political parties over time (Ladd & Fiske, 2010). In 2006 a radical change led to a new weighted student funding-regulation: the ethnicity weight component got eliminated (Ladd & Fiske, 2010). During this time, the issue of migration became an increasingly important topic of public concern (Alink, Boin & 't Hart, 2001). The political parties therefore had to act in agreement with their voters in order to legitimize their actions. A centre-right government was elected and this provided an incentive to eliminate the 'immigrant component' in 2006 and put more emphasis on the educational disadvantages of native Dutch children (Ladd & Fiske, 2010). Even though studies found that an immigrant status - with statistical control for education level of parents- was highly predictive of student achievement, the immigrant component of the criterion was eliminated (Ladd & Fiske, 2010). The new weight-regulation was introduced in steps over a period of four year (Nieuwe gewichtenregeling basisonderwijs, 2013). Because of the change in student funding weights, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science decided that there would be a compensation regulation to limit negative 'redistribution effects'. This regulation was implemented in December 2006 (Kamerbrief drempel en compensatieregeling gewichtenregeling basisonderwijs, 2007).

The 1990s -2010s: assimilation policy

The third important immigration flow occurred during the 1990s, when in 1994 52,000 refugees from Yugoslavia, Iraq, Iran, Somalia, Eritrea and Ethiopia arrived in the Netherlands (Obdeijn & Schrover, 2008). From 1994 onwards, the immigration and integration debate got more attention in the Netherlands (Van der Brug, Fennema, van Heersen & de Lange, 2009). In 1995 the Ministry decided to abolish the OETC-policy and focus on the education in living ethnic language- policy (OALT called in Dutch). This policy only focused on the language component. However the language classes were now given outside the regular ‘school hours’. Tineke Netelenbos (PvdA) was Secretary of State of Education, Culture and Science during that time (between 1994 and 1999) (Lucassen & Köbben, 1992). She argued that it was necessary to facilitate this language classes outside the normal curriculum so that the migrant children would not miss any regular school hours. She also states that it was the duty of the Dutch government to offer migrant education and to take care for the Moroccan teachers (Bouras, 2012). In 2004 the Ministry stopped financing the OALT-regulation (Nationaal expertisecentrum leerplanontwikkeling, 2016).

In 1992 the Van Kemenade committee advised the government to strive for integration and participation of migrant students. In this report they also advocate an integrated ‘early school system’ (Ministry of Education and Science: Ceders in de Tuin, 1992). The Meijnen committee in 1994 argued in favour of a policy also focused on the early school system (Commissie (voor) schoolse educatie, 1994). Between 1995 and 1999 the government started with some experimental early childhood education pilots and meanwhile did research into the implementation and effectiveness of these programmes. There are some important scholars that advocate the implementation of early childhood education programmes. Especially considering early childhood interventions, several studies have identified long-term positive effects of early interventions, which are the most cost-effective childhood investments (Committee for Economic Development- 2002; Karoly, Greenwood, Everingham, Hoube, Kilburgn, Rudell et al.- 1998; Reynolds et al.- 2002). In 2000, the Dutch government had a budget surplus and were able to start financing these programmes (funding municipalities) (Wet- en regelgeving, 2000). In 2006, a small change occurred. The responsibilities of municipalities and school education boards changed: municipalities were responsible for the education of children until 4 years; the school education boards were responsible for the education from 4 years onwards. Nowadays, early childhood education is funded by the central government and distributed to the municipal authorities (preschool VVE) and school boards (VVE in primary education) (Eurydice National Unit, 2009). The nature of the VVE-

programs have varied over time, depending on the political landscape, with the progressive parties – D66, VVD, GroenLinks, PvdA- supporting a stronger role for the municipalities than the conservative parties – CDA, SGP and CU (Ladd & Fiske, 2010). Adelmund (PvdA) was Secretary of State from 1998 till 2002. After her many Secretaries of State followed: Anette Nijs (VVD 2002-2006), Bruno Bruins (VVD 2006-2007), Sharon Dijksma (PvdA 2007-2010), Marja van Bijsterveld (CDA) and Habbe Zijlstra (VVD 2010-2012).

The current situation

Currently, many Syrian, Eritrean and Afghan refugees arrive in the Netherlands. In 2015, 10,595 migrants under the age of 18 sought asylum (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek).

On the first of December 2015 Sander Dekker (VVD Secretary of State Education, Culture and Science since 2012) informed the Parliament about the financing structure of education for asylum seekers. He especially focuses on two points within the primary education system. First of all he states that schools at asylum centers will receive 9000 EURO per year per student. This is called the ‘customized financing’. Secondly he states that the municipalities can get funding for housing of schools.

The number of asylumseekers increased and therefore the government and municipalities had to make important agreements about housing, healthcare, jobs and education. On the 27th of November 2015 this important administrative agreement was signed (Bestuursakkoord verhoogde asielinstream, 2015). In April 2016, the government made further agreements about the actual implementation of these accords. They decided to focus on the implementation of ‘central transition- language classes¹²’ and the ‘customized financing’ as described above (Uitwerkingsakkoord verhoogde asielinstream, 2016).

¹² Central transition- and language classes (schakel- en taalklassen as called in Dutch): a programme for children who have just arrived in the Netherlands and do not speak the Dutch language. There have been various variants since 2006: 1. In fulltime transition classes pupils follow the whole education in separate classes 2. In parttime transition classes pupils get several hours of extra Dutch language classes in the week 3. In extended transition classes the pupils follow Dutch-education lessons outside regular school hours (Hoogeveen, 2014).

Chapter 3: Analysis 1

As discussed earlier in section on method, the analyses will be clustered on three policies that the Dutch government used to address educational disadvantages. This chapter takes a closer look at the interviews that have been conducted concerning the changes in the OETC-regulation. It will identify the seven factors that have been determined earlier according to scientific research (international rules and regulations, change in migration, political landscape, path dependency, research and reports, geopolitics and reciprocity, costs and benefits). Are all these factors important considering the shift in the policy from OETC to OALT to no specified policy? Two policymakers from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science have spoken about this policy shift: Cees Buis and Fons Dingelstad.

Identifying factors

Buis starts talking about the importance of the recruitment- and cultural agreements during the OETC-regulation. He argues that the Netherlands had agreements with those countries [Turkey, Morocco, Greece, Spain, Italy, Portugal] stating that the Dutch government should provide classes and that the Netherlands should also recruit teachers from those countries.

He continues talking about the meetings that were organized once a year on the subject of organizing the education systems. Remarkable is the way Buis talks about the agreement with Turkey. He argues that Turkey emphasized the importance of using Turkish textbooks with stories about Atatürk and the Turkish history and culture in the Dutch education systems. Turkey had an interest in ties to be maintained with the home country. Buis argues that the Dutch Ministry denied to facilitate these textbooks, because there is a law in the Netherlands allowing primary schools to choose which teaching materials they use. According to Buis, Turkish embassies nowadays still use international channels at times to lobby for some space for Turkish language and culture. He says: ‘I don’t know exactly which law it is, but there is some international law, stating that you should give space for people to let them learn their own language. We [the Netherlands] give them the space, they are able to do it, but we don’t pay for it anymore, and it is not possible to facilitate these lessons under school hours. Sometimes it kind of ‘pops up again’, then the Turkish embassy refers to this law again, even if it [OETC/OALT regulation] was abolished a long time ago’. Buis is referring to the ‘Convention for the protection of national minorities¹³’ which has also been ratified and

¹³ Convention for the protection of national minorities: According to this convention, the Netherlands ‘has to undertake to promote the conditions necessary for persons belonging to national minorities to maintain and develop their culture, and to preserve the essential elements of their identity, namely their religion, language, traditions and cultural heritage’ (article 5.1) and ‘undertake to recognize that every person belonging to a

entered force in 2005 by the Netherlands (Wet- en regelgeving, convention for the protection of national minorities, 2005). It could be argued that international rules and regulations were important during this period, but not decisive concerning a certain policy shift.

Buis and Dingelstad also address the importance of changing migration flows, however it is important to be critical about this statements because it may be influenced by the fact that this is exactly what is stated as a factor in the literature. They indicate, in line with literature, that the Dutch government failed to see migration as a social process (Castless-2004; Lucassen & Köbben-1992). They argue that the Dutch government thought that the guest workers would stay for a limited period and then would return to their home country. Eventually this did not happen and many migrant children arrived in the Netherlands. Especially notable is the statement Buis makes about the time refugees came to the Netherlands during the 1990s. He argues: ‘Lubbers (CDA, Prime Minister from 1982 – 1994) was prime minister during that time. Many children refugees were coming to the Netherlands, but the Dutch Inspectorate of Education decided that all these children got exemption from compulsory education’. During that time Buis was called by a lawyer of one of the refugee families. The lawyer told him that they [the Ministry] were obliged to facilitate education for those children according to the Dutch ‘leerplichtwet¹⁴’. At the time this was not happening yet. He started talking about it within the Ministry and the Secretary of State eventually decided that all the children should receive education.

Both Buis and Dingelstad agree that the political landscape had an important impact on the decision making process during this time. Buis states that politics was the main reason that the whole policy [OETC and OALT] eventually was abolished. This is a remarkable statement, because it emphasizes the important and decisive role of politics. Dingelstad argues likewise that politicians had a high amount of influence during that time. Dingelstad also states that there was a strong debate concerning immigrants during this period. ‘There was Janmaat¹⁵ during this period. Janmaat saw the strong influx of immigrants as a financial problem’. Dingelstad also addresses the importance of Ministers and State Secretaries on the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. He argues there had only been PvdA State Secretaries for almost 12 years. It could be argued that the political actors thus became

national minority has the right to learn his or her minority language’ (article 14.1). However, this convention does not state that the Netherlands is obligated to pay for this education.

¹⁴ Compulsory education law/ Leerplichtwet (called in Dutch): compulsory education in the Netherlands starts at the age of five in the Netherlands. It ends for pupils aged eighteen or when they get a diploma on VWO, HAVO or MBO level.

¹⁵ JanMaat: Dutch politician centre party (centrumpartij called in Dutch) and centre democrats (centrum democraten, CD called in Dutch) from 1982 till 1989

dominant actors during the 1990s. This is in line with what Bonjour (2009) argues in her work on family migration.

Both policymakers state that specifically during this period there was an enormous discussion between academic researchers. Buis argues: ‘At a certain moment we had the OALT-regulation, but there was a serious discussion about it between linguistics. Some researchers said: you first have to learn your own language, before you can learn another language. If a child knows the Turkish language well, it can easily switch to another language. But other researchers stated: no, that is not the case. It is better to immerse (onderdompelen as called in Dutch) the children into the Dutch language from an early age’. Buis also states that Guus Extra, a researcher from the University of Tilburg, lobbied many times at the Ministry, sometimes in person, sometimes by sending a report. He was a strong defender of bilingualism. ‘In the beginning we really used this research to support our policy. However, eventually politics decided to do it another way’. Here Buis makes an interesting point. It is in line with literature (Almeida & Bascolo, 2006) arguing that researchers are able to change the terms of the debate on a given issue. However, it was not known before that Guus Extra actually lobbied at the Ministry. Buis also points at the importance of the OESO (OECD in English). Dingelstad argues likewise that research has played a role, emphasizing the permanent flow of research literature and reports from the Dutch Inspectorate of Education, the Education Council and the Educational Research Institute: Stichting voor Onderzoek van het Onderwijs¹⁶. It is interesting to mention that policymakers often refer to governmental research institutes like OESO, Dutch Inspectorate of Education, Education Council of the Netherlands and Stichting voor Onderzoek van het Onderwijs. This is in line with Lucassen & Köbber (1992), who argue that the Ministry did not actively carry out research herself. None of the policymakers referred to the importance of NGOs or other independent organizations.

Buis states the Dutch education system is not really comparable with other educational systems, which makes it very hard to compare policies with other countries. He argues that in other countries, for example, recruitment and selection of teachers was done by Turkey. In the Netherlands, however, the Dutch schoolboards did it themselves. Dingelstad argues likewise, that the Netherlands did not really look closely at the way other countries formulated their policies.

Buis argues that the Netherlands did not actively look at cost/benefit analyses during this period. He states that the Dutch education system has an open-ended financing structure.

¹⁶ Stichting voor Onderzoek van het Onderwijs: Dutch educational research institute which was responsible for the funding of research relating to education in the Netherlands until 1996

The more children arrive, the more money is needed and used and the Ministry is obliged to facilitate education. Some countries, like Morocco and Turkey, felt a strong need for 'maintaining ties', imperative, in their view, to maintain the economic situation in the home country. By maintaining these ties, the guest workers which were working in the Netherlands during that time, would still send money to their home countries. It could be argued that cost/benefit analyses were not important during this period. This is contrary to what Mishan & Quah (2007) argue, that cost/benefit analyses is fundamental to government decision-making.

Dingelstad does make an important argument concerning international rules and regulations. 'In the Netherlands we have a special situation, because we have compulsory education by law for all children, living in the Netherlands. Even if you are staying in the Netherlands illegally it is compulsory for you to attend and get education. This is implemented in the Dutch education system. We never had trouble concerning international rules and regulations'. Buis also talks about this important Dutch education law. 'The Dutch education law states that everybody who stays within the Netherlands is obliged to go to school'. The policymakers do not specifically address the importance of international rules and regulations, they specifically emphasize the importance of the Dutch law-system (Wet- en regelgeving, leerplichtwet 1968). This is in line with what Cortell & David (2002) state, that specific international norms with domestic legitimacy were able to change domestic policies in the past: in this case the implementation of the 'leerplichtwet' in 1968.

Chapter 4: Analysis 2

This chapter focuses on the factors that influence a shift in the system of weighted funding, compensation programmes and early childhood education. Three policymakers have talked about this shift: Cees Buis, Fons Dingelstad and Carla de Koning.

Identifying factors

System of weighted funding. Buis takes a closer look at the system of weighted funding and argues that international rules and regulations were used to show that the Netherlands acted according to these rules. Buis argues that those rules and regulations did not play a key role in changing a certain policy. However, according to Buis research and politics did play an important role during this period, especially concerning the changes within the system of weighted funding. During the interview he states that the factors within the system of weighted funding were differentiated in this way, because Van Kemenade (PvdA, Minister Education and Science from 1973 – 1977) was Minister during that time. Van Kemenade warmly supported the idea of Prof. Dr. Van Heek¹⁷ to support equal education opportunities policies because he emphasizes that each child would have the right to have the same chances in life. Buis makes some interesting arguments concerning path dependency. He argues that policies to address educational disadvantages were first mainly focused on Dutch children of working-class parents. He states: ‘Early 1980s, there was a big migration flow, and eventually the policies to address educational disadvantages of Dutch children were applied to these minorities who also had educational disadvantages’. Buis also talks about the importance of research done by the Stichting voor Onderzoek van het Onderwijs. There were experiments where certain schools got extra funding. Those experiments were in Rotterdam, Groningen and Amsterdam. The Stichting voor Onderzoek van het Onderwijs did research to find out if those children benefited from extra education. Later the Ministry used these minor experiments for their policy, and called them the compensation programmes. De Koning argues that path dependency is not an important factor. She argues: ‘In my experience, that is not the case, because when new politicians arrive, there will be a new government. Governments change regularly and new governments want to head in another direction, they have other ambitions’. However she argues that the changing of system of weighted funding was a big operation and that, if the previous government had not completed it, the new government probably would have done so. This is in line with the argument Ladd & Fiske

¹⁷ Van Heek: important researcher who argued that there was a strong relationship between education and the future social position

(2010) make, that the system of weighted student funding has maintained consistently strong support, from all the major political parties over time.

In 2006, the factor ethnicity got eliminated. De Koning argues that there was a strong political reason for this. But she also mentions the importance of the shared feeling within society at the time that it was not proper to use the factor ethnicity as an allocation criterion. This is an interesting argument, which is in line with what literature states on the importance of public opinion during that time (Alink, Boin & 'tHart, 2001). Buis also emphasizes the importance of public opinion. He argues: 'This was the time with Pim Fortuin, and it seemed that allocating extra money to immigrants was taboo. Immigrants had to integrate and it was not proper to use extra money for this'. De Koning also focuses on the importance of research concerning the change within the system of weighted funding. 'Research showed that the education background of the parents was the most important, most reliable criterion to relocate the money'. Dingelstad argues likewise that a high percentage of scientific research showed that the education background of the parents was the most important factor in indicating educational disadvantages. This is interesting, because Ladd & Fiske (2010) stated in their article that there were also studies that showed that immigrant status was still highly predictive of student achievement. Dingelstad and De Koning did not mention this during the interview. De Koning also talked about research done by Prof. Dr. Roel Bosker¹⁸, commissioned by the government to investigate the importance of the ethnicity factor. Lastly De Koning emphasizes the importance of the report of the Court of Audit¹⁹, which was very critical about the actual accomplishment of the regulation. The Court questioned whether the money allocated by this regulation would effectively be used for the child that deserved this extra money. The funding is allocated on individual level, however it ultimately ends up being used for the whole school, like for the implementation of smaller classes. According to De Koning the elimination of the ethnicity factor was not caused by cuts in the budget. She states: 'It was already clear in advance that we wanted to preserve the money, even when the educational background level of parents would rise – and thus less money needed - it was clear that we did not want to lose the money. The redefinition of the policy was purely done to determine which factors were most essential for allocating the funding'. It is worthwhile

¹⁸ Prof. Dr. Roel Bosker: Researcher in the field on Education and Educational Research. Roel Bosker's research focuses on evidence based education, inequality of educational opportunities, educational evaluation, and multilevel modeling.

¹⁹ Court of Audit (Rekenkamer called in Dutch): The Court of Audit checks that the government spends public funds and conducts policy as intended. (Algemene rekenkamer, 2001)

mentioning that costs and benefits were not important factors, especially during this change in policy.

Compensation programmes. De Koning continues talking about the compensation programmes and makes some notable statements, which have not been identified by the literature yet. ‘By implementing this new system of weighted funding the money was redistributed and there were redistribution-effects; some municipalities got more money and others less. The change in this regulation meant a lot for the big four municipalities and they demonstrated’. Buis argues likewise that the big four municipalities were actively lobbying during this time to get some extra money to minimize the redistribution-effects. De Koning argues that eventually politics decided to implement a compensation regulation to minimize the redistribution-effects for the big four municipalities. The new regulation was gradually implemented over a certain period of time. It is interesting to note that the bottom-up factor got identified here, and that this factor was very important during this period.

Early childhood education programmes. In 2000, the Dutch government started financing early childhood education programmes. All three policymakers emphasize the importance of cost/benefit analyses during this time. Buis emphasizes the importance of American research which found that it was financially beneficial to invest in early education programmes. De Koning also emphasizes the importance of Heckman’s research, stressing the important financial benefits. Dingelstad also emphasizes the importance of scholarly work that focuses on the importance of being able to learn the Dutch language from an early age. However, he also addresses the fact that there are some academic scholars who do not argue in favour of this early childhood education policy. He states: ‘Literature is mixed and contradictory about the efficiency of those early education programmes. Prof. dr. Fukkink²⁰ wrote a report, arguing that these policies do not lead to any improvements. However, other research argues that these programmes are able to make a difference once you organize them well’. De Koning makes a similar argument about the mixed literature. She argues that it is very hard to draw conclusions, because there are so many other factors – peer group, parents, living environment - that have an impact on the educational outcome. De Koning also states the importance of international rankings like PISA to be able to compare the Netherlands with other international countries. Dingelstad also stresses the importance of PISA and OESO international rankings.

²⁰ Prof. dr. Fukkink: Prof. dr. Fukkink is appointed Professor by Special Appointment of Childcare and Education Services for Young Children at the University of Amsterdam. Ruben Fukkink’s research area is childcare, ranging from daycare to out-of-school care, and from pre-school to early primary education.

Chapter 5: Analysis 3

Currently a shift is happening in the education policy with regard to asylum seekers. This chapter will try to identify the factors that will have an impact on the shift in this policy. Some policies have not been formulated yet. There are probably going to be two shifts within the education policy: the 9000EUR regulation and the implementation of international transition- and language classes. Four policymakers have talked about this policy shift: Cees Buis, Harry Swarts, Fons Dingelstad and Monique Göbbels.

Identifying factors

The situational factor is very important, because the policymakers have to adjust their policies towards this new situation – the sudden increase of asylum seekers' children, who need education. Two years ago Buis worked on the topic education for refugee children, all by himself. This is no longer feasible, due to the high numbers of migrant children coming to the Netherlands. Buis states: 'When I came back from my holiday in September, the Secretary General decided that there was to be a fixed structure and coordinated approach for this topic. We are now working on this topic with ten people (programme migration education asylumseekers). There is a project director, project manager, five policymakers and many account managers'. The account managers are appointed and travel through the Netherlands, have conversations with municipalities to make an inventory of possible issues and bottlenecks. Buis states that this new policy is very pro-active. He argues: 'In the past we only went into the field when there were serious problems'. Swarts confirms this and states there is a lot of attention for the asylum influx nowadays. He adds: 'In 2014 the number of asylum seekers doubled. In 2014: 2800 children, in 2015: 12500 children, so we had to facilitate a coordinated approach. We also started with the so-called account management to be able to determine the specific problems and bottlenecks: the system of funding, the employment of new personnel and the housing for primary education did not work well'. He argues: 'So that is how an issue can pop up again after fifteen years. It is interesting how a certain incident, can function as a kind of trigger, and how people then try to change certain rules and regulations'.

It is interesting to note that also the bottom-up factor is very important during this period. Dingelstad argues: 'Efficiency thinking is very important nowadays because schools are being assessed and judged on their achievements. Currently, these schools are demonstrating, because the influx of migrant children will reduce their achievements. Therefore the Dutch government has an important task in coordinating for example transition-

and language classes'. Buis and Swarts both mention the importance of the account managers in the field, the PO-raad²¹, VO-raad²², COA²³, LOWAN²⁴, VNG²⁵ and spokesmen of primary schools. These organizations are able to gather important information in the field which is important for the decision making process within the Ministry. Göbbels talks about the implementation of the 9000EUR regulation. She states that she has meetings with primary schools to discuss the amount of money they need to be able to educate those migrant children. She also emphasizes the importance of PO-raad, VO-raad and COA meetings. It could be argued that the Ministry is now in contact with many stakeholders in order to make a good policy.

During the interviews Swarts and Göbbels address the importance of international rules and regulations. Swarts emphasizes the importance of international law because it obliges the Dutch government to facilitate education within three months. Göbbels makes a similar argument, stating that the Netherlands has to facilitate education within three months even when children are staying in the Netherlands illegally. Buis and Göbbels talk about the impact of the sudden increase in the number of migrants – so the change in migration factor - at this time. Buis argues that the current policy is not changing but that it gets intensified. Göbbels states that it is possible that the education policy is going to change, thereby addressing the importance of the Syrian and Arabic language. She states: 'this language is so different from Dutch that we need another way of educating these people'.

Swarts and Göbbels both view the current political landscape as important. Swarts argues that it is a very complex political story: 'On the one hand, the government has to facilitate housing for all those people, but on the other hand, there is no need for the Netherlands to become overly attractive for migrants. And then there is the political resistance on the local level of course'. According to Swarts, the idea about the implementation of language- and transition classes did not come from the political parties. He states: 'This is an idea from within the Ministry, concerning the education for asylum seekers. We [programme group migration education asylumseekers] have had many conversations with several parties and eventually this idea was created. This is an interesting and new argument, because it emphasizes the influential role of civil servants nowadays on the topic of migration education.

²¹ PO-raad: council that represents the interests of primary-, special- and secondary education

²² VO-raad: sector organization for secondary education

²³ COA: responsible for the reception, supervision and departure (from the reception location) of asylum seekers coming to the Netherlands

²⁴ LOWAN: organization that supports schools that provide the 'first reception education' for asylum seekers in primary- and secondary education

²⁵ VNG: advocate of all municipalities in the Netherlands

Swarts states that the political parties will probably agree with this idea. ‘The organization of the central language classes is already mentioned in the agreement. However, we have to make clear that the asylum children should also follow education at local schools to encourage the integration process. Otherwise political parties will not agree with this policy.’ He also talks about the importance of the Minister and Secretary of State. ‘Our Secretary of State (VVD) argues in favour of simple care, however he has one important mantra: no child ever asked to be in this situation’. Similarly, Göbbels argues that the Secretary of State feels it is very important to facilitate proper education for the asylum-children. Göbbels also mentions the importance of public opinion and politics during this time.

Dingelstad makes a very important argument concerning path dependency: ‘We never had a distinct policy concerning asylum seekers. So it could be argued that it is special that with the huge influx of Syrian refugees, a discussion is now going on, whether we are able to handle this influx’. This is a remarkable statement, because academic literature has shown that there were policies concerning migration education. Dingelstad continues talking about the secondary education system in the Netherlands that already has central transition- and language classes and argues that now- the question is raised if the Ministry also needs these classes in the primary education system. Göbbels makes a similar argument concerning path dependency. She states that the Ministry is now taking a closer look how the current education policy should be changed and improved.

Swarts addresses the importance of the reports by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education and the contact with Mrs. Le Pichon²⁶ who argues in favor of central transition- and language classes. Mrs. Le Pichon did some important research on language education and found that the best way to facilitate education for this children, is in central language classes. Göbbels also stresses the importance of the reports from the Dutch Inspectorate of Education which is partly based on the work of Mrs. Le Pichon.

Swarts states that the Netherlands is also looking at how other countries facilitate their migration education policies. ‘Soon we will be travelling to Germany, where they have big asylum seekers centres. I am very curious how they organize their education over there’. Göbbels agrees: ‘Knowledge exchange is a regular phenomenon. Yesterday, for example, we had a European Agency meeting concerning special needs and exclusive education. This is

²⁶ Mrs. Le Pichon: currently assistant professor at the Department of Languages, Literature and Communication and researcher at the Utrecht Institute of Linguistics. She has been involved in the management of various initiatives to promote the integration of multilingual children into the regular school system.

one of the European networks that we use to exchange knowledge on certain topics. We will also pay a visit to North-West-Flanders, because they have many asylum seekers centres’.

Swarts argues that currently the costs are rising, due to the sudden increase of asylum seekers. ‘We will just pay for everything, related to the increasing amount of migrant children. However, we are currently not able to determine new, content related policies, if this will cost a lot of money’. Göbbels also emphasizes the importance of acting within budgetary framework of the Ministry of Finance. ‘We have to look what is possible, because there is no extra money; the money has to come from within the budgetary framework. Göbbels also mentions the importance of the economic situation in the Netherlands. ‘Whenever there are fewer jobs in the Netherlands, whenever the situation is getting worse, this will provoke certain sentiments among the Dutch population. Then it will be difficult to put this issue on the agenda’. It is obvious that costs and benefits, and the economic situation in the Netherlands are an important factor especially during this change in policy.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The main goal of this thesis was to give an overview of the factors that influenced the Dutch migration education policy response from the 1970s till 2016. The main sources for this thesis were five oral interviews, which were conducted in the Netherlands between March and April 2016. In my theoretical framework I have identified seven factors that can influence or even change existing policies: international rules and regulations, changes in migration, political landscape, path dependency, research and reports, geopolitics and reciprocity and costs and benefits. During the interviews two extra factors got identified: the bottom-up and situational factor. Overall, it can be concluded that all these factors did play an important role in the development of migration education policies from 1970 till 2016. It is possible to draw a number of conclusions on the impact of the factors over time.

The first analysis took a closer look at the shift in policy from OETC to OALT to no specified policy. The results of my interviews make it clear that the political landscape was the most important factor that caused changes in this policies. Also (governmental) research and reports had an important impact on the decision-making process during this time. It is worth mentioning that Guus Extra lobbied at the Ministry many times, sometimes in person, sometimes by sending a report. It is also interesting that it was argued that nowadays the Turkish embassies still use international channels to lobby for some space for the Turkish language and culture. It could be argued that international rules and regulations were important during this period, but not decisive concerning a certain policy shift. Costs and benefits were not an important factor either during this time, because the government maintained an open-ended financing structure. During this shift in policy, the Netherlands did not take a look at the way other countries created their policies. It was very hard to determine if the path dependency factor had an impact during this time. The policymakers addressed the importance of changing migration flows, although as argued before, this may be influenced by what is stated in the literature.

The second analysis focused on the factors that influenced a shift in the system of weighted funding, compensation programmes and early childhood education. The path dependency component was the most prominent factor that caused a change in the system of weighted funding. First the policies to address educational disadvantages were mainly focused on Dutch children of working-class parents, later on these policies were applied to minorities who also had educational disadvantages. The political landscape factor and research and reports factor were the most important factors in causing a change in the system

of weighted funding, when the ethnicity factor was eliminated in 2006. Especially public opinion became important during this time and therefore the political parties had to act in agreement with their voters in order to legitimize their actions. The elimination of the ethnicity factor was not caused by costs and benefits analyses. However, it could be argued that the implementation of the compensation programmes was mainly caused by the bottom-up factor. The big four municipalities did not agree with the new weight system, because they would not be able to spend the same amount of money anymore. They actively lobbied at the Ministry. The early childhood education programmes were eventually implemented because research and reports stressed financial benefits of these programmes. International rules and regulations were used to show that the Netherlands acted according to these rules in this period. The policymakers did not address the changes in migration as an important factor during this time. However, they do emphasize the importance of the PISA and OESO to compare the Netherlands with other international countries.

The last analysis focused on the factors that (will) influence a shift in the current migrant education policy. It was clear that all the factors have had an impact on the change in policy, the bottom-up factor and situational factor being the most prominent ones. The Ministry has to react to the situation adequately – more children migrants are coming to the Netherlands – and therefore new policies have to be made. It is interesting to note that the Ministry is now in contact with many stakeholders. However, during the interviews the policymakers also addressed the importance of the political landscape and the influential role of civil servants, the path dependency, geopolitics and reciprocity, costs and benefits and research and reports. International rules and regulations are also important because they oblige the Dutch government to facilitate education within three months.

In a wider perspective, this work gives us some important insights. The analysis revealed that nowadays more factors and actors have an impact on the formulation and change of migration education policies in relation to earlier education policies. The world is becoming more complex and therefore it is necessary to seek explanations from different areas of studies: history, psychology, sociology, international relations, political science and public administration. This research has tried to add to existing literature on migration education by offering an insight into the main factors and actors that have changed the migration education policy over time [1970 – 2016]. Furthermore, my research confirms the outcome of previous research to a certain extent, but adds to the literature by emphasizing the importance of other interdisciplinary factors in the policy making process.

Bibliography

Adviescommissie Onderzoek Culturele Minderheden – ACOM (1979). *Advies onderzoek minderheden*. Den Haag: SDU.

Adviescommissie Onderzoek Culturele Minderheden – ACOM (1982). *De positie van jeugdige allochtonen in het onderwijs en op de arbeidsmarkt*. Den Haag: SDU.

Algemene Rekenkamer (2001). *Bestrijding onderwijsachterstanden*. Den Haag: Algemene Rekenkamer.

Alink, F.B. (2006). *Crisis als kans? Over de relatie tussen crises en hervormingen in het vreemdelingenbeleid van Nederland en Duitsland*. Amsterdam: Vossiuspers UvA & Amsterdam University Press.

Alink, F., Boin, A., & ‘ Hart, P. (2001). Institutional crises and reforms in policy sectors: The case of asylum policy in Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 8(2), 286 – 306.

Almeida, C., Bascolo, E. (2006). Use of research results in policy decision-making, formulation, and implementation: a review of the literature. *Cad Saude Publica*, 2, 7-19.

Bonjour, S.A. (2009). *Grens en gezin: beleidsvorming inzake gezinsmigratie in Nederland, 1955 – 2005*. Amsterdam: Aksant.

Bouras, N. (2012). *Het land van herkomst, perspectieven op verbondenheid met Marokko, 1960 – 2010*. Hilversum: Verloren.

Bebbington, A., & Hickey, S. (2008). *Can NGOs make a difference? The challenge of development alternatives*. London: Zed Books.

Bestuursakkoord verhoogde asielinstream. (27 November 2015). Retrieved from https://www.gemeentewestland.nl/fileadmin/files/Vluchtelingen_asielzoekers_en_statushouders/bestuursakkoord_15-0755638_.pdf

Bryman, A (2004). *Social Research methods*. Oxford: University Press.

Burstein, P., & Linton, A. (2002). The impact of political parties, interest groups and social movement organizations on public policy: Some recent evidence and theoretical concerns. *Social Forces*, 81(2), 381 – 408.

Castles, S. (2004). The factors that make and unmake migration policies. *The international migration review*, 38 (3), 852 – 884.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2016, February 17). Asielverzoeken; nationaliteit, geslacht en leeftijd. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=81478NED&D1=a&D2=0&D3=1&D4=0-2,10,12,15-16,19,29,35,37,1&D5=16,33,50,67,84,101,118,135,148-150,152-153&HDR=T,G4&STB=G1,G2,G3&VW=T>

Checkel, J.T. (2007). *International institutions and socialization in Europe*. Cambridge: University Press.

Cortell, A.P., & Davis, J.W. (1996). How do international institutions matter? The domestic impact of international rules and norms. *International studies quarterly*, 40, 451 – 478.

Cortell, A.P., & Davis, J.W. (2000). Understanding the domestic impact of international norms: A research agenda. *International Studies Review*, 2(1), 65 – 87.

Committee for economic development (2002). *Pre-school for all: Investing in a productive and just society*. New York: Research and Policy Committee.

Commissie Blok (2004). *Bruggen bouwen: Eindrapport van de tijdelijke parlementaire onderzoekscommissie integratiebeleid*. Den Haag: SDU.

Commissie (Voor)schoolse Educatie (1994). *Allochtone kleuters meer aandacht; advies in opdracht van de minister van WVC en de minister van OCW*. Rijswijk.

Council of Europe (1976). Resolution 786: On the education and cultural development of migrants. Retrieved from:

<https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=0900001680306f0b>

Cushner, K. (1998). *International perspectives on intercultural education*. Routledge: New York & London.

De Haas, H., & Natter, K. (2015). The determinants of migration policies: Does political orientation of governments matter? *DEMIG project paper*, No. 29.

Driessen, G. (1990). *De onderwijspositie van allochtone leerlingen. De rol van sociaal-economische en etnisch-culturele factoren, met speciale aandacht voor het Onderwijs in Eigen Taal en Cultuur*. Nijmegen: ITC.

Driessen, G. (2012). Combating ethnic educational disadvantage in the Netherlands. An analysis of policies and effects. In C. Kassimeris & M. Vyrionides. *The politics of education. Challenging multiculturalism* (pp. 31 – 51). New York: Routledge.

Driessen, G. (2013). *De bestrijding van onderwijsachterstanden: een review van opbrengsten en effectieve aanpakken*. ITS: Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.

Driessen, G.W.J.M., & van der Grinten, M.A. (1994). Home language proficiency in the Netherlands: The evaluation of Turkish and Moroccan bilingual programmes – a critical review. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 20, 365 – 386.

Driessen, G.W.J.M., Jungbluh, P., & Louvenberg, J. (1987). *Onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur, doelopvattingen, leerkrachten, leermiddelen en omvang*. Den Haag: SVO.

- European Convention on Human Rights (2016, February 17). Retrieved from: http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf.
- Eurydice National Unit (2009). *Early childhood education and care in Europe: Tackling social and cultural inequalities*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Everett, S.E. (1992). *Oral history: Techniques and Procedures*. Washington, DC: United States Center of Military History.
- Extra, G. & D. Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe. Demographic, Sociolinguistic and Educational Perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Extra, G. et al. (Eds.) (2002). *De Andere Talen van Nederland: Thuis en op School*. Bussum: Coutinho.
- Extra, G. & K. Yagmur (2004). *Urban Multilingualism in Europe: Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Feiten en Cijfers. Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland. Retrieved 20 February, 2016 from: <http://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/feiten-cijfers/cijfers/bescherming-nederland>
- Grele, R.J. (1998). Movement without aim: Methodological and theoretical problems in oral history. In R. Perks & A. Thomson (Eds.). *The oral history reader* (pp. 38 – 52). London: Routledge.
- Heckmann, F. (2008). *Education and migration: strategies for integrating migrant children in European schools and societies. A synthesis of research findings for policymakers*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Hoogeveen, K. (2014). Effectief instrument bestrijding taalachterstand: taal en nog meer taal in de schakelklas. *Sardes, november 2014*, 15 – 20.
- Kamerbrief over drempel en compensatieregeling gewichtenregeling basisonderwijs (18 januari 2007). Retrieved from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/binaries/rijksoverheid/documenten/kamerstukken/2007/01/19/drempel-en-compensatieregeling-gewichtenregeling-basisonderwijs/1410.pdf>
- Kamerbrief over onderwijs aan asielzoekers (26 oktober 2015). Retrieved from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/kamerstukken/2015/10/26/kamerbrief-over-onderwijs-aan-asielzoekers>
- Karoly, L.A., Greenwood, P.W., Everingham, S.M.S., Hoube, J., Kilburgn, M.R., Rudell, C.P., et al. (1998). *Investing in our children: What we know and don't know about the costs and benefits of early childhood interventions*. Washington DC: Rand.
- Krasner, S.D. (1999). *Sovereignty: organized hypocrisy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ladd, H.F., & Fiske, E.B. (2010) Weighted student funding in the Netherlands: a model for the US? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 30(3), 470 – 498.

Lucassen, L., Köbben, A.J.F. (1992). *Het partiele gelijk: controverses over het onderwijs in de eigen taal en cultuur en de rol daarbij van beleid en wetenschap (1951 – 1991)*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Ministry of Education and Science (1992). *Commissie Allochtone leerlingen in het onderwijs. Ceders in de tuin, naar een nieuwe opzet van het onderwijsbeleid voor allochtone leerlingen*. Den Haag: SDU.

Mishan, E.J., & Quah, E. (2007). *Cost-benefit analysis*. Routledge: London and New York.
Nationaal expertisecentrum leerplanontwikkeling. *OALT*. Retrieved 19 February 2016 from: <http://www.slo.nl/primair/leergebieden/ned/taalsite/lexicon/00208/>

Nieuwe gewichtenregeling basisonderwijs (2013) Retrieved from: http://www.vosabb.nl/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/CFI-brochure_gewichtenregeling.pdf

Nusche, D. (2009). What works in migrant education? A review of evidence and policy options, *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 22.

Obdeijn, H. & Schrover, M. (2008). *Komen en gaan: immigratie en emigratie in Nederland vanaf 1550*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.

Onderwijsinspectie (2014a). *De kwaliteit van het onderwijs aan nieuwkomers, type 1 en 2, 2013/2014*. Den Haag: SDU.

Onderwijsinspectie (2014b). *De kwaliteit van het onderwijs aan nieuwkomers, type 3, 2013/2014*. Den Haag: SDU.

Onderwijsraad (2001a) *Advies Samen naar de taalschool. Nieuwe moderne vreemde talen in perspectief*. Den Haag: Onderwijsraad.

Onderwijsraad (2001b). *Wat 't zwaarst weegt. Een nieuwe aanpak voor het onderwijsachterstandenbeleid*. Den Haag: Onderwijsraad.

Onderwijsraad (2001c). *De rugzak gewogen: Over de bekostiging van WSNS, LGF en de gewichtenregeling basisonderwijs*. Den Haag: Onderwijsraad.

Onderwijsraad (2002). *Over leerlinggewichten en schoolgewichten*. Den Haag: Onderwijsraad.

Onderwijsraad (2005a). *Bakens voor spreiding en integratie*. Den Haag: Onderwijsraad.

Onderwijsraad (2005b). *Met 't oog op onderwijsachterstanden*. Den Haag: Onderwijsraad.

O'Neill, M. (1996). *The politics of European integration. A reader*. London: Routledge.

Penn, H. (2009). *Early childhood education and care. Key lessons from research for policymakers*. Brussels: European Commission.

Penninx, R. (2013). *Research on migration and integration in Europe: achievements and lessons*. Vossiuspers: UvA.

Penninx, R., Garcés-Mascareñas, B., & Scholten, P. (2005). *Policymaking related to immigration and integration: a review of the literature of the Dutch case*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Peters, B.G. (1999). *Institutional theory in political science. The new institutionalism*. London: Pinter.

Reynolds, A.J., Temple, J.A., Robertson, D.L., & Mann, E.A. (2002). Age 21 cost-benefit analysis of the Title 1 Chicago Child-Parents centers. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 24, 267 – 303.

Sacramento, F.B. (2015). Migrant education and community inclusion: Examples of good practices. *Sirius network policy brief series*, No. 5.

Schrover, M. (2010). Pillarization, multiculturalism and cultural freezing. Dutch migration history and the enforcement of essentialist ideas. *Low Countries Historical Review*, 125 (2-3), 329 – 354.

Shewbridge, C., Kim, M., Wurzburg, G., & Hostens, G. (2010). *OECD Reviews of Migrant Education: Netherlands*. Retrieved February 9, 2016 from: <https://www.oecd.org/netherlands/44612239.pdf>

Sirius Education Migration. Mission Sirius Network. Retrieved February 18, 2016 from: <http://www.sirius-migrationeducation.org/about-us/>

The United Nations. (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Treaty Series*, 1577, 3.

The United Nations (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>

Uitwerkingsakkoord verhoogde asielinstroom. (28 April 2016). Retrieved from: https://vng.nl/files/vng/nieuws_attachments/2016/28042016uitwerkingsakkoord-verhoogde-asielinstroom.pdf

United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. Committee on the rights of the child. Retrieved February 17, 2016 from: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRC/Pages/CRCIndex.aspx>

United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. International covenant on economic, social and cultural rights. Retrieved February 17, 2016 from: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CESCR.aspx>

Van der Brug, W., Fennema, M., Heersen, S., & Lange, S.L. (2009). Hoe heeft het integratiedebat zich in Nederland ontwikkeld? *Migrantenstudies*, 25(3), 198 – 220.

Vink, A. (2008). De verdwenen achterstandsleerling. *Onderwijsblad*, No. 22.

Wetenschappelijke raad voor het regeringsbeleid. Retrieved March 10, 2016 from:
<http://www.wrr.nl/en/home/>

Wet- en regelgeving. *Convention for the protection of national minorities* (2005).
Retrieved from: <http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBV0001714/2005-06-01>

Wet- en regelgeving. *Leerplichtwet (1969)*. Retrieved from:
<http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0002628/2015-01-01>

Wet- en regelgeving. *Regeling voor- en voerschoolse educatie (VVE)* (2000). Retrieved
from: <http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0011680/2000-10-12>

Wet- en regelgeving. *Culturele Overeenkomst tussen het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden en
het Koninkrijk Marokko* (1983). Retrieved from:
<http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBV0002369/1987-05-01>

Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid – WRR (1979). *Etnische minderheden*.
Den Haag: SDU.

Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid – WRR (1989). *Migrantenbeleid*. Den
Haag: SDU.

Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid – WRR (2001). *Nieuwe kansen voor
taalonderwijs aan anderstaligen*. Den Haag: SDU.

Appendix A

Interviewhandleiding

- Alvast hartelijk dank voor uw participatie aan dit onderzoek.
- Mijn master thesis focust zich op het ontrafelen van factoren die invloed hebben gehad tijdens het besluitvormingsproces van het educatie migratie beleid van het Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap.
- Het gaat dus niet zo zeer om wat het beleid precies was in die periode, maar welke factoren invloed hebben gehad op de besluitvorming.
- Voor mijn master scriptie heb ik op basis van wetenschappelijke literatuur een aantal factoren geïdentificeerd.
- Door middel van dit interview, wil ik valideren of deze factoren kloppen en of er nog andere factoren zijn die invloed kunnen hebben.
- Ik zal een semigestructureerd interview gebruiken, wat betekent dat ik al wat vragen heb voorbereid, maar dat er ook vrijheid is om af te wijken.
- Ik zou dit onderzoek graag willen opnemen, om zo uw antwoorden later te kunnen uit typen en analyseren. Vindt u dit goed?
- Ik zal het interview uiteindelijk uitwerken voor mijn analyse. Heeft u er behoefte aan om het letterlijk uitgeschreven interview na te lezen voor evt aanvullingen?

1. International rules and regulations
2. Change in migration
3. Political landscape
4. Path dependency (stoelt voort op oud beleid)
5. Research & reports
6. Geopolitiek/reciprocity
7. Cost/benefit

<p>Centrale vraagstelling Welke factoren hebben invloed op de besluitvorming van het educatiemigratiebeleid van het Ministerie Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap?</p>	
<p>Introductie/inventarisatie werkzaamheden</p>	
<p>Kort voorstellen: huidige functiebeschrijving</p>	<p>Wat is uw naam? Op welke afdeling bent u momenteel werkzaam? Wat is uw functie? Waar houdt u zich zoal mee bezig? Heeft u op deze afdeling ook veel te maken met educatie van migranten?</p>
<p>Kort voorstellen: andere afdelingen</p>	<p>Hoelang bent u al werkzaam op het Ministerie? Op welke afdelingen bent u nog meer werkzaam geweest? [vooral in relatie/betrekking tot migratie educatie?] Wat was uw functie daar? Waar hield u zich zoal mee bezig?</p>
<p>Mijn master thesis focust zich op het ontrafelen van factoren die invloed hebben gehad tijdens het besluitvormingsproces van het educatie migratie beleid van het Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap. Het gaat dus niet zo zeer om wat het beleid precies was in die periode, maar welke factoren invloed hebben gehad op de besluitvorming. Ik zou nu graag samen met u nader willen kijken naar een duidelijke verschuiving in het beleid die u heeft meegemaakt.</p>	
<p>Verschuiving in het beleid</p> <p>Context: inventarisatie</p> <p>Knelpunten</p>	<p>Heeft u een duidelijke verschuiving/breekpunt in het beleid meegemaakt? Dus een duidelijke verandering in het beleid? Het kunnen ook meerdere periodes zijn geweest; dan behandelen we eerst de eerste periode en daarna de tweede periode.</p> <p>Kunt u mij wat meer vertellen over deze periode? In het kort: welke verschuiving was er in het beleid?</p> <p>Met wie werkte u op dat moment veel samen? Met mensen van het Ministerie of met andere externe partijen misschien?</p> <p>Hoe verliepen de overleggen in deze periode? Wie/welke partijen waren er bij deze overleggen betrokken [scholen/bonden/directeuren/externe partijen]? Waar vonden deze overleggen plaats?</p> <p>Waren er knelpunten waar u tegen aan liep gedurende deze periode? [bv rekening houden met bepaalde partijen/actoren/factoren] voordat verandering kon plaatsvonden...</p> <p>Hoe werden er tijdens dit proces keuzes gemaakt? Op basis van welke informatie werden beslissingen gemaakt? [open vraag daarna naar concrete factoren]</p>
<p>Concrete factoren</p>	<p>Heeft u weleens te maken gehad met NGO/academische externe rapporten? Werd hier iets mee gedaan? [5]</p>

	<p>Zijn er tijdens uw periode wel eens benchmarks gemaakt van het beleid van andere landen? Werd hier iets mee gedaan? Werd er bv gekeken naar het beleid van andere landen [best practices]? [6]</p> <p>Hoe, waarom en is er naar internationale verdragen werd gekeken? [1]</p> <p>Invloed van veranderende migratiestroom? [2]</p> <p>Had u het idee dat er bv een kosten/baten afweging werd gemaakt? Van oke, als we dit gaan investeren dan? Waren er economische belangen? Werd dat besproken? [7]</p> <p>In hoeverre denkt u dat de politieke kleur van het kabinet invloed heeft gehad op de besluitvorming? [3]</p> <p>Path dependency: voortbouwen op oude beleid? [4]</p> <p>Kunt u zelf nog factoren bedenken die een rol hebben gespeeld tijdens de besluitvorming?</p> <p>Een andere beleidsmedewerker benoemde ook nog een aantal andere factoren.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heeft u het idee dat er ook naar gemeentes werd geluisterd? Had u het idee dat zij een belangrijke invloed hadden? Dat er echt naar hen werd geluisterd? Bottum-up? [10] - Situationeel: op de situatie inspelen? [8] - Media? [9]
--	---

Afsluiting

- We zijn alweer aan het einde gekomen van dit interview
- Ik wil u heel erg bedanken voor uw medewerking en uw openhartigheid [geven merci]
- Zijn er nog bepaalde zaken die niet besproken zijn maar die u graag kwijt zou willen?
- Hoe vond u het zelf om geïnterviewd te worden?
- Heeft u nog vragen aan mij?
- Heeft u er behoefte aan het letterlijk uitgeschreven interview na te lezen voor eventuele aanvullingen?
- Weet u nog beleidsmedewerkers op het terrein van migratie en educatie die ik zou kunnen interviewen?