

# **The Dutchman does not exist, or does he?**



**Jesse Bickes**

**Sociology, Migration and Ethnic Studies**

**11262036**

**W.G.J. Duyvendak**

**P.J.H. Mepschen**

**July 2017, Amsterdam**



**UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM**



# Content

<b>Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 <i>'The Dutch identity' in the public debate</i>	7
1.2 <i>Dutch multicultural society</i>	7
1.3 <i>This research</i>	9
1.4 <i>Research questions</i>	10
1.5 <i>Lay-out of the text</i>	10
<b>2. Methods</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 <i>Research design</i>	11
2.1.1 <i>Q methodology</i>	11
2.1.2 <i>Semi-structured interviews</i>	12
2.2 <i>Respondents</i>	12
2.3 <i>Data analysis</i>	13
2.3.1 <i>Q study</i>	13
2.3.2 <i>Semi-structured interviews</i>	15
2.3.3 <i>Linking Q sorts to semi-structured interviews</i>	15
2.4 <i>Ethical concerns</i>	15
2.5 <i>Position of researcher</i>	16
<b>3. 'The Dutch identity'</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1 <i>National identity</i>	16
3.2 <i>Dutch national identity</i>	18
3.3 <i>Findings: 'The Dutch identity'</i>	20
3.3.1 <i>All 20 respondents</i>	22
3.3.2 <i>White Dutch</i>	28
3.3.3 <i>Dutch of color</i>	31
3.3.4 <i>Differences between Dutch with and without a migrant background</i>	33
3.3.5 <i>Idealized image of Dutch identity and self</i>	36
<b>4. Dutchness</b>	<b>39</b>
4.1 <i>Informal citizenship</i>	39
4.2 <i>Effects of exclusion</i>	42
4.3 <i>Findings: Dutchness</i>	44
4.3.1 <i>White Dutch</i>	45
4.3.2 <i>Dutch of color</i>	51
4.4 <i>Catch 22</i>	54
<b>5. Conclusion</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>6. References</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Appendix 1: statements in Q study</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Interview guide</b>	<b>62</b>



## Summary

In this research I studied the perception of ‘the Dutch identity’ and Dutchness among Dutch heterosexual males between the ages of 20 and 37 years old. In Dutch society there is ongoing debate about ‘the Dutch identity’ and Dutchness. The aim in this research was to find out how ‘the Dutch identity’ and Dutchness is perceived by Dutch. So, is one person more ‘Dutch’ than the other, and how do Dutch see their national identity? Since being perceived as less ‘Dutch’ can lead to lesser life chances, this study is relevant because it provides deeper insight in the exclusion of certain Dutch from the status of full Dutch citizenship.

In this study qualitative research methods were used. Interviews were conducted from a sample of 20 Dutch heterosexual males between the ages of 20 and 37 years old. In this sample 10 respondents had a migrant background and 10 did not have a migrant background. In the first part of the interviews Q methodology was used. In this research method, which is used for finding patterns in opinions and other subjective parts of social life, respondents had to sort statements about Dutch identity from very central for ‘the Dutch identity’ to not central at all. In the second part of the interviews I conducted semi-structured interviews that focused on the perception of Dutchness.

Previous literature argued that in Dutch society there is an idealized image of Dutch identity, in which tolerance and equality for women and homosexuals are perceived as ‘Dutch values’. Therefore, I expected these aspects to be perceived as most central in ‘the Dutch identity’. With regard to Dutchness, literature distinguished between ethnic, civic and cultural perceptions of citizens. Recent literature argues that there is a cultural perception of citizenship in the Netherlands. In this perception newcomers have to assimilate into ‘progressive Dutch culture’ to be perceived as fully ‘Dutch’. In this cultural perception there is also an emotional aspect, meaning that Dutch with a migrant background explicitly have to show emotional attachment to the Netherlands as well.

As argued in the literature, this study shows that white Dutch hold an idealized image of Dutch identity. Progressive and tolerant values are indeed perceived as central to ‘the Dutch identity’. This idealized image is central in the perception of Dutchness as well. In this study I argue that for white Dutch, emotional citizenship is the leading perception. Dutch with a migrant background have to show explicit loyalty to the idealized self-image in order to be perceived as fully ‘Dutch’. Dutch of color on the other hand hold a more ethnic perception of Dutch citizenship, meaning that only white Dutch can be 100 percent ‘Dutch’ in their perception.



# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1 ‘The Dutch identity’ in the public debate**

In 2007 the Argentinian born Dutch Queen Maxima caused public outrage by arguing that *the* Dutch identity and *the* Dutchman do not exist. She argued that the Netherlands is too diverse to be captured in one cliché. She made this heavily criticized statement after The Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy published the report ‘Identification with the Netherlands’. This report concluded that using ‘the Dutch identity’ in policies could be counterproductive, and instead a more open approach that focused on identification with the Netherlands was preferable (WRR, 2007). The Queen’s statement was mostly criticized by the white Dutch population, without a migrant background, who felt offended by the denial of what they perceived as their national identity.

10 years after the Dutch Queen made the statement, ‘the Dutch identity’ was one of the main topics in Dutch national elections. In various television debates, political leaders debated whether ‘the Dutch identity’ was threatened. Islam and the ‘large influx’ of refugees were often seen as the biggest threats. Not only in television debates did politicians touch upon the topic, political parties also emphasized it in their electoral manifestos. Duyvendak and Kesic (2017) studied the electoral manifestos of Dutch political parties and found there was a huge emphasis on ‘typical Dutch’ traits and habits. For instance, the liberal right-wing party (VVD) of Prime Minister Mark Rutte mentioned the word (typical) Dutch 361 times in their 102-page manifesto. But while it is mentioned very often and is also discussed in national debates, it is still a hollow concept since no one really clarifies what this Dutch identity is.

The search for a defined national identity is not a new phenomenon in the Netherlands. In the last two centuries internal and external developments have caused a redefinition of the national identity. However, the search for a static definition of the national identity can be problematic, since it has already led to conflicts and forms of exclusion for certain groups in society, in earlier times (WRR, 2007). This time the multiculturalism of Dutch society is the reason for the call for a static definition of ‘the Dutch identity’. In the political arena, more conservative right-wing parties perceive (Muslim) Dutch with a migrant background as a threat to ‘the Dutch identity’ because it is argued that ‘they’ are unwilling to ‘integrate’.

## **1.2 Dutch multicultural society**

Due to Dutch colonial history, the arrival of guest workers in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the influx of refugees, Dutch society is very multicultural. In 2015 the Dutch

population counted over 3,5 million Dutch with a migrant background. That makes up 21,7 percent of the entire population. Of these Dutch with a migrant background, little over 2 million have a 'non-western background' (CBS, 2016). In Dutch policies, Dutch with a background in Africa, Latin America or Asia are labeled as Dutch with a non-western background. However, due to the assumed socio-economic and socio-cultural position of migrants from Japan and Indonesia, migrants from these two countries are labeled as having a western background. Turkey on the other hand is for the same reasons perceived as a non-western country. So, the distinction that is made in Dutch policies between western and non-western backgrounds refers to socio-economic and socio-cultural conditions instead of geographical conditions. As a result, in Dutch discourse a clear distinction is made between 'native Dutch' and Dutch with a 'non-western' migrant background. Although the government recently decided to stop using the two terms, in everyday life these two groups are still often referred to as Autochthones (native Dutch) and Allochthones (Dutch with a migrant background). The four biggest groups of Dutch with a migrant background are Moroccan-Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, Surinamese-Dutch and Antillean-Dutch. Every two years an Integration Report published by The Netherlands Institute for Social Research measures the extent to which these groups, and refugees, are 'integrated' in Dutch society. These groups do not just consist of actual migrants, but also children of migrants, who are born and raised in the Netherlands. By measuring their integration in Dutch society, it is implied that they are not already fully part of that society. Since, how can one integrate into something he is already a part of? The problem in this discourse is that a substantial part of Dutch population is excluded from the society they are living in and contributing to.

Besides the idea that ethnic minorities in Dutch society are excluded due to the perception they are not fully 'integrated', there is also an ethnic hierarchy in the eyes of the white majority group (Stupar et al., 2014). In this ethnic hierarchy, the ethnic ingroup of white Dutch is valued highest. Second comes Dutch of Southern European descent such as Italian-Dutch and Spanish-Dutch. Third comes Dutch of color from former colonies such as Surinamese-Dutch, Antillean-Dutch and Moluccan-Dutch and last comes the Muslim Dutch of which Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch are the biggest groups (Stupar et al., *ibid*). In Dutch discourse, Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch are often linked because of their presupposed Islamic background, while Surinamese-Dutch and Antillean-Dutch are often linked because of the similarities in physical features.

In a study conducted by Verkuyten and Martinovic (2015), they distinguish between ethnic and civic citizenship. In an ethnic perception of citizenship only those who belong to



the majority ethnic group are perceived as full citizens, while in a civic view on citizenship the perception is that anyone who respects the basic civil principles of society is perceived as a full citizen. Results of this study show that ethnic citizenship correlates with lower acceptance of Muslim rights and their normative political participation, while civic citizenship correlates with higher acceptance of these rights. The results of this study show that the culturalization of citizenship, as argued by Duyvendak et al. (2016), could lead to lower acceptance of the rights for those who are not seen as culturally similar. Hilhorst and Hermes (2016) studied Facebook comments of (mostly white) advocates of the controversial figure of Black Pete. In these comments, they found patterns where black protestors of the figure are told to be grateful for their chances in the Netherlands and that they should return to 'their own country' if they do not like it in the Netherlands. The findings of these studies show how Dutch with a migrant background are perceived as Other and as a consequence of this they are not allowed to participate in public debates about Dutch culture.

Not only are rights of Dutch with a migrant background less accepted or is their access in some public debates denied, studies also show that there is discrimination against Dutch of color. Blommaert et al. (2014) found that resumes of applicants with an Arabic sounding name were less likely to be viewed on recruitment websites, and Andriessen et al. (2010) show that Moroccan-Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, Surinamese-Dutch and Antillean-Dutch were less likely to be invited for job interviews.

### **1.3 This research**

What I aim to contribute to these studies is insight in the way Dutch people perceive Dutchness. What does it mean to be Dutch, and are there different degrees of Dutchness one can attain? Equal rights for women and homosexuals are often perceived as the most important values in Dutch society (Schinkel, 2013), but do Dutch people think that sharing these values is the most important factor to being perceived as completely 'Dutch'? Or do other factors also play a role? In this research, I want to explore how Dutch citizens perceive Dutch identity, whether they see different levels of Dutchness, and if they do whether they believe ones level of Dutchness can increase. Because I will focus on Dutch with and without a migrant background, I will also consider whether the two groups perceive Dutch identity differently, and if so to what extent the perceptions between the two groups differ.

This study contributes to society since the perception that 'the Dutch identity' is in danger due to the presence of Dutch with a migrant background, who are perceived not to share 'Dutch progressiveness', was an important topic in Dutch elections, and part of Dutch

public debate in general. McCrone and Bechhofer (2008) argue that a national identity in which some people are considered as outsiders because they do not fit the traits of the national identity, can lead to social exclusion. In turn this can affect life chances in wider society of those who are excluded. In the case of the Netherlands it can therefore lead, or already leads to, decreased life chances for Dutch with a migrant background.

#### **1.4 Research questions**

In this research the aim is to find what young Dutch males of various cultural backgrounds perceive as ‘the Dutch identity’, and how they perceive the idea of being ‘Dutch’. Because the way ‘the Dutch identity’ is perceived might influence the perception of who is ‘Dutch’ and who is not, the main research question focuses on ‘the Dutch identity’. The sub questions focus more on the concept of being ‘Dutch’.

Due to the idea that the position of women and homosexuals is in danger because of the presence of (Muslim) Dutch with a migrant background, I decided to interview heterosexual males since their position is not perceived to be in danger. I further focused on men between the age of 20 and 37 because in the early years of this century Dutch integration policies started focusing on socio-cultural adaption of newcomers (Scholten, 2011). Therefore, I focused on respondents who grew up in this discourse with a cultural idea of integration.

#### **Research question:**

*What is ‘the Dutch identity’ according to heterosexual Dutch men between the age of 20 and 37 years old?*

#### **Sub questions:**

- *Are there different degrees in Dutchness?*
- *Is it possible for Dutch with a migrant background who are not perceived as fully ‘Dutch’ to become more ‘Dutch’ over time?*
- *Is it possible for Dutch with a migrant background to become 100 percent ‘Dutch’?*
- *Is it possible for white Dutch to not be perceived as 100 percent ‘Dutch’?*
- *Are there differences in the perceptions of Dutch with and without a migrant background?*

#### **1.5 Lay-out of the text**

After this introduction follows the methods section (2). In this section I will elaborate on how the study is conducted and why certain methods were used. After the methods section comes

the chapter about ‘the Dutch identity’ (3). This chapter entails a theoretical framework about national identities and Dutch national identity in particular, and findings of this study with their connection to the theoretical framework. After this follows a chapter that discusses Dutchness (4). A similar structure as in the chapter about ‘the Dutch identity’ is used. I end with a concluding chapter (5) in which I summarize the findings, give recommendations based on these findings, discuss limitations of this study and give suggestions for further studies.

## **2. Methods**

### **2.1 Research design**

For this study a qualitative research approach was used. I used a combination of two methods: Q Methodology (QM) and semi-structured interviews. QM was used to study the perception of ‘the Dutch identity’, while the semi-structured interviews focused on the concept of Dutchness. I gathered data by conducting 20 interviews, where in the first part respondents had to sort the statements from the Q study. In the second part of the interviews I conducted semi-structured interviews that focused on their perception of Dutchness. Each interview lasted 60 to 90 minutes.

#### **2.1.1 Q methodology**

QM is a qualitative research method that was originally used for psychological studies. It is an empirical research method that is a tool for exploring patterns of shared viewpoints, attitudes, beliefs, opinions and other subjective aspects of social life (Shemmings and Ellingson, 2012). QM establishes systematic patterns by identifying individuals who share attitudes and gives a structure to subjective opinion (Raje, 2007). In a Q study, the respondent gets 40 to 60 cards with subjective statements about a topic. The respondent then has to sort the cards in a normal distribution, ranging from ‘extremely disagree’ to ‘totally agree’. During the sorting the respondent is supposed to give explanations about the reasons why he or she makes certain decisions. It is the interviewer’s job to make sure this happens. Afterwards a factor analysis is conducted to test whether the sorts show factors.

In this research respondents had to sort 62 statements (appendix 1) about Dutch identity. The statements consisted of values, habits, traits, traditions, holidays, demographics and historical events that have been labeled as ‘typical Dutch’. To gather the statements I used various sources in which ‘the Dutch identity’ was discussed, such as television talk shows,

political debates, Internet fora, television debates, electoral manifestos and informational websites about the Netherlands. All statements were formulated the same way so no bias could arise from different formulations.

During the sorting respondents were encouraged to think out loud. I often asked respondents why certain choices were made, and what they meant by certain choices. This was done to gather more information, but also to make sure all respondents interpreted the statements equally to avoid bias.

Overall, respondents found it difficult to talk about Dutch identity and Dutchness. Not because it was a sensitive topic, but because they had trouble defining their ideas. They admitted that they had always taken the two terms for granted, but never thought about their content. They had a hard time especially making decisions during the Q sorts, while discussing their ideas about Dutchness was easier for them. I encouraged them to make decisions based on what first came to mind, to prevent them from giving too rationalized and socially accepted answers.

### **2.1.2 Semi-structured interviews**

I used semi-structured interviews because they enabled me to ask all respondents similar questions, which made it easier to compare views on Dutchness. While at the same time it allowed me to go in-depth on certain topics to find out more about respondents' perceptions.

The semi-structured interviews were used to answer sub questions about Dutchness. To ensure that all topics got covered during the interviews, an interview guide (appendix 2) was made for structure and guidance. First I asked respondents whether the statements that were most important for 'the Dutch identity' in their Q sort were as well important to be fully 'Dutch'. After this I asked them what other factors were of influence in their perception to be 'Dutch'. I also tried to find out what factors played a role in a more indirect way, by comparing their ultimate Dutchman with fictional and non-fictional Dutch persons. Last I asked whether they thought someone can become more 'Dutch', and if so what they have to do to become more 'Dutch'. I also asked whether it is possible for Dutch of color to become 100 percent 'Dutch', and what role skin color plays in their perception of Dutchness.

## **2.2 Respondents**

For this research I collected a sample of 20 respondents. Because my research focus was aimed at eliciting deeper understanding of how Dutch themselves perceive 'the Dutch identity' and 'being Dutch', every respondent has Dutch nationality. Scholten (2011) argues that in the early years of this century a shift in integration policy took place in the

Netherlands. The focus in this new integration policy is socio-cultural and focuses on the adaption of newcomers to Dutch culture and society. Because I am interested how this socio-cultural focus surrounding integration may have influenced the perception of Dutch, I will select respondents who were not older than 20 years old at the time this integration policy was implemented. Therefore all respondents were born in or after 1980.

Due to this research's focus on the perceptions of both Dutch with and without a migrant background, I selected 10 respondents with a migrant background and 10 respondents without a migrant background. All respondents without a migrant background were white Dutch, and the group of Dutch with a migrant background consisted of five Dutch with an Islamic background and five black Dutch. In the group of Islamic Dutch were two Moroccan-Dutch, two Turkish-Dutch and one Bengal-Dutch. The group of black Dutch consisted of two Surinamese-Dutch, one Antillean-Dutch, one South African-Dutch and one Ethiopian-Dutch. The respondents had different educational levels, with their average educational level slightly above national average.

The last criterion for my sample is that I only selected heterosexual male respondents. Because the literature (Schinkel, 2013; Mepschen et al. 2010) shows that equal rights for women and homosexuals are often perceived as most important Dutch values, which are also used to exclude Muslims from society, I chose to only select heterosexual male respondents because their rights and their position in Dutch society are not perceived to be in danger due to the presence of Dutch with a migrant background.

## **2.3 Data analysis**

All interviews were transcribed with the use of Express Scribe Transcription software and were uploaded afterwards in Atlas.ti software to conduct the coding process. Because the interviews consisted of two parts, the analysis was also a two-part process. First I analyzed the respondents' Q sorts and the corresponding interviews that focused on their perception of 'the Dutch identity'. After that I analyzed the semi-structured interviews that focused on the respondents' perception of Dutchness.

### **2.3.1 Q study**

The Q study analysis was fourfold and was performed in line with the Q study performed by Raje (2007). First I entered the Q sorts of all 20 respondents in PQ Method software. This is a software program that is specifically designed to perform factor analyses in Q studies. After I entered all 20 Q sorts I performed a principal components factor analysis. This analysis generated eight factors. Addams and Proops (2000, p.27) advice that:

*...by convention, only (unrotated) factors with eigenvalues greater than or equal to one are considered significant and retained”*

In line with this guidance I selected five factors for further analysis, which were subject to a varimax rotation of the factors. To calculate the standard error (SE) for a factor loading the formula  $1/\sqrt{N}$ , where N equals the number of statements, is used (Raje, 2007, p. 471). So in this study that means that the  $SE = 1/\sqrt{62} = 0.127$ . Respondents with loadings over  $SE(2.58)$  can be considered statistically significant at the 0.001 level (Addams and Proops, 2000, p.77). That means that respondents with factor loadings over  $(0.127(2.58)) 0.3276$  are considered to load statistically significant on that factor. Respondents who load significant on more than one factor are considered as ‘confounded’ and should be eliminated from further analysis. In this case that means that 11 out of 20 Q sorts had to be eliminated from further analysis. Watts and Stenner (2005) however have opted a strategy to minimize confounded Q sorts and in this way prevent loss of valuable data. By raising the level in which a loading is considered significant, it is possible to minimize confounded Q sorts while at the same time the criterion are made more stringent from a statistical point of view. In this study, I raised the level in which loadings are considered significant to 0.5. With this criterion two Q sorts were considered confounded and one Q sort did not load significant on any factor, leaving 17 Q sorts valuable for analysis.

In Q studies, factors are accepted when two or more respondents load significantly on that factor (Raje, 2007). Therefore, one factor was eliminated from the study. I further decided to accept statements with Z-scores of  $1 >$  as being central to ‘the Dutch identity’ in factors, while statements with Z-scores of  $< -1$  were considered as not central to ‘the Dutch identity’.

Because I was also interested in whether different factors would arise when analyzing Dutch with and without a migrant background separately, I ran these two analyses as well. The analyses were performed the same way as the aforementioned analysis. Again, I raised the level of significance to 0.5 to minimize the amount of confounded Q sorts. As a result both analyses showed 10 Q sorts that were purely loaded on a single factor.

Because QM is a qualitative method instead of a quantitative one, it is also important to analyze the comments of respondents during the sorting process. The transcribed interviews that were uploaded in Atlas.ti therefore also contained a part where respondents were busy sorting the statements and some questions afterwards about certain choices. The analysis of this data started with an open coding process and out of these codes coding families and themes emerged, as is in line with Saldana’s (2013) recommendations. Because the discourse

used by respondents is also of the utmost importance, I also performed a critical discourse analysis (Van Dijk, 1993) during the coding process.

### **2.3.2 Semi-structured interviews**

After transcribing the semi-structured interviews I uploaded them in Atlas.ti, where I performed an abductive analysis. In an abductive analysis the focus is on constructing theories by holding surprising empirical findings on a background of other theories (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012). I chose this form of analysis because I wanted to use other theories about Dutch identity and Dutchness, without simply testing whether they were true.

In the coding process I started with two cycles of open coding. Out of these cycles of open coding, categories and themes emerged which I sorted in coding families in Atlas.ti. This process of going from open coding to categories and themes is in line with Saldana's (2013) recommendations. Because at some points the topics were quite sensitive, and people were inclined to give socially accepted answers, I used Van Dijk's (1993) critical discourse analysis to be better able to fully analyze their answers.

### **2.3.3 Linking Q sorts to semi-structured interviews**

Lastly I searched for patterns between respondents' perceptions of 'the Dutch identity' and their perception of Dutchness. To search for patterns, I created a datafile that showed an overview of the outcomes for all individual respondents. This overview contained what factors they loaded significantly on in the different analyses, what factors were important in their perception of Dutchness, to what extent they thought Dutch with a migrant background could become 100 percent 'Dutch', and whether white Dutch without a migrant background were unconditionally 100 percent 'Dutch'. For Dutch with migrant background I also entered whether they felt accepted as being 100 percent 'Dutch' and whether they felt 100 percent 'Dutch' themselves.

## **2.4 Ethical concerns**

With regard to informed consent I informed my participants about the topic of my research when I invited them to participate. Before I started interviewing, I told every respondent about the different parts of the interview and the topics that would be discussed. I told them that at no point they were obliged to answer questions and that they could refuse to answer questions without further explanations.

To respect the confidentiality and anonymity of my participants I asked them whether I was allowed to use their real name in this thesis. If they preferred me not to I promised them to use fake names. I later decided to use fake names for every respondent.

All participants participated voluntarily and agreed to participate after I approached them. I also respected their wishes when they were uncomfortable or unwilling to discuss certain topics, so I would not harm them emotionally or physically.

## **2.5 Position of researcher**

Although it is impossible to be completely objective while doing (qualitative) research, I tried to be aware of my personal bias to avoid biased research results as much as possible. I did this by asking second opinions when I was confronted with ambiguous excerpts during my analysis. I also did this by avoiding asking normative questions during the interviews and to formulate questions as objectively as possible. In this way, I tried to make respondents feel comfortable and stimulate them to give honest answers.

Additionally, not only can my interpretations cause bias, answers of participants can do so as well. Therefore, I needed to be aware of my own position as a non-white Dutch without a migrant background (in Dutch discourse) during the interviews. I tried to use this identity to my advantage by focusing on the similarities between the respondents and me, although for none of the respondents did I belong to their ethnical ingroup. As a result, it might be that participants were afraid to speak freely because they were afraid to give answers that might hurt me or be controversial, and instead gave socially accepted answers. I tried to avoid this by emphasizing before and during the interviews that there were no right and wrong answers. I also encouraged them to say what they really thought, instead of giving answers they thought I wanted to hear. When I felt they gave socially accepted answers, I also asked more questions about the topic in a non-offensive way until the point they started to contradict themselves and were forced to give honest answers.

## **3. ‘The Dutch identity’**

### **3.1 National identity**

It is hard to define what an identity exactly is. An identity can be as well objective as it can be subjective, depending on the context.

*...people sometimes experience their identity as given, sometimes as chosen, and sometimes as a combination of the two; that the meaning and salience of a given identity varies from one*



*person to another among those who share the identity, and may shift over time in both of these respects both for the group as a whole and for individual members within it (Carens, 2000, p.15).*

So a national identity is not a static construction that exists as an autonomous entity in addition to social life, it is a fluid social construct that is created and gets recreated in social life. But that does not mean that a national identity is a complete made up construct. A national identity can often be seen as a cultural identity with its own unique habits and values, and should be seen as something ‘real’ for two reasons according to Modood (2007). First, if cultures are changeable, then there must be something that changes at a certain point. Second, it is not a necessity for people to know exactly what they are talking about if there are some coherent features of a culture that make it possible to talk about it. If that were not the case, then it would be impossible to talk in these terms. So, a national identity is not an entity and it is not a myth, it is something in between (ibid).

The creation and recreation of national identities can be seen in two ways. It can be seen as a top-down construction in which the state and the elite transfer the national identity to the people. And it can be seen as a bottom-up construction in which the people construct the national identity. Gellner (2006) and Anderson (2006) support the first vision. Gellner argues that it was the state that created certain norms and values and defined it as a nation. Other scholars argue that the way the people construct a national feeling should be taken into account. This vision argues that a nation should be seen as:

*...not by governments and the spokesmen and activists of nationalist (or non-nationalist) movements, but by the ordinary persons who are the objects of their action and propaganda (Hobsbawn, 1990, p.11)*

As so often, in reality it is probably a mix of the two. The state and the elite create and recreate a national identity in a top-down way, but the people construct and reconstruct this national identity as well. So the creation of a national identity is an interplay between the two.

Anderson (2006) argues that the national identity is an imagined community. As he argues:

*It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them or even hear them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion (Anderson, 2006, p.6)*

A national identity is imagined in three ways according to Anderson. First its limitation is imagined, because there are limits on who can be part of the community and who cannot. Second its sovereignty is imagined, because the concept of a national identity was originated

during the enlightenment. A time in which people strove for freedom, which should be characterized by the nation state. Finally, a national identity is imagined because it connects its members, while they do not know each other. In Anderson's interpretation, a national identity can only exist when the members of the nation believe there is one.

Two processes can be distinguished in the creation of the content of a national identity. The first is self-categorization. In self-categorization, content of the national identity is based on a more absolute perception of the nation and its people. When for example 90 percent of a country's population is a farmer, agriculture can be perceived as an important aspect of the national identity. But a national identity can also be perceived in comparison to 'significant others'. This means that people in a nation compare themselves and their nation to other nations and its population. These comparisons are very important in shaping the national identity (Triandafyllidou, 1998).

But 'significant others' are not always from other nations. There can also be internal 'significant others', because certain parts of the internal population can be perceived as not belonging to the national ingroup. This shapes the national identity as well, because identity always gets activated by a certain context (Verkuyten, 1998). For example, when the ingroup perceives an ethnic threat by internal 'significant others', this might influence the national identity. So the presence of 'significant others' influences the way people define themselves. In this way, the presence of 'significant others' causes a process of self-consciousness of differences between 'the national ingroup' and the 'significant others'.

*These (immigrants) may become internal significant others when their different language, religion or mores are perceived to threaten the cultural and/or ethnic purity of the nation. The nation is likely then to engage in a process of reaffirmation of its identity and seek to re-define it so as to differentiate the ingroup from the newcomers (Triandafyllidou, 1998, p. 601)*

So the arrival of (Muslim) migrants since the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, who are perceived to threaten white Christian Dutch culture, might have changed 'the Dutch identity'.

### **3.2 Dutch national identity**

The previous section focused on national identities, and how they are created and defined. This section will focus on the content of national identities, the Dutch national identity, in particular. It is hard to define what the content of a national identity is. Although many scholars have tried to give a general definition of national identities, all admitted that there simply is not one definition that suits all (WRR, 2007). But although one general definition

seems to be impossible, WRR (ibid) distinguish six different perceptions of national identities, based on Canovan (1998) and Smith (1991).

The first is a territorial and spatial perception. In this perception, the land and its inhabitants belong to each other. But the land in this perception is more than just a patch of ground, it is the place where previous generations have lived and where traditions, stories and heroes originated. So the nation does not simply exist out of rough nature, but the roads, the buildings and the cities that were created on that ground have a symbolic value. In the case of the Netherlands, windmills, tulips and clogs can be seen as a well-known representation of the Netherlands, which are also presented as such on folders and travel guides.

The second one is a more ethnic perception of national identity. In an ethnic perception the focus is on a common heritage. The national identity in this perception is based on shared ancestry, which correlates with the ground of the nation, but is not attached to it. In this perception everybody with native Dutch ancestry belongs to the Dutch 'super-family' (Smith, 1991), even if they do not live in the Netherlands. At the same time those who live in the Netherlands without native Dutch ancestry do not belong to this family.

The third perception is a cultural perception. In this perception the emphasis is on the national identity as a cultural community, a shared set of values, views and habits and a clear view on who they are and what they stand for as a nation. It is often a job for the media and the educational system to maintain this shared culture that exists out of symbols, traditions and historical memories.

The next one is a state perception of national identity. This perception is about laws, norms, legal principles and institutions as a whole that form a nation into a political community. The rights and duties of civilians and institutions that maintain and regulate these rights and duties form the national identity.

The fifth is a modernistic perception that focuses on the industrial society. Gellner (1983) and Hobshawm (1990) are the most important representatives of this perception. They argue that nation states originated out of a process of modernization, and that the nation is first and foremost of interest for the functional needs of the economy. Because older social ties lose their meaning through the process of modernization, the nation state fulfills this role while politicians use this new nation state to gain power over the state apparatus. This is how a national community originates.

The sixth and last perception focuses on feelings and images and a by people constructed national identity. Anderson's (2006) aforementioned community is in line with this perception. A national identity and a national community can only exist if its members

believe it does. In this perception a nation simply is a collection of people who believe and act if they are a community.

The WRR (2007) conclude in their report that there is no such thing as one Dutch identity. Other studies however show some factors that are often perceived central in Dutch identity. Van Reekum (2016) argues there has been a shift ‘out of character’ that started with the staging of national identity debates since the 1970s, which resulted in a move away from ‘characterology’. In characterology there is a set of character traits that typifies the national person, who contrasts with other nations national persons. Because characterology is race related, moving out of character was an attempt to remove the racial aspect of the national identity. Therefore, the focus of Dutch national identity shifted from a typical national person to an identity consisting of values. A study performed by Verkuyten and Hagendoorn (1998) showed that white Dutch students self-categorized Dutch identity with the following factors: gender equality, tolerance, traditions, Dutch culture, efficiency, hospitality, modesty, adjustment, familiarity and frankness. Equality on the basis of gender and sexuality are perceived to be the most important values in Dutch identity according to Schinkel (2013) and Mepschen et al. (2010). Both argue that these two values are used in a narrative in which the Muslim Other is portrayed as non-modern, and therefore not belonging. This corresponds with the abovementioned quote of Triandafyllidou (1998) in which he argues that immigrants can be seen as ‘significant others’, and that the ingroup starts a process of reaffirmation and redefining of their identity to differentiate the ingroup from newcomers. Schinkel (2013) refers to this as the imagination of society. He argues that white Dutch hold a strongly idealized perception of a progressive and modern Dutch identity, with complete equality for women and homosexuals. The assumption is that Dutch with a migrant background do not share these values, and should therefore ‘integrate’ in this idealized progressive society. So in this view, the emphasis is on the portrayal of Dutch identity as very progressive in contrast to ‘significant others’, to maintain its whiteness.

### **3.3 Findings: ‘The Dutch identity’**

As previously mentioned, a national identity is not an autonomous entity that exists outside the social world. Therefore, the focus in this research is on the perception of Dutch themselves. How do they perceive their national identity? As the literature shows, ‘the Dutch identity’ is often perceived as the identity of white Dutch, while Dutch with a migrant background are perceived as ‘significant others’.

The findings of the Q study support this idea. They show that Dutch perceive their nation in general as a very progressive and tolerant nation. Liberal and progressive values such as freedom, freedom of speech and equality of all genders are overall perceived as being central in 'the Dutch identity'. But the way Dutch see their national identity can be divided in two ways. The largest group emphasizes progressive values. The Netherlands is perceived as a very liberal nation, in which (almost) everybody is perceived as equal, especially in comparison to other countries. The other group puts more focus on cultural traditions, traits and holidays. What is noticeable is that the cultural perception of national identities as described in WRR (2007), which focuses on traditions, habits, views and values, can be divided into two separate perceptions. Although both cultural, one perception seems to focus on views and values, while the other emphasizes holidays and traditions.

In the next part I will discuss the factors that were significant in the three Q studies, starting with the analysis with all 20 respondents, then the Q study with only white Dutch without a migrant background, and after that I will discuss the results of the Q study of Dutch with a migrant background. Last I will discuss the differences between Dutch with and without a migrant background and some other interesting findings.

### 3.3.1 All 20 respondents

In the Q study of all 20 respondents, five significant factors were found. But only one respondent loaded significantly on factor 5, so this factor was eliminated from further analysis. Of these four remaining factors, three focus on (progressive) values and one focuses on cultural holidays. On factor 1, 2 and 4 both Dutch with and without a migrant background loaded significantly, while on factor 3 only Dutch with a migrant background loaded significantly. In this section I will discuss all four factors.

#### Factor 1: White progressive factor

*Dutch without a migrant background:* Peter, Michael, Maarten, Thomas and Willem

*Dutch with a migrant background:* Daishano

Table 1: Factor 1 in Q study all 20 respondents

<b>Most central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>	<b>Least central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>
Freedom of speech	Hanukkah
Freedom	Little complaining
Diversity	Easter eggs
Multicultural	Only one cookie with your coffee
Equality of gender	Islamic sweet festival
Equality of sexuality	Homophobia
Freedom to be 100% yourself	Dinner at 5.30

As can be seen in table 1, those who loaded significant on factor 1 perceive ‘the Dutch identity’ as very progressive and liberal and see values as most central in ‘the Dutch identity’. The Netherlands is perceived as a country where there is freedom for anyone to say whatever they want and to be whoever they want to be. They also perceive the Netherlands as a very diverse and multicultural country. Although the word ‘multicultural’ has had a negative connotation in the past due to the critique on Dutch multiculturalism as expressed in Scheffer’s (2000) essay about ‘the multicultural drama’, the respondents in this study interpreted it demographically by arguing that the Netherlands is a multicultural country due to the presence of people with different cultural backgrounds. The fact that equality on the basis of gender and sexuality is perceived as very central to ‘the Dutch identity’ corresponds with Schinkel (2013) and Mepschen et al. (2010). The idea of homophobia as not belonging to ‘the Dutch identity’ also supports this idea of progressiveness.

The respondents who load significant on this factor are mainly white Dutch, accompanied by one Surinamese-Dutch. The Surinamese-Dutch respondent however is very ‘integrated’ in white Dutch culture and although he now lives in multicultural Amsterdam, he

grew up in a whiter part of the Netherlands. He is also perceived by other Surinamese-Dutch as an extremely ‘Dutch’ Surinamese-Dutch, as is shown in the following quote:

*“... for example when I meet a Surinamer from Amsterdam, they tell me what a ‘cheesehead’ I am.”*

Cheesehead, in Dutch ‘kaaskop’, is a Dutch slur that is used to refer to stereotypical white Dutch. So Daishano is perceived by other Surinamese-Dutch as extremely ‘integrated’, and also perceives himself as ‘Dutch’.

## Factor 2: The holiday factor

*Dutch without a migrant background:* Reinier, Ludas

*Dutch with a migrant background:* James, Jason

Table 2: Factor 2 in study all 20 respondents

<b>Most central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>	<b>Least central</b>
Kings day	Hanukkah
Wilhelmus (national anthem)	Homophobia
Sinterklaas (holiday)	Judaism
National football team	Polder model (consensus)
Liberation day	Creative
Freedom	Racism
Black Pete (helper of Sinterklaas)	Discrimination
Dialects	Islamic sweet festival
Dutch language	Xenophobia
Commercial spirit	Little complaining
Freedom of speech	Getting up early

In this factor ‘the Dutch identity’ is seen from a more historical cultural perception. It focuses on holidays that are massively celebrated throughout the country. The fact that these holidays are celebrated nationwide and the feeling of one united country that comes along with them makes them most central for ‘the Dutch identity’ in this factor. Reinier, a white respondent, explains his choice as follow:

*“Yes Kingsday and the Wilhelmus, followed closely by the national football team. These are the things that unite the country. The moments where we are all one, and which everyone support.”*

While holidays that are historically Dutch are perceived as central to ‘the Dutch identity’, holidays that have foreign roots such as Hanukkah and Islamic sweet festival are perceived as not belonging to ‘the Dutch identity’. This shows that only holidays that are

central in white Dutch culture are perceived to be central in ‘the Dutch identity’, showing that ‘the Dutch identity’ is actually a white Dutch identity.

But while holidays are perceived to be most central in their perception, ‘the Dutch identity’ is also perceived as quite tolerant and progressive. The fact that homophobia, racism, discrimination and xenophobia are perceived as not belonging to ‘the Dutch identity’ shows this. But that these negative aspects are perceived as not belonging is interesting. Because although equality of sexuality (Z-score of 0.542) and equality of gender (Z-score of 0.327) are perceived to belong to ‘the Dutch identity, equality of ethnicities (Z-score of -0.471) is perceived as not very present in the Netherlands. So while different ethnicities are not perceived as equal, there is no racism, discrimination or xenophobia in their eyes. This shows that while they admit that a tolerant value is absent, they do not admit that something negative is present. The following quote from Reinier about equality of ethnicity illustrates this mechanism:

*“Equality of ethnicity... Yeah I do think, yeah I do think that makes a difference. That unconsciously we still look at that, so I’m going to put that on the left side. I think that, for example, when you look at solicitations, that ethnical groups have lesser chances, even though they might be just as good.”*

In this quote he literally describes a process of discrimination that is, according to him, quite common in the Netherlands. But still he decided to sort discrimination among the nine least central statements for ‘the Dutch identity’.

But there is in fact a difference between the two white respondents that loaded significantly on this factor and the two black respondents in their reasoning not to select discrimination, racism and xenophobia as central to ‘the Dutch identity’. While both white respondents argue that these negative aspects are hardly to not present in the Netherlands, the two black respondents argue that they are very much present in the Netherlands, but that they are in every nation, and therefore not central in ‘the Dutch identity. The following excerpt of the interview with James, a Surinamese-Dutch respondent, illustrates this:

*“Discrimination, no that is really everywhere. It is not linked to a country.”*

*“But you do think it is present?”*

*“Yeah! Clearly!”*



### Factor 3: Critical factor of race relations

*Dutch with a migrant background: Najja, Yesser, Abdel*

Table 3: Factor 3 in study all 20 respondents

<b>Most central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>	<b>Least central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>
Discrimination	Equality of religion
Xenophobia	Equality of ethnicity
Freedom of religion	Colonial past
Freedom of speech	Freedom to be 100% yourself
Racism	Kings day
Freedom	Little complaining
Distinction between allochthones and autochthones	Innovative
Multicultural	Critical

This is the most striking factor of all four. While the Netherlands is perceived as a liberal country in which people are free to say and believe whatever they want, it is very intolerant towards ethnic and religious minorities. The respondents who load significant on this factor perceive the Netherlands as a country in which there is discrimination, xenophobia and racism. They also argue that there is a clear distinction in society between allochthones and autochthones.

What strikes further in this factor is the fact that on the one hand they argue that there is freedom of religion, and on the other they say equality of religion is the least central statement in ‘the Dutch identity’. They explain this by arguing that people are legally free to practice their religion, but that not all religions are perceived as equal, and as a result Muslims are discriminated against.

Although they perceive most statements about freedom very central in ‘the Dutch identity’, the freedom to be 100 percent yourself is among the least central statements. This is also related to religion. Because Muslims are treated unequally in their perception, they are not free to be who they really are. Abdel, a Moroccan-Dutch who strongly identifies himself as a Muslim, explains it as follows:

*“Freedom to be 100 percent yourself, well yeah... I am not looking at that from a cultural point of view, but uhm, more from a religious point of view. Can I be 100 percent myself as a religious person? I do not think so in the Netherlands. We are restricted here.”*

*“So you put it on the left side?”*

*“Yes, but then I am approaching it from my point of view, as a person. Besides my religion I can be 100 percent myself. But when religion comes in play, I don’t think so. I cannot be myself completely.”*

This is the only factor on which only Dutch with a migrant background are loaded significantly. So although Dutch without a migrant background can be critical about certain equalities not being as present as they like, none of them perceive the negative opposites as central in ‘the Dutch identity’.

Factor 4: Progressive paradise

*Dutch without a migrant background:* Tanne

*Dutch with a migrant background:* Rayu, Rachid

Table 4: Factor 4 in study all 20 respondents

<b>Most central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>	<b>Least central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>
Dutch language	Generous
Tolerance	Homophobia
Freedom	Little hierarchy
Freedom of religion	Racism
Freedom of speech	Gezelligheid
Equality of ethnicity	Xenophobia
Equality of gender	Studio Sport (sport program) at 7 o’clock
Equality of cultures	Discrimination
Equality of religion	
Polder model (consensus)	

This is the most progressive factor of all. As can be seen in table 4, the Netherlands is a very liberal country with several forms of freedom according to the respondents that load significantly on this factor. But not only are people free in practicing their religion or in expressing their opinions, everybody is also perceived as equal. In line with the presence of these equalities, homophobia, racism, xenophobia and discrimination are not central in ‘the Dutch identity’ at all.

What is striking in this factor is that while equality for homosexuals is in Dutch discourse often perceived as the most important ‘Dutch value’, in this factor it is the only equality that has a Z-score (0.810) below 1. So they perceive it as present in Dutch society, but not as present as the other equalities. This gets explained by Rayu, a Bengal-Dutch student, in the following quote about homophobia and homosexuality:

*“A lot of people tolerate it, but accept it less. They say: “I accept it, but they should not make out in front of me.”. So if you look at it like that they accept, uhm tolerate it, but if it gets too close to them they say no, don’t.”*

*“So you say it gets tolerated, but not perceived as equal?”*

*“We tolerate it, but we rather not have it. I also believe... Some friends of mine who came out of the closet, their parents are like: “Are you sure? Don’t you want to try it one more time or give it a shot with a woman?”. That’s a point yeah.”*

So while Rayu argues that homosexuality is not truly accepted in the Netherlands, and that homophobia is still present, he later argues that because homosexuals are relatively equal in the Netherlands compared to other countries, it is still quite central in ‘the Dutch identity’.

While in the Dutch narrative, Dutch society mainly is portrayed as progressive due to its tolerance towards women and homosexuals, which is used to exclude ethnic and religious others (Mepschen et al., 2010), the respondents of this factor also perceive the Netherlands as progressive when it comes to the position of ethnic and religious minorities. The following excerpt of Tanne illustrates this:

*“Racism, I don’t find that typical... I always find it a bit difficult. You always look a bit at the past and a bit at the present. And well yeah, the Netherlands has been quite racist during the Golden Century. You can’t deny that, so... And the Golden Century has been important for the foundation of the Dutch identity. So back then it was.”*

*“And do you also argue that in the Netherlands of today there’s racism?”*

*“No, now we have made our identity especially out of our liberal norms and ideals.”*

This excerpt shows how in the perception of Tanne there is no racism in the Netherlands due to idea that the Netherlands distinguishes itself through its liberal norms and ideals. Because he argues that they are ‘our’ liberal norms and ideals, he emphasizes Dutch progressiveness because by labeling them as ‘our’, it is also implied that other countries do not share this level of tolerance.

### 3.3.2 White Dutch

While the analysis with all 20 respondents showed four factors, the analysis with white respondents showed only two. When looking at the two factors, it is clear that Dutch without a migrant background have a cultural perception of Dutch identity. What is interesting is that while WRR (2007) perceives a cultural perception as a mix of values and habits, this analysis shows that there is a divide between the two. While one group emphasis progressive values as central in Dutch identity, the other group focuses more on traditions and holidays. This shows that there are actually two forms of a cultural perception.

#### Factor 1: Imagined society

Peter, Michael, Tanne, Maarten, Thomas, Willem, Stef

Table 5: Factor 1 Dutch without a migrant background

<b>Most central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>	<b>Least central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>
Freedom of speech	Hanukkah
Diversity	Little complaining
Freedom	Homophobia
Equality of genders	Easter eggs
Multicultural	Only 1 cookie with your coffee
Equality of sexualities	Getting up early
Polder model (consensus)	Christmas
Always having an opinion	Xenophobia
Tolerance	Islamic sweet festival

The seven Dutch without a migrant background who load significant on factor 1 perceive Dutch identity as very liberal and progressive, in line with the description of Schinkel (2013) from the imagined society. In their eyes the Netherlands distinguishes itself for its tolerance, freedom and equality for women and homosexuals. Therefore, it is not surprising that homophobia is perceived as not belonging to ‘the Dutch identity’.

An important factor in Schinkel’s (2013) article is the idea that the Netherlands as a progressive nation is idealized. This idealized image can also be found in the respondents’ explanations for their choices. An example is a quote from Peter:

*“These belong to each other: freedom of speech, equality of cultures, equality of religions, equality of genders, equality of ethnicities, equality of sexualities and multicultural. Those are ideal images of how we like to present ourselves, but it is not always present. But to me they are very important, so they definitely won’t end up on the left side.”*

This quote shows how Peter idealizes ‘the Dutch identity’. Although he argues that certain progressive values are not always present in Dutch society, this does not withhold him from perceiving them as central in Dutch identity.

At some points this incongruence results in respondents conflicting with themselves when they acknowledge that these values are not always present. They want these progressive values to be part of their nation, while they actually see they are not as present as they always perceived them to be. The following excerpt is an example of this, where Stef discusses equality of cultures:

*“Now I’m starting to think what’s really important. Then I guess that’s equality of cultures.”*  
*“Because you see that all cultures are perceived as equals in the Netherlands, or...?”*  
*“No, totally not. But it’s hard, because you also try to... This, this has been the Dutch identity. And it’s maybe threatened. But if you ask me this is what we should strive for. As our identity.”*

In this quote you see Stef struggling with his idealized idea of the Netherlands as a nation in which all cultures are perceived to be equal, while he acknowledges that they are not. But still he argues that it is part of ‘the Dutch identity’, creating an idealized identity that does not stroke with reality.

Factor 2: White holidays

Ludas, Reinier, Maurits

Table 6: Factor 2 Dutch without a migrant background

<b>Most central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>	<b>Least central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>
Wilhelmus (national anthem)	Discrimination
Sinterklaas	Homophobia
Christianity	Racism
Kings day	Hanukkah
Freedom	Little complaining
Christmas	Colonial past
Liberation day	Islamic sweet festival
Dutch language	Polder model (consensus)
Black Pete (helper of Sinterklaas)	Slavery past
Freedom of speech	Only 1 cookie with your coffee
Dutch national football team	Judaism

The second factor in the analysis of Dutch without a migrant background focuses on holidays. It is quite similar to factor 2 of the analysis with all respondents. Again the focus is on events

in which in their perception all Dutch come together, and the feeling of being one nation is present. Two liberal values and 'Christianity' supplement this focus on national holidays.

But what is even more interesting in this factor is what they perceive as least central in Dutch identity. The fact that in their eyes racism, discrimination and homophobia are least central shows that they also perceive the Netherlands as a very progressive nation. Although 'the Dutch identity' in their eyes really is about holidays, equality of genders (Z-score of 0.751) and sexualities (Z-score of 0.870) are also perceived as belonging to Dutch identity. This is also in line with the imagined society as argued by Schinkel (2013). The following quote of Reinier exemplifies this:

*"Equality of sexuality, sexual orientation. Yes I do believe that is very Dutch. In my opinion that is something we should be proud of, and uhm what I'm proud of myself. Everybody can be straight if they want to, everybody can be gay, or lesbian. I think it's really great that that's possible."*

What is also striking in this factor is the position of equality of ethnicities in relation to discrimination and racism. As mentioned above, racism and discrimination are among the three least central statements for Dutch identity in this factor. One would assume that the absence of discrimination and racism would lead to equality of ethnicities. But with a Z-score of -0.445, the perception is that there is in fact no equality of ethnicities.

Another interesting outcome is that they perceive non-native holidays such as Hanukkah and Islamic sweet festival as least central in Dutch identity. Just as Judaism, and to a lesser extent the Islam (Z-score of -0.703). This implies that they perceive Dutch identity as a white Dutch identity. So Dutch identity is not just about holidays and moments where the nation unites, it is especially about events that historically are Dutch.

### 3.3.3 Dutch of color

Where the analysis of Dutch without a migrant background only showed two factors, the analysis of Dutch with a migrant background shows three. What is similar to the analysis of Dutch without a migrant background is that there is a cultural perception of Dutch identity. This cultural perception, again, can be divided in the focus on values and the focus on cultural traits, holidays and habits.

All factors show an image of the Netherlands as a liberal country in which the language is a strong part of the national identity. What differentiates the factors is that factor 1 complements these liberal values with equality for cultures and ethnicities, factor 2 with holidays and cultural traits and factor 3 argues that although the Netherlands is a liberal country, it is also racist, xenophobic discriminative.

There is not a striking difference between Muslim Dutch and black Dutch. They are equally divided over all three factors.

#### Factor 1: Liberal and tolerant

*Rachid, Raja and Benny*

Table 7: Factor 1 of Dutch with a migrant background

<b>Most central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>	<b>Least central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>
Dutch language	Homophobia
Freedom of religion	Studio sport (sport program) at 7 o’clock
Tolerance	Easter eggs
Freedom of speech	Dinner at 5.30
Equality of cultures	Only 1 cookie with your coffee
Freedom	Generous
Multicultural	Little hierarchy
Diversity	Racism
Soberness	Colonial and slavery past

In factor 1 from the analysis of Dutch with a migrant background, the perception of ‘the Dutch identity’ is very liberal, multicultural and progressive. The difference with factor 1 in the analysis of white Dutch is that the focus is more on equality of cultures and to a lesser extent ethnicities (Z-score of 0.927), instead of equality for women and homosexuals. That does not mean that these values are absent. Equality of genders (Z-score of 0.782) and sexuality (Z-score of 0.146) are still on the right side of their sorts. The fact that homophobia is the least central statement in ‘the Dutch identity’ also implies that they perceive the Netherlands as a progressive nation in relation to sexuality.

Another difference with factor 1 in the white Dutch analysis is the position of statements related to religions. Dutch with a migrant background perceive freedom of religion (Z-score of 1.693) as more central in Dutch identity than Dutch without a migrant background (Z-score of 0.848). Dutch with a migrant background also perceive more equality of religion (Z-score of 0.810) than Dutch without a migrant background (Z-score of -0.090). This also affects the position of the three religions in this study. Although Dutch with a migrant background perceive individual religions as not belonging to Dutch identity (Z-scores of -0.396 for Christianity, Z-score of -0.542 for both Islam and Judaism), there is only a small difference between the religions. Factor 1 of Dutch without a migrant background however shows a clear ranking order, where Christianity (Z-score of 0.283) is perceived as most central, followed by Judaism (Z-score of -0.212), while Islam is perceived as least central (Z-score of -0.673).

## Factor 2: Habits and holidays

*Najja, Jason, James and Mehmet*

Table 8: Factor 2 Dutch with a migrant background

<b>Most central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>	<b>Least central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>
Dutch language	Judaism
National football team	Islam
Kings day	Islamic sweet festival
Freedom of speech	Hannukah
Dialects	Equality of religions
Freedom	Merciful
Liberation day	Generous
Just act normal, then you act silly enough already (saying)	Christianity
Sinterklaas	
Going Dutch	
Wilhelmus (national anthem)	
Being on time	

Just as factor 2 in the analysis with white respondents, holidays and liberal values are perceived as most central to Dutch identity in this factor. What is also similar is that holidays that are mostly celebrated by ethnic minorities are perceived as not belonging to Dutch identity. This implies that ‘the Dutch identity’ is mostly the identity of white Dutch.

The main difference between this factor and factor 2 of Dutch without a migrant factor is what is perceived as most central after liberal values and holidays. While Dutch without a



migrant background emphasize the progressiveness of the Netherlands, this factor focuses less on these progressive values. Instead the focus is on ‘typical Dutch’ habits and traits. Stereotypical ‘Dutch’ traits such as ‘going Dutch’, ‘only one cookie with your coffee’, ‘dinner at 5.30’ and ‘soberness’ are statements that are perceived as central in ‘the Dutch identity’.

Factor 3: Other side of the imagined society

*Daishano, Yesser and Abdel*

Table 9: Factor 3 Dutch with a migrant background

<b>Most central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>	<b>Least central in ‘the Dutch identity’</b>
Freedom of speech	Equality of religions
Xenophobia	Equality of ethnicities
Freedom	Little complaining
Dutch language	Only 1 cookie with your coffee
Always an opinion	Islamic sweet festival
Freedom of religion	Hannukah
Discrimination	Generous
Multicultural	Kings day
Racism	Just act normal, then you act silly enough already (saying)
Distinction between autochthones and allochthones	

This factor shows some resemblances with factor 1. In both factors the Netherlands is portrayed as a multicultural and liberal country. But their view on the position of ethnic and religious minorities differs greatly. While the respondents who load significant on factor 1 perceive religions, cultures and ethnicities as treated equally in the Netherlands, those who load significant on factor 3 are very critical with respect to these equalities. They perceive xenophobia, racism and discrimination as central in Dutch identity, and equality of religions and ethnicities as least central. So while they argue that the Netherlands is a liberal country in which you can say and believe what you want, the color of your skin and what you believe make a big difference in the way you are treated. Their perception of Dutch society as racist and xenophobic can also be seen as the result of the white Dutch narrative in which ethnic and religious others are excluded because they are perceived not to share ‘Dutch’ progressiveness.

**3.3.4 Differences between Dutch with and without a migrant background**

The most important difference for Dutch with and without a migrant background is the way they relate themselves to ‘the Dutch identity’. Dutch without a migrant background often talk about ‘we’ when they discuss ‘the Dutch identity’. This implies that they feel part of that

identity. This gets even more emphasized when they talk about ‘our identity’. For Dutch with a migrant background it is more complicated. While they talk about ‘we’ at some points, they also use ‘they’ quite often. This mix of the usage of ‘we’ and ‘they’ is something that happens without them realizing it. This pattern happened in almost every interview with Dutch with a migrant background. It shows that Dutch of color include themselves in ‘the Dutch identity’ when in their eyes a statement can be applied to them individually. But when in their opinion a statement does not apply to them, they say ‘they’. As a result, Dutch of color only identify with ‘the Dutch identity’ on positive statements they perceive as belonging to ‘the Dutch identity’. I will now illustrate this pattern with two quotes of Benny.

*“Hmm, homophobia does not belong to Dutch identity. We are quite accepting to gays.”*

This quote shows that Benny perceives homophobia as not belonging to Dutch identity. Because he perceives this as something positive and also does not see himself as a homophobe, he includes himself in the group that belongs to ‘the Dutch identity’. But while he perceives the Netherlands as a gay friendly country, he does not see it as a tolerant country. Because the absence of tolerance is a negative aspect in his perception, at this point he is distancing himself from the group that belongs to ‘the Dutch identity’. The following quote illustrates this.

*“Tolerance... Yes, they try their best. But it doesn’t always work out that well.”*

The discourse in which Dutch with a migrant background use ‘we’ and ‘they’ at different times when talking about ‘the Dutch identity’ shows that in their eyes, ‘the Dutch identity’ is a white Dutch identity. When their own identity correlates with ‘the Dutch identity’, as in Benny his quote about homophobia, they include themselves in ‘the Dutch identity’. But with negative aspects of this white Dutch identity they place themselves outside this identity. That ‘the Dutch identity’ is perceived as a white identity is illustrated by the following quote of Benny, where he catches himself on describing white Dutch identity, while he rationally likes to think of the Netherlands as a multicultural country.

*“I’m doubting myself a little. Because I was busy, and I suddenly realized: I’m actually sketching the image of white Dutch right now. But Dutch, like I said before, are not per definition white people.”*

While Benny realized this inconsistency in his rational image of Dutch and his unconscious image of ‘the Dutch identity’, other Dutch with a migrant background did not realize it, or perceived Dutch identity as white on a rational level as well. In the following excerpt, I asked Rajja at the end of the interview who he was thinking about while sorting the statements about Dutch identity.

*“While you sorted the cards, were you thinking: this is who we are as Dutch? Or were you thinking more like: This is who they are as Dutch? What feeling prevailed?”*

*“Uhm, yeah then I was actually more thinking about who are they instead of who are we.”*

*“Okay, so you were sorting the cards more like an outsider?”*

*“Yeah. And there will definitely be things that relate to me as well. But that is not the way I sorted the cards.”*

Dutch with and without a migrant background differed not only in whether they saw themselves as part of ‘the Dutch identity’, but the way they perceived ‘the Dutch identity’ also differed between the two groups. What both groups have in common is that they perceive the Netherlands as a liberal country where there is freedom in several ways. Another commonality is that in both groups factor 1 complements these liberal values with progressive values, while in factor 2 these liberal values are complemented with national holidays and traditions. But while factor 1 and 2 in both analyses look similar at first sight, there are some differences. Factor 1 in the analysis of white Dutch shows that equality of genders and sexualities are perceived as most central progressive values, which is in line with the literature (Schinkel, 2013; Mepschen et al., 2010). In the analysis of Dutch of color other progressive values are perceived as more central. Equality of cultures and to a lesser extent ethnicities are perceived as central to Dutch identity. This shows that white Dutch hold the image of the imagined Dutch society as described by Schinkel, in which equality of women and homosexuals are presented as ‘typical Dutch values’, while Dutch of color do not follow this discourse.

There are also differences between factor 2 in the analysis of white Dutch and the factor 2 in the analysis of Dutch of color. What the two factors have in common is that in both factors the emphasis is on liberal values and national holidays. The difference is in the statements that complement these liberal values and holidays. In factor 2 of white Dutch, these liberal values and national holidays get closely followed by ‘typical Dutch values’ equality of sexualities (Z-score of 0.870) and genders (Z-score of 0.751). So, while the emphasis is on holidays, the Netherlands is still perceived as a progressive country. In the analysis of Dutch with a migrant background, liberal values and national holidays get complemented with stereotypical Dutch habits and traits. ‘Going Dutch’, ‘dinner at 5.30’ and ‘only one cookie with your coffee’ are examples of such habits and traits. Progressive values of equality are perceived as less central or not central at all. So while white Dutch who load significant on factor 2 perceive the Netherlands as progressive, but emphasize national

holidays in ‘the Dutch identity, in the eyes of Dutch with a migrant background ‘the Dutch identity’ is more about habits and traits.

Another difference concerning the factors is that the analysis of Dutch with a migrant background resulted in a third factor. This factor also perceived the Netherlands as a liberal country, but was very critical of the position and treatment of ethnic and religious minorities. This factor emphasized the presence of discrimination, racism and xenophobia. So while all white Dutch perceived Dutch identity as a progressive identity, among the Dutch of color some perceived Dutch identity as conservative in certain areas.

Although factor 3 in the analysis of Dutch with a migrant background is the only factor that is explicitly critical on the position of ethnic minorities in Dutch society, overall Dutch with a migrant background were more critical in this respect. While white Dutch often argued that not all ethnicities are perceived as equal in Dutch society, they also argued that racism and discrimination were not present. Dutch of color in factor 2 also perceived discrimination and racism as not central in Dutch identity, but they argued that there is in fact discrimination and racism in the Netherlands. The difference is that white Dutch deny the presence of discrimination and racism, while Dutch of color argue that it is not central in Dutch identity because it is not as bad compared to other countries. So white Dutch see Dutch society as progressive with regard to the presence of racism and discrimination in an objective way, while Dutch of color perceive Dutch society as not racist and discriminative in a relative way.

### **3.3.5 Idealized image of Dutch identity and self**

The interviews and the Q sorts show that (white) Dutch hold a strong idealized image of Dutch identity. The Netherlands is perceived as a very progressive and liberal country. I found several ways in which this idealized image of the Netherlands gets created and maintained by Dutch.

The first way is by comparing Dutch society with other countries. In this relative way of judging progressiveness, the Netherlands is often perceived as more progressive than other countries. This positive comparison is also due to the fact that equality of genders and sexualities are perceived to be ‘Dutch values’ instead of human rights. Because these progressive values are claimed as being ‘Dutch values’, non-western countries are automatically assumed to not share this level of progressiveness. The following quote of Tanne about Dutch Queen Maxima is an example in which progressive values are claimed as being Dutch.

*“Well Maxima is a great example, because she’s really... she’s... she really learned these Dutch values, you know.”*

What is interesting about this quote is that the abovementioned mechanisms are displayed in one sentence. By talking about ‘Dutch values’ when referring to progressive values, the idea is that these values are only present in Dutch society. The idea that other countries automatically do not share these values works through in his assumption that Maxima did not share these values before coming to the Netherlands. His idea is that she only learned about the progressive values after she arrived in the Netherlands, while there is a good possibility that she already shared these values before her arrival in the Netherlands.

As a consequence of this idea of relative progressiveness that results in the idealized image of the Netherlands, equality is perceived as being relative as well. By perceiving the Netherlands as more progressive with regards to rights for women and homosexuals, the idea is created that women and homosexuals are perceived and treated as equals in Dutch society. The following quote of Thomas about homophobia illustrates this idea.

*“That is the least Dutch thing there is. If there is one country that is not homophobic, then it’s the country that was the first to allow gays to marry.”*

In this quote Thomas perceives the Netherlands as not being homophobic at all, because it is the first country that allowed gay marriage. His reasoning is that because other countries are more homophobic due to the fact that they did not allow gay marriage at the same time or did not allow it at all, Dutch society is not homophobic. By doing this he sees equality as something relative instead of something absolute. Ignoring the possibility that while other countries are more homophobic, Dutch society is homophobic as well. Partly due to this way of reasoning the idealized image of Dutch society is created.

Another way of creating an idealized image of Dutch society focuses on coping with the absence of certain progressive values and the presence of conservative attitudes. While in the aforementioned way of creating the idealized image of Dutch society conservative attitudes are perceived as absent in Dutch society, sometimes they are perceived as present. In these examples a coping strategy is used in two ways to maintain this idealized progressive image by placing negative attitudes outside ‘the Dutch identity’. The first way is to admit that conservative attitudes are present in Dutch society, but they are placed outside ‘the Dutch identity’. The following quote of Stef is an example of this way of coping.

*“Yes, I do think there are homophobes, but I don’t think that’s part of our identity. No, that does not belong to Dutch identity.”*

In this example Stef argues that while there are homophobes, homophobia does not belong to Dutch identity. So there can be homophobes or homophobic attitudes in Dutch society, but these negative attitudes are simply not central in 'the Dutch identity'. The second way conservative attitudes are placed outside Dutch identity is by placing those who hold conservative attitudes outside Dutch identity. In this line of reasoning Dutch identity is created by progressive Dutch, while Dutch with conservative attitudes do not belong to Dutch identity. This strategy of maintaining an idealized self-image is referred to by philosopher Anthony Flew (1975) as the 'no true Scotsman fallacy'. To maintain the image of moral superiority of the group, a group member who acts immoral is excluded from the group, and therefore the immoral act is excluded from the group.

The last way of creating the idealized image of Dutch society takes place on an individual level. All white Dutch saw themselves as progressive individuals that belonged to 'the Dutch identity'. In this image of their progressive self, conservative attitudes were not labeled as such to maintain this progressive self-image. Because they are part of 'the Dutch identity' themselves, every white Dutchman who is equally progressive as they are belongs to 'the Dutch identity' as well. As a result, everybody that belongs to 'the Dutch identity' is at least as progressive as they are. And in deciding what are progressive and conservative attitudes, their own level of acceptance functioned as a tipping point because their own attitudes are perceived as progressive. The following quote about homophobia of Michael illustrates this.

*"I must be honest, I'd rather see two women kissing than two men that are making out. Although I have nothing against it. But somewhere it does something to me that makes me not want to see it."*

*"No. And do you see that as homophobic, or not anymore? Is that still homophobic in your opinion?"*

*"Uhm I would... Uhm, I would rather... No, when I look at my own intentions it's not homophobia."*

This example illustrates how his own homophobic attitudes are not perceived as being homophobic to maintain the image of a progressive self. His own 'progressiveness' acts as a gatekeeper to decide who does and does not belong to 'the Dutch identity', and thus Dutch identity is perceived as a progressive identity. In this way the imagined society and the imagined self mutually reinforce each other which results in an idealized portrait of the Netherlands and its ethnic majority group as being free of homophobic attitudes. A portrait that is 'threatened' by the presence and arrival of (Muslim) immigrants and their offspring.

Because white Dutch see themselves as belonging to this idealized gay friendly ingroup, they automatically label themselves, and their own attitudes, as gay friendly, even when these attitudes are actually homophobic. The study of Buijs et al (2011) supports this idea. In their study, they interviewed Dutch perpetrators of antigay violence. One of their respondents, a soldier, tells how his dream of going to Afghanistan to bring ‘Dutch’ gay tolerance was shattered because he got dismissed of the army after he attacked gay men with his friends (ibid, p. 643-644). This example illustrates how the idea of the imagined society results in an imagined self, which in turn strengthens the idealization of the imagined society.

## **4. Dutchness**

### **4.1 Informal citizenship**

Bjornson (2007) differentiates three different stages of citizenship in the Netherlands. In the Fordist ‘male breadwinner’ regime the focus was on nationality. In the post-Fordist era the focus was more on active citizenship, being independent from the state. In the ‘Third Way’ regime those who were unwilling or unable to be independent were forced to ‘integrate’. Although the perception of citizenship has been different through the regimes, Hurenkamp et al. (2011) argue that citizenship has only become a burning topic in the past 15 years. According to them, citizenship entered the public spotlight as a result of three developments. The first is that due to increasing self-centeredness, as in the post-Fordism and ‘Third Way’ regimes (Bjornson, 2007), civic engagement is ending. A more communitarian form of citizenship is viewed as the answer. Second is the fear that growing diversity will decrease social cohesion. A republican idea of citizenship, that sees nationalism as a uniting force, is considered to be the solution. Third is another concept of republican citizenship due to increasing diversity. The argument here is that by debating the differences, a new shared language and shared solutions will be formed. The focus in all three developments is on creating a more cohesive society.

It can be argued that the focus in creating this cohesive society is on ‘Dutch values’. This might explain the shift to the culturalization of citizenship, as argued by Duyvendak et al. (2016). While having Dutch nationality used to be enough for the status of full citizenship, nowadays Dutch citizens with a migrant background also need to be recognized symbolically and emotionally as co-citizens, based on their adaption to the majority culture (ibid).

An important distinction is between civic and ethnic citizenship. Civic citizenship is based on the “ius soli” principle of nation building (Brubaker, 1990), which means that

citizenship is for all who live within the national territory. This idea of citizenship focuses on the basic civic principles of society. In this view on citizenship the national ingroup is defined as a community of people who all respect the social contract, which contains a set of basic principles such as respect for societal rules and laws, endorsement of equal political rights and active participation in society (Reijerse et al., 2013). Anyone who respects these principles can attain the status of full citizenship. Therefore, in a civic perception of citizenship it is relatively easy for immigrants to be included and to be seen as part of society (Verkuyten and Martinovic, 2015).

In contrast, the assumption of ethnic citizenship is based on the idea of “*ius sanguinis*” (Brubaker, 1990) of nation building, meaning that citizenship is related to blood ties. In this idea of citizenship, the national ingroup is perceived as a community of people of common descent and ancestry, and only those who share this common descent can attain the status of full citizenship (Reijerse et al., 2013). This idea of ethnic citizenship makes it impossible for immigrants to attain the status of full citizenship, since they cannot fulfill the ascribed criteria of nativeness.

The question is whether this dichotomy between civic and ethnic citizenship is still applicable. As described by Duyvendak et al. (2016), there is an increasing focus on the cultural aspect of citizenship since the start of this century. Kymlicka (2001) argues that there is a third perception of citizenship: cultural citizenship. In this view on citizenship the national ingroup is a community of people who share a common culture (Reijerse et al. 2013). Theoretically this form of citizenship should be open to immigrants, as long as they are willing to adapt to the culture of the ethnic majority. Reijerse et al. (ibid) however showed that this cultural perception of citizenship correlates significantly to negative attitudes towards immigrants, and that the majority culture is in fact used to exclude immigrants. Cultural citizenship is therefore overlapping with civic citizenship because citizenship is theoretically open, as it is with ethnic citizenship because it is used to exclude immigrants. In their study among high school students, Reijerse et al. (ibid) found that ethnic and cultural citizenship are positively related to each other and to negative attitudes towards multiculturalism. When they analyzed ethnic, civic and cultural citizenship simultaneously as predictors for attitudes towards multiculturalism and exclusion, only civic and cultural citizenship remained significant. This means that the effect of ethnic citizenship disappeared when controlled for cultural citizenship. So while in the cultural perception citizenship is theoretically open to immigrants, in practice it is used as another way of excluding ‘significant others’. This is in line with Schinkel’s notion of ‘culturism’, which he describes as a functional equivalent of



racism (2013, p.1145). Meaning that culture has become the new race and that in a culturist perception the different cultures are seen as incompatible, and should therefore not be mixed. In Dutch discourse this means that 'modern' Dutch/western culture is often perceived to be incompatible with 'backward' Islamic culture, which results in the exclusion of (Muslim) Dutch with a migrant background.

Duyvendak (2011) argues that out of this cultural citizenship another component arises: emotive citizenship. Besides conforming to 'Dutch progressive values', one must also feel emotionally attached to the nation state. This emotional attachment with the nation state must go deeper than simply feeling at home in the country of residence, there must be a feeling of true loyalty towards it. To be Dutch, one has to be loyal to the Netherlands, its society and 'its values'. If not, ones Dutchness is questioned. This emotional aspect plays a role in Dutch citizenship because of an 'affective restorative' focus on culture in Western Europe according to Tonkens and Duyvendak (2016). Restorative focuses on the idea of culture as something that is an already fixed given that must be (re)discovered if not known yet. The affective part emphasizes that citizens must feel affection for their nation and co-citizens. As a result of this affective restorative perception of culture, citizens must feel and show loyalty to the nation (ibid).

Antonsich (2010) writes about the politics of belonging. He argues that the notion of belonging is closely linked to a rhetoric of sameness and stresses the importance of boundary discourses of 'us' and 'them'. Duyvendak (2011) argues that in Dutch discourse, the distinction is mainly between 'us': the modern and progressive native-born western part of the population, and 'them': the Muslim 'Other' who comes from a different culture and of whom the most radical kill randomly. Yuval-Davis (2006) argues that assimilation to the language, culture, value, behavior and religion is very important to belong to the dominant group. In homogeneous progressive Dutch culture (Duyvendak, 2011), this means that newcomers must learn 'Dutch values'. This is also the goal in Dutch integration policy. Not only do immigrants need to become part of Dutch society, they also need to assimilate to the majority white progressive culture. Because of this focus on culture it can be argued that Dutch integration policy is not focused on integration, which would mean that immigrants need to participate in Dutch society, but that it actually focuses on assimilation. The focus on assimilation in progressive Dutch culture and the need for newcomers to be emotionally attached to Dutch society comes together in the newest feature added to the Dutch integration course: the declaration of participation (Rijksoverheid, 2016). In this declaration newcomers have to sign a document declaring they accept and respect 'Dutch values'. The implementation of this

feature emphasizes the discourse in which the Netherlands is perceived as progressive, while other countries are not. Which results in the idea that ‘others’ need to prove their loyalty to Dutch society and its progressiveness.

Citizenship is defined by the ethnic majority group (Duyvendak, 2011). Because in Dutch society the ethnic majority group is culturally homogeneous (Duyvendak, *ibid*), in Dutch discourse a clear distinction between progressive white Dutch and conservative non-white Dutch (with a Muslim background) exists. Because of this self-projected image of being a progressive nation, as seen in the analysis of ‘the Dutch identity’ of white Dutch in this study, sharing these progressive values is vital to be perceived as 100 percent ‘Dutch’. And because non-white Dutch are perceived to not share these ‘Dutch values’ and be loyal to them, they are also perceived as being less ‘Dutch’. The result of this is that Dutch of color constantly have to prove their Dutchness by showing their loyalty to Dutch society and ‘its’ progressive values in order to be seen as ‘Dutch’.

#### **4.2 Effects of exclusion**

What can be the effect of excluding people from full citizenship, and why can it be problematic? I will answer these questions with the help of three social psychological theories in relation to citizenship. The first is the self-categorization theory (SCT) by Turner et al. (1987), the second is Social Identity Theory (SIT) by Tajfel and Turner (1986) and the last is the theory of racial implicit bias.

SCT argues that once a social group is formed, its members go through a process of self-stereotyping. An ingroup prototype is created that is a representation of what defines the group as a whole. When it comes to citizenship, the perceived national identity functions as an ingroup prototype. As previously mentioned, the ethnic majority in Dutch society categorizes itself as a group that is connected by sharing progressive values. These prototypical characteristics, in this case ‘the Dutch identity’, may function as criteria of group membership, and can be used to include and exclude people (Reijerse et al., 2013). But as Triandafyllidou (1998) argues, a national identity can be recreated in order to distinguish the own group from groups of newcomers. This is what happened in the Dutch case. Dutch identity is perceived as progressive, with extra attention to equality of women and homosexuals. Progressive values that Dutch with a Muslim background are not perceived to share. Through this recreation of Dutch identity, (Muslim) ethnically others are placed outside the ingroup.

SIT argues that a person's own identity is for a great deal based on their group membership(s), and that people tend to perceive their own group as positive, while they tend to perceive the other group as negative. Because national identity is one of the most important social identities (Chrysochoou, 2004), being perceived as not belonging to the national ingroup can have negative implications for excluded groups. In Dutch society, this means that by excluding Dutch with a migrant background from full citizenship, and by doing so from the national ingroup, they are automatically placed in the outgroup. Since the outgroup is perceived as negative, Dutch with a migrant background are also perceived as negative. As a result, white Dutch are automatically perceived as progressive, while Dutch with a migrant background are perceived as conservative. Research shows however that in the Netherlands immigrants and their offspring show increasing support for 'western values' (Duyvendak, 2011). However, though they become more progressive, they are still perceived as conservative. Another negative implication argued by SIT is that people perceive bigger differences between members of the ingroup, than between members of the outgroup. This means that while white Dutch perceive their own group as a collection of individuals, they assign these conservative characteristics to all (Muslim) Dutch with a migrant background. Due to these negative images of Dutch with a migrant background, they are inclined to favor Dutch without a migrant background.

Most of these negative stereotypical images of (Muslim) Dutch with a migrant background are learned through a process of implicit learning. Seger (1994) defines implicit learning as follows:

*Implicit learning is nonepisodic learning of complex information in an incidental manner, without awareness of what has been learned. (p.1)*

Because Dutch with a migrant background are often portrayed and perceived in a negative light, they implicitly get linked to negativity. As people perceive outgroup members as more homogeneous, negative news about Dutch with a migrant background affects the perception of every individual member of this outgroup. Whilst according to SIT, Dutch with a migrant background could in turn perceive white Dutch as an outgroup, and therefore in a more negative light, it does not necessarily happen. Dasgupta (2004) found that members of disadvantaged groups show less ingroup favoritism, and sometimes even outgroup favoritism. Sachdev and Bourhis (1987) support this idea with their findings that minority groups often perceive high-status outgroups as more positive than the ingroup. A result that is also found by Hagendoorn (1995). This means that while white Dutch perceive their own group as

superior to Dutch with a migrant background, Dutch with a migrant background sometimes perceive white Dutch as superior as well.

These three theories show how exclusion from full citizenship can result in negative treatment of Dutch with a migrant background. Not only do Dutch of color always have to prove their progressiveness and their loyalty to Dutch society, favoritism of white Dutch also results in discrimination through the entire society, as shown in the discrimination report of Mink and Van Bon (2017).

### **4.3 Findings: Dutchness**

The semi-structured interviews show that in the perception of Dutch, Dutchness is a subjective idea of conforming to the prototype of ‘the Dutchman’. Although in the legal sense having or not having a Dutch passport decides Dutch citizenship, in the informal perception of Dutch themselves ‘being Dutch’ is an intangible mix of subjective criteria. For many respondents, having a Dutch passport is just a formality and not at all decisive for ones Dutchness, while for some it is one of the criteria to become 100 percent ‘Dutch’. Some make the distinction between being a Dutchman and being ‘Dutch’. In this distinction, a Dutchman is someone who is legally Dutch, so in this definition having a Dutch passport is enough for being a Dutchman, while being ‘Dutch’ is the informal perception of citizenship.

As aforementioned, progressive values such as tolerance and equality for women and homosexuals are perceived as being ‘Dutch’ by white Dutch. In this discourse the idea is that other countries do not share these progressive values. Because sharing these ‘Dutch values’ is vital for ones perceived level of Dutchness (Duyvendak, 2011), one is perceived as less Dutch if they identify with foreign citizenship. If this subjective perception of citizenship is used, the main idea of citizenship can be explained through the idea that everybody has 100 points, divided over their citizenship of different countries. I will illustrate this with the following quote of Thomas where he explains why he perceives Ahmed Aboutaleb, the mayor of Rotterdam, as less ‘Dutch’.

*“But I think that when someone identifies as Moroccan-Dutch, then it’s often, not always of course but often, uhm then it’s often of course because someone is proud to have Moroccan characteristics. And yeah... uhm... being more of something also means of course that you’re less of something else. Being more of one means that you’re less of the other. So, a Moroccan-Dutch, who identifies as being Moroccan-Dutch and for who Moroccan values are highly valued, Islamic stuff. Well yeah, less Dutch.”*

This quote illustrates how citizenship is perceived as having 100 points that are divided according to one's loyalty to several countries. In which the perception is that 'Moroccan values' and 'Islamic stuff' are by definition different than 'Dutch values', which makes someone less 'Dutch' when they identify as Muslim or as Moroccan(-Dutch). This perception of citizenship is in contrast with the legal idea of citizenship. In the legal interpretation, all who have Dutch nationality are equally Dutch. When persons also have the Moroccan nationality it only makes them more Moroccan, but not less Dutch. So the subjective and informal interpretation of Dutch citizenship enables the discourse in which there are degrees of Dutchness, where in the legal interpretation of citizenship it is a dichotomy: one is either Dutch or not.

In this section I will first focus on the perception of white Dutch on Dutchness, then I will focus on the perception of Dutch of color and lastly I will discuss the problematic situation that arises due to these perceptions of Dutch citizenship.

#### **4.3.1 White Dutch**

As the analysis of 'the Dutch identity' according to white Dutch shows, white Dutch perceive Dutch identity in two ways. In the first way 'Dutch values' are emphasized, while in the second way the focus is on national holidays and moments that are celebrated throughout the country. The semi-structured interviews show that the way Dutch identity is perceived, correlates with the way Dutchness is perceived.

According to the literature (Mepschen et al., 2010; Duyvendak, 2011; Schinkel, 2013; Duyvendak et al., 2016) Dutchness is related to sharing 'Dutch values', and loyalty to these values and the Netherlands. This notion of Dutchness corresponds with the way white respondents in this study describe their ideas of being 'Dutch'. White Dutch are not only a homogeneous group with their views on progressiveness (Duyvendak, 2011), they also share the same basic principles when it comes to criteria for ones Dutchness, especially for Dutch with a migrant background. A mixture of three components forms the criteria to be perceived as 'Dutch'.

The first component is 'Dutch values'. To be 'Dutch' it is a necessity to share progressive and liberal 'Dutch values'. In this discourse 'Dutch' progressiveness refers to the idea of Dutch society as a beacon of tolerance, equality and liberality. In their perception, the Netherlands is extremely tolerant towards ethnic and sexual minorities in contrast to other countries. Therefore these 'Dutch values' are seen as progressive. Equality for women and homosexuals, freedom, freedom of speech and tolerance are perceived to be the most

important 'Dutch values'. If one does not share these values, then they are perceived as less 'Dutch'. Of these values, tolerance is an interesting one. Although white Dutch perceive themselves as tolerant towards others, when someone is less progressive it affects their level of Dutchness. As Duyvendak argues:

*It may come as a surprise that a progressive and 'tolerant' country demands conformity from those whose views are not progressive. (2011, p. 89)*

Respondents sometimes struggled with this inconsistency during the interviews. While they emphasized their own tolerance, they also argued that those who did not share their progressiveness are less 'Dutch'. An example is a quote of Thomas about Turkish-Dutch. "Uhhmm... Yeah, I think that the moment people identify as Turkish-Dutch and not as Dutch, there's a difference. And I have no judgement on that, you know tolerance. But if we're talking about Dutch identity, then a something-something Dutch is something different than a uhh, Dutch."

This quote shows how although in his perception there are consequences for ones Dutchness when they identify as Turkish-Dutch, he still argues that he is tolerant and therefore does not judge them.

Another interesting aspect in the progressive self-image of white Dutch, is that in their eyes they are the only ones who can judge others progressiveness. While they judge others' conservative attitudes by perceiving them as less 'Dutch', claims of Dutch with a migrant background about white Dutch conservatism are not always accepted. Claims from Dutch of color, about conservative attitudes like racism and discrimination they experience, are not easily accepted as valid. As a response, they are perceived as being intolerant towards white Dutch, which makes them less 'Dutch'. Another response is that their criticism gets downgraded to them taking a 'slachtofferrol', a Dutch word for someone who portrays himself as being a victim, while he actually is not. An illustrating example of this mechanism can be found in the following quote of Tanne. In this quote he compares the Dutchness of Sylvana Simons to that of Jan de Wit. Sylvana Simons is a Surinamese-Dutch television personality who became a politician to fight against racism and other inequalities. Jan de Wit is a fictional prototype progressive white Dutch.

*"Well, she's really taking the slachtofferrol. She's talking about a lot of groups of which I'm not sure whether she really represents them. And then of course you can scream "Equality!", but everybody wants equality. I think it's typical Dutch that equality is possible. So, I think she is less Dutch than Jan de Wit."*

So while Sylvana Simons shares the progressiveness of white Dutch, and even fights for a higher level of progressiveness, she is less ‘Dutch’ because she is considered to be intolerant towards white Dutch conservatism. This shows that only white Dutch are allowed to be intolerant towards others’ conservative attitudes. This mechanism can explain why criticism of Dutch of color on the figure of Black Pete is not always accepted, as shown in Hilhorst and Hermes (2016).

The second component is that one must fully participate in Dutch society to be perceived as ‘Dutch’. Participating in the Netherlands is about work, speaking the language and housing. Forms of loyalty towards Dutch society are vital to participation. For instance, a foreign-born professional football player who obtains Dutch nationality, but does not integrate in Dutch social life is not perceived as ‘Dutch’. There is also an ethnic aspect at place here. White Dutch who move abroad, and do therefore not participate in Dutch society anymore, are still perceived as ‘Dutch’ because their loyalty is never doubted. Only Dutch with a migrant background have to prove their loyalty to Dutch society and therefore do need to participate at all levels in Dutch society to be perceived as ‘Dutch’.

This idea of loyalty is overlapping with the third component: emotional connection to the Netherlands. Duyvendak (2011) argued that for white Dutch, it is not enough if Dutch with a migrant background feel at home in the Netherlands. While surveys show that Dutch with a migrant background sometimes feel even more at home in the Netherlands than white Dutch (Duyvendak, *ibid*), this is still not considered as sufficient when it comes to emotional attachment. This emotional aspect of citizenship therefore is not merely about objectively feeling at home in Dutch society, it is about feeling attached and being loyal to the ideal type of white Dutch progressiveness. One must conform and adjust to the, as Schinkel (2013) calls it, imagined society. This not only means that Dutch of color have to share the level of progressiveness, they also have to agree with the idea that Dutch society is progressive. As a result, the critique from Dutch of color on conservative aspects in Dutch society affects their level of Dutchness, because it is perceived as disloyalty to this idealized image of the Netherlands as a moral superior nation. Therefore, this emotional aspect of attachment is not about feeling at place in Dutch society, but about sharing the idealized image of (white) Dutch ‘progressiveness’. In some interviews this is expressed in demands for persons to identify as Dutch and nothing else. For example, dual nationality is often disapproved of because it is perceived as a sign of disloyalty to Dutch society. For all white respondents it was important for Dutch of color to truly feel ‘Dutch’ in order to be ‘Dutch’. The fact that many Dutch with a migrant background do not identify themselves as ‘Dutch’ is therefore reason for white

Dutch to not perceive them to be ‘Dutch’. As was often reasoned, if one does not feel ‘Dutch’ himself, then who am I to perceive him as ‘Dutch’?

Sharing ‘Dutch values’, participating in Dutch society and feeling emotionally attached to the Netherlands often overlap, and a mixture of the three forms the fundamental concepts of Dutchness in the perception of white Dutch. Although everyone can become more ‘Dutch’ by adjusting to this prototypical notion of Dutchness, skin color also plays a role. While some respondents explicitly argue that only white Dutch can be 100 percent ‘Dutch’, others hold this idea more implicitly. While they argue that skin color is not a determining factor, Dutch of color always have to prove their progressiveness, loyalty and participation while white Dutch are assumed to conform to the criteria of Dutchness. This is illustrated in the following excerpt of the interview with Maurits where he was asked whether it was easier to consider a white person as ‘Dutch’ than a person of color.

*“For me? No, no. It doesn’t matter.”*

*“It does not matter?”*

*“No. Look, at first sight you would sooner think someone is Dutch. Without having talked to that person.”*

This excerpt illustrates how Dutch are perceived to be white, and therefore Dutch of color always have to prove their Dutchness. This creates a situation in which Dutch of color only can be perceived as fully ‘Dutch’ after they have proved their Dutchness. Which raises the question whether it is possible at all for Dutch of color to be fully ‘Dutch’, because how ‘Dutch’ are you when your Dutchness is constantly questioned?

#### ***4.3.1.1 Relation of Dutchness to ‘the Dutch identity’***

There are significant differences in the way Dutchness is perceived between white Dutch of factor 1 and factor 2. I will now discuss each group individually. As mentioned before, in factor 1 Dutch identity was perceived as very liberal and progressive. Equality for women and homosexuals and tolerance were perceived as the most central progressive ‘Dutch values’. For respondents of this group, these values were very important in deciding whether someone was ‘Dutch’. What was interesting is that not only Dutch with a migrant background could be less ‘Dutch’ by not sharing these values, but white Dutch as well. A white Dutchman with very backward attitudes about women and homosexuality was in this group almost unanimously perceived as less ‘Dutch’. This shows that while white Dutch overall are perceived to be progressive, their Dutchness is not unconditional. Therefore, meeting the criteria of the progressive Dutch image is more decisive for ones level of Dutchness than the color of their



skin. Their idea that Dutch with a migrant background can become '100 percent Dutch' when they conform to this progressive prototype and when they unconditionally identify themselves as Dutch confirms this idea. But skin color does play a role for respondents in this factor. White Dutch do not explicitly need to show their loyalty to Dutch society because they are assumed to identify themselves as Dutch, while Dutch with a migrant background have to show their emotional attachment explicitly to prove their loyalty to Dutch society. As white Dutch are perceived to share the progressive 'Dutch values', they have to show their conservative attitudes explicitly to be perceived as less 'Dutch'. For Dutch of color it is the other way around. Muslim Dutch are especially perceived to not share the same level of progressiveness, and therefore have to prove themselves over and over again. So, for white Dutch of factor 1, full citizenship is theoretically open for everyone. Whilst white Dutch are automatically assumed to be 'Dutch', Dutch with a migrant background have to constantly prove their Dutchness and are therefore not perceived as 100 percent 'Dutch' at first sight.

Where white Dutch of factor 1 perceived Dutch as liberal and progressive people who happen to be white most of the time, white Dutch of factor 2 perceived Dutch as white people who happen to be progressive most of the time. So many views of the two groups are overlapping, but the basic principles of Dutchness differ. For white Dutch of factor 2, white Dutch are unconditionally perceived as 100 percent 'Dutch'. Although they share the idea of equality for women and homosexuals as 'Dutch values', not sharing these values does not affect the Dutchness of a white Dutchman. Only Dutch of color become less 'Dutch' by not sharing these progressive values or by not feeling emotionally attached to Dutch society. But because Dutch are white in their perception, it is impossible for Dutch of color to become 100 percent 'Dutch'. The following excerpt of the interview with Ludas that starts with a question about the Dutchness of white Dutch, illustrates this.

*"When someone is racist, or discriminates, or is homophobic, does that make someone less Dutch?"*

*"No... If someone is very racist or very... that doesn't make him less Dutch if he celebrates Christmas and Sinterklaas and cheers in his orange suit when the national team scores. Then he is just as Dutch."*

*"And that homophobia, does that make a difference when for example an allochthone has it?"*

*"Yes..."*

*“Okay, so in that way Dutchness is unconditional for white people, at least white Dutch. But because these are important values in the Netherlands, someone who is... or whose parents aren't originally from the Netherlands has to conform to them?”*

*“Yeah, if he doesn't share these values, equality of genders and sexualities, and he's an allochthone, then it makes him less Dutch to me. Because I think these values are important in the Netherlands. But when a white Dutch does not share these values, then he is still Dutch. Emotionally.”*

This excerpt shows how Dutchness is only conditional for Dutch with a migrant background. White Dutch are per definition 100 percent ‘Dutch’, because of their ethnical background. Another difference between respondents of the two factors is that in line with their perception of ‘the Dutch identity’, white Dutch of factor 2 put more emphasis on celebrating national holidays as part of participating in Dutch society, while participating in Dutch society was mostly about conforming to the imagined society for white Dutch of factor 1.

#### ***4.3.1.2 Different perceptions of citizenship***

As previously mentioned, traditionally, there is a distinction between the two perceptions of citizenship: civic and ethnic (Brubaker, 1990). Kymlicka (2001) added a third perception: cultural citizenship. This new perception of citizenship is supported by Duyvendak et al. (2016), who argue there is a culturalization of citizenship. But Duyvendak (2011) argues that within this culturalization, there is a growing emphasis on emotive citizenship. In this part I will discuss how the perception of the white respondents in this study can be placed within these ideal typical perceptions of citizenship.

Reijerse et al. (2013) showed in their study that the three perceptions of citizenship correlate and overlap at certain aspects, this study confirms this notion. The criteria many respondents hold as a threshold to full citizenship are often a mixture of these three perceptions. From the ten white respondents, four showed elements of an ethnic perception of citizenship. Although Dutch of color could become more ‘Dutch’, and even come very close to attaining full citizenship, the color of their skin will always be a factor that withholds them from being just as ‘Dutch’ as white Dutch. These four respondents also considered white Dutch to be unconditionally perceived as fully ‘Dutch’. This shows that the fundamental perception of citizenship is based on ethnicity. Although, that does not mean they saw being ‘Dutch’ as a dichotomy, in which one is either ‘Dutch’ or not. They saw degrees in Dutchness for Dutch with a migrant background, leaving the possibility to become more ‘Dutch’ by conforming to their perception of white Dutchness. The idea of white Dutchness for these four

respondents is a mix of participating in Dutch society by speaking fluent Dutch, celebrating national holidays and loyalty to the idea of ‘Dutch’ progressive values. But while these aspects seem to belong to a cultural perception of citizenship, they are actually ways to show emotional attachment and loyalty to Dutch society. Dutch with a migrant background have to show their unconditional loyalty to Dutch society by explicitly showing their emotional attachment through these aspects, and only then they can come close to becoming fully ‘Dutch’.

The other six white respondents did not hold this determining ethnic undertone in their perception of Dutch citizenship. For them ‘being Dutch’ is about identifying with their progressive idealized perception of Dutchness. Although in their perception this prototypical identity is originally white, Dutch with a migrant background can become 100 percent ‘Dutch’ and white Dutch are not unconditionally 100 percent ‘Dutch’. Therefore, the difference with the other four white respondents is that skin color is not an impassable threshold. However, what they did have in common was the emotional perception in which one must be loyal to and identify with this imagined progressive identity of ‘being Dutch’. And although white Dutch are automatically perceived to share this emotional identity and Dutch with a migrant are perceived not to, it is accessible to all Dutch.

Therefore I argue that in Dutch society emotional citizenship is the leading perception among white Dutch. Due to the idea of progressive values being ‘Dutch values’ and therefore a central aspect in Dutch society, this emotional perception shows similarities with the cultural perception. I argue that the loyalty and emotional attachment to the imagined idea of Dutch society is more central in the perception of Dutch citizenship than the actual sharing of the same level of progressiveness. A good example is that Dutch of color who criticize ‘Dutch progressiveness’ are also perceived as less ‘Dutch’, even though they share the same level of progressiveness. This shows that it is more important to be loyal to the idealized idea of Dutch progressiveness, then to have progressive and modern attitudes. There is however a group that uses this idea of emotional citizenship to rationalize their exclusion of Dutch with a migrant background from full citizenship, and therefore cover their ethnic perception of citizenship by emphasizing the emotional aspects.

#### **4.3.2 Dutch of color**

Dutch of color have a different perception of Dutchness. While white Dutch hold an idealized image of Dutchness that entails progressive ‘Dutch values’, Dutch of color hold a less positive

image of Dutchness. Eight out of ten respondents with a migrant background held a similar perception of Dutchness, while two respondents had a different idea about being ‘Dutch’.

The majority of Dutch with a migrant background hold an ethnic perception of Dutch citizenship. Although it is possible for Dutch of color to become more ‘Dutch’ over time, it is impossible to become just as ‘Dutch’ as white Dutch because of the differences in ethnic features. They did not see themselves as part of the national ingroup and their ideas about Dutchness were formed from a sideline position. As a result, being ‘Dutch’ in their discourse was different than in the discourse of white Dutch. Two prototypical Dutch came forth out of the interviews with Dutch of color. The first prototype was an average Joe. A man who had a decent income, an average house and a wife and kids. The second prototype was more negative. In this perception, the typical Dutchman was a xenophobic man who was having a hard time accepting that ‘his’ country becomes more multicultural. What both prototypes have in common is that they are representatives of the stereotypical image of ‘white Dutch culture’. In contrast to white Dutch, progressive values were not used to describe their prototypical image of a Dutchman, and are therefore not important for ones Dutchness.

In the perception of Dutch of color one can become more ‘Dutch’ by assimilating into white Dutchness. Speaking the language is perceived as the most important factor, in line with their perception of Dutch identity. Not speaking the Dutch language fluently makes one automatically less ‘Dutch’. Assimilating into white Dutchness is mostly about adapting to white Dutch culture by celebrating holidays and by conforming to white Dutch traits and habits. The last condition to become more ‘Dutch’ is through becoming successful in white Dutch society. Finding a good job and developing a social network of white Dutch are ways to do this.

#### ***4.3.2.1 Outliers***

While most Dutch of color perceive Dutchness as abovementioned, there were two outliers who hold a different perception of Dutchness. The first is a black Dutchman who held a more civic perception of Dutch citizenship. Although he shared the image of white Dutch being the ‘typical Dutch’, Dutch who did not conform to this image were not perceived as less ‘Dutch’. Anyone who participated in Dutch society in the broad sense or who identified as being Dutch was equally Dutch in his perception.

The second outlier is a Moroccan-Dutch who emphasized the importance of participating in modern Dutch society. He argues that the Dutch society of today is different than Dutch society of a few decades ago. In modern Dutch society, there are people with all

sorts of ethnicities and sexual orientations. He claimed that anyone who does not accept this reality is less Dutch because it limits that person to fully participate in Dutch society. Another factor that has a limiting effect on the ability to participate in Dutch society in his perception, and therefore on their level of Dutchness, is Dutch language proficiency.

#### **4.3.2.2 Not accepted as ‘Dutch’**

Although four out of ten identified themselves as Dutch, nine felt they were not (unconditionally) accepted as ‘Dutch’ by white Dutch. They often felt they had to prove their Dutchness by showing that they speak Dutch fluently or by celebrating Dutch holidays. The following quote of Benny illustrates this.

*“I have noticed sometimes that others do not see me as much as a Dutchman, not as a Dutchman all the time. Except when I open my mouth and it appears that I talk polite and stuff. Then all of a sudden, I’m part of the group again.”*

They were often aware that the fact they were not accepted as Dutch had negative implication on their position in Dutch society. To prevent these negative implications some of them used strategies to appear as ‘Dutch’ as possible. Acting ‘Dutch’ in public and whilst in contact with white Dutch is one way of doing this. As some Dutch of color did not have ‘Dutch sounding names’, they also tried to avoid negative implications by hiding their name or by making it sound more ‘Dutch’. I will show two examples of Muslim Dutch who tried to hide their names to appear more ‘Dutch’. In the first quote Yesser explains how he tries to avoid people to perceive him as less ‘Dutch’.

*“Most of the time when people ask my name I don’t say Yesser, I just say Jesse. That immediately sounds different to them than when I say Yesser.”*

*“But when you say Yesser?”*

*“Then they say: “What?” And they ask where I’m from. They ask that right away, at least most of the times. What my origin is.”*

This quote illustrates that Yesser tries to avoid people asking where he is from, and therefore not perceiving him as less ‘Dutch’. What is also interesting is that he tries to avoid the questions about his origin. While white Dutch often ask this question in the first moments after meeting a Dutch with a migrant background, they do not notice that it makes Dutch with a migrant background feel excluded. The second example is an excerpt from the interview with Abdel that illustrates how he tries to avoid mentioning his name because he feels it might have negative implications for his work.

*“And I often don’t mention my last name, that’s not that important. So I often mumble “Hi, its Abdel” and then quickly proceed so they don’t really notice. But then, when you meet them and they see the black hair, the dark eyes and the darker skin color, you see in their reaction something like: ho, wait a minute...”*

*“And are you aware of it? Are you aware of the fact that you mention your name very quickly so they won’t notice?”*

*“Most of the times. Unless people ask for my name at the end of the call. Then there’s no way to wriggle out there. Then I just can’t say my name is Jan de Wit. But if they don’t ask for it and we’re just having the conversation then I often try to mention my name in the beginning, because when you call with someone they often forget the start of the conversation.”*

In this quote Abdel actively tries to avoid mentioning his name because he thinks it might negatively affect his work. So avoiding being excluded is not only to avoid negative emotional feelings, it is also to avoid decreasing life chances.

#### **4.4 Catch 22**

The combination of the perceptions of white Dutch and Dutch of color of Dutchness shows a problematic situation. White Dutch hold an idealized progressive self-image that is also used to emphasize imagined differences between themselves and (Muslim) Dutch with a migrant background. Within this discourse, progressive values are perceived to be ‘Dutch values’, thus the automatic assumption is that Dutch with a migrant background and newcomers do not share this level of progressiveness. Due to this assumption, Dutch of color constantly have to prove their progressiveness. Not only do they need to show their progressiveness to be perceived as fully ‘Dutch’, they also need to show an unconditional emotional loyalty to Dutch society that also entails themselves not identifying with their country of origin.

Dutch with a migrant background on the other hand perceive Dutchness, partly due to their exclusion from full Dutch citizenship by white Dutch, as a white Dutch identity. Becoming more ‘Dutch’ in their perception is only possible through a process of assimilation into white Dutchness. However, because ethnicity is an important aspect in their perception of Dutchness, becoming just as ‘Dutch’ as white Dutch is impossible. As a result, Dutch with a migrant background do not identify themselves as unconditionally ‘Dutch’.

This results in a catch 22 situation. White Dutch demand from Dutch with a migrant background to show emotional attachment to their Dutch identity and loyalty to the imagined progressive Dutch society in order to be perceived as ‘Dutch’. As such, they often do not perceive Dutch with a migrant background as fully ‘Dutch’. This results in Dutch of color

feeling like they are not accepted as being ‘Dutch’ by white Dutch, which is one of the main reasons for them not to identify as ‘Dutch’. In turn this is used by white Dutch to rationalize excluding them from full Dutch citizenship, because they themselves do not identify as ‘Dutch’. The result is a never-ending circular process that leads to exclusion of Dutch of color from full citizenship.

## **5. Conclusion**

Although Maxima argued that ‘*the Dutch identity*’ and ‘*the Dutchman*’ do not exist, in the perception of Dutch society they do. White Dutch perceive their identity as extremely progressive, and use several ways to maintain this idealized self-image. As literature shows (Mepschen et al., 2010; Schinkel, 2013) equality for women and homosexuals and tolerance are perceived as central values in Dutch society, and are even perceived as ‘Dutch values’. Dutch of color are assumed to not share the ‘Dutch’ level of progressiveness, which is one of the reasons why they are not considered to be fully ‘Dutch’. For some white Dutch, skin color can be a significant factor that determines whether someone is ‘Dutch’ or not. In this interpretation of Dutchness white Dutch are unconditionally ‘Dutch’. And while Dutch of color can become more ‘Dutch’ according to them, their skin color will always be an impassable threshold that excludes them from full Dutch citizenship.

Dutch of color have a different perception of Dutch identity and Dutchness, and see it as an identity of white Dutch. Their position towards this identity is often a view from the sidelines, which results in the usage of the word ‘they’ when talking about Dutch and Dutch identity. Their image of Dutch identity is less idealized, and sometimes even critical. They argue that it is possible for Dutch of color to become more ‘Dutch’ by assimilating into white Dutchness, although skin color will always be a determining factor. Due to this perception of Dutchness, they do not identify as ‘Dutch’.

The perception of Dutch citizenship for white Dutch is based on emotional attachment. In the literature, there were originally two perceptions of citizenship: a civic and an ethnic perception (Brubaker, 1990). Kymlicka (2001) argued there actually was a third perception, namely cultural citizenship. This idea of citizenship is supported by Duyvendak (2011) and Duyvendak et al. (2016). Duyvendak (2011) however argues that the emotional aspect is an important part of this cultural citizenship. In this research, I argued that this emotional aspect is even more central than the cultural aspect in Dutch citizenship in the perception of the ethnic majority.

This emphasis on the emotional aspect of Dutch citizenship creates a catch 22 situation whereby Dutch of color are excluded from full citizenship. In the eyes of white Dutch, Dutch of color have to identify unconditionally with the white idealized image of Dutch identity in order to be perceived as 'Dutch'. As a result, Dutch of color constantly have to prove their Dutchness and therefore do not feel accepted as belonging to the national ingroup by white Dutch, which is one of the reasons why they do not identify as 'Dutch' themselves. This in turn is used as a reason for white Dutch to not accept them as 'Dutch', because they do not fulfill the emotional requirements of full Dutch citizenship. This creates a cycle that results in the systematical exclusion of Dutch of color from full citizenship.

To end this cycle a new interpretation of Dutchness is needed. At the moment, Dutch informal citizenship is a subjective state of mind that causes exclusion of ethnic minority groups from the national ingroup. A new form of unconditional citizenship is needed that includes all Dutch. While at this moment several subjective criteria are used to exclude people from full citizenship, the focus must be on the objective legal aspect. In this perception full citizenship is not a privilege, it is a right. All criteria that exclude citizens who possess a Dutch passport are subjective and therefore create unnecessary exclusion. To achieve this new perception of Dutch citizenship, the focus must be on breaking the idealized image of Dutchness and white Dutch identity, and admit that the Netherlands is not the ultimate progressive and white nation it is in the minds of white Dutch. Not only will this give access to full citizenship for many excluded ethnic minorities, by admitting some conservative aspects in Dutch society, it can also help to raise the actual level of progressiveness. This recommendation is in line with the conclusion from WRR (2007), who argued that focusing on 'the Dutch identity' could be counterproductive.

The main limitation of this research is that due to the small sample size it is not generalizable to all heterosexual young males in Dutch society. However, although 20 respondents are not enough to generalize the results, the results do give an important insight in the way Dutch identity and Dutchness are perceived. These insights can be used to supplement the already existing bundle of knowledge about the topic.

Another limitation is that because of the qualitative research methods, the study is more subjective than quantitative research methods. Although interpretation plays a bigger role in this form of research, it also enables the researcher to dig deeper into respondents' minds and therefore gives data that can provide deeper insight in the perceptions of people. Due to the usage of Q methodology, this study also entails data showing patterns that other qualitative methods cannot give. This strengthens the objectivity rate of this research.



The next limitation is due to only selecting heterosexual male participants. Although this study gives insight in the perceptions of this majority group in Dutch society, it does not explain the role of their gender and sexual orientation for their perceptions. To give more insight in the role of gender and sexual orientation, other groups are needed to compare with. Due to limited time and resources I was not able to do this in this study.

For further research I recommend a quantitative study to examine whether the emotional perception found in this study is visible throughout Dutch society, or that a small group only supports this perception. I also recommend to further study the emotional aspects of citizenship to get a deeper understanding of this perception. This study showed that white Dutch do not get less 'Dutch' by not sharing 'Dutch values', in the perception of some white Dutch. However, the question remains whether they would be perceived as less 'Dutch' if they show disloyalty to the idealized image of 'Dutch progressiveness'. For instance, by converting to Islam or by showing loyalty to black Dutch in the Black Pete debate.

## 6. References

- Addams, H., & Proops, J. L. (2000). *Social discourse and environmental policy: an application of Q methodology*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities : reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Andriessen, I., Nievers, E., Faulk, L., & Dagevos, J. (2010). Liever Mark dan Mohammed?.
- Anthias, F. (2013). Identity and Belonging: conceptualisations and political framings. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 2(2), 102-110.
- Antonsich, M. (2010). Searching for belonging—an analytical framework. *Geography Compass*, 4(6), 644-659.
- Barth, F. (1998). *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference*. Waveland Press.
- Bjornson, M. (2007). Speaking of citizenship: Language ideologies in Dutch citizenship regimes. *Focaal*, 2007(49), 65-80.
- Blommaert, L., Coenders, M., & Van Tubergen, F. (2014). Discrimination of Arabic-named applicants in the Netherlands: an internet-based field experiment examining different phases in online recruitment procedures. *Social forces*, 92(3), 957-982.
- Brubaker, W. R. (1990). Immigration, citizenship, and the nation-state in France and Germany: A comparative historical analysis. *International sociology*, 5(4), 379-407.
- Buijs, L., Hekma, G., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2011). 'As long as they keep away from me': The paradox of antigay violence in a gay-friendly country. *Sexualities*, 14(6), 632-652.
- Canovan, M. (1998) *Nationhood and political theory*, Cheltenham: Edward Edgar.
- Carens, J.H. (2000). *Culture, Citizenship and Community*. Oxford: University Press.
- CBS: Bevolking; generatie, geslacht, leeftijd en herkomstgroepering, 1 januari. (2016, September 15). Retrieved May 15, 2017, from <http://statline.cbs.nl/statweb/publication/?vw=t&dm=slnl&pa=37325&d1=a&d2=0&d3=0&d4=0&d5=0-4%2C137%2C152%2C220%2C237&d6=0%2C4%2C9%2C14%2C18-19&hd=151214-1201&hdr=g2%2Cg1%2Cg3%2Ct&stb=g4%2Cg5>
- Chrysochoou X. (2004). *Cultural diversity: its social psychology*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dasgupta, N. (2004). Implicit ingroup favoritism, outgroup favoritism, and their behavioral manifestations. *Social Justice Research*, 17(2), 143-169.
- Duyvendak, J. W. (2011). Feeling at home in the nation? Understanding Dutch nostalgia. In *The Politics of Home* (pp. 84-105). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Duyvendak, J. W. (2011). Conclusion: Inclusive Ways of Feeling at Home?. In *The Politics of Home* (pp. 106-124). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Duyvendak, J. W., Geschiere, P., & Tonkens, E. (Eds.). (2016). *The Culturalization of Citizenship: Belonging and Polarization in a Globalizing World*. Springer.
- Duyvendak, J., & Kesic, J. (2017, February 15). Nationalisme in de verkiezingen. Retrieved May 13, 2017, from <https://www.groene.nl/artikel/to-be-dutch-or-not-to-be>

- Flew, A. (1975). Thinking about thinking: or, do I sincerely want to be right?. Fontana/Collins.
- Gellner, E. (2006) Nations and Nationalism. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Grillo, R. D. (2003). Cultural essentialism and cultural anxiety. *Anthropological Theory*, 3(2), 157-173.
- Hagendoorn, L. (1995). Intergroup biases in multiple group systems: The perception of ethnic hierarchies. *European review of social psychology*, 6(1), 199-228.
- Hilhorst, S., & Hermes, J. (2016). 'We have given up so much': Passion and denial in the Dutch Zwarte Piet (Black Pete) controversy. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 19(3), 218-233.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. (1990). Nations and nationalism since 1780. Programme, myth, reality, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurenkamp, M., Tonkens, E., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2011). Citizenship in the Netherlands: locally produced, nationally contested. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(02), 205-225.
- Kymlicka, W. (2001). Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism and citizenship. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCrone, D., & Bechhofer, F. (2008). National identity and social inclusion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31(7), 1245-1266.
- Mepschen, P. (2016). The Culturalization of Everyday Life: Autochthony in Amsterdam New West. In *The Culturalization of Citizenship* (pp. 73-96). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Mepschen, P., Duyvendak, J. W., & Tonkens, E. H. (2010). Sexual politics, orientalism and multicultural citizenship in the Netherlands. *Sociology*, 44(5), 962-979.
- Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid. (2016, July 08). Participatieverklaring verplicht onderdeel inburgeringsexamen. Retrieved May 24, 2017, from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/actueel/nieuws/2016/07/08/participatieverklaring-verplicht-onderdeel-inburgeringsexamen>
- Mink, I., Van Bon, S. (2017) Discriminatiecijfers in 2016: Een rapport over registraties van discriminatie-incidenten door de politie, en meldingen bij antidiscriminatievoorzieningen en andere organisaties in Nederland.
- Modood, T. (2007). Multiculturalism. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rajé, F. (2007). Using Q methodology to develop more perceptive insights on transport and social inclusion. *Transport Policy*, 14(6), 467-477.
- Reijerse, A., Van Acker, K., Vanbeselaere, N., Phaet, K., & Duriez, B. (2013). Beyond the Ethnic-Civic Dichotomy: Cultural Citizenship as a New Way of Excluding Immigrants. *Political Psychology*, 34(4), 611-630.
- Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. (1987). Status differentials and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 17,277-93.
- Saldana, J. (2013). An introduction to codes and coding. In *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (pp. 1-31). Sage.
- Scheffer, P. (2000). Het multiculturele drama. *NRC Handelsblad*, 29 January.
- Schinkel, W. (2013). The imagination of 'society' in measurements of immigrant integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(7), 1142-1161.

- Scholten, P. (2011). Constructing Dutch immigrant policy: Research–policy relations and immigrant integration policy-making in the Netherlands. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 13(1), 75-92.
- Seger, C. A. (1994). Implicit learning. *Psychological bulletin*, 115(2), 163.
- Shemmings, D., & Ellingsen, I. T. (2012). *Using Q methodology in qualitative interviews*. SAGE.
- Smith, A. (1991) *National identity*, Reno: University of Nevada Press.
- Stupar, S., van de Vijver, F. J., Te Lindert, A., & Fontaine, J. R. (2014). Multicultural attitudes mediate the relation between personality and perceived ethnic outgroup distance in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 38, 24-35.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter group behavior in S Worchel & WG Austin (Eds) *Psychology of intergroup relations*. Chicago: Nelson.
- Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory construction in qualitative research from grounded theory to abductive analysis. *Sociological Theory*, 30(3), 167-186.
- Tonkens, E., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2016). Introduction: the culturalization of citizenship. In *The Culturalization of Citizenship* (pp. 1-20). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Triandafyllidou, A. (1998). National identity and the 'other'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(4), 593-612.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Basil Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (352-363). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Verkuyten, M. (1998). Prejudice and Self-Categorization: The Variable Role of Authoritarianism and In-Group Stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. (24) 1, 99-110.
- Verkuyten, M., & Hagoendoorn, L. (1998). Prejudice and self-categorization: The variable role of authoritarianism and in-group stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 24, 99–110.
- Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2015). Behind the ethnic–civic distinction: Public attitudes towards immigrants' political rights in the Netherlands. *Social science research*, 53, 34-44.
- Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2005). Doing Q methodology: theory, method and interpretation. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 2(1), 67-91.
- WRR. (2007). *Identificatie met Nederland* (p. 240). Amsterdam University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of prejudice*, 40(3), 197-214.

## Appendix 1: statements in Q study

1. Gelijkheid etniciteit
2. Gelijkheid religies
3. Gelijkheid seksualiteit
4. Gelijkheid geslacht
5. Solidariteit
6. Vrijheid
7. Volledig jezelf mogen zijn
8. Gelijkheid culturen
9. Tolerantie
10. Vrijheid van religie
11. Vrijheid van meningsuiting
12. Barmhartig
13. Hardwerkend
14. Creatief
15. Innovatief
16. Handelsgeest
17. Direct
18. Sociale rechtvaardigheid
19. Polderen
20. Weinig klagen
21. Altijd een mening hebben
22. Vrijgevig
23. Doe normaal dan doe je al gek genoeg
24. Rijkdom
25. Kritisch
26. Zuinig/ gierig
27. Nuchterheid
28. Gezelligheid
29. Christendom
30. Plannen
31. Vroeg opstaan
32. Op tijd komen
33. Weinig hiërarchie
34. Jodendom
35. Islam
36. Diversiteit
37. Nederlands elftal
38. Wilhelmus
39. Onderscheid allochtonen en autochtonen
40. Multicultureel
41. Koloniale verleden
42. Koningsdag
43. Sinterklaasfeest
44. Zwarte Piet
45. Discriminatie
46. Xenofobie
47. Goudeneeuw
48. Slavernijverleden
49. Dialecten
50. Nederlandse taal
51. Homofobie
52. Racisme
53. Half 6 eten
54. Paaseieren
55. 1 Koekje bij de koffie
56. Going Dutch
57. Kerst
58. Oliebollen
59. Bevrijdingsdag
60. 7 uur Studio sport
61. Suikerfeest
62. Chanoeka

## Appendix 2: Interview guide

Interview topic lijst

Volgende punten benadrukken:

Geen goed of fout

Belangrijk dat je antwoordt wat je echt vindt, dat is vaak heel gevoelsmatig

Probeer geen antwoorden te geven die je denkt die ik wil horen, of die sociaal wenselijk zijn

Je antwoorden zijn anoniem

Als ik doorvraag is dat nooit om kritisch te zijn, maar puur om je punt duidelijker te krijgen

- Q-sort
  - Was het lastig?
  - Waarom bepaalde keuzes?
- Nederlandschap/ Nederlander zijn
  - Belangrijke punten NL identiteit, ook belangrijk voor Nederlander zijn?
  - Wat betekent het voor jou om Nederlander te zijn?
  - Iedereen met NLs paspoort even Nederlands?
  - Welke factoren spelen hierbij een grote rol?
  - Maxwell even Nederlands als Jan de Wit (volgens het ideaaltype vd Nederlandse identiteit)?
  - Turkse Nederlanders in R'dam even NLs als Jan de Wit?
  - Ahmed Aboutaleb even Nederlands als Jan de Wit?
  - Sylvana Simons even NLs als Jan de Wit?
  - Gelovige witte NLER die homoseksualiteit als ziekte ziet, vindt dat vrouwen niet mogen werken even Nederlands als Jan de Wit?
  - En is die gelovige witte Nederlander even Nederlands als Sylvana Simons?
  - Welke punten zijn er heel belangrijk gevoelsmatig voor of je iemand als Nederlander beschouwt?
  - Huidskleur ook van belang?
- Nederlandser worden
  - Kan iemand Nederlandser worden met de jaren?
  - Kan iemand ook minder Nederlands worden met de jaren?
  - Kan iemand dan ook 100% Nederlands worden?