

***The Joint Venture:
Social Capital, Social Cohesion And The Process of
Integration in The Dutch Participation Society. A case-study
from the Netherlands***

Linda Sloane

5685265

MA Social Policy and Social Interventions

Utrecht University

Abstract

As an example of the two sided process of integration into the Dutch participation society, the encounter of Eritrean newcomers who hold a residence permit and longer-established citizens and are members of a neighbourhood-initiative is portrayed. In order to do so, the concepts of social capital and social cohesion served as sensitizing concept to describe the case. The purpose of this case-study to give qualitative content to the discussion of these concepts in light of immigrant integration. Social capital is defined as the contact between the parties and the benefits of that contact. Social cohesion refers to a feeling of togetherness, getting to know each other and bonding with each other. Data was collected with qualitative means, namely semi-structured in-depth interviews. Due to the anthropological nature of this research, also participant observation was conducted but only to obtain an introduction to the field. The interviews reveal that the connection between many members of initiative and the Eritreans is of an informal family-like nature. It is this characteristic where it lies its strength and both groups identify many benefits of contact, such as practicing the language, getting to know the neighbours and feeling connected to each other. The first benefit is an advantage for the Eritreans, the latter two are benefits for both groups. In fact, the great benefit that both experience is getting to know the other including their cultural background, and a feeling of togetherness that is developed through activities that the initiative organises. Hence, social cohesion is a benefit of social capital for not only newcomers, but also longer-established citizens in a diverse setting such as the encounter of the Eritreans and members of the initiative.

Introduction

The triangle of (ethnic) diversity, social capital and social cohesion is a much discussed issue in academia, especially in sociology, but also in the public domain (Portes & Vickstrom, 2015). In fact, social capital building and enhancing cohesion have become particular items on the policy agenda of various European countries, such as UK (Fieldhouse & Cutts, 2010) and the Netherlands (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). The issue central to this discussion is whether or not social capital and social cohesion are effected by diversity. Browsing through the literature, one repeatedly comes across questions the question of “does diversity damage social capital?” (Fieldhouse & Cutts, 2010, p. 289). Putnam (2007) and his well-known research on social capital in ethnically diverse communities in the USA is an often crossed issue in that respect. He found out that people in diverse neighbourhoods generally distrust other people regardless their ethnicity and hunker down. This means that they develop an inward and passive attitude through which social capital, operationalized as trust, mutual help and friendships, declines. This claim has been re-assessed in many countries, including the Netherlands. For instance, Lancee and Dronkers (2008) support Putnam’s theory, whereas (Gijsberts et al., 2012) argue that it only counts for a specific context: Ethnic diversity seems to have a negative effect on the degree of contact in the neighbourhood.

Interestingly, the neighbourhood is a recurring feature regarding social capital and social cohesion. Neighbourhoods are considered to be an important layer when investigating and analysing both concepts in diverse settings (see for social capital Lancee & Dronkers, 2008 and 2011; and for social cohesion Morrison, 2003; Gijsberts et al., 2012). In the Netherlands, scholars were aware of the potential of neighbourhood to enhance social capital and cohesion already in the 80s and policy measures like the Big City Policies were established in the 90s (Dekker, 2007; Vermeij, van Houwelingen & de Hart, 2012). This issue is even more important since the proclamation of the Dutch participation society¹ by King Willem-Alexander (Rijksoverheid Nederland [Government of the Netherlands], 2013) in 2011: Everybody who is able to take on responsibility for one’s own life and direct environment is expected to do so. In the context of immigrant integration, this is crucial, as it suggests that not only immigrants have a pro-active attitude regarding integration, but also the Dutch citizens or neighbour respectively. It is a two-sided process at the micro-level of individuals, where newcomers and longer-established neighbours² approach one another (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek [Statistics Netherlands, CBS], 2014). Therefore, this undertaking is ought to be a joint venture: Integration, so says the Minister of Social Affairs and Employment, lies within the society (Asscher, 2014).

¹ Participation society and participatory society are used interchangeable throughout the paper.

² The term longer-established citizens is preferred as it includes citizens living in the Netherlands who are not necessarily Dutch by birth.

In light of the above mentioned discussion, this statement is debateable, as it presupposes encouraging contact between newcomers and longer-established citizens in the participation society in order to facilitate the integration process. However, a close description of this contact and its implications for social capital and social cohesion is yet missing. The aim of this research is therefore to provide such a narrative. In order to do so, descriptive research on a particular case of contact between newcomers and longer-established citizens has been conducted by means of anthropological methods combined with a sociological theoretical framework. The case-study of the encounter of volunteers of the initiative *Welcome To The Neighbourhood* (WTTN hereafter) with 96 Eritrean resident permit holders who were settled in a vacant student-housing complex in Lent is described.

This is of social and theoretical importance for several reasons. Firstly, many researchers tend to overlook the social nature of these social capital and cohesion, as they are mostly using quantitative measures. Since this research is focusing on individuals, the micro-level is central to the case. Secondly, some scholars such as Lancee & Dronkers (2011) have recognized the multiple layers of diversity, however, neighbourhoods are generally grouped together as either heterogeneous or homogenous settings. This dichotomy fails to notice that neighbourhoods are not only diverse regarding their ethnicity, but are diverse in several ways, f. i. regarding age, occupation and willingness to engage in contact. Thirdly, the description of the subject of this research is particularly relevant to policy-makers in Nijmegen, as it can hold insights of the daily life of integration to which the municipality of Nijmegen can respond. However, since newcomers can face the same challenges in the country of residence (Hynie, Crooks & Barragan, 2011), this case-study is also of interest for other municipalities that face a similar setting.

The broad research question to this case-study therefore is: *How do the newcomers and members of a neighbourhood initiative experience the integration process into the Dutch participation society?*

Theoretical exploration

In the following part, a discussion of literature on social cohesion and social capital will be presented. By doing so, they will be conceptually described and its connection to immigrant integration respectively diversity will be illustrated. Before finally specifying working definitions, the relation between theory and data within descriptive research based on anthropological methods is explained. This is particularly important as it helps to understand not only the relation, but also the manner in which social capital and social cohesion are defined.

Social capital

Social capital is a widely discussed notion in both the political and academic sphere. (Halpern, 2005) even argues that it has become a “buzzword” (p. 1) and that the broad interest derives from two directions: Policy-makers who rediscover the importance of the social while remaining in the economic sphere and academic researchers who investigate the relationship between social networks and various outcomes such as for instance economic growth, educational attainment, health and crime. A well-known conceptualization of social capital is made by Putnam (1993, 2000, 2007), although he was not the creator of the term. However, his analysis of the (presumed) decline of social capital in the US-American society facing increasing ethnic diversity (Putnam, 2000, 2007) is often quoted and of interest to this research. Putnam defines social capital as “connections among individuals” (Putnam, 2000, p. 19) – in other words social networks – and the related norms of trustworthiness and reciprocity that have an effect on individual and societal productivity. Furthermore, Putnam (2000, 2007) identifies two types of social capital: Bridging and bonding. The first refers to ties respectively connections of one’s own group, whereas the latter refers to ties/connections with people from groups that are different from one’s own group. This definition thus suggests that bonding social capital refers to homogenous ties and bridging social capital to ties that overcome heterogeneous differences (Cheong, Edwards, Goulbourne & Solomos, 2007). According to Putnam (2007), these two kinds of social capital are too often presumed to have an inversely correlation: Many bonding connections correlate to few bridging connections and vice versa. Increasing ethnic diversity, hence immigrant integration, would therefore lower social capital. However, Putnam found evidence for a different hypothesis which became known as the “constrict claim” (van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). The constrict theory implies that in-group and out-group ties can vary independently. Therefore, “we need to allow, logically at least, for the possibility that diversity might actually reduce both in-group and out-group solidarity – that is, both bonding and bridging social capital” (Putnam 2007, p. 144). During his research in the USA, Putnam (2000, 2007) found that people withdraw from social life regarding both bridging and bonding ties: Volunteering, community cooperation, in-group and out-group trust are lower and people have fewer friendships. However, Putnam (2007) also states that people eventually leave this fragmentation behind by establishing new forms of crossing solidarity and capacious identities.

Whereas Putnam (2000, 2007) focuses on community, Bourdieu (1986), a forerunner of theorizing social capital, is concerned with the routine custom of social capital in everyday life of the individual. Bourdieu (1986) is concerned with the benefits into which social capital may be transformed and defines social capital as the “aggregate of the actual or potential resource” (p. 248) that are linked to a certain relationships that one may have. Important to Bourdieu’s notion is that

(a) social capital can be transformed into other kinds of capital, for instance economic and cultural (Portes & Vickstrom, 2015), and (b) it is located at the very base of social units: The individual.

As different as the concepts social capital is, as disparate are its operationalisations (van Beuningen & Schmeets, 2013). In line of the Putnam-ian thought, reoccurring variables are trust and participation. In the Netherlands, for example, a well-known concept by CBS (2014) divides social capital into trust and participation, subdividing them into three dimensions, namely social, civic and political. The variety of definitions and measurement that scholars (Halpern, 2005; Portes & Vickstrom, 2015; van Beuningen & Schmeets, 2013) contend might be because of insufficient pinpointing the level of analysis. Halpern (2005) gives a very informative overview in that respect. In form of a three-dimensional coordinate axis, he classifies three kinds of social capital, components and levels – which leaves no less than 27 exemplary but measurable variables to investigate social capital.

Of course, since the case-study of WTTN is located at the micro-, such an in-depth framework is too broad for this research. In respect to neighbourhoods, Forrest and Kearns (2001) name eight domains of social capital and implications for local (neighbourhood) policies. The domains are:

- Empowerment (feeling of having a voice, being heard)
- Participation (taking part in local activities)
- Associational activity and common purpose (co-operation in formal and informal groups of shared interests)
- Supporting networks and reciprocity (mutual support and reciprocity)
- Collective norms and values (common values and norms of behaviour)
- Trust (trust in neighbours and local organisations)
- Safety (feeling of being safe in the neighbourhood)
- Belonging (place attachment and the feeling of connection to neighbours).

Although also in this framework micro- and meso-level are mixed, all dimension have one thing in common: The contact or connection to co-residents. This already indicates how Forrest and Kearns (2001) interpret social capital, namely as the foundation of social cohesion as a bottom-up process.

Social capital and social cohesion are closely related to each other. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to find an academic article that scrutinizes one of these concepts without touching upon the other. This leads to confusion where to make a distinction of the concepts. Van Beuningen and Schmeets (2015) state that the link of these concepts is defined in various way, for instance, social capital as a building block of cohesion, as an element or indicator of it.

Social cohesion

Social cohesion is a rather broad theoretical concept and various definitions can be found within academic literature (Schmeets & te Riele, 2014). In fact, according to van der Meer and Tosma (2014), the lack of a consensus is based on inadequate theoretical substantiation and has led to a “cacophony of empirical findings” (p. 460). However, as Schmeets and te Riele (2014) thoroughly observe, these definitions often consist of different “levels of participation that generate community” (p. 792). In this context, the question of ethnic diversity as being harmful to community – and its cohesion – is a reoccurring issue (van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). In the Netherlands for Schmeets and te Riele (2014) are ascertain the state of the art. They find that social cohesion has been stable in the Netherlands, but that there has been a divide between sub-populations regarding some indicators. Here, it is important to note that Schmeets and te Riele (2014) conceptualize social capital as a building block of social cohesion. This overlap of social cohesion and social capital is a frequently occurring phenomenon within social science research. For instance, Gijsberts et al. (2012) have discussed social cohesion within multi-ethnic neighbourhoods in the Netherlands. By doing so, they define cohesion as trust, informal help, voluntary work and neighbourhood contacts – whereas Putnam (2000, 2007) in his analysis of cohesion in the USA characterizes trust (and reciprocity) as associated norms of social capital. These different definitions are exemplary for the academic discussion on social cohesion and social capital and is not a coincidence, as social capital and social cohesion are closely linked to each other, yet the definition of this link, and consequently the definitions of the concepts, vary (Cheong et al., 2007).

Despite of the interconnectedness of social capital and social cohesion, it is important to identify them apart from each other, though the “inconsistent conceptualization and operationalization of the core concepts of social capital [and] cohesion” (Portes & Vickstrom, 2015, p. 175) make it difficult to find straightforward definitions of the concepts. However, Forrest and Kearns (2001) give a clear overview of social cohesion by identifying five dimensions:

- Common values and civic culture (having common aims, moral principles and codes of behaviour)
- Social order and social control (absence of conflict and threats; informal social control)
- Social solidarity and reductions in wealth disparities (equal access to wealth benefits; harmonious economic and social development)
- Social networks and social capital (social interaction, civic engagement, associations)
- Place attachment and identity (connection of personal and place identity)

Albeit other scholars (f. i. Schmeets & te Riele, 2014) also state that social cohesion has different levels such as social, organisational and political, Forrest and Kearns (2001) provide an all-round framework that allows an in-depth description of social cohesion and an insightful overview of its dimensions especially in relation to the neighbourhood, as the dimensions refer to relational character of social cohesion, namely its rootedness on the micro- or meso-level.

Nonetheless, there are also voices that have been rather critical of social cohesion as a concept, especially in relation to diversity. Harell and Stolle (2011) have argued that the assumption of homogeneity is the most problematic aspect of definitions of social cohesion in a twofold way. First, common values and identities are seen as a prerequisite for social cohesion, however, second, “the presence of foreign citizens and immigrants in Western democracies, homogeneity is equated with segregation” (Harell & Stolle, 2011, p.13) and therefore hindering social cohesion. This implies a rather assimilating view of the relation of ethnic diversity and social cohesion. Cheong et al. (2007) also support this view by stating that a shift to an “assimilationist framework for policy development” (p. 29) has marked the social cohesion and capital discussion – which reflects the discourse and predominant ideology of a certain time. Harell and Stolle (2011) see social cohesion as a series of social networks dealing with diversity rather than merging into homogeneity.

Before presenting working definitions, it is important to point out the role of theory within descriptive research. Since descriptive research is aimed at giving an in-depth description of a phenomenon, theory is used as an aid to describe, rather than to explain, falsify or verify a hypothesis (Baarda, de Goede & Teunissen, 2005). A theoretical concept, thus, serves as a “spotlight [zoeklicht]” (Baarda et al., 2005, p. 95) or “sensitizing concept” (Baarda et al., 2005, p. 95; Wester & Peters, 2004, p. 28) which serves the researcher as guidance. This is crucial to research based on anthropological methods, as it allows the researcher to be open towards the respondents’ description of an issue. To put it differently: One has to balance the inductive and deductive dimension of doing research. Induction refers to empirical findings, observations in reality and collecting information. Deduction consists of capturing patterns of reality by means of theory (Eriksen, 2010). Within descriptive research, thus, it is crucial to enter the field deductively impartial, but informed enough to make abstractions and depictions.

For this research, this means that the theoretical operationalization of social capital and social cohesion need to be broad in order to grasp the integral scope of the encounter between the Eritrean newcomers and the WTTN-members. Because of this, the theoretical exploration provided an overview of rather classical definitions of social capital and social cohesion. However, although this research is descriptive, it remains important to single out definitions to some extent that can serve as a spotlight and thus enable the researcher to be sensitive of empirical supplementation of theory.

In order to determine working definitions in context of this case-study, one must keep in mind that concepts of social cohesion and social capital, especially in the policy discussion, reflect a certain discourse or ideology of society: “Ideological positions on these issues [namely immigration and diversity] have shifted over the years, affecting the perception and constitution of ‘good’ social capital” (Cheong et al., 2007, p. 31). Therefore, it is important to include the Dutch participation society as a contextual component of social capital and social cohesion.

Within this society, participation means to join in society, and to actively take part (Vermeij et al., 2012). This does not necessarily mean that one does volunteer work or is a member of associations (as classic concepts of social capital suggest), rather it means that citizens are pro-active (Nicis Institute, 2010). Participation society, thus, is also called do-democracy. According to the Nicis Institute,

within the do-democracy, it is not so much about citizens who indicate which policy option (A or B) they prefer by raising their hand. Rather, it is about citizens who show where they stand through doing. If you want a clean street, go clean it up; if you want more ‘social cohesion’, organise encounters; if you have got a decayed playground, go fix it. (2001, p. 16)

Hence, social cohesion in the do-democracy is about meeting people and to take action together. In that respect, van den Berg et al. (2011) discover the potential of informal groups: mutual involvement based on solidarity, locality and identification amongst each other. WTTN can be classified as such a group, as it is a neighbourhood initiative based on informal connections of some (not all) neighbours, and its activities are based on a local level. Here, social cohesion is a living phenomenon of everyday life, much as Forrest and Kearns (2001) and Dukes and Musterd (2012) suggest. It is not about sharing, for instance, the same (Dutch) values and norms, but about a feeling of togetherness, getting to know the other and bond with each other.

Note that bonding is not referred to as bonding social capital in the Putnam-ian sense of the concept, as he determines is as an in-group trait whereas here it is not limited to one group only. Coming back to the social capital discussion of Bourdieu and Putnam mentioned above, this research makes use of a definition in line of Bourdieu’s thought. To recapitulate, Bourdieu (1986) sees social capital as a network of potential assets. Therefore, much as any capital, a characteristic of social capital is that one could invest it to make profits. Profits, of course, are not restricted to financial means, but could also be, for instance, an increased feeling of togetherness, i. e. social cohesion, or making sense of differences. The latter actually refers to the contact hypothesis that says, based on the intergroup theory by Allport (1979), more contact across diverse groups will contact will designate inter-ethnic solidarity and tolerance (Lancee & Dronkers, 2011). However, within this research, this hypothesis is not seen as an explanation of social cohesion or social capital, but as a potential effect or benefit of social networks that are inherent to both concepts (Zetter et al., 2016).

Social capital then consist of social ties, i. e. contact, and certain benefits that are they imply. It is, thus, “important not for its own sake, but for what one does with it, or can attain by it, as with other forms of capital” (Forrest & Kearns, 2001, p. 2141). Regarding this research, the working definition of social capital is therefore the contact itself and its benefits.

In conclusion, the theories used as sensitizing concepts for this case study are (a) social cohesion, i. e. the feeling of togetherness, getting to know and bonding with each other and (b) social capital, i. e. the contact itself and benefits of that very contact.

Empirical research question

As previously mentioned, the type of research is descriptive. The purpose of the case-study is to describe the two-sided process of integration into the Dutch participatory society, i. e. the contact of newcomers and longer-established citizens. To this end, the case of the encounter of Eritrean residence permit holders and members of the initiative WTTN in Lent was located. This research, thus, consist of a single case-study and refers to one particular situation only that is studied in its specific context (Baarda et al., 2005). In other words, this research is not designed to test a hypothesis, but to give a description of a social phenomenon in its relation to everyday life.

This shapes not only the research approach, but also the research question. The broad questions thus are: *How can the two-sided integration process in the Netherlands be described? How is it experienced by participants, i. e. the newcomers and longer-established citizens?*

Note that the two-sided integration process³ within the Dutch participatory society is regarded as the encounter of newcomers and longer-established Dutch citizens. Therefore, it is the contact that has to be described by means of the theoretical concepts of social capital and social cohesion. As explained earlier, the relation of data and theory is marked by its sensitizing character, therefore, no determining definitions were operated during the data collection. However, since theoretical concepts need to have a spot-light function even within descriptive research, the working definitions of social cohesion and social capital were operationalized. Within this research, social cohesion is understood in its entrenched meaning, namely togetherness. Part of this togetherness is getting to know each other and bonding with each other. The operationalisations of social cohesion thus are:

- Feeling of togetherness: feeling close to other people involved in WTTN (members and Eritreans)
- Getting to know each other: getting to know cultural differences, getting to know WTTN-ers and Eritreans

³ There are many layers of integration, such as social, political and economic. Within this research, only social integration is of concern.

- Bonding with each other: feeling connected with a person (WTTN-er or Eritrean).

Social capital was defined as the contact itself and the benefit that one may have from this contact. Therefore, social capital has been operationalized as follows:

- Contact: what kind of contact, with whom, means of contact between Eritrean newcomers and WTTN-ers.
- Benefits of contact: benefits of contact for Eritrean newcomers and WTTN-ers

The broader question mentioned above can thus be re-formulated into sub-questions by means of the working definitions: *How do WTTN-ers and Eritreans experience their encounter? What kind of feelings do they develop towards each other? In what way do they feel connected/bonded to each other? To what extent do they get to know each other? What kind of contact do they have? How do both parties may profit from that contact?*

Research strategy

In order to provide a thick description of the case, the issue was investigated by using an anthropological research approach. This means that qualitative methods were used to gather data and incorporated in a reflective research process. A reflective approach differs from the “classical” research circle, as it operates in a spiral movement rather than a linear process. Here, data is collected and analysed repeatedly, as they are “closely intertwined processes” (Gobo, 2008, p. 227) and ought to reveal the narrative of a case. In order to do so, the spiral process is divided into different steps, namely deconstruction, construction and confirmation. Briefly said, during the first phase, the researcher deconstructs the data into categories in order to find a pattern. During the second phase, the pattern is re-constructed and ideas about the case formulated. The last phase serves as a check-up in order to collect data that confirms (or discard) the pattern. Which analysis method is used in order to organise the data is explained later in this section. In reality those steps often interweave (Gobo, 2008) and the data collection regarding the deconstruction, construction and confirmation phase was staggered across the whole research period of three months. The qualitative methods in use were participant observation, informal conversations, partially structured interviews and group-interviews. The multiplicity of methods as well as the approaching and re-approaching of the “field” ensured the reliability of this case-study.

Population

The two different populations subject to the case-study had to fulfil several characteristics. On the one hand the volunteers of WTTN who needed to live in the neighbourhood, and on the other hand the Eritrean residence permit holders, who needed to live in the student-housing complex and know the initiative WTTN. In order to guarantee some diversity, the volunteers were of different age (18 -

70 years), gender and various degree of involvement in WTTN. This also counts for the Eritrean young men. However, their age group was pre-selected as all permit holders living in this complex are aged 18-23 years (Adviescommissie Allochtonen [Advisory Committee for Immigrants]). The WTTN-ers were approached directly during activities such as the weekly gathering of new and old neighbours on Sundays at the complex, or contacted by means of snowball sampling. That means that respondents made recommendations of who fulfils the requirements and could be approached next (Gobo, 2008). However, this worked differently for the Eritrean residence permit holders. Due to language barriers it was difficult to switch from a rather informal and amicable meeting to a formal request of an interview. Therefore, this research was presented during an empowerment-course of VluchtelingenWerk Nederland [Refugee Organization Netherlands, VWN], an independent organisation that is concerned with the needs of and support for refugees in the Netherlands. During the course, the Eritrean residence permit holders learn about the Dutch society, as for instance the school system, but also discuss cultural differences they encounter and would like to discuss. Since this course is given by a Tigrinya- and Dutch-speaking person, an informed consent was created. Thus it can be guaranteed that those who agreed to participate were fully aware of the research project. After the empowerment-meeting, two Eritrean residence permit holders were willing to be interviewed. However, also here the snowball sampling technique applied as they could make recommendations of whom to approach and interview as well. Nine WTTN-ers and seven Eritrean newcomers were interviewed in total.

Participant observation and informal conversations

The first two techniques, participant observation and informal conversation are solely of anthropological nature. The anthropological methods at work require an engagement of the researcher with the field, i.e. the research site, to a certain degree. Here, these methods were only used to gain an introduction into the field in order to be an informed interviewer. Participant observation means to enter the field and take part in it, but at the same time it means to reflect on what has been experienced. This differs from the ordinary participant who merely engages in activities. (Spradley, 1980, p. 54). By participating various activities organized by WTTN, such as a DIY-event in order to improve the shed of the housing, the field was explored in order to get a deep understanding of the context situation. Spradley (1980) defines five different levels of participation: non-participation, passive, moderate, active and complete. Regarding this research, the level of participation was without exception active. Active participation means that the researcher in first instance is participating and acting like an insider (without being one). Here, observations are made simultaneously to participation, but are processed afterwards.

Since this research is not exclusive ethnographic, it is important to maintain a certain distance to the field as well. In other words, the researcher has to balance the closeness that participant observation suggests. For this reason, participant observation was conducted on an irregular basis. For instance, the WTTN-ers organized a weekly casual meeting for new and old neighbours. In the shed next to the housing complexes, people can play cards, drink tea or coffee and spend some time together. These meetings were approached four times in total with a minimum of a two weeks' interval.

A crucial part of participant observation are informal conversations. Informal conversations are a sort of quasi-method, as they tend to be very rich in information but cannot count as an interview due to their informal nature. However, they are very valuable and informative in order to getting to know the research site, as the respondents can speak freely due to the informal setting and explain the field (Baarda et al., 2005). In fact, both participant observation and informal conversations are means to make the researcher familiar with the setting. Within ethnography, these techniques are also used in order to analyse. Regarding this case-study, both participant observation and informal conversation were used to "get the feel of what events are like" (Spradley, 1980, p. 51), to gain information about the situation (such as when did the Eritreans arrived etc.) and get into contact with people involved.

Due to the introductory nature of this strategy, no detailed recording of the observations and conversation has been made, as they were not subject to analysis. However, a fieldwork journal was kept throughout the research process in order to follow up new insights and be able to see the connection between events when starting the analysis (Spradley, 1980). The journal was written in style of memo's. Memos are an anthropological technique, i.e., ethnographic notes, that help the researcher to reflect on the collected information and on her/himself: observational, theoretical, methodological, but also emotional (Gobo, 2008).

Individual interviews and group-interviews

Two types of interviews have been used. First, the volunteers of WTTN were interviewed individually. The conversation was partially structured. This means that there have been pre-selected questions that could be answered in an open way. However, open questions were possible as well and the questions adapted due to the "expertise" of the respondents. For instance, some volunteers were more familiar with the organisation of WTTN than others, whereas some could talk about the contact with the Eritreans in-depth. Individual interviews bring the benefit of getting to know what an issue means to a certain person. Since this research is also aimed to describe the Dutch side of the integration-process, individual and partially structured interviews promise an in-depth insight. The interviews with nine WTTN-ers were conducted in Dutch. This was different in the second type of

interview, namely the group-interviews with the Eritrean young men. Here, since the Eritrean respondents asked for a translator, the languages of communication were Tigrinya, the most spoken language of Eritrea, and English. Conducting group-interviews has several advantages, for instance negotiating opinions (Baarda et al., 2005). Regarding this research, the respondents could discuss their ideas and opinions of WTTN in a group and complement each other if necessary. Moreover, due to financial concerns, lack of time and the limited scope of this research, the group-interviews were favourable. There were two moments of interviews. During the first conversation, two respondents were interviewed and during the second five.

The questions of both types of interview were organized along the line of the operationalized concepts of social capital and social cohesion. For instance questions about social cohesion were concerned with the connection that respondents might feel towards each other. Inquiries regarding social capital were made by asking about what the benefits of contact are for the Eritrean, as well as for WTTN-ers. However, some general questions that served as introduction, were asked as well. Moreover, in order to allow the respondents to fully give their insights and share their narrative of the contact between the WTTN-ers and Eritrean young men, the questions were adapted according to the expertise or preference of respondents⁴. To guarantee a complete collection of the answers of the respondents, the transcriptions of all interviews were verbatim.

Ethical considerations of data collection

The methods of data collection have to be ethical tenable. For this reason, several precautions have been made. First of all, as mentioned above, the distance to the field was an essential aspect. Therefore, the research proposal was not disguised but openly introduced as such when participating events. Regarding the contact to the Eritrean newcomers, it was difficult to introduce the research during the informal meetings due to language problems. In order to overcome this obstacle and guarantee a fully informed participation of the Eritrean young men, the research was presented to them in cooperation with VWN.

Second of all, the privacy of respondents needs to be assured. Therefore, the names of respondents are not connected to the data (i. e. transcriptions) and the analysis. For this reason, the respondents will be only quoted as either a WTTN-er or Eritrean throughout the paper.

Taxonomy and domain analysis

⁴ See appendix for a list of questions. Please note that this list is an incomplete representation of all question ask, as they could lead to conclusions of the identity of respondents. Moreover, some question were adapted during the interview due to the dynamic nature of a conversation.

The data collected was analysed by means of domain and taxonomy analysis⁵. Both are part of the developmental research sequence by Spradley (1980) and derive from ethnographic analysis. Originally they are means to discover cultural meaning and in essence aids to “[find] out what things mean to your informant” (Spradley, 1979, p. 92). Since this research is aimed to describe the integration-process from two sides, domain and taxonomy analysis are appropriate means to do so.

Domain refers to any symbolic category that includes other categories and consist of a cover term, included terms and a semantic relationship (Spradley, 1979). The latter is the link between cover term and included term. There are many semantic relationships in different language areas, but Spradley (1979) identifies nine universal ones:

- Strict inclusion: X (included term) is a kind of Y (cover term)
- Spatial: X is a place in/ a part of Y
- Cause-effect: X is a result/cause of Y
- Rationale: X is a reason for doing Y
- Location for action: X is a place for doing Y
- Function: X is used for Y
- Means-end: X is a way to do Y
- Sequence: X is a step/stage in Y
- Attribution: X is an attribute/characteristic of Y.

Strict inclusion, for instance, is a fairly common semantic relationship and refers to the included term as being a kind of the cover term. For example: a bike (included term) is a kind of vehicle (cover term). In order to conduct domain analysis, one has to identify cover terms first. Therefore, various parts of different interviews were investigated by means of the operationalized concepts of social cohesion and social capital. That means that the cover terms was sensitized by theory, but are complemented by means of semantic relationships and included terms. In the ideal case, respondents defined semantic relationships themselves. For instance, as one of the WTTN-ers denotes: the place of the weekly meetings is used for (i. e. semantic relationship function) getting to know each other.

The advantage of using domain analysis is thus to pinpoint what categories respondents themselves create instead of using top-down categories made by the researcher. Due to the spiral approach mentioned earlier, the domain analysis operated in the deconstruction phase in order to find patterns in the collected data. Consequently, in the construction phase, structural question can be formulated and asked in the interview. Following the example above, a structural question could be: Are there other places that are used to get to know each other?

⁵ See appendix for examples

After conducting more interviews, the taxonomy analysis was initiated. This does not mean, however, that the domain analysis was excluded. Rather, domain and taxonomy analysis were then conducted subsequently to each other. Due to the breadth of ethnographic analysis, the aim of taxonomy analysis is to make an in-depth analysis of meaning for a few selected domains (Spradley, 1979). It thus serves to identify subsets of domains and their relations. Since the domain analysis of this research has been broad as well, taxonomy analysis was an appropriate mean to find some structure in the domains. The first step is to select a domain with on semantic relationship. Then, broader, larger domains that may include the first selected have to be find. The aim of taxonomy analysis is to give a structured overview of the data and its relationships. For this reasons, it can be visualized with box diagrams, tree diagram or an outline list (Spradley, 1979). Within this research, the form of a tree diagram has been used. This was supplemented continuously as more data has been gathered. Here, again, the spiral structure of this case-study is of advantage, as the respondents can be asked – during the confirmation phase – about the domains or taxonomies that have been identified.

Results

The main question of this research was how the newcomers and longer-established citizens, who are active in a neighbourhood-initiative, experience their encounter, i. e. the contact between them. In order to describe this phenomenon, the concepts social cohesion and social capital served as spotlight theories during the process of analysis. By means of domain analysis, the great variety of both terms in this particular were discovered. For instance, regarding the contact itself, no less than six semantic relationships that describe the encounter were found. Since not all are relevant to this description, a point by point presentation of results will be avoided. Here, taxonomy analysis was helpful as it re-connected the differentiated domains.

The interviews demonstrated that the contact between WTTN-ers and the Eritrean young men is characterised by its informal nature. The activities that members of WTTN organise, such as the weekly meeting or sport events, have a “low threshold” (WTTN-er) that makes it possible to meet each other. During the Sunday meetings, for instance, some WTTN-ers who are involved on a regularly basis make sure that the shed, where people can sit and have a coffee or play cards etc., is always open. However, they do not expect people to come by and thus the constellation of participants is always changing. This might be also due to the fact that not all Eritreans were aware of WTTN in the beginning. Here, they point out the importance of a contact-person. A contact-person is a volunteer of VWN who helps refugees with getting to know the city, paperwork and other issues that might be relevant. Moreover, many Eritreans are not aware that WTTN also has got a Facebook page. However, Facebook and other communication technologies such as What’s App and Viber are

important means to contact each other, both for Eritreans and WTTN-ers. In fact, since WTTN-ers organise themselves via this means, one refers to them as “the power of social media”. Within WTTN, virtual and real-life contact are interwoven and some members meet digitally before they meet in person.

Regarding the real-life contact between WTTN-ers and Eritreans, the Griftdijk Noord itself appears an important place of action. WTTN-ers see this partially as an advantage, as it is easier to come together, but also as a disadvantage, as it might create a “mini society” (WTTN-er). However, it is this spatially close contact that is crucial regarding the encounter of Eritreans and WTTN-ers. For instance, through WTTN the Eritreans met a lot of neighbours and “there are many in the neighbourhood you would only have this small contact like, you say ‘hi’ when you see them somewhere” (Translator Eritreans). It was a start to meet people,

So every Sunday they would have from 3 to 4 ...it’s [the shed] always open, until now. So, if you want, you can go and have some chat with some Dutch people. Play cards, games and have a coffee together. And, yah [sic!]. Communicate with people. (Translator Eritreans)

Of course, the contact between WTTN-ers and Eritreans is as diverse as are the people involved. Some describe their contact as “really amicable” (WTTN), whereas another WTTN-er states that he “just keeps in contact by sometimes passing by”. By means of domain analysis it was possible to filter out some attributes of the different contacts. For the Eritreans, the ones who arrived at a later point indicate that they have less contact. Another attribute of contact is the age-difference between Eritreans and many WTTN-ers. Although some are the same age as the Eritreans (18-23 years), for the majority there is an age difference of 20 years. One respondent who is a member of WTTN-ers states that this is an obstacle to some extent, whereas others state that it is because of this that it is easy to get into contact. As one respondents puts it: “This way it is more likely that you dare to say something, or to take them by the hand. Or giving a hug” (WTTN-er).

Social capital was defined as the contact between WTTN-ers and Eritreans, but also as the benefits of contact for both groups. The great benefit that members of WTTN identify for themselves is that they have met a have met many people from the area and got to know them, “so, the feeling of in which neighbourhood I live, say, became broader through Welcome to the Neighbourhood”, as one WTTNer puts it. Some of them also realize that it is of advantage to know “what is going on” (WTTN) in order to communicate possible problems or issues that arise to organisations such as VWN. This reminds one of the theoretical concept of social control which was included in Forrest and Kearns (2001) conceptualisation of social cohesion. However, social control was not included in the theoretical framework of this research. This indicates how important it is to operate theory as a spot-light concept within descriptive research, as the dimension of social control can still be taken into account .

Regarding WTTN's position of reporting questions or problems of the Eritreans, they agree that members of WTTN can channel their concerns towards, for instance, VWN. Therefore, WTTN fulfils a mediating role which is a benefit for the Eritreans. However, members of WTTN also state that due to communication problems, there is a need of a mediator/translator on the side of the Eritreans.

Another benefit that many WTTN-ers mentioned is the "positive signal" (WTTN-er) that their encounter with the Eritrean newcomers promotes. Several members do not appreciate the "negative idea" (WTTN-er) about refugees and migrants in the Netherlands that media suggest. In combination with the right-wing populism that found its way into Dutch politics and society, some respondents feel that WTTN can "prove the opposite" (WTTN-er) by displaying how much they enjoy the contact with Eritreans and giving the Eritreans the opportunity to show "how great they are" (WTTN-er). This argument has to be understood in reference to the concerns that some citizens had before the newcomers arrived in Lent.

WTTN-ers also identify several benefits for the Eritreans. These benefits changed through time, according to "supply and demand" (WTTN-er). For instance, in the very beginning the great benefit was of material kind, as WTTN collected clothes, furniture and kitchen supplies for the Eritrean young men. Moreover, as the name of the initiative suggests, at that time the welcoming was essential. In the words of a member of WTTN: "I think that we, eh [sic!] as a group, say, from Welcome to the Neighbourhood, the most important [thing is] making them feel like 'guys – totally welcome here!'". In the meantime, other benefits emerged, such as building a network, getting into contact with (Dutch) people, and practicing Dutch.

Also for the Eritreans "language is the first thing" (Translator Eritreans), because you can "try all your broken Dutch" (Translator Eritreans). Here, again, the informal character of contact is important and is a benefit in itself:

Sometimes, when the Dutch people are coming, asking how things are going, sometimes they just talk about a lot of stuff, they would try to explain how things work in the Dutch system. Just in an informal way. (Translator Eritreans)

Therefore, getting to know the Netherlands is also a benefit. In fact, during both group-interviews the Eritrean young men indicated that throughout the contact with people from WTTN, they get they learn "how the Dutch people work" (Translator Eritreans).

Interestingly, both the Eritreans and one of the members of WTTN describe their encounter as an eye-opener. The Eritrean translator explains: "they [the Eritreans] say, they [WTTN-ers] were eye-opening for them. They opened their eyes, they, they helped them to know the neighbourhood, to know the people to somehow even know the Dutch culture". The member of WTTN speaks about cultural differences when he says that

They are very different than us Europeans. For example, if it is about making appointments, you know. Yes, they aren't very particular about time, everything is somewhat not binding. And less strict than we are used to it. And they have to adjust to that, but for me it was also a bit of an eye-opener, you know, we are all very strict about our agenda. (WTTN-er)

Hence, through the contact, both WTTN-ers and Eritreans are getting to know each other and are becoming familiar with the culture of the other. Note that "getting to know each other" is an operationalization of social cohesion. Here it becomes evident how interrelated social cohesion and social capital are. Another example of their interrelation is the above mentioned concept of social control. Earlier it was said that it is a benefit of contact that WTTN-ers can monitor problems and mediate them to relevant organisations. However, "knowing what is going on" (WTTN-er) is also seen as a result of "we know them, and they know us, too" (WTTN-er), in other words social cohesion.

Another question regarding social cohesion was to what extent the Eritrean young men and the members of WTTN feel connected to each other. Of course, the connections vary from person to person. Generally, the Eritreans know that the members of WTTN are "people who care and who come and just see how they are doing" (Translator Eritreans). However, as a respondent puts it, "of course, with some boys I have an extra-connection" (WTTN-er). As mentioned before, the contact between both groups is marked by its informal character. In fact, some relationships are family-like and are experienced mutually: "[She, a member of WTTN], would say you are all my sons. You are all my children. So they would call her, oh, you are our mum" (Translator Eritreans).

Here, it is interesting to note that Putnam (2007) made a distinction between bonding (intra-ethnic) and bridging (inter-ethnic) capital. Although within this research bonding is operationalized as social cohesion and not capital – regarding the quote above, it is questionable if one can make such a dichotomy as Putnam suggest, as the connection between the member of WTTN and the Eritreans is described as a strong bond and not a (metaphorical) bridge.

The WTTN-ers are very much concerned with bonding and getting to know the newcomers and are aware of the role that the activities they organise play in that respect. To them, it is important to "do it together" (WTTN-er) which can be anything from sporting together, to cooking and talking a walk, or building a vegetable garden. "You are talking, you are laughing, you are building a bond" (WTTN-er). This quote indicates: For most of the WTTN-ers, it is the underlying idea of getting connected and integrated that is central to the activities.

Next to the bonding between Eritreans and members of WTTN, there is also a feeling of bonding amongst WTTN-ers. In fact, a couple of respondents describe that the two neighbourhoods Lent and Oosterhout used to be somewhat disconnected which has changed now:

Old-Lent, New-Lent and Oosterhout they all said ‘yes, the guys [in Lent], those are our neighbours’. Through that, they [the Eritreans] are the bonding factor. For me, they became the bonding factor. (WTTN-er)

For some members of WTTN, bonding with other neighbours is a characteristic of a residential area such as Nijmegen-Noord, but since most parts of this borough are newly emerging neighbourhoods, it is often a missed feeling. As indicated above, the contact of members of WTTN with other neighbours, who are also part of the initiative, increased. Some of them can now identify with the area they live in more than before. “I feel Lent-ian”, as one of the WTTN-ers puts it.

Therefore, a feeling of togetherness is developed among members of WTTN. This feeling of togetherness also exists between Eritreans and WTTN-ers which is evident through the informal family-like contact. The Eritreans indicate that they feel at home and do not want to leave Nijmegen or Lent According to them, WTTN is of great influence regarding this feeling and describe it as “you feel like you are part of a big family here” (Translator Eritreans). Although a lot of WTTN-ers realize and appreciate this connection, one of them sees it is a temporarily condition, as the Eritreans are assigned to individual housing arrangements within three years. For the time being, however, their bond is mutually close.

In fact, the contact between the Eritrean young men and the members of the initiative has given the Eritreans “a sense of hope”, as they put it, “of being a part of society” (Translator Eritreans). In light of the Dutch participatory society, this quote is very interesting, as the Eritreans state they want to be part of it. Within the participation society the citizens are expected to actively take part in society by taking on responsibility for one’s own life and direct environment (Government of the Netherlands, 2013). It has been established earlier that it is also expected of immigrants to have a pro-active attitude in order to integrate. In that context, it has to be noted that the Eritreans see their relationship with the members of WTTN as reciprocal. Reciprocity then again can be characterized as an indicator of togetherness, especially with regard to an informal family-like bond as it is described here. In one of the interview they state:

If there is something that we [Eritreans] can do, even if it is in their [people of WTTN] place or in wherever, to help, to do something, they really, really want to do that (Translator Eritreans).

Discussion

The aim of this research was to give a description of an example of integration as a two-sided process of longer-established citizens that are members of a neighbourhood-initiative and newcomers with a residence permit who are settled in that same area. In order to describe the contact between those parties, the case of 96 Eritrean young men and the members of the initiative

Welcome to the Neighbourhood was portrayed by means of the theoretical concepts of social cohesion and social capital. The latter was operationalized as the contact itself and benefits of contact. Both Eritrean and WTTN-ers described their encounter as an informal contact, most of them described it even as family-like. The benefits of this contact were two-sided. The Eritreans saw the opportunity to practice Dutch as important, as well as discussing the culture of the Netherlands and getting to know people who live here. Also the WTTN-ers regarded the practice of language and the possibility to network as benefits. All parties appreciated the contact in itself and the feeling of togetherness that comes with it. Note that feeling of togetherness was an operationalization of social cohesion, as much as “getting to know each other” and “bonding with each other” was. Through the interviews it became clear that “bonding with each other” is actually multi-faceted. Not only were the Eritreans and members of WTTN mutually connecting to each other, the WTTN-ers also experience bonding amongst each other. This was partially because all participants of the encounter were “getting to know each other”. Here, it was mentioned of both the people of WTTN and the Eritrean young men that they get to know the culture of each other and can therefore understand each other better. In that respect, both parties regarded the connection between them as “eye-opener” (Translator Eritreans; WTTN-er). Also, many of the WTTN-respondents were accepting that the contact requires a meeting of both sides, or, as the respondents put themselves “cultural differences is about two sides” and “it is just not working the Dutch way” (WTTN-ers). In fact, regarding the two-sided process of integration within the Dutch participatory society, a member of WTTN states: “You always have to do integration together, because otherwise you can’t integrate, because you have to integrate into a society with Dutch people”.

Looking at the results of this research, the description of the integration process of immigrants into the Dutch society manifests itself to be important due to the micro-level nature of this endeavour. It reveals that within the participatory society there are individuals who want to engage in contact with newcomers, who then again become a part of society and want to contribute to it.

Although social capital and social cohesion are inherent to this process, the micro-level has often been disregarded in academic literature. However, as the theoretical exploration above suggest, the overload and overlap of theories that are concerned with social capital and social cohesion fit to the findings of this research. It is indeed difficult to distinguish the two and it seems to be a chicken-egg kind of problem. Nonetheless, regarding this research, some connections between social cohesion and social capital could be filtered out. Following the arguments of the respondents, social cohesion, i. e. getting to know each other, bonding with each other and a feeling of togetherness, are actually benefits of the contact itself, i. e. social capital. In figure 1 in the appendix it is made visible how social cohesion and social capital relate to each other regarding the findings of

this research. For instance, both (informal) social control and the mutual eye-opener are mentioned as benefits of contact, but they are also parts of social cohesion, as the former relates to “bonding/connecting with each other” and the latter to “getting to know each other”.

There are certain limitations of this research. First of all, a somewhat obvious criticism is the population of this case-study. Only a certain group of neighbours is included in the research, therefore overall statements about the neighbourhood cannot be made. Moreover, one could argue that the Eritrean young men are grouped together, as they are not interviewed individually due to financial and time issues. However, within this research a differentiation of the Eritreans has been made and since translator is a trusted person of both Eritreans and WTTN-ers, his translations can be count as valid representations for the Eritrean young men. Second of all, although this research provides insights into the integration-process on a qualitative basis, the lack of multi-method approach can be criticized, as it is the combination of the both that hold the most interesting findings.

However, this is a recommendation for future research: a multi-methods approach for investigating the integration-process into the Dutch society framed by the theoretical concepts of social capital and social cohesion. For instance, based on this descriptive research, some hypothesis could be made regarding these concept and then be tested by means of explorative research. Another option to get more insights into this issue is a multiple case-study, in other words conducting research like this very one in multiple settings in order to compare.

The case-study of the encounter of members of WTTN and Eritrean residence permit holders in Lent also holds recommendations for policy makers. Primarily, this accounts for the municipality of Nijmegen, but municipalities with similar settings can also profit from these insights. The main conclusion seems very simple: Contact is essential. However, if one thinks about the benefits and the interrelatedness of contact and social cohesion, it becomes much more complex. It is related to how connected we feel to the area and the people around us – it makes humans to the social beings that we are and lets us feel at home, like the Eritreans do in Lent. To facilitate informal contact, therefore, seems to be appropriate. However, it is also important not to “over”-facilitate the contact, as it then it is at risk to lose its informal charm. One way would be to answer needs such as the participating groups, i.e. Eritreans and WTTN-ers, claim. For instance, although the members of WTTN are a channel towards the Dutch society and Dutch culture for the Eritreans, due to language problems, at the moment, there is a need of a voice to channel the Eritrean culture. The municipality of Nijmegen could answer such a tangible request.

References

Adviescommissie Allochtonen. (2015, June 15). *Huisvesting statushouders Griftdijk in Lent*. Retrieved

from

http://www2.nijmegen.nl/gemeente/burgemeester_wethouders/adviescommissies/adviescommissie_allochtonen/adviezen/adviezen_2015

Allport, G.W. (1979). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Asscher, L. F. (2014, November 11). Kamerbrief 'Voortgang Agenda Integratie 2014'. Retrieved from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/kamerstukken/2014/11/21/kamerbrief-voortgangagenda-integratie-2014>

Baarda, D., de Goede, M. P. M., & Teunissen, J. (2004). *Basisboek kwalitatief onderzoek: Handleiding voor het opzetten en uitvoeren van kwalitatief onderzoek*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, pp. 241-258. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.

CBS. (2010). *Sociale samenhang: Participatie, vertrouwen en integratie*. Den Haag: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.

CBS. (2014). *Discrepancies in sociaal kapitaal van bevolkingsgroepen*. Den Haag: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.

CBS. (2015). *Jaarrapport integratie 2014*. Den Haag: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.

Cheong, P. H., Edwards, R., Goulbourne, H., & Solomos, J. (2007). Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: A critical review. *Critical Social Policy*, 27(1), 24–49.

Dekker, K. (2007). Social capital, neighbourhood attachment and participation in distressed urban areas. A case study in The Hague and Utrecht, the Netherlands. *Housing Studies*, 22(3), 355–379.

Dukes, T., & Musterd, S. (2012). Towards social cohesion: Bridging national integration rhetoric and local practice: The case of the Netherlands. *Urban Studies*, 49(9), 1981–1997.

Eriksen, T. H. (2010). *Small places, large issues*. London: Pluto Press.

Fieldhouse, E., & Cutts, D. (2010). Does Diversity Damage Social Capital? A Comparative Study of Neighbourhood Diversity and Social Capital in the US and Britain. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 43(02), 289–318.

Forrest, R., & Kearns, A. (2001). Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2125–2143.

Gijsberts, M., Van Der Meer, T., & Dagevos, J. (2012). "Hunkering down" in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods? The effects of ethnic diversity on dimensions of social cohesion. *European Sociological Review*, 28(4), 527–537.

Gobo, G. (2008). *Doing ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Government of the Netherlands. (2013, September 17). *Toonrede 2013*. Retrieved from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/toespraken/2013/09/17/toonrede-2013>

- Halpern, D. (2005). *Social capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hynie, M., Crooks, V. A., & Barragan, J. (2011). Immigrant and refugee social networks: Determinants and consequences of social support among women newcomers to Canada. *CJNR: Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 43(4), 26–46.
- Lancee, B., & Dronkers, J. (2008, May 15). *Ethnic diversity in neighbourhoods and individual trust of immigrants and natives: A replication of Putnam (2007) in a West-European country*. Paper presented at the inter-national conference on theoretical perspectives on social cohesion and social capital. Brussels: European University Institute.
- Lancee, B., & Dronkers, J. (2011). Ethnic, religious and economic diversity in Dutch neighbourhoods: Explaining quality of contact with neighbours, trust in the neighbourhood and inter-ethnic trust. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(4), 597–618.
- Morrison, N. (2003). Neighbourhoods and Social Cohesion: Experiences from Europe. *International Planning Studies*, 8(2), 115–138.
- Nicis Institute. (2010). *Burgerschap in de doe-democratie*. Den Haag: Nicis Institute.
- Portes, A., & Vickstrom, E. (2015). Diversity, social capital and cohesion. In C. Dustmann (Ed.), *Migration: Economic change, social challenge* (pp. 161-185). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century: The 2006 Johan Skytte prize lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137–174.
- Schmeets, H., & te Riele, S. (2014). Declining social cohesion in the Netherlands? *Social Indicators Research*, 115(2), 791–812.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Van Beuningen, J., & Schmeets, H. (2013). Developing a social capital index for the Netherlands. *Social Indicators Research*, 113(3), 859–886.
- Van den Berg, E., van Houwelingen, P., & de Hart, J. (2011). *Informele groepen*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Van der Meer, T., & Tolsma, J. (2014). Ethnic diversity and its effects on social cohesion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40, 459–478.
- Vermeij, L., van Houwelingen, P., & de Hart, J. (2012). Verantwoordelijk voor de eigen buurt. In Veldheer, V., Jonker, J.-J., van Noije, K., & Vrooman, C. (Eds.), *Een beroep op de burger*, pp. 254–274. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Wester, F., & Peters, V. (2004). *Kwalitatieve analyse*. Bussum: Coutinho.

Zetter, R., Sigona, N., Flynn, D., & Pasha, T. (2006). *Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: What are the links ?* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Appendix

Questions

Note: These question is not a complete representations of question asked during the interviews. In order to protect the privacy of the respondents, most follow-up question have been excluded.

However, this list provides an overview of the core questions on which the interview was based.

Please note also that some questions are closed, but those are follow-up questions of proceeding open questions. Some questions, such as the introduction question, served to gather background information.

WTTN-ers

Introducing questions

- Could you introduce yourself and explain how are you involved in WTTN?
- How did WTTN arise? What was/is the context-situation?

Core questions

- Could you describe the contact you have with the Eritreans?
 - To what extent do the Eritreans recognize/know you?
 - Is there a difference regarding the different groups? If yes, what kind of difference?
 - In your own appraisal: are you a trusted contact person for the Eritrean young men?
 - To what extent does the age of the Eritreans play a role in the contact?
 - How do you experience the encounter of your own culture with the Eritrean culture?
 - Are there particular benefits of contact for the Eritreans ?
 - Are there particular benefits of contact for you?
- What kind of activities does WTTN organise?
 - Why do you organise these activities?
 - What is your part regarding those activities?
 - To what extent do these activities promote integration?
 - To what extent do the acitivites have an effect on the neighbourhood? What kind of effect?

- To what extent does the experience with WTTN influences your contact with other neighbours/WTTN-ers?
- What is your motivation do take part in this?
 - Do you have got a sense of responsibility as a neighbour?
- Is there anything about WTTN that you would like to share but that we did not discuss?

Eritrean neighbours

Introducing questions

- Since when are you in Nijmegen?
- When did you see the people of WTTN for the first time?
 - How did you get to know WTTN?

Core questions

- With whom do you have contact of WTTN?
 - What kind of contact do you have with the people you mentioned?
 - What do you do together?
 - How do you get into contact?
 - Do you use the Facebook page of WTTN?
 - Do you know other (Dutch) people?
- What does WTTN mean to you?
- How do you feel here, in the neighbourhood?
 - Do you feel at home?
 - Do you feel welcome?
 - Does WTTN has got something to do with the way you feel? If so, can you explain it?
- How do you get to know the Dutch culture?
 - To what extent can you share your own cultural background?
- Is there anything about WTTN that you would like to share but that we did not discuss?

Domain Analysis of Benefits

INCLUDED TERMS	SEMANTIC RELATIONSHIP	COVER TERM
<p><i>WTTN-ers about Eritreans</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make connections • Getting help • Integration • Extending social network • To say something in Dutch • Get advise • To feel well „received“ • Contact with professional cyclists • Contact with Dutch people • Feeling of being welcome • In contact with Dutch people • To get a social network • Nice connection with each other • Support • Development of contacts • Get interior • Networking • Practise Dutch • Integration • Contact with people • Get off energy (spots) • Then it becomes “us” • Get rid of the negative (experience) • Being taken to the football club • Learning the way • Learn some Dutch words • Trust • To look somebody in the eye (cultural difference) • Seeing that it can be different • To know each other <p><i>WTTN-ers about themselves</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be more happy • To get to know people • Knowing each other • Trust • Be there on time • To watch out • Knowing what is happening • ‚Onbekend maakt onbemind‘ 	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strict inclusion: is a kind of</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Benefit of contact</i></p>

<p>(Unknown is unloved)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “They are acquaintances” • Neighbourhood is bigger • To get to know neighbours • To prove the opposite (of negative media) • Recognising faces • Positive signal (for the media) • Eye-opener • New friendships • Being involved • Good connection <p><i>Eritreans about themselves</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain how things work in Dutch system • Gives hope • Good feeling • Being a part of society • Try all your broken Dutch • Meeting friends • Opening up neighbourhood and Dutch society • Language • WTTN channels (f. i. problems) • Eye-opener 	<p><i>Strict inclusion:</i></p> <p><i>is a kind of</i></p>	<p><i>Benefit of contact</i></p>
---	--	---

Figure 1

