



["What we do not know, we fear." Facilitators and barriers for refugees' inclusion in Dutch workplaces]

Name and address: Veerle Ross

St. Annaplein 6, Tilburg

ANR: 792248

Name of the first supervisor: Lena Knappert

Name of the second supervisor: René Schalk

Project period: January 2016-November 2016

Project theme: Inclusion of refugees into Dutch workplaces

Date: 08-11-2016

Abstract

This study aims to provide new insights on the inclusion of refugees in workplaces in an understudied country, The Netherlands. Drawing on 15 in-depth interviews with employed refugees, employers and institutional actors such as NGOs and governmental institutions, this study applies Bourdieu's theory to enhance our understanding of the refugee status as one dimension in the diversity management literature. Across the three different levels (contextual, organizational, and individual level) described by Syed and Özbilgin (2009), the facilitators (e.g., an increase of media attention) and barriers (e.g., different treatment per local government) of refugees' inclusion in Dutch workplaces are analyzed. Further, the relations between the three different levels and theoretical as well as practical implications for the different actors are discussed.

Keywords: refugees, diversity management, The Netherlands, inclusion, barriers, facilitators, workplaces

Introduction

Countries of the European Union have recently become new homes for around one million refugees (UNHCR, 2015). The influx of refugees has reached many countries across the world, especially due to the Syrian civil war. Given the urgent need to fully accommodate considerable numbers of refugees, European societies and systems (e.g., fairly distribution of new arrivals across European countries) experience a 'shock' (Betts & Collier, 2015; UNHCR, 2015). Integrating this amount of people in a new and different society can therefore be challenging (Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland, n.d.), also knowing from history that the majority of refugees tend to stay for at least 10 years or longer (CBS, 2015). Being employed is a crucial aspect in achieving successful integration of refugees into the host country (Lundborg, 2013; Essed, 2002; De Vroome & van Tubergen, 2010). Yet, refugees feature high rates of unemployment, or have jobs with a lower status than their actual occupation (Ager & Strang, 2008; Cheung & Phillimore, 2013; Glastra & Vedder, 2010; Hooijer & Picot, 2015) and generally have a disadvantaged position in the European labor markets.

The purpose of this study is to explore what helps and what hinders refugees to find, get and keep a job in The Netherlands. This study focuses on an understudied country in the field of refugee research, The Netherlands (Van Tubergen, 2011). With 82.494 registered refugees in 2015 (UNHCR), refugees are becoming an important element of the immigration community in The Netherlands and information about the barriers and facilitators that refugees face in their job search is scarce (Van Tubergen, 2011). Even though there is not much known about the inclusion of refugees in The Netherlands (De Vroome & van Tubergen, 2010; Wrench, 2016; Block & Levy, 1999), a few previous studies on refugees in the Dutch context can provide a starting point for doing research on the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces. De Vroome and van Tubergen (2010) investigated refugees' experiences of employment and found that connections with natives, work experience, and Dutch language proficiency are positively related to the chances of employment of refugees in The Netherlands. Van Tubergen (2011) focused more on the different job search methods of refugees in The Netherlands and pointed out that refugees' job search is mainly facilitated by employment agencies. Taking a more broad perspective, Doomernik (1998) explored the labor participation and integration policies of immigrants in The Netherlands (e.g., refugees) and Bleijenbergh, van Engen and Terlouw (2010) specified the laws, policies, and practices of diversity at work in The Netherlands. They stated that policies regarding refugees became more restrictive since the year 2000, and Dutch organizations do not apply diversity practices very frequently.

Yet, these studies focused either on the individual level (experiences of refugees) by applying social and human capital theory (De Vroome & van Tubergen, 2010; Hartog & Zorlu, 2009; Portes, 2000; Chiswick & Miller, 2001) or on the contextual level, focusing on policies and programs (Doomernik, 1998; Bleijenbergh, van Engen & Terlouw, 2010). However, the organizational level (with an exception of the study of Van Tubergen (2011)) and the interactions between levels are barely taken into account. Therefore, this research will shed light on the organizational level and explore the

interplay between facilitators and barriers on the contextual, organizational, and individual level (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009). The leading research questions therefore are: *What are the contextual, organizational, and individual facilitators and barriers for refugees' inclusion in Dutch workplaces? And how do these facilitators and barriers work together across the three levels?*

I answer these questions by conducting explorative qualitative research (Spencer, Ritchie, & O'Connor, 2003). In particular, 15 semi-structured interviews with employed refugees, employers, and refugee experts (NGOs and governments) have been conducted and data has been analyzed with inductive content analytic methods (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004). Based on the relational framework of Syed and Özbilgin (2009) and the Bourdieuan theory (1990), the facilitators and barriers for refugees' inclusion in Dutch workplaces are firstly structured per contextual, organizational, and individual level and secondly analyzed with regard to their interplay and relations between the three levels.

Therewith, this study contributes to previous research by focusing on a qualitative, more in-depth perspective on the inclusion of refugees at work. It provides new insights on the organizational level and the refugee status in the domain of organizational diversity management (De Jong, 2015). Moreover, analyzing inclusion of refugees on three different levels (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009) while taking their interplay into account (Bourdieu, 1990), is essential for understanding facilitators and barriers of refugees' inclusion. Furthermore, this study sheds light on the understudied context of The Netherlands, while I hope to inspire future studies that may take a comparative perspective. Finally, this research provides practical implications for refugees themselves, employers and policy makers.

Theoretical framework

Syed and Özbilgin (2009) make a distinction between three levels, the contextual, organizational, and individual level. They state that diversity management will be reached in a context where the contextual, organizational, and individual level are approached and when there is support from all multilevel actors (Johns, 2006). They created a relational framework for diversity management in which they explain the relation between levels, the descriptions, give examples of variables and research questions. The relational framework for diversity from Syed and Özbilgin (2009) emphasizes that having a layered analysis is important to understand the objective- (e.g., laws and regulations) and subjective (e.g., how refugees interpret these laws and regulations) experiences that exist within a country. In order to explore the interplay between the levels and answer the research questions, this study provides an overview of the relevant literature per level.

The contextual level

The contextual level involves the societal and structural environments that have an influence on either the organizations as well as the individuals in a certain country (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009). Syed and Özbilgin (2009) based their relational framework for diversity management on the concepts of

Bourdieu. Moreover, in previous articles (e.g., Özbilgin & Tatli, 2011; Tatli & Özbilgin, 2012) Bourdieu's concepts are used to conceptualize and explore the field of diversity and equality. Applying Bourdieu's concepts became more popular among researchers in the equality and diversity field, since Bourdieu proposes that in order to understand society, relations are key. Therefore, in this study the Bourdieuan theory is used as a basis for the relational framework from Syed & Özbilgin (2009) to explore and conceptualize the refugees' inclusion dimension in the field of equality and diversity in The Netherlands.

The Bourdieuan theory explores two primary concepts, the field and capitals, which are interdependent and relational to each other. The field can be seen as the social space that is partially composed by historical powers (mainly the power of the state) (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) and is characterized by and build up through various forms of capital (e.g., money, skills, and networks) (Özbilgin & Tatli, 2011). Fields are territories where people compete for diverse forms of capital. Between these fields are certain rules that people should comply with (Özbilgin & Tatli, 2005). Bourdieu (1990) introduced the concepts of fields that societies consist of. The ownership and different forms of capital that exists within a certain field can on the one hand create inequalities and on the other hand cause privileges. It can for example create struggles between groups (refugees and Dutch people) and if you are in a field for a long time (e.g., living in The Netherlands your whole life), you will have an advantage over people who just arrived in that country (e.g., refugees) (Tatli & Özbilgin, 2012).

Next to the concept of fields, Bourdieu (1987) introduces the relational theory of capitals. This theory categorizes four different types of capital: economic (e.g., social class background), cultural (e.g., language skills), social (e.g., having networks), and symbolic (e.g., how previous capitals are valued) capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Özbilgin & Tatli, 2005; Bourdieu, 1998). The relational theory of capitals further explains that individuals use these capitals to improve their power and influence in a certain field they are in (Karataş-Özkan, 2011). Consequently, in order to have influence in the field, you need capital. For example, in the case of refugees having a network (social capital) or obtaining certain qualifications and skills (cultural capital), will help them to have influence in the labor market (the field).

The new institutionalism supports the Bourdieuan 'field' concept and focuses on how the society interacts with the institutions (Senge, 2013). The new institutionalism emphasizes the idea that organizations are not isolated organisms, but that organizations exist in a bigger context, which can be seen as the organizational field (Wooten & Hoffman, 2016). The new institutionalism expands the idea that organizations should not only be explained by profit organizations, by stating that other organizations such as hospitals, governmental organizations and educational organizations can contribute as well (Scott, Ruef, Mendel, & Caronna, 2000; Meyer, 1977). Furthermore, the new institutionalism states that when analyzing organizations, there is a variety of institutional influences that need to be taken into account, such as: cultural influences, political influences, and economic

influences (Meyer, 2010; Dobbin, 1994). In this study, the Dutch economic, political –and cultural influences can give insight in how the Dutch context can influence organizations' perspective on refugees (by looking at the employers' and NGOs perspective on hiring refugees) and which impact this can have on the refugees' inclusion in Dutch workplaces.

Therefore, I will provide certain characteristics from the Dutch environment. In Dutch law, equal treatment is a basic principle and unequal treatment of people in the field of paid work, salary, application and working conditions is forbidden. Refugees and migrants have become an important subject in the Dutch public debates, and since the 1990s refugees have to pass a strict citizenship exam to be able to get a residence permit (Bleijenbergh, van Engen and Terlouw, 2010). The Dutch society is ageing, wherefore organizations are more aware of developing the labor potential of for example refugees or women. However, The Netherlands faced a crisis in 2012 and 2013 with an increase of layoffs as a result (616.000 unemployed in 2015) (Van den Berge, Erken, de Graaf-Zijl, van Loon, 2014; CBS, 2015). This can hinder the development of labor potential at the moment.

When looking at the cultural influences on a national level (The Netherlands), Peretz, Levi and Fried (2015), point out that the way diversity programs are applied is related to the national culture. They emphasize that national cultures which are individualistic, more open, and more performance based are more likely to be supportive in encouraging the integration of minorities (e.g., refugees) into organizations. According to the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) project, The Netherlands show high individualistic values, while having authority is less important (lower power distance) (Allen, Inenaga, van de Velden & Yoshimoto, 2007). Further, according to Wennekers, Thurik, van Stel and Noorderhaven (2007), The Netherlands have low uncertainty avoidance, wherefore it's people are willing to explore the unknown and are less afraid of change, which again could create a welcoming environment for refugees at work.

The organizational level

The organizational level exists within the overall contextual level and emphasizes the employment context and inequalities in organizations (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009). De Jong (2015) emphasizes on the importance of studying the ethnic and migration field (e.g., refugees) in the field of (organizational) diversity management, since there are similarities and convergences and it is an under researched area. Barak (2013) defines diversity management as the organizational practices that are designed in order to create more inclusion of individuals (with different backgrounds) into the informal and formal organizational structures (e.g., policies and programs). Diversity management focuses on valuing the unique contribution of peoples' qualities (e.g., their knowledge, competences, and personality) to an organization (Heery & Noon, 2001). Looking at Dutch organizations, the majority does not apply diversity policies. Yet, individual initiatives (by pointing out individual qualities and work-family balance) are more common than initiatives aimed at certain target groups (e.g., refugees or ethnic minorities) (Bleijenbergh, van Engen & Terlouw, 2010). Previous studies investigated migrants'

inclusion in organizations (Ortlieb, Sieben and Sichtmann, 2014; Schnyder, 2015; Geddes, 2000). Yet, there is a lack in studies about refugees' inclusion in Dutch organizations. Ortlieb, Sieben and Sichtmann (2014) point out the importance of having organizational HR practices that promote inclusion of migrant workers. They state that on an organizational level, having HR practices that are linked to diversity practices can explain the positive effect of migrants on the profitability of a company.

The organizational approaches of diversity management from Thomas and Ely (1996) are applied into the Dutch migrant literature by Bleijenbergh, van Engen and Terlouw (2010). Thomas and Ely (1996) explain three organizational approaches of diversity management (discrimination and fairness, access and legitimacy, and learning and effectiveness). Firstly, the *discrimination and fairness approach* focuses on that all the employees have to acquire the dominant culture and deviations from the normal culture is viewed as something less. Most of the profit organizations in The Netherlands apply this approach (Bleijenbergh, van Engen, & Terlouw, 2010). Secondly, the *access and legitimacy approach* refers to the acceptance of diversity in organizations, but does not allow diverse employees to include their uniqueness in the organization. Mostly people with a similar background interact with each other. Certain Dutch organizations apply this approach with the aim of trying to attract new customers by hiring migrant people for *what* they are (potential customers) instead of *who* they are (people with a particular identity) (Bleijenbergh, van Engen, & Terlouw, 2010). Thirdly, the *learning and effectiveness approach* gives the necessary space to employees to make their choices based on their cultural background. It brings their (cultural) background into the work processes of the organizations. This approach represents an inclusive work environment, thus values multiculturalism, but also values the resources that a diverse employee obtains. For instance, certain Dutch multinationals applied this approach to increase innovation and reduce the life-long careers (Van den Berg, 2009).

According to Nishii (2013) the climate for inclusion is an environment that creates fair treatment for people from different backgrounds so they feel valued for who they are, and are for example included in important decision making. An inclusive climate is a climate where all employees are included and not only one specific group is targeted, such as ethnic minorities (Ferdman & Davidson, 2004; Shore et al., 2011). Creating climates for inclusion in organizations requires more than increasing the diverse workforce (e.g., hiring people with a diverse background) and implementing certain diversity/HR practices. It requires change in patterns of how people in organizations interact. The climate for inclusion emphasizes three dimensions (fairness of employment practices, integration of differences, and inclusion in decision making) (Nishii, 2013). Firstly, when *employment practices are fairly implemented*, employees tend to have more respect for interpersonal dynamics and social stigmas about people's identity and thinking. People who obtain another identity than the 'norm' do not have to hide their identity anymore (Hewlin, 2003). For instance, if authorities provide the same opportunities for refugees (and they do not have to hide their 'refugee status'

anymore), members of other groups (e.g., Dutch natives) and refugees are more likely to interact positively. Secondly, the *integration of differences* focuses on the integration of diverse people at the workplace. This approach implies that expectations and norms are collectively open for multiple identities (Kahn, 1990). If refugees do not have to restrain their emotions and behaviors in order to be aligned with the ‘desired’ in-group employees, but their differences are integrated. Lastly, *inclusion of decision making* points out that in inclusive climates employees can be part of the decision making and can express ideas which can even upset the ‘normal’ situation. The ideas that deviate from the norm are not seen as a threat, but more as something valuable for the organization (Ely & Thomas, 2001). Therefore, if refugees’ perspectives (e.g., based on their culture or previous experience) are seen as something valuable in the decision making by their supervisor or colleagues, there will be a climate for inclusion.

The individual level

The individual level exists within the contextual level and overlaps with the organizational level. This level implies the identity of a person and suggests that every individual possesses exclusive capitals that make him/her able to respond to different issues and challenges in the workplace (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009). Syed and Özbilgin (2009) emphasize the importance of knowing the objective and subjective experiences from individuals (in this case the refugees). The UNHCR (n.d.) identifies refugees as individuals who were forced to leave their country of residence in order to reach freedom. According to Turner and Herlihy (2009) refugees are individuals who are in danger of getting prosecuted in their own country, due to their political viewpoint, ethnic background, race, religion or citizenship. The interviewed refugees experienced the process of applying and having a job and furthermore experienced the feeling of inclusion in Dutch workplaces. Looking from the personal perspective of the refugees can therefore support answering the individual part of the research questions. The optimal distinctiveness theory and framework of inclusion suggest the importance of individual inclusion of minorities in organizations (Brewer, 1991; Shore et al., 2011). The optimal distinctiveness theory (ODT) demonstrates individual inclusion of minorities by suggesting that people on the one hand need the sense of similarity and on the other hand also need the sense of uniqueness. If the sense of similarity and uniqueness are in balance, there is an ideal level of inclusion (Brewer, 1991). The 2x2 framework of inclusion, formulated by Shore et al. (2011) elaborates on the ODT by showing that uniqueness and belongingness are the factors that create the feeling of being included. The framework consists of four elements; inclusion (high belongingness and high uniqueness), exclusion (low belongingness and low uniqueness), assimilation (high belongingness and low uniqueness) and differentiation (low belongingness and high uniqueness). In the case of refugees, if they feel they belong to certain groups in an organization, where they value their ‘different’ and ‘unique’ competences, background, and for instance their culture, they can feel included inside the organization.

Methods

To explore the topic of refugees' inclusion and to provide answers to the research question, explorative qualitative data collection was used (Spencer, Ritchie, & O'Connor, 2003). 15 in-depth, semi-structured interviews have been conducted with refugees (7 interviews), employers (3 interviews) and refugee experts (3 governmental professionals and 2 NGO professionals). The interviews have been conducted in April and May 2016. The interviews aimed to gain new insights from the perspectives of employers, the refugee experts (from the government and NGOs) and individuals (refugees) across the diversity/refugee field. To be able to explore the three levels and their interactions as outlined by Syed and Özbilgin (2009), the selection of interview partners considered actors from the contextual level (i.e., governmental and NGO representatives), the organizational level (i.e., employers and an employment agency), and the individual level (i.e., the refugees themselves). Further, this selection is in line with the New Institutionalism, which suggests to take profit organizations as well as diverse other institutions, such as NGOs and governmental institutions into account (Scott, Ruef, Mendel, & Caronna, 2000; Meyer, 1977).

Population and sample

The refugee sample consisted of people that settled in Dutch cities, were working, and also had the legal right to work in The Netherlands. The refugees were either status holders (that had a 5 years residence permit) or refugees who were in The Netherlands for longer than 15 years. The interviewed refugees came from Armenia, Senegal and Syria. Their age varied from 24-44 and 2 female and 5 male refugees were interviewed. The educational level varied from high school to university level (obtained in country of origin). Table 1 details the characteristics of the interviewed refugees.

Table 1
Refugee sample

Refugees	Age	Gender	Country of origin	Years living in The Netherlands	Highest educational level	Current position
Refugee 1	24	Male	Senegal	3	High school in country of origin	Warehouse employee
Refugee 2	32	Female	Armenia	17	University of applied sciences in The Netherlands	Legal assistant
Refugee 3	44	Male	Syria	2	University of applied sciences in country of origin	Interpreter
Refugee 4	24	Female	Armenia	17	University level in The Netherlands	Production employee
Refugee 5	26	Male	Syria	2	High school in country of origin	Hairdresser
Refugee 6	31	Male	Syria	1,5	University level in country of origin	All-round employee
Refugee 7	34	Male	Syria	2	University level in country of origin	Interpreter

The sample of refugee experts consisted of people that were working for governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and employers. 5 females and 5 males were interviewed and

the organizations were local governments, UAF (NGO for higher educated refugees), Vluchtelingenwerk (the Dutch council for refugees), a big consultancy company, an employment agency, and a housing corporation. Their professions differed as reintegration coach, account manager, policy employee, advisor refugees, consultant job support, and (project- and program) managers. Table 2 details the characteristics of the interviewed refugee experts.

Table 2
Sample of refugee experts

Organization type	Gender	Type of organization	Current position
Governmental organization	Female	Local government in ‘Brabant’	Reintegration coach
	1 Male/1 Female	Local government in ‘Brabant’	Account manager/policy employee economics and labor market
Non-governmental organization	Male	Local government in ‘Limburg’	Advisor refugees
	Male	UAF	Consultant Job support
Employers	Male	Vluchtelingenwerk	Project manager
	2 Females	Big consultancy company	Program manager refugee talents/CSR manager
	Female	Employment agency	Program manager social development and inclusivity
	Male	Housing corporation	Manager

Procedure

The refugees were reached out by using contacts at the Dutch council for refugees, different social media channels (e.g., LinkedIn) and snowball sampling. Snowball sampling was an advantage for this qualitative research, since it is an informal method of reaching the right people and people that are less visible in society (Atkinson & Flint, 2001). After every interview the respondents were asked if they knew anybody who would fit the sample and would want to participate in an interview. The interviews were conducted face to face by a master student and an assistant professor and lasted about 1 to 2 hours, taking place at the respondents’ workplace, public places, and refugees’ homes, wherever it was most convenient for the interview partners. All the interviews were recorded and a consent form was signed to get consent from the respondents regarding the scientific use of their data, while anonymity and confidentiality were ensured. The interviews were transcribed and translated into English. The interviews were conducted in Dutch or English, depending on the preference of the respondents and their level of understanding of the Dutch/English language.

Instruments

Two parallel semi-structured interview guidelines were used, specified for the refugees and the refugee experts. Before every interview the guideline was slightly adjusted to the individual

respondent (e.g., the company name was mentioned and previous knowledge about the organization/refugee was incorporated). Both interview guidelines consisted of 5 blocks of questions. The refugee guideline consisted of: (A) Introduction, (B) General questions about personal background, (C) Diversity and inclusion in the current organization, (D) The role of HR, and (E) Refugees and the Dutch context. Table 3 details the semi-structured guideline and examples of questions.

Table 3
Semi-structured interview guideline for refugees

A	Introduction Summary of the research
B	General questions about personal background 12 questions on the demographical, educational and organizational background of the refugee and the level of satisfaction about the job, e.g., What is your educational background? And where did you accomplish this?
C	Diversity and inclusion in the current organization 8 questions, e.g., To what extent do you feel you are a full member of the organization you currently work for?
D	The role of HR 7 questions about <i>finding a job</i> , e.g., Which barriers did you encounter during your job search? 6 questions about <i>while on the job</i> , e.g., Do you think all rules and procedures at your current workplace are fair towards you (for example, promotions, appraisals, access to information)?
E	Refugees and the Dutch context 9 questions, e.g., From your perspective, which institutions are most helpful for the inclusion of refugees into Dutch workplaces?

The refugee experts' guideline consisted of: (A) Introduction, (B) General questions about personal background, (C) Specific questions on the topic of refugees' inclusion at work regarding (...), (D) The role of HR, and (E) Refugees and the Dutch context. Table 4 details the semi-structured guideline and examples of questions.

Table 4
Semi-structured interview guideline refugee experts

A	Introduction Summary of the research and explanation of the structure of the interview
B	General questions about personal background 3 questions, e.g., Tell me about your academic and professional background. Briefly summarize the most important aspects of your CV.
C	Specific questions on the topic of refugees' inclusion at work regarding (...) 10 questions, e.g., Are there any facilitators that help you improving refugees' inclusion in the Netherlands?
D	The role of HR 6 questions about <i>finding a job</i> , e.g., Which barriers do you think refugees encounter during their job search in The Netherlands? 6 questions about <i>while on the job</i> , e.g., Do you think different groups of refugees are valued differently in this organization?
E	Refugees and the Dutch context 7 questions, e.g., Can you think of any factors typical for The Netherlands (cultural, historical, political, and legislative) that are helpful for the inclusion of refugees into Dutch workplaces?

Data analysis

Inductive content analysis was used to organize the qualitative data gained in this study. Inductive content analysis contains open coding, creating categories, and abstraction (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

Transcripts were *open coded* using qualitative data analysis software (Nvivo). Every interview transcript was read multiple times and certain patterns were written down. Open coding was used to create new codes that did not occur in the interview structure. Quotes were divided under the existent codes. After open coding, data management was used to diminish the data, to make it more feasible and *categories* were created. The codes and categories stayed close to the language and words used by the participants (quotes) (Spencer, Ritchie, & O'Connor, 2003). *Abstraction* was used to make a more general description of the categories (Robson, 1993). The categories in this research are threefold. Firstly, the inclusion of refugees' in Dutch workplaces, which is divided into the categories facilitators and barriers. Secondly, these facilitators and barriers were divided into the three levels (contextual, organizational, and individual). Lastly, per category, certain codes were provided. These categories and codes were manually changed and structured into a code system. The code system (shown in table 5) provides an example quote for each code. The coding system was led by the research questions '*what are the contextual, organizational, and individual facilitators and barriers for refugees' inclusion in Dutch workplaces? And how do these facilitators and barriers work together across the three levels?*' and the 3-level framework (contextual, organizational, and individual level) from Syed and Özbilgin (2009).

Table 5
Facilitators and barriers refugees' inclusion in Dutch workplaces

Facilitators			Barriers		
Main categories	Main codes	Quotations	Main categories	Main codes	Quotations
Contextual level	Media attention	“Media is representation. And we also noticed that we were called so much more by organizations all of the sudden. Two years ago it was silent, but now the phone keeps ringing. Now it is a little bit less, but the past half year it was really crazy. Now you see how this representation also works for organizations, because people who work there are also watching the news. I think we can only look at it in a positive way. It is a good tendency.” (UAF, Consultant Job Support)	Contextual level	Lack of taking responsibility	“The (Dutch) labor market is getting more flexible. This means that a party (employer, government or educational institution) does not feel responsible for the complexity anymore. Employers want people that can start directly and that are productive within 24 hours. The government says: ‘We invest in a starting qualification, so people can at least pick mushrooms. And the rest [further education or job search] they should be able to take care of themselves.’ The educational institutions say: ‘yes, we make sure they will have a diploma, they should be able to move on with this diploma’.” (Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees)
	Memory of Second world war	“A part of the society sees refugees as something to take care of as an extension of the Second World War, that they should be hosted. That we have a humanitarian obligation. I think that the memory of the Second World War could help.” (Local government Limburg, Advisor Refugees)		Dutch culture	“What I learned from them [the refugees] is that they are very capable of finding their own way and what you see is that in The Netherlands we say: ‘I know what is good for them [the refugees] and I will tell them what is good and how to do it’. And that is not the way. If you look in general to my point of view to the Dutch people, that we are not open for different cultures.” (Vluchtelingenwerk, Project leader)
				Unstable economic market	“Dutch people also do not have jobs, there are no vacancies. The economic situation now is a general problem for everyone.” (Refugee 6, All-round employee)
			Administrative hindrances	<p>Slow processes “You do not come to another country to sit, to receive something, the minimal, you just want to participate. People lose their enthusiasm if you as a local government applies certain policy rules or not.” (Refugee 4, production employee)</p> <p>Constant relocation “These people [the refugees] are randomly</p>	

located at a shelter, without knowing which government they will end up with in the end. If they are in the shelter here in Tilburg, it can be possible that they are relocated to Groningen. And they also do not pay attention to the labor market wishes. That you invest at this stage and they are working on their integration from day one, is important. That they will stay in Tilburg. That they will stay in the neighborhood. The people that are staying in the shelters already live there, know the neighborhood and know the city. And then when they get a status they need to move to a completely different city. But from the moment they enter the country they already start integrating.” (Local government Brabant, Policy employee economics and labor market)

Local governments “I want to be a lawyer again I have to go study maybe one or two years only, but the local government does not accept that, because I am older than 30 years. The local government will cut everything if I go studying. This differs per local government. Also per contact person inside the same local government. Sometimes very strong contract person and sometimes you facing good contact person. Sometimes you see your friend for example, he can go to university and you cannot, because it is luck. I live in another local government.” (Refugee 7, interpreter)

Strict legislation “What we see is that a lot of people in The Netherlands that could work, with the skills we need but they are not yet allowed to work. So it is not specifically what hinders our company, but what hinders asylum seekers, to start working immediately. The legal checks are a little bit difficult. Like you need to check permits, passports. Quite often they do not have a passport yet, and then they—then we need three additional checks I think. They are for instance not allowed to travel to the States. Some of our clients—we sometimes have international clients for which you need to travel. There are a lot of rules and I think that is not very helpful. I think we are in a country with a lot of legislation and everything. Procedures and rules and if you are not familiar with that it can be difficult.” (Big consultancy company, CSR Manager)

Lack of information about refugees

“There are a lot of refugees and a lot of employers, but how do we find them and what can they do? Who are we talking about? There is a lot of unclarity. We do not have a lot of information about the refugees coming to The Netherlands.” (Big consultancy company, Program manager refugee talents)

Organizational level	Job search	Corporate social responsibility	<p>“What we notice is that more and more companies are more open to take social responsibility. If you look at companies that take initiatives and also provide places such as internship places or general working places. Providing help in this way becomes more and more popular. So it gets more societal support. That definitely helps.” (Local government Brabant, Account manager)</p>	Organizational level	Dutch history with refugees and migration	<p>“What also plays a role is our history with the migrant workers and the not very successful approach. Therefore the third and fourth generations are still not participating in the society how we think they should participate. We are basing things on the integration we are used to, from our history. The belief that if every individual can be him or herself, it will create the best society. This is the ongoing discussion about integration and assimilation. We do it like we did it in the past and it will be all right.” (Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees)</p>
	On the job	(Not) labelling ‘refugees’	<p>“In the project we used and misused the word ‘refugee’, because sometimes you want to have attention and then we are talking about refugees and sometimes you do not want to have too much attention and then you say ‘people’ or ‘talented people’.” (Vluchtelingenwerk, Project leader)</p>		Previous education not acknowledged Stereotypes	<p>“In Syria I was a lawyer, But here my diploma does not work. If I want to be a lawyer again I have to go study maybe one or two years.” (Refugee 7, interpreter)</p> <p>“Companies still have a lot of incomprehension against certain groups. Ignorance, what we do not know, we fear (onbekend maakt onbemind). A company has certain expectations from his or her employees and that is not in correspondence with how people from a different culture are used to behave as an employee.” (Local government Brabant, Account Manager/ policy employee economics and labor market)</p>
			Cultural sensitivity	<p>“I think as a company you should facilitate people of all cultures to be happy at your company. It is the same about praying rooms. For example here we have one extra day off a year, you can choose from three days. You can choose from ‘Hemelvaart’ [Ascension day], ‘Pinksteren’ [Whit Sunday] or ‘Suikerfeest’ [Eid al-Fitr].” (Employment</p>		High requirements for knowing the language
					Social exclusion	<p>“What happened at company X is that in the first year that people who had a working experience place went out for lunch only with these people [the refugees] together. But they were also not asked from the department to lunch with them. These are simple things, but they still do not happen.” (UAF, Consultant Job Support)</p>

Individual level	Job search	Network	<p>agency, Program manager social development and inclusivity)</p> <p>“It is so important to expand your network during your integration process. It is very important to go further in the process. It will help them [the refugees] a lot in the future.” (UAF, Consultant Job Support)</p>	Individual level	Lack of network	<p>“Status holders are a group of people that are very diverse, people that were able to do a lot, but because of the network do not have a place now. So, not having their own network.” (Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees)</p>
		Motivation	<p>“The best benefit is that they [refugees] have shown is that they can cross all borders [by taking the risks and leave to another country]. So they are motivated and will go the extra mile.” (Vluchtelingenwerk, Project leader)</p>			
		Acceptance of obtaining different occupation than in home country	<p>“According to the execution of the job, the status loss, the acceptance of not being able to do the same job you are used to is important” (Local government Brabant, policy employee economics and labor market)</p>			
		Ability to learn the language	<p>“If you learn the language you have more chance to get the job than others.” (Refugee 6, all-round employee)</p>			
		Volunteer work	<p>“That they [the refugees] will find as fast as they can a volunteer job, despite setbacks and hearing ‘no’ a lot. It is very important to volunteer at a soccer club, get yourself into the society and do not stay at home a lot.” (UAF, Consultant Job Support)</p>			

Results

The data analysis led to various findings that are aggregated along the three levels (contextual, organizational, and individual level). The most prominent findings will be outlined as facilitators and barriers. These findings will be illustrated by quotes from the different actors. Next, the relations and dynamics between the three levels will be analyzed.

Facilitators

Contextual level

In this section, the facilitators on the contextual level will be presented to illuminate the refugees' and refugee experts' context. The findings show that the Dutch history can (positively) influence the way people look at the recent influx of refugees. The *memory of the Second World War* that is still present in the Dutch society can help the inclusion of refugees in The Netherlands. I found that the Dutch society sees the influx of refugees as something they should take care of, due to the past history of migration and refugees in the Second World War. The recent increase of *media attention* on refugees is also suggested as a facilitator by the respondents. When asked what was helpful for the inclusion of refugees in Dutch organizations, certain respondents mentioned that the media attention about the refugee topic was helpful for either their organization (more initiatives to help refugees) as well as the inclusion of refugees in Dutch organizations (UAF, Consultant Job Support; Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees). The influx of refugees was shown in the Dutch news almost every day and more people and organizations reached out to the NGO to ask if they could support the refugees.

“Media is representation. And we also noticed that we were called so much more by organizations all of the sudden. Two years ago it was silent, but now the phone keeps ringing. Now it is a little bit less, but the past half year it was really crazy. Now you see how this representation also works for organizations, because people who work there are also watching the news. I think we can only look at it in a positive way. It is a good tendency.” (UAF, Consultant Job Support)

Backing up this notion, another respondent mentioned that the increase of attention to the refugees can create more awareness about the refugees in the Dutch society. In the past the refugees were more hidden in the Dutch society. The refugee expert from the local government Limburg completed this opinion.

“What is helping is that the topic is very hot topic. This is maybe the most important part, attention. By having attention it makes people think about it and when they think about it there will be a discussion. This discussion can create movements. Merkel [Chancellor of Germany, made statement about the influx of refugees: ‘wir schaffen das’. Meaning: ‘we’ll make it’], Aylan [Syrian 3 year old refugee] that was found on the beach, it created commotion. Before this, status holders were hidden people that were going directly into receiving social security

payments. There was no consciousness. They were just immigrants.” (Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees)

Organizational level

The organizational level describes how Dutch employers can facilitate the inclusion of refugees in The Netherlands. Building further on the statement on the contextual level that media is representation and that organizations are also watching the news, respondents also suggest that Dutch organizations are taking their *corporate social responsibility* (CSR) since the recent influx of refugees. Organizations are taking their CSR in order to define their role in society and implement ethical and social standards in their organization (Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010). More organizations are looking at their social and ethical responsibility to hire refugees by providing workplaces and internships.

“What we notice is that more and more companies are more open to take the social responsibility. If you look at companies that take initiatives and also provide places such as internship places or general working places. Providing help in this way becomes more and more popular. So it gets more social support. That definitely helps, we really need this opening.” (Local government Brabant, Account manager)

According to Derous, Ryan and Nguyen (2012) people belong to numerous stigmatized groups (e.g., ethnic minorities and women). Certain respondents mentioned that they think that refugees are seen as a different group by people in the Dutch society. They are placed in different groups, varied from ‘terrorist’ and ‘fortune hunter’ to ‘talented people’ (Big consultancy company, CSR manager; Local government Brabant, Reintegration coach, policy employee economics and labor market; Vluchtelingenwerk; Project manager). Backing up this notion, one refugee expert mentioned that in the project he was leading he used and misused the term ‘refugee’. Depending on the interlocutor, using the term ‘refugee’ could be an advantage or a disadvantage for finding a job for refugees.

“In the project we used and misused the word ‘refugee’, because sometimes you want to have attention and then we are talking about refugees and sometimes you don’t want to have too much attention and then you say ‘people’ or ‘talented people’.” (Vluchtelingenwerk, Project leader)

Similarly, a refugee confirmed the point of not putting attention to the *label* ‘refugee’ by explaining that having her nationality and place of birth on her CV was not an advantage in her previous experience of applying for jobs in The Netherlands. Therefore, she mentioned that leaving out her nationality can facilitate having the same chances as Dutch people in her job search. Correspondingly, she was advised by multiple institutions to leave out her nationality on her CV.

“I also deleted my nationality from my CV. I applied for the Dutch nationality. Soon I can also write ‘Dutch’ on my CV. I deleted it on purpose. Only organization X [NGO for higher educated refugees] advised me to leave it on my CV, but other people like the local government told me: ‘no, leave it out, it has no advantage’. I also deleted my place of birth.” (Refugee 2, Legal assistant)

In line with the study of Van Tubergen (2011) actors mentioned that they make a distinction between refugees and non-refugees in the hiring process, for the reason that refugees have a disadvantaged position in the hiring process in The Netherlands. They positively discriminate by using their refugee status, but once they are working inside the organization they are seen as a normal employee and do not have the refugee status anymore.

“We do make the distinction once recruiting, because you need to use different channels, but once they are in the recruitment process it is a normal employee, it is not a refugee.” (Big consultancy company, CSR Manager)

Being *cultural sensitive* to refugees is one of the organizational elements that was mentioned by a respondent. She explained that if you are open to other cultures it can make people happier and therefore also more included in the organization. One example of being cultural sensitive is letting people choose when they want a day off based on their religion, for instance choosing between having a day off on Ascension day (Christian holiday) or Eid al-Fitr (Muslim holiday) (Employment agency, program manager social development and inclusivity).

Individual level

This section refers to refugees' capital and how they perceive inclusion. In line with previous research (De Vroome & van Tubergen, 2010) respondents mentioned that *having a network* and *doing volunteer work* can help the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces. Furthermore, knowing the Dutch language can also increase refugee participation in Dutch organizations (Chiswick & Miller, 2001). When asked for an advice to refugees entering the Dutch labor market, 'learn the language' was mentioned by almost all the refugees and refugee experts. They mentioned that most employers request refugees to speak Dutch. The respondent from the employment agency elaborated on this by stating that one of the first questions their partners ask is: 'does he or she speak Dutch?' In the same manner, a refugee explained this by stating that:

“If you learn the language you have more chance to get the job than others.” (Refugee 6, all-round employee)

Similarly, another refugee expert mentioned that Dutch is not required to get hired in their company. They only hire highly educated refugees and it is not necessary for them to speak Dutch. Yet, the recruiter of the same organization contradicted the suggestion from the other respondent from that organization.

“Dutch is very important for us. We are a global organization, but we do have a lot of Dutch clients.” (Big consultancy company, recruiter)

Next to knowing the Dutch language, respondents suggested that having *motivation* is an aspect that can help the inclusion of refugees. Refugees are forced to leave their home country due to extreme circumstances and when they arrive in The Netherlands they are mostly motivated to start a new life. When asked what they (refugee experts) thought refugees could personally bring (their capitals) and

benefit from when looking for a job, respondents mentioned that motivation is one of the things that make refugees unique.

“The best benefit is that they [refugees] have shown is that they can cross all borders [by taking the risks and leave to another country]. So they are motivated and will go the extra mile.” (Vluchtelingenwerk, Project leader)

Backing up this notion, multiple refugee experts mentioned that having *motivation* is “what can distinct them [the refugees] from others” and “being intrinsically motivated to integrate and to succeed here [The Netherlands] is important” (Big consultancy company, program manager refugee talents; Local government Brabant, reintegration coach and policy employee economics and labor market; Employment agency, program manager social development and inclusivity; Housing company, manager).

Barriers

Contextual level

In contrast to what is specified in the previous section, the context where refugees and refugee experts are located can also negatively impact the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces. It is found that refugees and refugee experts face *administrative hindrances* while looking for a job and hiring refugees. One aspect of the administrative hindrances is the slow process from entering The Netherlands to eventually being able to find and have a job. The respondent from the local government in Limburg explained that when refugees arrive in The Netherlands they are very motivated but due to the *slow processes* they lose their motivation while waiting in the shelters.

“For refugees it means that they will be in the shelters for a relatively long period without being able to develop themselves or keep up with their potential. What do I mean with that? People arrive in The Netherlands and want to start a future, are motivated, driven, are willing to take three jobs after each other. But at that time they do not know that it is not possible in The Netherlands and 24 months later they are programmed that they will get food in the morning, the afternoon and that they cannot do anything. The drive they had is mostly gone. This is one of the unique distinctions they have, but the way we organize it here in The Netherlands makes that disappear. And then they will come into the local government, they have to start integrating and if they are done with that four years have passed. And then they say: ‘now you have to be motivated to start on the labor market’.” (Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees)

Backing up this notion, one refugee mentioned that refugees can lose their motivation while waiting for the government to tell them if they can stay or not. She stated that there is a lot of insecurity and not being able to work can demotivate the refugees.

“You do not come to another country to sit, to receive something, the minimal, you just want to participate. People lose their motivation if you as a local government apply certain policy rules or not.” (Refugee 4, production employee)

Another administrative barrier is the *constant relocation* of refugees when they arrive in The Netherlands. When the refugees arrive, they can be randomly assigned to a shelter. Once they get a status, they can get relocated to another city. One respondent confirmed that constant relocation of refugees can be a barrier for the process of inclusion of refugees into Dutch organizations, due to the fact that their integration starts when they enter the country and constant relocation will slower the process of integration.

“These people [the refugees] are randomly located at a shelter, without knowing which government they will end up with in the end. If they are in the shelter in Tilburg [South of The Netherlands], it can be possible that they are relocated to Groningen [North of The Netherlands]. And they also do not pay attention to the labor market wishes. That you invest at this stage and they are working on their integration from day one, is important. That they will stay in Tilburg. That they will stay in the neighborhood. The people that are staying in the shelter, already live there, know the neighborhood and know the city. And then when they get a status they need to move to a completely different city. But from the moment they enter the country they already start integrating.” (Local government Brabant, Policy employee economics and labor market)

Besides the constant relocation and slow processes, the respondents also frequently mentioned the differences within the *local governments* in The Netherlands as an administrative barrier. It depends per local government or even per contact person within a local government which kind of benefits you receive, depending on for example how much money the local government has.

“One of the obstacles is also our municipalities. Based on the political climate in a municipality they have another program or other interests. So it depends on the municipality if things are possible or not, it depends on the municipality which benefits are there or not. So for example in Amsterdam, when somebody cannot deliver for 100%, but for 80%, they can pay for 20% of the minimum wage to gap the difference. To give the employers some benefit, but other municipalities do not have it. So it would be great if it was like one policy, because now when I have an interpreter from Groningen and an interpreter from Maastricht, it is totally different.” (Employment agency, Program manager social development and inclusivity)

Similarly, the respondent from Vluchtelingenwerk mentioned that refugees can also not be prioritized by local governments wherefore they cannot take the benefits.

“What we see is that in some local governments, if they know you are a refugee you will be on the bottom of the priority list.” (Vluchtelingenwerk, Project Manager)

Additionally to how the government is build up, one respondent mentioned that due to the influx of also higher educated refugees, the government is not able to provide individual treatment to

everybody. The government is not designed to support this ‘new’ group of middle and higher educated refugees. They try to give them a starting position, but that is not always in line with their previous occupation.

“We have a lot of diversity. The local government is not designed or equipped to cope with the middle and higher segment of the status holders. Apart from the diplomas, qualifications and language skills. In brief, this kind of individual treatment is very complex.” (Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees)

Based on the design of the government, a difference between higher and lower educated refugees was found. One high educated refugee mentioned that his *education is not acknowledged* in The Netherlands, which can be seen as a barrier for his inclusion in Dutch workplaces. He mentioned that “In Syria I was a lawyer. But here my diploma does not work. If I want to be a lawyer again I have to go study maybe one or two years.” (Refugee 7, interpreter) Other high educated refugees also coped with not working on the same educational level they are used to. When the refugees were asked if their qualifications fit their current position, the lower educated refugees (high school) mentioned that they were content with their jobs as a hairdresser and warehouse employee (refugee 5; refugee 1). While the higher educated refugees (University- or university of applied sciences level) all accepted their current job, but had the feeling they “could do much more” (refugee 2, legal assistant; refugee 3 interpreter) and “see it more as a start” (refugee 4; refugee 6).

Multiple refugees and experts mentioned that The Netherlands has a lot of rules and *strict legislation* about being able to work as a refugee. They said for example that: “we are a country with a lot of rules and a lot of laws” and “I think that we are a difficult country with a lot of paperwork, rules, rules and even more rules. A lot of forms and things that you have to arrange.” (Big consultancy company, CSR manager; Local government Brabant, Account manager; Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees; UAF, Consultant job support; Vluchtelingenwerk, Project manager; Housing corporation, Manager; Refugee 2, Legal assistant)

Dutch people are mostly used to the strict legislation and laws in their country. These laws and regulation can also develop further in the *Dutch culture*. One respondent suggested that due to the Dutch culture of telling other people (for instance refugees) what to do, they are not free to decide for themselves. He explained that he sees the Dutch culture as a barrier for the inclusion of refugees and thinks that Dutch people are not open for different cultures.

“What I learned from them [the refugees] is that they are very capable of finding their own way and what you see is that in The Netherlands we say: ‘I know what is good for them (the refugees) and I will tell them what is good and how to do it’. And that is not the way. If you look in general from my point of view to the Dutch people, then we are not open for different cultures.” (Vluchtelingenwerk, Project leader)

Similarly, one refugee mentioned that people who are raised in the Dutch culture can have miscommunications with people from other cultures. People asked her questions about her country of

origin, while she is living in The Netherlands for 17 years and is looking at topics mostly from a Dutch perspective. Consequently, often it was us (Dutch people) against them (Armenian people) when people talk to her. She explained that by answering the question about her home country, she will *socially exclude* herself.

“Some people say: ‘how is it at your place?’ You automatically say in Armenia it is like that. You will exclude yourself by doing that.” (Refugee 2, Legal assistant)

Organizational level

Organizations are taking more corporate social responsibility (CSR) to provide workplaces for refugees, explained in the section ‘facilitators’. Conversely, there still is lack of understanding from employers regarding refugees. They can *stereotype* refugees which can decrease the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces. The Dutch expression, “what we do not know, we fear” (resp. onbekend maakt onbemind) was mentioned by multiple refugee experts (Local government Brabant; Local government Limburg; Employment agency) when was asked if they could mention certain obstacles that hinder them from improving refugees’ inclusion in Dutch workplaces. The respondents from the local government Brabant elaborated on stereotyping by stating that:

“Companies still have a lot of incomprehension against certain groups. Ignorance, what we do not know, we fear. There is a difference between how people look at the labor market. A company has certain expectations from his or her employees and that is not in correspondence with how people from a different culture are used to behave as an employee. That is a stereotype that needs to be set right. It is also hard when you get incomprehension from the employers’ side. “(Local government Brabant, Account Manager/ policy employee economics and labor market)

The respondent from the employment agency looks at the stereotyping of refugees from the justice- and business perspective. She mentioned that both perspectives should be present in an organization that wants to hire refugees, while in a lot of organizations either one of these perspectives is present.

“I think for us the main obstacle is finding the support of employers. You have a justice case and a business case for employers. The justice case is about equality—equal chances, recognizing talents. And the business case is about earning money, making profit. So I think for an employer, [for being—] letting projects be successful, there has to be both. So that is something I think we struggle with. For many companies there is the justice case, but there is not a business case. And only a justice case is often—sometimes it is, but often it is not enough for a company to hire refugees. What we then also struggle with is that as an employment agency, our customers expect us to deliver the best talents. That is why they hire us, because they cannot find the candidates themselves, so sometimes the refugee is indeed the best person for the job, because of his qualifications and his skills. But often it is not, because what we see is that they have a gap on their resume of mainly three years. So then there is a

great chance that the employer says: ‘I have someone else with not a gap on his resume and I will hire that person’. So that is also something we encounter as an obstacle. That most of the time there is always someone who fits better than the refugee.” (Employment agency, Program manager social development and inclusivity)

Individual level

The respondents in this study suggested that having a network can increase the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces, nevertheless it was found that refugees still *lack in having a network*.

“Status holders are a group of people that are very diverse, people that were able to do a lot, but because of the network do not have a place now. So, not having their own network.” (Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees)

Interplay and relations between the contextual, organizational, and individual level

As previously stated, the relational framework for diversity management from Syed and Özbilgin (2009) takes into account the contextual, organizational, and individual level. This framework, built on the ideas from Bourdieu (1990) explains that having a layered analysis (investigating the relations and interplays between the levels) is useful for understanding (in)equality by recognizing the objective and subjective experiences that exist within a country. This study contributes by using empirical data divided by the three different levels and providing three examples of relations within the certain levels. This can create an overall picture of how the society, organizations and individuals can facilitate or be a barrier for the refugees’ inclusion into Dutch workplaces.

Firstly, the contextual level is the overall domain in which the other levels (organizational and individual level) exist (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009). The increase of *media attention* about the influx of refugees is seen as something positive by the respondents. When the influx of refugees was in the Dutch media every day, the NGOs were approached by multiple organizations and individuals to ‘help’ refugees. The NGOs explained that “people working in organizations are also watching the news” (UAF, Consultant job support) wherefore “more and more companies are more open to take the social responsibility” (*Corporate Social Responsibility*) (Local government Brabant, Account manager). Since potential employers of refugees are also watching the news, “companies take initiatives and also provide places such as internship places or general working places” and “providing help in this way becomes more and more popular. So it [providing work places for refugees] gets more societal support.” And more initiatives like *volunteer work* can be created. “Refugees can start their career in The Netherlands by doing volunteer work and gain experience in the Dutch complex labor market” (Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees). By doing volunteer work, (native) “people [that they worked together with] can create openings at companies and institutions.”(Local

government Limburg, Advisor refugees). Therefore, the increase of media attention about the refugees can facilitate organizations to take more corporate social responsibilities and part of the social responsibility can be that organizations provide volunteer work.

Secondly, the organizational level exists within the contextual level and explains the employment context and inequalities in the labor market (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009). For instance, as previously explained, some organizations are “taking their social responsibility.” (Local government Brabant, Account manager) by providing workplaces for refugees. Yet, *stereotyping* by Dutch employers still exists, since “companies still have a lot of incomprehension against certain groups [refugees]” (Local government Brabant, Account Manager/ policy employee economics and labor market) and what employers “do not know, they fear.” (Local government Brabant; Local government Limburg; Employment agency). Employers can create certain stereotypes about refugees since refugees are something ‘unknown’ and employers can show incomprehension by for example “not knowing the cultural differences” (Employment agency, Program manager social development and inclusivity) between the refugees and Dutch people. Similarly, one respondent mentioned that “Dutch people, are not open for different cultures” (Vluchtelingenwerk, Project leader). The context, the *Dutch culture of not being open for different cultures* and *stereotyping refugees* can therefore be a barrier for the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces.

Lastly, the individual level shapes the organizational and contextual level. It overlaps with the organizational level and exists within the contextual level. Every person has its own identity and experiences things within a certain society and employment context (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009). Multiple respondents mentioned that *motivation* is “what can distinct them [the refugees] from others” and “being intrinsically motivated to integrate and to succeed here [The Netherlands] is important” (Big consultancy company, program manager refugee talents; Local government Brabant, reintegration coach and policy employee economics and labor market; Employment agency, program manager social development and inclusivity; Housing company, manager). What refugees “have shown is that they can cross all borders [by taking the risks and leave to another country]. So they are motivated and will go the extra mile.” (Vluchtelingenwerk, Project leader) Conversely, one administrative hindrance, *slow processes* describes that refugees face slow processes while entering The Netherlands. They have to wait until they know if they get a status or not. In the meantime they are not allowed to work and “they will be in the shelters for a relatively long period without being able to develop themselves or keep up with their potential” and “the drive [*motivation*] they had is mostly gone.” Although, “this is one of the unique distinctions they have, but the way we organize it here in The Netherlands makes that [unique distinction] disappear.” (Local government Limburg, Advisor refugees). This contextual decision (slow processes of refugees’ integration) can therefore be a barrier for the unique distinction that refugees have, their motivation.

Discussion

The results demonstrate a variety in facilitators and barriers for the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces. In this section, these results will be discussed based on what is in line with previous theories and what is new. Also certain limitations, practical recommendations and implications for further research will be provided.

Interpretation of the results

Respondents mentioned that due to the increase of *media attention* about the influx of refugees, organizations take more *corporate social responsibility* to provide work places for refugees. In line with the organizational approaches of diversity management from Thomas and Ely (1996), organizations can on the one hand take more responsibility to hire refugees because they strive for an equal culture inside the organization (discrimination and fairness approach), or to increase innovation (learning and effectiveness approach). On the other hand, respondents also mentioned that employers still have a *stereotypical* view about refugees. They can also look at them from the access and legitimacy approach by trying to attract new customers by hiring refugees for *what* they are (potential customers) instead of *who* they are (refugees with their own identity) (Bleijenbergh, van Engen and Terlouw, 2010). Employers can also take corporate social responsibility in order to improve their brand image. Therefore, hiring refugees can give the impression to the society that they are ethically doing the right thing and can influence consumers' behaviors (He & Lai, 2014).

Looking at what refugees are or how they are perceived can also be linked to either to *label or not label refugees*. Respondents mentioned that in some cases they use the term 'refugee' to get things done, while in other situations refugees were mentioned as 'talented people'. A clear answer if it would help to mention the term 'refugee' or leave it out was not found in this data, since mixed opinions were found. It is a strategic choice whether to use the term 'refugee' or not. One refugee deleted her nationality from her CV in order to not be seen as a refugee, while another respondent mentioned that he sometimes used the term 'refugee' to get things done, but sometimes also left it out. Another respondent also mentioned that the term 'refugee' only is used to let refugees enter, but when they are inside the organization, they are seen as a normal employee. Not labeling refugees while they are inside the organization is in line with the definition of inclusion from Shore et al. (2011) that explains the fair treatment for people with different backgrounds, and that a person is perceived as a member of the organization by looking at their uniqueness and belongingness. In this example refugees were not seen as a refugee in the organization, but as an employee. They are valued for their uniqueness and can express their opinions inside the organization, but are not labeled as a refugee in order feel belonged to the in-group of employees in the organization.

Being culturally sensitive in an organization is seen as something that can help the inclusion of refugees into Dutch workplaces. The GLOBE project mentions that being open to other cultures can help the integration of minorities (Peretz, Levi & Fried, 2015). However, respondents also mentioned that *Dutch people are actually not open for different cultures* and *stereotypes* about refugees are

increasing. Dutch people not being open for different cultures can be explained by the increase of the right wing party from Geert Wilders (Dutch politician, right wing) who for example mentions that having another religion (mostly pointing out Islam) has an impact on the values of the Dutch society and created intolerance from the Dutch population against refugees (Bleijenbergh, van Engen & Terlouw, 2010). Velasco González, Verkuyten, Weesie, and Poppe (2008) state that stereotypes about Muslims can create prejudice towards Muslims in The Netherlands. Interesting to mention is that the respondents did not mention religion as a facilitator or barrier for the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces. Religion was not discussed, while the public attention is focused on Islamic refugees that for instance discriminate against homosexuals and overpower women and can be seen as a barrier for the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces. Religion can be a sensitive topic (Lee and Renzetti, 1990), wherefore it is possible that respondents did not want to mention it. Furthermore, The Netherlands is also a country that supports multiculturalism and majority of the citizens are somewhat positive towards participation and equal rights of ethnic minorities (Breugelmans, Van De Vijver, & Schalk- Soekar, 2009).

The importance to know the Dutch language in order to find a job in The Netherlands is found in previous studies (De Jong, 2015; De Vroome & Van Tubergen, 2010). Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) explain that having cultural capital, (e.g., knowing the language) can create power in the field. In this study, refugees mostly agreed that the language is one of the most important resources to be able to find a job in The Netherlands. They advised other refugees to learn the language, since it would increase their chances on the labor market. Employers and governmental organizations had mixed opinions about it. The government and the employment agency mentioned that it is almost required to speak Dutch, while the CSR manager from the big consultancy company explained that because they are an international company it did not matter if the refugee speaks Dutch or not. Interesting to mention is that the person who actually hires the refugees in the exact same company, the recruiter, stated that knowing the Dutch language is very important for their company. Overall, the majority of the respondents agreed that knowing the Dutch language can facilitate the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces. The only exception could be that if a refugee works in an international company where he or she does not have to talk to Dutch clients.

Having a Bourdieuan perspective on this study (and looking at the interplay between the levels), the 'field' is mainly seen as the power the state has. Applied to The Netherlands, from the respondents' opinion, the Dutch local governments have a big influence on the inclusion of refugees. Dowling, Schuler and Welch (1994) acknowledge this argument by stating that the national legislation plays an important role in having equal opportunity practices in organizations. The local governments give basic support that is equal for all the minorities in The Netherlands, but also encounter administrative hindrances (such as slow processes, constant relocation, local governments, and strict legislation). One prominent finding of this study is the influence of different treatment per local government on the chances of refugees to enter Dutch workplaces. Respondents mentioned that

refugees get stationed to a certain city. They cannot choose in which government they want to live. Therefore, it is up to 'luck' if refugees receive funding for doing a studies or get (more) help from the local government for their integration. Similarly, to the government's responsibility, the refugee experts mentioned their influences on the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces, but who is actually responsible for the inclusion of refugees is not concluded. The governments provide a starting qualification so refugees can pick mushrooms (low educated jobs), employers provide certain workplaces (but are also afraid of the unknown and are facing an economic crisis), and NGOs help them to get a language diploma or give guidance in finding a job. One respondent mentioned that in the Dutch culture it is common that Dutch people say: 'I know what is good for refugees, so they should do that', but he mentioned that refugees are to a certain extent able to take care of themselves. From Bourdieu's perspective (1990), refugees can use their own capital (e.g., their motivation and uniqueness) to survive in the field (the Dutch labor market).

Looking at the social capital explained by Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), and also previous research on the social capital theory of refugees (De Vroome & van Tubergen, 2010), this paper confirmed that on an individual level, having a network can help refugees to get included. However, respondents mentioned that refugees do not have a resourceful social network to find a job in The Netherlands. Van Tubergen (2011) states that refugees in The Netherlands do not have a broad network due to the small size of the refugee group (compared to migrants in The Netherlands or Dutch natives) and therefore refugees rely less on having personal networks. The lack of social capital links to another insight that was gained in the interviews: The 'constant relocation' of refugees. In fact, some actors mentioned that refugees get relocated in The Netherlands very often. They can be sheltered somewhere in the South of The Netherlands and get assigned to a house in the North. Yet, some respondents pointed out that the refugees' integration starts from the first day they enter The Netherlands, and they may indeed start exploring the neighborhood and build networks upon arrival. However, if they then have to move to another region of the country, previous ties may not be useful anymore and they have to start all over again to build their network.

Building further on the theory of capitals of Bourdieu, the institutionalized cultural capital is identified as the work experiences, qualifications, and skills people have (Özbilgin & Tatli, 2005). One of the interesting findings in this study is the difference in the qualifications refugees possess and the qualifications needed for the current job, between lower- and higher educated refugees. This is interesting since statistics in The Netherlands show that the difference in labor participation rate between higher educated ethnic minorities and Dutch people are lower compared to the difference between lower educated ethnic minorities and Dutch people (Statistics Netherlands, 2008). Whereas, in this study is found that lower educated refugees were satisfied with their job, since they could find a similar occupation they used to do in their home country. In contrast to the higher educated refugees that were not satisfied with their current job in The Netherlands. Mostly because their current job is not the same as the job they used to obtain in their country of origin. The person-job fit explains that

there is a fit when the individuals' qualifications match with the demands from the job (Edwards, 1991). In the case of the higher educated refugees, they do not have a person-job fit, since their qualifications do not fit with the demands they get from their job. Similarly, the symbolic capital refers to how capitals are valued, recognized and legitimized within the field (Bourdieu, 1998). Applied to this topic, the refugees can see their current capitals as something low in the field (Dutch labor market), compared to how they valued their capitals (e.g., home education and experience) as something high in their home country.

Our paper provides a list of facilitators and barriers that can answer the research question: *What are the contextual, organizational, and individual facilitators and barriers for refugees' inclusion in Dutch workplaces?* I suggest that there are facilitators (e.g., media attention and using their motivation) that can grow the capital of refugees. However, there are found more barriers (e.g., constant relocation and stereotyping) that hinder the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces. In the same way, the refugee respondents mostly focused on the objective experiences (language proficiency), while the refugee experts focused on the objective experiences (e.g., Dutch laws and regulations) as well as the more hypothetical and subjective experiences (e.g., motivation and stereotypes) as a facilitator for the inclusion of refugees. To answer the second research question: *How do these facilitators and barriers work together across the three levels?* certain relations derived from the data and theory are suggested. Firstly, the increase of media attention can lead to more initiatives from employers to provide volunteer work by taking their corporate social responsibility. However, taking social responsibility can be two-sided. Employers can hire refugees to include them into the Dutch workforce, but also to attract new potential customers, in line with the access and legitimacy approach (Ely & Thomas, 2001) or increase their image and brand (He & Lai, 2014). The refugees' network can be increased by doing volunteer work, although the refugees are a small group compared to the immigrant group in The Netherlands (Bleijenbergh, van Engen & Terlouw, 2010) and I found that due to the constant relocation, refugees cannot build their network. Secondly, I also found that the Dutch culture is not very open for different cultures and employers can stereotype refugees. This can be explained by the increase of the Dutch right wing party in politics (Bleijenbergh, van Engen & Terlouw, 2010). Lastly, a relation was provided between the decrease of motivation of refugees (which is seen as one of the most important capitals refugees possess), due to the slow processes for refugees entering the labor market.

Limitations and future research

One of the limitations of this study is its small sample size (15 in-depth interviews). The findings in this research can therefore not be generalized to the whole population of refugees in the field of diversity management. Although, after 15 interviews, a certain level of saturation was reached. According to (Fusch and Ness, 2015) reaching saturation means that researchers reach a point where collecting more data will not provide extra information to answer the research question. It is not

always important to look at the quantity (in the amount of interviews), but also the quality should be emphasized (in the richness of information from the interviews). During the interviews, certain patterns within our data occurred and the last interviews did not lead specifically to new information related to the research question, wherefore in this research saturation was reached to a certain extent. Although, using quantitative research by collecting numerical data about the phenomena, it can be more statistically analyzed (Muijs, 2011). Therefore, in order to better generalize the results and find quantified interplays between the three levels, in the future quantitative research can be done. Besides doing quantitative research, also more interviews or doing observations can support better generalization of the results.

Furthermore, when conducting the interviews with refugees, there was a small language barrier. The mother tongue of all the refugees was neither Dutch or English (but Arabic, Armenian, or French). Dutch and English were the only spoken languages by the researchers, whereby conducting the interviews in these two languages was the only option. In order to overcome this limitation, in future research interpreters, translators or bilingual/bicultural workers can be deployed (Lee, Sulaiman-Hill & Thompson, 2014).

As a final point, the sample consisted of two female refugees that were living in The Netherlands for more than 15 years and came from Armenia. In this study it was harder to find female refugees that wanted to cooperate in an interview. Therefore future research could make additional efforts to include more women from the 'recent' refugee influx.

Practical recommendations

The practical recommendations for the refugees are threefold. One of the main advices mentioned by the refugees was: 'learn the language'. Therefore putting effort in learning the Dutch language is highly recommended in order to get included in Dutch workplaces. Another recommendation is to not lose motivation, even though the processes can take a long time, the motivation refugees have to come here is an advantage they have and can convince employers to hire them. The last recommendation is to start doing volunteer work, as soon as possible. This will increase chances on the Dutch labor market. I would recommend NGOs to invest in refugees' talents by looking at their uniqueness and make them feel belonged inside Dutch workplaces and employers to introduce refugees to the Dutch workforce by providing volunteer and internship places. Since stereotyping still exists with employers, diversity training for non-discrimination can decrease the prejudiced way employers and employees look at refugees (Derous, Ryan & Nguyen, 2012). Even though governmental institutions apply diversity practices (De Vries et al., 2005), mostly these are short-term (Bleijenbergh, van Engen & Terlouw, 2010). Therefore, I would recommend governments to improve the administration hindrances as pointed out above (slow processes, constant relocation, differences per local governments, and strict legislation). The influx of refugees is recent, but refugees tend to stay for

longer than 10 years or longer in the country they flew to (CBS, 2015), therefore a long term perspective is recommended for the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces.

Conclusion

Given the high unemployment rate of refugees and the influx of refugees in The Netherlands, this research contributed by providing theoretical and practical implications for refugees, employers and the institutional context. Facilitators and barriers for the inclusion of refugees in Dutch workplaces were provided to get insight in the inclusion of refugees in the field of diversity management. More barriers than facilitators were found. In order to have inclusion of refugees in Dutch workforces, the three levels (contextual, organizational, and individual) explained by Syed and Özbilgin (2009) were taken into account. Based on Bourdieu's ideas (1990), this study provided thorough insights in how the different levels could interact.

Reference list

- Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2008).). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21, 166-191.
- Allen, J., Inenaga, Y., Van der Velden, R., & Yoshimoto, K. (2007). *Competencies, higher education and career in Japan and The Netherlands*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Atkinson, R., & Strang, A. (2001). Accessing hidden and hard-to-reach populations: Snowball research strategies. *Social research update*, 33(1), 1-4.
- Barak, M. E. M. (2014). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace* (3rd ed.). California, The United States of America: Sage Publications.
- Betts, A., & Collier, P. (2015). Help Refugees Help Themselves. *Foreign Affairs*, 94(6), 12-13.
- Bleijenbergh, I., van Engen, M., & Terlouw, A. (2010). Laws, policies and practices of diversity management in The Netherlands. *International Handbook on Diversity Management at Work*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 179-197.
- Bloch, A., & Levy, C. (1999). *Refugees, Citizenship and Social Policy in Europe*. London, Great Britain: Macmillan press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups. *Berkeley journal of sociology*, 32, 1-17.
- Boudieu, P. (1990). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. California, United States of America: Stanford University Press.
- Boudieu, P. (1998). *The state nobility: Elite schools in the field of power*. California, United States of America: Stanford University Press.
- Boudieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago, United States of

- America: University of Chicago Press.
- Breugelmans, S. M., Van De Vijver, F. J., & Schalk-Soekar, S. G. (2009). Stability of majority attitudes toward multiculturalism in the Netherlands between 1999 and 2007. *Applied Psychology, 58*(4), 653-671.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and social psychology bulletin, 17*(5), 475-482.
- CBS. (2015, July 17). CBS: Meeste immigranten binnen tien jaar weer weg. Retrieved from <http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/menu/themas/dossiers/allochtonen/publicaties/artikelen/archief/2015/meeste-immigranten-binnen-tien-jaar-weer-weg-2013.htm>
- CBS. (2015, November 19). Werkloosheid toegenomen. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2015/47/werkloosheid-toegenomen>
- Cheung, S. Y., & Phillimore, J. (2013). Refugees, social capital, and labour market integration in the UK. *Sage Publications, 48*(3), 518-536.
- Chiswick, B. R., & Miller, P. W. (2001). A model of destination-language acquisition: Application to male immigrants in Canada. *Demography, 38*(3), 391-409.
- De Jong, S. (2015). Converging logics? Managing migration and managing diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 42*(3), 341-358.
- De Vries, S., Van de Ven, C., Nuyens, M., Stark, K., Van Schie, J., & Van Sloten, G. C. (2005). *Diversiteit op de werkvloer : hoe werkt dit? - Voorbeelden van diversiteitsbeleid in de praktijk*. Retrieved from <http://repository.tudelft.nl/view/tno/uuid%3A37ed9fdb-c9c0-4831-b3b9-f7d21e1bac5e/>
- De Vroome, T., & Van Tubergen, F. (2010). The Employment Experience of Refugees in the Netherlands. *International Migration Review, 44*(2), 376-403.
- Derous, E., Ryan, A. M., & Nguyen, H. H. D. (2012). Multiple categorization in resume screening: Examining effects on hiring discrimination against Arab applicants in field and lab settings. *Journal of organizational behavior, 33*(4), 544-570.
- Dobbin, F. (1994). *Forging industrial policy*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Doomernik, J. M. J. (1998). *The effectiveness of integration policies towards immigrants and their descendants in France, Germany and The Netherlands*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.146559>
- Dowling, P., Schuler, R. S., & Welch, D. E. (1994). *International dimensions of human resource management* Wadsworth. Belmont, The United States of America: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Edwards, J. R. (2014). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. *Administrative Sciences, 6*, 283-357.

- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative science quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.
- Essed, P. (2002). Cloning cultural homogeneity while talking diversity: Old wine in new bottles in Dutch organizations. *Transforming Anthropology*, 11(1), 2-12.
- Ferdman, B. M., & Davidson, M. N. (2004). Some learning about inclusion: Continuing the dialogue. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 41(4), 31-37.
- Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408-1416.
- Geddes, A. (2000). Lobbying for migrant inclusion in the European Union: new opportunities for transnational advocacy?. *Journal of European public policy*, 7(4), 632-649.
- Glastra, F., & Vedder, P. (2010). Learning Strategies of Highly Educated Refugees in The Netherlands: Habitus or Calculation? *International Migration*, 48(1), 80-105.
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse education today*, 24(2), 105-112.
- Hartog, J., & Zorlu, A. (2009). How important is homeland education for refugees' economic position in The Netherlands?. *Journal of Population Economics*, 22(1), 219-246.
- He, Y., & Lai, K. K. (2014). The effect of corporate social responsibility on brand loyalty: the mediating role of brand image. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 25(3-4), 249-263.
- Heery, E., & Noon, M. (2001). A Dictionary of Human Resource Management: Oxford University Press Inc. *Hendrix, WH, Robbins, T., Miller, J., & Summers, TP (1998). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on factors predictive of turnover. Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 13(4), 611-633.
- Hewlin, P. F. (2003). And the award for best actor goes to...: Facades of conformity in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(4), 633-642.
- Hooijer, G., & Picot, G. (2015). European Welfare States and Migrant Poverty: The Institutional Determinants of Disadvantage. *SAGE Publications Ltd*, 48(14), 1-26.
- Johns, G. (2006). The Essential Impact of Context on Organizational Behaviour. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 386-408.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Karataş-Özkan, M. (2011). Understanding relational qualities of entrepreneurial learning: towards a multi-layered approach. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(9-10), 877-906.
- Lee, R. M., & Renzetti, C. M. (1990). The Problems of Researching Sensitive Topics:" An Overview and Introduction". *The American behavioral scientist*, 33(5), 510-511.

- Lee, S. K., Sulaiman-Hill, C. R., & Thompson, S. C. (2014). Overcoming language barriers in community-based research with refugee and migrant populations: options for using bilingual workers. *BMC international health and human rights*, 14(11), 1-13.
- Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2010). Corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 1-7.
- Lundborg, P. (2013). Refugees' employment integration in Sweden: Cultural distance and labor market performance. *Review of International Economics*, 21(2), 219-232.
- Meyer, J. W. (1977). The effects of education as an institution. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 83(1), 55-77.
- Meyer, J. W. (2010). World society, institutional theories, and the actor. *Annual review of sociology*, 36, 1-20.
- Muijs, D. (2010). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS* (2nd ed.). London, Great Britain: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Nishii, L. H. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(6), 1754-1774.
- Ortlieb, R., Sieben, B., & Sichtmann, C. (2014). Assigning migrants to customer contact jobs: a context-specific exploration of the business case for diversity. *Review of Managerial Science*, 8(2), 249-273.
- Özbilgin, M., and Tatli, A. (2005), Understanding Bourdieu's Contribution to Organization and Management Studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(4), 855–869.
- Özbilgin, M., & Tatli, A. (2011). Mapping out the field of equality and diversity: Rise of individualism and voluntarism. *Human Relations*, 64(9), 1229-1253.
- Peretz, H., Levi, A., & Fried, Y. (2015). Organizational diversity programs across cultures: effects on absenteeism, turnover, performance and innovation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(6), 875-903.
- Portes, A. (2000). The two meanings of social capital. *Sociological forum*, 15(1), 1-12.
- Robson, C. (1993). *Real world research* (2nd ed.). Malden, The United States of America: Blackwell Publishing.
- Scott, W. R., Ruef, M., Mendel, P. J., & Caronna, C. A. (2000). *Institutional change and healthcare organizations: From professional dominance to managed care*. Chicago, The United States of America: University of Chicago Press.
- Senge, K. (2013). The 'new institutionalism in organization theory: Bringing society and culture back in. *The American Sociologist*, 44(1), 76-95.
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups: A Review and Model for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1262-1289.
- Schnyder, M. (2015). The Domestic Issue-Specific Political Opportunity Structure and Migrant

- Inclusion Organization Activity in Europe. *Social Movement Studies*, 14(6), 692-712.
- Spencer, L., Ritchie, J., & O'Connor, W. (2003). *Analysis: Practices, Principles and Processes*. London, Great Britain: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Statistics Netherlands (CBS). (2008). Bevolking; herkomstgroepering, generatie, geslacht en leeftijd, 1 januari. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication>
- Syed, J., & Özbilgin, M. (2009). A relational framework for international transfer of diversity management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(12), 2435-2453.
- Tatli, A., & Özbilgin, M. F. (2012). An emic approach to intersectional study of diversity at work: a Bourdieuan framing. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(2), 180-200.
- Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter. *Harvard business review*, 74(5), 79-90.
- Turner, S. W., & Herlihy, J. (2009). Working with refugees and asylum seekers. *Psychiatry*, 8(8), 322-324.
- UNHCR. (2015). UNHCR Mid-Year Trends 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/56701b969.html>
- UNHCR. (n.d.). Flowing Across Borders. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c125.html>
- Van den Berg, B. (2009), 'Philips: diversity and inclusion', Guest Lecture Philips Global D&I, 10 November 2008.
- Van den Berge, W., Erken, H., De Graaf-Zijl, M., & Van Loon, E. (2014). *The Dutch labour market during the Great Recession*. Retrieved from <https://www.cpb.nl/sites/default/files/publicaties/download/cpb-background-document-dutch-labour-market-during-great-recession.pdf>
- van Tubergen, F. (2011). Job search methods of refugees in The Netherlands: Determinants and consequences. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 9(2), 179-195.
- Velasco González, K., Verkuyten, M., Weesie, J., & Poppe, E. (2008). Prejudice towards Muslims in the Netherlands: Testing integrated threat theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 47(4), 667-685.
- Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland. (n.d.). Eerste hulp van VluchtelingenWerk bij integratie. Retrieved from <http://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/wat-wij-doen/begeleiding-bij-integratie>
- Wennekers, S., Thurik, R., van Stel, A., & Noorderhaven, N. (2007). Uncertainty avoidance and the rate of business ownership across 21 OECD countries, 1976–2004. *Journal of Evolutionary economics*, 17(2), 133-160.
- Wooten, M., & Hoffman, A. J. (2016). *Organizational Fields Past, Present and Future* (Working Paper No. 1311). Retrieved from <https://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php>

Wrench, J. (2016). *Diversity management and discrimination: Immigrants and ethnic minorities in the EU*. New York, The United States of America: Routledge.