THE YOUNG ACADEMY

de **jonge** akademie

# AN EXPLORATION OF THE VIEWS OF STAFF AND STUDENTS OF COLOUR REGARDING ANTIDISCRIMINATION DATA

# INHOUDSOPGAVE

Respondents answers to: 'how would you self-identify, if it were up to you?'

# SUMMARY AND POINTS TO CONSIDER IN FUTURE DISCUSSIONS

This report seeks to contribute to an informed and nuanced discussion on the collection of data for the purpose of combatting ethnic discrimination and racism at Dutch universities. Dutch universities do not currently collect data on the migration background, ethnicity or racialisation (that is: perceived as belonging to a certain 'race') of Dutch university staff; data collection on students is limited to migration background. There are growing calls to collect such data as input for effective diversity policies, but there is also considerable opposition to doing so. Statistical data classifying people into ethnic and racial categories can contribute to exclusion and discrimination, for example when politicians argue that there are 'too many' people of a certain category in a country. Data of this kind can, however, also be used to identify, understand and combat ethnic discrimination and racism.

Students and staff belonging to discriminated groups should play a key role in decision-making about university antidiscrimination policies. If an antidiscrimination policy involves data collection, they should have a say in how these data are collected, analysed and published. The purpose of this project was therefore to explore what students and staff of colour at Dutch universities think about data collection.

This report is based on interviews with eleven staff of colour at Dutch universities and five representatives of multicultural and/or antiracist student organisations. The findings we present here are a preliminary exploration: they do not offer a representative sample of the opinions held by staff and students of colour in the Netherlands concerning antidiscrimination data. Since it was not feasible to conduct a representative survey with the available means, we set out to explore the widest possible spectrum of views. We cannot draw firm conclusions and recommendations from this study. What we can do is highlight some points that we hope will be considered in future discussions.

A majority of our respondents favour the collection of data to combat ethnic discrimination and racism. Most proponents, however, also express a certain reluctance: they see data collection as a 'necessary evil'.

The main argument put forward by the proponents of data collection is that quantitative data are needed to show that racism and ethnic discrimination exist at universities: 'Without data, they won't believe you when you tell them about racism'. Another respondent refers to 'legitimising the experiences of people of colour'.

A minority of our respondents believe that the disadvantages of quantitative data collection outweigh the advantages. They emphasise the risk of 'pigeonholing'. Instead of categorising people, the university itself should be the subject of research. These respondents would prefer to see qualitative research identifying the individuals or groups for whom the university is not a welcoming and safe place, and examining why that is the case.

Having a say in the data collection and analysis is crucial for many of our respondents. Several respondents emphasise that the categories identified in antidiscrimination data should be defined in consultation with those affected, i.e., the people who actually experience ethnic discrimination and racism. Stigmatisation can only be prevented through participation, these respondents believe.

Almost all respondents prefer self-categorisation (with students and staff being asked to self-identify) to categorisation by third parties based on data from population statistics (as is currently customary in the Netherlands). In the view of these respondents, it is crucial to give staff and students of colour a say in how they are categorised when collecting antidiscrimination data.

Respondents' opinions about data collection are shaped by their trust or lack of it in the institutions that collect these data. In the wake of the Childcare Benefits scandal, our respondents' trust in government has been severely shaken. Many respondents also do not have a great deal of trust in universities and their administrators. Universities and other government institutions can only regain this trust by showing that they are collecting and using data in a way that does not harm but rather benefits minorities.

For many of our respondents, it is important that the categories used in data collection match their self-identification, so that they can 'recognize themselves' in a survey instrument. Others prefer to think more strategically about categories:

AN EXPLORATION OF THE VIEWS OF STAFF AND STUDENTS OF COLOUR REGARDING ANTIDISCRIMINATION DATA

for them, the main purpose of categorisation in data collection is not to capture the complexity and layeredness of each individual identity, but to facilitate policies or interventions that serve the interests of minorities.

Many of our respondents prefer self-categorisation using categories based on 'origin' or 'descent'. In their view, a category based on geographical origin and family history best captures their identity. A few respondents prefer survey questions about nationality or place of birth. Several respondents feel that religion should be included in data collection meant to combat ethnic discrimination and racism.

A significant majority of respondents emphasise that it is not enough to collect data on ethnicity and racialisation alone if the purpose is to understand and combat inequality and discrimination. The data collected should cover gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic background, disability, and geographical origin in the Netherlands.

Several respondents say that they found answering questions about ethnicity and racialisation to be stressful and difficult. They emphasise the importance of caring for respondents before, during and after data collection.

# INTRODUCTION

This report seeks to contribute to the discussion on the collection of data for the purpose of combatting ethnic discrimination and racism at Dutch universities. Dutch universities do not currently collect data on the migration background, ethnicity or racialisation of Dutch university staff; data collection on students is currently limited to migration background. There are growing calls to collect such data as input for effective diversity policies, but there is also considerable opposition to doing so. The Young Academy wishes to contribute to an informed debate in which staff and students of colour play a pivotal role. They are, after all, the ones affected by ethnic discrimination and racism and by categories and statistics that have stigmatising effects. Beyond voluntariness and anonymity, one of the main principles that should govern the collection of antidiscrimination data is that 'representatives of discriminated groups must participate in the process of data collection, analysis and publication' (Ahyoud et al 2018: 33). The Young Academy has therefore undertaken two studies. The first explores the ways in which universities in other countries collect data to combat ethnic discrimination and racism. The results of that study, conducted by Sharon van Geldere, Rozemarijn Stadens and Linnet Taylor, are briefly summarised in Chapter 3 of this report and presented in their entirety in the report *Antidiscrimination data collection in academia: An exploration of survey methodology practices outside of the Netherlands*. The second study, which is discussed in this report, surveys opinions about data collection on ethnicity and racialisation held by people of colour in the university community. This study was conducted by Saskia Bonjour, Shanelle Hasselbaink, Chaima Nbigui, and Shivano Raghoenathsingh. We hope that this preliminary exploration will help ensure that students and staff of colour can play a greater and more structural role in decision-making about antidiscrimination policy and antidiscrimination data.

There are no neutral words to refer to migration background, ethnicity, racialisation, 'race', or cultural diversity. Every word is politically *and* scientifically charged. It will become clear in this study that word choice is highly

context-dependent and that all our respondents have their own views about it. The choices we have made as the authors of this report will be explained later in this introduction.

## Background and context

The topic of antiracism was suddenly on the front page of every newspaper in the summer of 2020. The worldwide Black Lives Matter protests mobilised tens of thousands of people in the Netherlands as well. For the first time, 'institutional racism' featured so prominently on the Dutch social and political agenda that even the Prime Minister, Mark Rutte, took up the term (NRC 2020). The mass protests of that summer built on an antiracism movement that had been very active in the Netherlands for about ten years, the most visible part of it being the opposition to the *Zwarte Piet* (Black Pete) folklore figure. That movement, in turn, represents a 'new wave of resistance' that builds on earlier anticolonial and antiracist movements in the Netherlands, most notably in the 1940s and 1950s, and in the 1980s (Esajas 2018). Antiracist movements have been present in Dutch universities well before 2020 as well. For example, the students and staff who occupied the Maagdenhuis Building at the University of Amsterdam for six weeks in 2015 hung a banner above the building's entrance reading 'no democratization without decolonisation' (De Ploeg & De Ploeg 2017).

Partly in response to this activism, diversity has become an increasingly prominent topic on the agendas of Dutch universities in recent years. Nearly all now have diversity policies and employ diversity officers (Bonjour, van den Brink & Taartmans 2020). In 2020, Education Minister Van Engelshoven presented a *National Action Plan for more diversity and inclusion in higher education and research*, drafted in cooperation with Universities of The Netherlands (UNL), the Dutch Research Council (NWO) and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). One of the five main goals of the National Action Plan was the 'broader monitoring of diversity' (Ministerie van OCW 2020: 2). As the Action Plan states:

'If progress is to be evaluated, objective measures of the current situation are required. Without data, it is not possible to demonstrate the extent and urgency of the issue. Nor can it be shown how much talent we leave untapped. At present, data input at all levels is not sufficient to provide a basis for analysis. … Wherever possible, it is important to ensure that personal data (e.g. on ethnicity, migration background) is used only for the purposes of research or monitoring with a view to promoting equality.' (ibid: 10)

The National Action Plan suggests that data on employees' ethnicity and migration background can be retrieved from Statistics Netherlands' CBS Cultural Diversity Barometer or by means of 'voluntary arrangements' in which 'staff or students supply their own data in response to an anonymized request' (ibid: 10). This proposal was met with resistance from the Dutch House of Representatives. Representative Wiersma (VVD party) initiated a motion asking the government to refrain from quantitative data collection of this kind, because 'people should not be reduced to only their ethnicity and migration background' (Wiersma 2020). The representative's motion was carried by a vote of 83 for and 66 against.[1]

Both Minister van Engelshoven, then Minister of Education, Culture and Science, and the UNL stated their commitment to continue working on the diversity agenda, despite the criticism from the House. In the spring of 2021, five universities in the Randstad region informed their staff that they were planning to have Statistics Netherlands analyse the composition of their staff, using the Cultural Diversity Barometer. The Barometer is a tool that Statistics Netherlands uses on behalf of organisations and companies to analyse the proportion of their staff with a Western or non-Western migration background. The plan met with objections, including objections by works councils, at all five universities, where staff voiced concerns about privacy, about the categories Western and non-Western used by Statistics Netherlands, and about whether employees' migration background should be monitored at all. In the meantime, Statistics Netherlands has replaced the 'Western' and 'non-Western' categories with a new classification based on country of origin (CBS 2022). Even so, all five universities have suspended their cooperation with Statistics Netherlands for the time being (NRC 2021).

In short, the idea of collecting data on the ethnic composition of the Dutch university community sparks a great deal of discussion. Proponents claim that this data is necessary to combat ethnic discrimination and racism, while opponents say that collecting data only exacerbates discrimination and racism. The discussion is in full swing and the outcome is highly uncertain.

---

1    The parties that voted in favour of the motion were VVD, PVV, CDA, ChristenUnie, SGP, FVD, Krol and Van Kooten-Arissen. Those that voted against were D66, GroenLinks, SP, PvdA, PvdD, 50Plus and DENK. Source: Tweede Kamer.

AN EXPLORATION OF THE VIEWS OF STAFF AND STUDENTS OF COLOUR REGARDING
        ANTIDISCRIMINATION DATA

## Data on ethnicity and racialisation: Emancipation or discrimination?

Classifying people into ethnic and racial categories is a powerful tool that governments and institutions use to create exclusion and inequality. Examples include Dutch colonial legislation according 'Europeans' superior status and rights to 'natives' (Jones 2007) and, more recently, discrimination by the Tax and Customs Administration in the Childcare Benefits scandal (*Toeslagenaffaire*) (Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens 2020). The same categories that drove oppression can also be used to combat that oppression, however. For example, the category 'Black' has united people in North America, the UK and beyond from the 1960s on, based on their shared experience of and struggle against racism (Hall 2000).

Something similar applies to statistical data in which people are divided into ethnic and racial categories. In the words of Bennett and Carrington (2000: 497), 'Ethnic monitoring reflects the logic of state surveillance and control. Yet it also acts as a site of social change and emancipation'. Such data can lead to exclusion and discrimination, for example when politicians argue that there are 'too many' people of a certain category in a country or organisation – we need only recall Dutch politician Geert Wilders calling for 'fewer Moroccans' in the Netherlands – or when researchers suggest that certain categories of people are 'problematic', for example because they are 'poorly integrated' or 'over-represented in crime statistics'. Data of this kind can, however, also be used to identify, understand and combat discrimination. For example, the European Commission (2017: 4) argues that 'data on (in)equalities based on racial and ethnic origin … is essential to measure the level of implementation and monitor the impact of [antidiscrimination] policies.' Bonnett & Carrington (2000) also emphasise that governments and organisations often decide to collect data on ethnicity and racialisation in response to protest movements against racism, as part of a package of antidiscrimination measures developed to meet the demands of these movements. Viewed from that perspective, the collection and analysis of data on ethnicity by, for example, employers is important because it 'helps not only in identifying and dealing with unlawful discrimination, but also frequently highlights other employment practices in need of improvement' (Bonnett & Carrington 2000: 488).

The Netherlands has almost no tradition of collecting data on ethnicity and racialisation in connection with empowerment and antidiscrimination. Dutch population statistics do not include data on ethnicity and racialisation – at least, not directly. It is, however, routine practice to record the nationality and country of birth of individuals and their parents and – until this year – to categorise

inhabitants of the Netherlands on that basis into people with or without 'Western' or 'non-Western' 'migration background'. According to Yanow and Van der Haar (2013: 229), this classification is 'in all but name, a racial discourse – one perhaps all the more powerful for being carried out in disguise'. The emphasis on origin has an essentialising effect and is associated, both in political and scientific contexts, with 'integration problems': a 'non-Western migration background' is presumed to be associated with a lower facility for 'integration' in the Netherlands.

Knowledge production regarding the position of ethnic and racialised minorities in the Netherlands has for decades been closely intertwined with policy issues and discourses. From the 1970s to the 2000s, academic research in this field was predominantly driven by questions posed by public officials and politicians about 'integration issues' (Scholten 2007). As a result, this research was detached from emancipatory movements in the Netherlands. People of colour were rarely involved. The only exception was the Center for Race and Ethnic Studies (CRES), founded at the University of Amsterdam in 1984 and headed by Professor Chris Mullard, one of the first professors of colour in the field of ethnic studies in Europe. CRES had a diverse staff who worked on issues concerning constructions of 'race' in relation to other social categories such as gender and class. The Center was disbanded in 1991. Since then, the field of 'migration and ethnic studies' has been dominated in the Netherlands by white researchers with close ties to policymakers (Essed and Nimako 2006).

Thus far, data on ethnicity and racialisation have not been collected in the Netherlands for and by people facing discrimination for the purpose of combating such discrimination. Instead, it is the Dutch government, institutions and researchers who have collected and used data on people 'with a migration background', without any involvement or input from these people themselves and in ways that they have often experienced as stigmatising. This helps to explain why many of the students and staff we interviewed are reluctant about the collection of antidiscrimination data.

## Reflection on our word choice

It is beyond dispute that racism and ethnic discrimination are harmful and must be combated. However, precisely *what* racism and ethnic discrimination entail and *how* they should be combated are controversial questions. The controversy starts with the word choice.

From a political and normative standpoint, there are, very roughly speaking, two conflicting views. One view argues that to ensure neutrality and equal treatment, institutions such as universities must make no distinction between people. According to this view, the problems start precisely when people are pigeonholed; when institutions differentiate between people, they end up treating them differently as well. Universities should therefore be 'colour blind' and certainly not categorise their students and staff on the basis of ethnicity, origin or racialisation. The opposing view argues that our society is not, in fact, colour blind. Some groups of people are subject to ethnic discrimination and racism, and others are not. According to this 'colour-sensitive' view, to combat inequality we must, inevitably, acknowledge that people are divided into ethnic and/or racial categories. There is, of course, a vast grey area and considerable nuance between and within these two views. The authors of this report have more affinity with the second, 'colour-sensitive' view.

The terminology of the social sciences is never 'colour blind'. After all, describing and interpreting social differences and inequalities is at the heart of social science practice. Various scholarly traditions have produced a range of terms to this end: 'ethnicity', 'race', 'racialised', 'migration background', 'non-Western', 'cultural diversity', and so on. Behind each of these concepts lurks a world of academic debate. As social scientists, we have made the following terminology choices in this study.

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the discussion on data collection meant to combat ethnic discrimination and racism. We therefore do not use the term 'migration background'. After all, where a person or their parents were born does not determine whether or not they experience ethnic discrimination and racism. The distinction between 'Western' and 'non-Western' is, in the words of the Dutch Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR), 'not supported by scientific evidence' (WRR 2021). We also consider terms such as 'cultural diversity' or 'cultural background' to be lacking in precision. The problem that this data collection aims to address, after all, is not cultural differences but ethnic discrimination and racism.

A controversy has arisen in the social sciences regarding the use of the concepts 'ethnicity' and 'race'. There is a very broad consensus that both 'ethnicity' and 'race' are social constructs: they are not biological or natural categories, but rather categories devised by people that take shape and acquire meaning in specific social contexts. The controversy concerns the *relationship* between 'ethnicity' and 'race'. Some social scientists insist on distinguishing between the two concepts. They stress that 'ethnicity' refers to an perceived common culture, language,

religion and/or history of a group of people, while 'race' refers to a perceived biological, phenotypic difference between groups of people. According to another school of thought, however, it is impossible to make a sharp analytical distinction between 'ethnicity' and 'race'. People with very different phenotypic traits may call themselves 'Black' because that term unites them politically in the fight against racism; people with very different phenotypic traits may be seen by others as 'naturally' lazy, stupid or dangerous, because they belong to a 'backward culture'. In this school of thought, 'ethnicity' and 'race' are usually used together, for example in the concept 'ethnoracial' (for an outline of these scholarly discussions, see Brubaker 2009: 25-29). Bonjour and Taylor, project leaders for this research project, adhere to the second school of thought. We regard ethnic discrimination and racism as different words for a single, complex cluster of forms of exclusion. In our view, it is unadvisable to refer only to 'ethnicity' and 'ethnic discrimination' (as is customary in the Netherlands), for two reasons. First of all, doing so does not make sufficiently clear that perceived biological and phenotypic traits do in fact play a role. Second, the concept of 'racism', more than the concept of 'ethnicity', alludes to the long European history of this form of exclusion, a history that includes not only colonialism but also the genocide and oppression of people within Europe, including Jews, Roma, Sinti, and Sami. To emphasise that 'race' is not an objective trait but a social process, we prefer the term 'racialised'.

We use the term 'person of colour' to refer to someone who is not categorised as white, European, or Western and who is therefore at risk of facing ethnic discrimination and racism.

## Reflection on our positionality

This research project was carried out by two white female academics, a full professor and an associate professor respectively, and five student researchers, four of whom self-identify as persons of colour and one as white. The composition of our research team, in which the project leaders are both white and the student researchers predominantly of colour, reflects patterns of inequality at Dutch universities and in society.

Our ethnicity and racialisation informs our perspective, as became apparent in the preparatory phases of the project. For example, the researchers of colour on our team had a much clearer idea of the level of distrust among Dutch people of colour regarding the issue of institutional data collection, certainly in the immediate aftermath of the Childcare Benefits scandal. In our interviews with students and staff of colour, this led us to ask the broader question of whether it is advisable

AN EXPLORATION OF THE VIEWS OF STAFF AND STUDENTS OF COLOUR REGARDING ANTIDISCRIMINATION DATA

to collect data to combat ethnic discrimination and racism and if so, under what conditions, instead of focusing immediately on which categories should be used in such data collection. All interviews with students and staff of colour were conducted by researchers of colour. Our impression is that this helped foster open and respectful discussions about this complex and often painful subject.

## Research design and approach

The original purpose of this project was to elicit input from organisations representing people of colour in the Netherlands about which categories would be appropriate for quantitative data collection at universities. We wanted to use crowdsourcing to get a better idea of which categories (e.g. 'non-Western', 'of colour' or 'Surinamese-Dutch') would be most appropriate in voluntary student and staff surveys. We soon became aware, however, that our original design had skipped some critical steps: before talking about data collection methods, we first need to discuss whether we want to collect these data, under what conditions and why. That is why we started from the beginning in our interviews with respondents. The outcome of this report is not a ready-made list of categories for self-categorising, as we had hoped. Instead, we have produced a preliminary exploration of the views of students and staff of colour on the issue of data collection, in the hope that our results will help put the opinions of these members of the university community at the forefront of this debate.

In selecting our respondents, we applied purposive sampling. Our aim, then, was not to paint a representative picture of the opinions of all students and staff of colour in the Netherlands on antidiscrimination data, but rather to explore the broadest possible spectrum of opinions in a series of 15 to 20 interviews. Alternative methods, such as focus groups or a representative survey, were not feasible given the time and resources available to us. Because the use of language and word choice are crucial in this discussion, we only interviewed Dutch-speaking respondents.

Initially, we had planned to speak to representatives of organisations that represent members of the academic community who might face ethnic discrimination or racism. This proved to be possible with regard to the students, and we were able to identify student organisations at all Dutch universities that either focus on issues of multiculturalism, diversity, antiracism and decolonisation, or represent a specific group of origin or non-Christian religious group. We wrote to 19 student organisations, seeking to achieve both a thematic and a geographical spread. Ultimately, we interviewed five representatives of student organisations.

Selecting university staff respondents proved more complex. There are no organisations representing university staff of colour in the Netherlands. We therefore wrote to individual employees. On the one hand, our purposive sampling strategy was aimed at selecting respondents who have strong views on the issue of ethnic discrimination and racism at universities, and who were prepared to speak out publicly on this matter. On the other hand, we sought diversity among respondents in terms of their job status (temporary/permanent, academic/non-academic, position in the academic hierarchy), discipline (humanities, natural sciences, social sciences) and the university where they were employed. The latter point proved difficult, and respondents from universities in the Randstad region are over-represented in our sample.

Given our colour-sensitive approach, it was crucial for us to speak to persons of colour on staff. Specifically, our view is that we must inevitably acknowledge and address the fact that people in our society are categorised in such a way that some groups are subject to ethnic discrimination and racism while others are not. Our using the category 'of colour' should be understood in this light. Information indicating which university employees do or do not self-identify as being 'of colour' is often not available, however. Where possible, we selected staff members who had previously self-identified in public interviews as persons of colour or as being of African or Asian origin. This did not produce the sought-after diversity in terms of job titles and disciplines, however. We therefore also wrote to university staff who we presumed self-identify as people of colour, based either on their name or their appearance on their university or LinkedIn profile page. We spoke to one member of staff informally, and sent e-mails to the others. Our invitation e-mail can be found in the appendices. One staff member was shocked that we had referred to her as a 'person of colour', especially because we did not explain in our e-mail how we had arrived at that categorisation and because she feared that her employer had designated her in that way. Understandably, this particular staff member did not wish to participate in our project. It is possible that the way in which we addressed other staff may have led to their deciding not to participate in our study. We wrote to a total of 18 university employees and interviewed 11 of them.

The interviews lasted 45 to 60 minutes and were conducted digitally, except for one in-person interview. They were semi-structured interviews in which we asked respondents to share their views about collecting data on ethnicity and racialisation at universities and then zeroed in on methods of data collection. Because many people in the Netherlands are not familiar with self-categorising as a data collection method, we showed our interviewees examples of survey forms distributed to students and staff at universities in Canada, the US, the UK, and South Africa. The interview guide we used can be found in the appendix.

Needless to say, these interviews do not allow us to paint a representative picture of what people of colour in the Dutch academic community think about quantitative data collection. That is explicitly not our intention. We do, however, seek to amplify the voices of people categorized as ethnic or racialised minority groups who find it important to speak out on these matters. All our respondents spoke only on their own behalf, and not on anyone else's. Subject to their consent, we therefore did not anonymise respondents in our report.

# COLLECTION OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION DATA AT UNIVERSITIES OUTSIDE THE NETHERLANDS

Parallel to the study covered in this report, The Young Academy conducted a second study investigating the ways in which universities outside the Netherlands collect data to combat ethnic discrimination and racism. The results are summarised here (and in the separate downloadable file, see www.dejongeakademie.nl) and in their entirety in the report *Antidiscrimination data collection in academia: An exploration of survey methodology practices outside of the Netherlands*.

- This study is meant to inform The Young Academy's project on categorisation and self-categorisation in Dutch academia, which examines both practices and views associated with ethnic and racialised categories used in academic institutions as part of antidiscrimination policies. We requested self-categorisation forms from institutions in a number of countries and, where possible, interviewed those involved in administering them to understand their rationale and purposes.

- Under the rubric of their countries' national equality laws and related institutional requirements, academic institutions collect data on people's personal background, including their ethnic identity, social group membership, and legal and physical attributes. These data collection practices differ widely from one country and institution to another.

- Institutions vary somewhat in their reasons for collecting data, the data they collect, and the type of accountability such data collection stems from and in turn makes possible. There is no particular approach or set of priorities we can point to as dominant; instead, local history and circumstances appear to be the defining factors.

- There is no legal prohibition in the EU against collecting such information, but data protection law does require a legal basis to be created first. This makes collecting data for antidiscrimination purposes a question of political will, as does the presence/establishment of oversight to make the data actionable.

- We identify some protections and features that make these surveys both more effective in representing diversity and more acceptable to employees in terms of data use and management:

  — Offering participants the option of updating the information they have provided;
  — Offering participants the option of elaborating on the answers they have given;
  — Allowing participants to tick multiple boxes to denote intersecting identities;
  — Acknowledging that there are far more identities than the surveys can realistically accounted for;
  — Communicating the broader objective of the survey and indicating how the information will (and will not) be used;
  — Clarifying data management and privacy matters by offering binding statements on access and purpose limitation.

- The surveys collected for this project suggest that we might draw a distinction between using data for institutional diversity oversight (i.e. institutions' upward accountability to government or equality institutions) and using data to support and inform antidiscriminatory action (possibly different in form, and created in response to demands for 'downward' accountability towards staff).

# VIEWS ON DATA COLLECTION

## Proponents, opponents, and their arguments

Many of our respondents are in favour of data collection, as it can ensure that ethnic or racial inequality can be addressed. 'You can't measure what you don't know,' said Professor Vinod Subramaniam, former rector of VU Amsterdam and chairperson of the board of the University of Twente. Other respondents also indicate that they would like to see data on access to universities by minority groups.

Several respondents think that data collection is a necessary prerequisite for acknowledging ethnic and racial exclusion at universities. So far, these respondents believe, such exclusion has been denied or trivialised. The university is held to be a meritocratic environment, the idea being that 'if you work hard enough, you will succeed', said a representative of Space to Talk About Race (STAR), a student collective at Leiden University. Respondents see quantitative data as the only way to ensure that claims of racism or ethnic discrimination are taken seriously at the university. Alfrida Martis, diversity officer at the University of Amsterdam[2], put it this way: 'If you don't acknowledge that there is a lack of diversity at the university and you don't have any relevant data, you can't change things'. A master's student in environmental studies at Wageningen University reported as follows: 'Now, without data, people simply have to take non-white persons' word for it, but white men can't imagine what they are experiencing. They very often want evidence'. Ngangitie, president of the Afro-Dutch student association Marula, also argued that data collection is needed to 'legitimise the experiences of people of colour in the Netherlands within educational institutions'.

---

2    At the time of the interview, Alfrida Martis was project leader diversity at the University of Amsterdam. Since then, she has been appointed diversity officer at the Willem de Kooning Academy in Rotterdam.

Other respondents see data collection as a necessary prerequisite for designing and implementing effective diversity policies. Subramaniam would like to see a baseline measure that would make it possible to monitor the impact of policies. In the words of Professor Kofi Makinwa (Delft University of Technology):

> 'You need numbers to work towards something. Progress is being made [with gender diversity] in my field precisely because it's quantifiable. … To measure is to know, otherwise you get stuck in vague comments, anecdotes and emotions that are not conducive to policymaking. … Collecting data could help to define targets. If you have the data, you can compare the university staff composition with data from society at large about different population groups and then determine whether or not they are reasonably similar. You can then ask: Where are we going wrong? Why is this happening? But how can you have a conversation like that without data?'

Martis, too, felt that 'What Dutch universities want is more policy to increase diversity and inclusion, but they are not collecting the scientific data that will allow them to develop that kind of policy'. Gözde, former chairperson of student platform Amsterdam United and student assistant, noted that the team she works with at the academic helpdesk is diverse because 'we are consciously looking for that'. But 'the rest of the department is white and then you have the people who are not white. The cleaners. And I find that problematic. If you can express that in numbers…'

Most respondents also perceive risks in data collection. A lack of trust in the university as an institution is particularly relevant in this respect. Many respondents do not trust the university to protect their privacy and would feel safer navigating the university environment without being monitored. In their view, data collection could be counterproductive and even exacerbate institutional discrimination; they point to recent examples of discrimination by the Tax and Customs Administration, the police and border guards. A representative of Tribez, a student association for Black students, said the following:

> 'The school doesn't need to know about my Black ethnicity. When they see me on campus, they see my skin colour. What would they do with that data? There's no point in registering me in the system as a Black person. It increases the risk of discrimination and racism, because who knows who's behind that screen.'

Some respondents resist the idea that quantitative data are needed to acknowledge ethnic or racial exclusion. A PhD researcher at Erasmus University

Rotterdam commented:

'It's quite clear that the university is a white institution. We don't need to collect data to figure that out. … There's already a lot of racialisation and institutionalised racism. Having data on that will only make it worse.'

Amade M'charek, professor of Anthropology at the University of Amsterdam, is fundamentally opposed to the 'idea of the university having a database on ethnicity':

'The danger is that ethnic differences will be 'reified': that they will be presented as very significant, almost natural differences that have much more significance, [rather than being regarded as something] produced to enable a statistical calculation or as a numerical exercise. Putting them into a database makes them seem like very natural, universal criteria. That is the process of reification that I find dangerous. The result is that we may overlook differences within a particular cluster, within a classification, simply because ethnicity has been turned into such an important factor.'

Some respondents, including M'charek, feel that these objections outweigh any of the benefits of quantitative data collection, while a few other respondents are enthusiastic proponents. Most respondents, however, are cautious advocates of data collection: they see it as a complex, high-risk but necessary step in combating ethnic and racial exclusion at universities. According to Mostafa Sadiqi, representing the Muslim Student Association (MSA), 'categorisation is always a mechanism of oppression: you are this and we are that'. He sees it as a 'necessary evil', however, a process that can be used to avert marginalisation – as long as marginalised groups are given a voice in that process.

## Requirements for ethical and effective data collection

What virtually all of our respondents find crucial is guaranteed anonymity. They worry about the difficulty, in practice, of presenting antidiscrimination data in a way that is not traceable to individuals. For example, Mohammed Badran, VU Amsterdam alumnus, former student assistant and founder of Syrian Volunteers & Network for Refugee Voices, described the problem as follows:

'It is very difficult [for anonymised data] not to be traceable. … If you have a very small number of staff from other cultural backgrounds, for example three Syrians, two Palestinians and three Iranians… Everyone knows who these people are.'

AN EXPLORATION OF THE VIEWS OF STAFF AND STUDENTS OF COLOUR REGARDING ANTIDISCRIMINATION DATA

A scrupulous and transparent protocol guaranteeing the anonymity of respondents must be in place. It must be clear who is managing the data, who has access to the data and how long the data will be stored.

A critical factor for respondents is that they can trust the actor that collects and manages the data. Some respondents do not have that kind of trust in the university or in any government institution: the Tax and Customs Administration was mentioned several times as an example of how the Dutch government handles data on ethnicity. These respondents are only willing to entrust the collection of data to a 'morally legitimate' institution: an 'independent institute' or a 'research body'. Gözde, former chairperson of Amsterdam United, commented that the university is a neo-liberal institution. In her view, it is primarily interested in money, and is not a morally legitimate institution.

Trust is a key factor in data collection. 'Yes, I think it's fine. VU Amsterdam is a good employer and they really do consider you,' said Avinash, who is a host at VU Amsterdam. He is satisfied with his employer, in other words, and trusts the university as a result. That in turn is why he has a positive attitude towards data collection. For Subramaniam, chairperson of the board of the University of Twente, trust hinges on the expertise of the body collecting the data: in his view, it is vital that researchers with relevant expertise play a leading role in data collection and categorisation and that their 'scholarly insights are taken into account'.

In addition, it is important for the university to explain why it is collecting this information, what exactly will be done with it, for what purpose and why that is important. Gözde, former chairperson of Amsterdam United and student assistant, said that Gloria Wekker had described this very well in the report *Diversity is a verb*, about the University of Amsterdam.

Having a say in the process of data collection and analysis is also crucial for many of our respondents. Several respondents emphasise that the categories identified in antidiscrimination data should be defined in consultation with those affected, i.e., the people who actually experience ethnic discrimination and racism. Gözde's view is that people should be at liberty to decide which categories are used. A student in environmental sciences in Wageningen argued that the process of data collection and analysis had to be undertaken with the people it concerned, so that they did not come away feeling that they were being 'thought about', but rather that they had been able to choose for themselves. According to Mostafa Sadiqi, representing the Muslim Student Association (MSA), data collection can only be used to prevent marginalisation if those who are being categorised participate in the categorisation process and if the categorisation method is

monitored constantly. The UK is an important example: there, the category 'Asian' has, over time, come to be divided into further categories because people of Asian origin pointed out the importance of distinguishing between a Pakistani and a Bangladeshi. If marginalised groups have no say in the categorisation and data collection process, then Sadiqi would prefer to avoid any sort of classification. Without that input, categorisation is 'problematic nine times out of ten and actually becomes a mechanism of stigmatisation, for example the categories Western and non-Western'. In Sadiqi's view, then, 'registration is fine provided that we minorities who are being registered have a say in the classification'.

Finally, many respondents emphasise the importance of obtaining an individual's explicit consent to having their data collected. According to STAR, this gives people more 'agency', as they are made aware of their participation and the sensitivity of the research topic.

Many respondents assert that an intersectional approach is needed to ensure the effective pursuit of diversity policy goals. Ngangitie of the Afro-Dutch student association Marula would like to see

> 'people bearing in mind that there are individuals within racial groups who each have their own particular experience. I think intersectionality is important here, because my experience as a Black woman without a physical disability will be different from the experience of a Black woman with a physical or mental disability.'

An associate professor in Humanities at Utrecht University explained that it is pointless to consider gender diversity alone in the context of career advancement because it means that only white women will move up the ladder.

Martis emphasised the sensitivity of data collection on racialisation and ethnicity, which she called an example of 'trauma data': 'You're asking people about their experience of racism and discrimination'. In her view, this means taking precautions when preparing the survey questions, and providing aftercare later: 'We always had a designated person you could call to talk about how you experienced the survey. That's another thing that's often forgotten'. Badran explained why data collection can be burdensome: 'It's tricky, because all of a sudden you get a form and you start thinking "What am I now, really?". I find that very interesting, because white people don't have that problem. But we do'.

Many respondents feel it is important that data collection should not be a stand-alone measure but part of a change in culture at universities. As one PhD

researcher at Erasmus University Rotterdam put it:

> 'Sure, you can add non-white people [to the staff], but for as long as the structure stays the same, I don't think anything much will change in the way the university operates. There really needs to be a radical change at the university. There are plenty of organisations and institutions where non-white, non-male, non-cis-hetero people rise to the top but where oppression is still being reproduced. Just look at our mayor [Aboutaleb].'

According to a student majoring in environmental sciences at Wageningen University, if the university wants a safer future, it must examine its own historical links to colonialism and their relationship to institutional racism. A STAR representative also called on universities to own up to their responsibility:

> 'Leiden University has a history of being associated with colonialism. Because that history remains unexamined, there is little room for a discussion of race. Racist incidents here point to a larger, systemic problem, but the university isn't treating it as such.'

In Martis's view, the university is a project that was used to legitimise colonial projects. That is why she finds it difficult to trust that Dutch universities have good intentions when it comes to data collection. It is hard for her to believe that data will be used to combat racism when the institution itself has roots in colonialism. According to an environmental sciences student at Wageningen University, this lack of trust applies not just to the university but also to the Dutch government. His argument is that the colonial past and neo-colonial present of Dutch government agencies, including academic institutions, make it impossible for them to carry out research that is socially safe.

## Word choice: race, racialised, ethnicity or origin?

Most of our respondents would prefer not to see the concept of 'race' being used when collecting antidiscrimination data. Subramaniam said that he does not think in terms of 'race' but in terms of 'ethnicity' and 'origin'. An environmental sciences student at Wageningen University would also rather be asked about 'origin' than 'ethnicity' or 'racialisation'. In his view, 'origin' means 'a geographical location that conveys a history of your identity'. M'charek also believes that concepts such as 'race' or 'ethnoracial' should not be used in Dutch. She noted that the concept of race is no longer as self-evident as it once was in the US and is in fact being called into question. In her field, forensic and medical anthropology, race was

once regarded as a very important concept, 'but now everybody is backpedalling. We thought the social constructivist approach to race would help, but what we're seeing is that it actually mesmerises people, as if [they've gone back to believing that] there's something in our DNA or bodies that makes us or others different.' According to M'charek, importing the concept of 'race' from the US is a bad idea: 'We're lagging behind in the debate on racism, but not when it comes to race'. She believes that the concept of 'racialisation' can be useful because 'when you use the term "racialised", you're essentially talking about the process by which people are turned into a race'. As a concept, racialised emphasises the social construction, the activity by which people are locked into a category that suggests something about their appearance or biology. Martis, on the other hand, does not like the term racialised. 'Because racialised by whom? "Person of colour" or "indigenous person" expresses more agency on the part of a certain group. So I wouldn't be so keen to use racialised.' In Martis's view, 'racialised' emphasises the process that is imposed by the dominant group on the other, thus reasserting whiteness as the standard.

## Data collection method

If Dutch universities were to collect data on student and staff ethnicity and racialisation, how would our respondents like to see them go about it? There are two ways to collect quantitative data of this kind. The first is to link data available to the university to data from the Population Register on country of birth, parents' country of birth, nationality, residence status or other personal details. In the Netherlands, it is customary to categorise people as having either a Western or non-Western migration background based on their country of birth and that of their parents. For example, officials are currently monitoring the enrolment percentage and academic success rates of students with a 'non-Western migration background' at Dutch universities.[3] The second way of collecting quantitative data on ethnicity and racialisation is self-categorisation, with respondents completing a survey consisting of open-ended and/or multiple-choice questions. This method is rarely used in the Netherlands, but is standard in Anglosphere countries and in much of Central and Eastern Europe (Simon 2012). We asked respondents for their views on both methods.

Opinions are divided on using statistics drawn from the Population Register, especially for data on nationality, country of birth and parents' country of birth. On the one hand, some respondents think that these are 'neutral' categories

---

3    For example in the annual report on higher education by the Dutch Education Inspectorate, _De staat van het Hoger Onderwijs_.

that allow for quantifying ethnicity and racialisation. Avinash, a host at VU Amsterdam, would prefer to be categorised on the grounds of his nationality, 'because people are quick to judge'. Subramaniam ( chairperson of the board at Twente University of Technology) and Makinwa (professor at Delft University of Technology) find categorisation on the basis of country of birth the most logical and least problematic method. Country of birth is 'neutral, because it's in your passport,' argued Makinwa, and 'more refined' than a category such as 'non-Western'. On the other hand, some respondents think that collecting data from the Population Register could be problematic for Dutch people of colour. They cite the stigmatisation of first- and second-generation Dutch nationals of colour caused by the distinction between *allochtoon* (foreign) and *autochtoon* (native). Although these categories are constructed for statistical and research purposes, they have very real adverse consequences for Dutch people of colour. For example, an associate professor at Utrecht University does not identify with existing Dutch categories such as *allochtoon*. She finds it objectionable that the Dutch government categorises people 'without them having any say in the matter' and thus 'structurally denies them the possibility of self-identification'.

Many respondents have very negative connotations when it comes to the distinction between Western and non-Western. According to a researcher at the University of Amsterdam, it distinguishes between 'those who are civilised and those who are not by Western and white standards'. An environmental sciences student at Wageningen University argued that the existing Dutch statistical categories are rooted in colonialism: he is denied full Dutchness because he was not born in the nucleus of the Dutch colonial empire. Sadiqi, chairperson of the Muslim Student Association, called the Western and non-Western categories 'dumb and racist'. The categories are 'analytically weak' because they lump together very different people and are 'inherently normative', with countries that perform well or are 'good' being labelled Western and the rest non-Western. This categorisation is really no longer acceptable, in his view.

Almost all respondents are positive about collecting data using the self-categorisation method. It is notable that the majority consider self-categorising attractive because it gives individuals the latitude and freedom to self-identify. An environmental sciences student at Wageningen University called self-categorising the 'ideal form' for collecting antidiscrimination data, and Martis described herself as a 'big fan' of this method. In Ngangitie's view, self-reporting is 'good, because it leaves people free to fill in what they feel comfortable with'. An associate professor at Utrecht University considered self-categorising 'the best option, because it lets people decide for themselves whether and how they want to self-identify'. A Tribez board member agreed, saying, 'Self-categorisation gives you more freedom to

self-identify'. Gözde thought that people should self-identify and that 'no one can do this for them, because then it's going to be based on background and/or skin colour', which she considers undesirable. Although Makinwa welcomes the use of self-categorising, he sees a disadvantage in that the response rate may be lower than when using data from the Population Register. A researcher at the University of Amsterdam further indicated that self-categorising could be less informative, since everyone can report different values.

We also asked respondents whether there were any alternative methods of data collection or research besides the Population Register and self-categorising that they would consider appropriate for combatting ethnic and racial exclusion. The majority found it difficult to come up with alternatives. An environmental sciences student at Wageningen University emphasised the importance of tracking racist incidents. Aouragh (lecturer at the University of Oxford) pointed out the importance of data collection related to job application procedures so as to examine at which stage or stages things go wrong: is it because few people of colour apply for job openings, because they are invited to interview less often, or because they are offered jobs less often? M'charek, who is very reluctant to collect quantitative data on ethnicity, offered the most ideas about alternative approaches, arguing that we 'have plenty of examples of how individuals are excluded and/or discarded'. In her view, it is with these sorts of examples at the casuistic level that one can begin to do the research. The questions that must then be asked are 'Why is this place not welcoming and safe for some people? What is the reason for that?'. This is how change can be effected without labelling people and their bodies. According to M'charek, instead of counting the number of coloured bodies that there are, we should look at what our problem is as an institution: 'We should problematise the institution, not the groups'.

Many of our respondents emphasise that data collection on ethnicity and racialisation alone is not enough and that they advocate intersectional data collection. They argue that Dutch universities should also collect data on gender, sexuality, class, religion, nationality and disability. An associate professor at Utrecht University explained that several grounds for oppression play a role in the way in which she navigates the university. Ngangitie considers intersectionality in data collection on ethnicity and racialisation important, because in her view, an individual's identity is layered and that means that 'you can't really stop at someone's race'. In addition, both Gözde and Ngangitie believe that intersectionality makes it possible to clarify that individual experiences may differ within racial groups. Said Ngangitie, 'My experience as a Black woman without a physical disability will be different from the experience of a Black woman with a physical or mental disability. The differences are okay'. Subramaniam emphasised

that even invisible human traits are part of diversity. That is why he believes it is important to think carefully about which traits are included in intersectional data collection. Sadiqi pointed out that, in addition to the standard factors such as gender, sexuality and class, it is also necessary to establish whether respondents have any disabilities, whether they are first-, second- or third-generation migrants, and whether their parents or grandparents are university graduates. Without all these factors, he said, there is no point in collecting data. M'charek thought it would be interesting to ask where someone comes from within the Netherlands, for example from the urban Randstad region or from a rural area.

## Self-categorising as a data collection method

All our respondents expressed themselves positively about using self-categorising to collect antidiscrimination data. We followed up by asking them precisely how they thought self-categorising should take place as a data collection method. We also showed them examples of the questionnaires used to collect antidiscrimination data at universities in other countries.

All our respondents emphasised how complex and layered identities can be. To do justice to that complexity, the option of ticking more than one box was a must for most respondents. Not a single respondent was against ticking more than one box.

When presented with questionnaires about ethnicity and racialisation, most of our respondents look for categories with which they can identify. For example, a PhD at Erasmus University Rotterdam found the categories listed in the diversity surveys of British and Canadian universities 'very limited and inflexible'. He felt that there should be scope for multiple identities, because a person's rich ethnic background may mean that they have more than one particular ethnic identity. He himself would have ticked the 'other ethnicity' box in most of the example questionnaires because there were no categories to which he felt he belonged. Martis said that surveys often ask whether she is 'Antillean'. She finds this very reductive: 'Not everyone from the ABC-SSS islands [Aruba, Curaçao, Bonaire, St Martin, Saba and St Eustatius] has the same identity. It has to be specific.' An environmental sciences student at Wageningen University warned against categorisations that were too broad for people to identify with. He argued that categories should not reduce diversity but rather embrace it. Black people's identity is often reduced in questionnaires to the category 'Black' or 'African'. They often forget that there are Black Latin Americans as well. This student favours multiple boxes or subcategories because he now often feels as if he is leaving out a part of his identity and history. Tribez, on the other hand, said it can

be 'overwhelming to see all those boxes. You might feel you belong in multiple categories, but all those options could also be detrimental for someone who prefers to self-identify simply as Black, for example. I do think, however, that having multiple boxes to tick encourages you to think about who you are and how you self-identify'. Aouragh is in favour of a multiple-choice model based on layers, for example a questionnaire that first allows you to tick the option 'North African' and then, below it, increasingly specific categories, such as Moroccan and perhaps indigenous identities as well. Aouragh also said that she is not a huge fan of the 'other' box because it feels a bit like a lost vote. She thought that it is more likely to have a psychological effect for individuals, who have an extra box to tick if they do not feel at home in a particular category, than being genuinely useful for measuring diversity.

Aouragh and Sadiqi emphasised that the main purpose of categorisation in data collection is not to capture the complexity and layeredness of each individual identity, but to facilitate policies or interventions that serve the interests of minorities. For them, categories are political choices that are not primarily about how individuals label themselves. Aouragh gave the example of Arabs in the United States, who have categorised themselves as 'White' and are therefore not entitled to antidiscrimination interventions – even though they are in fact discriminated against. Sadiqi emphasised the vast differences between Muslims – 'If you can get two Muslims in the same room to agree with each other, then you've hit the jackpot, because that's not going to happen' – but also that 'discrimination in education and business' affects all Muslims as well as people who are assumed to be Muslims: 'It doesn't matter if you're Shi'ite, wear a headscarf or have a slightly Moroccan or Turkish appearance, or whether or not you're a religious Muslim: if people make that association, you're likely to experience that form of marginalisation'. In that vein, Aouragh and Sadiqi advocate thinking strategically about categorisation in antidiscrimination data collection.

The great majority of our respondents indicate that they would prefer a combination of multiple-choice questions with another, open-ended question. Avinash prefers multiple-choice questions as he finds them 'clearer'. Martis prefers open-ended questions because she wants to feel that she has agency and is not just being lumped into one or another category. A researcher at the University of Amsterdam said that he was in favour of multiple-choice questions, but only in combination with an open-ended question, because respondents would otherwise be limited in their ability to self-identify. Martis proposed a 'hybrid form': a questionnaire that presents respondents with a set of groups based on data about the composition of the non-white population of the Netherlands but also gives them space to freely self-identify. 'You might be able to establish new categories

in this way, in consultation with the respondents,' Martis said. Ngangitie indicated that open-ended questions are very important to her because they allow for a broader perspective and individual experiences. The University of Amsterdam researcher suggested including questions such as 'How do you self-identify?', 'Where are you from?' and 'Which countries have you lived in?' in a survey. Badran preferred open-ended questions or a combination of multiple-choice and open-ended questions, but said that he is also fine with multiple-choice questions as long as the answer options include the identities with which he self-identifies. The form of the question about self-identification – multiple-choice or open-ended – makes little difference to M'charek: in her view, identity is too complex to be captured in one answer or category. She referred to identification as a 'lived practice' that is constantly changing.

Makinwa prefers closed-ended questions on place of birth, precisely because of the complexity of identification: '[Identification is a] difficult question, [for example for] some people of mixed descent. By forcing these people to categorise themselves, you back them into a corner. But everyone can give you a straight answer to the question of where they were born.' Avinash would prefer to see closed-ended questions about nationality and religion because he himself finds that convenient and appropriate. In contrast, an environmental sciences student at Wageningen University thought that nationality is not a good data collection category because it does not reflect how a person's nationality is determined. He has a Dutch passport, but he considers his Curaçaoan identity to be non-Dutch. A University of Amsterdam researcher suggested asking open-ended questions about 'origins. For example, you can ask whether people self-identify as Dutch. Some people will self-identify as Dutch-Surinamese. You can create your own categories then'.

Sadiqi thinks that religion should be included in data collection because Muslims are a minority group and data can be very useful in monitoring their experience but also to dispel stereotypes. For example, he suggested that collecting data on Muslim women could help dispel the stereotype that they are oppressed and are confined to their homes. Quantitative data can show that Muslim women in fact perform very well in higher education, thus helping to overcome racist stereotypes.

# REFERENCES

Ahyoud, Nasiha; Aikins, Joshua Kwesi; Bartsch, Samera; Bechert, Naomi; Gyamerah, Daniel; Wagner, Lucienne (2018). Wer nicht gezählt wird, zählt nicht. Antidiskriminierungs- und Gleichstellungsdaten in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft – eine anwendungsorientierte Einführung. Berlin: Vielfalt entscheidet – Diversity in Leadership, Citizens For Europe. Open access at https://www.kiwit.org/media/material-downloads/antidiskriminierungs_-_gleichstellungsdaten_-_einfuehrung.pdf

Bonjour, S., M. v.d. Brink & G. Taartmans (2020). Een diversity officer is niet genoeg. Het diversiteitsbeleid op Nederlandse universiteiten. *Thema Hoger Onderwijs.* Open access at: https://www.ru.nl/genderanddiversity/@1289046/artikel-diversiteitsofficer-genoeg/

Bonnett, Alastair & Bruce Carrington (2000). Fitting into Categories or Falling Between Them? Rethinking ethnic classification'. *British journal of sociology of education*, 2000, 21 (4): 487-500.

Brubaker, Rogers (2009). Ethnicity, Race, and Nationalism. *Annual Review of Sociology* 35, 21–42.

De Ploeg, Max & Chris de Ploeg (2017). 'No democratisation without decolonisation' A testimony from the student movement in Amsterdam. *Tijdschrift voor genderstudies* 20(3): 321-332. Open access at: https://www.aup-online.com/content/journals/10.5117/TVGN2017.3.PLOE

Esajas, Mitchell (2018). 'Untold Histories and Waves of Black Resistance in the Netherlands'. In: Melissa F. Weiner & Antonio Carmona Báez (eds.) *Smash the Pillars : Decoloniality and the Imaginary of Color in the Dutch Kingdom,* 3-16. Lanham (etc.): Lexington Books.

Essed, Philomena., & Nimako, Kwame. 2006. Designs and (co)incidents: Cultures of scholarship and public policy on immigrants/minorities in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* no *47*, 3–4: 281–312.

Hall, Stuart (2000). Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities. In: Back, L. & Solomos, J. (eds.). *Theories of Race and Racism. A Reader,* pp: 144-153. London/ New York: Routledge.

Jones, Guno (2007). *Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders : Nederlandse politici over burgers uit Oost en West en Nederland, 1945-2005*. Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers

Ministerie van OCW (2020). Nationaal actieplan voor meer diversiteit en inclusie in wetenschappelijk onderwijs en onderzoek. Open access at: https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/actueel/nieuws/2020/09/01/nieuw-nationaal-actieplan-voor-diversiteit-en-inclusie

Scholten, Peter. 2007. *Constructing Immigrant Policies: research-policy relations and immigrant integration in the Netherlands (1974-2004)*. Enschede: Ipskamp.

# APPENDIX A – LIST OF RESPONDENTS

| Name | Function/ role |
|---|---|
| Alfrida Martis | At the time of the interview: project leader diversity at the UvA. At the time of publication of the report: diversity officer Willem de Kooning Academy Rotterdam. |
| Ali Şahin | Member Student Platform Safe Space to Talk About Race (STAR), Universiteit Leiden |
| Amade M'charek | Professor of Anthropology, University of Amsterdam |
| Anonymous | Associate Professor Humanities Utrecht University |
| Anonymous | Board member Tribez, student association for the African diaspora |
| Anonymous | PhD-researcher Erasmus University Rotterdam |
| Anonymous | Researcher University of Amsterdam |
| Anonymous | Student Environmental Sciences Universiteit Wageningen, initiator petition to do research on institutional racism |
| Avinash Baitanash | Host, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam |
| Gözde | Former president of Amsterdam United, superdiverse student platform at the University of Amsterdam, and student-assistant University of Amsterdam (and International Office) |
| Kofi Makinwa | Professor of Microelectronics, TU Delft |
| Miriyam Aouragh | Reader, University of Westminster |
| Mohammed Badran | VU alumnus and founder of Syrian Volunteers & Network for Refugee Voices |
| Mostafa Sadiqi | Board member Moslim Studenten Associatie |
| Ngangitie | President Afro-Dutch student association Marula |
| Vinod Subramaniam | President of the University of Twente |

# APPENDIX B – INVITATION LETTER TO POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS

Beste XXX,

Ik ben XXX en ik werk als onderzoeksassistent mee aan het onderzoeksproject 'Sourcing Racial and Ethnic Categories for Dutch Academia'. Dit onderzoeksproject is een initiatief van De Jonge Akademie (DJA, onderdeel van de KNAW).

Dit project beoogt een bijdrage te leveren aan de discussie over dataverzameling over etniciteit en racialisering, binnen De Jonge Akademie en in Nederlandse universiteiten. Momenteel is deze informatie over de samenstelling van het personeel niet beschikbaar in Nederlandse universiteiten. Er gaan steeds meer stemmen op om dergelijke data te verzamelen, maar dat stuit ook op veel weerstand.

De Jonge Akademie wil eraan bijdragen dat de stem van mensen van kleur binnen de academische gemeenschap wordt gehoord in dit debat. Daarom zouden wij met u willen praten over welke categorieën u geschikt acht voor het verzamelen van deze gegevens en of u dat überhaupt wel wenselijk vindt. Op basis van een twintigtal interviews met universitaire staf van kleur en studentenorganisaties beogen wij een discussiestuk te schrijven, waarin verschillende visies op het vraagstuk naast elkaar worden gezet. Dat stuk zal worden gepubliceerd op de DJA website en hopelijk bijdragen aan een geïnformeerde en genuanceerde discussie binnen DJA en daarbuiten.

Wij hopen dat u mee kunt werken aan dit project, omdat [verwijzing naar specifieke rol/positie van individuele geadresseerde]

Natuurlijk kunnen we in een twintigtal interviews geen representatief beeld schetsen van wat 'de' mensen van kleur in de Nederlandse academische gemeenschap over dit onderwerp vinden. Dat is ook nadrukkelijk niet onze bedoeling. Wel streven we ernaar verschillende stemmen te laten horen van

mensen die tot etnische of geracialiseerde minderheidsgroepen worden gerekend en die het belangrijk vinden om zich uit te spreken over deze thematiek. Juist omdat u alleen voor u zelf spreekt, en voor niemand anders, zouden we u het liefst niet willen anonimiseren in ons rapport.

Als u vragen heeft dan ben ik uiteraard beschikbaar om deze te beantwoorden. Ik zie uw reactie graag tegemoet!

Met vriendelijke groeten,

XXX

# APPENDIX C – INTERVIEW GUIDE

## Intro:

- Welkom & dank
- Uitleg project

## [Consent]:

- Vindt u het goed als we u bij naam noemen in het rapport?
- (voor studenten): vindt u het goed als we u in het rapport beschrijven als 'een lid van de organisatie ...' ? Wilt u graag bij naam genoemd worden of liever niet?
- Vindt u het goed als ik het gesprek opneem, zodat ik dit op een later tijdstip nog eens kan beluisteren [toestemming vragen om interview op te nemen].
- zou u het fijn zou vinden na afloop een samenvatting van het interview te ontvangen, zodat deze eventueel nog aangevuld kan worden met opmerkingen?

## Algemeen:

- Wat is uw naam? (of: wat is de naam van de studentenorganisatie, waarbij u zit?)
- Op welke universiteit bent u werkzaam? (of: tot welke universiteit behoort deze studentenorganisatie?)
  — Wat is uw rol/functie op de universiteit? (of: wat uw functie binnen de studentenorganisatie?)
    — Hoe zou u uw werkzaamheden omschrijven?

## A) Mogelijkheid/wenselijkheid categorisatie:

1. Wat vindt u/jij van dataverzameling van etniciteit/racialisering/culturele achtergrond?
   — Welke gevoelens en gedachten komen bij jou naar voren?
   — Waarom?
2. In hoeverre vind jij het belangrijk om racialisering of etniciteit van studenten en staf van Nederlandse universiteiten te registreren?
   i) Waarom vind je het belangrijk/onbelangrijk?
   ii) Wat zou het doel van zulke dataverzameling moeten zijn volgens jou?
      1) Voorbeeld van doelstellingen: racisme bestrijden en diversiteit bevorderen, bijvoorbeeld door het onderbouwen van noodzaak van beleidsmaatregelen zoals quota of speciale beurzen/banen
   iii) Welke risico's of nadelen zie je?

3. Hoe zou het verzamelen van data over racialisering en etniciteit volgens jou het beste verricht kunnen worden?
   a) Wat vind je van huidige praktijk in Nederlandse statistieken van bijvoorbeeld CBS, waarbij etniciteit/culturele achtergrond bepaald wordt op basis van geboorteland en dat van (een van de) ouders?
   b) Wat zou je ervan vinden als in plaats daarvan gekozen werd voor zelfrapportage, waarbij mensen een enquete krijgen voorgelegd en zelf aangeven wat hun etniciteit/racialisering/culturele achtergrond is?
   c) Als voor zelfrapportage van etniciteit/racialisering wordt gekozen, wat voor vragen moeten dan worden voorgelegd denkt u? Wat voor categorieen vindt u het meest geschikt? Hoe zou u uw eigen etniciteit/racialisering het liefst geregistreerd zien op de universiteit?
   d) Bij antwoorden op al deze vragen steeds doorvragen: <u>waarom vind je dat?</u>

## B) Voorbeeldcategorisaties:

4. Ik wil u graag wat specifieke voorbeelden laten zien van etnische/raciale categorisering die in Nederland en andere landen wordt gebruikt voor dataverzameling. Kunt u me vertellen wat u van deze voorbeelden vindt? Wat vindt u er goed aan, wat minder goed?
   — *Voorbeelden van categorisaties uit NL en andere landen tonen: Alberta University Format, Oxford/Cambridge University Format, South Africa Format, Nederlands CBS format westers/niet-westers & land herkomst ouders, Nieuwe WRR-voorstel (wordt nog niet gebruikt)
5. In hoeverre vind je het belangrijk de mogelijkheid te bieden om meerdere hokjes aan te vinken?

AN EXPLORATION OF THE VIEWS OF STAFF AND STUDENTS OF COLOUR REGARDING ANTIDISCRIMINATION DATA

6. In hoeverre vind je het belangrijk om een open vraag te stellen over etniciteit/racialisering?
7. Wat vindt u van de optie om een ja/nee vraag te stellen, zoals: 'behoor je tot een groep mensen die op Nederlandse universiteiten met etnische of raciale discriminatie te maken heeft?' of 'behoor je tot een etnische of geracialiseerde groep die ondervertegenwoordigd is op Nederlandse universiteiten?'
    a) Hoe zou jij zo'n vraag liefst formuleren? Misschien anders dan wij het hier doen? Over welke woorden struikel je?
    b) Zou je het voldoende vinden om alléén deze vraag te stellen, of zouden daarnaast ook aanvullende/specifiekere vragen moeten worden gesteld?

## Afsluiting:

- Eventuele aanvullingen of opmerkingen?

- Dank & afronding

- Einde opname – mochten er nog interessante dingen besproken worden achteraf, worden deze, wederom met toestemming van de respondent, opgeschreven en meegenomen in het onderzoek.