

Veronika Puchkova

## Integration Policy in Germany before and after the Immigration Act of 2005

WP 2011-02

**Bielefeld University**



**St. Petersburg State University**



***Centre for German and  
European Studies (CGES)***



**CGES Working Papers** series includes publication of materials prepared within different activities of the Center for German and European Studies both in St. Petersburg and in Germany: The CGES supports educational programmes, research and scientific dialogues. In accordance with the CGES mission, the Working Papers are dedicated to the interdisciplinary studies of different aspects of German and European societies.

The paper is written on the basis of the MA Thesis defended in the MA SES in June 2011 supervised by Denis Gruber). The publication of this MA thesis in the CGES Working Paper series was recommended by the Examination Committee as one of the five best papers out of fourteen MA theses defended by the students of the MA programme "Studies in European Societies" at St. Petersburg State University in June 2011.

**Veronika Puchkova** graduated from the MA Programme "Studies in European Societies" in 2011.

**Contact:** [veron\\_puchkova@mail.ru](mailto:veron_puchkova@mail.ru)

In Germany the integration of immigrants has long been an issue triggering heated debates. Official state integration policy appeared in Germany after the Immigration Act entered into force in 2005; integration projects that had previously been implemented had an inconsistent and uncoordinated character. In this Master study, the immigration situation in Germany is described, and main the changes on the path to forming and implementing integration policy are discussed. The main focus is on the novelties of the Immigration Act 2005 and subsequent projects.

An actor-centred approach is used in this research: integration policy is viewed from the perspective of the structures of state governance that shape it. Laws, official programmes and reports from the German government served as the main material for the research. A number of expert interviews with employees for the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees were conducted, which helped us to obtain a deeper understanding of the specificity and relevance of individual projects as well as of integration policy as a whole.

**Key words:** integration policy, immigration flows, the Immigration Act.

<b>CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH	5
OBJECTIVE AND TASKS	6
HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	6
METHODOLOGY	7
DISSERTATION STRUCTURE	9
<b>CHAPTER II. WHAT IS INTEGRATION?</b>	<b>10</b>
INTEGRATION AS A SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPT	10
INTEGRATION AS AN OBJECT OF MIGRATIONAL RESEARCH	11
INTEGRATION THEORY OF HARTMUT ESSER	14
OPERATIONALISING ESSER'S CONCEPT	22
INTEGRATION POLICY	23
CONCLUSION	25
<b>CHAPTER III. IMMIGRATION SITUATION IN GERMANY</b>	<b>27</b>
"IMMIGRATION SITUATION WITHOUT IMMIGRATION COUNTRY"	27
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF IMMIGRATION TO GERMANY	28
<i>From emigration to immigration</i>	28
<i>Immigration to Germany after World War II</i>	29
<i>Summing up main trends of immigration to Germany</i>	43
AN IMMIGRATION SITUATION IN AN IMMIGRATION COUNTRY	44
<i>Present-day immigration situation according to statistics</i>	44
<i>Phenomenon of the "parallel societies"</i>	45
<i>Conclusion: Germany – an immigration country</i>	47
<b>CHAPTER IV INTEGRATION POLICY IN GERMANY</b>	<b>49</b>
FIRST ATTEMPTS AT INTEGRATION	49
<i>Who is now responsible for integration in Germany?</i>	54
<i>Who is to be integrated?</i>	54
<i>New political focus after 2005</i>	55
<i>Anti-discrimination legislation</i>	56
GENERAL AND SPECIFIC INTEGRATION POLICIES	57
<i>General integration policies</i>	58
<i>Special integration policies</i>	65
<b>CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>87</b>

## Chapter I. Introduction

Integration of immigrants is a question now very often discussed in many European countries, and Germany is not an exception: there, it has been a reason for heated debates for a long time already. In the 20th century, Germany stopped being a country of emigration and became rather a country of immigration. Having to deal with the consequences of World War II and rapid economic development in the post-war period, it became a destination for various immigration flows, including that of guest workers. Despite a high number of resident immigrant population, hardly any measures were taken by the state to integrate the new-comers into German society and system. On the contrary, such official political statements as “Germany is not an immigration country”, as well as the ideas, that this situation is only a temporary phenomenon, were very common. A number of small integration projects existed on the local level, but those were too uncoordinated and inconsistent to speak of them as of an integration policy. Only in the 1990s, the problem started to slowly find official recognition in the political circles, and legislative and policy changes followed. In 2000, jus soli was for the first time introduced in Germany and enabled, all in all, about 8 million of people, who were not Germans by origin but had resided in Germany, to be legally accepted as citizens.

The next significant changes took place when in 2005 after long debates the Immigration Act was enacted. Germany was officially recognised as an immigration country and introduced a new for it concept of the integration policy on the state level. Together with it, the main state integration project - the integration course – started, and recommendations for elaboration of further measures were given. What these measures are, to what extent they are different from the ones that already existed on the federal states’ and municipal level, if they are successful or not, and if this law can be really considered a turning point for the life of immigrants in Germany is the question to be explored in this research.

## Presentation of research

This study focuses on the impact of the official concept of integration introduced by the Immigration Act 2005 on the development of the integration policy in Germany. A great number of works have been written on the immigration and citizenship policies in Germany, on different migrant groups, especially on that of guest workers and ethnic Germans (R. Münz, W. Cornelius, K. Hunn, H. Kampen, U. Herbert). Almost as many authors presented their views on what was done for the immigrants starting from the 60s-70s and to the beginning of the 21st century (F. Heckmann, K.J. Bade, P. Martin, M. Hell, etc.). As for the research into contemporary projects, many social, political and migrational scientists, as well as lawyers and journalists, try to report on the latest changes of legislation, new projects and acute problems, etc. Much fewer of them, however, try to sum up main tendencies in the development of integration in Germany. This seems to be quite a problematic area still, for it is rather difficult to evaluate changes when consequences are not clear yet, especially when only a little more than five years have passed since the integration policy was introduced in Germany. Therefore, it presents necessary to undertake an attempt at assessing preliminary outcome of the integration policy yet at this early stage, giving an approximate evaluation of the present state of things and tracing the main changes.

Besides, one of the sources of gathering additional information about the projects for this research, as well as getting professional assessment of those, were expert interviews with employees of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, which is one of the key federal institutions in Germany. It is in the direct subordination of the Federal Ministry of Interior and is responsible for developing and implementing state-based projects, as well as trying out the pilot ones and conducting research in the fields of migration and integration. Usually studies based on questioning immigrants and presenting the situation from their perspective are much more common than those that aim to show the point of view of the officials. Therefore, the fact that this research relies on the actor-

centred approach and gives the overview of the situation through the eyes of state officials may also be considered a novelty.

## Objective and tasks

Thus, the **objective** of this research is to identify main changes that accompanied and followed official introduction of the concept of integration in Germany. The following **tasks** are set in order to achieve the objective: defining the main theoretical concept underlying the understanding of integration in Germany, finding out the reasons for Germany being considered an immigration country, explaining the need for integration policy, pointing out main stages on the way to the legislative change, describing main projects in the field of integration, and finally specifying concrete implications of the new law.

## Hypotheses and research questions

According to the defined objective and tasks of the research, four **hypotheses** were formulated:

- Germany has a specific, its own way of understanding integration;
- the legislative change of 2005 had a big impact on the content and quantity of the integration projects in Germany;
- the general position and opportunities of immigrants in Germany improved significantly;
- acquisition of the language of the host society is the basis for integration.

In accordance with the hypotheses stated above, **research questions** are the following:

- how can the concept of integration in Germany be defined;
- what were the crucial changes that occurred with the introduction of the state integration policy in 2005;
- what new opportunities and benefits migrants gained with the new integration policy;

- does German integration policy consider language as one of the main preconditions for successful integration.

## Methodology

For the general theoretical framework this research uses the actor-centred approach, so integration policy is viewed from the perspective of those who shape it, that is from the perspective of the state, and not from the point of view of an immigrant. The focus is on the social aspect of integration and thus on the understanding of integration in terms of individual actors' inclusion into a social system (Esser 1999). This approach helps to concentrate on dissecting the concept of integration of an immigrant into processes taking place on four levels (cultural, interactional (social), structural, and identification ones) and accordingly to distinguish between general and specific integration policies (Hammar 1985) intended for some particular level or a number of levels at the same time. This approach to integration especially well correlates with the main dimensions, in which the German state proposes to take measures: linguistic integration, education and integration, social integration.

Primary materials for the research were gathered by means of such qualitative method as **intensive interviewing**. During the research, ten semi-structured open-ended expert interviews were carried out. According to this structure, there were a number of questions and aspects of the problem to be touched upon included in the interview guide but questions could be interchanged depending on the flow of the conversation. Expert interviews were chosen as the best available source of primary information, as this kind of interviews allows concentrating on the person's knowledge and field of work, rather than on the interviewee's personality. According to Deeke (as cited in Flick, 2009, p. 165), "we can label those persons as experts who are particularly competent as authorities on a certain matter of facts". Besides, sometimes people who have personal experience in some particular field are also referred to as experts. In our case, not to adopt migrants' standpoint only state officials dealing with integration as part of their work were chosen as experts. However, three experts

out of ten have also confirmed having a migrational background, and this fact introduced some new aspects to the research. All of the interviewees were employees of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees in Germany and were selected using snowball sampling method: interviewees recommended their colleagues as experts in this or that area.

There were three interview guides composed, and they were applied depending on the position that the respondent holds at the Office: chief of a department, employee of a department, employee of the research department. The content of questions differed in respect to description of either bigger field of integration work (chief of a department), particular questions/projects of integration (employee of a department), or questions about development tendencies and problematic areas (employee of the research department); all the interviewees were also asked to give their personal opinion on the success of integration policy in Germany. Interviews lasted from 30 to 90 minutes. All of them were tape-recorded upon the prior consent of interviewees, jottings and notes were taken as well, which served later for producing verbatim transcripts.

Among the **secondary materials** used for research were official governmental documents, including the text of the Immigration Act (2004), Federal Integration Programme (2010), Report of the Federal Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration on the Situation of Migrants in Germany (2010), Migration Report of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (2005, 2009), reports of the Federal Office for Statistics; Internet sources such as website of the Federal Government, website of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, website of the Federal Commissioner for Integration, etc.

The main method used for analysis of primary materials was **grounded theory analysis** that included three stages of coding: open coding (defining various concepts (codes) out of the whole array of information and labeling them), axial coding (defined concepts were broken into several main categories important for this research: projects of integration, problems of integration, changes, personal examples), selective coding (the notion of “change” was chosen as the central

category). Apart from that, qualitative method of **content analysis** was used while working with secondary sources of data.

## **Dissertation structure**

The dissertation begins by pointing out the problem field, setting the objective and tasks, formulating hypotheses and research questions. Three main chapters concentrate on theoretical and historical background of the problem, as well as on the empirical analysis of the recent changes and present-day situation. Chapter II discusses existing theoretical approaches and main definitions. Chapter III of the paper is devoted to the historical background of the problem, shedding light upon diversity of the population with migrational background in Germany (that constitutes about one fifth of the whole population of the country at present), defining Germany as an immigration country and thus justifying the need for integration policy. In Chapter IV, main legislative changes on the way to official integration policy, as well as their consequences, are described, a particular focus is made on the measures introduced after adoption of the new law. Following the classification suggested by Tomas Hammar, all the projects are subdivided into general and specific measures of integration, a short description of main projects accompanied by the comments of the experts is provided. In the last chapter, conclusion on the main changes in the official perception of integration and their importance is made.

## Chapter II. What is integration?

The following chapter introduces the concept of integration in its multiple meaning, presents a short overview of the main theories important for this research with a particular focus on the theory of Hartmut Esser. The concept of integration policy is defined.

From a very general perspective, integration means adding elements to the existing structure, creation of a new entity out of single elements by means of relating them, or an ability of an entity to achieve cohesion through incorporation of parts basing on some common features. Integration can often be regarded either as a process, or a function, or as an aim. These definitions can be applicable in any area of study, depending on what one implies under structure, elements, features, etc.

### Integration as a sociological concept

Integration, in the sociological context, has always been one of the concepts most vigorously disputed by scientists. There exist a great number of approaches and explanations theorizing this concept, but there is no consent about the common definition of integration and its characteristics. In the *systems' theory of Niklas Luhmann* integration is referred to as stable relations (“coupling” is the term used by the author) between elements of a clearly defined system, the latter being separate from the surrounding environment. (Krause, 2005; p.65) In the same framework, *David Lockwood* distinguishes between system and social integration. System integration is a depersonalised cohesion of functional social systems (economy, the legal system, etc.); social integration, on the contrary, is the integration of individuals into society, it is a product of their cooperation and interactions. (Lockwood, 1969) In order to concentrate on conceptualising integration in terms of migrational discourse, one needs to slightly reformulate Luhmann’s theory and define integration not just as “stable relations” but rather as a process of “stabilizing” or strengthening relations within a social system after

involvement of new actors. This way, a society may be deemed to be integrated when the process of integration of migrants has been successful.

Still, achieving common understanding of what the whole concept of integration of migrants actually implies seems rather problematic both in sociological and political debate. A wide range of terms is used to speak about the integration of migrants, among others the most common being “assimilation”, “acculturation”, “accommodation”, “adaptation” and “inclusion”. Sometimes those terms are used interchangeably, sometimes – with a slight difference in meaning. According to some authors (Schäfers, 2004), in sociology, notions of assimilation and acculturation can explain problems of integration.

Subsequent to the increasing magnitude of migration flows in the twentieth century, a gradual change of paradigms has taken place. In the next subsection, some of the main approaches to integration are covered.

## **Integration as an object of migrational research**

Migration and integration first became an object of sociological research as early as in the 1920s, in the so-called *Chicago school*. The issue of migrants’ inclusion into society was studied with the help of a cyclical model. For example, Hannibal Duncan (1933) considered it to be a “progressive cycle over three generations”, and Robert Park (1950) developed a sequential model of contact-competition-accomodation-assimilation. (in Bosswick; p.4) The Chicago school based their view on assimilation on the idea of composite or hybrid culture, borrowed from their perception of the mixed character of the American society that evolved out of a number of different cultural traditions and practices. Their definition of assimilation implied a “diverse mainstream society in which people of different ethnic/racial origins and cultural heritages evolve a common culture that enables them to sustain a common national existence”. (Alba & Nee, 2003; p.10) Integration did not appear yet as a term then, “assimilation” was used instead in the same context.

First differentiation between integration and assimilation was suggested by a Swiss social scientist *Hoffmann-Nowotny*. He can also be considered as the first sociologist in the German-speaking world who investigated the concept of integration in the context of labour migration to Germany and Switzerland. His empirical research “Sociology of Foreign Worker’s Problem” (“Soziologie des Fremdarbeiterproblems”) introduces a number of theoretical assumptions on the process of incorporation of migrants. Hoffmann-Nowotny (1973) divides society into two subsystems, namely structure and culture. On the abstract level, the basic structure of hierarchy, power and organisation corresponds to the cultural level of a symbolic structure, legitimation or institution. This way, under integration the author understands “participation of immigrants in the structure of the society (legal status, education, income, pattern for social interaction)”, whereas assimilation is understood as “participation of immigrants in the culture of the host society (language, norms and value orientations). (Ingenhoven, 2003; p.43) Hoffmann-Nowotny also points out the interdependence of integration and assimilation and stresses its asymmetrical character: the structural dimension has a greater impact on the cultural one, that is, first integration defines the degree of assimilation before the reverse process starts. He uses this assumption to critique the host society that often urges migrants to adapt to customs, traditions and habits of the immigration land (that is, urges them to assimilate), whereby no conditions for migrants’ participation in the structural systems of the society (political, demographic, educational, etc.) are being provided (that is no conditions for integration itself exist). (Ingenhoven, 2003; p.45)

In the 1970s in Germany, understanding of integration was rather similar to that of assimilation. According to *Robert Park* (1950), *assimilation* can be defined as “a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life”. (Ingenhoven, 2003; p.36) Then, migrants were not yet perceived as a significant group of population. They were considered as a temporary phenomenon, and therefore no measures for their integration were supposed to

take place. Not being successful, in the beginning of the 1980s the assimilationist model was replaced with that of *multiculturalism*. Germany could not cope with the number of immigrants, stop of recruitment did not help, suddenly foreign religions, languages and cultures became a problem seen as jeopardizing German culture. Xenophobia and hostility started to develop. As neither the society, nor the state were ready yet then to introduce some serious measures, the 'problem of foreigners' was shifted to the sphere of culture. (Multikulturalismus in Deutschland)

Multiculturalism can be defined as a variant of pluralism characterised by the willingness of the majority group to accept cultural difference, whereas immigrant groups remain distinguishable with regards to language, culture and social behavior. (Castles, 1995; p.297) This idea, though, was widely criticised in Germany for being not more than just an idealistic concept which does not take into consideration the need for a common culture, language and self-identification as basic preconditions for stable existence of a society. Canadian model of multiculturalism seems not to have worked out in Germany with its 'too diverse' immigrant population and their enormously big cultural difference from the German society. However, 'multiculturalism' ('Multikulti') still remains a popular term in Germany but is used in absolutely various meanings. Some recur to it when speaking about dangers of immigration, some thematise with the help of it a potentially good cohabitation of representatives of different origins. For politicians, it is rather a political programme aimed at making life of people of different nationalities possible and beneficial for everybody. Besides, sometimes it becomes a word used by politicians to speak about failure of other parties' integration measures. ("Multukulti", 2011)

This work, however, relies on the concept of integration – that is discussed in the next subsection. The integration theory of *Hartmut Esser (1999)* is assumed as the pivotal theory here. Apart from being rather comprehensive and incorporating various aspects of integration, Esser's conception is also the one mainly used by the German government for defining integration, its levels and stages.

## **Integration theory of Hartmut Esser**

The integration theory of Hartmut Esser (1999), a contemporary German social scientist, is based on the concepts introduced by Niklas Luhmann and David Lockwood, which have been mentioned previously in this work. However, he extended the notion of social integration and elaborated with a particular focus on the integration of migrants in modern society. Therefore, this theory is of particular importance for this research.

### ***General definition***

Hartmut Esser defines integration of a system through the existence of relations between its units: “under integration one usually understands cohesion of integral parts in a “systematic” whole and this way achieved differentiation from unstructured surrounding”. He opposes the notion of integration to that of segmentation as a complete degradation of a system and liquidation of all the borders with surrounding. (Esser, 2001; p.14) However, at this stage, the concept of any “existing relations” seems to us too broad, as it may equally involve peaceful cohabitation as well as conflicts. Hence, it seems necessary to specify the possible structure of those relations, which is sure to determine in closer terms the degree of integration.

### ***System and social integration***

Basing on Lockwood’s idea of differentiation of integration forms, Esser distinguishes between two different kinds of integration in a society depending on the units that participate in the process of integration: if those are parts of a system, then one can speak of system integration, if those are actors of a system, then we are dealing with social integration.” (Esser, 2001; p.14-15)

### ***System integration***

The term “system integration” applies to the cohesion of entire social systems, connection and interdependence of its parts beyond different elements of a

society, for example, groups of ethnic minorities or functional subsystems. (Esser, 2006; p.7) A necessary precondition for it is the absence of open and systematic conflicts between 'parts of population', like social classes or territorial units, for example. This cohesion takes place irrespective of motives and relations between individual actors, sometimes even despite their intentions and interests, unlike social integration, which is largely dependent upon motives, intentions and reasoning of the actors. That is why, in the case of system integration, individual actors can often only "helplessly" observe what market forces or corporate actors and other global players do in the course of system integration of the world society. This way the market and organizations can be referred to here as basic mechanisms of system integration. (Esser, 2001; p.15)

### ***Social integration and its four dimensions***

Social integration, as opposed to system integration, describes "inclusion" of individual actors in the already existing social system. Esser mentions at least four different interdependent levels of social integration in terms of actors' participation in the functioning of society:

- *Acculturation ("Kulturation")*

It is the acquisition of knowledge, skills, cultural patterns and language. In other words, it is a part of cognitive human socialization. It implies that actors should possess some necessary knowledge and certain competences to act and interact in a meaningful, reasonable and successful way. These knowledge and competences are based on the person's awareness of the essential 'codes' and 'scenarios' of typical situations and societal norms, and hence their ability to behave in this or that socially acceptable way. What is more, knowledge and competences present here a kind of human and/or cultural capital, in which actors can or should invest if they want to be of interest to other actors and if they are themselves interested in occupying prestigious positions in society or in taking part in other interactions and transactions.

- **Placement** ("Plazierung")

According to Hartmut Esser, it is a highly important form of an actor's inclusion in society. We can speak of placement when an actor obtains some position in society and thus becomes its full and equal member. It implies bestowal of certain rights, like the right to citizenship and those deriving from it (for example, the right to vote); obtaining professional and other positions in society, which is often dependent upon one's educational background; having social opportunities to establish and maintain relations with other members of society. Therefore, acculturation can often be promoted by successful placement.

- **Interaction** ("Interaktion")

It is a form of a social action, during which actors communicate with one another through a mutual exchange of information and symbols, perform transactions and establish more or less permanent relations. While interacting, socially integrated actors usually build "networks" of relations and various other forms of communication. This way, interaction as a means of integration leads to acquisition of both cultural capital and social capital.

- **Identification** ("Identifikation")

Identification takes place when an actor sees himself as an integral part of a social entity, identifies himself with it. It is a mental and emotional relation between an actor and the system as collective unity, adherence to which boosts national pride and We-feeling towards other members of society or a group, including, for example, conscious loyalty to society and its governing institutions, support of political authorities and their decisions, civism. This type of integration through identification is achieved by means of distinct feeling of solidarity, unconditional acceptance of values and more or less conscious, stable and, at the same time, emotional identification of an actor with society as a whole. For the majority, that is often the most common way of understanding integration. (Esser, 2001; p.15-18)

These four dimensions of integration are closely connected and mutually dependent. Esser draws particular attention to the key role of the language for integration and the closely linked to it structural integration in the educational

system and the job market. The acquisition of language is strongly dependent on the learning chances and is constantly enhanced through daily interactions. According to Esser, all the other forms of social integration are secondary to the language skills and structural assimilation, which often rely on each other. On the one hand, through placement actors either obtain, or don't obtain certain competences; on the other hand, acculturation often presents an indispensable filter for the placement of actors. To put it in simpler terms, only a person who has good education can hope for a good job; only the one who controls some socially important resources, and consequently possesses certain power, will present an interest to the other actors in the system and eventually become a recognised and accepted member of society.

Besides, placement together with acculturation create important conditions for successful interaction: for example, control over common resources, possessing competences, being socially accepted, together make the possibility to establish and stabilise contacts more realistic. And, as a result, only the mastery of the language and adaptation to cultural patterns, participation in the employment market and educational system, acquisition of political and legal rights in the aggregate can eventually lead to the identification of a person with the values of the host country.

Social integration of migrants is not a one-day process. Usually, it is a matter of a few generations. For the first-generation migrants, who can't be expected to make great progress in integration, local ethnic communities play an important role, providing support and help that may be even more significant for the newcomers. As for the following generations, the success of integration can be correlated with the time of the first contacts with the native population and depend on the "migration biography" of his/her family as well: the younger the person is when he or she starts to be part of the educational system of the host society (preferably, still in the kindergarten), the easier and quicker will it be for him or her to be integrated afterwards, and for the following generations, too.

Nevertheless, if we do not focus only on the ideal type, we will see that placement and interaction do not always follow acculturation. Often willingness of a migrant is not enough, as we should not forget about such external factors, as specificity of the host society. In highly prejudiced society where discrimination practices are an accepted tool, a number of obstacles may often be intentionally put up in order to hinder migrants' participation in some of the functional systems of society. Discrimination on the labor market could be an example of this kind of inhibition to successful placement. Therefore, integration is not a "one way street" but a mutual process of adaptation.

### ***Multiple integration vs assimilation***

Social integration of migrants and ethnic minorities can refer to at least three social systems: the country of their origin, the host country and the ethnic community. It largely depends on the actor himself whether he is integrated only in one of those societies or in a few at the same time. For simplification, Esser proposes to consider an ethnic community as part of the country of origin and in this way he distinguishes four types of social integration of an actor (or a group of actors) into either host society or their ethnic group depending on the degree and direction of belonging:

- **multiple integration** which involves inclusion in both social systems at the same time (in terms of language it is characterised by bilingualism);
- **ethnic segmentation** which implies inclusion in the ethnic group but exclusion from the host society;
- **assimilation** which is the case of inclusion in the host society with exclusion from the ethnic group;
- **marginality** as complete absence of any social integration into both the ethnic group and the host society.

This idea is visually illustrated by the following table.

		Social integration in the host society	
		Yes	No
Social integration in the country of origin or ethnic community	Yes	<b>multiple integration</b>	segmentation
	No	<b>assimilation</b>	marginality

*Table 1. Types of social integration of migrants (Esser, 2001; p.21).*

With the help of this table depicting the concept of Hartmut Esser, we could assume that integration of migrants into the host society is possible only in two cases: multiple integration and assimilation. Though multiple integration could seem a more preferable solution for many immigrants, it may appear much more challenging in terms of provision of necessary education, which largely depends on the person's background and available resources, not for the least part financial. For example, it would be much more difficult for guest worker families to provide their children with an opportunity to be fully included in the society of their origin, whereas in case of children of diplomats having their service abroad that can be deemed as more possible, though still relatively problematic. That is why, there would almost always be either one or the other society in which a person is more integrated.

Therefore, Hartmut Esser insists on the idea that in terms of full social integration of work migrants into the host society, the only possible option is assimilation: acculturation in the host society through adoption of relevant behavior patterns, values and acquisition of language skills; placement through inclusion into functional spheres of the host society; establishing contacts and other various forms of interaction and mutual exchange with native population; and finally self-perception as a member of the host society and not as that of one's country of origin. Segmentation, however, may also be the case but not a preferable one, as it causes the so-called phenomenon of "parallel societies".

Social integration in the form of assimilation becomes possible providing some individual and contextual prerequisites are fulfilled, for example: favourable conditions on the job and housing markets; an "open" host society, not marginalised within itself, etc. Ethnic communities, on the contrary, interfere with

social integration in the host society, as well as systematic contacts with the countries of origin (like those through shuttle migration). As often the way to full integration into the host society requires many efforts and may appear quite challenging, some would choose keeping contact with the country of origin and local ethnic community instead as an easier alternative. As for the personal characteristics, good education and other kinds of human capital are crucial, as well as the earliest possible interethnic contacts.

Considering the fact that, according to Esser, assimilation seems to be the best possible option of social integration, questions arise as to what is then the best option for system integration, how social integration of migrants and ethnic minorities influences system integration of the whole society, and if it is possible without assimilation of migrants.

***System integration and assimilation***

Hartmut Esser’s view on the point of correlation between system integration and assimilation is depicted in the following table.

		System integration	
		Yes	No
Assimilation	Yes	Ethnic homogeneous and integrated society	Ethnic homogeneous environment but class or religious conflicts
	No	Multiethnic society	class or religious conflicts

*Table 2. System integration of the society and assimilation of migrants (Esser, 2001; p.25)*

In the case of assimilation of migrants in the host society, we may speak of an ideal type of ethnically homogeneous and fully integrated society (both systematically and socially). However, as we may see, system integration does not necessarily involve assimilation. For instance, loyalty to the host society, full acceptance of values, or the establishment of interethnic contacts are not required for successful functioning of the parts of society. One does not need to speak the language, to have contact with anybody apart from his ethnic community and spiritually perceive oneself as a member of the host society to be

able to work and pay taxes, i.e. function as a “unit” in the host society. Certain degree of “public spirit” and mere acceptance of societal norms can be quite sufficient. There may exist minor tensions and conflicts but there are no systematic ones between different groups of population. The case of multiethnic societies like Switzerland, Canada or the USA proves that system integration can exist without assimilation and may function smoothly with immigrant population being involved in both the host society and ethnic group but to a varied degree and in different spheres. (Esser, 2001; p.31)

### ***Ethnic stratification***

Though assimilation is also possible without system integration, in fact, it is likely to promote the so-called “ethnic stratification” (“ethnische Schichtung”). It becomes the case when parts of the society system are not perceived as equal, which leads to the evolvement of a hierarchical system, when different ethnic groups possess unequal opportunities to access structural funds of the society (like education, employment, level of income, and hence prestige).

At some point, it may well become a vicious circle, as initially migrants would rather often be employed in menial jobs, which leads to social alienation and social and territorial segmentation, a model that is doomed to reproduce itself over and over again. Attempts at investing extra efforts into education and cultural assimilation may often seem as too troublesome and not easily rewarded with success, therefore other more familiar and proved options for occupation (as those popular with relatives and people of the same milieu) are often preferred. Then, when a person realises that with the available resources promotion is still not possible, it is already too late to start investing more in one’s human capital. This way, this “unintended” ethnic stratification becomes perpetuated with time and almost impossible to break out of. (Esser, 2001; p.25-28)

Ethnic stratification is likely to lead to permanent conflicts, for example, class and regional ones. In this case, a legitimate way to stop those conflicts and achieve a different kind of relations between the migrant and native population would be through system integration. Then the question arises whether the preferable

option would be a heterogeneous or homogeneous society, or, in other words, what kind of integration policy is needed: oriented at assimilation or at the creation of a multiethnic society.

Many “classical” immigration countries like the USA, Australia, Canada have come a long way from the assimilation concept to that of a multiethnic society. Which direction was taken by Germany is an issue to be discussed in the following chapters.

## **Operationalising Esser’s concept**

Inclusion of new groups of population into existing social structures, in our case that is social integration of immigrants into structures of a host society, can be investigated with the help of four dimensions of integration suggested by Esser. Other authors suggest operationalising the theoretical concepts of Esser under the labels of structural integration (placement), cultural integration (acculturation), social integration (interaction)<sup>1</sup> and identificational integration. (Heckmann, Schnapper, 2003; p.10) Thus, structural integration refers to the obtaining of rights and obligations, getting equal (as compared to the local population) chances to an access to membership, positions and statuses in the main societal institutions (citizenship, labour market, the system of education, etc.).

Cultural integration implies processes of cultural, behavioural, attitudinal and cognitive alteration, partial transfer of norms and values. It becomes at the same time both a precondition for participation in the system and a logical preferable consequence. It concerns not only immigrants but also society of the host country as well, as integration is a mutual process that entails changes of both actors. Interaction, as a form of social integration, may often be viewed on the private level as different kinds of communication between the local and migrant population. This way, interethnic marriages, friendships or simply common activities are often signs of successful social integration. Identificational

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “social integration” introduced by Heckmann (2003), however, creates ambiguity as, though meaning “interactional integration”, it actually coincides with the broader term of “social integration” as opposed to “system integration”. Therefore, confusion should be avoided.

integration, as a feeling of belonging to the group, is the most subjective dimension. But though it exists only on the personal level, its implications may sometimes be visible in a person's behavior and attitudes.

As mentioned earlier, integration may occur either on all of the levels, or only on some of them. Thus, special preconditions need to be fulfilled to enable integration on each particular level. For example, immigrants need to have access to the educational system, to possess opportunities to occupy different positions in the society, should be able to speak the language and get a chance to develop a sense of belonging to the community, and, as a result, perceive oneself as a part of this society. And these requirements should be met by both the host society and migrants. All this kind of measures and many more, involving active participation of migrants, as well as that of the local population, and reciprocal accommodation to the needs of each other, may be well brought together under a broad notion of "*integration policy*". Understanding of this concept will be discussed in the next section.

## **Integration policy**

Integration in present-day societies is in many ways the result of individual choices and decisions, sometimes without clear motifs related to integration. It can occur "despite the intentions of migrants to resist it... as the often unintended, cumulative by-product of choices made by individuals seeking to take advantage of opportunities to improve their social situation". (Heckmann, Schnapper, 2003; p.10) But it causes no doubts that at the modern stage integration is not only a consequence of random personal choices aimed at adapting to the new societal structure in order to provide better living standard for oneself. It is also a "political process that sets conditions and gives incentives for individual choices and decisions", that is, **integration policies**. (Heckmann, 2003; p.46) Being a political process, integration policies often become the subject of hot political debates and change according to the change in power relations.

Many countries faced at some point more or less similar questions of how to deal with the consequences of immigration processes. Established patterns of nation-building and welfare state came at stake when the illusion of temporary migration disappeared. Rogers Brubaker sees postwar migrations as a “fundamental challenge” to the nation-states of the West, which have “compelled these countries to reinvent themselves as nation-states”. (in Joppke, 1999; p.3) New forms of membership and participation had to be devised for migrants. That involved accommodating citizenship (naturalization) and immigration law to the current situation, and introducing a series of provisions and regulations making peaceful, and in the long run, beneficial cohabitation and cooperation of local and migrant population possible. All the mentioned measures together fit well under the umbrella term of ‘integration policy’.

When talking about integration policy, we should be able to distinguish it from other notions that are closely related with it: immigration policy and citizenship policy. They both deal with the admission and exclusion of non-members of a state (Joppke, 1999; p.17), but while immigration policy mostly focuses on the rights to entry and residence, the citizenship policy decides who is eligible to become a “member” of the state and who is not. The integration policy, in turn, has the main concern in dealing with the implications of immigration. The three mentioned policies, however, are tightly bound and dependent on each other. In particular the citizenship policy can be said to be one the legal aspects of social integration.

Tomas Hammar (1985) suggests dividing integration policies into **special (direct) and general (indirect) integration measures**. Special integration policies are the institutions and regulations explicitly and directly designed for immigrants and their children. Some examples could be special language and orientation courses, founding of councils and commissions (like the Commissioner for Foreigners in Germany), where immigrants can turn for help and support, etc. General policies, on the contrary, are aimed at incorporation of immigrants in the general system of a nation-state. The latter are easier to perform as they are, as a rule, “normally” characteristic of modern welfare states

and are, therefore, more numerous. They include such measures as promoting participation in the labour market, education system, vocational training and many more.

Adrian Favell (2001) presents an “indicative”, though not exhaustive, list of what measures integration policy can include:

- basic legal and social protection
- formal naturalisation and citizenship (or residence-based) rights
- anti-discrimination laws
- equal opportunities positive action
- corporatist and associational structures for immigrant or ethnic organisations
- redistribution of targeted socio-economic funds for minorities in deprived areas
- policy on public housing
- policy on law and order
- agreements with foreign countries about military service
- multicultural education policy
- special sections within political parties
- policies and laws on tolerating cultural practices
- cultural funding for ethnic associations or religious organisations
- language and cultural courses in host society’s culture, etc.

These provisions and policies may vary greatly from country to country and may change depending on the policy of the leading party or coalition. An example of measures and social interventions adopted by the German state will be presented in Chapter IV.

## Conclusion

Already from the first glance, one can say that the concept of integration well-spread now in Germany does not completely fit any of the definitions or frameworks presented in this chapter but at the same time is closely connected to ‘assimilation’ and ‘multiculturalism’ and is often used interchangeably with them. According to Löffler (2011), a convincing explication of the notion of integration is lacking, a “conceptual chaos” is taking place. (Löffler, 2011, p.11)

This may be the reason for the popularity of this concept: it is indefinite, has multiple meanings and is rather blurred. (Löffler, 2011, p.181) One may undoubtedly state that German way of understanding integration and working on the way to it is rather unique, as it does not reproduce any of the models of other countries that had to face big immigration flows at some point in history (the USA, Canada, Australia, France, etc.). Therefore, it seems necessary to refuse from giving a definition to 'integration' 'in the German understanding' of this term at this moment. Integration policy will be presented from the German perspective and only then the question of what is actually meant under integration in Germany will be answered. But first it is necessary to give a characteristic to the immigration situation in Germany.

## Chapter III. Immigration situation in Germany

### “Immigration situation without immigration country”

This chapter deals with the long discussed in Germany issue if Germany is an immigration country (“Einwanderungsland”) or not. “*Immigration situation without immigration country*” (“Einwanderungssituation ohne Einwanderungsland”), a “*societal paradox*” is how Klaus J. Bade, a German migration and historical scientist described the situation in Germany in the early 1990s. (Bade, 1992, p. 393) An immigration country is a country where considerable groups of foreigners reside within a relatively long period of time and where special measures and policies for admission, management and integration of immigrants are developed by the state.

The USA, Australia or Canada could be named as examples of “classical immigration countries”. Germany, however, for a long time did not admit its status as a country of immigration and even officially denied it - “Germany is not an immigration country” (“Deutschland ist kein Einwanderungsland”) – irrespective of the fact that in the 1990s Germany was the second major destination for immigrants after the USA. If political actors do not acknowledge that there is an immigration process, they will not, like “classical” immigration countries, create institutions and adopt legislation aimed at receiving immigrants as future citizens. (Heckmann, 2003, p. 51) Migration and integration policies are the main areas of focus of an immigration country. Lately this has been more and more accepted in Germany. However, previously the situation was opposite: Germany had an immigration situation without being an immigration country. One of the first steps on the way to official and legal recognition of the immigration situation in Germany was made only in the year 2000 with the reform of the Citizenship law (first one since its enactment almost a century earlier in 1913), then the new Immigration Act followed in 2005, inter alia providing for state regulated integration measures.

In order to see if Germany is an immigration country or not and, according to that, if it needs an integration policy and why, first, one has to consider the specificity of immigration to Germany and the main groups that constitute German “population with migrational background”<sup>2</sup>.

## **Historical overview of immigration to Germany**

### **From emigration to immigration**

The way the German society is today has been to a large extent moulded by its emigration and immigration history: from internal and outward migration in times of the German Empire to forced migration under the National Socialist government, from guest workers’ recruitment over to consistent immigration and finally federal integration policy in 2005. The modern public debate, however, often tried to ignore the fact that the movement of people across the borders and the clash of cultures that it involved on all stages of German history had not been an exception, but rather the norm. It was also sometimes forgotten, that millions of Germans used to be foreigners abroad as well: for example, since the beginning of the nineteenth century around 8 million people have emigrated from Germany to the USA – and that is approximately the number of foreign population that Germany has now. (Bade, 2000, p. 7) Besides, according to the poll conducted in the USA in 1979, around 60 million, or 26% of Americans, reported being able to trace some, at least distant, German roots. (Bade, 1997, pp. 4-5) One cannot deny the fact that until the middle of the twentieth century, Germany had primarily been a country of emigration and hardly had any experience in managing immigration flows.

In the beginning of the twentieth century Germany ceased being a solely agricultural country and became an industrial one. As a consequence, numbers of internal migrants started to outweigh those of international ones. People migrated from around the Prussian Empire to the central German cities like Berlin, Leipzig and Dresden, later to the Ruhr region as well. Poles came to work

---

<sup>2</sup> This term introduced by the German government will be explained later in chapter 3.3.1.

there, and though they were Prussian citizens, they spoke a different language and worshipped a different religion. Italians were also invited to work in the mines in the Ruhr valley. Workers that were now in shortage in the cities on the outskirts of the Empire were replaced with foreign workers coming from the neighbouring areas. They were supposed to leave when the job was done but many settled there and integrated, as most Poles did. Number of foreigners started rising and already according to the 1920s' census made up 2% of the whole population. (Bade, 1987) Still, this first experience with labour migration didn't change much in the German perception of immigration: neither were the guest workers who settled there considered as a significant problem, nor was that believed to be a drawback of this kind of programmes, nor did the successful integration of Poles or Italians lead to the idea that immigration may enrich Germany.

During World War II forced labour migration was often the case in Germany. War prisoners and civilian workers, all in all, about 7.5 million workers (one third of the total labour force), were employed in the agricultural and industrial sector in Germany in 1944. This fact provided German enterprises with the feeling that they were experienced in dealing with foreign workers and could manage it again if such necessity arises, which did happen soon.

### **Immigration to Germany after World War II**

Klaus Bade (2000), a German migration scientist, distinguishes four main immigration and incorporation processes that have taken place in Germany since 1945 (finding rather different expression in West and East Germany):

- Integration of refugees and displaced persons in East and West Germany as a consequence of World War II;
- A long way from the recruitment of foreign workers over the “guest worker question” to immigration problem in West Germany;
- Immigration of refugees and asylum seekers;
- Inclusion of ethnic Germans (including the so-called “late repatriates” (“Spätaussiedler”)).

### ***German refugees and displaced persons***

Germans, who during World War II chose to or were forced to leave the territory where they had lived, started returning to their motherland in the late 1940s. They were coming mainly from South-Eastern and Eastern Europe. Their repatriation was not a one-day process but lasted for a few decades. Almost 1.6 million people came this way to West Germany in the time period of 1951-1988. (Bade, 2000, p. 8) In West Germany, unlike East Germany, “a right to homeland” was officially promoted. Therefore, very few people came back to East Germany, with the exception of family reunion reasons. Escape from East to West Germany was a more common case, which was widely appreciated in West Germany in times of the Cold War, firstly, as a living proof of capitalist regime advantages and, secondly, as an inflow of lacking work force.

### ***“Guest workers”***

*“We have called labour force, and those were people that came”<sup>3</sup>*  
Max Frisch

### ***Preconditions***

While migration in the late 1940s and early 1950s was mainly caused by the war and its consequences, starting with the end of the 50s till the early 70s migration was the outcome of processes on the labour market. The newly founded in 1949 Federal Republic of Germany instantaneously appeared to be in an ambiguous situation: rapid economic development (the so-called “economic wonder”) on the one hand and internal labour shortages on the other hand. Marshall Plan aid, currency reform, changes on the way to social market economy quickly brought Germany forward, but an adequate amount of labour force was still lacking.

In 1960, the number of job vacancies exceeded the registered number of unemployed, and German employers asked for the permission of the state to

---

<sup>3</sup> Max Frisch, a German writer, uttered this phrase characterising German attitude to the problem of guest-workers (“Wir haben Arbeitskräfte gerufen, und es sind Menschen gekommen”). (Migration Online, 2007)

recruit “foreign employees”<sup>4</sup>. This was considered as the best alternative for a few reasons. According to Hermann (1992) they are the following:

### **1) Decrease in German labour force**

Development of the welfare state hindered participation of various population groups in the production relations: due to better educational opportunities many young people stayed in school longer, better pensions encouraged earlier retirement, baby boom in the 1950s interfered with the female participation on the labour market. Furthermore, building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and end of a steady inflow of East Germans contributed to the shortage of German labour force and became one of the reasons compelling West Germany against its will to look for workers abroad.

### **2) The nation’s economic revitalisation at stake**

The country’s economic progress was the main goal, and possible negative implications were not considered as important. Trade unions were satisfied with the promise that all workers would get equal wages and social benefits and that domestic workforce would keep its primacy in case of new job openings.

### **3) Control over migration of the European Community workers**

Germany agreed to the freedom of movement rights for the nationals of the European Community, and many Italian and Spanish migrants soon arrived in Germany. Though around thirty different countries stated their wish to send workers to Germany, at first Germany adopted the decision to invite only European nationals.

### **4) “Foreign aid” to labour emigration countries**

In the 1960s a popular belief in Germany was that “3 R’s” (recruitment, remittances, returns) served as a sort of aid to less developed countries. In particular, it was expected to reduce unemployment in Southern Europe, provide economic development and job creation with the help of remittances, ensure

---

<sup>4</sup> Previously known as “guest workers”, in present-day discussions they are often referred to us “foreign employees”. (Schäfers, 2004, p. 201) Omitting the word “guest” might have served the purpose of finally admitting that having stayed in Germany they cannot be called “guests” any more.

better qualification of workers that would come back home from Germany and invest their knowledge and skills in the home economy. (Martin, 2004, p. 226)

### ***Guest worker recruitment programmes 1955-1973***

The decision to invite foreign workers was taken in 1955, when the first labour agreement with Italy was signed allowing German farmers to hire Italian workers for agricultural works, as a significant number of Italian farm workers had already been in the country by that time. Soon it was understood that agriculture is not the sector that was most of all in need of additional labour force, but it was rather in the new factories in car-building, steel and consumer durables industries where extra workers were needed in order to ensure competitive advantage of the German economy on the international level.

Guest worker recruitment turned out to be more success than it was originally expected. From 1958 to 1962 the number of immigrants to Germany has almost increased four times reaching about 549,000 people in 1962. After construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961, the flow of young, often well-educated specialists, from East Germany stopped, and West Germany felt the need to sign more recruitment agreements, this time with some non-EC, Mediterranean countries, starting with Spain and Greece yet in 1960, Turkey in 1961, Portugal in 1964, Tunisia and Morocco a year after in 1965 and finally Yugoslavia in 1968 (neither Spain, nor Greece or Portugal were members of the EC at that time). In 1968, number of guest workers was reported to have exceeded the threshold of 1 million. A few years later, after a short recession, it reached the previously unregistered number of 2.6 million people. In the early 1970s at some point about one thousand migrant workers arrived daily. (Schäfers, 2004, p. 101)

However, we can't say that Germany was not selective towards its new labour force. A number of Employment Service offices were set up in the sending countries' capitals, where selection procedure took place based on work experience, skills, and health of potential workers, as a result usually one in ten workers would be accepted. Then collective transportation in specially chartered trains was organised directly to the future employers. Contrary to the popular

belief that all the guest workers were low qualified, according to statistics, around 30-40% of Turks, for example, were considered skilled workers at home, but most of them worked as common manual workers in Germany. (Martin, 2004, p. 227)

Though majority of guest workers were recruited anonymously, a procedure was developed when employers could invite particular individuals. Often immigrants used this opportunity to escape the need for official selection procedure and either asked friends or relatives in Germany to have employers request them by name, or first went to Germany as tourists, found a work place and then came back home to be officially requested by the employer. This way, about 20-30% of guest workers first came to Germany with tourist visas. Soon foreign labour power constituted a major share of manual workers on German plants, for instance, migrant workers made up over 30% of total labour force at GM car engineering plants. (Martin, 2004, p. 227)

### ***Failure of rotation and return principles***

In fact, the idea of return migration fully underlies the guest worker regime, which treats foreign labour “as a conjuncturely disposed commodity without social reproduction and education costs”. (Joppke, 1999, p. 65) According to the rotation policy that had been borrowed from the experience of Switzerland, guest workers were expected to work for one or two years and return home, enriching the local economy with his new qualifications and being replaced with a new recruit. The temporary status of the workers was symbolised by their accommodation in army-style mass quarters provided by the employer. (Joppke, 1999, p. 65) This situation was indeed perceived as a temporary measure, everybody - the state, employers, trade unions, sending countries and workers themselves – at first shared a deceptive belief in provisional employment and “rotation system”.

However, when applied in practice, it appeared that this assumption found support neither with the employers, nor with the workers. German employers were keen on keeping experienced and trained employees and not spending

money every couple of years on socialising and retraining new recruits. Migrants, in their turn, realised that they would have to stay in Germany longer to achieve their saving goals, as those had often been underestimated due to the difference between the cost and standard of living in Germany and their home country. Providing that they were allowed to invite their family members after they had worked for one year some unified their families in Germany instead of returning home. As a result, due to joint “efforts” of both employers and guest workers, rotation policy failed. Meanwhile, migrant workers started to outweigh the local population in some industrial areas, it became obvious that permanent settlement was taking place, and the public slowly came to realise that the German society was facing a new problem, especially due to the fact that a legal political framework for dealing with something more than temporary presence of foreigners did not exist.

***End of guest worker recruitment (1973) and adoption of return policies***

With the onset of the Oil Crisis in 1973, the German government officially stopped recruitment programmes: no more low qualified foreign workers could be hired for more than 90 days. But the end of recruitment policies didn't lead to expected consequences. Both number of foreigners in Germany (4 million in 1973) and foreign workers in particular (2.6 million) were supposed to decrease significantly straightaway. And though in a few years the number of employed foreigners did fall to some 1.8 million, considerable numbers of foreign population persisted. Fear of workers not to be able to return back to Germany, once they have left it, is cited as one of the reasons. Family reunion continued occurring on the large scale, and in fact the foreign population went up to about 4.5 million people in 1980. (Bade, 2000, p. 10)

Lots of measures started to be taken to discourage family reunification. Firstly, the newly arrived spouses were not allowed to work for up to four years since their arrival, this way, only making the percentage of unemployed foreigners outweigh that of the employed ones by almost one third. Apart from that,

migrants' mobility was limited as result of a law prohibiting migrants to move to cities already having a significant share (at least 12%) of foreign population. Finally, the new coalition government that was formed in 1982 out of the rightist Christian Democratic Union, Christian Social Union, and the Free Democratic Party offered a migration management policy based on the French experience with departure bonuses programme. Migrant families were offered bonuses of up to \$5,000 for giving up their work and residence permits and reimbursement of their social security taxes once they return to their home country. As a result, the number of foreigners temporarily fell by 300,000 people. But according to many studies (Hönekopp, 1997), this incentive only accelerated normal emigration flows, as foreigners that left Germany left would have left anyway but later. In the 1980s, the German governmental policy was stated clearly enough: Germany is not a country of immigration. However, this policy apparently failed with the numbers of foreign population reaching the unprecedented 5.8 million in 1991. In 2003 the number of foreign worker population and their families accounted for 8.9% (7.34 million) of the total population in Germany, only slightly over 4% (315,000) of those were registered in the new federal lands. This fact brings up the question of guest worker immigration to the GDR.

### ***Contract workers in East Germany***

Contrary to popular belief, labour immigration to East Germany did take place, though in a comparatively unessential scope. The main aim then was to train the workers well enough, so that they would bring the knowledge to their home countries. Unlike mass organised foreign employees' programmes in the FRG, a small number of low qualified workers, mainly from Vietnam and Mozambique, had fixed-term contracts with the GDR. However, this kind of foreign labour involvement was officially concealed there. Foreign workers were provided with separate communal accommodations and segregated from the local population; close contacts were widely condemned, could only take place on the state permission and had to be reported. One could say that social integration of migrants in East Germany was even much less stipulated than in West Germany, instead controlled segregation and ghettoisation took place. This lead to a kind of

social vacuum, in which migrants lived, and fostered xenophobia and hostility on the part of the locals. (Bade, 2000, p. 10) That is why, by the time of reunification, both German states, apart from other unsolved issues, brought together their not yet overcome problems of how to deal with the foreign population.

### ***Asylum seekers and other refugees***

As the result of the painful experiences gained from history of National Socialism, political persecution and recognition, as well as not recognition of German refugees abroad in 1933-1945, in 1949 among basic rights Germany included into the new Constitution the famous article number 16 stating that “persons persecuted for political reasons shall enjoy the right to asylum” (“Politisch Verfolgte genießen Asylrecht”). (Grundgesetz 1949) Till the early 1970s, there had been rather few asylum applications with the exception of temporarily rising numbers after the suppression of the uprising in Hungary in 1956 and the “Prague spring” of 1968. The majority of refugees then originated from the states of the Eastern bloc, and their recognition was a welcome and easy way to prove the supremacy of the West.

At the end of the 1970s, the number of asylum applications rapidly went up. And now applicants came mainly from the third world countries, which turned out to be quite unexpected. After civil war like circumstances in Turkey adding to the understanding that Germany is not going to cancel its ban on recruitment programmes, many Turks came to Germany asking for asylum, and even if their applications were eventually rejected, they had a chance to work for a few years, while their matters were in progress. Moreover, some authors claim that Turkish newspapers even provided advice on how to better fill in the German asylum application form to prolong one’s stay in Germany. (Martin, 2004, p. 236) Over half of the total of asylum applications in Germany in 1980 was reported to have been submitted by the Turkish citizens. As a countermeasure, asylum seekers were soon forbidden to work for five years while awaiting for the decision to be taken, and as a result, asylum applications decreased from 110,000 in 1980 to some 20,000 in 1983. (Martin, 2004, p. 236) Then the discussion started in

Germany about the “abuse of asylum law”. According to Bade (2000), German state itself is to blame for the eventual abuse of asylum law. With the end of recruitment programmes and with the persisting absence of an Immigration law, asylum law remained the only “eye of a needle” to immigrate into Germany, with the exception of a few particular cases like family reunion, which were not available for everybody.

The situation got out of control once again by the end of the 1980s. The crisis situation in Eastern Europe, along with “defensive measures” against the so-called economic refugees from developing countries, lead to an absolute reversal of relations: in 1986 about 75% of all the refugees were migrants from the third world countries; whereas already in 1993 some 72% originated from Europe and mainly from Eastern Europe. (Bade, 2000, p. 11) Disintegration of the Yugoslavian Socialist Republic and collapse of the Soviet Union caused the number of asylum seekers to rise again with an eventual peak of 513,561 people in 1993. (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2011, p.8) But the Cold War was over, refugees were not needed any longer as an evidence of Western success in terms of bipolar world rivalry, and suddenly they became an additional burden in terms of welfare state crisis. Something had to be done as soon as possible.

Controversies regarding any measures that could be taken started to take place between the main political powers of the time: the Social Democratic Party together with the Greens argued in favour of developing an immigration system primarily by means of opening channels for legal immigration to reduce the number of asylum seekers, on which a substantial sum from the German budget was spent (about \$10,000 was spent on every asylum applicant per year). The CDU-CSE-FDP coalition government, however, was eager to amend the Constitution and cancel the right to not limited by timeframes stay in Germany that asylum seekers enjoyed. In 1993 the historical article 16 of the Constitution was finally amended by what was called “the Asylum Compromise”. The article was not any longer as concise as it had been preserved for almost 50 years. In 1949, it had been formulated in only one sentence on purpose: Carlo Schmid, a

German minister of justice of the post-war times (SPD), rejected all the doubts of his opponents stating that “asylum law is always a question of generosity, and when one wants to be generous, one has to take the risk of possibly being mistaken in a person”. (Bade, 2000, p. 12) In 1993, the article 16a of the Constitution became noticeably longer, that symbolises in fact to what extent the right to asylum was limited now, being “politically persecuted” was not enough anymore.

Till 1993, Germany used to have the “most liberal” asylum law and the “most restrictive” asylum law practice. (Bade, 2000, p. 12) The liberal law disappeared in 1993 leaving only the most restrictive practice. Practically no chance was left to asylum seekers who came from a country not enlisted among countries that performed political persecution and who arrived through a “safe country”, where asylum was to be claimed. (p. art. 16a Grundgesetz) As a consequence, Germany was now accessible for asylum seekers only by air, which already involved a social status selection. As a result, numbers indeed started slowly to drop again by some 10,000-20,000 per year and reached the lowest level by 2008 with only about 21,000 applications. The number of accepted applications was also year by year reduced to 0.8% (251 people) in 2006 with over 57% of rejections and 3.6% of applicants granted temporary protection. (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2011, p.8) According to official reports, success of German asylum policy seems to be measured not by the number of recognised applications but by the number of the rejected ones. (Federal Office for Recognition of Foreign Refugees, 2003, p.20) Still, Germany receives more asylum application than any other EU country, but a recognition average rate of 3.5% (the mean of 1991-2010) helped to solve the issue and cut the number of asylum applications to an “acceptable” level.

Tightening up the asylum law, however, did not only lower the number of recognised asylum seekers. As one of the remaining major paths of legal immigration to Germany were blocked now, illegal immigration was picking up pace. Its rates rose sharply, partly due to violation of visa and residence permit

regimes, partly due to illegal border crossing, etc.<sup>5</sup> An immigration law establishing and managing legal ways of immigration to Germany was still obviously lacking.

### ***Ethnic Germans***

“Ethnic Germans” is a rather broad term for all the Germans and their descendants who lived or still live abroad and don’t possess German citizenship. German ancestry may have taken place a few generations ago, as well as a few centuries ago. Due to historical reasons, areas with big concentration of ethnic Germans can be mainly found in Eastern Europe. One can distinguish several categories of ethnic Germans depending on the area of their settlement: descendants of Germans who migrated into Romania in the twelfth century (the so-called Transylvanian Saxons) and into Russia starting with the eighteenth century (the largest minority group was known as the Volga Germans, under Stalin they were moved by force to Kazakhstan), Germans who lived on the former territory of the German Empire till the new territorial division after the World War II (such as Eastern Poland, Kaliningrad region, etc.).

The German Constitution contains a provision that those who have German ancestors, no matter in what generation, have a right to German citizenship and all the ensuing rights and obligations, given that they suffered from persecution because of their belonging to the German ethnicity. Two waves of ethnic Germans’ migration to Germany have taken place. The first one started soon after the World War II and concerned mainly ethnic Germans from Poland and Romania. The second phase began in the 1990s, when another immigrant wave of ethnic Germans (so-called Spätaussiedler, or “late repatriates”) intensified with the breakdown of the Iron Curtain and more than two million people, majority of them being from the former Soviet Union, arrived. (Heckmann, 2003, pp. 48-49) Though officially and legally being recognised as Germans, culturally, socially and mentally they appeared to be in a real “immigration situation” (Bade, 2000, p.

---

<sup>5</sup> Though no reliable statistical data is available regarding illegal immigration, it is assumed that in the period from 1990 to 1996 it experienced a significant increase. (Schönwälder Karen, Vogel Dita, Sciortino Giuseppe, 2006, p. ii)

14), meaning that they faced similar problems adapting to the new country and life style as the rest of the foreigners in Germany.

Integration problems started to become serious when immigration of ethnic German became a mass movement. In 1993, the quota was set on not more than 220,000 people to be accepted each year and the year of birth was limited to 1992 as well. As a consequence, the German government introduced some formal procedures making the immigration process more difficult. Persecution was not presumed automatically any longer to have taken place, only migrants from the former USSR didn't have to prove it. Not the least countermeasure was the language test introduced in 1996 that potential immigrants had to take in their countries of origin yet before leaving for Germany. An average of 35% of the participants failed at it and another try was not envisaged. Still, all in all over 2.5 million people came to Germany in the framework of ethnic German immigration in the time period from 1990 till 2006. The highest number of ethnic Germans arrived in 1990 (397,073 people), the figures slowly decreased to 220,000 in the mid-90s due to the applied quota, reached some 100,000 in 2000 and finally went down to the lowest ever (since the beginning of acceptance of ethnic Germans in 1950) level of 3,360 people. (Migration Report, 2009, p.54)

The group of ethnic Germans is in a more beneficial position if compared to any other migrant group in Germany. Apart from being granted citizenship and all rights which it presupposes, upon their arrival in Germany and after assignment to one of the federal states, they were provided with social help, including financial assistance and accommodation. First state integration measures, like language courses, were originally meant also only for ethnic Germans. However, that didn't prevent them from becoming one of the problematic immigrant groups, as for many economic benefits were more important than affinity to German culture and values. Though often ethnic Germans are better educated than other immigrants, they tend not to be perceived and perceive themselves as Germans, but rather as Russians. High unemployment and crime rates remain among the most challenging issues. Conflicts and tensions with other immigrant groups also

---

<sup>6</sup> The last migration report for Germany was published in 2009.

often take place due to an “unjust” distribution of resources and unequal access to them (ethnic Germans possess an evident privilege) and at the same time different degree of integration (migrants who have lived in Germany all their lives would often feel themselves more German, than ethnic Germans who have lived all their lives in Kazakhstan, for instance).

### ***Migrants from the European Union***

Though Bade (2000) did not point out in his classification EU nationals as a particular group of immigrant population in Germany, it seems to be worth mentioning under a separate subheading. Citizens of the other EU states would also be often included in the described above groups (for example, there have been a substantial part of Italians or Greeks among foreign workers, Poles among the displaced persons or some Romanians among ethnic Germans), still, coming to Germany, finding work and staying there might sometimes be easier for them due to the free movement right that EU citizens enjoy (but for the newly accepted states). Free movement right is entrenched in the Schengen treaty and became part of the German Immigration Act of 2005 as well.

According to the migration report of 2009, about a quarter of foreign population (1,69 million people) in Germany possesses a citizenship of one of 14 old EU member-states (almost the same number as the share of Turkish population in Germany), about 11% (776,000 people) - that of one of the 12 new members. The numbers of the former have experienced a decrease since 2004, whereas the latter – a slight increase of 1.4%. (Migration Report, 2009, p.206)

Germany has just fully opened its borders for the new European states, such as the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia and Slovenia. From May 1, 2011, their citizens have an opportunity to work in Germany without long-term contracts or company sponsorship, this way they get the same chance as Germans. Researchers of the Cologne Institute for Economic Research predict that some 800,000 foreign workers are expected to arrive within till 2013 and up to 1.2 million are likely to migrate to Germany by 2020. (Cologne Institute for Economic Research, 2011) According to the director

of the Institute Michael Huethner, “especially now during the economic recovery Germany needs additional workforce... highly qualified workers from Eastern and Central Europe can help alleviate bottlenecks.” (Doerr, 2011) Many Germans are also said to be worried about the negative effect that unrestricted entry for workers from the Eastern EU states may have on their jobs and wages. At the same time fears persist that labour migration from Eastern European countries will disproportionately affect especially Germany’s less developed ex-communist Eastern regions, that border on some of the new EU states. Besides, the question about possible measures that will be required for integration of one million of new migrants, providing some of them might want to stay longer, also remains open.

### ***Jewish migrants from the former USSR***

Immigration of Jews from the former states of the USSR is also a relatively new phenomenon. And though Jewish migrants are far from being a large or problematic immigrant group in Germany, their case is worth considering. Firstly, due to certain negative pages of German history, they present a previously not mentioned example of help in terms of humanitarian action. Secondly, though considered a special case of refugees, the amount of support that Jewish migrants receive from the German state is more similar to the one that ethnic Germans get. Therefore, they should be pointed out as a specific group.

The immigration programme for Jews, as one of the implicit means for Germany to rehabilitate itself after the atrocities it had committed under the Nazi regime, started in the transitional for Germany period, namely in 1990. Since then, up to 2009 over 210,000 Jewish migrants immigrated to Germany. Unlike majority of other immigration processes, this one was initiated by the former GDR government and accordingly only East German states were responsible for managing this immigration programme and accommodating migrants.

In 1991, Jewish migrants from the Soviet Union were assigned the legal status of the so-called quota refugees, a particular group of refugees that are accepted in the framework of humanitarian action and enjoy a visa-free entry and more

privileged position as compared to other groups of refugees. (Quota refugees, 2004) However, the definition of those who can be recognised by the German authorities as Jewish quota refugees is more exclusive than, for example, in Israel: Germany accepts those who have at least one of the parents who is Jewish, as well as the person's non-Jewish close family members; in Israel, such close blood relations are not necessary – a Jewish grandparent is enough. (Cohen, Haberfeld, Kogan, 2008, p. 189)

Alike ethnic Germans and recognised asylum seekers, upon arrival, Jewish immigrants are also appointed to some particular area in the country. Similarly to ethnic Germans, they do as well receive state support such as subsidies for housing, all kinds of financial help, unemployment benefits, language courses and integration services; the only difference is that no citizenship right is stipulated for them by law. Though Jewish migrants did not present a danger to German welfare state, conditions for their acceptance experienced the same trend as those for immigration of other groups – gradual introduction of new legal restrictions. For instance, after the new Immigration Act in 2005, inter alia the German language competence also needs to be proved. With the highest indices registered in the beginning and in the end of the 1990s, after the reform of 2005, the number of Jewish immigrants has been significantly reduced from 11,208 to 5,968 and finally reached the lowest point of 1,088 people in 2009. (Migration Report, 2009, p.102)

### **Summing up main trends of immigration to Germany**

On the ground of all the information presented in chapter III, three main reasons may be cited accounting for the variety and scope of immigration flows to Germany, and, as a consequence, for the present-day situation:

1. economic reasons and need of labour power;
2. attempts to atone for the deeds of World War II;
3. rule of ethnic belonging.

However, everything has its limits: both the labour market and the willingness to right a wrong. That is why, all the programmes of immigration to Germany

experienced a similar trend of being gradually restricted (by means of introduction of time limits and more and more conditions required for immigration) and sometimes to the degree of finally being closed down (guest workers' programme, for example). The only exception is the migration from the other EU states, which is predicted to undergo a heavy increase. But the issue of European integration is dealt with on the supranational level and, initiated once, the ongoing process of deepening and widening would be very hard to stop, which is not the aim though.

## **An immigration situation in an immigration country**

### **Present-day immigration situation according to statistics**

Statistical data clearly states persistence of the immigration situation in Germany: since 1992 foreign population constantly remains on the level of some 8-9% of the total German population. (Migration Report, 2009, p.215) Due to the microcensus<sup>7</sup> introduced in 2005, it became possible to distinguish the overall group of people with the so-called "migrational background". According to the Federal Statistical Office, **people with migrational background** are all those that immigrated to the territory of the modern Germany after 1949, as well as all the foreigners born in Germany and all the Germans born in Germany, the latter having at least one parent who immigrated to Germany or was born in Germany as a foreigner. (Migration Report, 2009, p.215) Therefore, it is possible to tell between Germans without migrational background and people with migrational background. Among the latter the "broad" and "narrow" understanding of migrational background exists: the broad understanding includes people whose migrational status cannot be continuously followed and can be implied only from the characteristics of parents. People with migrational background in the narrow sense are, on the contrary, easily identifiable every year in the microcensus. According to the official statistical data published in the Migrational Report of

---

<sup>7</sup> The general sampling fraction is 1% of the population for all variables (Microcensus)

2009, the population of Germany looks the following way (numbers rounded up to thousands):

Population in total	81,904,000
Germans without migrational background	65,856,000
People with migrational background in the wide sense	16,048,00
People with migrational background that can't be continuously followed	345,000
People with migrational background in the narrow sense	15,703,000
People with own migrational experience (immigrants)	10,601,000
Foreigners	5,594,000
Germans (including both naturalised and not naturalised)	5,007,000
People without own migrational experience	5,102,000
Foreigners	1,630,000
Germans	3,472,000

*Table 3. Population in Germany according to detailed migration status. (Migration Report, 2009, p.216)*

From this table it may be deduced that, out of 81,9 million people in Germany, 15,7 million (around 19%) have a migrational background, out of which about 7,2 million (8,8%) don't have a German citizenship (are foreigners) and 8,5 million (10,4%) have a German citizenship. The number of people who have a migrational origin can be easily correlated with the seriousness and scope of the problem of integration connected to it. Here the phenomenon often referred to now as the "parallel societies" comes into being.

### **Phenomenon of the "parallel societies"**

German society has lately been often described using the notion of "parallel societies"<sup>8</sup>. This expression is colloquially employed in the public debate to define the self organisation of ethnic homogeneous groups of population, whose rules and morals do not comply with those of the majority group and which, as a consequence, tend to spatially, socially and culturally isolate themselves. (Belwe,

<sup>8</sup> This term was for the first used by a Bielefeld sociologist Wilhelm Heitmeyer in his study of Islamic fundamentalism to describe life of the young people of Turkish origin in Germany who don't have a contact with the majority society; but it didn't attract much attention then. (Heitmeyer, 1997) It was remembered and became popular only in 2004, first in the Netherlands, after the murder of a Dutch film director Theo van Gogh in Amsterdam, possibly for his provocative critics of Muslims. Immediately it became popularised in the media around Europe and, in particular, in Germany.

Leibold, Heitmeyer, Halm, 2006) Insufficient or wrong measures of the integration policy are often blamed for this voluntary or forced retreat from the society of the majority to that of one's ethnic group. Most often parallel society of Turkish migrants is mentioned as a problematic area, in this context, an important role is ascribed to the difference of religions and peculiarities of Islam.

However, existence of parallel society in its classical sense in Germany may be still disputable. According to Klaus Bade (2004), for example, description of the situation in Germany doesn't correspond to the ideal type of a parallel society that involves a one-cultural identity, voluntary or conscious social, spacious and economic differentiation, and reproduction of the state institutions. In Germany, usually migrant subgroups are ethnically and culturally diverse, the differentiation is usually induced by social conditions, and there is no reproduction of institutions. However, it doesn't deny the fact that parallel societies, if not in the classical understanding, could still be a reality in Germany.

Concept of the parallel societies can be linked to the theory of integration and ethnic stratification of Hartmut Esser (1999) presented in Chapter II. Existence of parallel societies is thus a direct consequence of the absence or insufficiency of a migrant's integration in terms of acculturation, placement, interaction and identification, degrees of integration differing from level to level and from person to person. The level of placement, or structural integration, can be considered to be basic for the possible differentiation of the society into that of the host nation and the migrant minorities. Therefore, obstacles at the level of placement can be seen as especially dangerous for migrants, for, as a result, ethnic stratification may be perpetuated and parallel societies will possibly evolve. For instance, most often being hired for low-qualified, predominantly manual works, migrants would settle in cheaper districts with other similar workers. In order to get a better work, a person needs to learn the language, get a better education and not the least importantly to have an access to these opportunities provided for by the state. Antidiscrimination measures are a basic precondition here on the part of the host society. Person's willingness to improve his life is a precondition on the part of migrants. Often, however, attempts at investing time, money and efforts

into education may often seem as too troublesome and not easily rewarded with success, therefore other more familiar and proved options for occupation could still be preferred. The more often this model is repeated, the more difficult it is for the following generations to step out of this vicious circle.

Situation of the second-generation migrants in Germany could serve as an example. According to the report of the OECD, they have low educational outcomes (partly may be explained by the rigidity of German educational system) than the locals often because of the lacking language skills, this hinders their access to vocational training and eventually to the labour market. (Liebig, 2007, p.4) Contacts with people in the similar conditions tend to prevail, whereas contacts with the population of the host society would remain limited, therefore, cultural and value exchange is little probable.

If we refer once again to table 2 on page 9, we could say that parallel societies would come into existence in case where there is neither system, nor social integration, which would lead to permanent class and religious conflicts, according to Esser (1999). From here stems the danger and the undesirability of this phenomenon, the main means of fighting which are different aspects of the integration policy.

### **Conclusion: Germany – an immigration country**

With a systematic non-recognition of the immigration situation and, as a consequence, long absence of planned integration and reluctant attitude towards acceptance of new immigrants, the term of a “classical” immigration country would not suit Germany. For a long time, immigration situation in Germany existed without Germany being an immigration country. Nowadays, however, one cannot deny that some 19% of population in Germany have a migrational background, and that Germany still needs migration for economic and demographic reasons, though to a smaller extent than 40-50 years ago. Therefore, it is a country of immigration. This first started to be officially acknowledged on the turn of the twenty first century, since then, the legislation has undergone a number of transformations on the way to development of

---

adequate immigration and integration policies meeting the needs of an immigration country and its diverse population. Development of integration policy in Germany is the question to be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

## **Chapter IV Integration policy in Germany**

This chapter gives an overview of how integration policy in Germany came into being, main political and legislative changes are discussed. Particular attention is paid to the *Immigration Act of 2005* and its impact on the integration policy. Further on, general and specific measures of the German integration policy are presented and considered, according to the theory of Hartmut Esser, on four levels. Examples of integration projects are taken from the *Federal Integration Programme (2010)* and from the latest *report of the Federal Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration on the Situation of Migrants in Germany (2010)*. Comments and details of the projects are provided on the basis of the expert interviews of ten employees of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF).

### **First attempts at integration**

As it has already been stated in the previous chapter, immigration and integration policies in Germany for a long time were influenced by denial of the immigration situation. During the period of guest worker recruitment till 1973, integration was not the case in Germany. After the end of the recruitment, as the number immigrant population did not decrease and permanent settlement continued, the phase of active denial on the official governmental level started: “Germany is not an immigration country”. Presence of migrants was regarded as temporary and their recruitment as something that would never happen again later. Basically, over a long period, this formula used to be the official political directive for German immigration policy.

However, “the long-lasting official denial cannot be equated with the lack of an integration policy” (Heckmann, 2003, p. 52). From the mid-1970s onwards, there was also another side to it – beginning of a discourse on integration and application of concrete integration policies on the local level. Migrants started to be integrated in the welfare state. Social and welfare organisations, churches and trade unions were the first to raise the question of living conditions,

economic opportunities and human rights with regard to migrants. In 1978, under social-liberal government of Helmut Schmidt, the Federal Government Commissioner for Foreigners' office was founded, which was accountable to the Federal Ministry for Work and Social System. (Federal Commissioner for Foreigners) As a democratic and welfare state, Germany could not completely ignore needs and problems of a growing part of the population. But according to Respondent 3,

*There had never been a systematic programme for integration initiatives. There have always been some projects, though they had never either gone beyond the federal state's borders or been coordinated, and what is most important they had never been brought to any systematic consistency. This way, there had never been a controlled and coordinated integration...*

That is how an ambiguous situation came into being: on the one hand concrete measures for integration started to be taken, but on the other hand official denial of the immigration situation persisted and return migration was encouraged. Legitimacy of the presence of migrants in Germany was still questioned, but gradual inclusion of migrants into welfare state institutions promoted migrants' connections to the host country and, in other words, "encouraged" them to want to stay, this way creating the contradictory character of the situation, in which migrants appeared to be. The ambiguity of the character of German policies towards migrants was also expressed in the official governmental programme in the 1990s, as 'integration', 'restriction of access', and 'support for voluntary return', though contradicting each other, were all mentioned as the guidelines to follow. (Heckmann, 2003, p. 52)

According to Expert 1,

*The change on the way to the new policy started from down upwards – not like it happens usually: the state decided that it is necessary to change something, created a political program and implemented it on all levels up to the local one. But here the change started with NGOs and different municipalities, i.e. from non-commercial ruling structures upwards. In the 90s, there were a huge number of migrants here, big inflows, family migration of guest workers (wives, children, grandchildren), Russian Germans and other ethnic Germans, refugees and Jewish migrants. They arrived in such quantities that on the local level they started to sound the alarm, were writing petitions... Municipalities were writing petitions: help us, you need to change something! That was yet in the 90s... All those organizations that protected rights of migrants (worked on some small projects)*

*saw themselves as lobbyists of migrants' rights, they also started to put forward the idea that these people had come not just for 5 or 10 years, but they were staying and something needed to be done about it...*

This kind of discussion continued till 2000, when the new citizenship law was adopted.

### ***Major political and legislative changes. Introduction of the “jus soli”***

In 1999, finally, denial of the immigration situation was officially abandoned. The Federal Commissioner for Foreigners of the newly elected governmental coalition of the Social Democratic Union and the Greens stated as one of the new tasks for the integration policy to recognise the immigration situation: “*We recognise that an irreversible immigration has taken place and we support the integration of migrants...*” (Heckmann, 2003, p. 53) Subsequently, in 1999, the *Citizenship Law* (“Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz”) was modified and an element of *jus soli* was introduced: a chance to receive German citizenship was given to those who is not German by ethnicity<sup>9</sup>. According to Expert 1, that was when “*the first step was done and the understanding of how “temporary” these people [immigrants] are here changed...*”

### ***From the Green Card to the Immigration Act 2005***

It is often said that it was after introduction of the so-called Green Card Programme<sup>10</sup> by the SDP-Green government of Gerhard Schroeder that discussions about concrete changes of immigration law started. (Spiegel, 2001) The official name of the Programme was “**the Emergency Programme for Satisfying the Demand for IT Specialists**” (“Sofortprogramm zur Deckung des IT-Fachkräftebedarfs”), and thus its aim was to cover in short term the acute shortage of IT specialists in Germany, as well as to emphasise the benefit of highly qualified foreign experts for German economy by offering up to 5-year long residence and work permits to IT specialists whose yearly income amounted to around at least 40.000 euro. At first the number of available Green Cards was limited to 10.000 in 2000 and subsequently for 20.000 per year. The Programme

<sup>9</sup> More on the citizenship policy is in the subsection 4.3.1.1a).

<sup>10</sup> It was “inspired” by the well-known case of the American green card, but in reality German green card hardly had anything in common with it.

was meant as a temporary measure for only 3 years, but had to be prolonged till 2004 till the Immigration Act came into force, and, among other things, entrenched the provision for employment of foreign specialists (including scientists, professors or just highly qualified employees with the annual salary of about 85.000 euro<sup>11</sup>). (§19 Zuwanderungsgesetz, 2004)

But heated political debates preceded introduction of the Immigration Act. According to Interviewee 3,

*As many social and political problems appeared, the red-green federal government said that we need an immigration law that would bring together certain responsibilities and jurisdictions and provide a consistent unified basic project focused on language skills...*

And so, yet in 2000, a few months after the start of the Green Card Programme, a special 21-member Independent Immigration Commission, or the so-called **Süssmuth Commission**<sup>12</sup>, was set up to “develop practical proposals for solutions and recommendations for a new foreigner and immigration policy” (Spiegel, 2001):

*In 2001, the Commission published a report where it was said: we are an immigration country, and they started suggesting measures what to do with it. (Respondent 5)*

In 2001, the Federal Ministry of Interior already presented a draft of the new Immigration Act or, to be more exact, of **the Law for Control and Limitation of Immigration and Managing Residence and Integration of EU Citizens and Foreigners** (“Zuwanderungsgesetz”<sup>13</sup>) taking into consideration some of the recommendations of the Commission and, in general, having a more restrictive character than the Commission advised. After the draft had been discussed by the SPD and the Greens’ coalition partners and the overall goal of “*steering and limiting the entry of foreigners*” (Martin, 2004, p. 249) had been formulated, it was passed and was to enter into force in 2003 if it was not for the Constitutional Court declaring it void due to incompliance with some formalities (not the contents of the law). Finally, it was enacted on January 1, 2005 (and was

<sup>11</sup> The salary is to be twice as high as the contribution assessment ceiling to the official health insurance (§19.2.3 Zuwanderungsgesetz), which changes each year.

<sup>12</sup> Süssmuth Commission was called so after its chairperson, CDU politician and former president of the Bundestag Rita Süssmuth.

<sup>13</sup> “Gesetz zur Steuerung und Begrenzung der Zuwanderung und zur Regelung des Aufenthalts und der Integration von Unionsbürgern und Ausländern”

afterwards slightly modified in 2007 to adopt policy guidelines of the EU in terms of residence and asylum law).

Apart from introducing changes to previously existing immigration and naturalisation legislation and bringing all the questions of migration together into one law,

*All of a sudden integration was mentioned as an objective managing foreigners' situation. In the second sentence of article 1 of the law it is said that immigration to Germany is shaped taking into account the capacity of Germany to accept and integrate those people as well as basing on the economic and market reasons. And then it says it regulates the entry, residence, employment and the integration of foreigners. Previously it regulated entry and residence and employment, which means whether they can work or not or not allowed, and now it also regulates integration. It is a legislative aim to regulate integration (Respondent 5).*

“Support of Integration” (Chapter 4 of the Immigration Act “Förderung der Integration”) is presented as an official policy of the state: “Integration of for a long time legally resident on the federal territory foreigners in the economic, cultural and social life of the Federal Republic is promoted” (§43.1 Zuwanderungsgesetz, 2004). Possessing a sufficient knowledge of German became the focal point of integration, “*it was to be ensured that an immigrant in Hamburg and in Munich have access to the same language-learning offer*” (Expert 3). Thus, the main tool of integration is the **Integration Course** (§43-44 “Integrationskurs” Zuwanderungsgesetz, 2004)<sup>14</sup>, covering both the intermediate competence of German and knowledge of the German society; it is complemented by a number of other integration recommendations (referring to the Süßmuth Commission observations) developed by the Federal Ministry of Interior with the help of other state actors and migrant and social organisations and presented in the form of the **Federal Integration Programme** (“Bundesweites Integrationsprogramm”) to be implemented on different state and private levels. (§45 “Integrationsprogramm” Zuwanderungsgesetz, 2004)

---

<sup>14</sup> More on the Integration course in subsection 4.3.2.3a).

## Who is now responsible for integration in Germany?

Before 2005, there had been integration projects in Germany, for which different actors were responsible, there was no consent on the programme, procedure, financing, etc. According to Interviewee 3,

*In 2005 by means of pooling together integration responsibilities on the federal level, stronger interconnections and unification of contents and responsibilities has followed and also a better control of the situation with financial resources invested into integration became possible.*

As the Republic of Germany is a system of federal states, according to the Constitution, a significant number of responsibilities are delegated to them. Respondent 3 describes the change in the following way:

*Integration was a responsibility of the federal states and of the municipalities. After 2005, integration was for the first time regulated as a responsibility of the state. That was a difficult thing, in terms of the Constitutional law. But most important is since 2005 the state (“der Bund”) became responsible for the integration of immigrants as well (and then BAMF got duties in the field of integration too)... Federal states and municipalities are still responsible for the implementation of integration, but the state subsidises, or financially supports, integration projects – it is also in the new Residence Act in §75 (“Aufenthaltsgesetz”)<sup>15</sup>. You can see there the main responsibilities of the state: carrying out integration course, conducting research (that is why our research department in BAMF exists) and, what is also important, providing migration counselling for adults (a person can address a counselling service and get an advice in such questions as integration, etc.).*

Conducting and implementing is the level of lands with the exception of the integration course, especially education and school are responsibility areas of the states in terms of integration. Some states now also have Ministries of Integration, in some Ministry of Interior or Ministry of Labour, etc. deal with it.

## Who is to be integrated?

A new notion of “a person with migrational background”<sup>16</sup> at first aroused rather controversial debates. It was introduced to cover all the problem migrant groups that lack integration, but at the same time had to include all those who are successfully integrated as well. According to Expert 1,

---

<sup>15</sup> A number of regulations in the Immigration Act concerned the former Aliens Act (“Ausländergesetz”) and after 2005 it became the Residence Act.

<sup>16</sup> This new term has already been mentioned in subsection 3.3.1.

*There are very few migrants in the first generation... they had to expand the concept of migrant to the extent that there is somebody to integrate. I exaggerate probably but this law is oriented on very specific migrant groups: guest workers from Turkey and other countries, - because there even in the second generation people can be badly integrated. They grow up in families that don't speak German. Those are people from a certain milieu, with certain problems, at which this law is aimed. And that is particularly for the purpose of covering especially this group by the definition that it was made so broad. And successful people, from bi-national families, that don't have any problems, they automatically also come under this migrational category... This is a certain political artefact that justifies certain political strategies...*

This way, according to Respondent 1, guest workers and their descendants still remain the most problematic immigrant group in Germany and thus are the main target group of German integration policy. Ethnic Germans could be named as the second big target group.

### **New political focus after 2005**

The new government of the CDU, CSU and SPD that gained power in November 2005 introduced new political emphases in the field of integration and migration among others, which was followed by a significant change of staff in the relevant institutions. The focus was set on promoting integration and managing immigration, establishing permanent contact with migrants and understanding their needs.

As one of the first and main actions undertaken in the framework of the new integration policy was the **Integration summit** (“Integrationsgipfel”) organised by Angela Merkel and the new Federal Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration Maria Böhmer in 2006. Since then, representatives of the state and migrant institutions have met already four times to discuss questions and problems of integration and develop a **National Integration Plan** (“Nationaler Integrationsplan”) to help implementation of the Federal Integration Programme, since 2010, work on the **National Action Plan** (“Nationaler Aktionsplan”) specifying integration measures is also in progress. The second major focus was on establishing dialogue with Muslims in Germany, whose numbers amount up to more than 3.5 million people. For this purpose, later in 2006, on the suggestion on the Federal Minister of Interior Wolfgang Schäuble, the **German Islam**

**Conference** (“Deutsche Islam Konferenz (DIK)”) was founded as the first attempt at initiating a long-lasting and mutually beneficial interaction between the German state and Muslim organisations and people.<sup>17</sup>

Integration remains one of the key issues for the German government in the new legislative period after 2009 as well. According to Böhmer, “*integration should become more obligatory*” (Hannoversche Allgemeine, 2009). One of absolutely new issues on the agenda is introduction in the next four years of the so-called “*integration contracts*”, a concept already existing in France. In the contracts mutual rights and obligations will be stated. Everybody who is planning to stay in Germany for a long time is to sign the agreement to accept German values, that includes “*acquisition of German language skills and participating in the life of the society*”, as well as freedom of opinion and equal rights for women. (Hannoversche Allgemeine, 2009) According to Interviewee 9,

*This project is often regarded as a very symbolic action... just by signing a contract a person can't be better integrated, it is the measures it prescribes that matter... It is rather a means for the government to show that everything is under control.*

What is more, in 2010, the Federal Government stated its plan to pass a new Integration law continuing to elaborate new aspects of integration.

### **Anti-discrimination legislation**

Apart from that, in August 2006, after long discussions, the EU-guideline to implement an anti-discrimination legislation was accepted. The **General Equal Treatment Law** (“Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz”) bans discrimination on the grounds of race, ethnic origin, gender, religion, disability, age and sexual orientation. (Bundesregierung, 2006) Subsequently, on the basis of the Federal Ministry for Family, Elderly, Women and Youth, an advisory anti-discrimination board was founded to consult, support and inform people on this matter, as well as to develop measures to prevent discrimination. (Antidiskriminierungsstelle) Besides, **German Anti-discrimination Association**, as an umbrella organisation for all the anti-discrimination councils, offices and research centres, was established. Their aim is to lobby rights of those concerned and in

---

<sup>17</sup> More on these projects is in the subsection for specific measures 4.3.2.1.

cooperation with other state and private actors discover violations of the law on the institutional and individual levels. (Antidiskriminierungsverband Deutschland, 2011) Expert 9 gives a critical remark concerning success of anti-discrimination legislation in Germany:

*In Germany, antidiscrimination laws are very strong; everybody can file a lawsuit to court on this ground. But in reality almost nobody does it. It is hard to say why. And it is interesting that it is in a country like Germany that it happens. In Sweden, for example, they have had a lot of precedents already, it is different. May be political culture is different, it is hard to say...*

That is still a very young field of work for the German state, and still a lot needs to be done in this area.

## **General and specific integration policies**

The notions of general and specific integration policies have been already theoretically discussed in chapter II. To analyse the concrete integration policies that the German state has had, it seems necessary to subdivide all the measures in general and specific and consequently, basing on the theory of Hartmut Esser (1999), to distinguish four levels of integration where measures were applicable. The fact that in the main official programme documents on integration it is done in a similar way facilitates the task. Majority of the projects mentioned have been introduced on state level, when it is a local project that is of interest, it is pointed out.

The main feature of the German mode of integration has been to open the core institutions (labour market, self-employment, education, training system, housing) to the immigrants and to include them in the general welfare state and social policy systems. (Heckmann, 2004, p. 16) Majority of specific integration policies (projects designed directly for migrants as a target group) appeared only after the Immigration Act 2005, when “integration” became a political programme. Whereas general integration policies can be considered in different integrational dimensions, specific policies often cover a variety of integrational levels at the same time.

## **General integration policies**

General, or indirect, integration policies are aimed at including immigrants in the general system of a nation-state. These policies “generally” exist in a variety of a modern-day welfare state, they are aimed at the local population and indirectly cover needs of the immigrant one as well.

### ***Structural integration policies***

Structural integration is often referred to as the basis for all the other forms of integration, therefore, it should be the first to be discussed. For migrants, it involves obtaining a position in the society, becoming its member with all resulting from it rights and obligations.

#### **a) *Citizenship policies***

Acquisition of citizenship can be considered as one of the most important conditions, as well as consequences, of structural integration. The ethnic nation concept that predominated in Germany till the end of the 1990s was rather exclusive towards integration of migrants. It was based on *jus sanguinis* (“the right of blood”), and, according to it, only Germans and their descendants, as carriers of German culture and blood, had the right to German citizenship. *Jus sanguinis* was introduced in Germany yet in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Prussia, and in its modern form existed since 1913. Debates about simplifying naturalization procedure, expanding the ethnic concept of nation and complementing it with *jus soli* (“the right of territory”), possibly introducing double citizenship, etc. started already in the end of the 1980s and went on in the 1990s. In 1993, the first minor deviation from *jus sanguinis* took place: in the citizenship law, a condition was added providing for children of foreigners at the age of 16-23 to receive citizenship given they lived in Germany 8 years and studied at least 6 years at school there. (Heckmann, 2003, p.58)

The next major step was made on January 1, 2000, with coming into effect of the **new Citizenship law**, replacing the old one yet of the Kaiser’s times. Its enactment had already failed 5 years earlier, but now, with the new government, it became possible. Its revolutionary character was emphasized by the

introduction of *jus soli*, which means not only formal simplification of naturalization but also evolvement of a new principle of belonging to the nation: not purely ethnic anymore and so, much less restrictive. The new law states the required length of legal stay of 7-8 years for a person to be eligible for citizenship (§85 AusIG, 2004). Besides, the person needs to be able to maintain their family without recurring to social benefits and to successfully pass the citizenship test (introduced later, in 2008). This law also developed the new idea of citizenship as adherence to the constitutional values. Naturalised citizens are obliged to sign a relevant declaration. This fact can be also regarded as an attempt of integration on identificational level, at least formally this necessity was acknowledged.

Interestingly enough, the Immigration Act introducing the integration course envisages also its impact on the possibility of getting citizenship:

*If you have finished successfully the integration course, you can get the citizenship earlier than usually (regular time is 8 years in Germany), but after integration course you can get one year earlier – in 7 years only (Interviewee 3).*

#### **b) Educational system**

German educational policy is the issue controlled by the federal states' governments with the general guidelines suggested by the Conference of ministers for culture. Yet back in 1964, the first decision about inclusion of migrants' children into German pre-school and school systems was taken. As well as everybody in Germany, they were obliged to attend schools. Unlike German children, migrant children were also obliged to attend kindergartens, as often they are considered as a crucial tool for socialisation and acquisition of basic language skills. (Esser, 2001, p.15) Preparatory and parallel training in the German language was also envisaged for migrant children at school to help them quicker integrate into German educational system. Classes in their mother tongues were offered on an optional basis. As a result, on the one hand these children were prepared for the life in Germany, on the other hand – for the return to their home country. The overall aim of educational policies towards migrants was to avoid social problems; no distinct integration goals were prescribed by the state. However, remaining in the competence of federal lands, curricula of many

schools included integration and acculturation measures. Despite gradual improvement of educational achievements of migrant children, still the rate of people with migrational background who do not finish schools remains higher than for people without migrational background: 12,6% as against 2,1%. (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.90) Besides, due to the rigidity of German educational system, it is very difficult for underperforming students (both migrants and Germans, with the only difference that overall achievements of migrants are still lagging behind) to continue to higher education.

### ***c) Occupational and vocational training***

Both German system of dual vocational training, as well as universities, are open to non-citizens. However, due to generally lower level of education and worse performance at school), much fewer migrants have higher education than Germans. For example, it would be unrealistic to expect some groups of children of former guest workers with rather low qualifications to directly enter universities. According to the report of the Federal Commissioner for Foreigners, “at each new stage Germany has been gradually losing people with migrational background”: in grammar schools the average share of migrants is about 9%, in the vocational training – 4,2%, in universities – 2,5%.

Due to the state’s efforts and demand for practical skills, participation of migrants in the system of vocational training has increased. Still, according to surveys, despite equally high interest, only 25% of migrants manage to enter the vocational training system, whereas for Germans this number is substantially higher (over 50%). (Federal Commissioner for Foreigners, p.138)

### ***d) Labour market***

Looking back at the times of the guest worker recruitment, we may say that labour market has always been the main area of focus in terms of integration. Starting with the first contract in 1955, foreign workers were employed under the same conditions of payment, social security, and benefits, as the local workers performing the same work.

Nowadays, there are practically no legal barriers to enter the labour market for foreigners who are in Germany (there are a few exceptions like asylum seekers, etc.). But still unemployment rate for people with migrational background is twice as high as that for Germans: 12,4% against 6,5%. However, since 2005 it has experienced a downward trend from 18%. (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.174) Germany also provides a number of programmes for training and retraining for problem groups of population, and participation criteria are not limited by German citizenship. But, according to Respondent 5, the German system of vocational training often becomes an obstacle for many foreigners on the way to the labour market:

*Many jobs in Germany require a vocational training which makes it harder for people from other countries where this system doesn't exist to be accepted only on the basis of their work experience. People who haven't participated in our system have problem having their qualification recognised<sup>18</sup>. But for some professions, like lawyers for example, we have retraining procedures. Private firms carry them out and then they can pass an exam and be recognised as lawyers. But this is only for specialists from EU.*

Originally, foreigners were only recruited on the basis of a contract in Germany, self-employment was illegal. Gradually since the removal of barriers more and more people with migrational background set up their own businesses: in 2008, the rate of self-employed male migrants doubled that of 1990 (11,2% as against 6%) and almost reached the level of self-employment for Germans (10,4%), the rates of female participation have almost equaled (7,1% for non-migrants and 6,8% for migrants). (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.160)

#### **e) Welfare state policies**

Germany, as a state with an outstandingly strong social security system, has included migrant workers in it from the very beginning, providing them and their families with the same rights and benefits as the native population: unemployment benefits, medical insurance, pension funds, tax reductions, children benefits, social assistance, etc. As a logical outcome of the above mentioned facts of integration into educational and vocational training systems, there are approximately twice as many people with migrational background that

<sup>18</sup> On the issue of qualification recognition see further in ...

receive unemployment benefits Hartz IV<sup>19</sup> (27%) than Germans, for example. (Arbeitslosengeld II)

### ***Cultural and social integration policies***

#### **a. Cultural integration**

Cultural integration (referred to by Esser as “acculturation”) encompasses a big number of aspects: knowledge of the society’s culture, acquisition of the language, internalisation of cultural patterns and values, adherence to societal norms. It is on the one hand a key to successful integration on other levels and on the other hand – its consequence. In this way it becomes an integral part of other types of integration.

**Public institutions** play an essential role as a tool of socialization and acculturation. Importance of structural inclusion into general pre-school, school and higher education systems can’t be underestimated. As it was previously mentioned, migrant children were obliged to be members of the schooling system from the very beginning. The first generation of guest worker migrants, on the contrary, was often excluded from any kind of participation in educational system. Therefore, they became a target group of special integration measures (which are discussed further). The main way to acculturate them was through inclusion in the labour market.

#### **b. Social integration**

Speaking of the general measures of social integration, those are indirect policies shaped by political decisions and state structures aimed at enhancing a person’s participation in the life of the society, promoting their relations with other society member. Various tools of socialisation, like kindergartens and schools (this case was partly covered in the section of education as an aspect of structural integration), as well as public housing policies, membership in clubs and societies are those features of a society that would help (or discourage, if a

---

<sup>19</sup> Unemployment benefits (Arbeitslosengeld II) introduced in 2005 and meant for those unemployed more than one year.

society is exclusive towards migrants) social integration of newcomers and their descendants.

### a) Avoiding segregation

German **educational system** encourages full participation of migrants from the early stages of life. Principle of being assigned to a particular kindergarten or school depending on the district where you live is rather strict and this way prevents children from choosing to go to a school where majority of their countrymen study. But still territorial principle cannot completely exclude this situation, as often migrants prefer to settle in the areas already populated by people of the same origin as they are. In Munich, for a long time already, about 50% of primary school students have been included in statistics as having a migrational background. The situation in Hamburg, Stuttgart, Frankfurt am Main, Wiesbaden and Ludwigshafen is similar. In some districts in the big cities, the share of migrant children is higher than 75%. (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.90) Such districts as Kreuzberg in Berlin or Wilhelmsburg in Hamburg are typical examples of extensive **ethnic concentrations** in German cities. However, public policies of urban development envisage prevention of ghettoisation and high concentrations of migrants in one area (Heckmann, 2003, p. 67), but often these measures are not enough and, as a consequence, concentration of migrants in some of the German cities may exceed 40% of the population (for example, in Frankfurt am Main, Stuttgart, Nuremberg, Cologne). (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.261)

### b) Participation in the system of associations (“Vereine”)

Citizens' involvement in the social or/and political life of the community is an important measure of social integration, subsequently leading to identification with common values. Germany is well-known for its culture of clubs and associations membership. Inclusion of migrants into this culture could be deemed as a very important step to reduce social distance between different groups of population. According to the surveys, 16% of migrants of Turkish origin are members of only German associations, 22% - of both German and Turkish ones,

12% - only of Turkish ones (mainly religious and cultural organisations). That is, all in all, a substantial figure of 38% stands for the Turkish migrants' membership in German associations (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.286). Sport clubs ("Sportvereine") are of particular importance here, due to the international team work they may provide: they can be considered among most important tools of social integration of migrant children, as well as their parents, into the host society. Yet in the 1980s, it was decided by the Federation of German Sport Organisations that sport clubs should not be functioning on ethnic basis, but should rather promote participation of foreigners. Statistical data also proves their popularity: sport clubs are the most popular with migrants type of German association (an average of 12% of members have a migrational background); trade unions are on the second place (with 10% respectively). (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.286)

### ***Identification integration policies***

Integration on the level of identification is a very specific area and is very difficult to attain, as it fully depends on the subjective perception and experience of a person. School subjects that teach about German history, culture, religion, political development are crucial in this respect.

However, the general policy that the German state had been following for a long time was aimed rather at discouraging any identification of people of non-German ethnicity with this nation. Legitimacy of presence of immigrants in the country itself was doubted by means of official denial of Germany being an immigration country. The model of belonging to the nation based on the basis of living and working there did not exist due to the legal impossibility of obtaining a German citizenship on any other ground but *jus sanguinis*. Only 11% of all immigrants in Germany reported as identifying themselves as Germans. (Heckmann, 2003, p. 67) The only migrant group officially included in the society as "Germans" were ethnic Germans ("Spätaussiedler"), although those still tend to identify themselves often with the country of origin. This way the pivotal change of the citizenship law in 2000 can be considered as a major achievement

not only in terms of naturalisation procedure, but also, quite importantly, for self-perception of migrants as full members of this society, irrespective of their origin.

Political participation, understanding that your opinion count in this society, also plays a role. Being refused to be granted citizenship, automatically right to vote was not given to any foreigners. As some kind of substitute, they were offered a possibility to work in local communities – **Ausländerbeiräte** (“Council of foreigners”). However, usually functions of these institutions were mainly advisory and did not possess any decision-making power. Formation of foreign political parties is also forbidden in Germany, but since 1982 almost all German parties started to accept foreigners as members. (Esser, Korte, 1985, p.192)

### **Special integration policies**

Special integration policies are the institutions and regulations explicitly and directly designed for immigrants and their children. Those may be new institutions as well as new functions of already existing institutions. Mostly, this kind of direct measures are aimed at “integration” of a migrant in various aspects of life in the host society at the same time.

#### ***Special integration policies on the interdimensional level***

Majority of special integration policies are not meant for only structural or cultural, etc. level. Many institutions designed to deal with questions of integration exist on the interdimensional level and their duties are very multi-faceted.

#### **a) Federal Commissioner for Foreigners (Integration Commissioner)**

Establishing the position of Federal Commissioner for Foreigners in 1978 was one of this kind of first special policies aimed at managing variety of questions in concern of migrants. In 2002, under chancellor Schroeder, their competence was extended to include migration, refugees and integration as well. With the new government in 2005, Maria Böhmer (CDU) was appointed as a new Integration Commissioner, and three main dimensions of the Commissioner’s activity were pointed out: promotion of cohabitation of Germans and foreigners, support of government in execution of integration policy, informing public of what has been

done in the sphere of integration. (Bundesausländerbeauftragte) *“For the federal government she (Dr. Böhmer) is a speaker of the interests of migrants and refugees”* (Respondent 3).

### **b) Federal Office for Migration and Refugees**

In 2003, following the expected (but at first failed) adoption of the new Immigration Act, the tasks of the Federal Office for the Recognition of Foreign Refugees (“Bundesamt für die Anerkennung ausländischer Flüchtlinge”) were nevertheless expanded to cover a number of new duties in the sphere of migration and integration; as a result, it ceased being an authority responsible purely for asylum. Subsequently, after the Immigration Act brought in, the Federal Office for the Recognition of Foreign Refugees officially became the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (“Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge” (BAMF)). New responsibilities of BAMF in terms of integration now include consultancy, supporting European and international cooperation in terms of migration and integration, designing and managing the integration course, steering the Federal Integration program, managing integration projects across country, supervising the citizenship test (since 2008), administering the German Islam Conference, etc. (BAMF Aufgaben, 2011) As one might see, duties of BAMF cover a number of projects referring to all four dimensions of integration that will be often mentioned further on in this chapter.

### **c) Federal Integration Programme**

The Federal Integration Programme may be regarded as an instrument of policy coordination: it presents

*what was already done and what should be done in the field of integration. Before it was not yet clear what had been already done because till 2005 there was no integration policy, not a de facto one, so to say. And this programme was to help to see what there already is in terms of projects and where the problem areas are and what further recommendations should be implemented (Respondent 2).*

The process of designing the Programme was described by the same Expert 2 in the following way:

*This document was being designed for a long time by a number of actors, by the whole country and experts for every section: you can see it all on the back pages (representatives of the federal ministries, federal states, former churches, Turkish communities, trade unions, political organisations – they were all involved in developing the programme). And for every part of the Programme you also have experts from universities giving their comments.*

*It was a part of the Immigration Act (§45) and was published only once – in September 2010, it is a very long process due to the number of actors and institutions involved, they come together to figure out what are the needs, what are the suggestions, what are the projects to be initiated. It took them over 5 years after adoption of the Act to bring it all together. It touches upon 4 main parts: social, linguistic, education and professional integration – they are called “Handlungsfelder”. Different needs are recognised in these parts...*

Thus, it embraces three levels of integration (cultural, structural and social)<sup>20</sup>. It is emphasised that in practice all these levels are closely connected and often overlap. (Bundesweites Integrationsprogramm, 2010) Recommendations presented in the Programme are first developed in pilot projects organised by BAMF and, if successful, are then to be implemented by the state, federal lands, communities and private and state organisations and associations (including trade unions, religious communities, employer associations, social service organisations, etc.).

The Programme is also quite flexible:

*It is not a closed finished concept but it is rather gradually developing further: new things can come into being when new problem areas are recognised. It is more of a flexible system – the focus is changing. Before we only had the migrant in the focus. Now host society is coming into focus... (Interviewee 2)*

#### **d) National Integration Plan**

The already shortly mentioned Integration Summits and the National Integration Plan consequently formulated on the second summit in 2007 can also be considered among special measures covering several levels of integration at the same time. In the cooperation between state, federal lands, representatives of political and social associations, and migrant organisations, main topics and aims of integration were determined on the political level and about 400 own obligations and recommendations for state and non-state actors were put down.

---

<sup>20</sup> Identificational level is always the most subjective and challenging to identify.

Language, education, vocational training and labour market and the main areas of focus. (Bundesweites Integrationsprogramm, 2010, p.11)

In 2010, at the third Integration Summit, Angela Merkel announced beginning of work on the **National Action Plan** for the further development and concretisation of the National Integration Plan. According to Respondent 3,

*The National Action Plan has 11 discussion panels, which all deal with integration that traditionally falls into four big spheres. At the moment a big assembly is taking place with workshops and seminars to elaborate the topics, and BAMF (department 323) is responsible for forum 7 – integration through language. There are also absolutely new forums opening such new fields as “Health care” or “Migrants in public service”...*

#### **e) Projects related to Islam**

Soon, after the enactment of the integration policy as part of the Immigration Act, first attempt of the state to develop cooperation on all governmental levels (the state, federal lands, cities, etc.) in terms of religious variety took place. Of particular importance is Islam, as a religion of around 4 million people in Germany, almost a half of which are already German citizens. According to Interview Partner 4,

*Before 2005, very little had been done in respect to Islam in Germany, up till now infrastructures were lacking for exercising religion, that is mosques, teaching Islam in schools, training Islam theologians at the universities, etc. And after 2005, it became also one of the areas to work at... In 2005, we started a project group at BAMF dealing with integration and Islam and in 2006 founded the German Islam Conference.*

In 2006, the **German Islam Conference** (“Deutsche Islam Konferenz” (DIK)) was set up by the Ministry for Home Affairs: a long-term forum between the German state and the living in Germany Muslims was set up aimed at their mutual rapprochement in terms of social, structural and cultural integration. According to Respondent 4, *“before 2006 there was no dialogue forum between the state and Muslims in Germany. By means of DIK dialogue between the state and German Muslims started to discuss problems of “living together”...”* The motto of the Conference “Muslims in Germany – German Muslims” clearly states its aim: Muslims in Germany should perceive themselves as a part of German society

and be perceived so as well. Now, the German Islam Conference, which has already been summoned four times, is in its second phase:

*Initiated in 2006 by Dr. Schäuble, the former Minister of Interior, DIK went into its new phase in 2009 when a new legislative period started with a new Minister de Maizière, – it was now not that scientific any longer, not just recommendations, and the focus moved down to the municipalities; “to bring things out on the kitchen table” as it was said, to do more for the integration of Muslims on the local level became the aim... (Respondent 4)*

The Conference holds meetings on two levels: four working groups (“German social order and value consensus”, “Religious questions from German constitutional perspective”, “Economy and Media as a bridge”, “Security and Islamism”) that meet every two months, and the Plenum that meets once a year to adopt recommendations and suggestions of the working groups. (Deutsche Islam Konferenz, 2010) Membership of DIK is equally divided by representatives of five largest umbrella organisations in Germany and experts, on the one hand, and German state representatives (from the Ministries, states’ bodies, etc), as well as scientists, university professors, etc. on the other hand. Among suggestions from the 1<sup>st</sup> phase that were already implemented as pilot projects, one can name further training for imams and introduction of Islam instruction in public schools<sup>21</sup>.

Direct **communication with imams** is an important task of DIK. As a religious authority, their role for establishing communication between the state and the Muslim population cannot be underestimated. According to Interview Partner 4,

*We rely on the idea that imams are a big authority in mosques. They have of course theological tasks, execute their spiritual duties, but also they are just important people for members of the mosque’s congregation. They are “Brückenbauer” [“bridge builders/mediators”] for their congregation. And when we, as a state, want to address deeply religious Muslims, it happens partly through imams. If imams speak good German, know the country, better know social structures of our society, they can also transfer this knowledge to the members of the congregation. It is also important for us in terms of children education. If imam cares that his children get a good education, then other members of the congregation will see that and also do that – this way we reach parents of Muslim children as well.*

---

<sup>21</sup> More on teaching Islam is in the sub-section 4.3.2.3d).

Imams are involved at DIK, and there are special cross-cultural trainings for them on the local level as well.

### **f) Social welfare organisations**

Apart from state actors, social welfare organisations have also been participating in the integration of migrants. They started providing social care for the guest worker population much earlier than the state acknowledged existence of the immigration situation – yet in the 1960s. According to Joppke, that had been preconditioned by the previous experience: yet in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, church-related charity organisations used to help Polish and Italian foreign workers. (Joppke, 1999, p. 210) In the FRG, taking care of marginal problem groups was often delegated by the state to the main para-public (to a large extent financed by the state) social organisations, which distributed “clients” according to the constituency principle. A kind of an informal agreement existed between the state and the three main charity organisations, according to which social care for guest worker population was distributed among them on the basis of their confession. The Catholic church-based “Caritas” was responsible for the guest workers from Portugal, Spain and Italy; “Diakonisches Werk” supported by the Protestant Church took care of the Greeks; and “Arbeitswohlfahrt” (AWO), a secular organisation, took over Muslim guest workers. (Joppke, 1999, p. 210) “Zentralwohlfahrtsstelle der Juden in Deutschland” (ZWST), as one of the six major social welfare organisations in Germany, undertook care for Jewish immigrants. Programmes on three main levels of integration included measures ranging from simple counselling services (often migrants were employed themselves for this position) to provision of language courses and health care.

Interview Partner 1 sees the difference of those projects with the present-day ones in the following way:

*Those projects were actually in no way different from the projects that take place now on the local level. But nobody used to speak about those projects. But there were lots of attempts to educate migrants, teach the language, integrate women. It was not centralized, everybody did what he could. At some point, I think, for example culture clubs or female clubs were in fashion, or it was also popular to attract them to become members of trade unions. Nobody was actually concerned*

*about it. Only on the local level they did, but in general there was no discussion in politics about integration, there was a discussion about their return home...*

## **Structural integration policies**

### **a) Education and vocational training**

“Transitory classes” (“Übergangsklassen“) is intensive German language instruction for migrant children to be able to participate in the German school system together with all the other children. (Heckmann, 2003, p. 70) Additional language training and tutoring is also provided in many schools. For example, BAMF is in charge of this kind of pilot projects:

*We have now a pilot project at school – German for communicative purposes, for school purposes. It is aimed at children and teenagers with migrational background. Here we teach “Bildungssprache”, in school or vocational context. It is a small project in 3 federal states (Berlin, Niedersachsen and Bavaria), there are 7 places where we teach it in each state... (Respondent 7)*

Besides, pupils are encouraged to possess necessary language competence yet on the pre-school stage to be able to have the same chances as other children of their age. Often special courses for parents or just mothers are organised in the child care facilities in case they do not speak German yet (for example, “Mama lernt Deutsch” programme (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.84), so that children would have a chance to speak German at home too and have a constant practice.<sup>22</sup>

There is a number of state projects to help young migrants to choose profession and get necessary training. Employers of migrant background are as well encouraged to provide migrant youths with apprenticeships: for example, the Jobstarter programme, which alone is supposed to create about 3,000 new apprenticeship places for people with migrational background by means of increasing capacity of foreign companies to take on interns from 15% to 25% (like in German enterprises).

With the inclusion of “intercultural competence” as a necessary qualification for employees, chances of young migrants grow due to their bi-cultural

---

<sup>22</sup> This kind of courses may be considered as having elements of structural, cultural and social integration.

qualifications, which can be consciously used by the enterprise to establish contacts with foreign clients, etc. (Federal Commissioner for Foreigners, p.132)

### **b) Labour market**

According to the Report of the Integration Commissioner, main steps for improving employment chances of migrants are taken in the sphere of vocational and further professional training. But, as for the labour market, new projects dominate the sphere of consulting. The state Information and Consultancy Network “Integration through Qualification” (IQ) was founded in 2005 and provides information concerning such questions as German for professional use, competence assessment, how to set up a business, etc. (Integration durch Qualifizierung)

One should also shortly mention that, according to one of the regulation in the Immigration Act, there is a possibility for the self-employed to start a business in Germany and get a permanent residence permit, provided they invest at least 250.000 euro in the German economy and generate at least 5 job places (decreased from the original in 2005 one million euro and 10 work places respectively). (§21 Zuwanderungsgesetz, 2004) It is clear, however, that few people use this opportunity: slightly more than 1000 people entered Germany this way in 2009. (Migration Report, 2009, p.99)

The most important project in terms of the labour market integration remains ***the law to recognise foreign degrees and qualifications***. It is crucial for the qualified migrants arriving in Germany to be able to apply their skills there and get a position according to their degree. Besides, Germany itself needs qualified labour force to fill in the lacking positions in a variety of sectors. According to Annette Schavan, the Federal Minister for Education, Germany “stands in a world-wide competition for the best minds, and that is why, it should optimally use the potential of all those that live there”. (Anerkennung ausländischer abschlüsse, 2011) However, recognition of foreign degrees still remains a big problem in Germany. Respondent 3 calls existing procedures of recognition in

Germany “*inconsistent and very complicated for the immigrant*”; Interviewee 2 speaks of it as of a “*jungle*”:

*There was a study in 2007 and they discovered that recognition of foreign qualifications in Germany is a “jungle” as they say, because you don’t know where to go, what kind of qualification you can recognise and, if you cannot, what else is possible to be done to prove your qualification, etc. The main problem is your origin. If you’re from EU – then there is a European law and you can get a recognition for some “regulated” jobs like doctor, teacher, engineer; but if you have a “non-regulated” profession, there is no possibility to get a recognition. If you are from other countries, non-EU, you don’t have any legal rights to have your qualification recognised because there is no legal basis (it differs between federal states though, as they all have their own laws and procedures for recognition).*

Recognition of foreign qualifications, as a question of education, is responsibility of the federal states. According to Respondent 3, now the state for the first time wants to enact a “*framework law that will guarantee consistent content, but implementation will still be on the level of the federal states, not the state*”, that is no legislative unification but rather a good system of coordination is expected. For a few years already, a draft for this Recognition Law (“Anerkennungsgesetz”) has been discussed in the German parliament, at present stage it has already passed the Cabinet (on March 23, 2011) and only needs to pass the Bundestag to be finally adopted. Its main idea is that “*everybody irrespective of the country of origin and not only with “regulated” jobs will have access to assessment of their qualifications (not recognition right away)*” (Expert 2). In other words, everybody will have a chance, after submitting all relevant certificates, to be informed how to fill in the possible gaps and what further training is necessary. A state telephone hotline, as well as a system of counselling offices, is supposed to facilitate the procedure and help people find their bearings. (Anerkennung ausländischer abschlüsse, 2011)

At the moment, two pilot projects of BAMF take place in this respect:

*These pilot projects are about councils on the recognition of foreign qualifications, they are trying to see what people needs are. If it is just advice or more support that they need. And if they get the recognition, will they find a job, do they need additional linguistic or linguistic professional training, so that they could learn professional language – what kind of additional qualifications they may need (Respondent 2).*

In short, work on this very important aspect of structural integration has only started.

### ***Cultural integration***

Hartmut Esser especially emphasises the role of the language skill and structural assimilation as the basis to integration on the whole. (Esser, 2001, p.15) Yet, in the 1970s, on the initiative of the German government the Language Association “German for Foreign Employees” was founded as a federation of schools around Germany offering instruction in German. Numbers are rather significant: in the span of over 20 years more than 1.32 million people participated in these courses (Heckmann, 2003, p. 71).

#### **a) Integration Course**

The main project initiated in terms of integration measures by the Immigration Act of 2005 is the Integration Course (“Integrationskurs”), therefore special attention should be paid to it. According to Expert 7,

*The state had an opportunity to participate in implementing the first language project... Though before in some federal states and cities there were a similar kind of language courses for migrants, but, it was very chaotic. If an immigrant was lucky he or she had a good course, if not lucky – no course at all. But now it is all over the country...*

This project can be considered on levels of both cultural and social integration, but as language is by itself deemed to be an element of culture and a means to transfer cultural values and features of the people’s mentality, it seems logical to attribute it to cultural integration section.

The course is meant for new immigrants and foreigners with long-term residency in Germany, as well as ethnic Germans. Participation in the course can be both voluntary and obligatory (when lack of language competence is proved), in the latter case and/or if a person receives unemployment benefit it is free for the participant. (Integrationskursverordnung, 2004) The general integration course consists of a language course (600 hours) and an orientation course (45 hours). As a state integration project the main aim of the integration course is not the transfer of values (cultural level) but rather developing a person’s ability to

independently (without help of third persons) and meaningfully communicate in all most important spheres of life (that is on the social/interactional level). Thus, it is stated that in the language course, the vocabulary necessary for everyday situations is learnt (e.g. contact with authorities, conversations with neighbours and colleagues, writing letters and completing forms). The orientation course also informs about life in Germany and provides knowledge about legal system, culture and recent history of Germany – that may be regarded as elements of cultural integration. Besides, an emphasis is made on “transfer of democratic values and principles of the rule of law, equality, tolerance and freedom of religion”. (Integration Course, 2010) By the completion of the course, participants are to take both a language and orientation exam and to confirm the level B1 on the European scale of language competence (otherwise they can repeat parts of the course once again).

Since the introduction of the course in 2005 and till the end of 2010, about 890.000 participants enrolled in it and over 380.000 people finished the course. Despite being originally meant for the new-comers, in fact, the integration course proved to be rather a tool of the so-called “catching up integration” (“nachholende Integration”) as 63% of course participants had already lived in Germany for a long time. But, however, as the number of immigrants who have been resident in Germany for a long time and still do not possess a relevant linguistic competence is limited, the share of this kind of integration course participants is expected to decrease in future. (Statistical Report (Integration Course), 2010) But still, according to the former Minister of Interior, Thomas de Maizière, as of 2010, about 1.1 million foreigners in Germany possess a too low level of German (under B1). That is why the course is planned to be slightly prolonged. (BZ Berlin, 2010)

#### **b) ESF-BAMF Programme**

Profession-oriented courses of German also exist since 2005 and are a joint programme of BAMF and the European Social Fund. (Berufsbezogene Deutschkurse ESF-BAMF-Programm, 2011) According to Respondent 3,

*It is also a language programme carried out by BAMF aimed at integrating migrants into the labour market. It is meant for the period of 2008 till 2013. It is about labour market integration. This is language courses, but not only: it is combined with an internship at an enterprise, and you can practice your language there. It is free for everybody, and if you have finished the integration course and reached B1 and you want to learn more for your later life in the labour market about specific jobs, you can visit this ESF programme. Everybody can participate...*

The objective of this programme is to help a person find a job or a trainee position afterwards. As 14.859 participants have started the course and 5.274 have already completed it, it can be said to be among most successful projects. (Bundesregierung, 2010) (p.254)

### **c) Mother-tongue instruction**

Native languages' instruction is also available now in more and more schools as an extracurricular activity. Before, this kind of bi-lingual schools also existed either as public schools supported by the consulates, or as private schools supported by the local ethnic community and/or the state of origin. They were meant to enable foreign workers' children return home (in terms of rotation system). Now, as multilingualism is officially regarded as a reality and as a competence that should be valued and promoted by the state, this kind of schools are often financed by the Federal government and aim at encouraging cultural and linguistic diversity in the country. Expert 8 came up with a personal example:

*Even at the school where my children study there are extra classes in 10 languages (Russian, Turkish, English, etc.), they are voluntary. It is just an average school. That was a pilot project supported by Freistaat Bayern and aimed at migrant children, at "activating their capacities", to show that it is not that they are unable to speak any German, but that they are able to do many things, they can already read and write in their language...*

### **d) Islam instruction in public schools**

Apart from language, religion is also an important means of transfer of cultural values. Though Germany is a secular state, traditionally the church has a leading role in public life and civil society; religion has been also institutionalized as a subject at schools. Up till a few years ago, Islam (as the most prominent religion of migrants in Germany) was not in the list of confessions, which pupils could choose to study. Recently, however, basing on the recommendations made in

the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of DIK, a number of schools in different federal lands have started pilot projects (supported by BAMF) introducing Islam as a subject as well. There are now already about 250 schools in Germany, where Islam was included as a subject of religious education. (Islamischer Religionsunterricht in Deutschland, 2011) (p.24) According to Interview Partner 4,

*Before there had been also similar projects but in single states... DIK gave now a strong impetus and, as a consequence, in many states there is now this kind of projects, and work continues. The main goal is to be able to offer Islam as one of subjects of religious education at schools on the federal basis, in all states to an equal extent... We have about 700.000 Muslim pupils in Germany, and they should have similar rights to choose their religion and not be excluded anymore...*

### **Social integration**

Special policies of social integration refer to fostering interaction between immigrants and native population.

#### **a) Local Integration**

The programme “Local Integration” (“Integration vor Ort”) deals closely with spatial segregation, communal integration possibilities and the necessity for spatial policy in disadvantaged migrant areas. The Federal Government stated in the National Integration Plan: “When ethnic segregation coincides with poverty segregation – of the German population as well – the state and society should take measures”. (Bundesregierung, 2010) (p.261) A number of local projects exists aiming at diminishing the concentration of migrants in the so-called “migrant districts”, for example, “Migrants in the city” (“Zuwanderer in der Stadt”) or at fighting discrimination on the housing market, etc. In terms of the city development policy, integration also became an important issue to deal with, such federal projects as “Social city” (“Stadtteile mit besonderem Entwicklungsbedarf – Soziale Stadt”) aiming at improving living conditions in poor areas (355 cities have participated and about 865 million euro were allocated) were developed.

It is important to remember that often spatial segregation and financial insolvency lead to further difficulties of structural integration (education, work, etc.). This issue also came into focus of the Local Integration programme. To improve

educational and professional opportunities of migrants, integrate the unemployed and young people in the job market and reinforce the local economy, the Federal Ministry for Transport, Construction and City Development with the sponsorship of the European Social Fund (184 million euro for 2008-2012) has established a programme “Social City – Education, economy, Construction and City Development in the District” (BIWAQ). (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.269)

### **b) Integration of migrant women**

Migrant women are often regarded by the German authorities as a particularly problematic group. As in some of the countries they come from they occupy a lower position than men and are often excluded from participation in many institutions, like labour market, political institutions, etc., when coming to Germany they also tend to be less integrated than male migrants, cultural gap and language barrier add to this. That is why a number of projects exist, whose target group is migrant women in particular (all women are accepted irrespective of their level of German, etc.): they help them understand better the German society, learn German and thus better support their children. They also get a chance to speak to other women and establish contacts, for example, to public bodies, associations, schools, etc. (Integrationsprojekte, 2010)

### **c) Measures for the host society**

In the new paradigm, integration is seen not as a “one-way street” (“keine Einbahnstraße”) but as a mutual process and this way includes measures for “integration” of the host society as well: “... *that concerns not only what an immigrant is to fulfil when he comes here, but also equally it concerns the host society*” (Respondent 3).

#### *i. Diversity Management/”Intercultural Opening”*

A new programme of the Federal State – Diversity Management/”Intercultural Opening” (“Interkulturelle Öffnung”) – “opening of the society and its institutions for migrants” – is encouraging increase in the number of employees with migrational background. There is no definite programme or law (like quotas in

some other immigration countries), it is rather a recommendation mainly addressed to public and educational institutions, etc., to care about ethnic diversity of their personnel and see it as a benefit. (Interkulturelle Öffnung) It is more a question of publicity and propaganda, “even Angela Merkel is saying that we need more people with migrational background in the governing structures, ‘we want to correspond to the reality that we have, that is why it is necessary that these people would also be involved with these institutions’” (Expert 1).

According to Interviewee 9,

*The first ones who were eager to employ more people who have a migration experience were the police, because they said: we need people that speak Turkish and other languages... And now other public entities do it, like our Federal Office, it specifically tries to hire people with migration background. It doesn't mean that we write in the job offer: people with migrational background are especially welcome. Police, for example, goes to schools and presents these programmes to children, because in many migrant families the original “German” jobs are not well-known, for example, a Turkish family for a long time couldn't imagine that their child goes and becomes a policeman, this was not on the agenda. So actually we need more measures to reach this group. It is not enough to use traditionally German ways to attract this group, we need more initiative. You can't just say “oh, nobody is applying!” but you need to investigate the reasons...*

As already mentioned, BAMF was among the first governing institutions that started paying attention to employing people with migrational background, according to Respondent 6, “about 15-20% of people with migrational background are presently (in 2011) working at BAMF”. Expert 1, however, sees this situation in quite a different light:

*In the context of more migrants in public sphere project, our former president [of the Office] tried to “urgently” find migrants in our Federal Office, organised a survey about migrational background hoping that we have many migrants. I don't know anybody but they call almost everybody a migrant...*

This may be a drawback of a very broad definition of “migrant”, so a question arises here, if people who are already more or less integrated in the society should still be called migrants and remain target groups for integration projects, instead of focusing on those who really need integration measures.

*ii. “Teachers with migrational background” programme*

Apart from ministries and police, educational establishments and youth associations also strive to employ more people with migrational background. Programme “Teachers with migrational background” is an important part of opening of educational institutions for migrant employees (in 2008, there were only 5% of school teachers with migrational background (Bundesregierung, 2010) (p.109)). Respondent 2 describes this programme in the following way:

*Before, in the part about education, the main focus was on the parents with migrational background: so that they are involved at schools and participate in the parents’ clubs, associations, etc... Now the focus is on teachers. It was found out that there are not so many persons with migrational background that want to become a teacher... Now meetings, etc. are initiated to involve teachers, encourage networking among teachers that have migrational background, to find what needs students with migrational background have: to study successfully, to start studying, to decide to study to become a teacher too.*

Teachers with migrational background do not only add to the ethnic diversity at school and present an example of successful integration, but also often have a better understanding of the needs and hidden resources of students with migrational background. According to Expert 2,

*It is important to have teachers with migrational background because they are “Brückenbauer” [“bridge builders/mediators”], they already possess intercultural competences (not all though) just because they themselves have migrational background and could act as mediators in different situations and be a positive role model.*

### *iii. Influencing the way of thinking*

#### *Bringing up new generation in diversity*

Nowadays it is often easier to bring up children and young people who are used to living in an immigrant society to accept people who are different from them, than teach new values to representatives of old generations. According to Expert 10,

*Now it is just inevitable to accept existence of other cultures, because this is the fact. Take the example of schools. Children start studying and about 30% of pupils (40% in some cities!) already speak more than language. They are not migrants, they were born here but they speak more than one language, and their parents might speak more than two languages. And nobody can deny this fact, and for schools it is a reality to deal with...*

That is, sometimes people are just forced to accept it this way, but for many younger people living in an immigrant society is already a norm, providing educational institutions also accept it and value. According to Respondent 10, “*some private schools still implicitly exercise an exclusion policy towards migrants, but those are few...*” Interviewee 9 gives a personal example:

*In our school (which is a common public school) at the entrance, there are a lot of billboards where all the countries are shown from where children have come from, or their parents. They are in different languages, the territory is written... how much bigger/smaller than Germany it is, how to say hello and bye in this language. And pictures of children are also there. And you can stand and look at the picture with your kid and think if you know this or other child or not... That's why I think children should be brought up in tolerance through institutions. These kids will grow up in an absolutely different world. Those people who are over 40-50 and vote for the Conservatives will be very hard to change...*

### *Cross-cultural trainings*

Apart from that, in the public bodies special cross-cultural trainings providing more information about foreign population are organised. According to Respondent 9,

*Here, in BAMF, for example, since 2010, there is an intercultural training where employees obtain relevant intercultural skills. And in other organisations, in police, in schools, etc. these also takes place.*

Participants of this kind of trainings are familiarised with basic concepts of intercultural communications, and by means of role games and discussions one is supposed to get rid of their “cultural glasses” and change one’s attitude to foreigners. Having taken part in one of this kind of trainings at BAMF, I can’t but admit that they present a big interest for employees (with and without migrational background) and as a result bring people to often surprising conclusions.

### *Shaping “welcoming culture”*

“Welcoming culture” (“Willkommenskultur”) is a brand new term for the German society. Respondent 6 explains it in the following way:

*‘Willkommenskultur’ is often mentioned these days, for example, by politicians, by de Maizière, for instance, and we try to fill it with meaning. It is very broad... I understand is welcoming every culture and cultural aspects of people with migrational background. What we could do here, for example, is combine integration measures in a way that people find their way easier, acculturate easier. For example, in Hamburg there is Welcome Centre that brings together integration*

*measures and programmes, there is also a welcome club there, and they organise events where every new-comer can go to and make contacts, etc. It is good example of the way state develops “welcoming culture” in Germany. We try to make it a good example for other regions, for smaller towns as well. But in other cities Welcome Centres also exist. Most German universities also have something similar, some already name it “Welcome Centre”. It is to help immigrants but it is also a measure for the host society. It structures the way we look at migrants, we don’t call it ‘Ausländerbehörde’ [Foreigners’ Office], we call it – a Welcome Centre. That is a shift in the way we look at things, a shift we have to make...*

In the new paradigm, diversity is a reality and a value. Not always, however, the host society is ready to accept this reality and adapt to it. Therefore, the state sometimes needs to impose some measures and views “from above”. Language is often as important tool to shape the way people think, a well-known example is the Political Correctness concept popular in the USA, for example. There are practically no signs of it in Germany yet, but it may also become an alternative measure.

Respondent 1 adds a critical point towards programmes aimed at influencing the way people think:

*There are a lot of smaller and bigger projects that are more like advertising aimed at... changing mentality. For example, they make an exhibition, tell about destinies of migrants, found a museum of migration (there is one in Hamburg), etc. But I am not sure that anybody who wasn’t conscious of it would suddenly become more understanding...*

It is hard to argue against it, as well as it is hard to expect people to start thinking differently over such a short period of time like the one that has passed in Germany since society started to accept itself as an immigration country.

However, “intercultural opening” still may be regarded as a key concept for understanding German integration policy:

*Before, Germany had never referred to itself as an “immigration country”, but after the Immigration Act of 2005 Germany became an immigration country. And that means not only that people that come to us must learn from us, but also that we should learn from them... The process of intercultural opening is a long process but it has already shown signs of positive development... (Respondent 3).*

#### *iiii. Informing host society*

Apart from the role of the state organisations in employing more people with migrational background and organising trainings, importance of Mass Media can’t

be underestimated. In respect of Islam coverage in the Media, for example, that is what Respondent 4 says:

*It is important to provide local German population with information about Muslim population too. One of the means is the website of DIK. Very often Islam is presented in negative light in media, with these political unrests in Africa for example, and this creates a negative image of Islam. Attempts are taken to avoid this kind of purely negative information...*

The same respondent also underlines the role of different events and conference that take place on the state and local level to draw attention of the population to the topics of migration and integration. This way, we may say that Mass Media, example of state organisations and different events have been the main means to provide “integration” of the host society.

### ***Identificational integration***

Identificational integration is the hardest to promote and the hardest to evaluate. Many projects may be said to contribute to the identificational integration in the long run. For some people, on the other hand, identificational integration with the German society may never become a reality (can be simply because they do not need it), even despite their successful integration on the other levels. This is supported by the fact that though including three above-mentioned dimensions of integration that of identification is not mentioned as a separate section in the lists of German integration projects. Besides, referring to all the people (about 16 million), yet whose grandparents moved to Germany, as immigrants does not anyhow promote feeling of unity among population. However, still to some projects identificational aspects may be ascribed a bit more - for example, to ‘civic participation’ (“bürgerschaftliche Engagement“).

#### ***a) Civic participation***

According to the new integration programme, being active as a civic actor is a basis for identification with the whole system, social cooperation and involvement in the democratic decision-making process on all political levels. (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.284) Thus, migrants are encouraged to participate

more in the political institutions of the German state. Engagement in the activity of the voluntary organisations and migrant institutions is also an important issue. The in 2007 started initiative “Civic participation – next to each other and for each other”, for example, encourages involvement of members of migrant organisations in voluntary service and their cooperation with similar German associations. The particular emphasis is on the participation of migrant women: the objective is to familiarize them with the concept of being a member of the civil society and support female organisations. (Bundesregierung, 2010, p.293)

*b) Projects for ethnic Germans*

A number of projects for ethnics Germans exist on all levels, but identificational integration may be deemed of more importance for them than for other migrant groups. As having granted the citizenship, they enjoy all the rights of German citizens (that is they are in a more beneficial position than other migrants), but often do not perceive themselves as Germans.

For example, a course “Identity and Identity PLUS” is designed specifically for ethnic Germans and deals with the questions of identity (which can be implied by the name already), as well as “possibilities and problems of coping with daily life in the new environment: opportunities at the labour market, German educational system, daily life and family in Germany, etc. are studied”. (Integrationsprojekte, 2010)

***Conclusion: Integration in Germany – between assimilation, acculturation and multiculturalism***

In 2009, about 400 integration projects were carried out by the German state in cooperation with different associations, foundations, migrant organisations, etc. BAMF provided for it resources amounting to about 14 million euro and the Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors and Youths – about 7.2 million euro. (Projektjahrbuch 2009) Angela Merkel refers to promotion of integration as one of the most important issues of her programme. (Angela Merkel) One may conclude now, that for a few years already integration has been an official policy of the state.

However, German understanding of integration differs from popular definitions and, in fact, represents a combination of assimilation, acculturation and multiculturalism. *Multiculturalism* is usually limited to structural and functional integration coupled with retained cultural diversity. *Assimilation* and *acculturation*, on the other hand, are the means of cultural and identificational integration. Taking into consideration variety of the measures and projects discussed, all of those types of integration are present in German integration policy. Integration in the labour market, educational system, welfare state, cultural integration (especially in the sense of acquisition of language) were main areas of focus of integration in Germany before 2005. In this framework, knowing the language has always been regarded (both in the old and the new paradigm) as one of the preconditions for the subsequent integration in all other spheres.

Besides, after 2005 *active* participation in all spheres of life becomes a goal. Projects of cultural and social integration become more numerous, ideas about encouragement of political participation appear, respect of German constitutional and moral values starts to be mentioned as a basic condition for integration. Most importantly, an understanding comes that immigrants are not a bugbear and an extra burden for the social system but are rather a benefit for the whole society; that they should be treated equally and have the same chances as the local population. This way, support of languages and religions of migrant groups comes naturally – that is one of the main features of multiculturalism. Germany is a multicultural society, and though multiculturalism is not a state policy, some features of it do find place there, as well as those of assimilation and acculturation.

However, an implicitly selective immigration policy can be said to have been introduced at the same time together with the integration policy: for very few categories of people it became easier to come to Germany and stay there. Therefore, a reverse, as compared to state of things before, picture can be stated: it used to be relatively easy to come to Germany, but it was difficult to be integrated there – now it is difficult to get there, but if one does it is much easier to be integrated and accepted.

What and in what case is better for the migrant and what for the host society remains a controversial point. Unfortunately, in this sense, interests of these two stake-holders do not always coincide. One cannot deny that being able to speak one's native language and profess one's religion is of importance. However, it seems that in contemporary society it is often more important now to have the same chances as the local population to study, work, have a family, participate in the social and political life, etc., and those are aspects of structural and social integration (language as a part of cultural integration still remaining a basic precondition). Understanding of multifacetedness and multidimensionality of integration is widely-spread now, and relevant measures have been taking place. But as already mentioned not once, integration is a very long and pain-stacking process requiring changes from both parties (immigrants and host society). And only later it will become clear if general position and opportunities of migrants in Germany have improved and if it was due to the state-regulated integration policy.

## Chapter V. Conclusion

Germany has come a long and thorny way from being a country of emigration to “not a country of immigration”, then becoming a country of immigration and to finally a country of integration<sup>23</sup>. 16 out of 82 million people that live now in Germany have a migrational experience or are descendants of those who had it. More than half of them already have a German citizenship. It is an undeniable fact now that Germany is a country of immigration.

Answering the research questions of this paper, it is necessary to point out the main changes that have been slowly taking place since the 1990s and became in particular evident after their official recognition by the Immigration Act of 2005. All of them are closely interconnected, and the basic reason for them is the official recognition of Germany as an immigration country: *“before Germany had never referred to itself as an ‘immigration country’, but after the Immigration Act of 2005 Germany BECAME an immigration country”* (Respondent 3). And in an immigration country, migrants are not any longer a temporary phenomenon, something that would come and go. Special measures need to be taken, attitudes need to be changed.

First of all, the Immigration Act was new in the sense that it created an absolutely new legal framework for the **state-coordinated integration policy**. *“Pooling together, joining and developing interconnectedness of responsibilities, duties and finances”* took place (Expert 3). Before, there had been no integration projects on the state level. The ones that existed on the level of federal states, municipalities, etc. lacked consistency and by nature could not be available all across the country. Therefore, immigrants in different regions of Germany could not benefit in an equal way from integration measures. Closely linked to it is the fact that the change was initiated not by the state, but was rather a response of the state to the demands of actors of lower level: municipalities and federal lands.

---

<sup>23</sup> Country of integration (“Integrationsland”) is a concept used by CDU and CSU.

Secondly, a crucial **change of paradigm** in the attitude to integration and to perception of immigrants started to take place. As Respondent 9 puts it, “*in 2005 it is not just that the integration policy appeared, it is that this resource-oriented discourse became clear in big politics...*” Before, the approach was rather **deficit-oriented**, immigrants were viewed as problem groups by definition lacking something and therefore requiring compensatory measures, such as to learn the local language, adapt to lifestyle and values, get used to the ideals of democracy, etc. Interviewee 1 points out that

*...In the 90s the discussion started from the more lobbyist structures... that this drawback-oriented approach is not right, and that in reality those are people with hidden advantages that came, but those advantages in terms of the existing here system, i.e. labor market and their opportunities, including the legal ones, are not revealed and enhanced here anyhow. And integration policy should be more oriented on how to support and promote what they already have...*

Expert 3 presents a similar point of view about new **resource-oriented approach**: “*not only people that come to us must learn from us, but also we should learn from them*”. Support of native languages and different religions, recognition of foreign qualifications, antidiscrimination measures are among most typical examples of this new approach. Despite “*having put on new glasses*” (Expert 1), some projects still retain the flair of a social problem to be solved, for example, fighting drug addiction, alcoholism, crime rates, that is fighting the consequences instead of promoting better integration of people into society and searching for the origin of the problem. Besides, some aspects of integration, such as language, for instance, can only be dealt in terms of deficit-oriented approach. Therefore, the integration course can be said to be in the framework of this approach: when a person does not know the language it cannot be anyhow considered as an advantage. Though, according to Interviewee 1,

*In general now, big opportunities are open to experiment with resource-oriented approach. Even those projects that existed 20 years ago, they try to reformulate their activity in the framework of resource-oriented approach... despite the fact that they do exactly what they used to do before, 20 years ago.*

This way, **language** has always been considered in Germany as a basis for successful integration. First projects organized by the welfare state organizations were the language courses, and the main present-day state project is one as

well. Angela Merkel mentions obligatory language tests for children and promotion of language learning as the main measure under the heading of integration in her programme. (Angela Merkel) Language is an indispensable tool to understand the society, to interact with other people, to work and lead a full life. It can be by right called the key to integration.

**Religion**, unlike language, became an absolutely new area that was said to be lacking integration measures. **Islam**, as a religion of about 4 million people in Germany, was pointed out in particular:

*State hadn't done much for integration in respect of Islam in Germany, up till now infrastructures for exercising religion were lacking, that is mosques, teaching Islam at schools, training Islam theologians at the universities, etc... And after 2005, it became also one of the areas to work at. (Respondent 4)*

All the programmes in this direction can also be considered as an element of the resource-oriented approach: valuing identity of immigrants, which as well as all the other members of the society have a right to choose religion and maintain religion of their ancestors. Often it is regarded as an element of culture too.

Another consequence of the paradigm change from deficit- to resource-oriented approach is that integration started to be perceived as “**not a one-way street**”: “... the German society should also open up for migrants and not the contrary, when they [migrants] must try, try and try to find their place and accommodate somehow” (Respondent 1). The main term here is the “**intercultural opening**” (“diversity management”): letting immigrants share their experience and skills with the host society, understanding that both will only benefit from it. Integration in this new sense means active participation. Therefore, “as for 2005 and this paradigm change, the key saying then was and is to guarantee that immigrants in Germany can **ACTIVELY participate in life**” (Expert 3). Before 2005, there were no widely spread ideas that immigrants should be not just let alone interfering as little as possible with the life of the host society, but that they should rather become active members of the society.

What is more, often the concept “**Fördern und Fordern**” (“Encourage and Demand”) is cited as one of the main ideas underlying the whole new concept of

integration in Germany. It basically implies providing opportunities for migrants to integrate and at the same time expecting them to take the given opportunities and to want to become full members of the German society. The idea of mutuality is also a basis of process of integration: not only a migrant should be integrated; host society also needs to get accustomed to equally treating its immigrant share of population. Prevention, accompanying and catching up – these are main strategies of integration policy after 2005: solving yet unsolved issues with immigrants who have been in Germany for a long time, ensuring that new immigrants are also well-integrated, and thinking ahead of what other problematic areas may appear.

An absolutely new thing, in connection to this, is the idea that the way people view and perceive immigrants should be changed accordingly with the new state policy. As Expert 6 said, the discussion about it is only starting. The state begins to undertake measures (founding immigration history museums, holding relevant conferences, setting up ‘Welcome centres’, etc.) to help native population see immigration as a normal phenomenon and immigrants as full, equal and “normal” members of the society, not anyhow different from anybody else. **Changing perception** is not a one day process, it is very hard to make people who have their own set of values and views on the world think differently. For young generations, however, it is easier: they can be already brought up seeing diversity as a norm and as an advantage. Perhaps that is how the change will take place in the minds of people too.

What, however, seems quite contradictory in this sense is the **new definition of an immigrant** as a broad concept of a person with migrational background. As already explained above, introduction of this definition was necessary to make sure that groups that are in particular need of integration measures would be covered by the policy and would not ‘escape’ from statistics just because they do not have migrational experience themselves (meaning that their parents, for example, were the ‘real’ immigrants in the usual meaning of it) or because they already have a German citizenship. Though serving the state need of justifying to some extent the introduction of the integration policy, this new concept ‘makes’

almost one fifth of the country's population immigrants. What is more, these people and their children who may be perfectly integrated in the society and even feel more German than anybody else may be doomed to be referred to as immigrants for many more years to come. A logical question would be: what is the sense of integration, if one still remains a migrant? Expert 10 asks a similar question that seems quite rhetorical though:

*So where does immigration biography end? At the moment when they get a passport in which it is written "Deutsch"? Or does it end with their children who already know hardly anything about their home country? Or will their grandchildren be also considered migrants?*

And no answer to this question exists yet.

Summing up all the main trends that received official recognition with the Immigration Act of 2005 or only appeared after 2005, one can't but notice that the way Germany views integration is rather specific: it is seen as a combination of assimilation, acculturation and multiculturalism. Main focus of multiculturalism is usually on structural and functional integration and retaining of cultural diversity, whereas assimilation and acculturation aim at cultural and identificational integration. Taking into consideration variety of the measures and projects discussed, all of those types of integration are present in German integration policy: therefore, German integration policy may be seen as a concept having **features of multiculturalism, assimilation and acculturation** at the same time.

All in all, introducing a state integration policy is undoubtedly a very big step for Germany. Much time is needed still for all the great designs to be brought into life and show results. This way, it may well be considered a turning point for Germany and German people. If it is as good and necessary for all 16 million of immigrants in Germany will become clear only later.

## List of references

1. Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. First Harvard University Press.
2. Anerkennung ausländischer abschlüsse. (2011, March 23). Retrieved May 6, 2011, from Bundesregierung: <http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Artikel/2011/03/2011-03-23-neues-gesetz-erkennung-auslaendischer-abschluesse.html>
3. Angela Merkel. (n.d.). Retrieved May 3, 2011, from 10 Punkte für ein starkes Deutschland: <http://www.angela-merkel.de/page/154.htm>
4. Antidiskriminierungsstelle. (n.d.). Retrieved May 8, 2011, from Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend: <http://www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/Ministerium/antidiskriminierungsstelle.html>
5. Antidiskriminierungsverband Deutschland. (2011, February). Retrieved May 1, 2011, from <http://www.antidiskriminierung.org/?q=node/297>
6. Arbeitslosengeld II. (n.d.). Retrieved April 29, 2011, from Landeszentrale für Politische Bildung: [http://www.lpb-bw.de/hartz\\_iv.html](http://www.lpb-bw.de/hartz_iv.html)
7. AusIG. (2004). Retrieved May 1, 2011, from Aufenthaltstitel: <http://www.aufenthaltstitel.de/auslg.html#85>
8. Bade, K. J. (2004, November). "Leitkultur"-Debatte.Zuwanderung wird als Bedrohung empfunden. Retrieved April 2011, from Spiegel Online: <http://www.spiegel.de/kultur/gesellschaft/0,1518,druck-329285,00.html>
9. Bade, K. J. (2000). *Europa in Bewegung: Migration vom späten 18. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
10. Bade, K. J. (1997). *From Emigration to Immigration: the German Experience in the 19th and 20th Century*. In M. W. Klaus J. Bade, *Migration Past, Migration Future: Germany and the United States*. Providence, R.I.: Berghahn.
11. Bade, K. J. (2000). *Migration und Integration in Deutschland seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Probleme - Erfolge - Perspektiven*. Niedersächsische Landeszentrale für Politische Bildung.
12. Bade, K. J. (1992). *Paradoxon Bundesrepublik: Einwanderungssituation ohne Einwanderungsland*. In K. J. Bade, *Deutsche im Ausland - Fremde in Deutschland*. München.
13. Bade, K. J. (1987). *Population, Labour, and Migration in the 19th- and 20th-Century Germany*. New York: Berg.
14. BAMF Aufgaben. (2011). Retrieved May 1, 2011, from BAMF: <http://www.bamf.de/DE/DasBAMF/Aufgaben/aufgaben-node.html>
15. Belwe Katarina, Leibold Jürgen, Heitmeyer Wilhelm, Halm Dirk. (2006, January). *Parallelgesellschaften?* Retrieved April 3, 2011, from Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung: <http://www.bpb.de/files/AQ6PWB.pdf>
16. Bundesausländerbeauftragte. (n.d.). Retrieved May 4, 2011, from <http://www.bundesauslaenderbeauftragte.de/bundesauslaenderbeauftragte.html>
17. Bundesregierung. (2006, June). Retrieved May 4, 2011, from General equal treatment bill passed: [http://www.bundesregierung.de/nn\\_6562/Content/EN/Artikel/2006/06/2006-06-29-allgemeines-gleichbehandlungsgesetz-beschlossen.html](http://www.bundesregierung.de/nn_6562/Content/EN/Artikel/2006/06/2006-06-29-allgemeines-gleichbehandlungsgesetz-beschlossen.html)
18. Bundesregierung. (2010, June). Retrieved April 10, 2011, from 8. Bericht der Beauftragten der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration über die Lage der Ausländerinnen und Ausländer in Deutschland:

- [http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/\\_\\_\\_Anlagen/2010/2010-07-07-langfassung-lagebericht-ib.property=publicationFile.pdf](http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/___Anlagen/2010/2010-07-07-langfassung-lagebericht-ib.property=publicationFile.pdf)
19. Bundesweites Integrationsprogramm. (2010). Retrieved May 15, 2011, from Integration in Germany: [http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/nn\\_282954/SubSites/Integration/DE/03\\_\\_Akteure/Programm/programm-node.html?\\_\\_nnn=true](http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/nn_282954/SubSites/Integration/DE/03__Akteure/Programm/programm-node.html?__nnn=true)
  20. BZ Berlin. (2010, September 2010). Retrieved May 2, 2011, from <http://www.bz-berlin.de/archiv/bundesregierung-will-mehr-lehrer-mit-migrationshintergrund-einsetzen-article972584.html>
  21. Castles, S. (1995). How Nation-States Respond to Immigration and Ethnic Diversity. *New Community* 21(3) , 293-308.
  22. Cohen Yinon, Haberfeld Yitchak, Kogan Irena. (2008). Jüdische Migration aus der ehemaligen Sowjetunion. Ein natürliches Experiment zur Migrationsentscheidung. In F. Kalter, *Migration und Integration* (pp. 185-202). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
  23. Cologne Institute for Economic Research (2011, April 26). Retrieved April 14, 2011, from <http://www.iwkoeln.de/Presse/Pressemitteilungen/tabid/183/articleid/31040/Default.aspx>
  24. Doerr, K. (2011, April 26). Over a million EU migrants seen set for Germany - study. Retrieved April 2011, from *Finanznachrichten*: <http://www.finanznachrichten.de/nachrichten-2011-04/20040185-over-a-million-eu-migrants-seen-set-for-germany-study-020.htm>
  25. Deutsche Islam Konferenz (2010). Retrieved May 4, 2011, from Deutsche Islam Konferenz: [http://www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/cln\\_110/nn\\_1318820/SubSites/DIK/DE/AufgabenZiele/AufgabenZiele/inhalte-node.html?\\_\\_nnn=true](http://www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/cln_110/nn_1318820/SubSites/DIK/DE/AufgabenZiele/AufgabenZiele/inhalte-node.html?__nnn=true)
  26. Duncan, H. G. (1933). *Immigration and Assimilation*. Boston: Heath.
  27. Esser Hartmut, K. H. (1985). Federal Republic of Germany. In *Comparative Ethnic and Race Relations. European Immigration Policy* (pp. 165-205). Cambridge University Press.
  28. Esser, H. (1999). *Inklusion, Integration und ethnische Schichtung*. Retrieved April 2011, from *Journal für Konflikt- und Gewaltforschung*. Vol. 1, 1: <http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/ikg/jkg/1-1999/esser.pdf>
  29. Esser, H. (2001). *Inklusion, Integration und ethnische Schichtung*. Mannheim: Arbeitspapiere - Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung.
  30. Esser, H. (n.d.). *Integration und ethnische Schichtung. Zusammenfassung einer Studie für das „Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung“*. Retrieved April 2011, from <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/akademie/online/50366.pdf>
  31. Esser, H. (2006). *Migration, Language and Integration*. AKI Research review 4. Berlin: Programme on Intercultural Conflicts and Societal Integration (AKI). Social Science Research Center Berlin.
  32. Favell, A. (1999). *Integration policy and integration research in Europe: a review and critique*. Report prepared for the Carnegie Endowment 'Comparative Citizenship Project' (June/Nov 1999). Retrieved April 2011, from <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/favell/CARN-PUB.htm>
  33. Federal Commissioner for Foreigners. (n.d.). Retrieved April 2, 2011, from Federal Commissioner for Foreigners: <http://www.bundesauslaenderbeauftragte.de/bundesauslaenderbeauftragte.html>

34. Federal Commissioner for Foreigners. Retrieved April 29, 2011, from <http://www.bundesauslaenderbeauftragte.de/integration.html>
35. Federal Office for Migration and Refugees. (2011, March). Retrieved April 13, 2011, from Aktuelle Zahlen zu Asyl: [http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Downloads/Infothek/Statistik/statistik-anlage-teil-4-aktuelle-zahlen-zu-asyl.pdf;jsessionid=BCE4EC09437842C0CF1CA72C06AACD53?\\_\\_blob=publicationFile](http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Downloads/Infothek/Statistik/statistik-anlage-teil-4-aktuelle-zahlen-zu-asyl.pdf;jsessionid=BCE4EC09437842C0CF1CA72C06AACD53?__blob=publicationFile)
36. Federal Office for Recognition of Foreign Refugees. (2003). Retrieved April 5, 2011, from Bundesamt für die Anerkennung ausländischer Flüchtlinge. 50 Jahre Behörde im Wandel: [www.prointegration.org/pdf/Download.pdf](http://www.prointegration.org/pdf/Download.pdf)
37. Gesemann Frank, Rott Rolland. (2009). Lokale Integrationspolitik in the Einwanderungsgesellschaft. Migration und Integration als Herausforderung von Kommunen. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
38. Grundgesetz. (n.d.). Retrieved April 5, 2011, from Bundestag: [http://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/rechtsgrundlagen/grundgesetz/gg\\_01.html](http://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/rechtsgrundlagen/grundgesetz/gg_01.html)
39. Grundgesetz 1949. (n.d.). Retrieved April 25, 2011, from Constitutions: <http://www.verfassungen.de/de/gg.htm>
40. Grunwald, H. (2001). Ist Deutschland ein Einwanderungsland? Gedankenansätze aus bayerischer Perspektive. In W. T. Curle Edda, Deutschland - ein Einwanderungsland? Rückblick, Bilanz und neue Fragen (pp. 47-50). Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
41. Hammar, Tomas. (1985). European Immigration Policy. A Comparative Study. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
42. Hannoversche Allgemeine. (2009, November 23). Retrieved May 11, 2011, from <http://www.haz.de/Nachrichten/Politik/Deutschland-Welt/Boehmer-strebt-Integrationsvertraege-mit-Zuwanderern-an>
43. Heckmann Friedrich, B. W. (n.d.). Integration of migrants: Contribution of local and regional authorities. Retrieved April 2011, from European Forum for Migration Studies (EFMS) at the University of Bamberg, Germany: <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2006/22/en/1/ef0622en.pdf>
44. Heckmann Friedrich, Schnapper Dominique. (2003). The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies. National Differences and Trends of Convergence. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
45. Heckmann, F. (2003). From Ethnic Nation to Universalistic Immigrant Integration: Germany. In D. S. Friedrich Heckmann, The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies. National Differences and Trends of Convergence. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
46. Heckmann, F. (2004). The integration of Immigrants in European Societies. In B. C. Kilton Tom, Migration in societ, culture, and the library: WESS European Conference. Paris.
47. Heitmeyer, W. (1997). Verlockender Fundamentalismus: Türkische Jugendliche in Deutschland. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
48. Hermann, H. (1992). Ausländer: von Gastarbeiter zum Wirtschaftsfaktor. Köln: Der Institut der Deutschen Wirtschaft.
49. Hoffmann-Nowotny, H.-J. (1973). Soziologie des Fremdarbeiterproblems. Eine theoretische und empirische Analyse am Beispiel der Schweiz. Stuttgart: Enke.
50. Hönekopp, E. (1997). The New Labour Migration as an Instrument of German Foreign Policz. In M. W. Rainer Münz, Migrants, Refugees, and Foreign Policy: U.S. and German Policies toward Countries of Origin. Providence, R.I.: Berghahn.

51. Ingenhoven, K. (2003). "Ghetto" oder gelungene Integration? Untersuchung sozialräumlicher Entwicklungsprozesse in der bedeutendsten Siedlungskonzentration von Aussiedlern aus Rumänien, der Siebenbürgerß Sachsenß Siedlung in Wiehlß Drabenderhöhe (NRW). Retrieved April 2011, from [http://books.google.ru/books?id=DhTagXDC1O4C&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.ru/books?id=DhTagXDC1O4C&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)
52. Integration Course. (2010). Retrieved May 12, 2011, from Integration in Germany: <http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/EN/Integration/Downloads/Integrationskurse/Kursteilnehmer/MerkblaetterAuslaender/merkblatt-zz-auslaenderbehoerde-630-036b-englisch,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/merkblatt-zz-auslaen>
53. Integrationskursverordnung. (2004). Retrieved May 1, 2011, from <http://www.aufenthaltstitel.de/intv.html#1>
54. Integrationsprojekte. (2010). Retrieved May 15, 2011, from Integration in Germany: [http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/cIn\\_110/nn\\_284058/SubSites/Integration/DE/01\\_\\_Ueberblick/Angebote/Integrationsprojekte/integrationsprojekte-node.html?\\_\\_nnn=true](http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/cIn_110/nn_284058/SubSites/Integration/DE/01__Ueberblick/Angebote/Integrationsprojekte/integrationsprojekte-node.html?__nnn=true)
55. Integration through Qualification. Retrieved May 13, 2011, from Integration durch Qualifizierung: <http://intqua.de/>
56. Interkulturelle Öffnung. (n.d.). Retrieved May 1, 2011, from Integration in Germany: [http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/nn\\_282926/SubSites/Integration/DE/03\\_\\_Akteure/Programm/Themen/Oeffnung/oeffnung-node.html?\\_\\_nnn=true](http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/nn_282926/SubSites/Integration/DE/03__Akteure/Programm/Themen/Oeffnung/oeffnung-node.html?__nnn=true)
57. Islamischer Religionsunterricht in Deutschland. (2011, February). Retrieved May 12, 2011, from Federal Ministry of Interior: [http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Broschueren/2011/relegionsunterricht.pdf?\\_\\_blob=publicationFile](http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Broschueren/2011/relegionsunterricht.pdf?__blob=publicationFile)
58. Joppke, C. (1999). *Immigration and the Nation-State. The United States, Germany and Great Britain.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
59. Krause, D. (2005). *Luhmann-Lexikon.* Retrieved April 16, 2011, from [http://books.google.ru/books?id=cN8pNb7BODMC&pg=PA65&lpg=PA65&dq=niklas+luhmann+integration&source=bl&ots=9dHR8z\\_ZgX&sig=RwebCoCvZg2S1tAMgdsah1Tw7lQ&hl=ru&ei=TV-tTd-xJcSBOsWxnNQL&sa=X&oi=book\\_result&ct=result&resnum=7&ved=0CEgQ6AEwBg#v=onepage&q=niklas%20](http://books.google.ru/books?id=cN8pNb7BODMC&pg=PA65&lpg=PA65&dq=niklas+luhmann+integration&source=bl&ots=9dHR8z_ZgX&sig=RwebCoCvZg2S1tAMgdsah1Tw7lQ&hl=ru&ei=TV-tTd-xJcSBOsWxnNQL&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=7&ved=0CEgQ6AEwBg#v=onepage&q=niklas%20)
60. Liebig, T. (2007). OECD. Retrieved April 28, 2011, from *The Labour Market Integration of Immigrants in Germany (OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 47)*: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/28/5/38163889.pdf>
61. Lockwood, D. (1969). Soziale Integration und Systemintegration. In W. Zapf, *Theorien des sozialen Wandels* (pp. 124-137).
62. Löffler, B. (2011). *Integration in Deutschland. Zwischen Assimilation und Multikulturalismus.* München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag GmbH.
63. Martin, P. L. (2004). *Germany: Managing Migration in the Twenty-First Century.* In T. T. Cornelius Wayne A., *Controlling Immigration: a Global Perspective* (pp. 220-260). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
64. Microcensus. (n.d.). Retrieved April 2011, from Federal Statistical Office: [http://www.destatis.de/jetspeed/portal/cms/Sites/destatis/Internet/EN/press/abisz/Mikrozensus\\_\\_e,templateId=renderPrint.psm1](http://www.destatis.de/jetspeed/portal/cms/Sites/destatis/Internet/EN/press/abisz/Mikrozensus__e,templateId=renderPrint.psm1)

65. Migration Online. (2007). Retrieved May 15, 2011, from [http://www.migration-online.de/schlagwort.\\_cGFnZS5zaWQ9NDlmcGlkPTIz\\_.html](http://www.migration-online.de/schlagwort._cGFnZS5zaWQ9NDlmcGlkPTIz_.html)
66. Migration Report. (2009). Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Federal Office for Migration and Refugees:  
[http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Migrationsberichte/migrationsbericht-2009.pdf?\\_\\_blob=publicationFile](http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Migrationsberichte/migrationsbericht-2009.pdf?__blob=publicationFile)
67. "Multikulti". (2011, May 21). Retrieved May 2, 2011, from Frankfurter Rundschau:  
<http://www.fr-online.de/home/-multikulti--wird-unterschiedlich-interpretiert-/1472778/4750114/-/index.html>
68. Multikulturalismus in Deutschland. (n.d.). Retrieved May 2, 2011, from Portal gegen Rassismus: <http://www.portal-gegen-rassismus.de/hintergrund/87-multikulturalismus>
69. Park, R. (1950). *Race and Culture*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
70. Projektjahrbuch 2009. (n.d.). Retrieved May 11, 2011, from Integration in Germany:  
[http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/cln\\_117/nn\\_284210/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Integration/Publikationen/Integrationsprojekte/projektjahrbuch-2009.html](http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/cln_117/nn_284210/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Integration/Publikationen/Integrationsprojekte/projektjahrbuch-2009.html)
71. Quota refugees. (2004). Retrieved April 25, 2011, from Aufenthaltstitel:  
<http://www.aufenthaltstitel.de/stichwort/konti.html>
72. Riedel, S. (2010). Muslim Self-Organisation between Etatism and Civil Society: Countries and Concepts. In B. M. Kreienbrink Axel, *Muslim Organisations and the State-European Perspectives* (pp. 22-37). Nürnberg BAMF.
73. Schäfers, B. (2004). *Sozialstruktur und sozialer Wandel in Deutschland*. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
74. Schönwälder Karen, Vogel Dita, Sciortino Giuseppe. (2006, February). *Migration and Illegality in Germany*. Retrieved April 2011, from Programme on Intercultural Conflicts and Societal Integration (AKI) at Social Science Research Center Berlin:  
[http://www2000.wzb.eu/alt/aki/files/aki\\_research\\_review\\_1.pdf](http://www2000.wzb.eu/alt/aki/files/aki_research_review_1.pdf)
75. Spiegel. (2001, November 5). Retrieved May 3, 2011, from Von der Green Card zum Einwanderungsgesetz: <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/a-166153.html>
76. Statistical Report (Integration Course). (2010). Retrieved May 6, 2011, from BAMF:  
[http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Integration/Downloads/Integrationskurse/Kurstraeger/Statistiken/2010\\_Integrationskursgeschaefsstatistik\\_3.\\_Quartal\\_2010,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/2010\\_Integrationskursge](http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Integration/Downloads/Integrationskurse/Kurstraeger/Statistiken/2010_Integrationskursgeschaefsstatistik_3._Quartal_2010,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/2010_Integrationskursge)
77. Süddeutsche. (2010, Maz). Retrieved April 18, 2011, from Einwanderung und Integration:  
<http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/einwanderung-und-integration-das-neue-deutschland-1.935423-3>
78. Uwe, F. (2009). *An Introduction into Qualitative Research*. Edition 4. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
79. Zuwanderungsgesetz. (2004, July). Retrieved May 5, 2011, from [http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Gesetzestexte/DE/Zuwanderungsgesetz.pdf?\\_\\_blob=publicationFile](http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Gesetzestexte/DE/Zuwanderungsgesetz.pdf?__blob=publicationFile)

## Appendix 1. List of respondents

1. Respondent 1: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (research department)
2. Respondent 2: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (integration department)
3. Respondent 3: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (integration department)
4. Respondent 4: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (integration department)
5. Respondent 5: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (integration department)
6. Respondent 6: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (integration department)
7. Respondent 7: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (integration department)
8. Respondent 8: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (integration department)
9. Respondent 9: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (research department)
10. Respondent 10: employee of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Germany (research department)



ZDES Working Papers

Arbeitspapiere des Zentrums für Deutschland- und Europastudien

Рабочие тетради Центра изучения Германии и Европы

Universität Bielefeld – Fakultät für Soziologie  
Postfach 100131 – 33501 Bielefeld – Deutschland

Staatliche Universität St. Petersburg – 7/9 Universitetskaja Nab.  
199034 St. Petersburg – Russland

<http://zdes.spb.ru/>

[info@zdes.spb.ru](mailto:info@zdes.spb.ru)