

Diversity, Governance and Integration – Policies in the City of Berlin

Dagmar Vinz

EURODIV PAPER 63.2009

JANUARY 2009

KTHC - Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital

Dagmar Vinz, *Freie Universität Berlin*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Series Index:
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/EURODIVpapers/default.htm>

The special issue on *Cultural Diversity* collects a selection of papers presented at the multidisciplinary and multinational Marie Curie project on “Cultural diversity in Europe: A series of Conferences” (EURODIV).

EURODIV focuses on cultural diversity in Europe and aims to understand the ways of dealing with diversity and its dynamics in the globalisation era. Its primary objective is to provide top-level training opportunities to researchers in the first years of their research career. EURODIV is a four-year project (2006-2009) co-ordinated by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) and supported by the European Commission, Sixth Framework Programme, Marie Curie Conferences and Training Courses (contract no. MSCF-CT-2004-516670).

Schedule of Conferences:

- **First Conference “Understanding diversity: Mapping and measuring”**, 26-27 January 2006, FEEM, Milano, Italy. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it
- **Second Conference “Qualitative diversity research: Looking ahead”**, 19-20 September 2006, K.U.Leuven, Leuven, Belgium. Contact person: Maddy Janssens, maddy.janssens@econ.kuleuven.ac.be, and Patrizia Zanoni, patrizia.zanoni@kuleuven.ac.be
- **Third Conference “Diversity in cities: Visible and invisible walls”**, 11-12 September 2007, UCL, London, UK. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it
- **Fourth Conference “Diversity in cities: New models of governance”**, 16-17 September 2008, IPRS, Rome, Italy. Contact person: Raffaele Bracalenti, iprs.it@iprs.it
- **Fifth Conference “Dynamics of diversity in the globalisation era”**, 15-16 September 2009, FEEM, Milan, Italy. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it

EURODIV goes in parallel with SUS.DIV, the Network of Excellence on sustainable development in a diverse world. For further information on EURODIV and SUS.DIV, please visit the web site: www.susdiv.org

This batch of papers has been presented at the Fourth Conference “Diversity in cities: New models of governance”.

Diversity, Governance and Integration – Policies in the City of Berlin

Summary

The term „diversity“ is prominent in the integration policy report of the Commissioner for Integration and Migration of the Senate of Berlin. The report, which informs about Berlin’s integration policy, is entitled „Encouraging Diversity – Strengthening Cohesion. Integration Policy in Berlin 2007-2011“. The title refers to the integration concept for Berlin that the Berlin Senate passed on August 23, 2005. This contains information about existing strategies and measures, and the focal points of the future integration policy. The concept of diversity in this report serves, so my assumption, as an idea of governance. The market is considered a central and especially efficient instrument of social governance. Within labour market policies diversity as a policy framework however, is not little problematic because it wants to sell difference as something positive and because it wants to define the otherness of „disadvantaged groups“ as potential. Last but not least the potential of the educational system as a mechanism of integration is discussed. The question is how integration policy can strengthen equal opportunities for pupils with migrational background in Berlin’s educational system in the sense of strengthening the potentials of diversity.

Keywords: Diversity, Integration, Governance, Berlin, Education, Employment, Equal Opportunities, Migration

JEL classification: I, R

Address for correspondence:

Dagmar Vinz
Freie Universität Berlin
Fachbereich Politik- und Sozialwissenschaften
Politikwissenschaft mit dem Schwerpunkt Gender und Diversity
Innestr. 22
14195 Berlin
Germany
Phone: +4903083852889
Fax: +4903083854041
E-mail: dagmar.vinz@fu-berlin.de

1.1 Diversity as a concept of governance

The term „diversity“ is prominent in the integration policy report of the Commissioner for Integration and Migration of the Senate of Berlin. The report, which informs about Berlin's integration policy, is entitled „Encouraging Diversity – Strengthening Cohesion. Integration Policy in Berlin 2007-2011“. The title refers to the integration concept for Berlin that the Berlin Senate passed on August 23, 2005. This contains information about existing strategies and measures, and the focal points of the future integration policy. The concept of diversity in this report serves, so my assumption, as an idea of governance. According to Holzinger and Knill (2003), changes of ideas of governance must be understood as new conceptions of goals and types of political governance that are becoming dominant within a policy field. These are „policy paradigms“ that refer to higher-ranking guiding principles with regard to concrete goals of governance in certain policy areas. Referring to diversity as an idea of governance in the integration policy report of the Commissioner for Integration and Migration of the Senate of Berlin means that Berlin is defined „as a city with strong ability for integration“ (The Commissioner for Integration and Migration of the Senate of Berlin 2008: 16) and that „the living together of people from various social, cultural and religious backgrounds becomes the scene of urban normality“ (ebd.). In the previous decades Germany was not yet recognised as an immigrant nation. The federal German policies concerning non-German nationals were shaped by the ambivalence between integration policy and return programmes. The first commissioner for non-German nationals of the Berlin Senate, Barbara John, argued even prior to her appointment at the start of the 80s that return programmes were necessary to lower the high percentage of non-German nationals in Berlin, and that overall, the number of foreigners was too high. In contrast, Berlin is recognised as an immigrant city in the integration report: „In the past years the fiercely held discourse on the question of whether Germany is an immigration country or not just could not reflect the social reality in the city adequately. It does not concern a small group of a neglected minority, but a significant part of the urban population. Just now, around 40% of the children and youth in Berlin under the age of 18 have an immigrant background“ (The Commissioner for Integration and Migration of the Senate of Berlin 2008: 16). Within the report, diversity is defined as a positive resource for the city: „Diversity means strength‘ – this fundamental principle of a modern corporate culture is especially suited for Berlin. Immigrants contribute immensely to this strength“ (ebd.). Thereby diversity as an idea of governance is accompanied by an equal opportunities rhetoric. It says: „integration policy concerns primarily the establishment of equal opportunities. (..) If diversity existed without equal opportunities, social segregation would just be worsened; and if equal opportunity comes without consideration for the cultural diversity, the culturally dissimilar one will then be excluded“ (ebd.). Parallel to the commitment to an approval of different social and cultural designs of life, the necessity for

migrants to learn the German language and adhere to their duty of participating in language and integration courses is stressed. These courses were introduced with the new immigration act and are binding for all new migrants. Diversity as an idea of governance is on the one hand closely linked to realising equal opportunities for migrants. On the other hand the migrants, within the framework of language and integration workshops, have to learn to live up to the demands of the receiving society. This does not stand in contradiction to concepts of multiculturalism. Will Kymlicka, the Canadian theoretician of multicultural citizenship, in his works refers to clear boundaries of allowing for difference, and justifies the implementation of an official language. It is accordingly also legitimate, especially within the frame of multicultural citizenship, to demand of migrants that they ensure their integration into the societal culture, shaped by a common language and social institutions, by learning the official language. Following the approach of hierarchical governance, multicultural citizenship is constructed by granting rights and duties. Ethnic-cultural diversity becomes in a functional sense the focal point of governance, with the aim of integration into the societal culture. Here Kymlicka (2007) demands language acquisition as an integrational effort not least in order to live up to the demands of the labour market and the economy:

„In their history nearly all liberal democracies have sooner or later attempted to accomplish a single societal culture on their entire territory (...). This form of nation-building serves some important and legitimate goals. A modern economy, for example, requires mobile, educated, literate workers. When all citizens are to have the same opportunity for work in this modern economy, a standardised public education system with a common language seems indispensable“ (ebd.: 303). Language support aside, labour market and education policy are therefore important areas of an integration policy which in Berlin is designed as an inter-departmental „across the board“-task.

1.2 The Berlin labour and (vocational) training market – the market as a mechanism of governance

The market is considered a central and especially efficient instrument of social governance. The governance-theoretical implications of the market-price-mechanism consist of decentrally coordinating decisions of independent economic subjects. The market-price-mechanism is meant to coordinate the ability of economic subjects to learn and adapt so that they pursue their self-interest and at same time satisfy the needs of other economic subjects. Thus foreign unskilled workers were recruited for industrial labour especially in West-Berlin in the Sixties until the recruitment stop in November 1973. As an integration mechanism the enterprises were successful where social integration of foreign nationals was concerned. Integration via the enterprise, however, presumes employment, and the development in this area is fatal in Berlin (Hunger/Thränhardt 2001: 112ff.). After the unification there was a

slump in the production sector that knows almost no equal. The number of workers in the industry has more than halved (in German nationals as well as non-German nationals). This is because due to the discontinuation of certain tax breaks West-Berlin lost its role as an „extended workbench“. 250.000 industrial work places have disappeared since the unification, and the unemployment rate of non-German nationals rose from 14.5% to 44.1% between 1991 and 2004 (Gesemann 2006: 202ff.) In order to avoid unemployment foreign nationals have increasingly sought self-employment and enterprises led by non-German nationals have more and more become an important economic factor in Berlin. The number of self-employed foreign nationals has increased from 22,900 to 40,200 between 2003 and 2006, which means that „almost every fourth employed person (23,7%) with foreign nationality in Berlin was self-employed in 2006, compared to 15,6% of their German counterparts“ (The Commissioner for Integration and Migration of the Senate of Berlin 2008: 22f.) Hunger and Thränkhardt (2001) note that therefore the conditions for social integration – which were previously realised via the work place – have changed and that the Berlin integration policy is faced with a challenge which it has not yet been able to rise to. The governmental machinery with its surroundings as a „new industry“, in turn, has not led to a demand in non-German national workers. Due to their lack of German citizenship non-German nationals are excluded from the bureaucracy and the political arena. Furthermore do they lack qualifications. Of the non-German nationals registered as unemployed in Berlin in 2005, 53.2% have no school leaving certificate and 88.1% have no qualifying vocational training (Gesemann 2006: 202). This shows that calling diversity a strength is often no more than a rhetorical figure in integration policy. Rather, we are faced with the problems of intersectionality. Intersectionality as a concept refers to the cumulation of disadvantages: non-German national workers are doubly discriminated against due to their lack of language skills and due to their lack of qualifications. In the political arena they are therefore classed as „market-disadvantaged“. The labour market as a mechanism of governance especially fails when facing the challenge of integrating this group. The same is true for the vocational training market: The number of non-German nationals in vocational training has fallen by 43.1% between 1991 and 2004, and the absolute number of non-German nationals in the overall number of those in vocational training has been almost halved (from 8.5% (1991) to 4.5% (2004) (Gesemann 2006, 202f.). Projects for the increase of training and employment of immigrants are brought forward using instruments of activating labour market politics: here the integration report refers to projects for modular vocational training, the intercultural opening of the Job-Centre (BA) and the campaign „Berlin needs you“, through which the ratio of immigrants in vocational training in the public services is targeted. In addition, the announcements from Berlin's administration will henceforth include the following statement: „We welcome explicitly the applications from youths of non-German origin who fulfill the

requirements“ (The Commissioner for Integration and Migration of the Senate of Berlin 2008: 25).

Following on from this, I would like to portray, with regard to searching for vocational training, how diversity can still be defined as potential. Diversity as a policy framework however, is not little problematic in employment policy because it wants to sell difference as something positive and because it wants to define the otherness of „disadvantaged groups“ as potential. We'd like to give an example for this approach based on a difference-theoretical understanding of diversity from the area of vocational training: The analysis of support and equality measures for better integration of youths with migrational background into vocational training shows that a change of political paradigm has taken place here (Granato 2003). Intercultural designs of life especially with regard to language skills and special intercultural communicative competences are increasingly defined as a resource. Thus the act concerning „education and further education of young migrants“ in the Alliance for Work, Vocational Training and Competitive Ability“ (Bündnis für Arbeit, Ausbildung und Wettbewerbsfähigkeit) from the year 2000 stresses that it is essential to not speak of deficits, but of existing strengths and capacities. With this, in our opinion, employers and employee representatives make a public change of paradigm into the direction of diversity politics, which needed and needs to be observed in relation to other diversity dimensions. Descriptive for this is the increasing mention of „experience“ as a potential for older people and of certain soft skills as alleged potential for women. Migrants were belatedly integrated into this discourse when their special ability of intercultural competence was discovered. The change of paradigm described above can be questioned by drawing on the criticism of difference-theoretical approaches in gender studies. The criticisms have developed in relation to the special „female working abilities“ (Knapp 1989): The seemingly positive approach of an alternative position to the deficit-oriented perception of disadvantaged groups stresses the otherness of young migrants. However, with such a difference-theoretical approach it is not the structural inequalities that are stressed, but „socialised abilities“ that can be attributed to a certain group and can only with difficulties be distinguished from this „close relation with stereotypes“ („Verschwisterung mit Stereotypen“) (ebd.: 282)/. Such an understanding of diversity as differences between groups is opposed to an alternative understanding of diversity in which intercultural competence is generally a necessary key skill for the labour market and an advantage for employees (and the organisations that employ them). Establishing intercultural competence as a qualification aim in education and further education would in this alternative sense be relevant as an objectively measurable criterium in the hiring process of employees with and without migrational background. This could further contribute to formalising intercultural competences that have so far frequently been

enlisted only informally and with no further approval in the work process. Changing this could lead to (possibly monetary) gratification.

1.3 Diversity in the education system

The principle of equal opportunities ought to function in the light of the formal structure of Berlin's school system, with its six years of primary schooling and the high percentage of migrants at the comprehensive schools (Gesamtschulen). A high success rate for children with a migrational background would be expected, but this is not the case. In the academic year 2005/06 15,3% of all non-German national students gained no school leaving certificate, but only 6,6% of the German students didn't. Only 17,8% reached the Abitur-level which qualifies for university entrance, but 41,3% of the German students. A new study of the German Institute for Economy Research (Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW)) shows that 75% of migrants from a Turkish background have no school leaving certificate and that the unemployment rate of migrants of Turkish origin lies at 44% (Brenke 2008). In other words: one in four inhabitants of Berlin with a Turkish background has no school leaving certificate, and almost one in two is unemployed. Measured by the education level of non-German nationals and especially of migrants of Turkish origin the integrative approach to schooling in Berlin does not prove successful. Because the integration mechanisms school and enterprise go hand in hand, there are negative cumulation processes when both institutions find themselves in crisis. These figures are especially startling when viewed before the backdrop of demographic development: If today one in four inhabitants of Berlin is of non-German origin, the contingent is bound to rise in the future. Therefore it is the task of the city of Berlin to qualify the children from a non-educated background better than their parents. If this does not happen, it will also lead to severe problems for the city's economy. Berlin's integration policy reacts with the intensified construction of special programmes and the implementation of community schools. In the present school-year eleven community schools start in Berlin as model experiments of collective learning (Goddard 2008). Students from 1st to 10th grade are to henceforth learn together in collective classes: without differentiation into different performance groups, without „probation half-year/term“ and without repeating classes. It is even possible to give out circumstantial reviews of performance instead of grades up until year 8. Background to this is the programmatic idea of taking diversity in the classroom seriously and of viewing it as an opportunity and not as an obstacle. Among the 57 schools who applied for the model experiment there were, admittedly, no Gymnasien (grammar schools), and only three comprehensive schools that offer advanced schooling. There were also some community schools with no registration from children qualified to continue on to grammar school after completing the primary level. Scepticism may be justified in that of the costs of 22 million euros for the duration of the

model experiment any community school is only allowed to apply for 7000 Euro a year for further training, and only receives money for half an additional teaching post and for a quarter post of pedagogical personnel. Whether managing diversity, which is bound to be necessary in community schools, can be had at this price, evaluation studies will have to show.

1.4 Conclusion

It is a good thing that diversity is now considered as an idea of governance, as that goes hand in hand with the acceptance of Berlin as a city of immigration and with a positive understanding of diversity. The conditions of governance, however, are that many little- or unqualified migrants came to Berlin. Their descendants could not „inherit“ their work places due to the deindustrialisation of Berlin, but at the same time did not achieve societal advancement due to the lack of equal opportunities in the education system. Calling diversity a strength becomes rhetoric when it is denied that we suffer from problems of intersectionality, the cumulation of disadvantages. As the market fails as an instrument of governance in the integration of little qualified workers with migrational background, political efforts need to be made to rectify the crisis of intergration mechanisms in workplace and school. First points of departure for this are offered in the integration report discussed here with its many project proposals. As the first State (Land) government in Germany, the Senate of Berlin introduces – with the integration concept of 2007 – a system for controlling the integration processes and for measuring the achievements of integration. The introduction of a monitoring system on integration supported by indicators should allow a transparent and controllable governance of integration policy.

1.5 Bibliography

- Brenke, Karl (2008): Migranten in Berlin: Schlechte Jobchancen, geringe Einkommen, hohe Transferabhängigkeit, DIW Wochenbericht, in: <http://www.diw.de/documents/publikationen/73/88442/08-35-1.pdf>.
- Gesemann, Frank (2006): Grundlinien und aktuelle Herausforderungen der Berliner Integrationspolitik, in: Baringhorst, Sigrid/Uwe Hunger/Karen Schönwälder (Hrsg.): Politische Steuerung von Integrationsprozessen. Intentionen und Wirkungen, Wiesbaden: 195-213.
- Goddar, Jeannette (2008): Lernen ohne Zensuren und Sitzenbleiben. Berlin startet mit elf Gemeinschaftsschulen, in: FR, 28.8.2008: 15.
- Granato, Mona (2003): Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund in der beruflichen Bildung, in: WSI Mitteilungen 8 (2003): 474-483.
- Holzinger, Katharina/Knill, Christoph (2003): Faktoren des Steuerungswandels: Das Zusammenspiel von Ideen, Bedingungen und Mustern politischer Steuerung, in: Holzinger, Katharina/Christoph Knill/Dirk Lehmkuhl (Hrsg.): Politische Steuerung im Wandel: Der Einfluss von Ideen und Problemstrukturen, Opladen: 7-30.

- Hunger, Uwe/Thranhardt, Dietrich (2001): Die Berliner Integrationspolitik im Vergleich der Bundesländer, in: Gesemann, Frank (Hrsg.): Migration und Integration in Berlin. Wissenschaftliche Analysen und politische Perspektiven, Opladen: 109-126.
- Knapp, Gudrun-Axeli (1989): Arbeitsteilung und Sozialisation: Konstellationen von Arbeitsvermögen und Arbeitskraft im Lebenszusammenhang von Frauen, in: Beer, Ursula (Hrsg.): Klasse Geschlecht. Feministische Gesellschaftsanalyse und Wissenschaftskritik, Bielefeld: 236-273.
- Kymlicka, Will (2007): Die neue Debatte über Minderheitenrechte, in: Mackert, Jürgen (Hrsg.): Staatsbürgerschaft. Eine Einführung, Wiesbaden: 295-315.
- Schwarz, Thomas (2001): Integrationspolitik als Beauftragtenpolitik: Die Ausländerbeauftragte des Berliner Senats, in: Gesemann, Frank (Hrsg.): Migration und Integration in Berlin. Wissenschaftliche Analysen und politische Perspektiven, Opladen: 127-144.
- The Commissioner for Integration and Migration of the Senate of Berlin (2008): Encouraging Diversity - Strengthening Cohesion. Integration Policy in Berlin 2007-2011, in: http://www.berlin.de/imperia/md/content/lb-integration-migration/publikationen/berichte/integration_policy_in_berlin_2007_2011_bf.pdf.