

# From Foreigner Pedagogy to Intercultural Education: an analysis of the German responses to diversity and its impact on schools and students

**DANIEL FAAS**

*Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom*

**ABSTRACT** Germany has been reluctant to adapt its education systems to the growing number of minority ethnic students, and politicians and policy makers have only recently officially acknowledged that Germany is an immigration country despite decades of mass immigration. This article first provides a socio-historical analysis of the German responses to migration-related cultural and religious diversity by tracing the development of educational policies from assimilationist notions of ‘foreigner pedagogy’ in the 1960s and 1970s to intercultural education, which slowly emerged in schools in the 1980s and 1990s. However, unlike European education, intercultural education still lacks official support in some German federal states. Drawing upon qualitative data collected in two Stuttgart secondary schools, the article then discusses the ways in which schools and students have mediated such macro-level policies. Goethe Gymnasium (a university-track school) promoted European values alongside multicultural values whereas Tannberg Hauptschule (a vocational-track school) was close to being Eurocentric and positioned minority ethnic students as the ‘Other’. The findings suggest that Germany still has some way to go to overcome cultural insensitivities, to increase minority ethnic representation amongst teachers and to promote both diversity and civic cohesion.

## **Introduction**

Integration has become the buzzword in political and educational debates in contemporary Germany. Politicians and policy makers have started to reform the country’s citizenship law and introduced immigration and anti-discrimination legislation. These laws are aimed at improving the hitherto marginalised position of many minority ethnic communities in German society. The new grand coalition government under Chancellor Merkel appointed a Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration as one of only three Chancellery Ministers of State (*Staatsminister*) and, in July 2006, hosted the first so-called integration summit (*Integrationsgipfel*) with 86 political and societal representatives to discuss issues of German language learning, education and job opportunities and equal opportunities. Two additional Islam conferences (*Islamkonferenz*), organised by Interior Minister Schäuble, have since focused on the interaction between the national majority and Muslim minorities in Germany, addressing religious topics, German law and values as well as equal opportunities and employment policies. More recently, in May 2007, the Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration also hosted a youth integration summit (*Jugendintegrationsgipfel*) bringing together 80 young people from diverse backgrounds to discuss their ideas about (a) language and education, (b) local integration, and (c) cultural diversity. In July 2007, the National Integration Plan – consisting of 10 thematic priority areas such as improving integration courses, promoting early German language learning, integration through sports and using the diversity of the media – was launched (Bundesregierung, 2007). These initiatives indicate, above all, that after five decades of migration, German policy makers and politicians finally appear to be making some coordinated effort to address the presence of minority ethnic communities.

However, after decades of reinforcing the perception of ‘foreigners’ (*Ausländer*) as ‘Other’ and maintaining that Germany is not an immigration country, politicians and policy makers are now facing the challenge of having to address the disparities that have developed between the national majority and minority ethnic communities, particularly in education. For example, a review report which built on data from the 2003 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) study [1] showed that the difference in school performance between minority ethnic students and native students was more pronounced in Germany than in almost any of the other participating countries (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2006). On average, in mathematics, 15-year-olds with a migrant background trailed their native peers by 40 points, an educational deficit of about one year of study. In Germany, the gap between second-generation students and native students was nearly twice as big (93 score points) and reached 120 score points between Turkish students and German students – the equivalent of about three years of study. Paradoxically, first-generation immigrant students performed significantly better than second-generation students. This is particularly disconcerting as the latter have spent their entire school career in Germany. The mathematics performance gap between first-generation students and native students was only 71 points. The 2006 PISA study confirmed many of these findings, albeit with a focus on science (OECD, 2007). The fact that Germany has some 7.3 million ‘foreigners’ (‘guest workers’ and asylum seekers) and a total of 15.3 million migrants (‘foreigners’ plus refugees and resettlers of German origin) can hardly account for the fact that students with a migrant background underperform in schools because other immigration countries show much better results than Germany (Konsortium Bildungsberichterstattung, 2006). Although different migration histories may be one factor, this article contends that the main factors are macro-political responses and school dynamics, including ethos, interactions and curricular interpretations.

The aim of this article is, therefore, to examine, from a socio-historical point of view, the German responses to migration-related diversity in order to understand better why politicians and policy makers have been struggling to integrate minority ethnic communities into Germany’s ‘Europeanised concept of nationhood’ (Risse & Engelmann-Martin, 2002; Faas, 2007a); and to discuss the impact of these policies upon schools and students. Analysing the educational responses is particularly difficult in Germany since each of the 16 federal states is responsible for educational and cultural matters and thus operates its own policy. Rather than looking at all these educational responses separately, I shall focus primarily upon the directives issued by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education in Germany (*Kultusministerkonferenz* [KMK]). While the empirical data I draw upon derive from a larger study designed to explore how German and English national agendas and identities are reshaped by European and multicultural agendas at government level and what implications these political agendas have for schools and young people (Faas, 2008), the main argument of this article is based on a critical review of the relevant literature as well as empirical evidence from two schools.

### **German Educational Responses to Cultural Diversity**

There were four major post-war groups of immigrants in Germany: refugees with German roots (*Flüchtlinge*); resettlers (*Aussiedler*); ‘guest workers’ (*Gastarbeiter*); and asylum seekers (*Asylbewerber*). The first two immigrant groups were refugees and resettlers of ethnic German origin, and the most important groups of the non-German ‘foreigner’ population were ‘guest workers’ and asylum seekers. The German–Italian agreement of 20 December 1955 paved the way for the officially organised recruitment of, mainly male, non-German workers to fill labour shortages and to rebuild Germany’s traditional economy (Bade, 2000). Subsequent agreements were signed with Spain and Greece (1960), Turkey (1961), Portugal (1964), Tunisia and Morocco (1965) and Yugoslavia (1968). The influx of non-German workers put the Government in a difficult position in terms of education. Because they did not want the ‘guest workers’ to stay in Germany, education policy was at first not affected. It was only after 1964 that schooling became compulsory for ‘guest worker children’ (*Gastarbeiterkinder*). Instead, at the time, politicians from the centre-right to the centre-left focused on redefining Germany’s national identity, shattered by the war, in European terms.

By 1964, however, educational policy makers started to notice the presence of 'guest worker children' in German schools and the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education recommended that 'guest worker' children's attendance at German schools should be facilitated with the help of additional classes in German or preparatory classes (*Vorbereitungsklassen*) but that the possibility of a return to their original school system also be allowed for. From the mid 1960s, education in Germany was largely based on an assimilationist model called 'foreigner pedagogy' (*Ausländerpädagogik*) which was closely related to special needs education for mentally or physically disabled children (Hoff, 1995). The 'handicap' of the 'guest worker child' was not to be German, and not to speak German. This meant that the child was not able to follow the German educational system. In subsequent years, according to Luchtenberg (1997), the strategy of assimilating 'guest worker' children into the German school system (while preparing them for a possible return to their country of origin) was renewed because politicians continued not to recognise Germany as an immigration country.

A shift in the response to the multicultural question in Germany was brought about by the 1973 Arab oil crisis, which prompted the Social Democratic (SPD) government under Brandt to put a hold on the further recruitment of 'guest workers'. The image of immigrants was transformed from being a welcome pool of cheap labour into a threat to jobs, a drain on the welfare state. They were thus unwanted 'foreigners' (Herbert, 2003). Politicians adopted an increasingly reluctant and hostile approach to multiculturalism and passed legislation promoting the return of 'guest workers' to their countries of origin. For example, under the 1983 law for the 'Promotion of Readiness to Return' (*Rückkehrförderungsgesetz*), every 'guest worker' who voluntarily left Germany received an incentive of 10,500 *deutschmark* (5,400 euros) but only about 250,000 migrants, mainly those of Turkish origin, responded to this opportunity (Santel & Weber, 2000). Until the late 1990s, state officials continued to deploy a distinction between *us* (Germans) and *them* (guest workers); in other words, migrant workers and their children were often perceived as inferior and addressed by terms such as 'guest worker' or 'foreigner'.

By the 1980s, the concept of 'foreigner pedagogy' was increasingly shunned as 'compensatory and deficit oriented' (Hoff, 1995, p. 828). Instead, a concept of multicultural education – or intercultural education as it is more commonly referred to in Germany [2] – developed in response to the presence of 'guest worker children'. Intercultural education, according to Hoff (1995), attempts to address all children in order to prepare them for a life in a culturally diverse society; tries to establish cultural identity; guarantees mother-tongue teaching; and modifies curricula towards a multicultural representation of values. The German debate also recognised the notion of anti-racist education which was, however, more prominent in other European countries such as the United Kingdom (see Archer, 2008). Anti-racist education took the burden away from the immigrant as the person who must integrate into school and society at large; instead, educational institutions were expected to develop an awareness and understanding of the 'racist' structure of German society itself, its laws and its institutions. Auernheimer (1990) strongly argued for cooperation between the anti-racist and the intercultural/multicultural approaches in education since intercultural education, in his view, failed to address power inequalities in the German educational system.

As a result of the federal structure of the German educational system, no general document on multicultural education was issued other than the guidelines published by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education. The 1996 guideline, 'Intercultural Education at School' ('Interkulturelle Bildung und Erziehung in der Schule'), argued that federal states should:

Overhaul and further develop their curricula and guidelines for all subjects with regard to an intercultural dimension; develop teaching materials which address intercultural aspects as an integral part of school and education; only allow school textbooks that do not marginalise or discriminate against other cultures and include texts and pictures that give non-German students an opportunity to identify with them; facilitate the employment of non-German teachers in all subject areas and intensify the collaboration between mother-tongue teachers and other staff; and include intercultural aspects in teacher training courses.  
(KMK, 1996, translated from German)

Several of the 16 German federal states developed an intercultural dimension for their schools, mostly as a result of the above KMK recommendations but in some cases independently of these. For example, the curriculum guidelines of the state of North Rhine-Westphalia stated that teaching had changed because of the fact that children with different ethnic backgrounds and different cultural norms and traditions were taught together (Der Kultusminister des Landes Nordrhein- Westfalen, 1985). In 1995, the Education Commission of North Rhine-Westphalia argued that 'reflective living together in a multicultural school and society demands an intercultural education in all school types and the support of equal opportunities for minority ethnic students' (Bildungskommission Nordrhein-Westfalen, 1995, p. 117, translated from German). To date, North Rhine-Westphalia is also the only German federal state that has an integration minister (Armin Laschet of the conservative Christian Democrats [CDU]).

The guidelines and teaching materials that were developed in the mid 1990s in several federal states with regard to an intercultural dimension were based upon recommendations by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education in Germany. Thematic aspects which were recommended included 'the teaching of characteristics and developments of different cultures and societies; similarities and differences between cultures and societies; the reasons for racism and xenophobia; the causes and significance of prejudices; human rights and their meaning in different cultural settings; and the living together of minority and majority ethnic communities in multicultural societies' (KMK, 1996, p. 8). Following their recommendations, the KMK offered didactical guidelines showing how these thematic aspects could be taught in subjects such as citizenship, geography, religious education, and history. However, the implementation of multicultural education in mainstream curricula still lacked official support in many German states (Luchtenberg, 1997). At the same time, during the 1990s, Europe became a focal point for national political identities in German schools. For example, the KMK document 'Europe in the Classroom' (*Europa im Unterricht*) stated that the goal of education must be 'to awaken in young people the consciousness of a European identity' (KMK, 1990, translated from German). Several German federal states (such as Baden-Württemberg in 1994) subsequently overhauled their curricula to implement a European dimension, indicating the role of education in shifting German national identities towards a more European agenda.

In the past few years (1998-2008), schools have received mixed messages from governments. Whilst the national agenda of 'political integration' had little influence on the shaping of regional educational systems, schools continued to privilege European agendas over and above multicultural educational responses. At the national level, a more tolerant approach to cultural diversity was reflected in reforms of Germany's citizenship law (2000), the first Immigration Act (2005) and an anti-discrimination law (2006). In the new citizenship law, *ius sanguinis* (citizenship by birth) was complemented by a *conditional ius solis* (citizenship by territoriality). This legislation gave citizenship rights to children of 'foreigners' born in Germany of parents where one parent has been resident in Germany for a minimum of eight years with an unlimited residence permit. However, the restrictive implementation led to a decrease in naturalisations (Schiffauer, 2006). Under the Immigration Act (*Zuwanderungsgesetz*), new immigrants are expected to attend integration courses [3]; failure to do so may result in fines of up to 1,000 euros. Minority ethnic people already living in Germany are also obliged to attend such integration courses in so far as places on courses are available (Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2004). The new anti-discrimination law (*Gleichbehandlungsgesetz*) punished discrimination based on race, ethnic origin, age, sex, disability, religion or sexual orientation, thus addressing the needs of *all* minority communities. Despite some of the reorientations of Germany's response to cultural diversity at the national level in recent years (including the integration summits and Islam conferences), regional governments have often adopted different approaches. For example, in 2003, Germany's highest constitutional court ruled that the federal state of Baden-Württemberg was wrong to ban an individual teacher from wearing a headscarf in school but declared that states could in principle legislate on such issues. To date, eight mainly conservative-controlled federal states (Bavaria, Baden-Württemberg, Bremen, Hesse, Lower Saxony, North Rhine-Westphalia, Saarland

and Thuringia) have introduced legislation banning teachers from wearing headscarves (Oestreich, 2005). The amended Paragraph 38 of the Baden-Württemberg school law now prohibited teachers from wearing the hijab:

Teachers in public schools may not show political, religious or other affiliations which may endanger or disturb the neutrality of the federal state towards students and parents, or the political and religious school peace. In particular, an exterior behaviour which can give students or parents the impression that a teacher may be against human dignity, human rights or the free democratic constitutional structure is inadmissible. The representation of Christian and Christian Occidental educational and cultural values and traditions does not contradict the behavior requirement above. The religious neutrality requirement does not apply to religious education lessons. (Landesinstitut für Schulentwicklung, 2006, translated from German)

However, the ban did not include Christian and Jewish religious symbols, thus showing a new form of institutionalised discrimination against Muslim religious communities. Berlin is the only city and German state (under a Social Democrat-led government) which not only banned the headscarf but all religious symbols in schools and other public institutions, and thus decided to treat all religious symbols equally. Further controversial proposals in recent years which highlight the continuing struggle German policy makers and politicians face in integrating all minority ethnic communities have included the enforcement of German as a spoken language in mosques; a compulsory kindergarten year for minority ethnic children combined with a German language test; the call for a 'German leading culture' (*Leitkultur*) which all minority ethnic people would have to adapt to; an oath on Germany's constitution (*Grundgesetz*) for all those who were granted German citizenship; the provision of Islamic religious education in the German language in *all* schools; and a foreigner quota for boroughs, schools and kindergartens (Özdil, 1999; Zschaler, 2004).

In the past few years, the combination of multicultural and anti-racist education, described earlier, was still the prevailing educational response to cultural diversity in Germany. Some federal states (e.g. Saarland, Thuringia) developed multicultural *teaching units* and others (e.g. Berlin, Hamburg, Schleswig Holstein) introduced multicultural education as a *cross-curricular theme*; some (e.g. Bremen, Hesse, Rhineland-Palatinate) carried out *intercultural projects* during special project days in school and others (e.g. Baden-Württemberg, Bavaria, Brandenburg) took a combined approach of the above. However, less than half of the German federal states revised their curricula and school laws specifically to include multicultural education. Several states including Saxony Anhalt and Saarland also argued that the 1996 recommendations by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education in Germany (KMK) were not mandatory, thus indicating not only the limited power of the KMK but also the discrepancies within Germany regarding educational responses and policy making. On the other hand, North Rhine-Westphalia and Hamburg were amongst the states that took a leading role in implementing multicultural education. Hamburg's revised school law today states that 'schools have the task to educate for a peaceful living together of all cultures and the equality of all human beings' (Behörde für Bildung und Sport, 2003, p. 9). Baden-Württemberg, the federal state in which Tannberg Hauptschule and Goethe Gymnasium, the two schools that are the focus of the second part of this article, are located [4], delivers intercultural education in a range of subjects including geography and history.

At the same time, an additional approach to providing education for children speaking a first language other than German developed in some federal states that were controlled mainly by the conservative Christian Democrats but influenced by other coalition partners. The focus of this so-called 'cross-cultural education' (*kulturübergreifende Erziehung*) was Europe. According to Hoff (1995), this approach replaced notions of nationalism with Eurocentrism and there were intrinsically racist elements within this coalition who intended to exclude all non-Europeans, meaning non-Caucasian, non-white and non-Christian people (p. 826). Such Eurocentric educational concepts are open to the accusation that they ignore the rest of the world and should thus include all those recent Europeans who live in Europe whose roots are in Morocco, Bangladesh or Turkey. The gradual shift from monocultural to multicultural/intercultural education is summarised in Table I.

<i>Ausländerpädagogik</i> (foreigner pedagogy)	<i>Interkulturelle Erziehung</i> (multicultural education)	<i>Antirassistische Erziehung</i> (antiracist education)	<i>Kulturübergreifende Erziehung</i> (cross-cultural education)
Mainly 1960s to 1970s	Since 1980s	Since 1980s	Since 1990s
Monocultural education, assimilative, deficit-oriented approach	Multicultural education, integrationist/pluralist approaches	Anti-racist education (linked with <i>Interkulturelle Erziehung</i> )	Potentially Eurocentric education, broadly conservative approach
Politicians, teachers and parents are unsure whether or not 'guest workers' would return to their country of origin	Minority ethnic people should be allowed to maintain their mother tongue and cultural heritage	Minority ethnic people have to struggle for racial justice and have to defend themselves against racial discrimination	Non-European people have to struggle for equality and have to defend themselves against discrimination
Provision of single or group tuition to help children with language 'problems' (e.g. <i>Deutschförderkurse</i> , <i>Vorbereitungsklassen</i> )	Attempts to establish cultural identity; provision of mother-tongue alphabetisation; teaching of all major and locally represented religions	Teaching an awareness and understanding of the 'racist' structure of German society (e.g. laws, institutions); cf. multicultural education	Quarrel about teaching and contents: focus on EU countries and values versus integration of non-European cultures and religions

Table I. Educational responses to migration-related diversity in Germany. Source: adapted from Hoff, 1995.

One of the latest educational debates in Germany (which was also addressed at the Islam conference) has focused on the country's religious diversity, particularly its 2.6 million Turkish Muslims, of whom 840,000 have so far been granted German citizenship (Isoplan, 2005). Minority ethnic students made up 8.5% of the 2004/05 German school population, with Turkish students forming nearly half of the minority ethnic school population (500,000 – though figures should be treated with caution because German statistics record nationality not ethnicity). As a result of the large number of Turkish students, several federal states started providing Islamic religious education in the German language (*Islamunterricht in deutscher Sprache*) for students of Muslim origin alongside the Protestant and Catholic religions in German state schools (Özdil, 1999). At the centre of this debate was, and still is, the question about the content of Islamic lessons and the extent to which Islamic organisations and communities should be allowed to shape the curriculum. While the provision of Islamic religious education for Muslim students might be considered a step forward in educational policy making, one could challenge the widely debated concept of faith-based classes as a form of exclusive education. A more inclusive alternative would be to teach the major world religions to all students in the same class, an approach that had already been adopted, for instance, by most schools in England. This socio-historical analysis has provided an insight into how the German educational system(s) have dealt with migration-related diversity. Contemporary schools could well have been influenced by these developments, which is why I shall now move on to look at the responses of two schools (and their students) in Stuttgart.

### **Worlds Apart: Eurocentric education and inclusive education**

In Germany, the school system is more or less under the direct control of the regional government, and each type of secondary school (e.g. *Hauptschule*, *Realschule*, *Gymnasium*) has a mandatory curriculum. However, this section shows that although the two Stuttgart schools were in the same inner-city borough, their responses to education policies and the presence of minority ethnic students appeared to be worlds apart. For the broader study (Faas, 2007b), conducted in 2004, I collected available documents on multiculturalism,

Europe and citizenship and I interviewed the head, citizenship coordinator, the head of geography and the head of religious education. I also distributed a questionnaire to about 100 students in each school to obtain broad insights into how students positioned themselves in relation to national, European and multicultural issues. Then, I conducted six focus group interviews with groups of four to five students in each school (native youth and youth of Turkish origin) and interviewed a total of 32 students (eight in each school). Purposive sampling was used in an effort to ensure a gender and ethnic balance. Whilst the focus group method used group dynamics to elicit information about what the different groups thought, the individual student interviews allowed students to tell their personal stories regarding these topics.

The interviewer, who is the author of this article, is a native speaker of German, fluent in English and relatively young, which, in terms of age, resulted in a fairly balanced power relation during the interviews. The data analysis of student and teacher discourses was guided by MacLure (2003), who has argued that one of the most common ways in which texts are stitched together is through the setting up of binary oppositions (e.g. 'us' and 'them'; 'German' and 'foreigner'). One 'side', she maintains, comes to meaning through its difference with respect to a constructed 'other' which is always lacking, lesser or derivative in some respect. Arguably, my analysis can only provide an account of my reading(s). Other researchers might put together the findings, or truths, in different ways.

It should also be noted here that a majority of students (56.8%) in Tannberg Hauptschule had skilled and unskilled parents. In contrast, a majority of students in Goethe Gymnasium had professional middle-class and routine non-manual parents (54.2%), underlining the middle-class character of this school. However, more than one-quarter of Turkish students at Goethe (28.6%) had skilled and unskilled parents compared with just one German student, and nearly seven out of ten German students had professional middle-class and routine non-manual parents compared with one-third of Turkish students. This not only indicates that the Turkish sample at Goethe is somewhat 'less middle class' than the group of German students but, more importantly, it also lends weight to other factors affecting immigrant incorporation, including the school dynamics. In the remainder of this article, I discuss some of the implications the aforementioned macro-level policies had for schools and students. Tannberg Hauptschule, located in a predominantly working-class residential area of Stuttgart, mediated citizenship agendas through a dominantly European and arguably, at times, Eurocentric approach. Mr Koch, the Citizenship coordinator, maintained that there was no alternative to the European approach and that it was essential to deal with Europe in school:

**DF:** Citizenship should include experiencing the European dimension. What do you make of that?

**Mr Koch:** Must, must; not should. The curriculum must have a European dimension. We are living in a united Europe, a multicultural society, especially here at this school and the European spirit must be promoted more strongly than ever before. There is no alternative to that. The only problem we have is that we do everything on a theoretical level. For example, it's very problematic when I visit Strasbourg with my Turkish students; they need a visa. Same problem occurs when I want to travel to England; I have a lot of trouble at the border. That shouldn't be the case in a united Europe; all countries should have the same rules. But it's absolutely necessary to deal with Europe in school.

Despite some intercultural teaching, the teachers I interviewed seemed to struggle to combine notions of multiculturalism or cultural diversity with the dominant European agenda. For example, while eating with the students in the canteen, I witnessed cultural insensitivity amongst some Tannberg Hauptschule teachers towards Turkish Muslim students. On that particular day, there was pork and beef sauce available for the students and the teachers on duty told a male German student who wanted to help himself to some beef sauce that this is 'Muslim sauce' (*Moslemsoße*) and that he should rather take some 'non-Muslim sauce', and when the German student asked why he shouldn't eat beef sauce the supervising teacher replied that 'you will get impotent from that'. I also sat in some lessons where teachers occasionally spoke German with a foreign accent

(*Ausländerdeutsch*). These examples indicate the ways in which some teachers marginalised and excluded minority ethnic students.

Although there was no obvious hostility towards Turkish students at Tannberg, there were suggestions that Turkish people were considered 'others' and not part of the European project (cf. Faas, 2007c). For example, Miss Klein (the head of religious education) referred to the white Christian roots of Germany and Europe and established a racial/religious hierarchy which privileged the wearing of the Christian cross over the Muslim hijab. She also showed little understanding for the dilemma Muslim teachers faced in German schools:

**DF:** How do you feel about wearing headscarves or crosses in school?

**Ms Klein:** I think that we are still Christian Occidental [i.e. white and European] here with our basic values. I am of the opinion that if a religious symbol was allowed in class then it should be the cross. Islam, for me, has both a religious and political dimension and I'm not allowed to wear the cross in a Muslim context. Then why should we allow things, despite being a democracy, that are not possible in other countries either. I mean, I can only argue from my religious viewpoint. When children wear the headscarf I have no problem with that but I think that as a teacher I have a political function. As our constitution demands neutrality, and teachers are meant to be role models, I cannot accept that. And if teachers were allowed to show their religious-political background, then it should be the cross and not the headscarf.

Arguably, the Eurocentric approach of some of the teachers at Tannberg together with the societal positioning of minority ethnic, particularly Muslim, communities as 'Other' reinforced tensions between the school's different ethnic communities, and the Turkish youth were subject to verbal abuse and discrimination. However, the attempts of my sample of second-generation Turkish students to integrate were expressed, for instance, in their cross-ethnic friendships. When I observed some of the lessons, I noticed that students mixed fairly well and, in the playground, I also saw friendship groups consisting of Greek, Turkish, Thai and Syrian students; others with Russian, Italian, Turkish and German students; and yet another group of Albanian, Turkish and Italian students. Age seemed to have been a more important factor in the formation of groups than ethnicity. As a result of being born in Germany, most Turkish youth had mixed friendship groups:

**DF:** Could you tell me a bit about your friends, where they come from?

**Cengis:** Italy, Croatia, Serbia, Greece. I've different friends from different countries and we all get on well.

**Bülent:** I've got friends that are half Greek and half Turkish although Greece and Turkey had an argument initially, only in the past. The citizens [of Turkey and Greece] sometimes argue with each other.

**Hakan:** They're all our friends. It's humanity. There are people who say things against Albanians and stuff, they make jokes about them.

**Zeheb:** Yes, or in the United States, black people were called niggers and stuff.

The four nationalities mentioned by Cengis were also the largest minority ethnic groups other than Turkish in Tannberg Hauptschule. Hakan's reference to humanity indicates that, for him, personality was more important than ethnicity. The non-German mixed European friendship groups could, however, also indicate that the sample of Turkish students felt more at ease being friends with other minority ethnic classmates with whom they shared their 'guest-worker children' status in German society. We saw earlier that, until the late 1990s, politicians and policy makers deployed a distinction between Germans and non-Germans. Migrant workers, particularly of Turkish origin, were often perceived as socially and ethnically inferior and addressed by oppressive terms such as 'guest worker' or 'foreigner'.

Similarly, a majority of German interviewees had mixed friendship groups. However, there were also a few native German students in this sample who employed racialised discourses towards minority ethnic people, and Turkish youth in particular. These were counterproductive to the integration attempts of Turkish students and resulted in divisions between some German and Turkish respondents which, as we saw earlier, were



reinforced by the hostile remarks of some of the teachers at Tannberg Hauptschule. For example, the German male and female students I interviewed discriminated between Germans and 'foreigners', a term which Benjamin and Sebastian seemed to equate with 'being Turkish':

**DF:** Could you tell me a bit about how mixed your friendship groups are?

**Franziska:** I have only Germans in my group. I won't let any foreigners in.

**Tobias:** No, that's not the case with me. But foreigners do have other opinions and stuff.

**Franziska:** We've enough foreigners here in Stuttgart. We don't need any more as friends. I don't know, it's not that I hate foreigners. It depends where they're from.

**Sebastian:** No, I wouldn't say that, every human being is different.

**Benjamin:** I've recently seen in a chat show, there was a 'Southerner' and he sat down and said that Germans were ugly and stuff like that and started like 'you have small dicks' and stuff. He said that his wife would only be in the kitchen, exactly the kind of Turk that we have here. And when you pass by them they say, 'What are you looking at? You wanna be beaten up?' They say things like that.

**Sebastian:** They make so many children here. I hardly see a Turk who doesn't have a brother or sister, always five family members or more.

**Jessica:** That's good though cos if we didn't have the foreigners we would be few people here. Germans only have one or two children and that's not enough. We need foreigners.

The use of the word *foreigner* has several different connotations in the German context. Firstly, it refers to the different citizenship status of Germans and minority ethnic communities. As we saw earlier, the concept of German citizenship has been ethno-cultural and, until 2000, the 'guest workers' had limited or no right to German citizenship. Only since then has *ius sanguinis* (citizenship by birth) been complemented by a conditional *ius solis* (citizenship by territoriality).

Secondly, the use of such oppressive terms by native German youth sends a strong message to minority ethnic communities that they are different, unwanted and not part of Germany. Arguably, this makes it extremely hard for minority ethnic people to identify with Germany. However, because the term 'foreigner' or 'foreign citizen' has been used frequently throughout Germany, some Turkish youth have come to terms with their status and even use the word themselves.

Finally, in purely linguistic terms, the word 'foreigner' can mean someone who is not a member of a group (i.e. who is an outsider). Whilst it is not necessarily always clear in official public discourse which meaning is referred to, the sample of German students at Tannberg mostly associated 'foreigner' with 'outsider'.

The discussion I had with the Turkish male and female students revealed that it is above all members of the Turkish community who are referred to as 'foreigners' in Germany and that Turkish students in Tannberg Hauptschule were singled out by teachers and classmates because of their Muslim religion and customs, including the wearing of headscarves:

**DF:** Have you ever experienced any form of discrimination or prejudice?

**Bülent:** Yes, I have. People say 'they're Turks' and stuff; and the women because of their headscarves.

**Hakan:** The Germans call the Turks 'foreigners', not so much any of the others. ...

**Yeliz:** When my mum and my auntie were on the tram one day, a German approached them, stared at my auntie and she said, 'why are you staring at me like that?' And then he said, 'why do you walk around here wearing a headscarf?' My mum doesn't wear a headscarf but my aunt does and my mum found that guy really silly cos the Germans used to wear headscarves too; they used to go to church wearing a headscarf, I mean, we're not the only ones wearing headscarves.

**Tamer:** And some people say 'fuck the Turks'. There are many who don't really like us.

**Umay:** I was once waiting for the tram together with my sister. An old woman came to us and said something stupid, said 'shit religion'.

The fact that so many of the discriminatory incidents reported by this sample of Turkish students involved the wearing of headscarves reflects an ongoing German debate about whether Muslim teachers should be allowed to wear headscarves. The main arguments in this debate were that the hijab symbolises the suppression of women, and that Christian and Western values were at the heart of the German educational system.

The German students I interviewed were also subject to verbal abuse and reported experiences of prejudice because of both their ethnicity and socio-economic status. For example, Ralf argued that 'sometimes they say something about Germany, that it's a stupid country or so; and then I say go back to your own country and stuff'. Both Peter and Andrea added that 'my friends, all the foreigners, they sometimes call me "potato" and stuff, just for fun. But I don't care. ... We then say "you foreigner" and things like that. But we only say that for fun'. The term 'potato' also has several different meanings. Firstly, it refers to the white and fleshy vegetable which grows underground and can be cooked and eaten; and secondly, it is a very passive term, particularly if it is associated with 'couch potato', a person sitting or lying on a couch and typically supposed to be overweight or out of shape. While German students at Tannberg called their non-German peers 'foreigners', the Turkish and other minority ethnic students called their German peers 'potatoes'. Both terms imply a sense of racial/ethnic hierarchy and are a means by which German and Turkish students reassert their superiority and refer to the other group as having an inferior culture.

Turning now to Goethe Gymnasium, located in the same inner-city Stuttgart borough, we shall see that students received very different messages from the school despite a similar curriculum emphasis on Europe. The school valued the fact that minority ethnic students had an additional language and regarded this as a particular asset. Like Tannberg, Goethe Gymnasium promoted European values but this time alongside rather than instead of multicultural values. The school prospectus stated that:

The ethos of our school is characterised by mutual respect, confidence and tolerance towards other people. Our students, who come from diverse backgrounds, practise intercultural tolerance and community; they learn the manifoldness of European languages, cultures and mentalities and can thus develop their own identity within our school. The internationality of our school community alongside its location next to libraries, museums, opera houses, archives, theatres and galleries characterises our profile. Europe as a cultural area is one of our guiding principles. (School brochure; translated from German)

Unlike at Tannberg, there was ample evidence that staff at Goethe tried to promote an inclusive multi-ethnic concept of Europe and attempted to integrate all students into the school community. For example, the school prospectus showed that, when racial discrimination in Germany boiled over in the 1990s into a series of violent attacks by young neo-Nazi skinheads, the school management organised a series of theme days against hostility. Students covered the outer walls of the school building with national flags from around the world. The school organised a parent brunch twice a year to bond the different school communities together and fostered seemingly congenial relationships between parents, students and teachers. The teachers I interviewed also maintained that as far as they could they tried to integrate minority ethnic students into their lessons. For example, Miss Adler, the head of geography, strongly argued in favour of a multicultural dimension:

**DF:** How do you include minority ethnic students and address their particular needs in your lessons?

**Ms Adler:** Well, first of all I ask where they come from and let them talk about their country of origin. I have a lot of Turkish, Italian and Spanish children in all my classes and we once developed a questionnaire and went to the market hall and specifically asked Italian, Spanish and Turkish traders about the products they sell, you know, products like olives, goat cheese and so on and the kids could learn a lot from that and could see that this is part of Germany's diversity. Also, erm, when we talk about volcanoes in Italy or agriculture in Mediterranean countries, students are directly addressed. Mediterranean countries are very similar in their structure and that gives me the flexibility to talk about tourism in Greece or Turkey and then say that it is

similar in Spain. ... I always try to include an international and European dimension in my lessons because national thinking is a thing of the past.

European and multicultural values also figured prominently in the curriculum of subjects such as geography and history at Goethe. For example, in geography, three out of four teaching units in Year 6 (ages 11-12) were spent on Europe, with students studying central Europe, the continent of Europe and European integration. The entire Year 8 (ages 13-14) dealt with global and multicultural geographical issues, including India and China, Japan, the United States, and the Muslim world. In history, half of the Year 7 (ages 12-13) and the entire Year 8 (ages 14-15) curriculum taught students about medieval Europe, the Enlightenment in Europe as well as the Greeks and Romans. Only some of the Year 10 teaching units explicitly dealt with German national agendas including World War Two and National Socialism. Goethe Gymnasium delivered the mandatory curriculum but in its own unique way, through the promotion of European *and* multicultural agendas.

The culturally tolerant atmosphere of Goethe Gymnasium clearly contributed to students' well-being. For example, Ali argued that 'there are loads of different nationalities [29 nationalities], I feel comfortable here. This school doesn't make much of a difference between "foreigners" and Germans', and Zafer added that 'the school simply makes me feel part of the community and it doesn't matter from which country you come from'. Other school efforts that were mentioned by the German and Turkish 15-year-olds included school trips, group discussions and patience on the part of teachers. In particular, Nadine mentioned that 'teachers take their time to explain things because they know that there are different people here'. Nadine also mentioned the beautiful architecture of the building and the fact that all her friends are in this school too. 'During break times I'm together with my friends and the atmosphere is just great. That's what I like about this school, being together with friends and having fun'. These views stand in stark contrast to what we saw at Tannberg Hauptschule where some teachers I interviewed were getting close to being Islamophobic and positioned minority ethnic students, and the Turks in particular, as the 'Other'.

Students' stronger sense of integration at Goethe Gymnasium was also expressed in their cross-ethnic friendships. There were no reports on ethnic tensions and all I saw was that students formed groups along gender lines so that there were some boys-only and girls-only tables in the classrooms. Although many in the sample of German and Turkish respondents had inter-ethnic friendships, there was a slight tendency amongst Turkish students to form non-German friendship groups which, according to Zafer (a Turkish boy), was the result of 'all foreigners [being] somewhat equal in their behaviour, just the way they live, they're different from Germans I think, cos they live in a different country and lead a different life'. Nevertheless, Nerhim's best friend was German and the other three girls had German friends too:

**DF:** Could you tell me a bit about your friends?

**Semra:** Well, my friends are predominantly non-Turks but foreigners from Greece, Italy and Croatia. I've also got German friends but prefer foreigners.

**Nilgün:** Turks, Germans, Greeks too; fairly mixed I'd say but that doesn't really matter. I get on very well with Germans too.

**Nerhim:** I've many friends from different backgrounds, but my best friend is German. That's no problem. I mean, I get on well with everybody in principle. I have no problems whatsoever and that's why I've so many different friends.

**Zeynep:** Well, I've different friends from different countries too. I've never had any problems and stuff.

**Semra:** I think it's stupid when you've got problems with Germans. I mean, we're in Germany but I've no problems with the Germans.

Similarly, as a result of the school's culturally tolerant atmosphere, the German students I interviewed had ethnically mixed friendships and typically argued that personality was more important than ethnicity when choosing friends. For example, Kai argued that 'I don't choose friends according to nationality; it's important

what the character of a person is like' and Jonas added that 'I don't mind which nationality they have. I've to get on with them'. The openness and tolerance of Sophie and Nadine, which may have been reinforced through the school's teaching of mutual respect and intercultural tolerance, allowed the girls to gain an insight into the (home) culture of some of their classmates and boyfriends. During our conversations, both girls maintained that, despite some religious differences, their friends had very similar characters, underlining the importance of personality over ethnicity:

**Nadine:** I've a Turkish friend and at their home I always have to be very polite. But they give you so much, when I go there, they offer you so many things, whatever you want. That's just so nice. But you've to be polite and respect all the different traditions. That's simple; or, I have a Greek friend too and when I go to his place, they have lots of holy pictures on the wall and talk in Greek and stuff, erm. Then I sometimes ask what this and that means, and learn a lot. That's good.

**Sophie:** My boyfriend is Italian, a proud Italian. And that's how I got to know the Italian cuisine and mentality. But I've lots of Turkish friends too. My best friend is Spanish and I've lots of Croatian friends too. But it also has to do with the area I live in. There are lots of foreigners. I don't have a problem with that cos I don't pick my friends according to nationality, looks or language, but other personal criteria.

However, despite these alleged sociocultural and religious differences, this group of students still formed friendships with the Turkish and other minority ethnic communities. Arguably, the fact that Goethe Gymnasium mediated such differences through notions of liberalism and a strong sense of community helped students to learn more about other cultures and to make contact with students from different backgrounds. As a result, there were few signs of any ethnic tensions *within* the school community. Both German and Turkish 15-year-olds reported only isolated discriminatory incidents. For instance, Sema argued that 'I've recently heard from my teacher that Turks always have cleaning jobs and that's really hurt me; and then the headscarf is the next problem'. Sema's remarks not only revealed how some teachers positioned Turkish youth as inferior to Germans but also alluded to the German political debate about whether or not headscarves should be allowed in public institutions.

A number of Turkish interviewees, however, felt subject to discrimination *outside* Goethe Gymnasium, many of which revolved around verbal abuse (e.g. being called 'foreigners', sexist remarks) and cultural insensitivity (e.g. relating to the wearing of headscarves, gender roles in Turkish society). Some of the cultural insensitivities students encountered outside school are exemplified in the following quotation from a discussion with male and female Turkish students:

**DF:** Have you ever experienced any form of discrimination or prejudice?

**Pelin:** Well, people often ask me why I don't wear a headscarf. That's annoying; I then think, 'what kind of impression do you have of us?' I find that really stupid, these court shows on TV and so on; they picture Turkish men beating their women. That just doesn't reflect reality any more.

**Nurhan:** Yes, that's not true. I'd say the Turks are as modern as you are. They can just do whatever they want to and it's up to the individual whether or not they want to wear a headscarf. ...

**Aysegül:** People ask me whether my mum wears a headscarf and whether I need to pray now and other stuff and that's just annoying.

**Melik:** They ask things like whether the Koran allows me to masturbate and whether we'd force women to marry us. I mean, there are certain things we're not allowed to do, like sex before marriage, but then we just don't do that. ...

**Ismet:** What's also very rude is when they say 'eat döners'; for example, some are making fun of the Turks and then they go and eat a döner. I find that rude. Then they should go for Italian food.

Another example which was suggestive of the higher level of integration was the minority students' willingness to adapt to the German way of life. Most interviewees at Goethe felt that integration and multiculturalism were compatible and that minority ethnic communities should integrate into the German society *whilst* also maintaining their culture and traditions. For example, the group of German girls considered knowledge of the German language as a key to successful integration. 'They should master the German language. I know so many "foreigners" who can't speak a word of German. If I go to a country then I should first learn the language so that I can communicate and integrate and don't just go there'. This strongly resembled the arguments of recent governments expecting new immigrants to attend language and integration courses. Some of the Turkish respondents also argued that 'one should adapt to the language, that's what we have to master above all'. However, there were also those few Turkish interviewees who argued that they would not give up parts of their culture, customs and traditions (e.g. 'I'm strictly against that, no matter what the Germans think; we've our rules and I'd never deny my culture'). For most young people, however, there was no contradiction between integrating into the German society and retaining their culture.

### **Forever Foreigners? Ways of Improving Policy and Practice**

Germany took considerably more time than other European countries to develop deliberate processes of integration, despite its strong welfare system model. The growth of immigration (e.g. 1964: 1 million, 1982: 4.7 million, 2002: 7.3 million) overshadowed the attempts by policy makers and politicians to reconceptualise the national identity, shattered by the war, in European terms. The Turkish Muslims were physically brought into the European project by the Germans, who increasingly needed labour after the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961. However, because the Government did not want the 'guest workers' to stay in Germany for more than a few years, it took 10 years for policy makers to respond to the increasing cultural and ethnic diversity. And even when they responded in the mid 1960s, this was not the sort of policy approach that former colonial powers like England took because they recruited labourers who initially had the right to reside permanently in the host country. Although several European countries initially developed assimilationist educational approaches, the German approach in the 1960s and 1970s was viewed as the key means of assimilating 'guest worker' children into a monocultural conception of Germany and did not attempt to recognise cultural and ethnic differences within the concept of national identity. To date, state officials have been struggling to redefine the country's Europeanised identity in multicultural terms so as to fully include minority ethnic communities like the Turkish Muslims (International Crisis Group, 2007).

This can also be seen, for instance, in the limited recruitment of teachers from non-German backgrounds. Out of 740,711 male and female teachers, only 5,302 (0.7%) held a foreign passport and a total of about 1% had a migrant background (Verband Bildung und Erziehung, 2006) despite the fact that Germany had 15.3 million 'foreigners', refugees and resettlers (18.6%). Although these quotas are considerably higher in inner-city boroughs, schools like Tannberg Hauptschule (62.4% minority ethnic students compared with 2.9% minority ethnic teachers) and Goethe Gymnasium (24% minority ethnic students and 0.6% minority ethnic teachers) in Stuttgart highlight the discrepancies in Germany between a multicultural student population and a largely monocultural teacher population. This invisibility of role models is counterproductive to the notion of intercultural education and does little to facilitate the integration of minority ethnic students. The fact that nearly one-quarter of male minority ethnic students (and 13% of female minority ethnic students) leave school without any qualification prompted the education minister of the state of Berlin (Klaus Böger, SPD) to call for young male Turkish teachers. However, fully qualified teachers from minority ethnic communities are rare in Germany. There is thus a need for state officials to promote the recruitment of minority ethnic teachers (and other public service staff) and to encourage all schools to close the 'ethnic gap' between their student and teacher populations.

Another implication arising from this article, and related to the above, is the need to collect more statistics to assess the educational and professional situation of minority ethnic communities. Like France (see Raveaud,

2008), Germany has no tradition of gathering such data; and statistics have recorded nationality rather than ethnicity, which have made it difficult to provide exact figures about the size of the migrant population or the performance of school students. It was only on 1 January 2005 that a new micro-census law (*Mikrozensusgesetz*) came into force which included questions about the previous nationality of migrants and their naturalisation date (Konsortium Bildungsberichterstattung, 2006). However, since Germany has not conducted an official census since 1987, these new data must be treated with caution as there are no means of comparison. Most recently, following the introduction of national educational standards, the 16 federal states have started to monitor educational progress. For example, a report in the state of Baden-Württemberg revealed that, in 2007, students with a migrant background achieved significantly lower than their German peers and had an average educational deficit of up to one year (Landesinstitut für Schulentwicklung, 2007). Although the collection of such data is a step in the right direction, there has been no systematic approach to look at individual student data in German schools. PISA and other earlier-cited studies have shown that the one-size-fits-all approach of grouping migrant students together only provides a partial view. There is thus a real need to collect data by ethnicity across all federal states.

However, this still invites the question about whether all the new laws and integration initiatives and Germany's shift from notions of 'foreigner pedagogy' to intercultural education can help overcome the sorts of cultural insensitivities we saw in Tannberg Hauptschule where some teachers were getting close to being Islamophobic and also constructed minority ethnic students as the 'Other'. It is deeply problematic that, after 50 years of migration, Germany still officially employs terms such as 'foreigner' (*Ausländer*) or 'foreign citizen' (*ausländische Mitbürger*) rather than acknowledging hybrid identities such as German Muslims or Turkish Germans. Just as a large majority of interviewees at Goethe said they felt that integration and multiculturalism were compatible concepts, German policy makers and practitioners need to promote both diversity and solidarity. In other words, it is important to foster social cohesion through a common German language and citizenship on the one hand whilst valuing non-German cultures and identities on the other. We have seen in this article that schools and teachers can make a difference but that German policy and practice still has some way to go to leave behind the image of the third-generation 'foreigner'.

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Sharon Gewirtz and Chris Gaine for taking the time to edit this special issue and for inviting me to contribute. I am grateful to Madeleine Arnot for challenging my sociological thinking and commenting on earlier drafts of this article. I also thank Lynne Chisholm for her advice during data analysis and interpretation; and the British Economic and Social Research Council (Award No. PTA-030-2002-00853), the Cambridge European Trust and Clare Hall College, Cambridge for their financial contributions.

### Notes

- [1] These OECD studies are conducted every three years amongst 15-year-old students and assess young people's performance in reading (PISA 2000), mathematics (PISA 2003) and science (PISA 2006). The 2003 tests were conducted in 41 countries, 17 of which were part of a follow-up study on immigrant students' success (OECD, 2003).
- [2] There is still no common definition of interculturalism and multiculturalism and intercultural and multicultural education. The notion of interculturalism seems to have originated in France and is employed in Council of Europe and European Commission documents while the policy origins of multiculturalism can be traced back to Canada. The former concept emphasises dialogue, interaction and individuals whereas the latter emphasises collectivities and is often criticised for the coexistence of communities. Arguably, instead of differentiating between the two, we might like to define what kind of multiculturalism we are talking about: (a) *pluralistic* multiculturalism or (b) *inclusive* multiculturalism which promotes both solidarity and diversity (see Faas, 2008).

- [3] The standard integration courses consist of a basic and intermediate language course totalling up to 900 hours of instruction; and a 30-hour orientation course about the German legal system, culture and history. Intensive courses consisting of 430 hours have also been made available. Some participants may pay a token fee.
- [4] The identities of all schools, teachers and students in the study were protected from outsiders by using pseudonyms.

## References

- Archer, L. (2008) The Impossibility of Minority Ethnic Educational 'Success'? An Examination of the Discourses of Teachers and Pupils in British Secondary Schools, *European Educational Research Journal*, 7(1), 89-107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2008.7.1.89>
- Auernheimer, G. (1990) How Black are the German Turks? Ethnicity, Marginality and Interethnic Relations for Young People of Turkish Origin, in L. Chisholm, P. Büchner, H.H. Krüger & P. Brown (Eds) *Childhood, Youth and Social Change: a comparative perspective*. Basingstoke: Falmer Press.
- Bade, K.J. (2000) The German Hub: migration in history and the present, *Deutschland Magazine on Politics, Culture, Business and Science*, 6, 38-43.
- Behörde für Bildung und Sport (Ed.) (2003) *Hamburgisches Schulgesetz vom 16.4.1997 geändert am 27.6.2003*. Hamburg: Behörde für Bildung und Sport.
- Bildungskommission Nordrhein-Westfalen (1995) *Zukunft der Bildung – Schule der Zukunft: Denkschrift der Kommission 'Zukunft der Bildung – Schule der Zukunft' beim Ministerpräsidenten des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen*. Neuwied: Luchterhand.
- Bundesregierung (2007) *Der Nationale Integrationsplan: neue Wege, neue Chancen*. Berlin: Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung.
- Der Kultusminister des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (Ed.) (1985) *Richtlinien und Lehrpläne für die Grundschule in Nordrhein-Westfalen: Sachunterricht*. Frechen: Ritterbach.
- Faas, D. (2007a) The Europeanisation of German Ethnic Identities: the case of German and Turkish students in two Stuttgart secondary schools, *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 17(1), 45-62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09620210701433738>
- Faas, D. (2007b) Youth, Europe and the Nation: the political knowledge, interests and identities of the new generation of European youth, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10(2), 161-181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13676260601120161>
- Faas, D. (2007c) Turkish Youth in the European Knowledge Economy: an exploration of their responses to Europe and the role of social class and school dynamics for their identities, *European Societies*, 9(4), 573-599. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14616690701318805>
- Faas, D. (2008) Constructing Identities: the ethno-national and nationalistic identities of white and Turkish students in two English secondary schools, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(1), 37-48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425690701737440>
- Federal Ministry of the Interior (2004) Einzelheiten des Zuwanderungsgesetzes. [http://www.bmi.bund.de/Annex/de\\_25620/Gesetzestext\\_des\\_Zuwanderungsgesetzes.pdf](http://www.bmi.bund.de/Annex/de_25620/Gesetzestext_des_Zuwanderungsgesetzes.pdf)
- Herbert, U. (2003) *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
- Hoff, G.R. (1995) Multicultural Education in Germany: historical development and current status, in J.A. Banks (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- International Crisis Group (2007) *Islam and Identity in Germany*. [http://www.crisisgroup.org/library/documents/europe/181\\_islam\\_in\\_germany.pdf](http://www.crisisgroup.org/library/documents/europe/181_islam_in_germany.pdf)
- Isoplan (Ed.) (2005) Statistik: Fünfzig Jahre Zuwanderung, <http://www.isoplan.de/aid/2005-3/statistik.htm>
- Konsortium Bildungsberichterstattung (Ed.) (2006) *Bildung in Deutschland: ein indikatorengestützter Bericht mit einer Analyse zu Bildung und Migration*. Bielefeld: Bertelsmann.

- Kultusministerkonferenz (1990) Europa im Unterricht: Beschluss der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 8.6.1978 in der Fassung vom 7.12.1990. [http://www.bebis.cidsnet.de/faecher/feld/europa/unterricht\\_dateien/kmkeuropa.htm](http://www.bebis.cidsnet.de/faecher/feld/europa/unterricht_dateien/kmkeuropa.htm)
- Kultusministerkonferenz (1996) Interkulturelle Bildung und Erziehung in der Schule: Beschluss der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 25.10.1996. <http://www.bebis.cidsnet.de/faecher/feld/interkultur/rechtindex.html>
- Landesinstitut für Schulentwicklung (2006) Schulgesetz für Baden-Württemberg. <http://www.smv.bw.schule.de/Gesetze/schulgesetz.pdf>
- Landesinstitut für Schulentwicklung (2007) Untersuchung zum Abschneiden von Schülerinnen und Schülern mit Migrationshintergrund im Rahmen der DVA 2007. [http://www.schule-bw.de/entwicklung/bildungsbericht/migration\\_dva.pdf](http://www.schule-bw.de/entwicklung/bildungsbericht/migration_dva.pdf)
- Luchtenberg, S. (1997) Stages in Multicultural Theory and Practice in Germany, in R.J. Watts & J. Jerzy (Eds) *Cultural Democracy and Ethnic Pluralism: multicultural and multilingual policies in education*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Maclure, M. (2003) *Discourse in Educational and Social Research*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Oestreich, H. (2005) *Der Kopftuchstreit: das Abendland und ein Quadratmeter Islam*. Frankfurt am Main: Brandes & Apsel.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2004) *Learning for Tomorrow's World: first results from PISA 2003*. Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2006) *Where Immigrant Students Succeed: a comparative review of performance and engagement in PISA 2003*. Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2007) *Naturwissenschaftliche Kompetenzen für die Welt von Morgen: OECD briefing note für Deutschland*. Paris: OECD.
- Özdil, A. (1999) *Aktuelle Debatten zum Islamunterricht in Deutschland: Religionsunterricht, religiöse Unterweisung für Muslime, Islamkunde*. Hamburg: E.B. Verlag.
- Raveaud, M. (2008) Culture-blind? Parental Discourse on Religion, Ethnicity and Secularism in the French Educational Context, *European Educational Research Journal*, 7(1), 74-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2008.7.1.74>
- Risse, T. & Engelmann-Martin, D. (2002) Identity Politics and European Integration: the case of Germany', in A. Pagden (Ed) *The Idea of Europe: from antiquity to the European Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Santel, B. & Weber, A. (2000) Zwischen Ausländerpolitik und Einwanderungspolitik: Migrations- und Ausländerrecht in Deutschland, in K.J. Bade & R. Münz (Eds) *Migrationsreport 2000*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
- Schiffauer, W. (2006) Enemies within the Gates: the debate about the citizenship of Muslims in Germany, in T. Modood, A. Triandafyllidou & R. Zapata-Barrero (Eds) *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: a European approach*. London: Routledge.
- Verband Bildung und Erziehung (2006) Migranten für den Lehrerberuf gewinnen: Pressekonferenz zum Weltlehrertag 2006. <http://www.vbe.de>
- Zschaler, M. (2004) Ohne Schleier. <http://www.welt.de/data/2004/11/22/363874.html>