DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND PHILOSOPHY
TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

POLICY BRIEF

The Challenge of Migration:
Schooling the Second Generation in Europe

Dr. Daniel Faas, daniel.faas@tcd.ie
Department of Sociology, Trinity College Dublin

Overview

In several European countries, 10% or more of the student population now has a migrant background; and some countries are facing this phenomenon for the very first time. There is growing concern that some students with an immigrant background perform lower than their native peers. Dealing effectively with the increasing migration-related diversity in schools, and in society at large, thus presents challenges. Nations in Europe differ considerably in their responses. For example, in Greece, for a school to be classified as intercultural, at least 45% of its student population must be non-Greek, but not all schools which pass this threshold are classified as intercultural. In Germany, 'integration' has become a policy buzzword but the country is still struggling to leave behind the image of the third-generation 'foreigner' (*Ausländer*) or 'foreign citizen' (*ausländische Mitbürger*). In Britain, we have witnessed a rethinking of multiculturalism which led to the emergence of 'community cohesion' as a public agenda alongside promoting global citizenship. By contrast, the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland continues to influence schooling, particularly culture and ethos.

The core questions that I have explored in the book *Negotiating Political Identities: Multiethnic Schools and Youth in Europe* are: How do EU and national policies connect to what is happening in schools across Europe? What differences exist in response to the challenges of globalization, migration and European integration within and between schools in a country and between countries? What are the impacts of school ethos and peer cultures on integration and identity formation? How can we balance cultural diversity and social cohesion in such a way as to promote more inclusive citizenship and educational policies?

The findings presented here are based on a comprehensive analysis of EU and national policy documents and other relevant data collected as part of fieldwork in four secondary schools in England (London) and Germany (Stuttgart). The primary material analysed includes 410 student questionnaires, 24 student focus groups, 32 individual student interviews, 16 teacher

interviews as well as a number of informal observations during time spent in schools and discussions with other researchers and practitioners during conferences and seminars.

Main Findings

Different historical engagements with national identity, migration-related diversity and European integration have had enormous impacts on the identities students can access in schools across Europe. German schools generally promote Europe rather than national identity whereas English schools favour national and multicultural topics and pay little attention to Europe in the curriculum. However, schools reinterpret the national political framework in different ways creating distinct learning environments that affect young people. It is therefore the micro policies within schools and local contexts that matter most.

I closely analysed four schools with rather different ethos and policies:

1. *Tannberg Hauptschule* was located in a predominantly working-class inner-city area in Stuttgart. The school had 62% ethnic minority students and advocated what I call a 'Eurocentric approach' in the sense that some teachers were rather hostile toward migrants, particularly Turkish students. For example, they occasionally spoke German with a foreign accent and referred to beef sauce as 'Muslim sauce'.
2. *Goethe Gymnasium* was located in a more middle-class area in the same inner-city area as Tannberg. The school had 24% ethnic minority students and promoted what I termed a 'liberal approach' that combined European and multicultural issues. In both German schools, the relationships between different groups were congenial.
3. *Millroad School* was located in a primarily working-class inner-city area in London. The school had 80% ethnic minority students and generally celebrated its cultural and ethnic diversity without advocating a sense of cohesiveness. For example, there were multilingual signs, Turkish music and dance performances and students sat within their own ethnic group inside all classrooms. The result was lots of ethnic tensions.
4. *Darwin School* in the same inner-London borough, by contrast, celebrated neutrality and similarity and emphasized liberal democratic values – what I call 'multicultural Britishness'. 27% of students were from ethnic minority backgrounds, similar to Goethe Gymnasium in Stuttgart. There was hardly any conflict apart from occasional name-calling which was more homophobic than ethnic-related.

These distinct schooling approaches impacted in rather different ways on young people's identities. It is important to note that the socio-economic backgrounds of Turkish students, my main group, were similar across all schools which strongly suggests the levels of integration and identity formation were due to schooling (i.e. ethos, peer cultures, curricula).

In both working-class schools, many ethnic majority and Turkish minority students did not connect much with Europe as an identity and favoured their own ethnic group. At Millroad, as a result of the ethnic conflict, students described themselves as Turkish-only or English-only. At Tannberg, the picture was slightly more complex in that male Turkish 15-year-olds would

typically describe themselves as Turkish German or Turkish Stuttgarter whereas girls would more commonly refer to themselves as German Turkish, arguably as a result of the patriarchal structure of Turkish society. This suggests higher levels of integration among working-class youth in Germany. In both middle-class schools, many students first and foremost identified themselves as 'being British' or 'being German'. 'Being European' was part of students' multi-layered identities at Goethe but not at Darwin. This means that young people in England have rather limited access to Europe regardless of socio-economic background.

The study looked at differences *between* and *within* countries. Germany and England had different approaches to national identity, migration-related diversity and Europe, and these factors were linked with *between-country* differences in young people's opinions and identity formations. Youth in both German schools generally revealed a significantly higher level of geopolitical knowledge about Europe than their counterparts in both English schools. Over 80% in the German sample correctly identified the location of six European countries on a map whereas in the English sample only one country (Britain) was correctly identified by eight out of ten students. The score at Tannberg Hauptschule (63%) was still higher than in the middle-class Darwin School in England (49%). This difference highlights the increased European awareness and identity among young people in German schools.

Apart from differences between countries, different school approaches were most important in accounting for *within-country* differences of identity formation. At Tannberg, Turkish youth were subject to verbal abuse and discrimination because of their cultural and religious 'otherness'. The Eurocentric approach made it difficult for them to identify with Germany, let alone Europe. However, as a result of being born in Germany, they were able to mediate such marginalization. At Goethe Gymnasium, the peer-group and teacher-student dynamics were less divisive. Both ethnic majority and Turkish minority students showed higher levels of integration, as observed through inter-ethnic friendships. Attending a university-track school (as opposed to the more vocational-track Tannberg Hauptschule) created more wide-ranging opportunities for them within and beyond school and, consequently, a majority not only felt more comfortable in German society but also saw themselves as German Europeans.

Millroad School in London had the strongest ethnic conflict and there was little sense among staff of how to bond the conflicting school communities together. Turkish youth were locked in a battle with African Caribbean students over who controlled the school territory which left ethnic majority students (who were in fact in the minority in this school) marginalized. As a result, all students formed strong nationalistic and exclusionary identities. In contrast, at Darwin, teachers made a conscious effort to integrate students on the basis of being British citizens living in a multi-ethnic community. 15-year-olds felt comfortable talking to each other which was associated with the development of Turkish British and English British identities (in the case of Turkish and ethnic majority students respectively).

Ethnic majority students in all schools formed what I call 'chains of identities', integrating local, regional and (supra)national spheres. In both German schools, ethnic majority youth

linked the local Stuttgart, regional Baden-Württemberg (Swabian), national German and supranational European citizenship level. However, in the English context, as a result of the different prioritization of Europe at government level, these chains of identities typically excluded Europe. It is worth noting that majority-group students, in both Germany and England, generally also had a regional identity (Swabian or English) whereas virtually none of the Turkish respondents saw themselves as Swabian or English.

Put differently, Turkish 15-year-olds broke the chain by linking the local with the European level (Stuttgart European identities) or the local with the national level (Turkish Stuttgarter identities). I call this a 'triangle of identities'. In such a triangle it is possible to combine all the different political identities (local, regional, national and supranational) without seeing one as being integrated within the other. In fact, most Turkish interviewees saw regional and national identities as competing and said that you have to be born Swabian or English in order to draw on these identities (which are unavailable to them).

Recommendations
- I recommend a balance between cultural diversity and social cohesion. Celebrating diversity or advocating nationalistic (or Eurocentric) views undermines social cohesion and can drive communities further apart.
- I would like to see policies incorporate diversity and allow all people to forge new identities that are recognized and valued at school and government level. Policies that only promote assimilation or pluralism are an ineffective means of bonding together ethnic majority and minority communities, in schools and societies at large.
- The challenge that needs to be addressed is how to mobilize the cultural and linguistic capital of migrants *and* the host community in order to promote inclusive citizenship models and cohesive policies, not how best to assimilate migrants.
- In terms of curriculum development, finding a balance between national, European, global and migration-related topics and units is pertinent to allow young people access to all aspects of the knowledge economy, including Europe.
- With regard to teacher training and recruitment, I would like to see a true reflection among staff of population diversity in each European country and more intercultural awareness and knowledge as part of formal qualification.
- Potentially divisive and derogatory terms, such as 'foreigner', 'foreign citizen', 'alien', 'newcomer', 'black' or 'white' to mention but a few should be critically reviewed at all levels and replaced with terminology that reflects reality on the ground. This includes terms like Turkish German or Irish Polish.
- Integration takes places at many levels. It is to be welcomed that decision-makers continue or renew their efforts to promote a multiethnic, multifaith concept of nation-states and Europe that includes EU and third-country nationals.
- It is not only national governmental responses that drive integration on the ground, but above all individual school approaches in terms of ethos, peer cultures and micro policies. Management staff need to be aware of their role in the migration challenge.

The Atlas on Migration. Overall figures of immigrants in European society. On 1 January 2019, there were. 446.8 million inhabitants living in the EU. 20.9 million were non-EU citizens (4.7% of EU's total population). Â The European Commission's Knowledge Centre on Migration and Demography has issued The Atlas on Migration – an interactive resource of harmonised, up-to-date and validated data on the status of migration and demography in 27 EU Member States and 171 non-EU countries and territories. Browse through worldwide coverage of data for 198 countries and territories on more than 60 different indicators related to demography, migration, asylum, integration and development here: The Atlas on Migration. The performance of the second generation hinges above all on two factors. First, it depends on the background characteristics of the immigrant population. Generally, children of immigrants who bring low levels of human capital into the country are the most disadvantaged. Â Numbering nearly 4 million, Turkish migrants form the largest immigrant group in Europe, and they reside in a number of European countries. Turkish migration followed comparable patterns everywhere. Beginning with Germany in 1961 and ending with Sweden in 1967, European countries signed labor-migration agreements with Turkey. Labor migration peaked between 1971 and 1973, when more than half a million Turkish workers came to work in Western Europe. German industry recruited 90 percent of them. The migration into Europe was almost ignorable until after the Second World. War. Whatever outsiders were living in various European countries had. Â considered, that many people in the category of UK National and UK born. may be the second generation of migrants (their UK born children) came in. or earlier than 1970's. They are British Citizens by birth. Europe's focus on migrants 1 and migration is not new, however. Migration and integration have dominated political and social discourse across Europe for decades, with governments, politicians and experts engaged in heated debates on the pros and cons of Europe's increasingly diverse population. From warnings in 1968 by Enoch Powell, the British Conservative member of Parliament, that clashes between locals and immigrants would lead to "rivers of blood" flowing through Britain, to Brexit, migration has been a major British preoccupation, especially for the Conservative Party. Â The number of migrants arriving in Europe is down from the peak reached in 2015. Many refugees who fled violence in the Middle East are returning to their homes.