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Executive Summary

This deliverable identifies former and current policies and measures in the area of integration in the three partner cities Berlin, Malmö and Rotterdam. For each partner city we describe the policy history, policy setting, policy goals and policy measures. The deliverable is based on a triangulation of data: analysis of policy documents, a review of relevant literature and interviews with people who were involved in the integration policy process. Our analysis of local integration policies is based on the taxonomy of integration areas and models that is outlined in deliverable D3.1 “Integration issue classification and taxonomies report”. This report identifies a socio-economic, legal-political, socio-cultural and spatial integration area. It distinguishes between assimilationist, multiculturalist, civic republicanist, differentialist and post-nationalist models of integration policies.

In Berlin, legally structured and regulated integration policy has emerged only recently. From the mid-1970s onward, the Senate introduced initial policies that aimed at integration of the people with a migration background who came to Germany as guest workers. Policies were characterised by the national attempt to slow down immigration to Germany on the one hand, but to foster integration of people with a migration background already living in Berlin on the other hand (i.e. socio-economic and cultural integration, intercultural opening of the public administration, simplification of naturalisations, etc.).

Since 2003, the legal institutionalisation of integration policy has been the major aim of integration policy making. In December of 2010, the Senate passed the Integration and Participation Law of Berlin (PartIntG). This law includes specifications of integration policy in Berlin (e.g. definition of aims and objectives, i.e. fostering migrant participation or encouraging the intercultural opening of the public administration, permanent establishment of integration commissioners and the advisory board for integration, structural adaptation of integration policy infrastructures in the districts, etc.). The Senate as well as the districts of Mitte, Neukölln, Spandau, Pankow, Marzahn-Hellersdorf formulated their own integration concepts which contain goals and objectives as well as practical measures. Examining both administrative levels, it becomes clear that each district has created objectives and measures that cater to their specific needs. For example, Neukölln’s integration policy goals and measures emphasise the fight against (youth) delinquency and other criminal activities whereas other districts such as Pankow or Treptow-Köpenick regard anti-xenophobic policies and related measures as more important.

In Malmö, since the economic crisis in the early 1990’s, most policies and measures have focused on improving the labour market situation, especially for migrant groups. The steady inflow of unemployed migrants has made unemployment a constant struggle. To improve the situation, the city of Malmö has invested in large construction and infrastructure projects and made efforts to increase the human capital of the population. The central government plays an important part in local integration policies and measures. Most of the targeted integration measures, like language training and introduction programmes, are either decided and/or coordinated by the central government and state authorities. The main ideology of integration in Malmö is mainstreaming. Most money and efforts to improve integration are spent on general socio-economic measures like schools, employment and adult education. The spatial
Integration is often an important part of these measures. There are also legal-political and socio-cultural integration measures, like counteracting discrimination and racism as well as encouraging inter-ethnic contact and civil society participation.

In 1978 Rotterdam’s first integration policy came into force when it became clear that guest worker immigration was not a temporary phenomenon and the social-economic position of immigrants worsened. Policies focused on the legal-political and socio-economic dimension of integration and were of multiculturalist nature. After 1985, the Rotterdam authorities concluded that generic measures were not sufficient to fight immigrants’ socio-economic deprivation and temporary specific socio-economic measures were enforced. The policy became more demanding instead of accommodative towards immigrants. Policy on the socio-economic dimension of integration can be characterised as republicanist. Still, socio-cultural issues were left to the public. The municipality did publish a document that proposed to create space for mosques. From 1998 to 2002 Rotterdam experienced a short period that was characterised by multiculturalism. Socio-cultural measures were taken to promote and celebrate the ethnic diversity of Rotterdam’s population. In 2002, the new city executive in which the political party Liveable Rotterdam had a majority, announced a radical break with the previous policies. The assimilationist policy discourse on the socio-cultural and spatial dimension of integration was politically contested.

Rotterdam’s current integration policy is not named ‘integration policy’ but has been transformed to a ‘citizenship policy’ targeting all citizens of Rotterdam. However, there is a special focus on the weakest social groups. The policy reflects the economic situation and budget cuts that have to be made. Integration policies are developed on the socio-cultural and socio-economic dimension of integration. They are of civic republicanist nature demanding more self-sufficiency and active citizenship without distinguishing between ethnicities. Policy measures – except for the organisation of civic integration courses – are executed by NGOs that are subsidised by the municipality. Currently, the subsidy infrastructure is limited to four areas of expertise: diversity, emancipation, non-formal education and anti-discrimination.

Based on rich descriptions of integration policies in each city, some interesting comparative conclusions can be drawn. First of all, we see that the policies of all cities are targeting multiple areas of integration. In many cases, measures combine several domains. The spatial dimension of integration is often dealt with implicitly, for example in measures that target specific areas of the city. Secondly, we observe that all three cities are struggling with the target groups of their integration policies. In Berlin, next to ‘immigrants’, ‘foreigners’ and ‘Spätaussiedler’ currently the more general distinction of people with a migration background is used. Malmö and Rotterdam try to refrain from ethnic categories and no longer speak of ‘integration policies’. Their policies are targeting the population as a whole. Their policies can be characterised as republicanist policies that contain a liberal egalitarian view on immigrant integration. Thirdly, we can conclude that in Berlin and Rotterdam, the main actors engaged with the execution of integration measures are NGOs. In Malmö, where less government services are privatised, the main actor in this is still the local government. NGOs often have socio-cultural aims next to socio-economic goals. In Malmö, without the NGOs as executive partners, the measures are less socio-cultural.
1. Introduction

We analyse integration policies and measures in Berlin, Malmö and Rotterdam along the lines of the taxonomy of categories and dimensions of integration which we have developed in deliverable D3.1, the 'Integration issue classification and taxonomies report'. This report identifies a socio-economic, legal-political, socio-cultural and spatial integration area. Hereby, we can capture the multidimensionality of integration policies. The taxonomy report also distinguishes between assimilationist, multiculturalist, civic republicanist, differentialist and post-nationalist models of integration policies. This captures the assumptions and ideologies on which the policy is based. This deliverable also draws on deliverable D2.1, the 'Public administration workflow and key role report'. In this deliverable, we described the institutional setting and workflows in which integration policies are developed in the three cities. We concluded that the cities differ in their administrative settings and have varying degrees of local and regional autonomy. Therefore, they have established distinct approached and workflows concerning migrant integration policies and their planning, implementation and evaluation of measures. Finally, this deliverable relates to deliverable D3.2, the 'Integration issue report' that gives an overview of present integration issues in Berlin, Malmö and Rotterdam. This report is also structured in terms of the integration area taxonomy of deliverable D3.1. We found that socio-economic integration issues are important in all three cities but even more so in Malmö. In Berlin and Rotterdam, socio-cultural issues are highly prevalent as well. In Berlin, legal-political issues are present.

While identifying the integration policies of Berlin, Malmö and Rotterdam, we addressed some relevant questions. First of all, we aimed not only to list the integration areas that the measures addressed, but we also evaluated to what extent they combined integration areas and whether certain integration areas were left out. Secondly, we analysed what groups of society the measures targeted and how this relates to the policy models on which the measures are based. Finally, we looked into ways how the institutional setting and workflows of the city administrations (as outlined in deliverable D2.1) relate to the policy outcomes in terms of which integration areas are addressed. We describe our answers to these questions in the comparative conclusion.

This deliverable takes an essential role in the UniteEurope framework, particularly with regards to the decision support function of the software. It constitutes a thorough basis for the deliverables D3.6 and D3.11 ("Integration measures libraries 1 and 2") in which, as a first step, results of the deliverable at hand will be derived into a systematic list of integration measures which are to be integrated into the tool.
2. Methodology

The results in this deliverable are based on a triangulation of data. Three methods were used to identify former and current integration policies in the three European cities: analysis of policy documents, a review of relevant literature and interviews with people who were involved in the integration policy process. Most types of data were available in the three origin languages of the city. During analysis some parts have been translated to English and used in this deliverable.

In Berlin the relevant policy documents were mainly retrieved from the Internet. Especially the publications by the Senate’s commissioner for integration and migration were included in the research. For example, the integration concept of the Senate played major role. A list of documents scrutinised in the context of this analysis can be found in the appendix of this document. All policy documents were examined extensively.

Next to a broad document analysis, we also conducted semi-structured interviews with several district integration commissioners (from Neukölln, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, Lichtenberg, Marzahn-Hellersdorf, Treptow-Köpenick, Pankow, Steglitz-Zehlendorf, Wilmersdorf-Charlottenburg) as well as a senior policy advisor from the integration commissioner’s office of the Senate. We included relevant answers provided by the interlocutors in our analysis of Berlin’s integration policies and measures.

In the city of Malmö interviews were done with a manager at Rosengård city district, four senior civil servants working at the Immigrant service and the Unit for integration and employment and a political secretary at the Commissioners unit. In addition to persons employed in the city administration, interviews were done with people responsible for local integration policies at the Employment service and the County administrative board.

In Rotterdam, the city administration was closely involved in identifying relevant policy documents regarding integration of third country nationals. They concern the period of 1978 onwards. Next to this, existing literature on Rotterdam’s integration policy was used. Finally, nine in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted. The municipality of Rotterdam themselves made the choice of respondents on the basis of what they deemed to be important and key actors in the field of integration policy making. The municipality strived to interview a diverse group of informants. They are working as senior policy makers, strategic advisors, governors in politics or as senior employees of NGOs.
3. Berlin

The history of Berlin, and therefore the history of Berlin as an immigration city, is strongly influenced by the division of Germany and the development of two distinct German states. After the Second World War the city was divided into four spheres of influence among the allied occupying powers. After 1949, West-Berlin was part of the Federal Republic of Germany, while East-Berlin became the capital of the German Democratic Republic. Despite the new inner-German border, up to the sixties, more than 1.5 million refugees from the German Democratic Republic made their way to West-Berlin. While most of them later left the city to settle in other regions of the Federal Republic, 200,000 remained in West-Berlin. After the erection of the Berlin Wall this trend ended and the population of West-Berlin began to decline. At the time, due to the politics of the National Socialists in the Third Reich, there were practically no foreigners living in West-Berlin, apart from the members of the allied troops (Gesemann 2009; Kapphan 2001).

Thereafter, the history of immigration in the two parts of Berlin was influenced by the different economic development and opposing political ideologies. The immigration of foreigners to East-Berlin stayed fairly limited and was confined to citizens of “fraternal countries” like Vietnam, Poland, Angola and Mozambique. Foreign students and workers in East-Berlin lived fairly isolated from the German population, in special dormitories and were not allowed to rent flats on the free housing market. Their working treaties, and therefore their residence permissions, were temporarily limited. After the reunification many of them lost their jobs and had to leave the country. Accordingly, the population rate of foreigners in East-Berlin at that time was, compared to the western part of the city, strikingly low. While in 1989 13,7 per cent of the population in West-Berlin consisted of foreigners, in East-Berlin the ratio was 1,6 % (Gesemann 2009; Kapphan 2001).

In West-Berlin the immigration of foreigners began in the middle of the sixties and was associated with the recruitment of foreign workers as so called “guest workers” by the Federal German Republic. In the 1950s the federal government of West-Germany started to sign labour recruitment agreements with various nation states of Southern Europe to compensate the labour shortage in West-Germany and to facilitate the clearance of war damages. While other cities in Germany already hosted a large amount of migrant labourers, the recruitment of foreign workers in Berlin2 started comparatively late – around 1968. Since there were not enough workers arriving from Italy, Spain and Greece, Berlin recruited its “guest workers” mostly from Turkey and former Yugoslavia. It is noteworthy that Berlin’s electronic and consumer goods industry recruited a high number of female workers. The recruitment of labour migrants as “guest workers” ended with the nationwide recruitment ban in 1973 (Gesemann 2009; Kapphan 2001).

After 1973 the circumstances of immigration to Berlin changed. The following migration period was characterised by family reunifications and the immigration of refugees. Initially, the

---

1 The first bilateral agreement for the recruitment of foreign workers was concluded in 1955 between the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy.

2 In the following paragraphs “Berlin”, unless otherwise stated, means “West-Berlin”.
sojourn of the so called “guest workers” was intended to be temporary. The latter were recruited to bridge a momentary labour shortage. “Guest workers” were supposed to leave, once the city had been reconstructed and the economy had recovered. However, the recruitment ban kept many migrants from returning to their home countries. Instead, their intention was to permanently reside in Berlin. Consequently, they encouraged their family members, spouses and children to move to and live in Germany. The family reunifications of the former “guest workers” are the reason why the foreign population of Berlin was still on the rise after the recruitment ban.

During the 1980s violent conflict in various regions around the globe and political changes in Eastern Europe shaped the immigration to Berlin. Therefore, most of the foreigners who came to Berlin during that time were asylum seekers from Iran, Vietnam, Poland, Lebanon and Palestine. In the late 1980s many migrants were refugees from the civil war in former Yugoslavia and Kurdish refugees from Iraq and Turkey. Not all of these refugees received a permanent residence permit and many of them later left Berlin. Nevertheless, refugees were the most important reason for the rise of the migrant population in Berlin during the 1980s (Gesemann 2009; Kapphan 2001).

Since the late 1980s and during the 1990s Spätaussiedler (migrants of German origin mainly from the former Soviet Union) form the biggest group of immigrants to Berlin (Kapphan 2001). These Spätaussiedler are German nationals in a legal sense. Yet they are immigrants and as such became subject of integration policies. Sometimes this contradiction leads to difficulties for the municipal administration. One of the members of the municipal administrations we interviewed told us, that Spätaussiedler associations protested against the fact that the commissioner for foreigners was responsible for them while they did not identify themselves as foreigners and are no foreigners in a legal sense either.

3.1 Policy history

3.1.1 Integration policies in Berlin from 1971 to 1981

Long before integration had been conceptualised as a coherent strategy in immigration politics, in 1971 the Senate of Berlin commissioned a cross-divisional planning team with the development of concepts for the inclusion of foreign workers. In their final report, submitted in 1972, they suggested a “demand-orientated integration model”, that was supposed to ensure a sufficient labour supply for Berlin’s economy. On the one hand this model suggested a limitation of immigration and financial support for those foreigners who were willing to return to their home countries. On the other hand family reunification should be respected. Various social and economic policy measures were to ensure the inclusion of foreign workers and their families (Gesemann 2009; Schwarz 2001).

Furthermore the first advisory board for foreigners was funded in 1971 in the district Kreuzberg. This advisory board consisted of various representatives of welfare associations, labour associations, employers, the police, municipal administrations and other institutions. The board was supposed to help with the coordination of all these actors, who were concerned with social implications of immigration (Baran 2011). Later similar advisory boards
were founded in other districts of Berlin, on the Senate level and in other cities of Germany. These boards gradually became more participatory, including migrant representatives. They developed into important actors in the policy field of migrant integration (see deliverables D2.1 and D3.2).

After the recruitment ban in 1973, political stakeholders slowly became aware of the fact that foreign workers and their families might not only stay temporarily in Germany, but might become permanent residents. In 1979, the Senate of Berlin submitted a strategy paper with "guidelines and measures for the integration of foreigners in Berlin". This strategy paper focused on foreign children who immigrated to Germany in the context of family reunification as well as the second generation of foreigners who were already born in the country. The goal was to ensure equal chances for foreign children regarding education and vocational training while at the same time not lowering the educational standards (Gesemann 2009).

Another important issue of the 1970s, from the perspective of the municipal administration, was the concentration of migrant population in certain districts of Berlin. To prevent the anticipated development of ghettos, the Senate reacted with a ban on foreigners in the respective districts (Zuzugssperren) in 1975. Accordingly, for foreigners it was forbidden to locate in the districts Tiergarten, Wedding, or Kreuzberg in which already more than 15 % of the population had a migration background. However, this ban was never very effective and was relieved in 1990 in the context of the political changes along the reunification of the city (Kapphan 2001).

3.1.2 Integration policies in Berlin from 1981 to 2003
Since the 1980s the work of the commissioner for foreigners determined to a large extent the integration policy in Berlin. The Berlin public administration established this position on the senate level in 1981. Barbara John was the first appointed commissioner and held this office for more than twenty years until 2003. Thus the work of John shaped the possibilities of this office, its influence within the public administration, its acceptance among the migrant population and its perception in the public during this period (Gesemann 2009).

One central function of the commissioner for foreigners – as it was then labelled – is the representation the migrant population’s interests within the public administration. Since the general political strategy during the 1980s was to reduce and prevent further immigration, the establishment of this office may seem contradictory. The general containment strategy of the public administration during this period included immigration limitation as well as fostering remigration of foreigners who already lived in Berlin. At the same time the integration of foreign residents became more and more important. In fact, this ambivalence was characteristic for Berlin’s policy on foreigners which was positioned between restrictive immigration policies on the one hand and liberal integration policies on the other. Nevertheless, this setting led to

---

3 The office has later been renamed. Since 2003 the "commissioner for foreigners" is called "commissioner for integration and migration".

4 For detailed information about the function of the office within the municipal administrations see D2.1.
various conflicts between the commissioner and the different senators of the interior (Gesemann 2009; Schwarz 2001).

In terms of the dimensions of integration as outlined in deliverable D 3.1 the most important aspects of the commissioner’s work at that time was in the fields of socio-economic and legal-political integration. Most services provided by the office came down to counselling services concerning legal and social matters. Indeed, as we have demonstrated in deliverable D 2.1, this focus is still ingrained in the organisational structure of the commissioner’s office today. Another crucial task was to get in touch with already existing migrant associations and to establish a constant dialogue with their representatives. Rather than developing new integration policies and measures, it was understood as more important to support these inhabitants who were affected by them. At the time, the municipal administration began to interpret the self-organisation of migrants as a resource for integration. Accordingly, another task of the commissioner for foreigners was to organise and to coordinate financial support for initiatives and projects from within the migrant community (Gesemann 2009).

Apart from the efforts mentioned above there were some further legal-political issues on the agenda of John. First, she saw in the naturalisation of migrants a crucial means for their integration. In this context she pledged for a legal right of naturalisation during the 1980s. Second, John was one of the first officials who suggested an intercultural opening of the public administration as an integral part of her integration policy. Third, she saw anti-discrimination policy as an important aspect of her work. For this purpose she introduced a task force on “anti-discrimination and violence prevention” in 1991, which was supposed to provide counselling and support for victims (Gesemann 2009). The work against discrimination, introduced by John, later became a central task of the office, as it is to be shown below.

Many scientific observers and actual members of the municipal administration are convinced that John shaped with her personal commitment the position of the commissioner for integration and migration (Gesemann 2009; Schwarz 2001). This personal commitment is certainly one of the reasons for the far reaching public attention this office gained in Germany. While John at the beginning of her term was often criticised for Berlin’s political handling of foreigners’ affairs, she later became an “inconvenient” member for the public administration, since she started to criticise restrictive immigration policies herself (Schwarz 2001).

It is noteworthy that during the city’s reunification, the commissioner for foreigners of East-Berlin, Annetta Kahane, offered to remain in office in order to provide services for the specific needs of the eastern districts. In the end, however, Kahane office was abandoned in the context of the administrative reforms described in deliverable D 2.1. Kahane played a significant role in the implementation of nationwide anti-racism programmes later on (Schwarz 2001).

---

5 During one of our own interviews, a high member of the office confirmed this assessment.
3.1.3 Integration policies in Berlin from 2003 to 2007

The next phase in the development of integration policies in Berlin begins with the inauguration of Günther Piening, the successor of Barbara John, as commissioner for integration and migration in 2003. Piening’s term is linked to various innovations of Berlin’s integration policy as well as to a change of the definition of the office itself. Integration policy in Berlin during his term covers all dimensions of integration. First of all, various nation wide projects have been set up to improve the chances of migrants to participate in the educational system respectively the labour market (socio-economic dimension). Some initiatives especially focused on the situation of refugees are supposed to ensure the better integration of all migrants, regardless of their residential status. Numerous efforts were made to influence the mutual perceptions of migrants and the German population (socio-cultural dimension). One important step in this context was the establishment of a new office against discrimination within the senate in 2005. The Senatsleitstelle gegen Diskriminierung (coordination centre against discrimination) is supposed to work together with other parts of the public administration and private partners. The goal of this institution is to prevent discrimination based on ethnicity, religion or ideological ideas in every day life. Once again, the focus is on equal access to educational institutions and the labour market. Furthermore, the Berlin programme against right-wing extremism, racism and anti-semitism falls in the term of Piening. Moreover, the dialogue between the public administration and the Islamic community was an important policy during this term. In 2003, the foundation of the State Advisory Board for Integration and Migration related Questions was established in 2003. With the development of neighbourhood-oriented integration programmes the local situation of migrants became more relevant in a spatial dimension of migrant integration policies (Gesemann 2009).

The integration policy of Berlin experienced a fundamental change with the submission of the first integration concept “encouraging diversity – strengthening cohesion” in 2005. Describing challenges, defining goals and suggesting measures concerning migrant integration, it was the first coherent and cross-divisional strategy paper in Berlin. One central matter of content is the coordination of efforts by different parts of the public administration. The focus is on the integration of various programmes and measures by defining common goals and pooling resources in the policy field of migrant integration (Gesemann 2009).

The concept was the object of controversial debates in the Berlin House of Representatives. The representatives demanded to define goals more clearly and to have the means to evaluate the success of the respective programmes. Furthermore, the function of the office of the commissioner for integration and migration as a cross-divisional institution was under question. As a result of these extended hearings and debates a new edition of the integration concept was commissioned in 2007. This concept is still valid today and includes a detailed monitoring system, based on integration indicators. This monitoring system is set up to help the responsible actors to evaluate the progress of the integration measures in order to develop new programmes. In this context integration policy itself and the function of the office of the commissioner for integration and migration have been redefined: it is now set up as a strategic management institution (Gesemann 2009).
While we shall analyse the integration concept as the main policy document for migrant integration in Berlin in the third part of this city case, we will describe in the following part the development of the national policy setting of the German federal government.

### 3.2 Current policy setting: National

The policy setting in the field of migrant integration in Germany takes place mainly on the national level. Legislation on citizenship, refugees or immigration is issued by the Deutscher Bundestag (see deliverable D 2.1). It is only since 2004 that Germany has an immigration law (Zuwanderungsgesetz). Most legislation in this area, however, has to pass the Deutscher Bundesrat (second chamber composed of deputies of the federal states). On the national level it is the home office and its subordinated Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge – BAMF (Federal Bureau for Migration and Refugees) that determines the policies in the asylum seeking process as well as for migrant integration measures, e.g. the conceptualisation and organisation of integration and language courses. The federal Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration is – as a permanent minister and therefore as a member of the federal government – responsible for policy making on the national level. The position is currently taken up by Prof. Böhmer who was also responsible for the recent Nationaler Ak tionsplan Integration (National Action Plan for Integration) in 2012 (see below). The federal states execute the legislation for the national state. This means that they are responsible for the actual administrative processes in the fields of asylum seeking, immigration and migrant integration. Furthermore, the states have the right to issue legislation – effective only in their territory – if it does not fall into the competence of the federal state (see deliverable D 2.1). One of the subject areas relevant for the question of integration is for instance the policy area of education.

#### 3.2.1 1998–2005

In Germany, integration policies have always been linked to immigration policies. During the large immigration waves of the 1950s and 1960s the question of integration was considered only as a temporary integration into the German labour market (see deliverable D 3.2). Germany was never considered a country of immigration by the German political mainstream till the end of the last century. The change to a social-democratic / green national government in 1998 marked a profound adjustment of the policies in both areas – immigration and integration – towards the fact that immigration took place de-facto since the 1950s. Until the end of the last century the citizenship law was based only upon the principle of inheritance (ius sanguinis). Most migrants (i.e. those who did not apply for naturalisation) as well as their children and grand-children remained foreigners in the country. As a consequence, a large part of the population born, grown up and living in Germany was excluded from many forms of political, economic and social participation. In 2000, the law was modified so that children born in Germany – independent of their parents’ origin – are given German citizenship. Those children who additionally hold – due to inheritance – a foreign citizenship will have to choose by the age of 23 to “return” one of the two. This option model was a result of political negotiations between the social-democratic / green national government and the conservative majority of Bundesrat – the second chamber of the parliament representing the federal states. The unspoken political agenda of the time was that the first of these decisions will have to be
taken in 2023 and therefore political deciders in the future will have the possibility to adjust the legislative situation.

The second major shift in German immigration and integration policies took place in 2004 with the enacting of the first German Zuwanderungsgesetz (immigration law). Again, the issues of immigration and integration were linked in a single piece of legislation called “Law on the control and limitation of immigration and the regulation of residence and integration of citizens of European member states and foreigners”. Next to the strict regulation of the conditions for immigration to Germany, the law for the first time outlines integration policies for newly arriving migrants to the country. The most eminent integration measure was the provision of and the obligation to participate in civic integration courses. It is the Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge – BAMF (Federal Bureau for Migration and Refugees) that determines the structure and content of these classes. The courses consist of 600 hours language classes and 45 hours civic integration courses in which participants learn about the history, the political and social situation as well as the legal system of Germany. Again, these courses link the issues of migration and integration: The BAMF is the public institution regulating all questions of migration to Germany, at the same time it has a major stake in national integration policies. In fact, most migrants moving to Germany (e.g. spouses of legally accepted foreigners) have to successfully pass associated exams.

The social-democratic / green government between 1998 and 2005 significantly modified the political framework for both German migration and integration policies. The two pieces of legislation still form the legal basis for the integration of third-country migrants. They mark a shift in two ways: First, it is now beyond political discussion that Germany is a country of immigration. The German society up to its conservative margins accepts the existence of the recent history of migration to the country and sees in the latter even chances to tackle problems within the German society, i.e. the issue of a negative demographic development. It was well agreed upon in principle that the integration of migrants requires specific policies. While the conservative political forces relied on an assimilationist model, the social-democratic and green parties took more of a multiculturalist approach. However, since the beginning of the century there is a widespread societal acceptance that integration policies are required.

Second, the modification of the citizenship law disrupts the distinction between foreigners and Germans when it comes to the issue of migrant integration. While before most migrants and their offspring were allocated in the former group, the latter was understood to not require policies and measures of integration. Whereas integration policies until the change of the citizenship law differentiated only between these two groups, policy makers thereafter face up to a situation in which also some German citizens require specific integration measures. This has consequences for the identification of policy target groups. We now find diverse and partly overlapping groups of people towards which integration policies are directed:

An immigrant is a non-German person entering the country with the intention to take up her residence there. Some immigrants may later be naturalised and become German citizens. Still, policy and statistics distinguish between Germans and naturalised Germans.
A foreigner is a person who does not hold German citizenship. Due to the history of migration and integration policy, in political and public debates the notion foreigner often includes naturalised Germans. In statistics and policy, however, the notion is strictly limited to the right of having a German passport. Yet it is important to understand that, due to the former citizenship laws based on parentage (ius sanguinis) even a person who was born in Germany before 2000 is still considered a foreigner (in a legal sense) if none of her parents is a German citizen and if she did not go through the process of naturalisation.

A Spätaussiedler is a German citizen or her descendants who stayed after WW-II in a formerly German territory in Eastern Europe or an ethnic German or his descendants who migrated from a formerly communist state in Europe or China to Germany. On the one hand these people do have immediate access to German citizenship. On the other hand – as most of the Spätaussiedler migrated to Germany after the fall of the Berlin Wall – they require assistance not dissimilar to non-German migrants.

The term Migrationshintergrund (migration background) refers to all three before-mentioned groups and two generations of their descendants. It does not make a difference, if the ancestor of a person with a migration background became a German citizen or the person is a German citizen herself. For instance, a person who was born in Germany as a German citizen still has a migration background, if the grandfather or the grandmother of this person once was a foreigner or Spätaussiedler. In the context of this deliverable we also use the term migrant to refer to this policy target group.

This distinction has outlasted the social-democratic / green government which was replaced by the grand coalition (conservative / social-democratic) in 2005. Particularly, the concept of the migration background is better suited to capture the issue of migrant integration, its accompanying policies and measures.

**3.2.2 2005–2009**

Triggered by alarming results of the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) surveys describing poor “knowledge and skills essential for full participation in society”\(^6\) of 15 year old pupils with a migration background in Germany, the then new chancellor, Angela Merkel, set up a series of conferences on the issue of integration (Integrationsgipfel) in order to improve migrant participation in the German society. Associations of migrants, politicians, media representatives, scientists, labour unions and employer associations joined together to discuss the situation of citizens with a migration background in Germany. The main result of these conferences was the development of Nationaler Integrationsplan (Plan for Integration) – developed under the guidance of the Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration – which constitutes the first national integration policy for Germany. The plan delineates ten policy fields which can be categorised according to the dimensions of migrant integration (see deliverable D 3.1):

**Socio-economic dimension**

---

\(^6\) [http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,2987,en_32252351_32235731_1_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,2987,en_32252351_32235731_1_1_1_1_1,00.html)
The integration courses, which were introduced in the context of the immigration law shall be improved via an enhancement of the students’ success, optimisation of the course management, an amelioration of the funding and a focus on the sustainability of the courses.

The language skills of children with a migration background shall be fostered from very young age onwards. Children shall be supported in acquiring and developing languages skills through their parents. Furthermore, more of a focus shall be given on the continuous development of language in the day-care facilities, kindergartens and primary schools.

Profound education and vocational training shall improve the situation of migrants in the job market. Academic capacity rather than the social, linguistic and ethnic background of children shall decide on their enrolment in the German education system and consequently on the German job market. Migrant parents shall be more involved in the education of their children. Furthermore, the situation or vocational trainees and employees with a migration background shall be improved in companies and businesses.

Science plays a major role for migrant integration in the country. Therefore, Germany’s position as an attractive and international site of university education and academic research shall be fostered so that the country can persist in the international competition for high-skilled migrants. A particular focus shall be given on the integration of this group. Further resources shall be provided for the research on the issue of migration.

**Social-cultural dimension**

The situation of girls and women with a migration background shall be improved in subject areas such as domestic violence and forced marriage. The independence of female migrants shall particularly be fostered in the realms of education, health and political participation.

Cultural education within and outside public sector schooling shall be fostered for an improved migrant integration. Cultural institutions shall accommodate more the needs and requirements of a changing society. The public administration shall capture cultural integration as a cross-divisional policy field.

The potential of sports as a driver of migrant integration shall be developed further. Therefore, efficient structures shall be developed on the federal states and municipal level. Sports associations shall be provided with the resources to integrate particularly young citizens with a migration background.

Media are seen as particularly important for the integration of migrants. On the one hand it is important that media themselves become more intercultural, on the other hand media competence shall be taught to citizens with a migration background.

**Legal-political dimension**

Civil society engagement and equal participation shall be considered as crucial elements of integration. It is therefore necessary to open this part of the society to citizens with a migration background. Migrant associations play therefore a particularly important role.
Spatial dimension

Policies of migrant integration have to be initiated on the local level. Concepts have to be developed and implemented cross-divisionally. The local public administration shall be open for migrants and awareness of the topic has to reach out to local civil servants. Local public sector institutions shall cooperate to avoid spatial segregation into ethnic communities. Neighbourhoods shall be developed so that social deterioration is avoided. Educational measures shall foster migrant integration locally. Policies shall be developed to foster education locally. Success shall be monitored on the local level.

The Nationale Integrationsplan of 2007 had a clear focus on the socio-economic and social-cultural dimension of migrant integration. The political-legal and the spatial dimension of integration were at the time not in the focus of national policy making. After the change from the grand coalition to a conservative / liberal government in 2009 migrant integration remained as a political issue as did the format of conferences on migrant integration (Integrationsgipfel).

3.2.3 2009–2012

The very recently – 2012 – published second national integration policy (Nationaler Integrationsplan) almost completely kept the existing policy content of the first national policy paper in place. Migration experts in politics, public administration and academia evaluated and recommeded further issues in each policy field. While some successful steps towards a better integration of migrants had been acknowledged, more efforts and further goals were described in the policy paper.

Particularly the socio-economic dimension is more elaborated, specifying in more detail the policies in the field of migrant education and labour market access. Furthermore, in this dimension the issue of migrants’ health has been added to the national policy agenda, outlining the particular situation and requirements of access to general health and geriatric care for migrants in Germany.

Two aspects of the recent German migrant integration policy are intriguing: First, even though since 2009 the same – conservative and liberal – parties are in power which used to lose sight of migrant integration issues in the 1980s and 1990s, integration policies remained an important political topic after the change of the national government from the grand coalition government. The general approach towards a commitment of migrant integration did not change significantly. Second, despite of the demand for a more assimilationist policy approach by some parts of the public as well as by some conservative politicians the integration policy is rather multiculturalist as introduced by the social-democrat / green coalition at the beginning of this century.

3.3 Current policy goals
The Berlin public administration consists of two layers of government, the Senate as well as the twelve districts\(^7\) of Berlin. While the latter are subordinate parts of the Berlin administration, they nevertheless – due to their legitimacy via independent elections – have political space to manoeuvre (see deliverable D 2.1). While there is an overall political strategy for migrant integration on the Senate level, there are also integration policies developed and implemented on the district level. Consequently, we analyse policy goals and objectives separately in this part of the Berlin city case, according to the defined dimension of migrant integration: the socio-economic, socio-cultural, legal-political, and spatial dimension (see deliverable D 3.1).

### 3.3.1 Senate Level

There are two essential policy milestones that form the basis of Berlin’s integration policy objectives and goals. First, the Senate passed the PartIntG – *Partizipations- und Integrationsgesetz* (Participation and Integration Law) at the end of 2010. The PartIntG is the main law that directs participation and integration in Berlin. All public sector institutions connected to the city of Berlin have to adhere to the rules and regulations outlined in this legislation. Next to the public administration, these include also public law companies (e.g. the *Berliner Stadtreinigungsbetriebe* – Berlin’s waste disposal company, or the *Berliner Verkehrsbetriebe* – the city’s public transportation company), public foundations as well as the audit court of Berlin. It is the law’s purpose to enable societal integration and participation of migrants. Thus, the primary objective is the elimination of all disadvantages that may occur to people with a migration background in Berlin.

Second, the Senate of Berlin – i.e. the office of Berlin’s commissioner for integration and migration – issued the main policy document: the integration concept for Berlin. The concept is a detailed description of current goals and objectives. It is structured along eight spheres of action:

1. International appeal and cultural diversity of Berlin
2. Integration through work: migrants in vocational trainings – as employees and entrepreneurs
3. Integration through education
4. Integration through strengthening the social-spatial cohesion
5. Integration through the intercultural opening of Berlin’s public administration
6. Integration through participation and strengthening of the civil society
7. Creating integration perspectives for asylum seekers
8. Closer cooperation between the Senate and the districts of Berlin

---

\(^7\) The Berlin districts are Neukölln, Tempelhof-Schöneberg, Wilmersdorf-Charlottenburg, Steglitz-Zehlendorf, Spandau, Reinickendorf, Mitte, Lichtenberg, Marzahn-Hellersdorf, Treptow-Köpenick., Pankow, and Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg.
In the following, we shall analyse the contents of the Participation and Integration Law and the integration concept in the context of the four dimensions of migrant integration.

**Socio-Economic Dimension**

The sphere “integration through work” focuses on the creation of equal access to vocational trainings and the labour market, either for first time applicants or as a reintegration effort. Migrants shall have equal chances with regard to occupational development so that they can qualify for better-paid jobs and reach an income above poverty level. Furthermore, it is the aim to create equal opportunities for migrants who start their own businesses.

The sphere “integration through education” draws attention to knowledge and skills of migrants. In this context, increasing migrants’ German language skills as well as setting the same educational standards for migrants and non-migrants are of special concern. Therefore, the policy aims at extending the time migrant children spend in day care facilities before school enrolment to a minimum of two and a half years. Furthermore, language skills of migrants and non-migrants shall be levelled and advanced at all stages of pre-schooling and schooling. Extra-curricular training for migrant children shall focus – next to language training – also on a socio-political education about the German society. Integration policy aims to foster a closer cooperation between the schools and parents of children with a migration background. In order to improve the intercultural competences of teaching staff more teachers with a migration background shall find employment in Berlin’s schools and institutions for higher education. On the upper educational level the policy is focused on increasing university enrolment of migrants at the city’s universities and polytechnic schools. To sum up, the sphere of ‘integration through education’ aims at laying the basis for an easier access to the labour market.

**Socio-Cultural Dimension**

The integration concept encompasses several goals and objectives belonging to the socio-cultural dimension of integration. The sphere “international appeal and cultural diversity” is based on the assumption that people worldwide perceive Berlin as an open-minded city. Migrants influence the city’s character and (self-) perception. Today, Berlin is a centre of attraction for many foreigners from Europe and beyond. The integration policy aims at strengthening Berlin’s international attractiveness and fostering the city’s cultural diversity. In order to achieve this objective, the policy promotes intercultural competences and openness by both the migrant population as well as the host society. The focus of promoting intercultural openness is on cultural institutions such as theatres, libraries and other artistic centres. The policy aims to increase the awareness of the city’s cultural diversity by creating multilingual marketing and public relations strategies for centres of creativity. A further focus of the policy is the integration of migrant artists by including them appropriately and proportionately in publicly funded projects. In this context, the number of experts with intercultural competences in boards that decide on the usage of public funding for cultural and arts projects is devised as a policy goal. Overall, it is the aim of Berlin’s integration policy to create a welcoming culture for migrants that decide to move to Berlin.

**Legal-Political Dimension**
The law on participation and integration (PartIntG) requires each public institution of Berlin to both maintain equal chances for migrants as well as to promote the intercultural opening of the administration. The latter includes, inter alia, employing more candidates with a migration background as well as fostering intercultural competences of the administrative staff. This policy goal also embraces the requirement for employees to participate in intercultural trainings and skill advancement programmes. Also, with regard to job placements and careers in the public institutions, the law instructs that intercultural skills shall be considered as crucial and beneficial competences. In this context, job advertisements shall include the notice that applications by migrants are particularly welcomed.

Next to the Participation and Integration law, Berlin’s integration concept also focuses on the intercultural opening of the public administrations and institutions. It is a policy objective to make intercultural trainings for the employees of the public institutions in Berlin obligatory. Furthermore, language skills shall play an increasing role for the intercultural opening of Berlin’s public administration. The city of Berlin aims at employing more people with a migration background. This objective applies to Berlin’s public administration in general, but particularly to social services that in frequent contact with migrants (care for the elderly, medical aid, etc.).

The policy objective “integration through participation and the strengthening of the civil society” is generally concerned with (political) participation of migrants, which includes fostering a culture of acceptance and equal opportunities as well as an improvement of the protection against discrimination. In the context of political participation one particular policy goal of the city is to increase the number of naturalisations in Berlin. Furthermore, efforts shall be taken to further develop the advisory board for integration and participation as one of the major participatory institutions for migrants. The integration concept outlines appropriate services for migrants to enable self-determined and self-supporting ways of life. The prevention and intervention work with regard to racist, anti-Semitic, or gender-based discrimination shall be extended. In this context the protection of asylum seekers in Berlin is of particular relevance. The objective is to provide integration perspectives for asylum seekers in Berlin and Germany. This includes access to social and medical aid. Even though this is beyond the political range of the Senate, the integration concept advocates for homogenous humanitarian asylum rules for political refugees in the EU.

PartIntG officially mandates the establishment of Berlin’s advisory board for integration and participation as well as regulates the work of the board and defines its objectives. According to the law, the advisory board’s goal is to support the Senate administration with regard to integration issues in Berlin. The board should function as a link between the public administration and the migrant population. § 5 of the law clearly defines the goals of the integration commissioner’s work. Thereby, the integration commissioner is officially in charge of advancing integration and participatory prospects for migrants in Berlin.

**Spatial Dimension**

The integration policy aims to strengthen the socio-spatial cohesion in Berlin, which includes opposing social and ethnic segregation in Berlin. In this context the policy aims to collect specific data as a basis for the distribution of resources among the districts and socially en-
dangered city quarters. Thereby, specific needs of migrants living in the different areas as well as the fostering of the social infrastructure of Berlin shall be taken into account. This also includes the intercultural opening of the public administration. Consequences of social disadvantages in quarters with a high share of migrants shall actively be encountered. The policy aims at creating structures that enable people to help themselves, i.e. by fostering solidarity in neighbourhoods and by increasing the social participation of local inhabitants – especially those with a migration background.

After having summed up the goals and objectives of the Berlin integration policy, it is necessary to state that this policy is currently in transition. Elections took place at the end of 2011 and the integration commissioner – Günter Piening – recently announced his withdrawal. Furthermore, the reshuffle of competences in the Senate administration changes the administrative setting (see deliverable D 2.1). Consequently, new concepts and plans will be developed in the near future. We expect alternations of the concept as the Senate is now headed by a coalition of the social-democratic and conservative party (formerly social-democratic and a leftist party).

3.3.2 District Level

Due to the decentralised responsibilities of the public administration in Berlin, districts also develop local integration policies and according objectives and measures. PartIntG as well as the integration concept passed by the Senate deal with integration on district level. In this context it is necessary to put the PartIntG and the integration concept under closer scrutiny.

According to the Participation and Integration law, it is a major goal to create similar administrative structures on both the Senate as well as the district level with regard to integration policy. This means that the law also mandates the constitution of an advisory board as well as an integration commissioner in each district. Both institutions have similar responsibilities as on Senate level, only that their approach focuses on local issues. Consequently, there are differences in goals and objectives of integration on district level.

The integration concept emphasises the importance of the close cooperation between the Senate and the districts as most of the integration work is undertaken locally. Considering this, the Senate’s integration concept advises the districts to develop local integration programmes. Similar to the PartIntG, the integration concept highlights that each district shall establish an advisory board for integration and an integration commissioner.

As outlined in the deliverable D 2.1, most districts nominated an integration commissioner and established an advisory board for integration issues – most of them already since many years. However, fewer districts have formulated their own integration concepts. In the following paragraphs we will take a closer look at the local policy goals and objectives in the Berlin districts that have already issued their own integration concept. The goals and objectives of the other districts (Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, Lichtenberg, Treptow-Köpenick, Steglitz-Zehlendorf, Tempelhof-Schöneberg, Wilmersdorf-Charlottenburg) are analysed and summarised on the basis of the conducted interviews with the districts’ integration commissioners. The only district we did not consider in the course of this analysis is Reinickendorf since at the time the district neither issued a policy document, nor had employed a commissioner for
integration even though there are several socially problematic areas such as the Märkisches Viertel or East and West.

**Mitte**

The district of Berlin just recently published an integration programme. The district structured the programme along two major modules. The first module of the integration programme deals with cross-departmental integration work, whereas the second focuses attention on specific departmental work.

For the first module, the programme constitutes six spheres of action, which are closely related to the spheres of action stipulated in Berlin’s integration concept. Generally, there are two spheres of action that create goals and objectives dealing with socio-economic issues. First, the integration programme aims at a qualitative improvement and systematisation of language teaching and promotion in the district. This includes, inter alia, the establishment of minimum standards regarding language instruction on pre-school and school level. In order to ensure the quality of the standardisation, the programme aims at the creation of an educational monitoring that measures the success and sustainability of the language skills programmes. Furthermore, the district plans to enter partnership treaties with relevant actors that work in the field of language training (especially kindergartens, pre-schools, high schools, regional education programmes, etc.) in order to create concerted language skills promotion measures. Second, the integration programme formulates the objective of establishing closer cooperation with schools. In this context, the district’s integration policy emphasises the importance of constituting a shared meaning of integration and equal chances in schools as general aim. In order to do so, the policy devises the creation of basic principles that formulate realistic prospects for the school’s personnel, pupils and parents regarding integration. This involves the clarification of questions such as: “How do we understand integration and equal chances in the schools’ environments?”, “Which processes were successful regarding integration?”, “How can the offers be improved and interlocked?”, etc.

The intercultural opening of Mitte’s public administration is an important objective that pertains to the legal-political dimension. It focuses attention on two major goals: First, initiating job-related intercultural trainings for the staff and second, developing and implementing a plan that deals with the intercultural opening of Mitte’s administration. A further objective in the legal-political dimension is integration through participation. In this context, especially the development of the advisory board for foreigners and integration of Mitte as the predominant possibility for political participation of migrants is in the centre of interest. The advisory board supports the public administration in framing the integration policies of Mitte.

Two other policy goals go beyond the dimensions of integration. First, the district of Mitte aims to improve the services of so-called “integration navigators”. There are various public services specifically created for migrants in Mitte. However, most people with a migration background are not aware of these services. Integration navigators help migrants to find fitting services that have been set up according to their needs. The challenge for the navigator is that projects have spread without central coordination. Also, most of the projects are not continuously funded. The programme therefore aims at improving the coordination and qualitative advancement of those projects. Second, Mitte aspires to generate relevant data about
migration work in the district. Therefore, the district administration set up an inventory with actively involved migrant organisations and associations. With the help of the data, Mitte aims at creating better integration policies.

**Neukölln**

Neukölln’s integration policy is structured along ten major principles of integration. The district of Neukölln emphasises the importance of education with regard to integration – a part of the socio-economic dimension. Next to German language skills and basic school education, social competences as well as tolerance and understanding the values of democracy are considered as an important objective of education.

An objective that belongs to the socio-cultural dimension is that Neukölln strives to create a welcoming culture in the district as moving to another country and possibly taking up the German citizenship is a highly emotional matter for migrants. Furthermore, it is a policy goal to enable independent and self-determined lives. In this context, the integration policy for Neukölln pays special attention to young female migrants. Accordingly, integration policy aims at the emancipation of migrant women in society.

There are several goals and objectives adhering to the legal-political dimension. First, the integration policy in Neukölln puts emphasis on strict law-enforcement and crime prevention. This extends over several areas such as enforcing compulsory school attendance, no tolerance towards criminals, prevention of criminal activities, etc. Neukölln’s integration policy aims at an equal participation of migrants. This includes not only a close cooperation with migrant associations, but also an intercultural opening of the district’s public administration.

The integration policy in Berlin-Neukölln is also relevant for the spatial dimension. Social segregation is one of the main issues in the northern areas of Neukölln as most people living there have a migration background and / or live on social welfare. That is why fostering social dispersion of different cultural backgrounds and social classes is a major policy goal in the district.

Furthermore, an objective of Neukölln’s policy is establishing a continuity of integration efforts. The district administration strives for an integration policy that is not solely based on short-term and highly specific projects but on long-term and stable structures.

**Marzahn-Hellersdorf**

In this Berlin district lives a high share of migrants. The integration programme mirrors the goals and objectives defined in the Senate’s concept. In the socio-economic dimension the major objective is to integrate migrants into the local labour market, i.e. simplifying access to vocational trainings and jobs and enabling self-employment. This general objective substantiates the creation of equal chances regarding the access to vocational trainings and employment by initiating an intercultural opening of the employment promotion. This also includes an intercultural opening of the job centres, which enables employees to pay attention to the specific needs and concerns of migrants. Furthermore, education is considered as a basis for integration. In this context, the district administration targets its efforts at enabling life-long learning, i.e. offering educational services for children, teenagers and adults. Furthermore, the integration policy aims at strengthening schools and kindergartens as places
for integration efforts. This effort also involves an inclusion and activation of parents with regard to the children’s education.

Part of the socio-cultural dimension is Marzahn-Hellersdorf’s effort to make the district’s cultural diversity more visible – an objective, which is closely related to ideas of the Senate’s integration concept. Thereby, particular focus is on a positive public display of migration in the district, developing the intercultural competences of the public institutions (for example via creating networks between public institutions and migrant associations etc.). Furthermore, Marzahn-Hellersdorf subscribes to the objective of creating a welcoming culture in the public administration. This involves improving public services for migrants (for example lowering language barriers by translating information brochures), actively inviting migrants to participate politically, as well as appreciating integration successes.

**Pankow**

Also in this district most policy objectives and goals are concerned with integration through education, improving possibilities of political participation, simplifying access to the labour market and interculturally opening the public administration. What is different to other districts is the fact that Pankow’s integration policy focuses its attention more actively towards fighting right-wing radicalism. This also became evident in an interview conducted with the integration commissioner of Pankow, who emphasised that dealing with right-wing radicalism is taking up most working hours.

**Spandau**

The integration concept of the district Spandau is mainly a description of the current state of integration and the existing and prospective competences in each administrative unit. On the basis of this analysis, the integration policy formulates objectives including encountering social and cultural segregation, encouraging migrants to take responsibility regarding integration, developing an atmosphere of tolerance, acceptance and respect in the district, perceiving education as basis of integration efforts, integration through political participation and increasing the quality of life for migrants.

**Others**

All the other districts of Berlin, including Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, Steglitz-Zehlendorf, Tempelhof-Schöneberg, Treptow-Köpenick or Wilmersdorf-Charlottenburg do not have a written local integration policy. However, we were able to interview the integration commissioners of these districts. Our analysis of the interviews reveals that the districts have basically the same priorities with regard to integration policies, i.e. intercultural opening of the public administration, creating equal access to services of the public administration, the schools, etc., integration through education, creating a welcoming culture and fostering the intercultural dialogue.

**Summary**

Generally, the Senate’s and districts’ goals and objectives of integration policy are similar. There may be differences in details. For example, in the district of Neukölln, one of the major objectives is strict law-enforcement (enforcing compulsory school attendance, working
against youth delinquency, etc.), whereas districts such as Treptow-Köpenick and Pankow mainly target their efforts on right-wing radicalism and prevention of discrimination.

### 3.4 Current policy measures

Next to the definition of goals and objectives, the integration policy for Berlin includes precise descriptions of pilot projects that the Senate worked on since 2007. In the following, the integration measures on Senate level are under closer scrutiny. Our analysis gives a relevant overview of the measures. A detailed list of measures can be found in the annex of this document. The mentioned four dimensions serve as a basis for the following analysis.

#### 3.4.1 Socio-economic dimension

There are two major spheres of action in the Berlin integration policy in the socio-economic dimension of migrant integration: “integration through work” and “integration through education”. Both spheres hold several measure clusters. The following analysis is structured according to these clusters. First, we deal with employment-related clusters and second, with education related clusters.

**Integration through work**

A cluster of measures deals with the integration of young migrants in vocational trainings. A pilot project in this context is the modularised vocational training. The project takes the fact into account that many migrants did not finish school and do not have proper training certificates accredited in Germany. Modularised vocational training provides portions, i.e. completed components of the full vocational training are accredited and enable admission to final vocational exams (in Germany operated by the chambers). The advantage of this concept is that people who are not able to finish the entire vocational training are still partly qualified and not considered as entirely unqualified. This offers migrants further opportunities on the labour market. Also, young migrants without basic capabilities to complete a vocational training at once can take a step-by-step approach. Thus, a finalisation of vocational trainings becomes easier to accomplish.

The second measure in this cluster is the campaign *Berlin braucht Dich!* (Berlin needs you). The campaign aims at increasing the share of migrant trainees in the Berlin public administration. The *BQN Berlin - Berufliches Qualifizierungsnetzwerk für Migrantinnen und Migranten* (vocational qualifying network for migrants) is in charge of putting this project into practice. Next to the campaign, the BQN Berlin also initiated several other employment-related measures for migrants.

The second employment-related cluster deals with integration of migrants into the labour market. In order to simplify access to the employment market for migrants the Senate supports the intercultural opening of job centres of the *Bundesarbeitsagentur* (Federal Agency for Employment). This includes, inter alia, the advancement of the staff’s intercultural competences, thus enabling improved support for migrants. The Senate can only provide support, as the *Bundesarbeitsagentur* is an independent agency which functions as job placement agency. So far, the Senate and the integration commissioner have dealt with three job cen-
tres in the districts Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, Lichtenberg and Tempelhof-Schöneberg. The aim was to create pilot projects that can successfully find application in the other job centres of Berlin.

Furthermore, the Senate works on a simplification of acknowledgements of vocational trainings that have been successfully completed in foreign countries. Even though the Senate has no direct influence on the laws regulating these acknowledgements, it aims at expanding its efforts in this area. Furthermore, the Ministry for Work, Integration and Women offers official approval certificates of vocational competences that have successfully been completed abroad, i.e. vocational trainings are not officially accredited, but approved by an official institution.

The third cluster tackling the issue of integration through employment deals with the integration of the migrant population into Berlin’s local economy, i.e. encouraging and supporting self-employed migrants. The number of migrants owning businesses is increasing steadily, thus constituting a significant share of Berlin’s economy. It is a measure of the Senate to support migrants that are willing to establish their own businesses. For that purpose, but also for the economic integration of migrants in general, the Ministry for Economy, Technology and Research constituted a working group that regularly analyses the economic situation of migrants. The working group is considered to be a dialogue platform between associations representing the migrants, the German chambers as well as other representatives of the economy in Berlin. It meets twice a year in order to find ways to support migrants in their economic endeavours. Also, the Berlin public administration offers several services for entrepreneurs, for example the ‘entrepreneur telephone’, an information hotline that deals with questions regarding business start-ups.

Integration through education

One of the education-related clusters pays attention to integration in Berlin’s pre-schooling institutions. As mentioned above, the advancement of language skills is one of the major objectives of integration policy in Berlin. This also includes the pre-school institutions. Accordingly, it is one measure in the context of pre-school education to develop a programme for language trainings in kindergartens and day care organisations. Next to placing highly qualified personnel in pre-school institutions and guaranteeing the supply with current and up-to-date educational materials, this measure includes that the pre-school institutions monitor the development of the children’s language skills.

Also, the integration policy provides free of charge kindergartens to children whose parents suffer from financial hardship. Indeed, since the beginning of 2011, the three years at kindergarten before school enrolment are free of charge – depending on the families’ general financial status.

Next to measures for pre-school institutions, the sphere “integration through education” also contains measures for intermediate and high schools in Berlin. Also here, a major concern is the language skills of pupils, especially for children not speaking German as their native language. The aim of the measures involving language training is that all pupils can participate in all courses at school as quickly as possible without suffering from language barriers. This involves:
1. Mandatory language skill tests before school enrolment
2. Mandatory participation in a language training before enrolment when German is not
   the mother tongue
3. Development of school specific language training programmes
4. Further highly qualified personnel improving the quality of language trainings
5. Introduction of a language skills diary which documents the learning progress
6. Small classes for migrants without any knowledge of the German language
7. Summer schools: extra-curricular language trainings for migrants
8. Evaluation of the language training measures
9. Advancement of the model project “FürMig Berlin” (see: http://www.foermig-
   berlin.de/konzeption.html)

Next to enhancing the intercultural skills of the teaching staff, it is also a measure to increase
the share of teachers with a migration background in Berlin. Thus, the staff absorbs intercul-
tural competences brought in by those teachers with a migration background. Of course, this
measure is closely linked to the general policy of an intercultural opening of schools, which is
furthermore substantiated by the effort to develop cooperation between schools and migrant
associations. Migrant associations thereby function as mediators and accompany the inter-
cultural profiling of schools.

Furthermore, the Senate of Berlin wants to reform the school system in Berlin by creating
community schools related to the Scandinavian school model, thus discarding the three-
level-school system in Germany (Hauptschule as lowest school level, Realschule as the
middle and Gymnasium as the highest school level). The Senate hopes to thereby end social
segregation on the lower levels of the school system (in the Hauptschulen the share of mi-
grants is the highest – see also deliverable D 3.2).

Another cluster targets integration efforts for migrants in universities and other facilities of
higher education. One out of several measures to increase the number of students with a
migration background at universities is to offer better information on possibilities of studies.

3.4.2 Socio-cultural dimension

Berlin's integration policy distinguishes the sphere “strengthening Berlin's international ap-
peal and cultural diversity” into two major clusters. The first cluster is “making the cultural di-
versity of Berlin as immigration city visible”; the second is “creating a welcome culture in Ber-
lin”. For each cluster, the integration concept fixes several measures.

The first cluster is put into practice by the intent to develop the intercultural strengths of pub-
licly funded culture institutions such as theatres. This involves, inter alia, taking a multi-
lingual approach that attracts more people with a migration background as measure. The
public relations, the marketing as well as initiatives were adjusted accordingly.
Another measure in this context is to consider intercultural aspects with regard to the funding of artists and cultural projects. This includes a potential increase of the funding of artists with a migration background. Also, boards regulating the use of funds should take the professional opinions of experts with intercultural experiences into consideration when taking decisions. Thus, the Senate ensures the potential promotion of cultural work by migrants.

Several measures support the implementation of the second cluster “creating a welcome culture”. First, the Senate regularly revises and updates the welcoming package that is given to newly arriving migrants in Berlin. The welcoming package offers people with migration background current information about Berlin’s public administration.

Furthermore, the integration policy demands a more use-friendly Foreigner Department (Ausländerbehörde) as a measure. In 2006, the department installed a service point in its facilities. This service point is a joint project initiated by the Senate, the federal bureau for migrants and refugees as well as a charity organisation. This cross-departmental facility offers several different services, such as consulting services regarding the integration courses, possibilities on the employment market as well as support on the housing market. The service point thereby makes it easier for migrants to accommodate in Berlin.

The integration policy also perceives a sophisticated welcoming culture as an important measure to attract certain migrant groups – such as highly qualified scientists or successful entrepreneurs. A measure in this context is the Business Immigration Service (BIS), a one-stop-shop for highly skilled migrants. This cooperation between the Chamber of Commerce of Berlin, the Foreigner Department and the semi-governmental company Berlin Partner GmbH not only offers the usual migration paperwork, but also includes labour market consulting services for the highly skilled migrants.

3.4.3 Legal-political dimension

The integration policy emphasises the importance of an intercultural opening of Berlin’s public institutions. The Senate divides the sphere into several major clusters substantiated by concrete measures.

One cluster directs attention towards the central public administration of Berlin. In this context, the integration policy obligates the administrative staff to participate in intercultural trainings. Furthermore, intercultural competences become part of the profile requirements for certain jobs in the public administration.

Another measure in this context is the organisational development of the public administration in Berlin with regard to intercultural aspects. The intercultural organisational development of the public administration is part of a more general approach towards administrative modernisation. This measure includes, inter alia, an alternation of procedures, training opportunities, enlargement of competences, etc. Main target of the measure is to increase the customer orientation, i.e. orientations towards specific requirements of migrants.

Next to intercultural trainings, another measure deals with the language barriers that may hinder the communication between the administrative staff and people with a migration background that have not learnt German as mother tongue. The Senate plans to establish an
'internal' service that aids with translations and intercultural communication when needed. Thus, language barriers will become less problematic.

Another sphere of action, which pertains to the legal-political dimension, is labelled “integration through participation and strengthening of the civil society”. This sphere also contains several clusters and adhering measures.

One cluster is about fostering possibilities of political participation in Berlin. The first measure pertaining to that cluster is the further development of the advisory board for integration and migration issues. The Senate is keen on strengthening the advisory board’s position as a cross-divisional institution that is able to exert a dominating influence on the city’s integration policies.

A further measure is an initiative for more naturalisations of foreigners in Berlin. The aim of the measure is to simplify the procedures and to inform especially young people about naturalisation. In this context, the integration commissioner initiated the campaign “PASSt uns” (‘fits us’, pun with the German word for “passport”). The campaign promotes naturalisation via radio spots, information brochures, advertisements, and information events.

As another measure the Senate supports an initiative, which has frequently been debated in Germany throughout the past few years: voting rights for foreigners on local / regional level. In order to advance the idea of non-EU foreigners with voting rights on local level, the Senate set up a campaign positively promoting the issue. As the Senate does not have the competence to decide on voting rights on its own, the other German Länder (states) will have to be persuaded through the Senate’s campaigning.

Another cluster of measures is about “fostering mutual respect and protecting democratic values” in Berlin. In order to reach that objective, the Senate Ministry for Work, Integration and Women established the “Landesstelle für Gleichbehandlung - gegen Diskriminierung” (the city’s office for equal opportunities – against discrimination) in the year of 2007. The office has the task to prevent discrimination, decrease structural discrimination and to develop an infrastructure for self-help and consultancy services in Berlin for victims of discrimination.

Closely related to the issue of discrimination is the city’s programme against right-wing extremism, racism and anti-Semitism. In 2010, the Senate defined three different categories for the programme. In each category several selected projects receive funding provided in the context of this programme. The categories are: “strengthening of democracy and human rights”, “education and youth for democracy”, “democracy in the local community and the social sphere”. Each year, about 40 projects receive financial support by the Senate. For example, a project related to the category “democracy in the local community and the social sphere” is the Mobile Beratung gegen Rechtsextremismus in Berlin (mobile advisory service against right wing extremism) that supports locally based and issue-specific initiatives against right-wing radicalism in Berlin. The project Schule ohne Rassismus – Schule mit Courage (schools without racism – schools with courage) encounters racism in Berlin’s schools through educative measures and is part of the category “education and youth for democracy”. An example that adheres to the category “strengthening of democracy and human rights” is the victim advisory service “ReachOut” which supports victims of xenophobic attacks and discriminations.
A cluster, which is also part of the sphere of action “integration through participation and strengthening the civil society”, directs attention towards gender issues and asserting the rights of self-determination. A project’s main focus is domestic violence against female migrants. In order to encounter domestic violence, the Senate published a directory for female migrants, which lists contact points where victims receive support. Furthermore, the Senate administration continues the development of the BIG – Berliner Interventionszentrale bei häuslicher Gewalt (Intervention Centre against domestic violence in Berlin). The BIG works as cooperation between the Senate administration, the police, female migrants as well as anti-violence projects and offers – inter alia – a hotline offering support to victims of violence.

A further cluster aims at making the exchange with the Islamic community obligatory. The main project in this context is the further development of the Islam Forum of Berlin. The Islam Forum meets four times a year and functions as dialogue and coordination platform between the Senate and the Islam associations of Berlin.

Also part of the legal-political dimension are strategies on how to act upon refugees. The sphere of action is clustered into three different categories. The first cluster is about the accommodation of political refugees. As a pilot project, the Senate aims at creating a general legal framework that enables asylum seekers and tolerated refugees to live a self-determined life in Germany. For example, the Senate ensures more independence of refugees by giving money for individual use instead of non-cash benefits or by allowing independent rental of flats that are not part of the refugee homes.

The second cluster aims at an implementation regarding the rights of residence and creating better opportunities for education for migrants. For that, the Senate simplifies access to education and employment for tolerated refugees. For example, the project bridge – Berliner Netzwerk für Bleiberecht (bridge – network for rights of residence) provides labour market integration and vocational training for refugees. The integration commissioner organises the network and administers the projects that partaking institutions initiate. Participating institutions are among others: Arbeit und Bildung e.V. (the Association for Labour and Education), the Migrationsrat Berlin & Brandenburg (the Advisory Board for Integration of Berlin and Brandenburg), the zfm – Zentrum für Flüchtlingshilfen und Migrationsdienste (Centre for refugee support and migration services).

In the context of the third cluster the Senate deals with health-related issues of migrants. Here, the improvement of the social and health situation of persons without residence permit is in the centre of interest. This effort also includes the free provision of health care to refugees.

### 3.4.4 Spatial dimension

The Senate deals with spatial projects in the sphere of action labelled “integration through strengthening the social-spatial cohesion”. Here, two clusters of action are dominant. First, integration issues should become a part of the social city framework strategy of Berlin. The strategy is a project initiated by the Ministry for Urban Development and Environment and deals with the city’s social development. As a measure, the Senate plans to include further integration issues when advancing and refining the social city framework strategy. Moreover,
Integration considerations are, for example, taken into account by including measures depicting the status quo of migrant integration in the performance measurement system of the social city framework strategy. Negative results may lead to an advancement of the strategy with regard to integration issues.

The second cluster promotes social cohesion of neighbourhoods in Berlin. In order to do so, the Senate wants to strengthen the city’s district centres. For that reason, the cooperation between migrant associations and the city district centres is intensified thus including integration issues and creating special offers for migrants in the city centres. The charity organisation Paritätische Wohlfahrtsverband manages the district city centres, whereas the Senate supports them financially and gives directions with regard to contents of the work.

Furthermore, the Senate increases its efforts with regard to the Quartiersmanagement (quarter management), which is part of the social city framework strategy. The quarter management takes care of socially and economically disintegrated areas in Berlin’s districts and targets its efforts at creating structures that help socially disadvantaged city areas to manage their problems themselves. For example, the main institution of the quarter management is the Quartiersrat (quarter’s advisory board) that can decide on how funds provided by the Senate administration will be used and what problems will be tackled in the concerned areas. So far, there are 34 quarter managements in Berlin.

A third measure in the context of the spatial dimension is the programme Vielfalt fördern – Zusammenhalt stärken (fostering diversity – strengthening cohesion). For this programme, the Senate funds 16 cooperative projects that link district service institutions of any kind with migrant organisations. Thus, the communication between different migrant and service organisations is fostered which ensures the advancement intercultural competences. An exemplary project funded in this context is Legal Leben (living legally) initiated by the Gangway e.V. (Gangway Association). The project aims at taking care of teenagers with a criminal record and tries to reintegrate those teenagers into society after imprisonment. Partner for this project is the Türkische Bund Berlin-Brandenburg e.V. (Turkish Association of Berlin-Brandenburg) adding intercultural competences to this project. Thus the commitment of local public service institutions is support by intercultural know-how of the migrant organisations.
4. Malmö

Malmö used to be an industrial city. This could, until the late 1990s, also be seen through the city’s landmarks: the cement plant and the harbour crane of the Kockum shipyard. The company Euroc who owned the cement factory in 1973 had 11 000 employees. Five years later, by 1978, the last production unit was closed down. Kockum had through the 60s and beginning of the 70s about 6000 employees and was one of the largest shipbuilders in the world, producing mainly large cargo ships. In February 1986 they decided to abandon the civilian shipbuilding and in 2002 the crane was sold for 1 dollar and shipped to Ulsan in South Korea.

These numbers exemplify the severe economic crisis in Malmö throughout the 70s and 80s. In the manufacturing industry employment decreased by one third between 1965 and 1985 while the textile and clothing industry basically was wiped out. This was partly offset by the dramatic expansion of the public sector where the number of municipal employees more than doubled between 1965 and 1980. But it became even worse. Between 1990 and 1994 one in four jobs disappeared when much of what was left of the manufacturing industry was closed. All in all, the economic crises in the 1970s and the early 1990s hit Malmö worse than other large cities in Sweden. According to Schön (1996) the transformation process towards a knowledge-intensive economy did not start in Malmö until the late 1980s, almost a decade later than in other large cities in Sweden. That is one reason why Malmö was hit worse than other cities by the economic crisis in the early 1990s. In the late 1980s the number of jobs in Malmö was 146 000. Only 118 000 were left in 1993 and it took until 1997 before the number of jobs in Malmö started to increase again. In 2010, the City of Malmö was back to about 150 000 jobs (Malmö stad, 2011a).

The crisis in the beginning of the 90s was aggravated even more by the large influx of refugees from the war in former Yugoslavia which put pressure on public services. In one year there were over 3,000 refugees who settled in Malmö. Immigrants, in a strictly economic sense, went from being an asset to a burden. Ever since World War II immigrants had come to Malmö to meet the demands for labour. In the 1950s the industrial sector expanded and with it a demand for skilled industrial labour. The larger part of this labour came from West Germany, Denmark and Italy (Ohlsson, 1978). In the 1960s, the structural change in the industrial sector created a demand for unskilled labour working at the assembly lines. These workers, in contrast to their counterparts a decade earlier, were used more as substitutes for the native workforce than as complements. Labour force migrants during this decade came largely from Nordic countries and from Mediterranean countries as Greece, Yugoslavia and Turkey. As the economy went through crisis after crisis and a restructuring of the labour market, the immigration to Sweden also went through a change.

After pressure from the unions, a new legislation came into force in 1968 that drastically cut down the labour immigration from non-Nordic countries. Instead, Sweden, and Malmö, became a haven for refugees from outside Europe. This meant a redefinition of the migrant, from worker to refugee and that the immigration lost the correlation with the general economic development or specific labour market needs. Thus, integration gradually became a social issue with humanitarian overtones, which affected the focus of the integration policy in the
municipalities (Soininen, 1992, 25-26). The large influx of refugees, especially from former Yugoslavia, together with tens of thousands lost jobs resulted in that the employment of foreign born in Malmö decreased from 63 percent in 1990 to 41 percent in 1993 (Bevelander, 1997). In many ways the economic problem in Malmö became an integration problem.

"Between 90 and 95 the employment rate in Malmö sank from 78% to 60% in a short time, actually in a period of 3.5-4 years. … When we did go out and check what really happened, we discovered that the Swedish-born population had an employment rate of 70%, which was pretty close to the national average of 73%, while foreign born was at 34%, awareness was increasing about "what is happening?", and we could also see that there were two reasons for this. One was that the labour migrants’ jobs had disappeared, and the other is that the immigration to Malmö that began in 1985 begun to have a major demographic impact, and was at its highest during the years that we lost the very most jobs." (Kent Andersson, Commissioner with responsibility for integration issues between 1998-2010, translated from Broomé 2007)

Because the economic crisis hit Malmö worse than other parts of Sweden the labour market integration of the refugees from the Balkans suffered. Of the Bosnians who immigrated in 1993 and 1994 only about 20 per cent were employed in 1997. However, there were large regional differences. In some municipalities over 70 percent of the Bosnian men were employed. In contrast, the corresponding figure in Malmö was only 10 per cent (Ekberg, 2000). The number of jobs in Malmö has slowly but steadily increased since 1997, but so has also the immigration. In 1997, 52 000 persons were foreign born, which represented 21 per cent of the population. 15 years later, in 2012, the foreign born population increased to 91 000 persons and 30 per cent of the population.

Up until the end of 2008, Sweden had experienced almost no labour migration since the 60s. Even though some immigrated to Malmö from EU countries, most persons that have come to Malmö since the 80s have been humanitarian and family migrants from outside of EU. Those migrants are from war torn parts of the world, especially from the Middle East, Afghanistan and Somalia. From those migrants almost none are economically self-sufficient when they arrive in Malmö. This steady flow of unemployed migrants has been a challenge for the city of Malmö and has contributed to the many projects and programmes the last 10-15 years. So even though the local labour market has expanded since with about 30 000 jobs, the inflow of unemployed foreign born has been higher than that. That is why the employment rate for foreign born in 2010, 41 per cent, is still on the same level as in 1993.

4.1 Policy Developments

The economic situation in Malmö in the middle of the 1990s was very problematic. Something had to be done. The city of Malmö chose a strategy with two pillars. The first was to stimulate economic growth by large infrastructure projects and to market the city as exciting and knowledge based. The second was to improve welfare and the human capital amongst the population.
4.1.1 The transformation of Malmö

According to Bevelander (2009), Vision 2015 played an important role to break the downward spiral in Malmö by redefining the involvement and responsibilities of public and private actors and by bringing resources from national and municipal governments together at the local level. Vision 2015 was a local development vision statement, put together by political parties, representatives of local companies and other important local stakeholders and presented in February 1996. The strategy helped all stakeholders to come together and made Malmö’s negotiating power with the state strong. It identified knowledge and human capital as key to future economic development and increased employment and it contained a number of different visions for the city in areas like business, environment, culture, social and youth. In the following years many large infrastructure projects were initiated, like the bridge to Copenhagen (2000), the establishment of Malmö University (1998), the development in the docklands, Western Harbour (2001) and Turning Torso (2005) in particular, and the decision to build the City Tunnel (2010). Another important factor in the recovery of Malmö was, according to the city of Malmö, the new national equalisation scheme for municipal income and costs (2005) that benefited Malmö (Malmö stad 2011b).

In her dissertation, Veselinka Möllerström (2011) writes about the transformation of Malmö from an industrial to a knowledge based city. Her analysis shows that the transformation was a top down project aiming at transforming the discourse about Malmö. “The empirical study shows that the omnipresent discourses on network, knowledge, urban entrepreneurialism, neo-regionalism, combined with the notion of global competition have guided the transition. Using words and values dominating the contemporary entrepreneurial identity market at the moment (flexibility, innovation, meeting place, creativity, network etc.) a new identity is constructed discursively, materialized and visualized in the built environment (e.g. waterfront projects, a university, research centers, shopping galleries and signature architecture like the Turning Torso in the West Harbour, a former shipyard)” (Ibid. sid.221). The infrastructure investments have been one important way of developing attractiveness. This in turn would lead to stimulation of growth and secure the city’s welfare commitment.

In Malmö, the discourse on urban entrepreneurialism is re-contextualised into three micro-discourses (Dannestam, 2009). First, a discourse centered on the image of a new, transformed post-industrial city is selected, constructed as an antipode to the city’s industrial past. This discourse is getting discursive support from meta-discourses on the ‘knowledge-based economy’ and the ‘knowledge-region’. The second micro-discourse in Malmö is centered on local government as both a growth and a welfare provider simultaneously. In the last micro-discourse the city of Malmö is framed as a regional growth machine. The discourse of a transformed city, which includes description of the contemporary society and visions, is being uttered through a technology of repetition and narrated through storytelling (Möllerström, 2011). These brand- or communication strategies are still important and are mentioned in many of the interviews done for the UniteEurope project. On one hand, the message of a new successful Malmö continues to be spread and reproduced by ardent supporters in the media, through new urban policy initiatives, and various awards to the municipality. On the other hand, a number of competing reality descriptions is seen in the media. Malmö is por-
trayed as a city marked by political demonstrations in the streets, riots, poverty, segregation and social problems (Dannestam, 2009).

4.1.2 Welfare programmes

Investments in infrastructure and a new image of Malmö have been accompanied by major welfare initiatives. Some of them have been targeting the whole population but most have focused on the same geographical areas in Malmö, immigrant dense areas of persistent social challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Budget (SEK)</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blommanpengarna</td>
<td>1995-1999</td>
<td>About 100 million</td>
<td>Neighbourhoods, Migrants</td>
<td>Segregation, Labour market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>1995-1999</td>
<td>About 100 million</td>
<td>Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEFAS</td>
<td>1997-2000</td>
<td>560 million</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Labour market policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDI</td>
<td>1999-2003</td>
<td>About 500 million</td>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Segregation, Economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for a socially sustainable Malmö</td>
<td>2010-</td>
<td>Excluded persons</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood programmes</td>
<td>2010-</td>
<td>Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Major welfare programmes in Malmö

Blommanpengarna was an initiative from the central government in an effort to reverse negative trends in immigrant neighbourhoods, contribute to social development and improve peoples’ skills and labour force participation. Malmö was one of eight municipalities in the programme. Collaboration, innovation and methodology development was the focus of the action plan. Each district in Malmö was made responsible for the allocation of money and responsibility for activities. The state contributed 55 million, while Malmö also added their own resources. Meeting points were an important part of the project. These meeting points were driven by a council of representatives from residents, associations and local organisations (Malmö stad, 2011c).

URBAN was an initiative within the EU to promote a positive neighbourhood development. The central government chose Malmö as one of the municipalities in the programme. Five neighbourhoods in Malmö were selected: Sofielund, Augustenborg, Nydala, Almhög and parts of Möllevången. The strategy was to promote innovation, entrepreneurship, skills upgrading, development of services, cultural belonging and a feeling of belonging in the neighbourhoods. A central part of the strategy was the establishment of the develop-

---

8 Named after the by then integration minister Leif "blomman" Blomberg, the Blomman-money.
ment centre, named Facklan (the Torch), where people from the neighbourhoods joined to renovate the building. The Torch would act as a catalyst for idea creation, business creation and node for local businesses and associations. Activities were also to focus on local identity and belonging, where meeting places, networks, ecology, environment and local history were the focus. The bottom-up perspective was a pronounced important component (Malmö stad, 2011c).

**GEFAS** (1997-2000), a master plan for work and employment, had a budget of about 560 million SEK and an ambition to change the labour market policy from standardised programmes to more individual solutions. With the individual at the centre there would be a better match between the individual’s profile and the increasingly diversified needs in the labour market. Evaluations show that the initiative was successful (Jansson, 2001). The city achieved the ambition to coordinate public resources to combat unemployment and to use them in a more flexible manner. Collaboration in the districts and between the administration units involved in social and employment issues and with the Employment service improved. Individualisation was achieved, with a strong emphasis on active skills development and activation of the individuals. These methods were later applied and developed further in the local Labour and development centres (AUC), where local services and state authorities pooled their resources to help disadvantaged individuals to upgrade their skills and gain better access to employment (Bevelander, 2003). This also benefitted new immigrants that could get tailored skills development based on prior learning and work experience.

Despite Blommanpengarna and URBAN, Sweden did not have a specific policy for the metropolitan areas until 1998 when the bill Development and justice – a policy for metropolitan areas in the 21st century was adopted by the parliament (Proposition 1997/98:165). The main reason behind the policy were increased problems during the 90s with segregation and social polarisation in the wake of the immigration of several hundred thousand refugees to the large housing estates of the metropolitan suburbs (Andersson, 2010). As a result of the new metropolitan policy a large area-based **Metropolitan development initiative (MDI)** was launched 1999. The Swedish government and seven municipalities invested about 400 million Euros in 24 of the most deprived urban neighbourhoods in the Stockholm region, Gothenburg and Malmö. The policy had two primary goals: to create economic growth and to combat economic, social and ethnic discrimination and segregation. As Andersson (2006) and Bunar (2011) point out, the policy was, in fact, very much an integration policy. The integration and equality perspectives definitely became more important than economic growth in terms of funding, concrete programmes and media coverage. The second goal “to stop social, ethnic and discriminating segregation in the metropolitan regions and to work for equal and comparable living conditions for people living in the cities” had 8 sub-goals and most of them were socio-economic.\(^9\) To implement the policy, the state signed local development agreements (LDAs) with seven selected metropolitan municipalities, including Malmö. Andersson (2006) identifies seven elements in the Metropolitan Development Initiative:

---

\(^9\) Increase employment, decrease social benefits, strengthen Swedish language, better school results, higher education level, more attractive and safe neighbourhoods, better public health and increased democratic participation.
(a) It is selective in the sense that a rather limited number of neighbourhoods/urban
districts are targeted; 24 in the Swedish programme (4 in Malmö: Rosengård, Fosie,
Hyllie and Södra Innerstaden).

(b) It is integrated in the sense that a range of sub-programmes and projects focus on
the same neighbourhood (education, employment, health, democratic participation,
culture, etc.).

(c) The programme runs under a co-funding, cost-sharing principle where the state
and local actors provide a similar amount of resources to the initiative.

(d) It is regulated by signed contracts, a method used at least in all northern Europe-
an countries.

(e) It is time-limited, in the MDI case the programme period was set to about three
years.

(f) The initiative calls for active citizen participation in designing and carrying out the
programme.

(g) The MDI requests the coming together of a range of local actors – i.e. it aims at
setting up a partnership structure. In practice, like in other countries, it has been dif-
cult to involve private firms in the partnerships and we could label the outcome as
‘public–public’ partnerships.

Several ambitious evaluations of the Metropolitan development initiative were carried out.
The consensus is that the programme did not succeed in the goal to “break the segregation”.
The main reason for the failure was selective migration. These neighbourhoods have a
gateway role in the cities. Data show that, irrespective of macroeconomic conditions, people
who leave poor and immigrant dense areas are on average much better off in terms of em-
ployment and income compared with those who move into the areas. In short, people with
jobs leave the areas and get replaced by newly arrived migrants without jobs. A policy co-
nclusion is therefore to direct measures towards the neighbourhoods rather than the indivi-
duals living there, as this might lead to a reduction of the out-migration directed towards other
but similar housing estates. And, as we shall see in a later section, this is actually what is
happening now in Malmö.

After the disappointing results of the MDI a new local action plan was initiated in 2004: “Wel-
fare for all - the dual commitment” (Malmö stad, 2004). This dual commitment was in one
part “to ensure that all Malmö residents have a welfare that provides a good standard of liv-
ing” with a focus on work, education and housing. The second part was on economic growth,
that “Malmö together with Lund must be strong enough to drive growth for south-west Skåne,
Skåne and the Öresund region”. The action plan was divided into five main areas/issues:
work, education, housing, security and civil dialogue. ‘Welfare for all’ had its own budget (128
million SEK, including 74 for schools) and an organisational and political superstructure. The
staff in the programme was recruited from the city organisation and was supposed to initiate
projects and activities to achieve the goals. Collaboration with other local actors was consid-
ered important, but also to interact with the government, parliament and the EU was marked
in the plan. Working groups were set up which initiated a long list of projects that would take various measures that would lead to the objectives of the ‘Welfare for all’.

Broomé (2007) interprets ‘welfare for all’ as a new way of thinking about the integration work in Malmö, based on the experience of MDI. Instead of concentrating on vulnerable neighbourhoods and separate projects in the districts the integration work was intended to apply to the entire population, all districts and all administrations. The message was that it is not migrants or certain neighbourhoods that are the problem, but a more general phenomenon in the city: that the social and economic differences are too large and the economic growth too weak to provide jobs for everyone. The organisation tried to avoid categorising directed against only certain ethnic groups or certain neighbourhoods. Instead, problems are analysed in a broader perspective and solutions are based on increased coordination and cooperation with others. At the same time, integration issues were central. The focus was on groups of people who are socially and economically disadvantaged and who rely heavily on support from society to meet their everyday needs, and those were in large parts migrants concentrated in specific areas of Malmö. The programme therefore had a strong geographical and ethnic dimension where different groups of foreign origin were especially affected.

In addition, the programme emphasises that the municipal organisation alone cannot bring about change without the collaboration with other parts of society, such as the police, business and voluntary organisations. The local labour market policies that were developed in the MDI were institutionalised in a new administration, the Integration and employment unit (INAR) at the city office, which according Broomé strengthened the work first principle of the integration policy. But the empowerment focus (democracy and participation) that was also part of MDI did not lead to corresponding institutionalisation in the municipal organisation.

In addition to the measures to improve the welfare of groups that were seen as socially and economically disadvantaged the plan also called for general measures that require initiatives from government and parliament. Here, they focused on four areas: a) better cooperation between state authorities and the city of Malmö; b) that fewer refugees are allowed to move to Malmö; c) that asylum seekers should live in accommodation centres and not be allowed to live where they want and d) tougher action against economic crime.

The final report on the results of Welfare for all was published in 2009 (Malmö stad, 2009). There, the city states that the employment target was not reached. According to the report, that is partly because more people work in Denmark and there has been a large influx of young students and foreign-born. They also conclude that the target for education (students eligible for post-secondary education) has not been reached. Other targets had more positive results. Crime decreased somewhat, more apartments were built and the number of jobs increased from 130 000 to 144 000 between 2004 and 2007. When they look to the future, they write that a major challenge is how to deal with the integration and participation of groups that are partially or wholly excluded from society. They expect continued migration, and expect that Malmö needs help to include people from other parts of the world.

The programme Commission for a socially sustainable Malmö and the Neighbourhood programme are described in the section “Current policy measures".
4.2 Current policy setting

4.2.1 National integration policy and its impact on the local level

Following the principle of universalism, migrant workers who arrived from the mid-1950s onwards received the same social benefits as Swedes (Sarah Scuzzarello, 2010). In 1975, the universalist approach was complimented by a form of multicultural ideology, established by a unanimous Parliament who decided on the immigrant policy goals of equality, choice and collaboration. Ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities should now have the possibilities to preserve and develop their own cultural and social life. This was accompanied by mother tongue reform, voting rights in municipal elections and support for ethnic associations and cultural expressions (Broomé, 2007). In 1997, a law proposal concerning immigrant policies was presented (Prop. 1997/98:16). The proposal, which came into force on January 1, 1998, confirmed the change from multiculturalism to individual rights and civic integration. It entailed a discursive shift from immigrant politics to integration politics. While the ideological shift seemed major, most of the old measures prevailed. Some even argue that nothing other than the rhetoric changed (Dahlström, 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>New policy for newly arrived humanitarian migrants</td>
<td>The responsibility for introduction programmes was transferred from the central government to the municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Own housing reform</td>
<td>Asylum seekers could now find their own housing, and did not have to live in accommodation centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>New immigrant policy</td>
<td>Change from a multicultural to an integration policy focused on individual rights and civic integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>New policy for labour migration</td>
<td>Opened up for labour migration from outside EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>New policy for newly arrived humanitarian migrants</td>
<td>The responsibility for introduction programmes was transferred from the municipalities to the central government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. National integration policies

National policies, laws and regulations are playing a very important role in local integration policies. To understand the power of maneuver the city of Malmö has when it comes to integration policy, we must put the city into its national context.

Migration policy

During the last decades the central government has retained responsibility for migration policy, but decentralised integration to local governments. This means that the city of Malmö cannot control the inflow of migration, but still has to deal with the effects of migration. This was not a major problem up until the beginning of the 90s, because the inflow of migrants was not that large and asylum seekers had to live in accommodation centres provided by the
central government. After they got asylum and a right to stay in the country the humanitarian migrants settled in municipalities with which the government had an agreement.

The 1994 law on the reception of asylum seekers, the so called “own housing reform” changed this arrangement. It meant that asylum seekers were given financial support if they found their own accommodation during the asylum process. This was done to relieve the Immigration Board’s accommodation centres in a time of large numbers of asylum seekers. Quickly it became clear that the possibility of own accommodation was more attractive than was anticipated, and since the reform over 50 per cent of the asylum seekers has stayed in own accommodations. It did not only mean that cities like Malmö had to manage an increasing number of asylum seekers. After they got a residence permit they also had the right to stay in the municipality where they lived as asylum seekers. For Malmö, a popular municipality to settle in, this led to an increase of humanitarian migrants – an inflow which they could not control. Many municipalities have been dissatisfied and have pointed to the problems both for the asylum seekers and for the host municipalities (Bevelander, 2008). In March 2005, the housing allowance was taken away in an attempt to reduce the number of asylum seekers who choose their own accommodation, but without results. There are, according to civil servants at the city office, currently thousands of asylum seekers living in their own accommodation, often in overcrowded apartments together with friends and relatives. In Malmö, it means that the municipality has received many more immigrants per year than is contracted with the state, which in turn creates pressure on the introduction system, school system, social system and the ability to absorb the labour supply in the local labour market. The reform has been one of the largest lines of conflicts between the city of Malmö and the government since it was introduced. When an integration problem arises in Malmö, the Mayor is quick to blame the migration policy of the central government and to demand changes to the system.

Integration policy

The point of departure for integration policy is, according to the 1997 bill, that general policy should be based on society’s ethnic and cultural diversity and that the integration process is mutual in the sense that everyone is involved and must make a contribution (Regeringskansliet, 2002). In the 2009 budget the three former objectives of integration policy were replaced by a single overarching goal: “equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for all regardless of ethnic or cultural background” (Prop 2008/09: 01). The change meant that two of the former objectives were discarded ((i) a community based on diversity and (ii) a society characterised by mutual respect and tolerance, in which everyone can take an active and responsible part, irrespective of background). The policy goal is to be achieved mainly through general measures for the whole population, regardless of country of birth or ethnic background. The general measures are supplemented by targeted support for the introduction of newly arrived immigrants in their first years in Sweden (Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality, 2009). The general measures and policies can be decisive for the integration processes at the local level, especially because a lot of the legal-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural issues are decided by the state.
National legal-political and socio-economic framework

There are many indications that the national integration policy goal in Sweden has had a major impact. The project Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) is an instrument that measures integration policies in all European Union Member States plus Norway, Switzerland, Canada, USA, Australia and Japan. Using 148 policy indicators MIPEX creates a multi-dimensional picture of migrants’ opportunities to participate in society by assessing governments’ commitment to integration. By measuring policies and their implementation it reveals whether all residents are guaranteed equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities, which accidently is precisely the same goal that the Swedish integration policy has. MIPEX summarises the results for Sweden based on their 2010 data:

Ranked 1st again, Sweden’s ‘mainstreaming’ approach works to improve equal opportunities in practice. All residents are legally entitled to be free from discrimination, live with their family and secure in their residence and citizenship. … All workers are treated equally and use targeted support to address their individual needs. … Immigrants to Sweden will find that rare combination of a country experienced with immigration and open to their economic potential.

This opportunity structure for migrants is created on the national level and is the same in all municipalities. For example, in the legal-political area there are equal political opportunities for all residents. All can vote in local/regional elections and can form or join associations, media and political parties. The socio-economic rights are also the same for all residents. Once residents obtain a permit of at least 1 year, the Swedish labour market and the general welfare system do not create distinctions between Swedes and EU/non-EU nationals.

Socio-cultural framework

The legal-political and socio-economic framework is almost entirely decided on the national level and creates the environment which within the city of Malmö must work. The socio-cultural dimension is in part also influenced by national policies. The MCP index monitors the evolution of multiculturalism policies across the Western democracies by examining the adoption of eight policies. Sweden has seven of the eight multiculturalism policies, which means that the country is in the top layer among the 21 studied countries, barely beaten by Australia and Canada. What makes Australia and Canada have a higher index is that they have some affirmative action programmes which Sweden lacks. Some of the multicultural policies also affect local policies, especially when it comes to education (school curriculum and bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction).

---

10 [http://www.mipex.eu/](http://www.mipex.eu/)
11 The eight multicultural policies: constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism; the adoption of multiculturalism in school curriculum; the inclusion of ethnic representation/sensitivity in the mandate of public media or media licensing; exemptions from dress-codes, Sunday-closing legislation etc.; allowing dual citizenship; the funding of ethnic group organisations to support cultural activities; the funding of bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction; affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups (not in Sweden).
Laws and regulations

The general measures, that are the primary focus of the integration policy, are supplemented by targeted support for newly arrived immigrants in their first years in Sweden. The state has, through laws and regulations, made the municipalities obliged to provide specific services to newly arrived immigrants and thereby created a bureaucratic system of integration (Broomé, 2007). The obligations for the municipalities differ between two target groups: humanitarian migrants and other migrants.

The municipalities took over the responsibility from the Swedish Employment service for the introduction of humanitarian migrants in 1985. The municipalities offered the migrants targeted services and economic allowance and were compensated for the costs by the state. The transfer of the integration task to the municipal level, with increased state funding, has continued in the 1990’s and early 2000’s. In 1991, an improved standard compensation for the municipalities’ reception of immigrants was introduced that compensated for all costs of their integration for a maximum time of three and a half years. 25 years later, in December 2010, the responsibility shifted back to the central government and the Employment Service. There are, according to the government, two main reasons behind the reform: poor results and that there are too large differences between how the municipalities are working with the introduction (Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality, 2010).

The introduction of newly arrived immigrants has been designed differently in different parts of the country. The municipalities have, for example, made their own decisions on whether to pay introduction benefits or financial support (social allowance) to newly arrived immigrants who take part in an introduction programme. The municipalities have also decided on the size of the benefit. Evaluations show that it has taken a long time for newly arrived immigrants of refugee background to become established in the labour market. … The results show that there have been major structural problems with the introduction activities.

Now newly arrived immigrants who take part in activities according to an introduction plan will be entitled to benefits paid by the state.

Although not responsible any longer, the municipalities will continue to have important tasks for the reception of newly arrived humanitarian migrants, for example for Swedish for immigrants and other adult education, housing provision and initiatives for children and young people. The municipalities will also be responsible for offering civic orientation courses to newly arrived immigrants. The municipalities receive compensation from the state for these activities. A municipality that has an agreement concerning the reception of newly arrived immigrants for settlement is entitled to basic compensation corresponding to ten price base amounts per year. For each newly arrived immigrant a standard allowance is paid that is intended to cover the costs of reception and services. The standard compensation for 2011 is SEK 80 000 for people under the age of 65 and SEK 50 000 for people aged 65 and over. Standard compensation is also provided for the initial costs of financial support to newly arrived immigrants that the municipalities may need to pay before the state introduction benefit

---

12 The target group covered by the Introduction Act are refugees, other people in need of protection who have a residence permit and their close relatives between the ages of 20 and 64 who have applied for a residence permit within two years. Newly arrived immigrants aged 18–19 without parents are also included.
can be paid out. In addition, there are other compensations paid for reasons like health and medical care. Special compensation is also provided for unaccompanied minors. The state expects that the introduction of the new arrivals will cost about 8 billion per year 2012-2015. In 2012, the distribution is as follows: about 5 billion to municipalities, 1 billion for the introduction allowance and 1 billion to the introduction guide (Prop 2011/12:01 Budget 2012).

For all other migrants the municipalities are required to offer Swedish for immigrants (sfi) to all adult immigrants who lack basic Swedish language skills. For this there is no specific state funding. SFI follows the national curriculum for non-compulsory education (Lpf 94). In 2010, 96 100 immigrants studied Swedish, which was the highest number ever. The costs for the municipalities for the language training were about 1.9 billion SEK.

### 4.3 Local integration policy

Beginning in 1965 (when the free teaching of Swedish for immigrants was introduced) tasks and funds were transferred from the state to local governments to manage integration policy. In the 1980s, this was consolidated when municipalities became responsible for the introduction and integration of humanitarian migrants. At this time local integration policy was almost only about offering services to newly arrived humanitarian migrants. Since then the introduction of newly arrived humanitarian immigrants has become increasingly professional and institutionalised. During the second half of the 80’s the introduction of newly arrived in Malmö consisted of three hours language training per day. Only after completing the course the migrants were referred to the Employment service to find a job. During the 90’s the language training was complemented with civics and other activities. In the late 90’s there were nine different introduction programmes in Malmö, ranging from university-oriented ones to programmes for those who lack basic education from their homelands (Bevelander, 1997). The perspective had changed. Language training was now only supposed to be a part of a larger programme and it should be adapted to function alongside the other activities. In spite of the developments, the central government gradually became more and more disappointed by the poor results of the introduction activities in the municipalities. At the same time, they had limited opportunities for sanctions. To improve the results the Swedish integration board, established in 1997, took in 2001 initiative to a central agreement on the development of introduction for humanitarian migrants which included several state agencies and local municipalities, which led to local counterparts in various parts of the country. The local agreement for Malmö lists a wide range of activities that the city should provide. Similarly, the Employment service, the county of Skåne and the Migration board are committed to provide other services and to interact with the municipality in developing the introduction for humanitarian migrants. But it still did not work as intended. The Employment Service continued with its reluctance to register the newcomers as unemployed in the first years as long as they were the responsibility of municipalities. In 2010, the central government shifted the responsibilities to bring about some real change.

In the mid to late 90s, the concept of integration broadened and the city expanded its integration efforts. In addition to the welfare programmes described in 2.2 and the introduction programmes other integration policies were developed. In the wake of the city district reform in 1996, the city adopted a policy of integration mainstreaming. The intention was that the entire
municipal organisation shall work with an integration perspective. One would not any more particularly focus on refugees and immigrants. Immigrants should be seen as any other person. The Immigrant administration was shut down and only a minor subdivision called Ethnic relations was retained to work on anti-discrimination and possible ethnic conflicts arising in connection with service work.

The broader integration perspective is reflected in the Integration plan from 1999 where integration is understood as participation in society and as mutual understanding between people with different backgrounds. The basis is, like in the central governments integration policy from 1997, that integration is a mutual process. Other central components of the plan are empowerment, discrimination and diversity.

The diversity approach was first introduced in the 1998 staff policy where diversity was connected to the employer’s responsibility. In the integration plan it is emphasised that the staff of the city of Malmö should reflect the diversity of the population, act as a model for diversity and realise the value of diversity in their service to the citizens. The integration plan has a target for the representation of foreign-born in the municipal organisation which is followed up annually. Among other things, extensive training of staff was conducted that emphasises the importance of cultural diversity, and diversity training for all managers was conducted for the first time in 2002 and was repeated later. During the period 2002-2005, the city administration has in addition worked with an Equal Project, “Diversity as the Human Resource” (2002-2005) where they were supposed to be a ‘laboratory’ for diversity work. The ambition that the city itself shall be a role-model for others has, according to several studies, not been very successful. In Broomé (2007) three separate articles describe and analyze how diversity issues have difficulty in being included in management practices and fail to materialise in the organisation of the city of Malmö. Diversity issues are also identified as something primarily concerned with “arranging diversity in society”, while diversity issues are dismissed in the internal organisation. There also seems to be a conflict between the core work and the diversity perspective. Core work is experienced by managers as the most central.

Empowerment was an important aspect of the integration projects like URBAN and the Metropolitan development initiative that was carried out in the late 90s and early 00s. But with the increased focus on economic growth it has gradually been played down. The policies are back to more traditional social engineering with a bias towards uniform solutions for public policy, which provides little room for empowerment and a bottom-up perspective. The local integration policies and their implementation reflect this. This lingering on methods and approaches, despite the criticism, points to a long-standing tradition in public policy and administration, a so-called path dependency (Broome, 2007). The tradition also tends to marginalise migrant organisations.

The emphasis of mainstreaming over group provisions and on individual rights over group rights can explain why there are no formal bodies which represent the migrant population in policymaking processes. The issue of representation is also mentioned as a reason for not institutionalizing dialogue with migrant associations.

“The lack of formal channels of representation of migrant associations is legitimised by the Council because it is concerned that these organisations cannot truly speak for the group
they claim to be representing. At the same time, participation in civil society and in particular in voluntary associations is presented as pivotal by the Council and by the national Government in order to achieve an equal and cohesive society.” (Sarah Scuzzarello (2010) p.158)

Generally speaking, the city has tended to steer the migrant associations away from ethnic-based mobilisation towards a more general idea of civil society participation. The participation of migrants is constrained by the conceptions of what an association is supposed to be doing, i.e. foster a democratic ethos, educate democratic principles and promote integration as defined by the state (Sarah Scuzzarello, 2010).

Thus, integration policy in Malmö and Sweden has relied on a strong tradition of universal welfare policy, which has been supplemented with special treatment of newly arrived immigrants. Employment difficulties for immigrants have challenged the general welfare policy. However, this has not entailed any changes in the established integration policy of introduction programmes, employment and employment services, language training and anti-discrimination policy. Renewal has instead revolved around increased collaboration with the rest of society, above all other state authorities. The municipality’s influence on integration policies is limited. Although the implementation of integration policy is decentralised, it is state legislation, regulation and funding that are most important for its design. The scope for Malmö is primarily the organisational design and impact on the organisation.

4.4 Current policy measures

The City of Malmö’s integration plan was adopted by the City assembly in 1999 (Malmö stad, 1999). Even if it is more than ten years old it is still in use as long as there is no political decision to change it. The plan introduces measures in three areas: children and youth, jobs and employment and discrimination and racism. The measures are not very concrete, and much has transpired since the plan was decided so I will not go into detail about the content. The plan belongs more into history, than current policies and measures (for more on the integration plan, see the section about policy history). According to civil servants at INAR, there have been several initiatives to replace or update the integration plan. The latest effort was made in 2010 when the plan was to be complemented with measurable indicators for integration. But the 2010 election brought about changes in the political leadership and the new Commissioner decided to fold the entire project on integration indicators and the new action plan on integration.

After the election the Commissioner and Committee for integration and employment were replaced by a Commissioner and Committee for employment and adult education. This is, according to the political secretary at the Commissioners unit, the final and logical step in the integration mainstreaming strategy. But a mainstreaming strategy is not without problems. An official at the city office said in an interview that integration issues are more invisible now that employment is in focus. On the one hand, integration is visible because it is supposed to be everyone’s responsibility, all departments and all operations should work with integration, but somehow it becomes easy to not do it then. And it has become difficult for civil servants to initiate new integration measures that are not targeted at employment because the responsi-
The policy on mainstreaming can therefore in reality mean a narrowing of integration policy to employment.

(informer 1) Before the last election there was a broad view of integration as something that was all about mutual adaptation, which followed the state integration policy quite faithfully. What has happened now is this new word exclusion, that means unemployed, and that there is a very high unemployment among some groups in Malmö, has brought about a hard focus on self-sufficiency and that as many as possible actually enter the work force and are employed. This is now equated with inclusion. Which, from what I have got used to and learned, I think is not enough and a shallow approach. But so it is now, anyway. It’s quite clear.

(informer 2) It is clear. Things that one refers to as “integration projects”, they cannot be supported anymore unless there is a particular focus on work, you could say. (from an interview with two civil servants at the city office)

The discussion on what integration should mean and what measures to support is not new. It existed already in 1996 when the city decided to no longer support immigrant associations with special funds. They had to rename themselves as cultural organisations or something else, and seek funding on the same terms as everyone else. In conjunction with that, the immigrant associations’ umbrella organisation also disbanded. The idea was that you should not distinguish between people, but to treat all equally in the same way. There is within the labour movement a tradition that equality should be based on similarity rather than diversity. Among the Social democrats the idea of similarity has been quite strong and has left its mark on local politics.

One of the responsible politicians agrees:

It has gone from the idea of integration as a separate thing, to mainstreaming in different areas. And concentrate it on just work. It’s about work and schools, nothing special just for migrants. That’s how we try to work now ... And all that is needed for these people, it’s here anyway. There are channels for them to seek funding. But instead of coming to one place to apply for money, for example INAR, we try to channel it through normal channels. For leisure activities, go to the Recreation department, for cultural activities, go to Cultural department. We normalize it, and I think it’s a better way, to not make it into something special. (Interview, political secretary at the Commissioners unit)

The strategy of mainstreaming is a challenge in a report like this which is supposed to map local integration policies. It makes it hard so make out what is an integration policy or not. A narrow definition of integration leaves us with only those policies that are decided by the central government and are directed towards newly arrived migrants, i.e. introduction programmes and language training. Another obvious area is the work against racism and discrimination. At the same time it is obvious that general policies favor migrants. Migrants represent a majority of the population in the neighbourhood programmes and are often the majority of participants in vocational training, labour market programmes and adult education. Also, much of the work to improve the education in schools is intended to help migrant youths and invest in schools where many migrants are pupils.
4.4.1 Socio-economic dimension

Employment

In 2012, the city of Malmö is spending 153 million SEK on labour market policy (Malmö stad, 2012). The goal is to increase labour market participation. The municipal labour market activities are focused on young people and those who are farther from the labour market. Those who are estimated to be closer to the labour market usually use the services of the Employment service, the state authority responsible for labour market policy. Malmö’s labour market activities shall provide participants with opportunities to take part in the general labour market and education services.

In March 2012, about 2600 persons participated in the 24 different labour market programmes financed by the municipality (Malmö stad, 2012b). Few labour market programmes and projects are targeting only migrants, but in most of them the majority are persons with migrant background. Special funds are allocated for the support in Swedish for people who need enhanced understanding of language in order to participate in vocational training or labour market activities. Almost all of the programmes are organised by the city administration. In the budget for 2012 15 millions are set aside to fund projects run by NGOs. The funds are supposed to finance labour market projects and activities that lead to the development of meeting places and increase Malmö residents’ opportunities for participation in society. A major recipient of funds is the football club FC Rosengård that is engaged in projects focusing on education and employment for youth and adults.

Table 3 shows the current labour market related projects and activities\(^\text{13}\) in the city of Malmö. Only three are organised by NGOs, two of which are football clubs. All, except Kontaktpersonersverksamheten (Contact persons, described in the socio-cultural section) are focusing on socio-economic issues. Some are labeled as integration projects although not all participants are migrants. But others, which only work with migrants, are not. For example, IntroRehab (Introduction rehabilitation) provides rehabilitation for traumatised newly arrived migrants but is not labeled as an integration project. There are also projects not in the list that are clearly integration-related labour market projects, like Jallatrappan (Jalla-steps) – a work-cooperative where migrant women offer services like cooking, sewing and cleaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/activity</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Principal organiser</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AktivitätsArenan</td>
<td>activation, employability rehabilitation, internship, rehabilitation</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Service administration</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbetsrehab Kompassen</td>
<td>employability rehabilitation</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Service administration</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost by FC Rosengård</td>
<td>activation, employability rehabilitation, Integration, internship</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>City office</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2C</td>
<td>activation, internship, youths, education</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Education administration</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenix</td>
<td>activation, employability rehabilitation, internship, rehabilitation</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Service administration</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Service</td>
<td>employability rehabilitation</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Kirseberg city district</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntroRehab</td>
<td>rehabilitation</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Service administration</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) [http://webapps03.malmo.se/insatskatalogen/public](http://webapps03.malmo.se/insatskatalogen/public)
Table 3. Current projects and activities in Malmö (source: city of Malmö 2012-05-29)

Introduction for newly arrived humanitarian migrants

As described in chapter 2.3, newly arrived humanitarian migrants are offered an introduction programme. Because very few of them have an income when they get a residence permit, almost all participate in the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Newly arrived humanitarian migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Number of newly arrived humanitarian migrants in Malmö 2005-2011

For the migrants this means that they draft an introduction plan together with the Employment service. The introduction plan can last for a maximum of 24 months and must include language training, civic orientation and labour market activities. A newly arrived migrant with an introduction plan is also entitled to choose an introduction guide. The guide is an independent actor that is supposed to support newly arrived immigrants in their search for work.
While participating in the programme the migrants are entitled to an introduction benefit. The introduction benefit is individual and the same for everyone regardless of where in the country one lives.

**Language training**

Swedish for immigrants, also known as SFI, is an education in the Swedish language, designed for immigrants. It is every municipality’s obligation to offer SFI free of charge to the adult immigrants who are registered in the municipality. Swedish for immigrants shall, according to the national curriculum, provide adult immigrants with basic knowledge of Swedish as well as basic reading and writing skills to facilitate participation in social and working life. Language training should be individualised and combined with other activities such as introduction activities, other education, validation, work or other labour market activities. There are three different study paths, customised for the educational background of the participant. Language training should be offered throughout the year. In Malmö it is the Education department, on instruction from INAR, which organises the entire SFI. The instruction is that 50 per cent of the education places (about 3500 every year) should be procured, while the other half is carried out by the Education departments themselves.

**Education**

Education for children and adults plays an important part in local integration policies, but at the same time there are only a few special measures for migrants. The effort is rather to arrange and adapt the general education so it fits the whole population in Malmö.

Children and youths in pre-school and school have a possibility to attend special classes to develop their mother tongue. The national curriculum for pre-school education states that children with a mother tongue other than Swedish should be given the opportunity to develop their mastery of that mother tongue as well as the mastery of the majority language. For both compulsory comprehensive and upper-secondary level mother tongue studies is a school subject in its own right. In Malmö, a pupil can receive mother tongue teaching if one or both parents have a language other than Swedish, the student has basic knowledge of the language, the student uses the language daily at home, at least five students in the municipality wish this teaching and there is a suitable teacher in the current language. There is a Mother tongue unit with the mission to provide mother tongue education. It employs 180 teachers who educate about 10 000 pupils in 40 different languages. In addition, there are 36 mother tongue teachers working in pre-schools. Most of the language instruction takes place in the afternoons, outside the students’ curricular time. The Mother tongue unit also administers the introduction of newly arrived migrants in schools. An individual assessment is made of what is best for the pupil. Some are placed in regular school classes and simultaneously receive individually tailored support, but others are placed in preparatory groups. The school receives an extra 2000 Euros to support the newly arrived. After an evaluation report of the introduction of newly arrived migrants in schools showed that the arrangements were ad hoc and different across the city districts, the city assembly decided to tighten up the policies (Malmö stad, 2010b). The new policy differentiates between three age groups. Pupils up to third grade are to be placed in ordinary classes; pupils in fourth to sixth grade are placed in
preparatory groups in ordinary schools while a separate school is established for pupils in seventh to ninth grade.

All adults can attend free adult education. If you lack primary education you are allowed to study while living on social welfare. Other students can apply for loans administrated by a state authority. In 2010, there were 1100 full year students in primary adult education and 2700 students in secondary education in Malmö. Statistics from the Swedish board of education show that close to 90 per cent of the students in primary adult education and 30 per cent of the students in secondary adult education are foreign born. In the big cities the share of foreign born is even larger, so adult education is obviously an important measure for migrant integration in Malmö. Within the adult education in Malmö there is also a unit working with foreign credential recognition.

Health

Public health has become an increasingly important starting point for policy development in Malmö. The latest major welfare initiative from the city of Malmö, the Commission for a socially sustainable Malmö, is based on public health and its determinants (Malmö stad, 2010c). The commission came about in light of the present differences in health observed among different population groups and different areas in Malmö. The quality of health, mortality rates and the ability to self-assess one’s health varied across the city, essentially creating a situation that was considered both unethical and unjust and contradicting of the city’s strategic goals for a socially sustainable Malmö. The decision to launch a commission was made in May 2010 by the city assembly. The Commission works independently and consists of fourteen commissioners, each with specific areas of expertise within the domains of social sciences, health economy, urban studies and the city of Malmö. The main task of the commission is to assemble evidence and based on those propose strategies for reducing health inequalities and improve the long-term living conditions for the citizens of Malmö. Over 15 reports have been delivered up until June 2012, on issues like consumption of health care, children and young people’s living conditions and unemployment and health. A final report is due in December 2012 with a recommendation of strategies that answer the questions about what can be done in order to reduce health disparities in Malmö, and how it can be done.

4.4.2 Legal-political dimension

Discrimination and racism

The action plan against discrimination was adopted by the city assembly in September 2010 (Malmö, 2010a). In the plan the city acknowledges that discrimination is not only individual, but also institutional and structural. It is not only about attitudes, but also norms, rules and laws. It is aimed at all municipal activities in Malmö, relates to all in the municipality and encompasses all discrimination grounds, including ethnicity and religion or other beliefs. The objective is to make discrimination visible and work against it and promote human rights and equal treatment. The aim is for all who work in the municipal sector to be aware of the norms and structures that exist in their own administration and that expose people to discrimination.
Diversity and equality plans have been drawn up by the administrations as a tool in their work for equal rights. The work is reported in connection with the annual report and final accounts. Much of their work is directed at the administration to identify which obstacles are present to all people’s right to equal treatment. Some examples are the strategic work that is going on in the HR unit to quality assuring the recruitment process where the document KARP (quality-assured recruitment free from discriminatory structures) will form part of the process in the future. Diversity is a goal in recruitments but affirmative action is not allowed according to Swedish law. The department is also responsible for certain diversity training that is directed at all personnel in the municipality. The city is also following up the proportion with a foreign background (born abroad or born in Sweden with two foreign-born parents) of the municipality’s staff at all levels, shall correspond to the proportion of the total population.

External services are another part of the action plan. Labour market policy in the municipality’s budget is followed up and reported on the basis of gender, age and foreign birth. There are also efforts in areas like housing, school and civil society participation. The municipal housing company MKB shall, according to the plan, give consideration to the housing needs of different groups and actively counter housing segregation, promote integration and equality and combat discrimination and the municipality’s planning of new production of housing shall include mixed sizes and forms of provision in order to satisfy different groups’ requirements. In civil society Malmö aims to support independent organisations that prevent and counter discrimination through free-of-charge advisory services and information to individuals as well as through opinion forming and education. The newly started NGO Malmö Against Discrimination is, though, mainly given financial grants from the state. The city also supports organisations working to prevent honour based violence.

The city is also a member, and in the board, of European coalition of cities against racism. Another means to work against ethnic and religious discrimination and racism is the dialogue forum that was set up after several anti-Semitic incidents. Soon after the dialogue forum was established in 2010, even more serious incidents occurred and therefore it was complemented with a conflict council. The Forum brings together representatives from the municipality, from religious communities and groups that have been subject to racism and hate crimes. The purpose is to find ways to counteract and prevent such crimes. Later, in 2012, a relay service for hate crime victims was established. Other activities are a story-telling project about victims of the Holocaust, The Holocaust Memorial Day and an annual anti-racist film festival. The international day to combat racism and discrimination is being celebrated with an open conference every year in cooperation with the university, the local state administration and a group of local NGOs.

**Citizenship**

Each year at the Swedish national holiday the 6th of June the municipality is inviting new citizens to celebrate their naturalisation. At the 2012 celebration at the Malmö opera 280 of the about 2200 persons that became citizens during 2011 attended, and including relatives the total number was 800. Prince Daniel gave a welcome speech to the new Swedes and handed out the first welcome diploma.
4.4.3 Socio-cultural dimension

Diversity award

The city of Malmö’s integration award was introduced in 2000 to acknowledge efforts to improve local integration. In 2008, they decided that the award should be given to two categories, one to persons or organisations in the civil society and one to persons or institutions within the public sector. In 2011, the two awards were redone into one award for ethnic diversity and one for gender equality. This change is in line with the current policy in the city, where integration as a concept has been phased out. Ever since the introduction of the award, the chosen winners have reflected the city’s approach to integration. In the beginning of the 2000s the winners tended to be private companies that worked with diversity issues, local sports clubs and public initiatives that led to inter-ethnic contact between persons with Swedish and foreign background. In the second part of the decade most winners were associations or individual enthusiasts working with youths in civil society or public sector. The first award for diversity in 2011 was given to John Monhardt, CEO of Radisson Blu Hotel in Malmö because he has “realized the importance of taking advantage of the diversity that exists in Malmö and the benefits it entails. John has got an entire sector in Malmö to understand the importance of diversity and not just in the company he leads.”

Contact persons

This programme has been in place in some form since 2002, but recently became more noticed when the city of Malmö in the beginning of 2012 did a city-wide advertising campaign to recruit participants. The programme is quite straightforward. Through the contact person programme Swedes and recent immigrants meet each other. The municipality helps the volunteer to find a suitable person or family and then they themselves choose when, where and how often they want to meet. During the time they meet, the municipality offers support in terms of follow-ups and meetings. After 6 months the programme is over.

Violence against women and honour related violence

The city of Malmö has a programme to prevent violence against women. A part of the programme is dealing with honor related violence. Guidelines how to work with persons subjected to oppression and violence in the name of honour have been developed. Much of the work is based on cooperation with, for example, the police, healthcare and Malmö women’s shelter and other voluntary organisations. The Crisis Centre Malmö has accommodations for girls and young women aged 16-22 years who are victims of honour related violence and who need protection. The accommodation is staffed around the clock and girls are offered protection, conversations and support in planning for their future. There are several NGOs working with honour issues that have support from the city of Malmö, like Tänk om! (Re-think!), ATIM and Malmö Kvinnojour (Women’s shelter).

Civic orientation

When the new reform for newly arrived humanitarian migrants came into force in 2010, Civic orientation became an obligatory part of the introduction programme. Its aim is to foster a basic understanding of Swedish society (Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality, 2010).
Civic orientation highlights the importance of human rights and fundamental democratic values, as well as the rights and obligations of the individual in general, how society is organised and the practical aspects of everyday life. Civic orientation is supposed to provide room for dialogue and reflection and, as far as possible, be conducted in the participant’s mother tongue or another language of which the participant has a good command. The municipalities are obliged to offer a minimum of 60 hours of civic orientation, starting as soon as possible after the introduction plan has been drawn up and normally ending within a year. In Malmö the employees of the Immigrant service are teaching the first 20 hours with help of interpreters. This part is offered to all new migrants, and not only to those with an introduction programme. Immigrant services also help with other needs that a newly arrived immigrant may have, like temporary income support and information about housing and schools. The remaining 40 hours are taught in the migrants’ mother tongue by the Community and health communicators. The communicators are employed by County Administrative Board of Skåne and work in several of the County’s municipalities. In addition to teaching civic orientation they also work with language and culture specific information and guidance about health and the organisation of health care in Skåne.

**Roma-issues**

In April 2009, the “Roma Information and Education Centre” opened. The Centre is part of the city administration. It has a special task to develop methods for social inclusion and participation in society of the Roma group and to counteract discrimination of Roma people. The centre offers information and support to Roma people and organises information events and theme nights with authorities, Roma organisations and NGOs in various current topics. There are five people employed at the centre, four of them are Roma.

**Civil society**

The city of Malmö supports some projects that aim at increasing migrants’ participation in civil society. The project Integration in associations, run by Malmö sport organisations union (MISO) and Malmö nonprofit associations’ umbrella organisation (MIP) has been supported by the city of Malmö since 2008. The associations committed to the project are recruiting contact persons among its members. Such persons provide the new immigrants support in different ways and introduce them to the association. The match between the new migrant and the association is based on the common recreational and sporting interests. Information in association knowledge is also given to the Swedish for immigrants (sfi) students. Students will then indicate his/her interests and the coordinator tries to help the person find the appropriate association. In 2011, the project visited 64 SFI classes and helped 125 persons to come into contact with an association.

### 4.4.4 Spatial dimension

**Neighbourhood programme**

The spatial dimension is an important part of most policy measures. But in addition to those measures there is a neighbourhood programme that deals specifically with this dimension.
The city of Malmö has a long history of area based programmes. Compared to earlier programmes, the current programme is focusing on neighbourhoods rather than districts. Five areas are selected – Herrgården, Holma Kroksbäck, Lindängen, Segevång and Seved, and all but one of them are in districts that have been part of earlier programs. The programme started in 2010 and is supposed to go on for five years. The neighbourhood programme means a commitment to all of Malmö’s city administrations to invest time and resources in the areas. Instead of doing the same thing in many places, it is proposing to do many things at the same place. The idea is to build a broad group of stakeholders - residents, civic organisations, businesses, property owners, university, state authorities, etc. to address each neighbourhood's challenges and build on their opportunities (Malmö stad, 2011d).

The objective is to improve living conditions in areas where welfare is at its lowest and upgrade the physical environment. The overall objective is to create a sustainable city where ecological, economic and social sustainability go hand in hand. A central idea is that the programmes are to be built around a “physical skeleton” and “social muscles”. Major physical changes will take place in all five areas. Stations, new buildings, densification of housing, parks, streets, gardens, etc. are supposed to highlight the potential for change that exist in the areas. But in addition to this skeleton there also should be investments in social capital - human capacity and knowledge, through schools, clubs, libraries, computer networks and communication - to enhance the ability of people to influence their lives, their livelihood, their housing, their education. Dialogue and involvement are central concepts in the programme, which signals an ambition in doing things with residents and stakeholders, rather than to and for them. Each neighbourhood has its own action plan. For example, in Herrgården in Rosengård with its nearly 5000 residents, the city wants to improve schools, create more jobs and stimulate participation in cultural- and community organisations. Several physical projects are planned, as renovation and ecologically adaptation of houses and the local swimming pool and to adapt the physical environment to contribute to a more secure environment. They also plan major investments in infrastructure. The district will get its own train station and one of the city’s first two tram lines will go from Rosengård through the city to the Western harbour. The pedestrian and bicycle path between Rosengård and Möllevångstorget will be renovated and developed.
5. Rotterdam

Since the Second World War and during the mid-70s in particular, Rotterdam has developed into a multi-ethnic urban society. In the first years after the Second World War, Rotterdam attracted only a relatively small number of immigrants. In the 1950s, many people migrated from the former Dutch East Indies to the Netherlands, arriving in the port of Rotterdam. Most of them settled in other places but some immigrants put down roots in Rotterdam until the 1960s. Until the 1970s, immigrants made up only a small percentage of the Rotterdam population. A large proportion of them came from other European countries.

The 1970s, Rotterdam saw an influx of Yugoslavians who often came to work in the metal industry in Rotterdam and its surrounding area. When the Dutch colony of Suriname was about to gain its independence in the mid-1970s, immigration from this South American country to the Netherlands took off. Next to this, a growing recruitment of Turkish and Moroccan workers took place. Until the beginning of the 1990s, the Turkish group made up the biggest part of the influx, with the exception of 1983 and 1984, when a larger number of Moroccans came to Rotterdam. These Turkish and Moroccan immigrants were called ‘guest workers’ and they were expected to stay only temporarily. However, many ‘guest workers’ settled in Rotterdam on a permanent basis resulting in subsequent migration of their family members. More recently, also their children often married partners from their countries of origin. In 1975, the immigrant percentage of the Rotterdam population was 6%. Their share grew to 20% in 1985 and 30% in 1990 (Veenman, 1998; 2000).

Over the past decade the percentage of immigrants more or less stabilised with 45% in 2000 and 47.7% in 2012. Rotterdam currently counts 166 nationalities. 47.7% of the population is of non-Dutch origins or has at least one parent born outside the country. In the Dutch political and policy discourse, the concepts of ‘ethnic minorities’ and ‘allochtonous citizens’ usually refer to people who have at least one parent born in a non-Western country or who were born in a non-Western country themselves. Thus, this does not only include immigrants but also their children who were born in the Netherlands. Residents of Surinamese origin now constitute the largest minority population in Rotterdam numbering 52,924 and making up 8.5% of the Rotterdam population. Next to the Surinamese, the largest minority groups are Turkish (47,519; 7.7%), Moroccans (39,708; 6.4%), Antilleans, (22,073; 3.6%) and Cape Verdians (15,302; 2.5%) (Centre for Research and Statistics Rotterdam, 2012).

The influx of immigrants in Rotterdam and the growing realisation that immigrants would settle permanently, urged the municipal government from the late 1970s onward to initiate immigrant integration policies. The next paragraph will outline several phases that can be distinguished in the history of Rotterdam’s integration policy. Subsequently, we will focus on the current integration policy. The policy setting, goals and measures will be addressed.
5.1 Policy History

5.1.1 Until 1978

Until 1978, the local government of Rotterdam did not have a policy dealing with immigrants or integration. Guest workers were expected to stay temporarily and the city would just temporarily accommodate immigrants. Although the municipality did not pursue policy actions, Christian organisations provided help to individual cases and initiated socio-cultural activities (De Nieuwe Rotterdammers, 1991). The national government financed socio-cultural organisations to support the well-being of foreign workers (De Nieuwe Rotterdammers, 1991). Immigrants were encouraged to maintain strong ties with their own communities in the Netherlands (Veenman, 2000). The leading discourse was that immigrants should ‘integrate while retaining their own identity’ (WRR, 1979).

The first attempt to develop an integration policy was a result of the riots in the Afrikaanderwijk when local residents tried to expel guest workers from the pensions where they were staying. In reaction to these conflicts, the Rotterdam authorities tried to develop a policy to spread immigrants over Rotterdam’s neighbourhoods. Policy initiatives for spatial dispersal in 1972 and 1979 were revoked by the Council of State of the Netherlands.

5.1.2 1978-1985

In 1978, the municipality of Rotterdam initiated its first immigrant policy by publishing the policy document ‘Immigrants in Rotterdam’ (Nota Migranten in Rotterdam). In this policy document it was ascertained that Rotterdam had an increasingly diverse population and the Rotterdam city executive believed that this was not of temporary nature: ‘It is remarkable that many still believe that we are dealing with a temporary phenomenon. This even regards the Dutch government that asserts that our country is not a country of immigration, that assumes that foreign workers will only stay temporarily and that as a result of this does not search for structural measures’ (Nota Migranten in Rotterdam, 1978: 4). The city of Rotterdam was thus heralding cutting edge policy. In the years after, the national government and other municipalities also developed their first integration policies.

This policy was concerned with the worsening of the socio-economic position of the growing immigrant communities, owing primarily to gradually rising unemployment (Nota Culturele Minderheden in het Rijnmondgebied, 1981). The policy measures primarily focused on the immigrants’ position on the labour market and the related educational attainments of the immigrant community. There was particular attention to improve the quality of housing and to promote a more even distribution of immigrants over the city. Also, the city encouraged inter-ethnic contact through organised meetings in the neighbourhoods and there was a focus on political integration. Economic, political and social integration was required, while immigrants could retain their own culture and identity – a remnant from the previous policy phase (Veenman, 2000). Exemplary for this is that a summary of the policy note was also published in the most common immigrant languages – an attempt to make public information available to all citizens. This would nowadays be unthinkable.
Instead of targeting immigrant groups specifically, the policy addressed the population of Rotterdam in general. ‘It is of upmost importance not to distinguish between allochthonous and autochthonous citizens. This means that we need to pursue universal policy for both groups. That should stay this way.’ (Migranten in Rotterdam, 1978: 2). The Rotterdam authorities focused on making general services available to immigrants as well.

In this period, the Rotterdam authorities paid particular attention to the legal-political position of immigrants as a prerequisite for other dimensions of integration. Antillean and Surinamese immigrants often had the Dutch nationality. Other immigrant groups had a limited legal status. Rotterdam campaigned for the introduction of immigrants’ right to vote and to stand as candidates at municipal elections. In 1979, the Rotterdam City Council enacted legislation to that end that was brought forward by the City executive. Also, the local government was concerned that there were still few ethnic organisations. This would limit their voice in the democratic process. The formation of immigrant organisations was successfully stimulated. An Alderman engaged with ‘Special Groups’ was assigned to coordinate immigrant policies and a Rotterdam Anti-Discrimination Board (RADAR) was installed (Evaluerende Notitie, 1982).

Next to actively pursuing legal-political and socio-economic integration measures, Rotterdam addressed the question whether in addition to pursuing a policy of integration, the government should facilitate the return of migrants to their home countries (Remigratie, 1985). Although this policy was not pursued, it reflected the doubt of the municipality of Rotterdam whether all immigrants were really prepared to integrate in Dutch society. One policy document concluded that integration would probably take more time and effort for non-European immigrant groups and in particular for Moroccan immigrants (Minderhedenbeleid in een Gewijzigde situatie, 1985: 17).

5.1.3 1985-1998
During the 1980s, the number of immigrants in Rotterdam increased, their socio-economic position worsened and inter-ethnic tensions between Dutch and foreign workers grew. Temporary housing arrangements were not always sufficient and the housing situation of immigrants concentrated in certain neighbourhoods of the city caused nuisance (De Nieuwe Rotterdammers, 1991). Unemployment amongst ethnic minorities became three to four times as high as amongst the autochthonous population: 45 to 60 per cent of the largest immigrant groups were unemployed during the economic harsh times of the 1980s (Minderhedenbeleid in een Gewijzigde Situatie, 1985: 3; Memorandum inzake het minderhedenbeleid in de jaren 90, 1988: 3). In the meantime, immigration for the purpose of family reunification was increasing and the immigrant population was growing (Nota Culturele Minderheden in het Rijnmondgebied, 1981). This was particularly the case for the large cities in the Netherlands: the share of immigrants in the Netherlands was 5% but in the cities it was already 20% of the population. Issues concerning immigrant integration concentrated in the cities.

From the mid-1980s onward, the realisation grew that general anti-deprivation policies were by themselves not effective enough to improve the socio-economic position of immigrants. This marked a period of tougher integration policies: ‘Just a few years ago, it was thought that with the second generation of immigrants, integration issues would be solved. Their par-
ents were considered to be a lost generation but it was believed that their children would find their way. This optimism has vanished" (Minderhedenbeleid in een Gewijzigde Situatie, 1985: 14). The city of Rotterdam would no longer act merely as a host, but asked for active integration of immigrants (De Nieuwe Rotterdammers, 1991). There was a growing perception that the traditional social democratic approach – based on providing support to disadvantaged groups such as immigrants – was creating a culture of dependency rather than one of economic self-sufficiency that was desired. The focus of this new phase in Rotterdam’s integration policy was no longer exclusively on the rights of immigrants but there was a new emphasis on their responsibilities toward society, particularly the responsibility become self-reliant.

Rotterdam enacted temporary specific measures for immigrant economic integration as part of the general anti-deprivation policy (Minderhedenbeleid in een Gewijzigde situatie, 1985; Memorandum Inzake het Minderhedenbeleid in de jaren ’90, 1988). ‘Before, there was a strong tendency to confine specific measures for immigrants to a minimum. This was pursued because we were afraid that they would increase or at least confirm segregation.’ (Memorandum Inzake het Minderhedenbeleid in de jaren ’90, 1988: 15). In the policy document ‘Memorandum regarding the Minority Policy during the nineties’ eighteen Dutch municipalities concluded that general measures were however insufficient and ‘unorthodox measures’ (Memorandum Inzake het Minderhedenbeleid in de jaren ’90, 1988) were needed.

Immigrants were urged to learn the Dutch language in order to improve their social-economic position. Education was provided to enhance their opportunities for labour market participation. These concerned special vocational training facilities, Dutch language courses, anti-discrimination measures and job-creation schemes. The Project Integration of Newcomers (Project Integratie Nieuwkomers) that was initiated in 1991 and was executed by the Rotterdam department of Social Affairs and Employment incorporated such immigrant courses and was mandatory for welfare recipients with an immigrant background (Muskens, 1995). PIN-courses can be considered to be a precursor of national civic integration courses. Rotterdam also pursued affirmative action programmes to improve the socio-economic position of immigrants. For instance, attention was raised for the role of the Rotterdam administration as a very important employer that needed to reflect on its policy of hiring immigrant employees.

This turn in the assumptions on which the Rotterdam integration policy was based, required a redefinition of the role of the municipality. This was laid down in the 1989 policy document ‘The New Rotterdam from a Social Perspective’ (Het Nieuwe Rotterdam in Sociaal Perspectief). The local authorities wanted to cooperate with the ministerial departments and immigrant organisations more intensively. From the national government, municipalities asked for more space to develop their own policies. During the nineties, Rotterdam counted 190 immigrant self-organisations and support organisations (Muskens, 1995:17). Some of them were subsidised by the municipality or sub-municipalities to enhance integration and emancipation of immigrants. The relationships with subsidised CSOs were put on a new footing. Clear-cut relationships with marked objectives and accountability were pursued (Muskens, 1995).

Accountability was also favoured with respect to individual immigrants. This is part of a broader policy of ‘social renewal’ in Rotterdam (De Nieuwe Rotterdammers, 1991). Individu-
als who took little or no action to find work were sanctioned, while those who were able to find jobs were rewarded. Local authorities warned that undesirable group behaviour – including youth crime and anti-social behaviour – would be clamped down on (Veenman, 2000). Even though tougher integration policies were pursued on the socio-economic dimension of integration, the Rotterdam authorities still felt that this should not hinder efforts by ethnic minorities to hold on to their own culture, identity and religion. Exemplary of this is that necessary space for mosques was created by the local government (Huisvesting van Moskeeën, 1992).

5.1.4 1998-2002
The political period from 1998 to 2002 was marked by multicultural policies. The socio-cultural dimension of integration gained primary attention and Rotterdam’s diversity was brought forward as a strength (Uitvoeringsprogramma Met Raad en Daad, 2008). This diversity policy did not only target immigrants. It also addressed women, young people and disabled people.

In the coalition-and execution programme ‘Met Raad and Daad’ we read that public services, the cultural events, employee stocks and administrative boards do not reflect the diversity of the population sufficiently. The Rotterdam administration strives to alter this situation via the policy programme ‘The Multicoloured City’ (Veelkleurige stad) that was initiated in 1998. Key to this programme is a positive reinforcement of diversity in all policy domains. Cultural diversity was considered a given and needed to be lived out by the municipal services and civil society. Public services, organisations, policies and events were checked for their culturally diverse character: ‘this creates the opportunity for Rotterdam as one of the first to present itself as a multicultural city. A city that citizens are proud of and that benefits from all its diverse talents, and that challenges allochthonous citizens to claim the position they (wish to) take in Rotterdam’ (UItvoeringsprogramma Veelkleurige stad, 1998: 4). The focus is not on socio-cultural contradictions and conflict but on the beneficial nature of cultural diversity.

With regard to ethnic minorities, priority goals of the Multicoloured City policy were (1) to enhance the participation of allochthonous citizens in subsidised organisations and initiatives, (2) for the administration of Rotterdam to hire more allochthonous personnel, also in higher positions, (3) to change the cultural policies of Rotterdam in order to fit the new cultural diversity of the population and (4) to promote and encourage ethnic entrepreneurship and labour market participation (Uitvoeringsprogramma Werk en Economie, 1998: 12-13). To this end, a programme manager and programme team were appointed. Next to this, a think tank is constituted of ‘diverse’ citizens to generate and evaluate ideas. Iconic for this policy phase is the subprogramme ‘Education in current allochthonous languages’ which is operationalised in 1998 to offer education in migrant languages in the regular educational programme.

The local authorities felt that many ethnic minorities were not sufficiently represented. The municipality asked migrant organisations to take part in the process of policy making. The local authorities took the lead in this and set up an advisory board with representatives from the immigrant community, they hired more immigrants (including people who were appointed
to managerial positions) and encouraged public organisations to follow suit (while referring to the possibility of reducing or ending municipal subsidies in the event of non-compliance) and they closely monitored the results being achieved in the municipal apparatus and in the public organisations (Veenman, 2000).

On the socio-economic and spatial dimension of integration, the Rotterdam administration struggled between developing general policies and specific policies targeting problems that concern certain ethnic minority groups. In 1998 Rotterdam published the policy document ‘Effective Policy on Minorities’ (Effectief Allochtonenbeleid). Even though it observed that the socio-economic and educational position of immigrants had improved, they were still lagging behind in terms of education, labour market participation and housing conditions. It urged immigrants to fully make use of the opportunities being offered through existing welfare arrangements. The Kadernota Effectief Allochtonenbeleid concludes that general policy measures are pursued where possible, but specific arrangements for ethnic minorities will be installed if needed: ‘general policy arrangements where possible, specific policy arrangements where needed’. This can be done in case of deficiencies that concern specific ethnic groups or in case of promising initiatives that can be encouraged (Kadernotitie Effectief Allochtonenbeleid, 1998). An example of specific policy is the programme ‘Lus di Trafiko’ (Traffic light) aimed at integration and civic integration of citizens of Antillean origins. It comprises a total of 46 projects which try to prevent downward social mobilisation, promote self-reliance and repress criminal behaviour and nuisance.

In 1998, the national Law on Civic Integration (Wet Inburgering Nieuwkomers, WIN) came into force. A national civic integration policy required immigrants to integrate into society by participating in a 12-month integration course. This course consisted of 600 hours of Dutch language instruction, civic education and preparation for the labour market. The Dutch municipalities would refer immigrants to local education institutions. After completion of the course, immigrants would receive a certificate. It was possible for municipalities to sanction non-compliance by a fine of €2,269. This sanction was however hardly executed. Since 1998, the law on civic integration has been adapted several times but civic integration is still mandatory for immigrants.

Even though in this period tougher integration policies were pursued in the socio-economic dimension of integration, the Rotterdam authorities still felt that this should not hinder efforts by ethnic minorities to hold on to their own culture, identity and religion.

### 5.1.5 2002-2006

In 2002, the political party ‘Liveable Rotterdam’ won the local elections. Immigrant integration was one of the central topics in the election debates. Liveable Rotterdam propagated that many citizens were insufficiently integrated in the society of Rotterdam. Liveable Rotterdam constituted a political coalition in which they provided three aldermen together with CDA (Christian Democrats – 2 aldermen) and VVD (Liberal – 2 aldermen). For the first time in many years, the social democrats were not part of the city executive.
The 2002-2006 city executive announced a radical break with the previous integration policies. However, policy measures were not always as innovative as opposed to the previous policies as they were claimed to be. ‘Social integration’ is problematised in the city executive’s programme (2002: 6). It states that newcomers are not yet at home and native citizens feel less at home in Rotterdam. Social cohesion in Rotterdam was lost over the past decennia when new immigrants arrived in the city (Collegeprogramma 2002: 33). Priority of the city executive is to enhance the identification of citizens with Rotterdam and to thereby reinforce social integration. As a necessary condition for this, the city executive prioritises limiting safety issues in Rotterdam by a more repressive policy approach. Vice versa, they expected that more social cohesion would contribute to safety. By stressing good manners and public order, the strengthening of social cohesion in Rotterdam was not only a goal in itself but serves first and foremost as a means to prevent criminality and nuisance (Uitermark en Duyvendak, 2008).

As opposed to the previous political period, ‘integration’ was propagated in a more assimilationist sense regarding the socio-cultural dimension of integration. The framework document on social integration (Kadernotitie Sociale Integratie, 2003) proposes to solve the lack of social integration by bringing people together in a cultural and spatial sense. The aimed result of this is active citizenship which involves active engagement and involvement with others in the street and the neighbourhood and with Rotterdam and its citizens as a whole. The local government assigned itself a dual role towards its citizens: They presented themselves as a repressive government for those who break the law and as a companion for citizens who take responsibility. Integration policy in this period has two aspects: it is both constitutive social policy and repressive social policy.

Most integration policy measures in this period are part of the programme ‘People Make the City’ (Mensen Maken de Stad, MMS). MMS focuses on multiple policy domains: safety, housing, economic development; education and youth and civic integration. It thus combines the socio-economic, spatial and socio-cultural dimensions of integration. The programme aims to enhance ‘social cohesion’ and ‘active citizenship’ by intensifying and expanding existing initiatives such as ‘Opzoomeren’14 and ‘Stadsetiquette’15. Key to this approach is to draw on pre-existing ideas and initiatives of citizens, named ‘civil science’. The integration agendas of the municipality and civil society organisations are constituted by citizens on the street or neighbourhood level. The assumption behind this is that if the social life on this level is a co-production of citizens with the help of the municipality and organisations, it becomes clear what they are capable of and what the municipality needs to do to support this. Social integration is developed bottom-up.

During this period, integration policy actions take place on the level of the street. The city executive chooses the street level as they state that this is the level people relate to and want to take responsibility. Policy measures do not only directly aim at increasing social integration

---

14 A project in which inhabitants of a street together will renovate the outlook of their street and/or organise common activities.
15 A project in which inhabitants of a street define and engage themselves to certain rules and manners of dealing with each other in public space.
and social cohesion, but they often also address other issues that surface on the level of the street such as litter, nuisance, youth delinquency and health issues. Integration policies became less open-ended. A ‘hands on’ methodology is effected which is strongly result-oriented. Executive departments are monitored based on the policy outcomes they achieve. When integration measures do not have measurable effects, they are aborted. Uitermark & Duyvendak (2006) are calling this ‘assertive social policy’ as the municipality does not merely facilitate citizen actions but actively stimulates them to do so. It does not only focus on streets and neighbourhoods where citizen have already taken initiative, but executive CSO’s actively recruit citizens for participation in streets where citizens’ involvement is lacking.

Next to social cohesion, this city executive’s integration policy also propagates ‘normative cohesion’. This stresses that citizens share certain values, norms and behaviours. Instead of diversity as propagated in the previous period, this city executive seeks conformity between citizens. This search for socio-cultural common ground is most prominent in a series of debates that was initiated. There is the Day of Dialogue, debates on ‘Islam and integration’ and other similar activities. The city executive aims to take the lead in debates about spatial concentration, segregation and dispersal of minority groups, a pluriform society, norms and values, and Islam (2003: 11-12).

As final product of the integration campaign ‘Rotterdam Mee’ (2005-2006) the city executive formulated the ‘Rotterdam Citizenship Code’. This outlines the position of the Rotterdam city executive in the integration debate. The city executive states that there is a need for such a code because: ‘diversity can lead to tensions and conflicts when the norms and values of people differ too much; when people want to force on each other their ideas and behaviours; when their behaviours differ from what is normal. To be able to live together in diversity, it is necessary to formulate a number of values and norms that are recognized by all citizens of Rotterdam. And that we use those norms in our everyday lives.’ (Rotterdamse Burgerschap-scode, 2006: 1). The Rotterdam Code consists of the following seven rules:

‘We, the citizens of Rotterdam,

1) Take responsibility for our city and for each other and we do not discriminate;

2) Use the Dutch language as our common language;

3) Do not accept radicalism and extremism;

4) Educate our children to become full citizens;

5) Treat women equal as men and treat them with respect;

6) Treat homosexuals equal as heterosexuals and treat them with respect;

7) Treat religious people equal as non-religious people and treat them with respect.’

The Rotterdam code makes clear that in this policy period for the first time, cultural values of some groups of citizens are considered to be problematic. Differing norms and values are famed as an integration issue. This formulation of favourable norms particularly seems to
address Islamic citizens that might have different views with a religious basis. The city council did not accept the Rotterdam code as a municipal guideline.

Islam as a common characteristic of multiple ethnic groups is during this policy period also problematised in the sense of extremism and radicalisation. In a series of debates on ‘Islam and Integration’, the city executive aimed to (1) identify and appoint bottlenecks in the relationship between Islam and integration, (2) stimulate the process of modernisation among Rotterdam muslims, (3) formulate a common view on social integration, (4) describe and stimulate the ‘we-feeling’ in the city and (5) stimulate the ‘we-behaviour’ in the city based on common norms and values.’ (Actieplan Islam en Integratie, 2004:4). In 2005, the action programme ‘Participate or Stay behind’ (Meedoen of Achterblijven) was launched to prevent primarily Muslim extremism as part of the socio-cultural integration measures. The programme states that integration measures can decrease the fundamentals for extremism but that it does not take the risk away. There can be structural integration whilst socio-cultural integration is limited. Radicalisation and extremist actions are conceptualised as the counter-part of socio-cultural integration.

Because integration policies in this political period were sometimes provocative, some proposed policies in the area of integration did not have the support of the city council and were not (fully) put into action. In 2004, alderman of Liveable Rotterdam Marco Pastors initiated policy to limit the build of large mosques in Rotterdam. This policy was called Spatial Mosque Policy (Ruimtelijk Moskeebeleid). In this policy, the build of mosques is explicitly connected to integration of Islamic minorities. The city executive claimed that ‘the realisation of large, prestigious plans to build mosques no longer fits in Rotterdam’s integration policy’ (2004:4). Criticism arose among the sub-municipal governments and the political opposition. Alderman Marco Pastors had no choice but to withdraw the proposed policy.

A well-known policy in this period that was not enforced as such, is the so called ‘Rotterdam Law’. The official name of this law is ‘Law on Special Measures for Urban Issues’ (Wet Bijzondere Maatregelen Grootstedelijke Problematiek). This national law that was initiated by the Leefbaar coalition in Rotterdam offers large cities in the Netherlands discretion to develop measures for specific urban problems in their city. Cities can assign problematic ‘hotspots’ where economic, spatial and social actions can be taken. For instance, to lower taxes for entrepreneurs in those areas to stimulate business and to deal with slumlords. The most controversial measure that the Rotterdam Law aimed to facilitate was to spread disadvantaged people over Rotterdam’s neighbourhoods to prevent concentration and ‘ghettoisation’. Initially, Alderman Pastors wanted to deny ‘disadvantaged allochthonous people’ access to reside in those neighbourhoods.

This particular measure was politically contested. A number of political parties, social housing agencies and CSOs argued that this measure was discriminating. The Major of Rotterdam said that it was not right to distinguish along ethnic lines and the Dutch Equal Treatment Commission (Commissie Gelijke Behandeling) judged that the proposed policy was discriminatory. The ethnic criterion was replaced by an income criterion: Only people who earned 120% of minimum income would be allowed to rent a house in those neighbourhoods (with an exception for students) (Rotterdam Zet Door. Op Weg naar een Stad in Balans, 2003).
2004, Rotterdam experimented with this measure and they valued the results to be positive. Although the income requirement was still politically contested because it indirectly disadvantaged allochthones citizens, the law was adopted by the national government in 2005 and came into force at January 1st, 2006. They argued that the law limits the rights of some groups to serve a higher goal.

5.2 Current policy setting
Since the Netherlands is a decentralised state, the municipalities cannot operate autonomous from the centralised government. They are delegated with tasks which they need to carry out in line with national policy (‘t Hart & van Twist, 2007). In case of integration policies however, municipalities can, within the context of these broad policies, adapt policies which are city specific. In the Netherlands, local governments have a large degree of discretion in developing their own integration measures (Scholten, forthcoming).

In this paragraph, we will first outline the central government’s integration policy which provides general guidelines for local integration policies. Subsequently, we will discuss how the local policies in Rotterdam relate to this and what role the sub-municipalities have.

5.2.1 National policy setting
Since 2002, the Dutch government includes a minister of Immigration, Integration and Asylum. Integration policies are distinct from immigration policies. Over this past decennium, Dutch national integration policies have harshened and taken an assimilationist turn (Scholten, 2007). In contrast to what is often assumed of the Dutch integration policy, it is no longer multiculturalist. The current central policy document is titled ‘Integration, Cohesion, Citizenship’ (Integratie, Binding, Burgerschap, 2011). A sense of shared citizenship and community of all Dutch citizens is formulated as a policy goal (Integratie, Binding, Burgerschap, 2011: 1). The policy document clearly reflects the assimilationist turn: ‘By integration, integration in the Dutch society is meant.’ (Ibid.: 5). This policy aligns with the broader government’s aim to enhance citizens’ responsibilities and self-sufficiency.

The current national integration policy consists of three principles. The first is that integration is not the responsibility of the government but that of immigrants themselves. The second principle is that ‘not one’s background but one’s potential is what counts’ (Ibid.: 7). This implies that there are no targeted integration measures based on people’s origins, but that there is a generic integration policy. The last principle is that generic policy measures are to facilitate every citizen’s participation on the labour market, housing market and in education. When this policy is insufficient for some groups, no specific instruments will be developed, but the general policy will be changed.

The contents of the Dutch integration policy are largely decided upon on the municipal level: ‘Integration policies will largely be shaped at a local level. This means that each municipality in the Netherlands formulates suitable answers to problems that are a consequence of insufficient integration of its inhabitants.’ (Ibid.: 11). Contacts with migrant organisations, local CSOs and key persons are considered to be of utmost importance to signal problems and to
measure the effectiveness of measures. The policy document also states that the local integration policies will be developed in close cooperation with other Dutch municipalities and the national government. Integration policies developed by the municipality of Rotterdam have often served as precursors for the national integration policy.

A result of such national-local cooperation is the constitution of a ‘common integration agenda’ (Gemeenschappelijke integratieagenda) for all Dutch municipalities in 2009. This was initiated by the Ministry of Interior. This common policy framework mirrors the principles that are stated in the national integration policy document: generic policies and self sufficiency of citizens. The tone of the document is however less assimilationist. Integration is depicted as a mutual process of all citizens instead of a ‘one way street’. Integration policy goals in seven policy domains are formulated. These are: civic integration, education, labour market, housing, social integration, active citizenship, emancipation and participation of migrant women, safety and health. Integration of ethnic minorities in these domains is problematized. The common integration agenda of the national government and municipalities agrees that the municipal policy arrangements will focus on these areas of integration.

Civic integration is still largely decided upon on a national level. National law states that civic integration courses are mandatory for third-country newcomers who settle in the Netherlands. They have to acquire Dutch language skills and knowledge of Dutch society. The law on civic integration prescribes that Dutch municipalities have to inform newcomers and refer them to a civic integration course. The municipalities have to fine people who do not meet their obligations to successfully complete a civic integration course (Wet Inburgering, 2006). Municipalities thus fulfil a key intermediary role in civic integration for which they are financially compensated by the national government. New immigrants already have to take an integration test at the Dutch embassy at their country of origin as a precondition for being granted even a temporary residence permit (Joppke, 2007). By this, integration policy became intertwined with immigration policy.

A new Law on Civic Integration is foreseen to come into force at January 1st, 2013. According to this law, municipalities will no longer be responsible for mediating and monitoring civic integration. It is yet unclear to what institution this role will be transferred. Participants of civic integration courses can no longer get reimbursed, but can take a loan from the national government. The available budget for civic integration will be drastically cut from 296 billion Euros over 2011 to 25 billion Euro in 2013.

Another notable (financial) measure on the national level is funding for municipal policy measures to reduce delinquency by Moroccan and Antillean youths. Over the period from 2010 until 2013 a total of 17.940.000 Euro are invested to prevent and cope with Moroccan and Antillean ‘problem youth’. Rotterdam is one of the 22 municipalities that are participating in this policy programme and the municipality receives a yearly 1.172.500 Euro. It is unlikely that this only remaining ethnicity-specific programme will be continued after 2013 as this is in conflict with the central principles of the current national integration programme. A policy
advisor at the municipality of Rotterdam confirms that he expects that this policy programme will be aborted after 2013.

5.3 Current policy goals

We consider the policy periods from 2006 onwards to be part of the current policy stage. This period comprises of two political periods: the one from 2006 to 2010 and the current period from 2010 to 2014. In both periods, the social democratic party ‘PvdA’ became the largest party in the elections and was the leading party in the city executive.

In the political period of 2002-2006, ‘integration’ was an explicit policy goal and integration was promoted in an assimilationist way. In the two political periods after 2006, we can observe a turn from integration policy to ‘participation policy’ that is aimed at all groups of citizens. Therefore, we could speak of civic republican policy (cf. Koopmans & Statham, 2000). Citizenship and participation are pivotal terms in this policy. This linguistic change shows that not only allochthonous citizens but all (disadvantaged) groups of citizens in Rotterdam are targeted by this range of policies. Also, whilst in the previous period the socio-cultural and spatial dimensions of integration were dominant, in the current period, integration is again also framed in terms of socio-economic and legal-political participation. However, integration is hardly mentioned in policy documents and less policy documents exist than in the period before.

A dual notion of ‘urban citizenship’ is propagated: Citizenship does not only come with rights, but also with obligations and responsibilities for each citizen. This dual notion of citizenship is clearly brought forward in the political programme of 2010: ‘We will provide space and opportunities to citizens of Rotterdam who are willing and able, the group that is willing but unable we will support, but at the same time we set boundaries to the ones who are unwilling.’ (Collegewerkprogramma, 2010: 3).

From all citizens in Rotterdam, willingness to participate is demanded. For disadvantaged groups, this means to become self-sufficient in the sense that they have to participate in regular daily activities such as labour, education or voluntary work. For other citizens this means to fully utilise their talents: ‘Being self-sufficient does not equal fully utilizing ones talents’ (Burgerschapsbeleid, 2011: 4). Most measures focus on people who have not reached the level of self-sufficiency yet. Hereby, the more responsibility is asked of citizens: ‘We assume that every citizen of Rotterdam makes a contribution to the city. In case where obstacles exist, we will support them to do so. In exchange for this, we expect that citizens will push their limits to overcome their limitations and to participate in society.’ (Collegewerkprogramma, 2010: 13). A striking example of how the bar for citizenship is raised is the following: ‘We deem the level of the civic integration exam too low to be sufficiently able to enter the labour market. We strive to educate as many citizens as possible on a higher level and will therefore improve the quality of the trajectories.’ (Collegewerkprogramma, 2010: 12-13). The city executive aims to accelerate the social upsurge.
On the other hand, the city executive limits the tasks of the city administration. Their main task in this is to remove obstacles for participation in local society: ‘we want to offer people chances to overcome obstacles so that they are sufficiently self-reliant and are able to utilize their talents.’ (Collegewerkprogramma, 2010: 12). Many policy documents such as the programme ‘Building bridges’ refer to making the responsibilities of citizens, civil society organisations and the municipality more explicit. They try to delimit governmental interference and promote collaboration in ‘vital coalitions’. They aim to co-create more social cohesion. This withdrawal of governmental interference can partly be ascribed to the economic recession which has resulted in budget cuts.

The policy programme ‘Urban Citizenship. The Motto is to Participate’ (Stadsburgerschap. Het motto is Meedoen) from 2007 introduces this new perspective on integration. According to policy documents, citizenship mainly involves identification with the city of Rotterdam: ‘For urban citizenship, it does not matter for which country you cheer during the World Championships of Football. What matters is that you feel connected to the place where you live and work.’ (Stadsburgerschap Motto is Meedoen, 2007: 5). According to this policy document, urban citizenship concerns five aspects: (1) City pride, (2) Reciprocity, (3) Identity, (4) Participation and (5) Awareness of norms. Under this last aspect, the rules from the Rotterdam Code are repeated. People who do not wish to conform to those rules are considered avert from society. Whilst the government will support people who are ‘willing but unable’ to participate, the ones who are unwilling will be approached with repressive measures. ‘There are people who turn their back to society. Sometimes they are people with radical ideologies who do not wish to respect the law and other citizens. This can concern people who continuously cause nuisance, criminal or uncivilized behaviour. They show no respect for safety and the rights of other people. Those who intendedly turn their back to society, can count on repressive measures from judicial institutions and from the Rotterdam municipality to change such developments.’ (2007: 7).

The subsequent executive programme of the period 2010-2014 is called ‘Participation: Choosing Talent’ (Participatie: Kiezen voor Talent). This policy programme focuses – as introduced in the collegewerkprogramma – on the utilisation of existing talent, stimulation of entrepreneurship and to trust the capacities of the citizen. Starting point are the existing capabilities of citizens and facilitating them to utilise and develop them. However, this policy note stresses that this is not uncommitantly. They will actively hold citizens accountable for this.

Policies stimulating and removing obstacles to participation in society exist in various integration areas. The executive social policy programme (Uitvoeringsprogramma Sociaal) stresses that socio-economic deprivation is apparent in all groups, including autochthonous citizens. Four aldermen are joined in the ‘social assembly’ (stuurgroup sociaal) to decrease socio-economic deprivation and support vulnerable groups in the Rotterdam society. This concerns a return to issues of structural integration such as educational level, socio-economic position and labour market participation. They aim to do so by providing services which will motivate them to ‘participate’.
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In socio-cultural policy measures, there is less attention for normative integration and the propagation of shared norms, values and behaviours. Again, cultural diversity is presented as an advantage for Rotterdam. Multiculturality as a strength instead of a problem is stressed by striving to become a ‘leading intercultural city’ (Stadsburgerschap Het Motto Is Meedoen, 2007:4). Ethnic diversity is again celebrated as a benefit and talents are supported and stimulated.

5.4 Current policy measures

Currently, the Rotterdam municipality does not employ integration policies that specifically aim at immigrants or ethnic minorities\(^\text{16}\). ‘The policy has an inclusive character. No distinction is made based on ethnicity. Mono-ethnic activities are not eligible for subsidies, unless there are strong arguments for doing this.’ (Beleidsregel Burgerschap, 2011: 24). Instead of this, they took up ‘participation policies’ concerning all citizens of Rotterdam. The execution of this policy is mainly outsourced to organisations in civil society, businesses and citizens. This includes schools, welfare organisations, health care institutions, businesses, active citizens and volunteers. The current participation policy is mainly executed via subsidies to CSOs (Uitermark, 2010).

Currently, 36 organisations are subsidised by JOS dealing with diversity, discrimination, emancipation of women and emancipation of homosexuals. Although none of these themes specifically target ethnic minorities, projects and organisations involved often do as they aim for equal participation and consolidation of cultural diversity. In 2012, 38 subsidised projects explicitly mention that they deal with ethnic diversity. This concerns 24 organisations. Key actors are: Avanço, Dona Daria, Lokaal, LOV, PBR, RADAR, Rotterdam Verkeert, SPIOR, In dialoog, Young Up, SVOR and Welkom in Rotterdam.

There has been criticism on the method of subsidising many different organisations. An alderman advisor states that ‘for a long time, they have been dependent on subsidy IV bags’ meaning that the organisations were too dependent on money from the municipality. The requirements to receive subsidies for integration measures have become stricter over the past years and are expected to become even more strict due to the current economic recession. According to the current framework, subsidies are mainly provided based on results and less to support the organisations themselves. By this, the city administration aims to increase efficiency and effectiveness. Financial cuts are pursued in the municipal subsidy structures ‘When institutions can function independently, they will receive less or no subsidy from the municipality.’ (Collegewerkprogramma, 2010: 3). By ‘emancipating’ the citizens, the municipality aims to focus on its core business.

The subsidy goals of the urban citizenship policy until 2010 were to yield results in six ‘achievement fields’ (prestatievelden) (Stadsburgerschap Motto is Meedoen, 2007). These are: (1) Learning the Dutch language, (2) Rotterdam Idea (funding for citizen initiatives), (3) Non-formal education (to increase personal development and skills of citizens), (4) Emancipation (mainly aimed at women and homosexuals), (5) Anti-discrimination and (6) Stimuler-

---

\(^{16}\) With one exception: policy for Moroccan and Antillean youth that will be described later on.
ingsinitiatieven stadsburgerschap (funding for citizens initiatives increasing a sense of urban citizenship). Organisations and projects that target multiple fields and multiple ethnic groups will have a bigger chance to receive (more) subsidy (Rotterdam Idee, Stimuleringsinitiatieven Stadsburgerschap). Also, the programme states that all subsidy requests need to confine to the seven statements of the ‘Rotterdam Citizenship code’ (Beleidsregel Participatie en Burgierschap, 2007: 3).

Instead of six fields of achievement, the current city executive limits itself to four. The motivation is that ‘Due to this broad policy, many activities fit in the policy measure. There have been many activities, loose initiatives and projects. Many things happened but due to fragmentation, lack of coherence and overlap with other policy domains and activities of institutions on a sub-municipal level, the impact of activities was hard to objectify.’ (Beleidsregel Burgierschap, 2011: 2). The four ‘achievement fields’ regarding citizen participation are Emancipation, Anti-discrimination, Diversity and Non-formal Education. The field of emancipation focuses on gender equality, self-reliance, social mobility and homosexual emancipation. Anti-discrimination concerns removing discrimination as an obstacle for participation. It concerns not only to maintain the legal prohibition of discrimination but also to create empowerment for discriminated groups of people so they do not keep considering themselves to be victims. Cultural diversity is regarded as a benefit that needs to be utilised. The municipality wants to appeal to a diversity of ideas and talents. By non-formal education, talent development is meant in order to increase the competencies of citizens to participate in society. This includes for instance professional behaviours needed on the labour market, language courses and trajectories that lead to participation in voluntary work.

The municipality aims to focus its funding in these four achievement fields by creating expertise centres (Dutch: Kennисcentra) around the four themes including certain key actors. The expertise centres need to apply for subsidy for the whole centre. Organisations need to cooperate in order to get subsidised for specific projects. This is meant to limit the fragmentation of activities. The policy note describes 3 ‘functions’ or means of achieving results in the four achievement fields. The first is to cumulate and share/transfer knowledge on the issues. Second is ‘volunteers first’. The municipality funds volunteer initiatives within the expertise centres. Last is ‘the upsurge of the citizen’ (de burger in de lift) concerning arrangements for citizens to become self-reliant and ‘able to participate’.

Within each achievement field, the Rotterdam administration asks (1) more participation and sharing of knowledge among civil society actors within this field, (2) funding of initiated projects relevant to each achievement field, and (3) stimulating the emancipation in the sense of increasing levels of participation (self-reliance /talent utilisation) of a certain number of citizens in each achievement field. The output figures and result indicators for each year are formulated very specifically. Language education is the only area in which the municipality actively engages. Again, the policy focuses on a lower level than that of the city. ‘Gebiedsgericht werken’ in the sense of organising activities in line with the needs of certain geographical areas is central to the policy but it is mentioned less.

Although the urban citizenship policy programme aims at all citizens of Rotterdam, some subprograms implicitly or explicitly have a primary focus on ethnic minorities. There is for in-
stance the execution programme ‘Participation through Language’ (Meedoen door Taal, 2006). This programme intends to improve people’s language skills. Most people who participate in the trajectories this programme offers, are part of an ethnic minority (oldcomers or newcomers) and a minority of native analphabetic citizens participate. This measure was succeeded by the action programme ‘language offensive’ (Actieprogramma Taaloffensief, 2011). Speaking the Dutch language is portrayed as a necessary condition to participate in society. ‘Language deficiencies are often at the basis of unemployment, health issues, insufficient societal participation and criminal behaviour.’ (Actieprogramma Taaloffensief, 2011:3). The policy programme is aimed at parents, of young children, youth and employees/ the unemployed.

Next there is a policy programme particularly focused on ethnic minorities with a Muslim identity. The executive programme ‘Building Bridges’ (Bruggen Bouwen, 2008) aimed at organising a dialogue about urban citizenship. Noteworthy is that with regard to this programme, philosopher and Islam expert professor Tariq Ramadan was hired to lead debates about citizenship and identity. ‘During the Islam debates from 2002-2006, it became apparent that the message of Ramadan was attractive to many citizens of Rotterdam, especially young Islamic citizens. By this, extra attention for their dilemmas on the intersection of citizenship and identity is guaranteed.’ (Uitvoeringsprogramma Bruggen Bouwen, 2008:11).

From previous policy periods two programmes are continued particularly focusing on Moroccan and Antillean youth. The current programme ‘Dealing with Risk groups of Moroccan and Antillean descent’ (Aanpak risicogroepen van Marokkaanse en Antilliaanse afkomst) is a continuation and expansion of the ‘Action programme integral dealing with Antillean citizens’ (Actieprogramma Integrale Aanpak Antillianen 2006-2009) and the program ‘Prevention criminal career Allochthonous youth’ (Voorkomen criminele loopbaan Allochtone jongeren) which mainly dealt with Moroccan youth. The programme is stimulated and partly financed through the national government. The aim is to decrease the relatively high numbers of Antillean and Moroccan youngsters up to 24 years old in criminal activities, nuisance, school drop-out and unemployment. The municipality partly explains this overrepresentation from a cultural perspective. Socio-economic deficiencies and criminalities are framed in terms of insufficient integration: ‘Social and economic deprivation that these groups often have, leads to less attachment to and integration in Dutch society. Antilleans and Moroccans have problems in different areas: criminality, school dropout and unemployment.’ (Aanpak risicogroepen van Marokkaanse en Antilliaanse afkomst, 2010: 3). The programme is directed by the safety department of the municipality of Rotterdam. They cooperate with other municipal services such as JOS and SoZaWe, sub-municipalities, the police, justice and Antillean and Moroccan (self-) organisations. The sub-municipalities decide in which neighbourhoods which actions will take place and what partners will be part of this. Improvements and targets of this situation are monitored (De Boom et al., 2011).

By the action programme ‘Say goodbye to Discrimination’ (Discriminatie de groeten, 2007), the Rotterdam government formulates an integral policy against discrimination (ethnic and otherwise) and racism. The policy stresses that discrimination is not only unwanted on a moral basis, but that it is also an obstacle to full (socio-economic) participation in society. Therefore, the municipality is actively engaged in fighting discrimination. In case of discrimi-
nation based on ethnicity, the administration outsources their activities to the Rotterdam Anti-Discrimination Board (RADAR) – soon to become the expertise centre on discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dimensions of integration</th>
<th>Type of integration policy</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Level of governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-1985</td>
<td>Legal political</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>Ethnic minorities</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1998</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Civic republicanism</td>
<td>Ethnic minorities</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>Ethnic minorities</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2002</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Civic republicanism</td>
<td>Ethnic minorities</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>All citizens, particularly ethnic minorities, women, youth and disabled.</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2006</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Civic republicanism</td>
<td>All (disadvantaged) citizens</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
<td>Assimilationism</td>
<td>Immigrants, particularly Muslims</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Assimilationism</td>
<td>Poor (&gt;120% minimum income)</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2012</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Civic republicanism</td>
<td>All (disadvantaged) citizens</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
<td>Civic republicanism</td>
<td>All (disadvantaged) citizens</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Overview Integration policy history Rotterdam
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6. Conclusion

This deliverable describes a rich history of integration policies and measures in Berlin, Malmö and Rotterdam. Some interesting conclusions can be drawn for each city case separately and for the city policies in comparison with each other. Conclusions are framed with regard to the theory based integration taxonomy that was outlined in Deliverable 3.1. In the annex is a list of current integration measures. First we draw some conclusions for each city case and thereafter, we describe some comparative conclusions.

Berlin

Berlin is one of the cities in Germany with the highest share of migrants. In some districts (such as Mitte and Neukölln), up to 40 per cent of the inhabitants have a migration background. Accordingly, the public administration and politicians deal with integration issues on a daily basis. However, legally structured and regulated integration policy emerged only recently. Especially the work of the current integration commissioner, Günter Piening, aimed at promoting a stable, sustainable and long-lasting integration policy.

Before Piening took office, we identified two major integration policy periods in Berlin. During the first period in the 1960s and 1970s the federal government invited so-called guest workers to Germany which were expected to return to their country of origin once their manpower was not needed anymore. Following the ban of guest worker recruitment activities in 1973, the Senate of Berlin soon realised that the migrants already living in Berlin would not move back to their origin countries. The awareness of people with a migration background increased as they settled permanently in Berlin. Consequently, starting in the mid-1970s, the Senate initiated first policies that aimed at integration of the people with a migration background that came to Germany as guest workers. Furthermore, the Senate of Berlin instituted the so-called “commissioner for foreigners” in 1980. Barbara John was the first to be in charge as the “commissioner for foreigners” launching the second identifiable period of integration policy in Berlin. This period was characterised by the national attempt to slow down immigration to Germany on the one hand, but to foster integration of people with a migration background already living in Berlin on the other hand (i.e. socio-economic and cultural integration, intercultural opening of the public administration, simplification of naturalisations, etc.). John’s tenure ended in 2003. Even though John was highly committed to the integration of migrants, the legal institutionalisation of integration policy was the major aim of the third period of integration policy, which started with the inauguration of Günter Piening as the newly labelled “commissioner for integration and migration”.

After several years of work, Günter Piening succeeded with his plan to institutionalise integration policy in Berlin. In December of 2010, the Senate passed the Integration and Participation Law of Berlin (PartIntG). As described in the preceding chapters, the law includes specifications of integration policy in Berlin (e.g. definition of aims and objectives of integration policy in Berlin, i.e. fostering migrant participation or encouraging the intercultural opening of the public administration, permanent establishment of integration commissioners and the advisory board for integration, structural adaptation of integration policy infrastructures in the districts, etc.). Analysing integration policy today, it appears that the basis for institutionalisation of integration policy was established. However, the completion process may take a
few more years. This is especially obvious in the districts. In some districts the integration policy infrastructures still need to be developed and established.

However, the fact that the Participation and Integration law was just recently passed does not mean that the Senate and the districts were not eager to tackle major integration issues by formulating fitting policy goals and measures. On the contrary, the Senate as well as the districts of Mitte, Neukölln, Spandau, Pankow, Marzahn-Hellersdorf formulated their own integration concepts which contain goals and objectives as well as practical measures. Examining both administrative levels, it becomes clear that each district has created objectives and measures that cater to their specific needs. For example, Neukölln’s integration policy goals and measures emphasise the fight against (youth) delinquency and other criminal activities whereas other districts such as Pankow or Treptow-Köpenick regard anti-xenophobic policies and related measures as more important.

Summing up, we come to the conclusion that integration policy in Berlin is already quite advanced. However, the institutionalisation of the structures legally stipulated in the Integration and Participation Law still need more time for a full implementation – especially on the district level.

**Malmö**

Malmö was hit hard by the economic crisis in the early 1990’s. At the same time as the number of jobs declined, the immigration of refugees and their relatives increased and has been large since then. Even if the local labour market has expanded, the inflow of unemployed migrants has been high and kept the employment rate for foreign born as low as about 40-45 per cent during the whole period up until today.

To change the situation the city of Malmö chose a two-pillar strategy. The first was to stimulate economic growth by several large infrastructure projects. These projects were also an important part of the strategy to develop attractiveness and change the negative discourse about Malmö. The second pillar was to improve welfare and increase the human capital amongst the population. The city and central government have themselves or together launched several large projects to improve local welfare, especially in areas where many immigrants live.

National policies, laws and regulations are playing a very important role in local integration policies. The city of Malmö cannot control the inflow of migrants and they are obliged to provide a specific set of integration policy measures. Integration policy in Malmö and Sweden has relied on a strong tradition of universal welfare policy, which has been supplemented with special treatment of newly arrived immigrants. The focus has been on introduction programmes, employment and employment services, language training and anti-discrimination. The municipality’s influence on integration policies is thus limited. Although the implementation of integration policy is decentralised, it is state legislation, regulation and funding that are most important for its design.

The main ideology of integration in Malmö is mainstreaming. Most money and efforts to improve integration is spent on general socio-economic measures like schools, employment
and adult education. In addition, there is a specific group provision, introduction programmes, for newly arrived humanitarian migrants which is coordinated by the state agency the Employment service. About 600-1000 persons are enrolled per year in Malmö. The programme takes maximally 24 months and shall include language training, civic orientation and labour market activities.

The municipals labour market programmes focus on people who have low skills and are considered far from the labour market. Many in this target group are migrants, so they often constitute a majority of participants in the programmes. It is the same when it comes to adult education. Almost all participants in primary adult education are migrants and they represent a large share of other adult education students as well. In spite of the mainstreaming strategy, there are some socio-economic measures that target migrants. The municipality is obliged by the state to offer free language training to all adults without basic skills in the Swedish language and to offer mother tongue education to pupils. The city also has arrangements to integrate newly arrived children in schools.

The main legal-political policy measures are to work against discrimination and racism. There is a local action plan against discrimination that is followed up yearly. It focuses mainly on countering discrimination within the city’s own administration and services through increased awareness and diversity training of staff. The city is also involved in anti-racism activities like the Holocaust Memorial day and the annual anti-racist film festival. To celebrate new citizens, a citizenship ceremony is held every year at the Swedish national day.

There are several and diverse measures that deal with the socio-cultural dimension of integration. There is a yearly diversity award. Some measures, like the contact person programme and the project Integration in associations, stimulate inter-ethnic contact and civil society participation. A programme to work against violence against women, including honour crimes, is in place. The precarious situation of the Roma minority is addressed in the Roma information and education centre.

The spatial dimension is an important part of most integration measures. But the issue of ethnic and socio-economic segregation is also addressed through a specific Neighbourhood programme. The objective is to improve living conditions in five neighbourhoods by improving the physical environment and invest in infrastructure and social capital.

**Rotterdam**

As one of the most diverse cities in the Netherlands, Rotterdam has often functioned as a predecessor in the policy domain of immigrant integration policies. Early policy initiatives in the spatial domain of integration in 1972 and 1979 were revoked by the Council of State of the Netherlands. The city executive aimed to enforce spatial dispersal in the Afrikaanderwijk after riots took place there.

In 1978, Rotterdam’s first integration policy came into force when it became clear that guest worker immigration was not a temporary phenomenon and the social-economic position of immigrants worsened. Policies focused on the legal-political and socio-economic dimension integration and were of multiculturalist nature. Equal citizenship was valued important for an
equal position on the labour market and for immigrants' political participation. At first, measures focused on equal rights as a prerequisite for socio-economic integration and no specific socio-economic measures existed for immigrant groups yet.

After 1985, the Rotterdam authorities concluded that generic measures were not sufficient to fight immigrants' socio-economic deprivation and temporary specific socio-economic measures were enforced. The policy became more demanding instead of accommodative towards immigrants. Policy on the socio-economic dimension of integration can be characterised as republicanist. Still, socio-cultural issues were left to the public. The municipality did publish a document that proposed to create space for mosques. From 1998 to 2002 Rotterdam experienced a short period that was characterised by multiculturalism. Socio-cultural measures were taken to promote and celebrate the ethnic diversity of Rotterdam's population.

In 2002, the new city executive in which the political party Liveable Rotterdam had a majority, announced a radical break with the previous policies. The assimilationist policy discourse on the socio-cultural and spatial dimension of integration was innovative and politically contested. The civic republicanist policy on the socio-economic dimension of integration was less contested and was continued in the period from 2006 onwards.

Rotterdam's current integration policy is not named 'integration policy' but has been transformed to a 'citizenship policy' targeting all citizens of Rotterdam. However, there is a special focus on the weakest social groups. The policy reflects the economic situation and budget cuts that have to be made. Integration policies are developed on the socio-cultural and socio-economic dimension of integration. They are of civic republicanist nature demanding more self-sufficiency and active citizenship without distinguishing between ethnicities. Policy measures – except for the organisation of civic integration courses – are executed by NGOs that are subsidised by the municipality. Currently, the subsidy infrastructure is getting limited to four areas of expertise: diversity, emancipation, non-formal education and anti-discrimination.

Comparative conclusions

Berlin, Malmö and Rotterdam have been confronted with relatively large influxes of immigrants over the past decades. As highly diverse cities, they are dealing with integration of third-country nationals on a daily basis. A comparison of integration policies of the three cities shows some interesting results.

First of all, we see that the policies of all cities are targeting multiple areas of integration in terms of the taxonomy of deliverable 3.1. In the tables overviewing policies and measures in the city chapters we categorised them according to the main area of integration but in many cases, measures combine several domains. For instance, civic integration courses that aim to improve immigrants’ language proficiency while teaching them about cultural habits of the country of residence. The spatial dimension of integration is often dealt with, while not explicitly mentioned in the policy documents. Most measures target specific areas of the city such as specific district, neighbourhoods or even streets. We see this particularly in Berlin and Rotterdam.
Second, we observe that all three cities are struggling with the target groups of their integration policies. In Berlin, next to ‘immigrants’, ‘foreigners’ and ‘Spätaussiedler’ currently the more general distinction of people with a migration background is used. Malmö and Rotterdam try to refrain from ethnic categories altogether.

Malmö and Rotterdam do no longer speak of ‘integration policies’. Their policies are targeting the population as a whole. Their policies can be characterised as republicanist policies that contain a liberal egalitarian view on immigrant integration. The policy is adverse to the institutionalisation of majority as well as minority cultures. Instead, it is oriented at the individual and its membership as a citizen of the urban society. In accordance with this model immigrant integration is named in colour-blind and individualist terms, such as ‘citizenship’ or ‘participation’. The only ‘ethnic’ categorisation that remained is that of recent immigrants who are obliged to take a civic integration course. A difference between Malmö’s and Rotterdam’s republicanist integration policy models is that in Sweden integration for a large part is seen as a state responsibility while Rotterdam asserts that it is the responsibility of immigrants themselves.

In contrast to Malmö and Rotterdam, the integration policies of Berlin seem to be quite multicultural in nature. This is in contrast with the current political discourse and can possibly be explained by administrative specialists with more multiculturalist preferences who play a large role in the development of integration policies.

Third, we can conclude that in Berlin and Rotterdam, the main actors engaged with the execution of integration measures are NGOs. In Malmö, where less government services are privatised, the main actor in this is still the local government. Also, the integration policies are quite centralised and differ less between cities. Interviews with key actors taught us that the interventions developed by the NGOs are often implicitly targeting socio-economic integration issues, but are more socio-cultural as they seem. Many projects have socio-cultural aims next to socio-economic goals. In Malmö, without the NGOs as executive partners, the measures are less socio-cultural of nature.
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# List of Policy documents

## Senate of Berlin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Published by</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gesetz zur Regelung von Partizipation und Integration in Berlin&quot;</td>
<td>Berlin City Parliament, Senate of Berlin</td>
<td>Participation and Integration Law of Berlin</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Districts of Berlin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Published by</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Integrationsprogramm Berlin Mitte: Förderung von Kommunikation, Respekt, Partizipation und Gleichbehandlung&quot;</td>
<td>Integration Commissioner of Mitte</td>
<td>Integration policy for the district Mitte</td>
<td>2011/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Integrationskonzept für den Bezirk Pankow von Berlin&quot;</td>
<td>Integration Commissioner of the district of Pankow</td>
<td>Integration policy for the district of Pankow: Detailed description of issues, measures, and projects</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Integrationskonzept in Neukölln&quot;</td>
<td>Integration Commissioner of Neukölln</td>
<td>Integration policy for the district Neukölln</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Bezirkliches Integrationsprogramm Marzahn-Hellersdorf&quot;</td>
<td>Integration Commissioner of Marzahn-Hellersdorf</td>
<td>Integration policy for the district Marzahn-Hellersdorf</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Published by</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1993/94:94 Mottagande av asylsökande m.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill on reception of asylum seekers</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality (2010): New policy for the introduction of newly arrived immigrants in Sweden</td>
<td>Information leaflet on Swedish policy for newly arrived humanitarian migrants</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City of Malmö documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Published by</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malmö stad (1999): Action plan to promote integration in the city of Malmö</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action plan to promote integration in the city of Malmö.</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö stad (2010a): Plan against discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan against discrimination.</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö stad (2010c): Commission for a Socially Sustainable Malmö</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action plan for the programme Commission for a Socially Sustainable Malmö.</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö stad (2011b): Malmö in Brief, Department of Internal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information leaflet about the city of Malmö.</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö stad (2011c): Slutrapport: Förstudie innovationsforum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot study on setting up innovation forums in Malmö.</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of Policy documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malmö stad (2011d)</td>
<td>Nu lyfter vi Malmö: Områdesprogram för ett socialt hållbart Malmö</td>
<td>Information about the Neighbourhood programme in Malmö.</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dutch national government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Published by</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integratienota Integratie, Binding, Burgerschap</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior</td>
<td>Integration policy 2011 onward</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Published by</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nota Migranten in Rotterdam</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Immigrant policy</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leegloop en Toeloop, een eerste Vervolg</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Immigrant policy</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leegloop en Toeloop II</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Immigrant policy</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werkplan migranten</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Immigrant policy</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nota Culturele Minderheden in het Rijnmondgebied</td>
<td>Governmental board Rijnmond area (Openbaar Lichaam Rijnmond)</td>
<td>Note on minorities in the Rijnmond area</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minderhedenbeleid in een gewijzigde situatie.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Immigrant policy</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remigratie</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Policy document exploring whether remigration is an option for certain immigrants</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum inzake het minderhedenbeleid in de jaren '90.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Policy note on minority policy in the nineties</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het Nieuwe Rotterdam in Sociaal Perspectief</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Policy document on social policy</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etnische Minderheden en Sociale Vernieuwing in Charlois.</td>
<td>Executive board of Submunicipality Charlois</td>
<td>Immigrant policy in Charlois</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Nieuwe Rotterdammers.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Minority policy</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Document</td>
<td>Lead Beneficiary</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facetbeleid Culturele Minderheden in de jaren '90.</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>Various CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reacties op de Nota ‘De Nieuwe Rotterdammers’ Facetbeleid Culturele Minderheden in de jaren ‘90.</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>Responses of various CSOs to De Nieuwe Rotterdammers. Facetbeleid Culturele Minderheden in de jaren ‘90.</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moskeeën in Rotterdam</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>Policy on the build of mosques in Rotterdam</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectief Allochtonenbeleid</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>Immigrant policy</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansen Garanderen. De Gemeentelijke Uitdaging voor het Integratiebeleid.</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>Response to immigrant policy by RADAR</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieuwsbrief Veelkleurige Stad.</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>Newsletter Multicolored City</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advies Inzake de Rijksnota Integratiebeleid en het Rotterdams.</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>Advice on national and municipal diversity policy</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Document</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Report/Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaarverslag Veelkleurige Stad.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Annual report Multicolored City</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samen Leven in Rotterdam. Deltaplan Inburgering: Op Weg naar Actief Burgerschap.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Civic integration policy</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mensen Maken de Stad... Zo gaan we dat Doen in Rotterdam. Plan voor de Straataanpak.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Policy programme MMS</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginaal of Modern? Bestuurlijk Advies inzake Burgerschap onder Migranten in Rotterdam.</td>
<td>G. van den Brink &amp; D. de Ruijter</td>
<td>Advice citizenship policy</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadernota Sociale Integratie in de Moderne Rotterdamse Samenleving.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Integration policy</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lus di Trafiko Rapportage.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Report policy Lus di Trafiko</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actieprogramma Rotterdam Zet Door: Op weg naar een Stad in Balans.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Executive programme</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samenvatting Actieprogramma Rotterdam Zet Door: Op weg naar een Stad in</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Summary executive programme</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Responsible Entity</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balans.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Policy for the build of mosques</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociale Integratie...En de Islam in Rotterdam. Feiten, Teksten en Publicaties over de Islam en Moslims in Rotterdam.</td>
<td>Projectbureau Sociale Integratie</td>
<td>Report on expert meetings on islam and integration</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociale Integratie...Zo Denken ze Erover. Verslag Expertmeetings.</td>
<td>Advisory board on social integration</td>
<td>Advice on social integration in Rotterdam</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integreren doe je zo. Een advies over Sociale Integratie in Rotterdam.</td>
<td>City executive and Institute for safety and crisismanagement</td>
<td>Policy to prevent radicalisation and extremism in Rotterdam</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdamse Burgerschapscode.</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Coalition programme 2006-2010</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programma Sociaal</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Education and Society</td>
<td>Inventarisation of integration issues</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integratie Inventarisatie Gemeente Rotterdam en Rotterdamse Deelgemeenten.</td>
<td>J.L. Uitermark &amp;</td>
<td>Evaluation note on MMS pro-</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Document</td>
<td>Author/Lead Beneficiary</td>
<td>Type/Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadsburgerschap: Het Motto is Meedoen</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Integration/Citizenship policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminatie? De Groeten! Uitvoeringsprogramma Integrale Aanpak Discriminatie en Uitsluiting</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Education and Society</td>
<td>Anti-discrimination policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meedoen door taal. Uitvoeringsprogramma Inburgering en Educatie 2007-2011</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Education and Society</td>
<td>Policy to increase Dutch language proficiency among Dutch citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogen Stadsburgerschap. Bruggen Bouwen. Het Motto is Meedoen</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Education and Society</td>
<td>Report of series of Dialogues about urban citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actieprogramma Aanpak Risicogroepen van Marokkaanse en Antilliaanse Afkomst</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Policy dealing with Antillean and Moroccan youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werken aan Talent en Ondernemen. Collegeprogramma 2010-2014</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Coalition programme 2010-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgerschapsbeleid Participatie: Kiezen voor Talent. De invulling van het Burgerschapsbeleid voor de jaren 2012 tot 2015</td>
<td>City executive</td>
<td>Integration/Citizenship policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taaloffensief 2011-2014</td>
<td>City Executive</td>
<td>Language proficiency policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 1: Overview of current measures

Overview of measures: Berlin Senate Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Dimension</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution involved</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modularized Vocational Training</td>
<td>Senate of Berlin / Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Step-by-step approach to completing vocational trainings: Accreditation of parts of a vocational training that enable the admittance to final exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign &quot;Berlin braucht Dich!&quot; (&quot;Berlin needs you!&quot;)</td>
<td>Senate of Berlin / BQN Berlin – Berufliches Qualifizierungsnetzwerk für Migrantinnen und Migranten, supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Campaign that aims at increasing the share of trainees with a migration background in the public administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural opening of the job centres</td>
<td>Senate / Integration Commissioner / Bundesagentur für Arbeit (Federal Agency for Employment)</td>
<td>Increasing intercultural competences of the job centres' employees thus improving the service for migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification of foreign vocational training certificates</td>
<td>Senate Ministry for Labour, Integration and Women</td>
<td>No full accreditation, but official approval of foreign vocational trainings which can be used for applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FörMig-Transfer Berlin</td>
<td>Senate of Berlin / Werkstatt für Integration durch Bildung e.V. (Association for Integration through education)</td>
<td>Continuing language education of young migrants at schools and during vocational trainings: Supporting schools as well as advanced and vocational training facilities in their efforts to offer continuous language trainings for migrants. The project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 1: Overview of current measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQ-Netzwerk Berlin (IQ-Network of Berlin)</td>
<td>Regional network coordinated by the Integration Commissioner of Berlin</td>
<td>Focuses on the districts with the highest shares of migrants (Mitte, Neukölln, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, Tempelhof-Schöneberg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;KUMULUS&quot;</td>
<td>Arbeit und Bildung e.V. (Association for Labour and Education), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Network that aims at integration through qualification: consulting service for vocational training, help with accreditation of qualifications, etc. for people with migration backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPART (ESF Learning Network)</td>
<td>Senate Ministry for Economy, Technology and Research in cooperation with public administration of several other public administrations and supported by the EU</td>
<td>IMPART is a transnational ESF learning network aiming improvement of employment strategies that increase the participation of migrants and ethnic minorities. With the help of three benchmarks, the members of the network drafted a toolkit with critical factors for projects working for the employment of migrants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Socio-Cultural Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willkommenspacket für Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund</td>
<td>Senate of Berlin</td>
<td>Welcome package that informs migrants about Germany and the administration's services for people with migration backgrounds. The welcome package is frequently updated and offered in several different languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mobile Beratung gegen Rechtsextremismus in Berlin
(Mobile Advisory Service against right wing extremism in Berlin)

**Project supported by the Senate of Berlin**

Mobile support for local initiatives against right-wing radicalism: development of action strategies, trainings, and implementation of action strategies in areas where right-wing extremism is a major problem.

### "Schule ohne Rassismus – Schule mit Courage"
("School without racism – school with courage")

**Project supported by the Senate of Berlin**

Educative measure at schools against right-wing radicalism: Schools can receive the title as "school without racism – school with courage" when 70% of the schools members (teaching staff and students) to pledge to go against right-wing radicalism

### "ReachOut"

**Project supported by the Senate of Berlin**

Support for victims of right-wing, racist or Anti-Semitic violence

### BIG – Berliner Interventionszentrale bei häuslicher Gewalt (BIG – Berlin's intervention centre for cases of domestic violence)

**BIG / supported by the Senate of Berlin**

Centre against domestic violence, support for female victims of domestic violence

### "Vielfalt fördern – Zusammenhalt stärken"
(Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion)

**Senate of Berlin**

Berlin's Senate funds several projects that are constituted as cooperation between migrant and other social organisations. The programme includes projects in the fields of youth work, intercultural trainings for people in migrant organisation and intercultural work with parents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercultural organisational development of libraries</th>
<th>Senate of Berlin</th>
<th>Intercultural development of Berlin's libraries with a pilot project in Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, where the district's library was adjusted according to intercultural aspects (more books in foreign languages, etc.).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Demokratie. Vielfalt. Respekt&quot; (Democracy. Diversity. Respect.)</td>
<td>Senate / Integration Commissioner</td>
<td>Berlin's programme against right-wing radicalism, racism and Anti-Semitism: In the context of the programme, the Senate funds over 40 projects that direct efforts at right-wing extremism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haus der Kulturen Lateinamerikas (House of Cultures of Latin America)</td>
<td>Latin-American Centre of Berlin, supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Umbrella organisation for migrants from Latin America: Fostering the intercultural communication between the Latin-American and German population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Härtefallkommission (Commission for hardship cases)</td>
<td>Advisory Board for Migration of Berlin-Brandenburg, supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>The board provides support for refugees that are about to be deported (especially in hardship cases, e.g. in cases of deportation into politically unstable and dangerous countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Treffpunkt für Selbsthilfegruppen des Polnischen Sozialrates&quot; (Meeting point for self-help groups of the Polish social board)</td>
<td>Polnischer Sozialrat e.V. (Polish Social Board Association), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Support for Polish migrants: advisory services, legal support, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;südost Zentrum&quot; (South-east centre)</td>
<td>Süd Ost Europa Kultur e.V. (South East Europe Culture Centre), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of</td>
<td>Support for migrants from south-east Europe: advisory services, legal support, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 1: Overview of current measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;Treffpunkt für türkische Gruppen und Vereine sowie Beratungsstelle&quot; (Meeting point for groups and associations as well as advisory services)</strong></td>
<td>Türkischer Bund in Berlin-Brandenburg.e.V. (Turkish Association in Berlin-Brandenburg), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Support for migrants from Turkey: advisory services, legal support, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informations- u. Beratungsstelle für ausländische Bürger, Projekte, Vereine und Selbsthilfegruppen im Migrantenbereich (Information and Advisory Centre for foreign and migrants citizens, projects, associations, self-help groups)</strong></td>
<td>Verband für interkulturelle Arbeit (VIA) - Regionalverband Berlin-Brandenburg e. V (Association for intercultural work – Region Berlin-Brandenburg), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>The Verband für interkulturelle Arbeit (VIA) supports several projects and functions as advisory service for people with a migration background. Furthermore VIA functions as umbrella association for migrant organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Werkstatt der Kulturen in Berlin (Workshop of Cultures in Berlin)</strong></td>
<td>Werkstatt der Kulturen in Berlin (Workshop of Cultures in Berlin), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Organisation of cultural events, such as the Carnival of Cultures in Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration measures for Jewish migrants</strong></td>
<td>Jewish Community of Berlin, supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Support for the Jewish community in Berlin, especially the office for integration in Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language course and transfer of knowledge for Polish children</strong></td>
<td>Polnischer Schulverein &quot;Oswiata” in Berlin e.V. (Polish School Association &quot;Oswiata&quot;), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering</td>
<td>The association aims at teaching the Polish children in Berlin about Poland and the Polish language. Thus the Polish community shall be supported in connecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>more strongly with their country of origin. Furthermore the association organizes events that depict the Polish culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beratungs- und Ausbildungszentrum für zugewanderte Gewerbetreibende (Advisory and training centre for migrant entrepreneurs)</td>
<td>Gesellschaft für urbane Wirtschaft, Beschäftigung und Integration e. V. (Association for urban economy, employment and integration), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Advisory service for entrepreneurs with a migration background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration work with Arab Women and Girls</td>
<td>Al Dar e.V., supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Association for women with an Arabic migration background; current services: homework help for pupils, women's breakfast, German courses, computer courses for Office word and the Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Centre for People speaking Russian</td>
<td>Club Dialog e. V. (Club Dialogue Association), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Aim: Fostering the intercultural exchange between the Russian migrants and the host society. The Communication centre functions as meeting point for the exchange. Here, migrants can benefit from advisory services (social, legal and psychological) and cultural events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-help and advisory centre for parents and pupils from Kurdistan</td>
<td>Verein der Eltern aus Kurdistan in Berlin e. V. (Association of parents from Kurdistan), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme &quot;Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion&quot;</td>
<td>Support of migrants with a Kurdish background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cultural work and advisory services for Kurds
- **Kurdisches Zentrum e.V.** (Kurdish Centre Association)
- Support of migrants with a Kurdish background

### Intercultural project for parents:
- "Learning German – discovering the new homeland – developing understanding and tolerance"
- **Interkulturelle pädagogische Gesellschaft MITRA e.V.** (Intercultural Education Association MITRA), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme "Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion"
- Offering educational support for Russian speaking families: fostering children's multilingualism, advisory services (educational, psychological, social support), extracurricular lessons, information, etc.

### Al-Nadi
- **Nachbarschaftsheim Schönberg e.V.** (Neighbourhood Centre of Schönberg), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme "Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion"
- Al-Nadi is an advisory service centre for Arabic women from different countries for issues such as rights of residence, employment, domestic violence, marriage and divorce, German language courses, alphabetisation, etc.

### Meeting, communication and advisory centre for Turkish parents and pupils
- **Türkischer Elternverein in Berlin e.V.** (Association of Turkish Parents in Berlin), supported by the Senate of Berlin as part of the programme "Fostering diversity, strengthening social cohesion"
- Support of Turkish parents in Berlin

### State Office for Equal Treatment – Against discrimination
- **Senate of Berlin**
- The state office works on the basis of the General Law on Equal Treatment and has the task to inform citizens about their rights and to encourage the fight against discriminations. Furthermore, the office works as an advisory service in cases of discrimination, initiates campaigns, etc.

#### Legal-Political Dimension

- "PASSt uns" (lit. "Fits us") –  
  Senate of Berlin / integration
  Campaign for more natural-
| Annex 1: Overview of current measures |

### Spatial Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution involved</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quartiersmanagement</td>
<td>Senate Ministry for City Development and Environment</td>
<td>Management of socially problematic areas of Berlin: Supporting city areas in developing structures that enable the people living there to solve the problems themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Socio-Economic Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution involved</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitution of a working group &quot;Schools in Mitte&quot;</td>
<td>District of Mitte</td>
<td>The working group aims at creating working packages that help to improve education in the district of Mitte. Thus, the concerted effort is directed at education for the migrant population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rüti School</td>
<td>District of Neukölln / Senate of Berlin</td>
<td>Innovative community school, which focuses on integration issues. After the teaching staff demanded police protection due to aggressive behaviour of the mainly migrant pupils, the following media attention encouraged the district and Senate to deal with the problematic school. School buildings were renovated and alternative educational approaches especially with regard to in-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security at Neukölln's schools</td>
<td>District of Neukölln / Senate of Berlin</td>
<td>Due to an increasing violence at schools in Neukölln, the security service was introduced to prevent violent assaults on pupils and the teaching staff. This measure, however, came to a stop due to financial restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Bezirklicher Migrationssozialdienst&quot; (District service for Migrants)</td>
<td>District of Marzahn-Hellersdorf</td>
<td>The district of Marzahn-Hellersdorf aims at developing a local service for people with migration background that offers support for integration issues. The local service is also a way to build a network among the district's associations that deal with migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a network between the musical schools and adult education centre as well as the migrants associations</td>
<td>District of Marzahn-Hellersdorf</td>
<td>The district of Marzahn-Hellersdorf aims at strengthening the cooperation between the district's educational institutions and the migrant associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school as evening classes for migrants</td>
<td>District of Marzahn-Hellersdorf</td>
<td>The district offers evening classes for migrants that enable them to complete the secondary school (Hauptschule).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of language courses</td>
<td>District of Marzahn-Hellersdorf</td>
<td>The district establishes language courses for parents with children attending kin-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 1: Overview of current measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>组织实施机构 and Supporting Districts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Kreuzberg handelt – Wirtschaften im Quartier&quot; (Kreuzberg acts – Economy in the Quarter)</td>
<td>LOK.a.Motion GmbH, supported by the district of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg</td>
<td>The project &quot;Kreuzberg handelt – Wirtschaften im Quartier&quot; deals with the local economy in the district and aims at supporting ethnic businesses. Two measures in this context are to provide consulting services for start-ups and entrepreneurs and to establish a network among business owners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Socio-Cultural Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>组织实施机构 and Supporting Districts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sprachförderzentrum Mitte (Centre for Language Teaching)</td>
<td>District of Mitte, Senate Ministry for Education, Youth and the Sciences</td>
<td>The Sprachförderzentrum Mitte aims at centralising the efforts of language skills tuition involving infantile education and day care institutions, schools as well as extra-curricula programmes. Main objective of the centre is to increase the quality of the language skills training in Berlin-Mitte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Die Brücke&quot; (The Bridge)</td>
<td>District of Mitte, Job Centre of Mitte, Bildungsmarkt e.V.</td>
<td>&quot;Die Brücke&quot; is a programme for creating integration support teams: Well-integrated migrants are employed in order to connect (&quot;build bridges&quot;) with migrants isolated from the host society. In this context, migrants inform newly arrived migrants about integration programmes and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtteilmütter (Neighbourhood mothers)</td>
<td>District of Neukölln</td>
<td>The district of Neukölln established the so-called “Stadtteilmütter”. The “Stadtteilmütter” are semi-professional women with a migration background that work in particularly problematic areas of the district. Their aim is to connect with the migrant population, build trust and support them with integration issues. Currently, 70 “Stadtteilmütter” are working for the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus Mondeo</td>
<td>District of Neukölln</td>
<td>The participative circus “Mondeo” helps migrant children in elementary schools to learn with fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical School &quot;Paul Hindemith&quot;</td>
<td>District of Neukölln</td>
<td>The district of Neukölln supports children and teenagers in learning an instrument as educative measure. With high financial support, every child is enabled to participate in music courses without waiting lists or fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuköllner Kinderbüro (Children's office of Neukölln)</td>
<td>Youth welfare office of Neukölln, District of Neukölln</td>
<td>The Neuköllner Kinderbüro is an office, which offers children the possibility to participate in multiple activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinder- und Jugendzentrum Lessinghöhe (Youth and Teenager Centre, the)</td>
<td>District of Neukölln, Youth and Teenager Centre, the</td>
<td>The Kinder- und Jugendzentrum Lessinghöhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teenager Centre)</strong></td>
<td>Police of Neukölln</td>
<td>engages in prevention work against youth delinquency. It offers free support in cases of legal problems (weekly legal advisory services by the police or an lawyer). Furthermore, the centre organises several projects in cooperation with schools of Neukölln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;MaDonna&quot;: Centre for migrant women</strong></td>
<td>MaDonna, supported by the District of Neukölln</td>
<td>MaDonna is an advisory service and meeting point for women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural Facilitators at schools</strong></td>
<td>Jugendwohnen im Kiez – Jugendwohnen gGmbH in Neukölln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;KulturdolmetscherInnen für den Stadtteil Marzahn NordWest&quot; (Culture interpreter of Marzahn North-West)</strong></td>
<td>District of Marzahn-Hellersdorf, Reistrommel e.V. (Vietnamese association), caritas (social services association), Vision e.V. (Association of Migrants in Berlin)</td>
<td>The cultural interpreters of Marzahn-Hellersdorf help migrants that may encounter problems of any kind. The interpreters are available via mobile phone. Meetings are held in order to solve personal problems. The cultural interpreter’s work is especially focused on Vietnamese and Roma people as well as German resettlers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;Interkulturelle Tage in Marzahn-Hellersdorf&quot; (Intercultural Days of Marzahn-Hellersdorf)</strong></td>
<td>District of Marzahn-Hellersdorf</td>
<td>Each year, the district of Marzahn-Hellersdorf organises the intercultural days. This year’s slogan is &quot;Herzliche Willkommen – wer immer du bist&quot; (Welcome – whoever you are). During</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these days, the district also honours persons or associations that have been particularly committed to integration in the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Adoptive grandparents for Vietnamese children</strong></th>
<th><strong>District of Marzahn-Hellersdorf, the district's quarter management</strong></th>
<th>The aim of this project is to connect single / widowed elderly people with Vietnamese pupils whose parents may not have the skills to help their children with homework, etc. The elderly take care of the children and help with their educational development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>InterKreuzHain</strong></td>
<td><strong>District of Kreuzberg-Friedrichshain</strong></td>
<td>Yearly Intercultural event organised by the district: presentations, exhibitions, discussions, panels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal-Political Dimension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural Opening</strong></td>
<td><strong>District of Mitte</strong></td>
<td>Use of the certified programme Xpert Culture Communication Skills (Xpert CCS): Three consecutive courses for employees, participation in the course is accredited by the public administration of Berlin-Mitte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modell UDO (Concept UDO)</strong></td>
<td><strong>District of Neukölln</strong></td>
<td>The concept &quot;UDO&quot; (&quot;Unmittelbar, Direkt, Operationalisiert&quot; – immediate, direct, operationalised) fosters a closer cooperation between persons and institutions in-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of two-year cooperation agreements between the public administration and migrants associations of Marzahn-Hellersdorf</td>
<td>District of Marzahn-Hellersdorf and migrant associations</td>
<td>The district of Marzahn-Hellersdorf closes two-year agreements with the district’s migrant associations in order to strengthen integration work on an ongoing basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural opening of Marzahn-Hellersdorf’s public administration</td>
<td>District of Marzahn-Hellersdorf</td>
<td>Inter alia: Offering at least 10% of the traineeships to people with a migration background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Safe me - Campaign&quot;</td>
<td>Campaign supported by the district Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg</td>
<td>The campaign supports residence rights for refugees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Vote during the local elections in 2011</td>
<td>District of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg</td>
<td>The &quot;symbolic vote&quot; deals with the request and discussion that non-European migrants should be allowed to vote on local level in Germany. In order to create awareness for this issue, the district of Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg organised the &quot;symbolic vote&quot; for migrants during Berlin's elections in 2011 where migrants were able to cast their votes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Spatial Dimension

| "Task Force Okerstraße" | District of Neukölln | The "Task Force Okerstraße" deals with spatial problems in the Oker Street of Neukölln. It is a cooperation between the integration commissioner, the police and other district departments of Neukölln. Its objective is to maintain public order in an area where multiple integration problems are located, i.e. housing problems, unregistered migrants, social problems, violence, etc. |

## Overview of measures: Malmö

### Socio-Economic Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution involved</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction program</td>
<td>Employment service, City of Malmö</td>
<td>All newly arrived humanitarian migrants have a right to an introduction programme, including language training, civics, labour market activities and an introduction guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish for immigrants</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>All migrants have a right to attend free language training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction guide</td>
<td>Private companies</td>
<td>All migrants in an introduction programme have a right to choose a coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction benefit</td>
<td>Employment service</td>
<td>All migrants in an introduction programme have a right to an individual allowance of about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction Rehabilitation (IntroRehab)</td>
<td>City of Malmö, Red Cross</td>
<td>Rehabilitation for traumatized newly arrived migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market programs</td>
<td>City of Malmö, NGOs, Employment service</td>
<td>The City of Malmö and the Employment service offer several different labour market programmes. If needed the municipality can offer Swedish language support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalla-steps</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>A work-cooperative (social economy) where migrant women who are far from the labour market offer different services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult education</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>All citizens have the right to study up until a primary education. The municipality also offer secondary level education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign credential recognition</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>A part of the adult education that validates skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of newly arrived migrant children in schools</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>Special arrangements, classes and schools for newly arrived migrant children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue education</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>Pupils have a right to mother tongue education in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for a socially sustainable Malmö</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>A programme to increase welfare by using public health as a starting point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Socio-Cultural Dimension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic orientation</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>All migrants with an introduction program have to attend 60 hours civics. Other migrants are offered 20 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration in association</td>
<td>City of Malmö, Umbrella organisation for NGOs in Malmö</td>
<td>Introduce and integrate newly arrived migrants in local associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact persons</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>Help newly arrived migrants meet ordinary Malmö-citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma information and knowledge centre</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>Help Roma people and inform about Roma issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program on violence against women</td>
<td>City of Malmö, Women’s shelters</td>
<td>Help abused women, give them shelter and work against honour crimes that include programmes for men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity award</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>Every year the city of Malmö gives an award to a person or institution that works with integration and/or diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community- and Health Communicators</td>
<td>County Administrative Board, City of Malmö</td>
<td>Gives information to newly arrived migrants with a special focus on health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant service</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>First stop for newly arrived migrants, where they can guidance about living in Malmö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue forum and conflict council</td>
<td>City of Malmö</td>
<td>A forum where representatives of communities (mainly Muslim and Jewish) try to sort out misunderstandings and conflicts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legal-Political Dimension**

| Action plan on discrimination | City of Malmö | The plan is implemented in the city of Malmö and is followed-up yearly. |
| Anti-racist activities | City of Malmö | For example The Holocaust Memorial Day and an annual |
### Annex 1: Overview of current measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship ceremony</th>
<th>City of Malmö</th>
<th>A yearly celebration for new Swedish citizens held at the national day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-discrimination centre</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Local centre that help victims of discrimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spatial Dimension

| Neighbourhood programme | City of Malmö | Management of socially problematic areas of Malmö. Focusing on infrastructure and social issues. |

### Overview of measures: Rotterdam

#### Socio-Economic Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution involved</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities of Expertise centre non-formal education</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Education and Society; various CSO's</td>
<td>Initiatives to develop citizens' competencies participate in society. This includes for instance professional behaviours needed on the labour market, language courses and trajectories that lead to participation in voluntary work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation through language / Language offensive</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Education and Society</td>
<td>Programmes to improve people’s language skills. Most people who participate are part of an ethnic minority. Also a minority of native analphabetic citizens participates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Risk groups of Moroccan and Antillean descent

**Safety department**

Nationally funded programme to decrease the relatively high numbers of Antillian and Moroccan youngsters in criminal activities, nuisance, school drop-out and unemployment.

### Socio-Cultural Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities of Expertise centre Diversity</th>
<th>Department of Youth, Education and Society; Various CSO’s</th>
<th>The municipality appeals to a diversity of ideas and talents to utilize this in a beneficial way for the city.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building bridges</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Education and Society</td>
<td>Series of dialogues on Islam and citizenship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legal-Political Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities of Expertise centre Emancipation</th>
<th>Department of Youth, Education and Society, various CSO’s</th>
<th>Initiatives to increase gender equality, self-reliance, social mobility and homosexual emancipation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities of Expertise centre Anti-discrimination</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Education and Society; various CSO’s</td>
<td>Initiatives to end discrimination as an obstacle for participation by not only maintaining the legal prohibition of discrimination but also to empower discriminated groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say goodbye to discrimination</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Education and Society; RADAR</td>
<td>Programme to fight discrimination and racism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>