mobile identities

# Mobile Identities: Migration and Integration in Transnational Communities HOME/2012/EIFX/CA/CFP/4201

## National Report – Germany

## CJD Hamburg + Eutin

With the financial support of

Directorate B-Immigration and Asylum-Directorate-General Home Affairs

European Commission, European Fund for the Integration of

Third-country nationals 2007-2013

Co-funded by the
European Union

## Table of Contents

## List of Annexes



## List of Tables

## 1. Introduction

Germany has a **diverse population** today: Out of a population of 81.913 million people, 16.3 million (i.e. 20% of the population) have a so called "migration background". This includes *"everyone who migrated after 1949 to the territory which is now the Federal Republic of Germany as well as all foreigners who are born in Germany and all people born in Germany as Germans when they have at least one parent who is immigrated to Germany or born in Germany with a foreign nationality"*.[1] 7.4 million people living in Germany (9% of the population) have a foreign nationality. Most of the **people with a migration background** have a Turkish background (18.3% of all people with a migration background), followed by people with a Polish background (9.4%), a background from the Russian Federation (7.4%), from Kazakhstan (5.6%) and Italy (4.6%). 10.9 million people living in Germany have "an own migration experience", i.e. there were born outside Germany and immigrated to the country.[2]

**Immigration to Germany** – in particular to West Germany after the Second World War – took place in several waves: In the booming economy of the mid 1950s until the early 1970s, the country had a programme for so-called **"guest workers"**. Germany concluded contracts with Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Morocco, Portugal, Tunisia and Yugoslavia regulating the temporary migration of workers. About 14 million people came to Germany and 11 million "guest workers" left the country again.[3] After the 1973 ban on recruiting "guest workers", some stayed in Germany, raising the percentage of foreigners in the country to about 4%.[4] In the following years, immigration to Germany was mainly characterised by family reunification; many of the "guest workers" brought their partners and children to Germany. In the 1980s and early 1990s, **refugees and asylum seekers** constituted the biggest group of immigrants. They were predominantly European, e.g. from the former Soviet Union or the Balkan region during the war in Yugoslavia; some also came from Africa and Asia. At that time also ethnic German "Spätaussiedler" – mainly from Poland and the former Soviet Union – migrated to Germany.[5] Furthermore, **EU internal migration** has been – and still is – a major type of immigration to Germany.

**Current data** shows that in 2012 1,080,936 people immigrated to Germany. In the same year, 711,991 people left the country as well. This amounts to a net migration of 368,945 people – which is the highest num-

[1] Statistisches Bundesamt (2013) *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund – Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2012.* Fachserie 1, Reihe 2.2. Wiesbaden. Available at: https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/Bevoelkerung/MigrationIntegration/Migrationshintergrund2010220127004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

[2] Ibid.

[3] Bade, K. J. (2000) *Migration und Integration in Deutschland seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg: Probleme – Erfolge – Perspektiven.* Available at: http://www.forum-interkultur.net/uploads/tx_textdb/18.pdf

[4] Butterwegge, C. (2005) *Von der „Gastarbeiter"-Anwerbung zum Zuwanderungsgesetz – Migrationsgeschehen und Zuwanderungspolitik in der Bundesrepublik*. bpb, Dossier Migration. Available at: http://www.bpb.de/gesellschaft/migration/dossier-migration/56377/migrationspolitik-in-der-brd?p=0

[5] Bade, K. J. (2000) *Migration und Integration in Deutschland seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg: Probleme – Erfolge – Perspektiven.* Available at: http://www.forum-interkultur.net/uploads/tx_textdb/18.pdf

ber since 1996. Most of the people immigrating came from Poland (17.1% of all immigrants), followed by Romania (10.8%), Bulgaria (5.4%), Hungary (5.1%) and Italy (4.2%). Almost two-thirds of all immigrants in 2012 (63.9%) came from an EU member state. The main countries of destination for outward migration were Poland (16.1%), Romania (10.0%), Bulgaria (4.7%), Turkey (4.6%) and the United States (4.1%).[6] One can see that there is a high fluctuation and – although it is not possible to detect from this data who is staying for how long – that some immigrants stay only temporarily in Germany.

The project "**Mobile Identities**: Migration and Integration in Transnational Communities" focusses on forms of temporary and circular migration. We thereby use the definitions by the European Migration Network (EMN). There, temporary migration is defined as *"migration for a specific motivation and/or purpose with the integration that, afterwards, there will be a return to the country of origin or onward movement"*. The EMN defines circular migration as *"a repetition of legal migration by the same person between two or more countries"*.[7] Mobile Identities looks at these forms of immigration in five European countries (Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom) with the aim of fostering the well-being and integration of temporary and circular immigrants.

This **national report of Germany** first presents a short insight in the methodology used (chapter 2). Then it gives an overview of the policy approach to migration in Germany (chapter 3). Since Germany has already had a major programme for temporary migration in the 1960s and early 70s ("guest worker programme"), chapter 4 contains an excursus on this programme, its consequences and current developments with regard to immigrants from Turkey. Chapter 5 will then deal with the current forms of migration and the empirical findings of the project. The report finishes with a summary and recommendations (chapter 6).

## 2. Methodology

"Mobile Identities – Migration and Integration in Transnational Communities" was created in 2012 with the **aim** of analysing state-run programmes on temporary and/or circular migration to the EU states Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom. We investigated whether and if so how these forms of migration (could) lead to a winning situation for the migrants, the country of origin and the destination country – and therefore for the EU. To this end we conducted secondary research (cf. Chapter 2.1) and interviews with actors such as researchers, members of the administration and of projects or representatives

[6] Bundesministerium des Innern – BMI (2014) *Migrationsbericht des Bundesamtes für Migration und Flüchtlinge im Auftrag der Bundesregierung* (Migrationsbericht 2012). Berlin. S. 15 – 19. Available at: http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Broschueren/2014/Migrationsbericht_2012_de.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

[7] EMN (2011) *Temporary and Circular Migration: empirical evidence, current policy practice and future options in EU Member States.* Luxembourg. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/circular-migration/0a_emn_synthesis_report_temporary__circular_migration_final_sept_2011_en.pdf

of migrant organisations (cf. Chapter 2.2) as well as with migrants (cf. Chapter 2.3). In addition, we organised a number of transnational events (cf. Chapter 2.4).

Together with the CJD Hamburg + Eutin the following institutions took part in "Mobile Identities" as research or associated **partners**:

- **Psychoanalytical Institute for Social Research (IPRS)**, Rome, Italy (Coordinator and Research Partner)
- **Autonomous University of Barcelona**, Spain (Research Partner)
- **University College London**, United Kingdom (Research Partner)
- **Free University (VU)**, Amsterdam, Netherlands (Research Partner)
- **Matej-Bel-University**, BanskáBystrica, Slovakia (Project Evaluation)
- **Alliance of Islamic Communities in Northern Germany e.V. (BIG)**, Hamburg, Germany (associated Partner)
- **Marie Curie Sklodowska University**, Lublin, Poland (associated Partner)
- **Organisation for Development and Emancipation**, Albania (associated Partner)
- **Mohamed First University**, Oujda, Morocco (associated Partner)
- **Region Emilia-Romagna**, Italy (associated Partner)
- **Lavoratori Stranieri Association (ALS)**, Turin, Italy (associated Partner)

However, after the project had begun in 2014, **changes** had to be made to the original idea of the Mobile Identities project in all participating countries regarding the question of research and the target group. In Germany, for example, although temporary residence permits are granted to newly arrived migrants, there are, however, no explicit circular migration programmes with third countries. Seasonal worker programmes with countries in Eastern Europe, which were classic circular migration programmes, were very common before the citizens of the respective countries were able to enjoy full freedom of movement in the EU. Such programmes only exist today with Croatia and could not be included as part of the research of "Mobile Identities". Currently there are only a few state-run immigration programmes with bilateral agreements with other states and these are in the healthcare sector. Although these are not tailored to circular migration and not necessarily temporary, they were included in the present research on the grounds that the participants were initially only granted temporary residence permits. Moreover, Germany has extensive past experience with its "guest worker" programmes of the 1950s and 1960s which was of a temporary and rotating nature, but which in reality led to permanent immigration.

Therefore the **target groups** in the "Mobile Identities" project in Germany are as follows:

(1) Participants on migration programmes in the care sector
(2) Temporary and/or circular migrants from Turkey
(3) Qualified skilled temporary and/or circular migrants in general

As opposed to other participating countries, such as Spain and Italy, in Germany we have concentrated on qualified immigrants, as a large number of the possibilities for immigrants from third countries require that

they hold special qualifications. Turkey was selected as a partner country in the project in view of the experience gained from the "guest worker" programmes.

### 2.1. Desk Research

At the outset of the project we carried out **desk research** on "Mobile Identities" and produced essays, reports, projects and research findings relevant to its issues. Of particular interest were the reports of the European Migration Networks (EMN), which – as quoted above – provide us with one the few definitions comparing temporary and circular migration in Europe.[8] In the literature circular migration is often viewed in connection with development policy. In her report for the UNDP, for example, Kathleen Newland writes about potential advantages not only for the country of origin, but also for the host country, which among other things are dependent on external conditions and the degree of freedom of choice that immigrants have about their mobility. People would choose circular migration if their status allowed them to migrate back and forth (e.g. settlement permit, dual citizenship). She refers to 'de facto circular migration', i.e. if immigrants are given the opportunity, they become circular migrants.[9] In their dossier the Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung points out that circular migration is "not a migration policy panacea" and a "triple-win situation" will not automatically follow. In order to achieve an advantageous position multiple migration, for example, must be ensured, further training, integration and contact with the majority society promoted and permanent immigration brought into the equation.[10]

In his 2007 analysis entitled "Circular Migration – a sustainable concept for migration policy?" Steffen Angenendt took up the **discussion on temporary and circular migration in the EU** which had been raised by a German-French initiative and had the aim of working together to combat illegal migration and control legal immigration. Angendendt recommended using the then German EU Council presidency for developing this discussion further, taking three points into consideration in the process: "First it must be decided whether the concept intends primarily to achieve development policy or migration policy goals [...]. Second, it must be determined whether the concept of circular migration actually means repeated or simply one-time migration. […] In order to avoid the pitfalls of past recruitment policies, provision of integration measures

[8] EMN (2011) *Temporary and Circular Migration: empirical evidence, current policy practice and future options in EU Member States.* Luxembourg. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/circular-migration/0a_emn_synthesis_report_temporary__circular_migration_final_sept_2011_en.pdf
EMN (2011) *Circular and Temporary Migration: Empirical Evidence, Current Policy Practice and Future Options in Germany.*Nürnberg. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/circular-migration/de_20111115_circulartempoirarymigr_finalversionnov2011_en.pdf

[9] Newland, Kathleen (2009) *Circular Migration and Human Development*. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Human Development Reports. Research Paper 2009/42.

[10] Fincke, Gunilla (2010) You can't have the cake and eat it! Migrationssteuerung in Deutschland und die Versprechen der zirkulären Migration. In: Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung (2010) Mobility & Inclusion – Managing Labour Migration in Europe. MID-Dossier. Online unter: http://www.migration-boell.de/web/migration/46_2413.asp

should be considered also for temporary migrants when staying for longer periods (temporary integration). Third, it should be taken into account that temporary migration programmes can only achieve sustainable outcomes when they are incorporated into comprehensive migration concepts. To this end, it should be clarified under what condition a temporary stay can be converted into a permanent stay."[11] In 2014 Angenendt once again specified the development policy aspect of migration: he made the case for a new pragmatism in order to resolve the conflict of goals between migration and development policy. He regards collaboration with the countries of origin as partners and good basic conditions, such as legal and fair opportunities for migrant workers, protection of rights and protection from wage dumping and other risks as crucial for this.[12]

Due to the **pairing of Germany with Turkey** in the project, the desk research also paid special attention to literature on circular migration between these two countries. Ibrahim Kaya's report on "Circular Migration and Turkey: A Legal Perspective", which formed part of the CARIM project, dealt with how changes to the law could favour circular migration between Turkey and the EU. For example, a bilateral social insurance agreement would be necessary in order to pay out pensions and other social insurances in Turkey, which had been paid into in Germany. Regulations governing (political) participation should, however, also be revised.[13] Helene Krumme concentrates on the transnational commuting of retired Turkish migrant workers, describing three types of commuting based on biographical narrative interviews: "'Bilocal circular migration', 'circular migration after return to the country of origin', and 'circular migration with primary residency in the country of former employment.' In addition, the analysis indicates that transnational migrants develop feelings of national belonging which can no longer be classified as 'either-or,' but rather as 'both-and' or 'neither-nor.'"[14]

Studies have not only been carried out on migration between Germany and Turkey. Current temporary or circular migration programmes are often analysed in view of the former **'guest worker' programmes.**[15] In addition to literature on the former 'guest worker' programmes and their effects in particular on transnational relationships and circular migration, desk research has focused on the identification of temporary and circular migratory paths to Germany, notably state and binational mobility programmes. Although

---

[11] Angenendt, Steffen (2007) *Zirkuläre Migration – Ein tragfähiges migrationspolitisches Konzept?* Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik. SWP Aktuell 27 / April 2007.

[12] Angenendt, Steffen (2014) Entwicklungsorientierte Migrationspolitik – Handlungsmöglichkeiten für die deutsche Politik. WISO direkt Mai 2014. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Abteilung Wirtschafts- und Sozialpolitik.

[13] Kaya, Ibrahim (2008): *Circular Migration and Turkey: A Legal Perspective*. CARIM Analytic and Synthetic Notes 2008/37.Circular Migration Series – Legal Module.Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico di Fiesole (FI): European University Institute.

[14] Krumme, Helene (2004) *Fortwährende Remigration: Das transnationale Pendeln türkischer Arbeitsmigrantinnen und Arbeitsmigranten im Ruhestand*. Zeitschrift für Soziologie, Jg. 33, Heft 2, April 2004, p. 138–153.

[15] Cf. E.g. Heckmann, Friedrich/ Hönekopp, Elmar/ Currle, Edda (2009) *Guest Worker Programmes and Circular Migration: What Works?* The German Marshall Fund of the United States. Immigration Paper Series 09.
Constant, Amelie/ Zimmermann, Klaus F. (2007) *Circular migration: counts of exits and years away from the host country*. IZA Discussion Papers, No. 2999. Online at: http://ftp.iza.org/dp2999.pdf

there are no binational migrant worker programmes in Germany, such as seasonal worker programmes, with non-EU countries, the new skilled-worker recruitment programmes in the healthcare sector with China and Vietnam do meet the requirements insofar as they are binational arrangements for the recruitment of workers from third countries.[16] A further step involved researching these programmes and the identification of potential interviewees. As the number of participants on the programmes is very low (approx. 220 persons), experts were also selected for the subsequent interviews who in general occupy themselves theoretically or practically with the topic of labour market immigration, for example in research, in an advisory capacity or in migrant organisations.

### 2.2. Stakeholder Interviews

In order to get a better insight into the topic of Mobile Identities, we conducted 11 stakeholder interviews with 12 people from relevant organisations identified during desk research. Among them were:

- 4 people involved in 2 migration programmes of the care sector
- 3 people from migrant organisations
- 2 researchers (EU Blue Card/ employment-related migration; migration to and from Turkey)
- 2 people from foreigners' offices (1 written interview)
- 1 person from a project supporting migration of qualified workers to Hamburg

In use was a **standardised interview guideline** which was modified according to different groups of interview partners (researchers, representatives of migrant organisations).[17] There are no direct transcripts of the interviews, but the minutes are comprehensive and filled in a template (in English). So information from the interviews can be easily used for the report.

We would have considered it to be important to also talk to government officials involved in immigration (programmes), mainly from the Federal Employment Agency, Central International Placement Service (*Bundesagentur für Arbeit, Zentrale Auslands- und Fachvermittlung – ZAV*) or the initiative "Make-it-in-Germany". However, even after several attempts scheduling interviews was not successful. We found it very difficult to approach big government organisations and mainly ministries for stakeholder interviews.

[16] According to a statement made on the telephone by a member of staff at the ZAV, once the seasonal worker programme with Croatia has finished there are no plans for any further seasonal worker programmes; they are not regarded as necessary.

[17] The interview guideline for interviewees connected to programmes can be found in Annex 2.

### 2.3. Migrant Interviews

We conducted 18 interviews with migrants. In use were the interview guidelines part A and B (mainly in 1 interview). Conducting the interviews took about 1.5 hours on average. Part C of the planned interview guideline seemed rather difficult to conduct; given time constraints we did not use it for the project.

On the one hand we interviewed **participants of a migration programme in the care sector**, i.e. care staff from Vietnam.[18] During the time of the empirical phase of Mobile Identities, the first group of Vietnamese care workers lived in Germany. 100 participants of the programme are staying in different parts of Germany for training and employment. Due to massive public interest in their experiences and a tight schedule for the participants (working, learning German, getting training, internal evaluation of the programme), it proved difficult to get the chance to interview them. We managed to interview the small group of the Vietnamese care workers living and working in the city of Braunschweig – thanks to the support of their school there. First we conducted two group interviews and then another 2 in-depth individual interviews so that we talked to 10 participants out of the 100. Further attempts to talk to Vietnamese care workers in other cities have not been successful.

On the other hand we interviewed **qualified immigrants**,

- Whose residence permit is temporary (e.g. EU Blue Card, job seekers' visa, research visa, exchange of personnel)
- who are able to conduct the interview in German or English
- Who work in Germany, e.g. qualified workers, foreign graduates of German universities, researchers, internal exchange of personnel, etc.
- Who ideally come from Turkey or another (African or Asian) country (Turkey: country pairing; Africa, GUS and Asia: are seen as having a good potential for qualified immigration[19])

It proved to be rather difficult to find suitable interview partners who fit to the above mentioned criteria. Immigration of (qualified) workers is only a small share of total immigration to Germany: In 2013, about 24,000 people immigrated with visa for qualified workers to Germany – out of 885,000 immigrants in total in that year.[20] Access to interview partners proved to be rather difficult. Thanks to the support of our asso-

[18] It had not been possible to conduct interviews with participants of the care workers programme with China.
[19] See: Kreienbrink, Axel (2014): *Fachkräftemigration aus Asien nach Deutschland und Europa – Migration of skilled labour from Asia to Germany and Europe*. Beiträge zu Migration und Integration, Band 5, Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF);
Schmid, Susanne (2010): *Vor den Toren Europas? Das Potenzial der Migration aus Afrika*. Forschungsbericht 7. Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF);
Schmid, Susanne (2012): *Das Migrationspotenzial aus der GUS in die Europäische Union*. Forschungsbericht 17. Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF)
[20] See: Mayer, Matthias M. (2015): *Fachkräftezuwanderung aus Nicht-EU-Staaten nach Deutschland 2013: Aufenthaltstitel zur Erwerbstätigkeit und weitere Kanäle*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

ciate partner as well as through personal contacts, we interviewed 4 people from Cameroon, 3 people from Turkey, 2 people from India, 1 person from Senegal, 1 from Russia and 1 from Moldova. Using personal contacts proved to be the most successful way to reach potential interview partners; institutions or organisations (apart from the associate partner) were less helpful. 2 interview partners do currently not live in Germany. These interviews had to be conducted via Skype. The others were done as face-to-face interviews. In use was an extensive interview guideline.[21] Summaries of each interview are provided as well as an overview of all migrant interviews conducted.

### 2.4. Workshops

"Mobile Identities" was planned as a practical project so we therefore arranged not only the interviews, but also a number of events in order to hold discussions and exchange ideas with the target group and local, national, and international experts. The following events were held as part of the project:

- A national workshop on 28.04.2015 in Hamburg, Germany
- A transnational workshop on 07.05.2015 in Barcelona, Spain
- A transnational final conference on 21.07.2015 in Rome, Italy

The **national workshop** took place at the premises of the associated partner *Bündnis der Islamischen Gemeinschaften in Norddeutschland (BIG) e.V.* (Alliance of Islamic Communities in Northern Germany). As well as staff of the CJD Hamburg + Eutin and representatives of the associated partner, a further ten participants from Hamburg and Northern Germany attended the event. They came from regional migrant organisations, associations, institutes and projects and were involved in the issues of "Mobile Identities" or were themselves employers or involved in temporary/circular migration. The initial findings of the qualitative interviews and suggestions for policy recommendations were presented to the participants. In addition, two participants involved in the GIZ project "Training workers from Vietnam to become Qualified Nurses" presented their experiences of this recruitment programme. In part three of the event, the participants held a moderated discussion about the effects of temporary and circular migration on the country of origin, the destination country and the immigrants, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of these forms of migration and experience gained from the 'guest worker' programmes. Based on the participants' contributions we were able to formulate important ideas for the national policy recommendations and also suggest areas for the EU-wide analysis.

The "Mobile Identities" **transnational workshop** in Barcelona was attended by representatives of national and international governmental and non-governmental organisations, politics, societies, associations and other organisations from the participating EU states in order to exchange information about programmes and experiences in their own country. The initial findings of each country's study were presented as well as examples for programmes from the respective countries. In the workshops the participants made contribu-

[21] The interview guideline for the migrant interviews can be found in Annex 3.

tions for subject areas and content of the European policy recommendations. The **final conference** brought together experts from areas of practice, politics and international organisations in order to gain information about the findings of "Mobile Identities" and to gather further suggestions for the European policy recommendations. Even during the term of the project these events made it possible to make findings available to a circle of experts and use their comments for the further development of "Mobile Identities".

# 3. Policy Approach to Immigration in Germany

## 3.1. History of Labour Migration to Germany

If we look at the current public debate on migration policy, we might gain the impression that politics and society in Germany are being confronted with the phenomenon of mass immigration for the first time. However, history tells us that with increasing industrialisation in the nineteenth century there was also a significant level of immigration in particular from Austria-Hungary, Russia-Poland and Galicia. Whereas initially, immigrant agricultural labourers replaced agricultural workers who had moved to rural industrial regions due to the rural exodus, at the beginning of the twentieth century increasing numbers of foreign workers were being employed in mining, iron and steel works and in the brick and tile industry. Although the seasonal employment of foreign workers in agriculture still made economic sense, this temporary labour migration in industry was hardly feasible. The self-definition of an emergent Prussian state which claimed to represent the nation state and defined belonging to the German nation according to the criterion of the **'ius sanguinis'**, i.e. genetic ancestry, was opposed to the economic benefits of the permanent integration of foreign workers. As a result of this national identity the fear of being 'overrun by foreigners' was simply a logical consequence and propagandistic malicious tirades against 'East-European Jewry' and 'Polonisation' became socially acceptable not only among the majority of the population, but also among members of the government. Interestingly, however, this ideological construct of the 'ius sanguinis' was annulled with regard to the 'Ruhr Poles'.[22] This term refers to people from the Prussian part of Poland who held Prussian-German citizenship, but their native language and cultural identity was Polish. In the interests of territorial expansion, this group was to be germanised as quickly as possible. It is clear that even at this early phase of German national migration policy, structures had been put in place that are still highly influential today: the definition of belonging according to the 'ius sanguinis', which excludes all citizens of different ethnic origin, but also the contradiction between economic demands on the one hand and national identity and psycho-social sensibility on the other. Even into our millennium it is still not possible to talk of openness to integration or even an integration policy; the desired Germanisation of the 'Ruhr Poles' is not an example of integration, but of colonisation.

[22] See: Herbert, Ulrich: Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland; Bonn 2003; Kapitel 3. Die „Ruhrpolen"; S.74 ff. (The history of immigration policy in Germany, chapter 3, the "Ruhr Poles" p.74 ff.)

The use of **foreign forced labour** is the darkest facet of German migration policy, whose beginnings lie in the war economy of The First World War of 1914 to 1918. The recruitment of men fit for military service and the production boom in the armaments industry increased the need for manpower within a very short time. Prisoners of war were indeed used in industry and agriculture, but supervising them was problematic and the inspections of the International Red Cross limited the exploitation of this workforce. For this reason the seasonal residence limits for foreign workers were replaced with a prohibition to return as early as 1914 - the very first year of the war – and a number of measures were introduced which forced the foreign workers to be available to the German labour market for the duration of the war. Here, regulations, byelaws and threats of punishment were not just aimed at their employment, but also at their private life, which effectively made it forced labour. The mass forced deportation of Belgian workers in November 1916 and their internment in work camps, which under the pressure of neutral countries had to be ended as early as Spring 1917, formed the high point of a 'policy of forced labour'. It formed the "basis of experience for the use of foreign labour by national socialists in the Second World War" and influenced "preconceptions about foreigners among those responsible, but also in German society as a whole".[23] The Weimar Republic phase is characterised by "revisions to statutory legislation and nationalisation of labour market organisation".[24] Regulations were introduced for the employment of foreign workers, the primary aim of which was to protect the native workforce. These included the tariff obligation, which was designed to avoid wage dumping, or the so-called "*Inländerprimat*" (priority to native Germans), whereby a check was carried out to determine if a position could be filled by a native employee. Aspects of these regulations have also continued into the present day. During the global economic crisis the labour market collapsed and in 1932 the German border to Poland was closed to seasonal agricultural workers. In the course of the rearmament programme of the Third Reich the need for foreign workers increased again and after the attack on Poland in 1939 and on Russia in 1940 the war economy built on the massive use of forced labour and prisoners of war from the occupied areas. By August 1944 the proportion of foreign workers had risen to 26.5% of the workforce as a whole. More than 7,650,000 civilians and POWs had to endure forced labour under the Third Reich, including many minors.[25]

Unlike the forced labour in the First World War, the **exploitation of foreign workers under National Socialism** was based on racism, so that in addition to the economic gains, the aim of forced labour was the "annihilation through work" of Jews and East Europeans. This aim, based on a racist ideology, as well as the unspeakable suffering of the victims forbid us from finding similarities with guest worker policy of the 1960s in the FRG, as was often alleged in the historiography of the GDR; what is still evident today, however, is the many years of repression of national socialistic forced labour in the public consciousness of the FRG by political and economic stakeholders and by large sections of society. Trivialisation and romanticising of the 'loyal Russian nanny' who had it much better in Germany than at home, or of the Polish farm hand who was moved to tears because he'd been gifted a pair of shoes, are still widespread among contemporary wit-

[23] Loc. sit., p. 87
[24] Loc. sit., p.121
[25] Loc. sit., p.146

nesses today. It was not until 1999 following reunification that payment of DM 10 billion in compensation was agreed between the FRG, representatives of the German economy and victims' associations, but a broad public discourse on forced labour under national socialism beyond reappraisal by specialists had not even taken place in the 'reunified' population after 1990. It is no surprise, therefore, that to this day vague and in many cases oblivious presuppositions, prejudices and pejorative attitudes persist in the subconscious of many German citizens, which influence them with regard to immigrants.

After the Second World War there was a phase of stagnation followed by the currency reform of 1948 and a period of economic growth in the three western zones of Germany. While in the 1950s the growing requirement for manpower could still be covered to a great extent by the influx of refugees and displaced persons, the erection of the wall separating the two German states in 1961 cut off the flow of immigrants from the GDR. The German-Italian **recruitment agreement** had already been prepared in 1955 and was followed in 1960 by contracts with Spain and Greece, in 1961 with Turkey, in 1964 with Portugal, in 1965 with Morocco and Tunisia, and finally in 1968 with Yugoslavia. The rapid succession of these agreements shows clearly that the pressure from industrial stakeholders was great, because the idea was also to limit wage rises in such a way that the economy would not be adversely affected. In addition, as a mobile reserve without long-term obligations for employers, "guest workers" were a regulatory instrument for dealing with economic fluctuations. Employers were able to hire and fire them at will and this was also advantageous for ‚native' permanent employees in companies. This phase of German migration policy is characterised by its exclusive concern with the temporary employment of workers.

The **Aliens Act of 1965** created a legal framework that superseded individual statutory requirements and edicts of the pre-war era. With this law workers from EEC countries, such as Italians, were step by step put on an equal footing with German employees, whereas there were strict rules which applied to foreign workers from other countries, and these rules could be applied flexibly by the immigration authorities according to the prevailing economic situation. This first phase of federal German migration policy came to an end with the ban on the recruitment of 'guest workers' in 1973 as a result of the economic slump caused by the oil crisis.

The second phase of immigration policy in the FRG is summarised by Klaus Bade who calls it **the "consolidation of the employment of foreigners"**, the key points of which were limiting immigration, a repatriation support programme and the development of the first steps towards social integration.[26] The intended effect of the ban on recruitment, of limiting the influx of foreigners, proved in his opinion to be a "boomerang" by (accelerating) "the path from an existence as a guest worker to one as an immigrant while losing some of the functions that had heretofore been attached to the >guest worker population< on the labour market".[27] By 1978 the immigrant population had already exceeded that of 1973 and repatriation pro-

[26] Klaus Bade: Ausländer- und Asylpolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Grundprobleme und Entwicklungslinien; Friedrich Ebert Stiftung 2001; http://library.fes.de/fulltext/asfo/01011002.htm
[27] Klaus Bade: Von der Arbeitswanderung zur Einwanderungsgesellschaft – Teil 1; ZAR 2010; http://kjbade.de/inhalt/aufsaetze-in-zeitschriften-und-sammelwerken/

grammes fizzled out ineffectively. The initiative regarding the integration of foreign citizens in this phase was taken primarily by NGOs such as welfare organisations and migrant organisations, but also by churches and trades unions.

Bade refers to a third stage of immigrant policy in 1979 and 1980 as "**the integration concepts phase"** in which, represented by the so-called Kühn-Memorandum, it was also recognised also at the national political level that the majority of the foreign population were not 'guest workers' who wanted to return to their homeland, but immigrants who wanted to stay in Germany permanently, many of whose children were born in the FRG, and in all cases had grown up there. Although the Office of Federal Commissioner for Foreigners' Affairs created in 1978 is attached to the Federal Ministry of Labour, it was clear at this stage that integration was not just a task for the economy, but a challenge for all sections of society.

A further phase was the period between Liselotte Funke becoming **Commissioner for Foreigners' Affairs** in 1981 and the introduction of the nationality law in 2000. In this phase the political parties were in competition until 1989 to see who could devise the best plan for limiting immigration, immigration policy became the tool of electoral strategy. The rise on the one hand of asylum-seeking refugees and the dearth of immigration policy concepts on the other led to a "spiral of frustration and aggression between parties and the electorate" which resulted ultimately in the electoral success of radical right-wing parties, e.g. in 1989 in Berlin and Hessen.[28] There were three aspects in this tendential change in immigration policy: responsibility in the area of 'immigration policy' shifted increasingly from the Federal Ministry of Labour to the Ministry of the Interior; immigration policy became less the subject of labour market policy development and more the subject of measures of domestic and security policy. A second aspect is that the topic of asylum overlaps immigration policy and consequently distorts an objective public discourse on immigration. Finally, the political instrumentalisation of the topic of 'immigration policy' as a tool of electoral strategy made it virtually impossible to implement a reform of immigration policy in line with legal policy. This became particularly clear when the new aliens act came into force in 1991, but it does not represent significant progress, because while political participation and multiple citizenship are being denied, deportation guidelines and supervision by the immigration office are being intensified.

### 3.2. From Migration to Integration

The FRGs immigration policy did not improve until the introduction of the **nationality law in 2000**, with increasing immigration being recognised as a societal reality and permanent integration understood as a task for the whole of society. With this piece of legislation the 'ius soli', the acquisition of citizenship through birth in the country, was put on an equal footing with the 'ius sanguinis', the right on account of ancestry, which meant that many descendents of the first generation of 'guest workers' became German citizens. However, as the law only allows multiple citizenship in exceptional cases, many are still dissuaded from accepting German citizenship. Further important legal steps towards the political identity of the FRG as an

[28] Klaus Bade: Ausländer- und Asylpolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland; Loc. sit.

immigration country were on 1 January 2005 when the 1991 aliens act was replaced with the **residence act**, the primary aim of which was integration, and the entry into force of the immigration act. These two new legal regimes provided the legal framework for an active and desired immigration and integration policy that accepts integration as a central political task and takes responsibility for this. This change in political identity expressed itself in the nomination of a Minister of State for Integration and Migration, the hosting of a national 'Integration Summit' and the adoption of a 'National Integration Plan' in 2005 as well as the regular hosting of a 'German Islam Conference' by the Federal Minister of the Interior.

The influence of **globalisation** has stepped up changes in international migratory movements. Improved access to information, the worldwide optimisation of transport infrastructures, but also the speed of the changes on the labour market are leading to a reduction in permanent immigration, whereas temporary and circular migration are on the increase. While the expression 'temporary migration' has been a familiar one in discourse in the FRG since the beginning of labour migration in the 1960s, as 'guest worker' migration was taken for granted up until the 1980s, the term 'circular migration' relatively new in expert political debate and therefore defined differently according to context. However, to distinguish it from temporary migration two criteria can be named: circular migration describes on the one hand repeated return to the country of origin or third county, on the other however, this is, for example unlike seasonal work characterised by the migrants setting themselves up for a longer to long-term permanent stay in the country of immigration and they base their life there at least temporarily.

Currently, programmes in particular about temporary migration are being discussed at the political level most notably in the context of the **demand for specialists**. In order to refute the accusation of a 'brain drain', mobility partnerships were formed with individual threshold and developing countries and temporary-migration programmes developed which were supposed to be advantageous to all partners in the programme ('triple-win'). The country of origin should benefit by having its social and economic development boosted by the return of well (or further) qualified specialists, the host country by having its shortage of specialists alleviated in certain areas such as the care sector, and the migrants, by being given the opportunity to bridge periods of unemployment and gain further qualifications. These programmes, agreed at the political level of the countries of origin and Germany, are however abstract concepts which assume that migratory movement can be steered at the political level – a chimera that we have fallen victim to in the past, as the experiences with 'guest worker' immigration in the FRG show, because "it has to be understood that the decision about whether migration is temporary, circular or permanent is ultimately up to the migrants themselves".[29]

Whether desired or not, however, **circular migration** appears increasingly to be a phenomenon of the reality of immigrants. In addition to the benefits of circular migration already mentioned, immigration history and the resulting relationship between the country of origin and the host country in particular have a sub-

[29] Steffen Angenendt: Entwicklungspolitische Perspektiven temporärer und zirkulärer Migration; SWP-Studie Berlin 2014; S.6; http://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/studien/2014_S13_adt.pdf

stantial influence on the forms and scale of circular migration. This will be highlighted below through the example of the history of migration between the FRG and the Republic of Turkey.

# 4. Excursus: Migration to and from Turkey as an example of Germany's "Guest Worker" Programme and its Consequences

## 4.1. History of Labour Migration from Turkey to Germany

At 2.9 million, the number of people with Turkish roots living in Germany today represents the second-largest group with an immigration background after the *(Spät-) Aussiedler* [(late) ethnic German resettlers].[30] This shared **German-Turkish history of immigration** began with the first recruitment contract with Turkey in 1961. The industrial boom after World War II led to an increased requirement for manpower not only in the FRG but also in the neighbouring countries. However, as the decision makers in industry and politics could not yet estimate how long this growth phase in the FRG would last, the ‚guest worker' model was created. The attraction with this model appeared to be the possibility of employing these workers on a temporary basis, but when the order books were not so full, sending them 'home' without having any obligations under labour law, or any economic or social consequences. Similarly to today, those in charge in the FRG had already explained in the 1960s that "these economic benefits would also impact positively on the guest workers and their homelands: the unemployment figures of the sending country would be lowered, the balance of payments improved by wage transfers, the qualification structure of the workforce raised by their employment in German factories – 'a bit of development aid for the South European countries' (...)".[31]

In order to prevent their uprooting in the FRG, workers were to be changed annually according to a **rotation principle** and as a rule the work contracts were initially limited to one year. It soon became apparent, however, that this rotation principle did not make economic sense, above all in industry, because companies repeatedly had to train the 'guest workers'. Though the first recruitment agreements had been made with Italy, Greece and Spain before the Wall was built, the shortage of workers in the FRG increased so sharply due to lack of immigration from the GDR thereafter that it was necessary to turn to other countries for recruitment. These were, in addition to Portugal and Yugoslavia, countries such as Turkey, Morocco and Tunisia, in which the majority of the population were Muslims. Consequently, the proportion of migrant workers, in particular from Turkey, continued to increase, becoming in 1972 "the largest among the national groups" of foreign workers.[32] For a long time federal policy was geared towards the majority mainstream of the population of the FRG, which viewed the ‚guest workers' above all as an economic necessity and their quickest-possible return as a matter of course.

[30] Neue Potenziale – Zur Lage der Integration in Deutschland; hrsg. v. Berlin-Institut für Bevölkerung und Entwicklung; Berlin 2014; S. 19; www.berlin-institut.org/publikationen/studien/neue-potenziale.html
[31] Ulrich Herbert: Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland; Munich 2001; p.210
[32] Loc. sit.; p. 224

It was not until between 1966 and 1968 as the NPD was elected into the government of 7 states and met with the approval of some sections of the majority population throughout Germany with their xenophobic words that the federal government had to react, all the more as they feared substantial damage to their image in other countries, too. The principle victims of **radical right-wing baiting** were the workers from Turkey, who were accused of having a different Asian background and were marginalised as being non-European on the grounds of their different religious beliefs. The fact that this propaganda also in the minds of representatives of the federal government is made clear, for example, by the statements of the then interior minister Zimmermann during an interview about the comparison between the Turkish migrant workers and the Italian immigrants: "They come from a different culture and in different proportions. There is a huge difference having 1.7 Muslims on my doorstep who in reality don't really want to stay here forever, and don't want to integrate (...)".[33] For this reason the response of federal policy to the phenomena of right-wing radicalism was not primarily to facilitate integration in Germany, but to excuse these phenomena as quasi natural reaction to potential 'foreign infiltration' and the focus was laid upon restricting recruitment as far as this was economically viable.

By 1967/68 the economic boom had begun to slow down and when the oil crisis arrived in 1973 this appeared to be the welcome occasion both domestically and in the sender countries to end recruitment. The result of this political decision, however, was completely contrary to the desired aim, for due to a massive increase in family reunions as a reaction to the **recruitment ban** it was not the proportion of 'guest workers' that rose, but the proportion of migrants in the population as a whole that rose significantly. In the end, the fear that entry into the country could be denied to family members sparked an increase in emigration to the FRG. At the latest with this development it became clear that even though many migrants still wanted to return home, an extended stay was to be expected and integration policy would have to be adapted to take account of this. Instead of this, the FRG continued with an exclusion policy, especially as this promised greater success at the polls. Consequently, for example, a repatriation assistance law was created, which extensively petered out having had no effect. The fear of an unbridled influx of Turkish immigrants after the opening of the EU labour market in 1986 intensified the policy of exclusion, fomented resentment against the migrant group in public debate, and reinforced prejudices and the exclusion of this section of the population. This is particularly shameful in view of the fact that at this point in time the majority of the second and third generation descendants of Turkish 'guest workers' had already been born in the FRG and had been part of social reality for a long time. That this "refusal of politics to acknowledge the situation up until the 1990s" has not only consolidated xenophobic attitudes in the majority society, but has also "caused historically mental damage" rather than having "left behind partly sustainable collective-mental irritations, as Klaus Bode emphasises, are reflected in the statements of some of the interviewees of Turkish origin in the "Mobile Identities" project".[34]

[33] „Der Spiegel" 02.07.1983; quoted from: Ulrich Herbert: Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland; Munich 2001; p. 253

[34] Klaus J. Bade / Jochen Oltmer: Normalfall Migration; Bonn 2004; S. 85

A **political rethink** did not occur until the collapse of the Eastern Bloc and the mass immigration of refugees and ethnic German resettlers in the early 1990s. Integration as a task for the whole of Germany was now explicitly related to the expansion and further development of the FRG in line with the constitution. In addition, there was a need to deal with the fears and apprehension regarding the bygone defeated 'Greater Germany' among politicians such as Margaret Thatcher. Xenophobic acts of violence, such as in Hoyerswerda in 1991, Rostock in 1992, Mölln in 1992 and in Sollingen in 1993 appeared to justify these fears, so that politics urgently had to take up position against xenophobia. Significantly, the attacks in the old federal states of Schleswig-Holstein and North-Rhine Westphalia were not against newly-arrived immigrants, but against three families of Turkish origin that had been established in the FRG for decades. The reaction to these acts of violence took the form of large demonstrations at which citizens with and without an immigration background declared their solidarity and issued a reminder that they all belong to the German population. Parallel to this, business representatives signalled a new requirement for computer scientists and engineers as a result of the rapid development of the high-tech sector. In doing so, they brought immigration onto the political agenda as an issue of global competitiveness, so that an increasing identity as an immigration country has been noticeable since 1998 among decision makers and in media debate in the FRG. As unsatisfying the immigration law of 2005 may ultimately have been, it was at least the first step towards recognising the co-existence of people with and without an immigration background in the FRG as normal. The economic necessity of immigration, as the project "Mobile Identities" shows, has become even greater today, so that a new immigration law is currently under debate. A stark reminder that this discussion is not without tension, and that the majority of the population is not open to it, comes from the minister for immigration: "according to studies, two thirds of Germans would like to see no further immigration from non-EU countries" and "approximately 50 per cent of Germans reject any further influx from EU member states".[35]

If we want to understand the reciprocal relationship between the native population and the population of Turkish origin, then we need to throw some light on the topic of "**Islam**" in the public debate of post-reunification Germany. As pointed out in the quotation from Interior Minister Zimmermann, until the end of the 1980s political stakeholders and the majority of the population viewed Islam as a foreign culture that did not have a place in Europe. In many sections of the population in Germany this rejection turned into Islamophobia following the attacks of 11 September 2001 in the USA, and further actions of radicals who justify themselves via Islam. Even the media did not make an inconsiderable contribution to fuelling fears among the population. The population of Turkish origin frequently felt themselves pressurised by the majority population to justify themselves, which in relation to the reality of the peaceful co-existence of Muslims and non-Muslims in the FRG were totally unreasonable. The political reaction to this was for Interior Minister Wolfgang Schäuble to convene the first Federal German Islam Conference, which on the one hand elucidated the immense diversity and heterogeneity of Muslim life in Germany, and on the other, gave

[35] http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/inland/einwanderungsgesetz-integrationsministerin-sieht-spd-konzept-kritisch-13468032.html

more than just a verbal signal that Islam belonged to Germany and Europe. In the meantime, the German Islam Conference (DIK) has become an established institution in the process of political participation and has been expanded to include the Young Islam Conference.

The bestseller "*Deutschland schafft sich ab*" (Germany Does Itself In) by Thilo Sarrazin tried in 2010 to make socially acceptable anti-Islamic propaganda and the marginalisation of the majority of citizens with a Turkish immigration background in particular as unwilling and unable to integrate. In this situation, too, the federal government gave clear signals, with the then federal president Christian Wulff propagated in his speech on the 20th anniversary of German reunification: "Islam belongs to Germany". None the less, Sarrazin's book was a major contribution to increasing the feeling of rejection and marginalisation among citizens of Turkish origin. In addition, the debate stirred up by Sarrazin about failed integration in Bade's opinion was a diversion from the actual core issue of an immigration society, then "important in the immigrant immigration society is not only what you have to defend yourself against, but also what you stand for together. The (...) solidarity of the 'we' that secures the supportive two-way basic trust in a democratic immigration society is a thorn in the side of extremists on all sides".[36] Finally, similarly to anti-Islamic propaganda, Sarrazin uses a completely undifferentiated stereotype of the population of Turkish origin in his attack. To a great extent this group is diverse and heterogeneous in present-day Germany with regard not only to its religious and ethnic identities, but also to its social status, political orientation, way of life and educational achievement. "This needs to be more firmly anchored in the public's perception, too. (...) Only with a differentiated approach will we be able to exploit potential and promote positive developments, and identify and rectify shortcomings", as Jan Hanrath already demanded in 2011 in a publication of the *Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung* (Federal Agency for Civic Education).[37]

Looking back on almost **55 years of Turkish-German migration history**, Klaus Bade declared: "in spite of the long absence of integration concepts, in spite of a number of hesitations in the integration process among the immigrant population and in spite of equally immense social flashpoints, the German path towards an immigration society is still an overall pragmatic success".[38] As immigrants had not been assimilated, no potential could emerge from which all partners in the migration process – Turkey, Germany and the immigrants – could actually benefit. Although the lives of most families of Turkish origin are based in the FRG, they continued to nurture ties to the homeland and retained their knowledge of their own language and system. Many citizens of Turkish origin, irrespective of whether they have experienced migration themselves, do not want to choose between German or Turkish identity, but want a combination of the two. This multiple identity was viewed as an advantage by many interviewees of Turkish origin in the 'Mobile Identities' and 'ID' projects. This was under the proviso, however, that they could independently choose it and that the majority society respects this identity as being appropriate. Technical progress in respect of the transport and information infrastructures makes repeated or regular commuting between Germany

[36] Klaus J. Bade: Kritik und Gewalt; Schwalbach/Ts. 2013; S. 365

[37] http://www.bpb.de/apuz/59735/vielfalt-der-tuerkeistaemmigen-bevoelkerung-in-deutschland?p=all; S. 6

[38] http://kjbade.de/bilder/Bade_OBS.pdf

and Turkey possible. With the support of German building societies, entire roadways and villages have been built in Turkey. An entrepreneur of Turkish origin takes thousands of German holidaymakers to Turkey and German pensioners are moving to Turkey and bolstering the economy there**.** Turkish restaurants are an integral part of German cityscapes, German radio stations and discotheques play Türkçe Pop and Turkish influences enliven the design of clothing, jewellery and furniture. Germany is Turkeys biggest trade partner with a bilateral trade volume running at 33 billion Euros. There are almost 6,000 companies with German capital participation in Turkey and in addition to large companies like Mercedes, MAN, BASF, Siemens, Bayer and Bosch; ever more medium-sized enterprises are setting up subsidiary companies in Turkey.[39] In the process, the German businesses have almost always used the knowledge of language and systems as well as the networks of citizens of Turkish origin. They are also increasingly succeeding in founding their own companies, which link the German and Turkish economic areas. Both the economic and the cultural exchanges bring mutual benefits and bring about new innovative symbioses. A prerequisite for this successful circular migration is the unfettered freedom of mobility between the two countries, which is exclusively steered by the individual. Only in this way can „transnational social areas be established, in which economic, political and cultural relationships between persons and groups cross over the borders of sovereign states."[40]

### 4.2. Consequences of this Migration with Regard to the Identity of the Population with a Turkish Migration Background and the Majority Society

The history of migration described above still has a **mental, social and political effect** today for the population of Turkish origin and the indigenous German population. The functionalisation of people to economic resources, whose life in residential homes was reduced to the rhythm of work and breaks from work with the aim of regeneration for work, characterised the self-image and the perception of the Turkish migrant workers in the FRG up until the 1970s. The lack of interest of most fellow citizens in the person and the individual history of any single immigrant represented a collective insult, which makes the especially high esteem held by many citizens of Turkish origin for dignity and respect a plausible reaction. By contrast, without thinking, the population of German origin linked the 'recruitment of guest workers' to one of the darkest chapters of German history: 'the use of forced labour'. As this chapter was not processed sociopolitically until the 1990s, judgments and prejudices regarding foreign workers continued to in the minds in many citizens.

As labour migration was voluntary, many Germans saw themselves as 'rich benefactors' for their poor neighbours. Not only the role as 'guest', but also the functionalisation of the people as manpower and the subordinate role allocation into 'benefactors and supplicants' freed German politics, society and each indi-

[39] Handelsblatt 26.04.2014:"Enge Bande – Deutsch-Türkische Wirtschaftsbeziehungen" by Gerd Höhler; http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/international/deutsch-tuerkischen-wirtschaftsbeziehungen-enge-bande/9806016.html

[40] Jan Hanrath; loc. sit. ; p. 5

vidual citizen from the responsibility of perceiving an immigrant holistically and offering them support and help. Therefore we can see this lack of responsibility a cause of the maligned 'segregation' of the population of Turkish origin, as it was in their own community where they were able to get the help and support they needed. If the lack of success at school of pupils of Turkish origin is currently bemoaned, this has an aftertaste of hypocrisy, if the structural deficits of language development before and at school are left unchecked and there is no admonishment of the dilemma of federal structures in educational policy. As long as structural changes in educational policy do not appear on the integration policy agenda, government schemes such as educational vouchers are just token gestures which cannot solve the problem. Also, the lack of success in education cannot be dismissed as a self-inflicted deficit of this population group, but first and foremost caused by the discrimination in the apprenticeship and labour markets, as the Federal Anti-discrimination Office had discovered in an investigation in 2013.[41]

The interviews with Germans of Turkish origin confirmed the findings of the investigation, as the interviewees gave the impression again and again that they were **discriminated against on the labour market** and did not have the same chances of advancement as their German counterparts.[42] As those with political responsibility do not communicate the causes of these effects, however, it is no surprise that most people seek the reasons for the lack of success in education among the population of Turkish origin and also in other contexts principally see the deficits in this population group and not in their own integrative capacity. Therefore, the economic performance and the cultural contribution made by the population of Turkish origin over the last 50 years are also neither sufficiently communicated nor praised in the public arena. The aforementioned irritations and the mental insecurity that was referred to by Klaus Bade[43], the feeling of marginalisation and the lack of acceptance for the otherness of this population group, which none the less is a component part of Germany's development and its present, are concretised politically in the argument surrounding dual citizenship. A collective mental effect of these experiences of irritation and marginalisation is the tendency to conservative traditionalism in a small section of the population of Turkish origin and the new phenomenon of the radicalisation of young people on the grounds of religion.

For the population of German origin the result of this common experience of history in terms of a mental, but also political effect up to the present day is the lack of preparedness to reflect on one's own nationally-exclusive values (mainstream German culture) and to agree to the common development of new values with all population groups, therefore de facto not just to recognise the status of the FRG as an immigrant society, but also to participate in its formation. The price of this blinkered persistence is a lack of societal

[41] "Discrimination in education and in working life"; second collaborative report of the Federal Anti-discrimination Office and associated Commissioner of the Federal Government and the German Parliament; 2013
[42] E.g. Interview 05, 09, 17
[43] See footnote 6

internationalisation and signal of societal openness, which is perceived abroad by the more highly qualified in particular and represents a clear disadvantage in the competition for these people.[44]

# 5. Temporary and Circular Migration Programmes

In Germany temporary and circular migration are very common. At first, almost all of the migration paths taken by third-country nationals to Germany are of a temporary nature, i.e. their residence is of limited duration. This central chapter of the report will firstly provide information about important forms of immigration (chapter 5.1). We shall then present the assessments of the experts (chapter 5.2) and migrants (chapter 5.3) we interviewed on the subject of migration to Germany and how they view life in the country for migrants.

## 5.1. Legal and Organisational Framework

There are a number of ways of migrating to Germany and the conditions involved in this change relatively frequently. The most important aspect is whether the migration is from another EU country or from a third country. In certain circumstances EU citizens have freedom of movement and are allowed to stay in Germany without a visa or residence permit.[45] Internal migration from a EU state currently makes up the largest proportion of immigration to Germany (approx. two thirds in 2014, see above). The situation is entirely different for third-country nationals (TCN). If we disregard immigration on humanitarian grounds or for family reunion, TCN must have a place at university or on a training course, or have a job if they want to settle in Germany.[46]

In Germany there are various special forms of **immigration for the purpose of taking up employment** that are at first temporary, and which are described in more detail in the tables in appendix 1. These include, for example, regulations for seasonal workers, show assistants, domestic helps, workers on fixed-term contracts, guest workers, au-pairs, speciality cooks, care workers, international staff exchanges or holders of the EU Blue Card. Each programme has its own specific requirements regarding the qualifications of the participants and access to the labour market. For seasonal workers and show assistants there were bilateral agreements with individual countries of origin and annual quotas that could be adapted to meet demand. These programmes will soon have completely run their course as they affect countries which now belong to

[44] See Interview 03: "There is no sense of "us" in Germany, no identity. In England it's easier, being British. British identity has no ethnic connotation." (42:00 f.)

[45] Cf. Law on the general freedom of movement of EU citizens (Freizügigkeitsgesetz/EU – FreizügG/EU). Online at http://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/bundesrecht/freiz_gg_eu_2004/gesamt.pdf

[46] One exception is in §18c of the Law on Residency, employment and integration of foreigners in the FRG (*Aufenthaltsgesetz – AufenthG*) covering the possibility for qualified workers to obtain a residence permit in order to search for employment. This job search visa for allows a maximum stay of six months in Germany if the applicant possesses an academic degree and their livelihood is secured. One interviewee called this a "paradigm change", as it has become possible for the first time to immigrate to Germany without having secured a job beforehand. (cf. Expert interview 07)

the EU and whose citizens will enjoy freedom of movement for workers from July 2015 at the latest (see below). They were organised by the Federal Employment Agency, Centre for International Placement Services (ZAV) and the employment agencies or ministries of the source countries. There are also programmes for immigrant care workers based on bilateral agreements with the countries of origin (see below).

At the height of seasonal worker employment in Germany this form of immigration was used by 300,000 people annually. These figures have reduced considerably as a result of the eastward expansion of the EU. However, the work is undertaken by the same workers who now no longer need a work permit and can work in Germany freely under EU freedom of movement for workers. The same applies for Polish care workers who are now employed as EU citizens in private households in Germany. Other forms of immigration that we have mentioned include a few hundred to many thousands of participants; figures relating to this can be found in the tables in Annex 1.

One regulation relevant to the "Mobile Identities" project which requires further explanation is the **EU Blue Card**.[47] It was introduced in August 2012 and bundles together various regulations for the immigration of (highly) qualified migrants. The EU Blue Card is based on an EU guideline and should have been introduced as early as 2011. The delay can be attributed to the removal of free movement restrictions of the EU8 which were being phased out at the same time.[48] Germany implemented the EU guideline in a very liberal way with the aim of creating the most attractive form of immigration possible for specialist workers. Therefore, income limits were reduced (2014: €47,600; in shortage professions €37,128) and the "priority check" abolished.[49] Language courses are no longer obligatory. Regulations about spouses and children are also liberally interpreted and allow the spouse to move to Germany without attending a language course beforehand, as many immigrants as part of the family reunification process have to do. Spouses of those in possession of a EU Blue Card have the right from the very first day to take up employment in Germany. Holders of a EU Blue Card can leave Germany for longer than six months without losing their status; this can be very beneficial to circular migration. Initially, residence is limited to four years. The regulation, however, was conceived with permanent residence in mind: after 33 months (21 months with appropriate knowledge of German) – and not as usual five years – a holder of a EU Blue Card can be granted a settlement permit.[50] Approximately 16,000 EU Blue Cards were issued within the first two years after the introduction of this residence permit, many of which to people who had changed their status (e.g. foreign graduates of a German university). The main countries of origin were India, the USA and Russia.

A second aspect of immigration requiring further elucidation, as it is particularly relevant to the "Mobile Identities" project, are the **programmes for the recruitment of care workers** from China and Vietnam, whereby the latter is a particular point of focus. Both programmes are based on the extreme lack of per-

[47] Both of these descriptions are used synonymously in the report.
[48] Expert interview 07
[49] I.e. The Federal Employment Agency does not have to check whether the position could also be filled by a German or other EU citizen.
[50] Law on residence, employment and integration of foreigners in the FRG: (*Aufenthaltsgesetz – AufenthG*) § 19a EU Blue Card

sonnel in the care sector, which can barely be covered with native personnel or employees from other EU states and which will become worse in the coming years.[51] However, in order to recruit staff from third countries bilateral agreements and special regulations are required, as there is still an absence of a legal basis for immigration in this field.[52]

Firstly, an explanation of the recruitment programme with **China**: The pilot project, involving federal ministries, such as the Federal Employment Agency, the Centre for International Placement Services (ZAV), the Federal Association of German Employers' Federations, the Care Sector Employers' Association, the ministries of the federal states of Baden-Württemberg, Hessen und Hamburg, the Chinese Embassy and the Chinese Ministry of Employment, as well as the Goethe Institute, local language course providers and various employers, includes 150 participants from China. These have all gained a bachelor degree in their country of origin and have at least one year's experience of working in the health sector. Following a selection process, they received eight months' language and intercultural training in China (level B1) and after their arrival in Germany a level B2 language course for a maximum of 6 months and further training in the German health sector – during which to all intents and purposes they were already working in the institutions. The costs of the training and language courses were carried by the employers, who then had a vested interest in attaching the care workers to their institutions and furthering their integration.[53]

The recruitment programme with **Vietnam** also involves the Federal Employment Agency, the Centre for International Placement Services (ZAV), the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, the German Society for International Cooperation (GIZ), the Goethe Institute and the Vietnamese government, and in particular the Ministry for Employment there. The programme provides for a comprehensive evaluation which is carried out by the IEGUS institute as the coordinator of the evaluator. Plans for the programme began in 2012; a year later the GIZ began the applicant selection process. There were 100 participants in the first round of the programme, all of whom had a university degree in a healthcare field and entry-level professional experience. They began their language course in Hanoi (A2 and German for the Workplace) and continued up to level B2 parallel to their training in Germany, supported by the Federal Ministry for Migrants and Refugees (BAMF). The preparation also included intercultural training and information sessions; the participants are closely supported on the programme. When they arrived in Germany, they began a shortened two-year dual training course in the area of geriatric care. Experiences in the first round have shown that language preparation up to level A2 in the country of origin is far from satisfactory and that the training as geriatric nurses, which had been shortened by one year, had also not been optimally planned, because the participants had to be taught about basic care, as this was not a part of their training at university in Vietnam. The lessons learned from these experiences formed the basis for changes to the

[51] Cf. i.a. Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Technology (Publisher) (2012): Opportunities for the recruitment of skilled workers in the Care Sector. [*Chancen zur Gewinnung von Fachkräften in der Pflegewirtschaft]*. Abridged. Online at: http://www.bmwi.de/BMWi/Redaktion/PDF/Publikationen/Studien/chancen-zur-gewinnung-von-fachkraeften-in-der-pflegewirtschaft,property=pdf,bereich=bmwi2012,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf

[52] Expert interview 01

[53] Expert interview 01

second round of the programme. In addition, the participants relay their experiences of the first round to new participants. The pilot programme was financed by the German government and public funds. The plan is for the employers to assume the costs for any further recruitment after the pilot phase and for this programme to be privately run in the future.[54]

### 5.2. Assessment of the Migration Programmes by the Interviewed Stakeholders

The currently propagated **'triple win'** of the bilateral mobility programmes, e.g. in the geriatric care sector, is no different from the arguments used to justify the recruitment of guest workers in Germany in the 1960s.[55] The statement of one interviewee shows that this justification is at least contentious today, describing the recruitment of skilled workers from third countries as "theft from the country of origin, which for Germany, as such a rich country, should not be necessary – train them yourselves".[56] Therefore, a key recommendation of the national workshop was not just that the partner country for a bilateral labour market programme should be very carefully selected, but also that a very close check should be made to determine in which clearly defined occupational field such an exchange would generate added value for the source land. With regard to current bilateral programmes in the geriatric care sector, however, this added value was doubted by the majority of the workshop participants, as the transfer of knowledge from German care institutions has not resulted in the creation of structures for qualified geriatric care locally in either China or in Vietnam. In addition, a transfer of knowledge by returning care workers is debatable, as the participating companies in particular expect that the qualified employees stay with the company – incidentally a lesson that can also be drawn from the 'guest worker employment' phase. Moreover, with these bilateral agreements, which are negotiated at the political level, the desire to control the flow of migrants is father to the thought.[57] Today, as sixty years ago, the individuals subject to negotiation in these programmes are functionalised in respect of the economy in both the source and destination countries and reduced to this aspect, but "people don't allow themselves be pushed back and forth like machines or goods".[58]

Although as a rule these **bilateral programmes** are planned to last three to five years, the forced repatriation of most of the participants was condemned "on the grounds of their human rights" and rejected with reference to family and other personal ties in Germany.[59] The discussion in the workshop also showed that the majority were against rigid residence restrictions and in favour of individual and flexible solutions. Only by letting the individual decide whether to stay or return will we avoid repeating the cardinal mistake of

[54] Expert interviews 02 and 11
[55] Expert interview 02: "Remissions", Transfer of "professional knowhow"; see footnote 3 also
[56] Expert interview 05 (32:00)
[57] Expert interview 03: "You cannot switch migration flows on and off like a tap." (47:30)
[58] Loc. Sit. (35:00)
[59] Expert interview 02 (17:00); see interview 01 also: "It's obvious! You can't say that after 3 or 5 years they have to go back, they might have family here (...)" (15:40)

guest worker migration, and Germany's identity as a true land of immigration be clearly signalled. Furthermore, it was suggested in the workshop that suitable participants on these bilateral programmes be especially promoted as so-called "bridge builders" or role models in executive capacities, so as to make the bilateral programme more attractive. Overall in the workshop, however, the success of these programmes was adjudged to be meagre, especially with regard to the number of participants.

Taking into consideration the detailed description of the special German-Turkish relationship the question arises of why **Turkey** was not chosen as the partner for a bilateral agreement. Germany is not a "terra incognita" for these immigrants and after many years of interpersonal contact the linguistic barriers are comparatively low and an increasing number of people of Turkish origin requiring care are being admitted into geriatric care homes. When interviewed, one expert referred to the special quality of the relations between Germany and Turkey, which among other things was down to the population of Turkish origin against all expectations of assimilation have maintained a "transnational social area" and by fostering the Turkish language and Turkish culture have created "transnational social capital" that all German citizens can profit from.[60] He believes that a high level of transnational mobility can be observed among young qualified people with Turkish roots in particular and that German-Turkish relations have helped to add a new quality to "circular migration".[61] Unlike seasonal mobility in agriculture, repeatedly changing between Turkey and Germany has become matter of fact for these young Germans of Turkish origin and their knowledge of the languages and systems in both countries enables them to exploit opportunities on both labour markets. This begs the question why economic and labour-market considerations of those in positions of responsibility in the FRG do not refer back to these longstanding well-established bilateral relationships.

Compared with the bilateral mobility agreements the EU Blue Card model appears to be a lot more progressive. Here too, residence is at first fixed term, but after 33 months in employment the immigrant is granted the right to permanent residence, may spend a period of more than six months abroad without losing the right to permanent residence, and family reunification is possible.

Access to the **Blue Card**, however, is restricted to the hotly sought-after academics, for which reason one stakeholder suggested including non-academics in the scheme, "that would be something we could think about (...), we could at least discuss it".[62] Although the EU Blue Card was adjudged by this interviewee to be one of the most progressive instruments of immigration policy in the world, he believes the attractiveness of the legal framework for the target group to be secondary. Thus, for example "the pool of English or French-speaking highly-qualified people (...) is far larger than the German-speaking one" and the demands placed on the German language skills of immigrants are often inappropriately high particularly in small and medium-sized enterprises.[63] The importance of language knowledge was also discussed during the workshop and the participants pointed out that this was not only relevant with regard to professional training,

[60] Expert interview 03 (22:00)
[61] Expert interview 03 (07:20)
[62] Expert interview 07 (28:30)
[63] Expert interview 07 (16:00) (38:00)

but played an equally important role in social participation. Consequently, this should not only mean a one-sided improvement in German skills, but also the demand for the widespread internationalisation of society, which could take the form, for example, of offering the possibility of communicating in English in all service sectors.

Many interviewees complained of a lack of "social gestures" of respect and acceptance and that despite exemplary legislation there were still instances of **discrimination**, then "laws are one thing, but people, the social aspect, are another."[64] One interviewee referred to the economic theory of Richard Florida, according to which technology, talents and tolerance are strong drivers of economic development, and regretted that the "tolerance" factor was not yet that strong in Germany. Although a study by the Berlin Institute for Population and Development provides conclusive evidence that the theories presented by Florida only apply to the German economic area in a limited way, it remains incontestable that the internationalisation of the economy and society are a driving force for economic growth.[65] However, the term "tolerance", which conveys a passive, more uncommitted attitude, should be replaced with the term "respect", in order to show appreciation for the otherness of the immigrant.[66]

It was particularly emphasised in the workshop that after 9/11 receptiveness towards Muslim and non-Muslim immigrants was very different, as **Muslims**, due to their representation in the media, were under the general suspicion of being terrorists. This is particularly disappointing for fellow citizens of Turkish origin who for generations have lived in Germany and the majority of whom are Muslims. The far-reaching ethnic definition of German identity also deters people outside of Germany.[67] Xenophobic attacks and movements such as PEGIDA, whose ideas are spread throughout the world via modern media, reinforce this negative publicity. According to one interviewee it must not be underestimated that today every single experience of discrimination can be communicated via social networks such as Facebook within minutes.[68] Moreover, the point was raised that the international reporting in the media of demonstrations by PEGIDA or xenophobic attacks could give people the impression in other countries that civil-war-like conditions prevailed in Germany, even though this swing to the right existed in every country in Europe. Those in positions of responsibility in industry and in politics combat these impressions, e.g. by launching image or news campaigns. Looking from the outside it seems to many that a policy of immigration which on the one hand sets up a "Welcome Centre" and on the other commissions an "Aliens Registration Authority" is contradictory and it is not transparent for immigrants that an engineer who has fled Syria is not welcome in the Wel-

[64] Expert interview 05 (27:40); see also expert interview 11: "It's about changing what's going on in people's heads" (42:30)
[65] Talents, Technology and Tolerance – where Germany's future lies (*Talente, Technologie und Toleranz - wo Deutschland Zukunft hat*); published by the Berlin-Institut für Bevölkerung und Entwicklung 2007; in particular p. 25 ff.; http://www.berlin-institut.org/publikationen/studien/talente-technologie-und-toleranz.html
[66] Expert interview 05 (22:00)
[67] Expert interview 05; see also footnote 16
[68] Expert interview 11 (44:00)

come Centre, but an engineer from Russia is.[69] The interviewees of Turkish origin in particular, but also stakeholders from the Aliens Registration Authority, bemoaned the two-tier immigration policy, which on the one hand skims off the potential in source countries and on the other does not promote the potential in its own population.[70] Here, federal policy seems to be guided more by economic rules, i.e. keeping the financial expenses in the current situation as low as possible, rather than being guided by future possibilities for the development of the national economy, which would admittedly be more expensive in the present, but would unlock potential for the future.

### 5.3. Assessment of the Migration Programmes by the Interviewed Migrants

The statements made by the migrants we interviewed must be evaluated in a more differentiated way than those of the experts, as the significance of their statements is dependent not only on their **residence status** and the security of their residence, but also on the **length of residence** and their resulting knowledge of the language and systems. Therefore, when analysing in particular the statements of interviewees currently on mobility programmes in the geriatric care sector, we must take into account that due to their residence status and their life situation in general they are highly dependent on those running the programme and their employees and due to their relatively short period of residence in Germany most have little knowledge of the language and systems. For this reason, the interviewees in this group tended to express themselves very carefully and reservedly. Criticism of the mobility programme was usually aimed at the dissemination of information about recruitment and preparation, so generally at procedures.

By contrast, the group of interviewees who have/had been in Germany for many years, whose residence is in the main secure and are predominantly well versed in the language and the systems expressed themselves much more openly about their own life situation as an immigrant in Germany. Participants in this group did not only criticise legal structures and procedures, they also referred to specific deficits in society such as the majority population's reluctance to communicate and their own experiences or feelings of discrimination. Their longer period of residence in Germany gave many of the interviewees the time to reflect on the effect of their experiences of marginalisation or insecure life perspectives on their mental state. Some of them went into detail about how circular mobility affects them mentally, and there was even mention of psycho-social aspects. As the migrants interviewed are themselves affected, their accounts from the individual perspective represent an important addition to the rather more abstract and general statements of the stakeholders.

There are many **reasons** for participating in a work programme or for migrating including personal ones, but where bilateral mobility programmes are concerned the professional aspect predominates. The lack of career prospects and low wages, the opportunity to gather knowledge and experience relevant to the labour market, as well as to gain further qualifications were frequently mentioned by the interviewees. When

[69] Expert interview 03 (36:00); Interview 06
[70] Expert interview 08; see also footnote 18

comparing countries, the particularly distinguishing factors about Germany for the interviewees were the quality of its training system and its excellent reputation in the automotive, machinery construction and engineering sectors: "All over the world people say that Germany has the best engineers – I wanted to be one of them".[71] The most attractive employers appear to be the world-wide renowned large concerns, although the economy in Germany is based more on small to medium-sized enterprises. One reason that these large concerns are particularly valued as employers is that they appear to promise development opportunities and usually have an international business culture. Some of the immigrants from third countries find the architecture and construction sectors exemplary and hope to be able to transfer the knowledge and experience gained to their country of origin. Low university fees and the quality of training courses attract people from third countries to study in Germany. In addition to these training and other professional aspects, the German language and culture were given as reasons for choosing Germany, especially by interviewees from eastern European third countries.[72] Other reasons for choosing Germany as the destination country were also purely pragmatic, e.g. the chance to gain access to the German labour market through employment programmes or labour market initiatives. If we summarise these reasons, two aspects become apparent, which should be considered in order to change Germany's public image in the future: firstly, the insufficient perception of small and medium-sized enterprises as potential employers and secondly, it is not sufficiently clear to potential immigrants that Germany, as an aging society, offers many opportunities in the service sector in particular.

Although the mobility programmes under study theoretically provide for a limited period of residence in Germany, many of the interviewees expressed the wish for an unlimited period of residence in Germany, or the possibility of deciding for themselves over time. If the decisive factors for choosing Germany as the host country when migrating are training and employment, the reasons for wanting to stay in Germany for longer or permanently are often related to their private life. Personal contacts and relationships with Germans often develop while they are in the country to work: "I wanted to stay in the country where I lived. (...) It's not until you meet more people that you want to stay."[73] The regional setting also has an influence on the decision to stay in Germany, especially when it is regarded as cosmopolitan and international: "I'm very happy in Hamburg. Hamburg's my first choice and always will be."[74] If the political circumstances in the country of origin are more authoritarian, during the stay in Germany these become seen as negative and the basic democratic rights and equality of opportunity in German society become weighty arguments in favour of staying. Moreover, the German work ethic and virtues such as reliability were also cited by some interviewees. It has already been stated above that immigrants from Turkey have higher demands than other migrant groups regarding their views and expectations of German politics and society. This is also clear with regard to remaining in the country, because they are much more critical of developmental tendencies than are immigrants from third countries: "It has been officially recognised that we are an im-

[71] Interview 11
[72] Interview 18
[73] Interview 9
[74] Interview 10

migration society. The question is how we tackle something like that. There is major resistance in German society: PEGIDA, Thilo Sarazzin. If the transition to an immigration country succeeds, Germany will be of interest to me – irrespective of economic development. If it doesn't succeed, then Germany is a country of no interest to me."[75]

When asked, the interviewees gave not only reasons to stay in Germany, but also to **leave the country again**. However, the interviewees participating in mobility programmes, e.g. in geriatric care in Germany, are not free to decide when their work contract ends and therefore their residence permit expires. It also became clear in the interviews that the participants on the mobility programmes were very much involved with their current training and work situation and had little scope for planning their future: "At the moment we're concentrating on our exams; we've got to pass them first. Then we think we might stay here for about three years. We're still thinking about whether to stay here or go somewhere else."[76] The interviewees who had already been in the FRG for a longer time, however, and whose residence status was in the main secure, supplied arguments for leaving the country from the context of their private as well as their working lives. A number of times family ties in the country of origin were given as an argument not to stay in particular by interviewees on mobility programmes: "There are times when you want to be closer to your own people"[77]; or: "They can receive pictures on their mobile phones, so I send them pictures of me. They miss me."[78] The parental duty to provide for the family, which is the tradition in some cultures of origin, can be a reason for returning to the country of origin: "One [of the brothers] has to go and live in India [to be there for the parents]."[79] For some of the interviewees the German mentality, which others regard positively, is a negative factor: "I think the Germans are uncool people. They're too rational for me. I don't like German thoroughness, discipline, everything just so. I've got a lot of German friends, but I don't find them cool either, to be honest. I want to be incorrect now and again, I'm not a machine - I'm a human being."[80] The interviewees described a number of incidences of discrimination that occurred in their private and working lives, such as: "People smile at you and then stab you in the back".[81] Opportunities for a professional career appear to them to be scarcer than in other immigration countries such as the USA or the UK. One interviewee, who wanted to run for a political party, bemoaned the lack of opportunity for political participation, as the answer he received was: "You're not the candidate the Germans want".[82] Another reason to leave Germany can also be a booming economy in the home country, as stated by interviewees in particular from India and Turkey. In general, the majority of the interviewees emphasised that flexible adaptation to global economic developments and a willingness to be mobile as the preconditions for optimising their own career paths.

[75] Interview 17
[76] Interview 06
[77] Interview 18
[78] Interview 06
[79] Interview 08
[80] Interview 17
[81] Interview 01
[82] Interview 17

**The relationship of the immigrant to the country of origin** also varies significantly according to the social and economic situation in the respective homelands and of course depends very much on the individual socio-economic background. The migrant workers from Vietnam we interviewed, who are currently participating in mobility programmes, regularly send money to their families to support them. They miss their families very much and keep in contact at least once a week: "I 'phone my family. They live in the country, where there's no internet. So I have to 'phone. Other people lend them a mobile 'phone, so that we can talk."[83] For the majority of these people migration is an economic necessity, which is supposed to make life easier for them and their families, and after a few years abroad they hope to return to their homelands. German culture and the German language do interest most of them, but due to the enormous effort they put into their training and work, for example on the mobility programmes for nurses, they scarcely have time to build relationships with Germans. The overall conditions of the programme and the desire of many to return to Vietnam result in the Vietnamese living together, spending their work and leisure time together, and therefore remaining in their culture of origin.

While financial responsibility for the family in the homeland is great among the interviewees from **Vietnam**, the socio-economic situation of the migrant workers from India appears to be considerably better. The bond to the family in the homeland is also very strong for this group, although less a matter of economic responsibility and more of respect for the family hierarchy, but also, as already shown, of traditional responsibilities.[84] When money is transferred to India, it is not usually used for the upkeep of the family, but saved towards building up a business in India.[85] The lives and working worlds of the interviewees from India appear to be much more global than those of the migrant workers from Vietnam, as the former migrate many times within Europe and between European countries and India. It must be born in mind, however, that the Indian interviewees are highly qualified academics who have many options globally and for whom mobility is a central element of their own career paths.

Another group comprises the interviewees from **African countries** such as Cameroon and Senegal. Unlike the interviewees from Vietnam the individual socio-economic background is mainly good, but the economic and political situation in the homeland is described by them as either unstable or poor. If a return to the country of origin is a consideration at all, then this would be in post-working life: "I would like to go back when I'm old. My children can grow up here. When I go back it will have nothing to do with my children. I'll go back home in my retirement."[86] Another interviewee does not want to return, but wants to dedicate himself to social causes in his homeland and "give something of his knowledge back to (his) country".[87] The very fact that some interviewees come from elevated social and economic circumstances in African countries caused many to air their discontent with what they have achieved in Germany compared with opportunities in their country of origin: "There's an element of shame. I have a degree, I'm qualified, but those

[83] Interview 5
[84] See note 51
[85] Interview 8
[86] Interview 16
[87] Interview 15

who stayed in Cameroon have achieved more. They have an apartment, a nice car, a good family, have everything in place; and then you come (here) and have to start all over again from the beginning. You might have to rent somewhere and then wonder what the others think of you."[88] They feel that the cause of their disappointing career path in Germany is not personal failure, but discrimination on the grounds of their status as immigrants, and believe they "lead a second-class life" in Germany.[89] The interviewees did not say to what extent they thought discrimination was racially-motivated.

To represent immigrants from **Eastern Europe** we interviewed a young woman from Moldova. She was also mobile within Europe and had studied and worked in both Germany and France. She described her relationship with her family in the homeland as very intensive, so her family was her only reason for returning to Moldova. However, after a short period of residence in her country of origin it became clear to her that her professional and private future lay in Germany: "You feel like a stranger in your own country. It's a culture shock at home."[90] At the time of the interview the young woman was living in Moldova and was searching for an opportunity to live and work in Germany again.

With regard to relationships to the country of origin the group of immigrants from **Turkey** once again play a special role. This is a result of the geographical proximity on the one hand and the excellent transport infrastructure on the other: from Germany you can reach almost every Turkish city within four hours by air, there are numerous daily flights from all airports to every large Turkish city and the cost of flights are very reasonable on account of the large number of airlines in this market. This makes it possible for immigrants from Turkey keep in regular contact with friends and family, not only by telephone and over the internet, but by visiting the country of origin several times a year. In addition, because of the long history of 'guest workers' the societal relationships between Germany and Turkey are so intensive that the establishment of a transnational social area would be possible in which "economic, political and cultural relationships between persons and groups cross over the borders of sovereign states" as has already been described above.[91] Both factors make the need for deciding between Turkey as country of origin and Germany as destination country redundant; you can "commute" between the two countries, as one interviewee from Turkey described it: I like Germany, but I couldn't stay here for several months at a time. It's the same with Turkey: I like Turkey, but I don't want to live there permanently."[92] Similarly to the interviewees from India, sending money home plays only a subordinate role and when people transfer money to Turkey, it is usually used to buy real estate and prepare for their own return. The innumerable remittances made by 'guest workers' in the past have made a huge contribution to Turkey's economic development. Today, Turkey has the status of emerging nation that can also definitely offer career prospects. Accordingly, an electrical engineer from Turkey then also remarked that he would choose to return to Turkey if he thought that his pro-

[88] Interview 16
[89] Loc. Sit.
[90] Interview 18
[91] Jan Hanrath; loc. sit. ; p. 5
[92] Interview 17

fessional progress in Germany was being hindered because of his Turkish origins.[93] Whereas for one interviewee a return to Turkey appears attractive because of the options for career advancement or the possibility of founding a company and joint ventures[94], others are concerned about the political and social development in Turkey, the restriction of human rights, e.g. the freedom of the press and freedom of speech, or equality for women being suppressed again. Thus it is not enough for a young physicist from Turkey to have excellent promotional prospects in his career, but to be restricted in his private life and in political participation.[95] This example clearly shows that the political and social conditions are also important for migrant workers, whose motives for their migration are mainly economic. It also shows, however, that states should not only focus on economic aspects in their prospective development, but also take politics and society into consideration if they want to enjoy sustainability in the competition for manpower.

The length and context of residence must also be taken into consideration regarding statements about **experiences in daily life**. The interviewees from Vietnam, who are currently on bilateral mobility programmes in geriatric care and have been in Germany for only a short time, expressed themselves more carefully than the others about their daily working lives. This is undoubtedly down to their insufficient knowledge of the language and systems, but their economic dependence on their employer also plays a role. All interviewees in this group emphasised the great importance of competence in the German language, not only with colleagues, but with the elderly people in their care: “We’ll have to see how the job goes, see if it goes well. It’s always so difficult with the language, with my colleagues and the residents in the home, not that easy, we’ll see.[96] One female nurse from Vietnam finds the working conditions in geriatric care very “stressful” due to the pressures of time and “staff shortages” and pointed out that things are much slower and quieter in Vietnam.[97] Language barriers can lead to misunderstandings, make working with their German colleagues difficult, especially under pressure of time, and are sometimes the cause of the rejection of Vietnamese nurses by the elderly people. On the basis of the interview findings the question arises of whether the expectations on the German side regarding speed and language competence are not too high and if geriatric care itself, with its high demands on the communication skills of the nursing staff, is the appropriate kind of work for a mobility programme. Moreover, many of the interviewees in this group were disappointed, if not shocked, by the activities that have to be carried out by geriatric nurses in Germany: “In Vietnam we trained to be nurses and we gave our patients injections or infusions, things like that, but we’re not allowed to do those things here, not in the old people’s home as a geriatric nurse. We didn’t know exactly what the job entailed, that we would have to deal with excretions and the like. Here we’re supposed to make conversation with the old people and provide basic care. We didn’t know that.”[98] The prime attraction of the work for this group is therefore the high wages and the possibility to support their families fi-

[93] Interview 13
[94] See e.g. interview 17
[95] Interview 10
[96] Interview 4
[97] Interview 3
[98] Interview 7

nancially or to save for the future. Career planning and gaining professional competences are also motives for this group, but of less importance.

Other interviewees, irrespective of their country of origin, who work in technical or business fields or are self-employed, had different views. They praised "German virtues" such as punctuality or reliability, which also ensure discipline in working life and a good working atmosphere.[99] The good reputation that Germany enjoys with regard to technological research, machine construction and engineering is another reason for these interviewees to hold the German world of work in such high esteem: "I'm privileged to have been educated in new technologies"[100] or: "All over the world people say that Germany has the best engineers – I wanted to be one of them."[101] They regard offers of support such as the 'Welcome Center' in Hamburg or 'Make-it-in-Hamburg' as practical.[102] The interviewees believe that the superiors in the companies should be aware that they are responsible for supporting migrant workers' integration in the work team and promoting their professional development. In larger enterprises and research institutes such as DESY the teams are international and the working language is English.[103] The highly qualified in particular expect the companies to be internationally oriented and their German colleagues to be able to communicate in English: "My employer said they're international and want to be international, but they aren't. Many of my colleagues don't speak English."[104] As small and medium-sized enterprises in particular are the backbone of the German economy, these interview findings show that these enterprises also need to develop an international business culture if they are to competitive in the future.

A particular phenomenon of work migration was presented by the interviewees from India employed as engineers. They are delegated to Germany for a period of three years and are generally responsible to an Indian project manager. Their working conditions and salaries are poorer than if they are employed directly by a German company. As they are an attractive workforce and there is the danger of them being headhunted, their private and working contacts are closely monitored, as reported by one Indian interviewee: "The Indians keep themselves to themselves in one particular area of Hamburg. They do not mix with other groups very often, as they have all come here to take up work. If they speak to someone outside the group, they run the risk of being stabbed in the back by someone, especially if they have an Indian project manager. He is afraid of them speaking to someone else in order to get another job. Because they are afraid of losing their jobs, they do not mix with Europeans."[105] The question remains whether these migrant workers will have positive memories of Germany as their destination country under these living and working conditions and how much responsibility the German partner company should take for the **employment conditions** of these employees.

---

[99] E.g. interview 13
[100] Interview 8
[101] Interview 11
[102] Interview 10
[103] Interview 10
[104] Interview 9
[105] Interview 11

It is significant that interviewees from Africa and Turkey in particular said they were discriminated against at work in Germany because of their migrant status. Compared with German employees this discrimination took the form of lower salaries and fewer chances of promotion: "A lot of my friends, especially the well-qualified ones, have said they'd go back to Turkey because here it's not possible for them to become what they would like to become, because of their migration background, even though they're qualified. To be honest, I feel the same. With my qualifications, if I'd been a German, I'd have been on the board of a company by now, or the managing director of a larger enterprise."[106] Self-employment is often chosen as an alternative to returning to the homeland. On account of the transnational social area and the possibilities of circular migration new areas of business open up for migrant workers from Turkey in particular.[107] If both returning home and self-employment are the individual options for avoiding discrimination on the German labour market, then these experiences and impressions are negative factors that are communicated abroad and starkly reduce the attraction of Germany as a destination for migrant workers. Where chances of promotion and jobs in position of responsibility are concerned, the internationalisation of German companies is also a challenge for the future, because smaller companies and entrepreneurs must recognise that international top management and diversity within the workforce are an advantage on the global market.

A final assessment of the challenges and opportunities of labour migration in general and temporary or circular migration in particular is very different for the various groups of migrants we interviewed in Germany. Firstly, if we compare the comments about migration in general, then it becomes apparent that not only the interviewee's age, residence status and length of stay in Germany, but also the reason for migrating influence how they assess their experience of migration. Younger interviewees who have not been in Germany for many years tend to assess their stay more positively and optimistically than older interviewees who are looking back on their career path in Germany and are sometimes disappointed with what they have achieved. The influence of the motive for migrating becomes clear when we compare two different groups: those who migrate to gain professional experience and qualifications are usually more positive and optimistic about their experience of migration than, for example, the Vietnamese participants on the mobility programme who are under financial pressure. Common to all, however, is that they are grateful for all the help and support that has enabled them to gain a start in working and everyday life in Germany, whether in the form of welcome centres, information portals ("Make-it-in-Germany"), counselling projects ("Make-it-in-Hamburg") or the support of those running the mobility programmes.

These offers also appear to be important because some interviewees complained about how hard it is to make friends with Germans and that in the main there are few people in German society who are prepared to take up contact with immigrants.[108] The **contacts** that do develop tend to be made at university or at work. In this respect, the majority of the interviewees understand integration into German society not as an undertaking shared by both partners, but as a task of the individual immigrant. However, this under-

[106] Interview 17; see also interview 16
[107] See interview 17
[108] E.g. interviews 01, 11, 13

standing of integration puts individual migrants under a lot of pressure, then the question remains of how much of their own identity they have to relinquish or how this has to be changed in order for their integration to be deemed successful: "I never want to be like a German, I'm a foreigner in Germany, I will never be a German.... But for my own sake I am trying to be happy in my life.... I do not want to be at a disadvantage, but I also don't want to be like a German."[109] This statement highlights the psychological dilemma for the individual that can be triggered by an understanding of integration that is still defined ideologically rather than pragmatically even though the lack of skilled workers is an exclusively pragmatic problem. The continued rejection of dual citizenship in both politics and society is also an expression of this ideologised understanding of integration and is regarded by the majority of the interviewees as something that diminishes Germany's competitiveness.[110] This rejection seems absurd when we consider the German-Turkish tradition of migration in which to all intents and purposes belonging to two countries is reflected as a reality in individuals' biographies. ("We have certain Turkish characteristics and certain characteristics of the Germans.")[111] In addition, dual citizenship is appropriate to the form of circular migration that will continue to increase due to globalised labour markets, economic areas and traffic flows. It frees circular migrants from the pressure of "having to choose" and allows them to commute between the source and destination countries on the basis of their individual free choice.[112] This dual citizenship, this 'rootlessness' and 'indeterminacy' does of course demand a lot of energy, but the more normal and matter of course this binational and bicultural belonging becomes, the less the individuals affected will have to justify themselves to themselves and others. Apart from this special German-Turkish situation, all participants in circular or temporary mobility programmes should be allowed to decide if and when they leave the FRG, because for the highly-qualified in particular this is a key criterion for making a positive decision. When an interviewee declares the essential condition for his well-being so: "I want to live in a country where I am valued"[113], the patronising lack of respect shown to the recruited immigrants by dictating how long they can stay in the country is a throwback to the 'guest worker policy' of the 1960s and 1970s, which regarded migrant workers in particular as economic pawns.

## 6. Policy Recommendations and Conclusion

There are degrees of success and failure in temporary migration (programmes). Temporary migration addresses much needed skills shortage, and allows employers to have workers without having to spend time and money for training. It also gives migrants an opportunity to work. However, different interest groups have different needs and expectations. They all have to be taken into account when planning and implementing temporary and circular migration programmes.

[109] Interview 16
[110] Interview 11
[111] Interview 17
[112] Loc. sit.
[113] Interview 8

### 6.1. Policy Recommendations

The following recommendations are lessons learnt from the "Mobile Identities" research project and mainly summaries the discussions and ideas from our stakeholder and migrant interview partners as well as from the participants of the workshops conducted in the course of the project.

I. *Offering language courses and integration projects is necessary and should be strengthened and participation facilitated.*

Language is seen as the key to integrating and participating in the German society by the interview partners. Germany already offers a wide range of language and integration courses. However, not all migrants are required to take up such a course, e.g. highly skilled migrants including EU Blue Card holders and their spouses. These groups can participate voluntarily in a public course or are sometimes offered language courses by their employers. Experience of our interview partners shows that highly skilled migrants mainly have English as their working language and do not always take up German language courses. However, they regret this and see it as a disadvantage in getting in contact with people in Germany and fully participating in the country. Thus, also highly skilled migrants should be motivated to take up a language course, e.g. by their employers and participation in the courses should be facilitated.

II. *Counselling and information for migrants should be extended.*

There already is a wide range of counselling and information services for migrants in Germany. Initiatives like "Make it in Hamburg" that counsels for migrants who want to move and work in Hamburg or look for new employment or the "Welcome Centre" in Hamburg and at universities that provide information and help migrants e.g. in the fields of housing, health care, child care and requirements of daily life, are vital guidance in particular for newly arrived migrants. Such initiatives should be enhanced and extended. On the other hand, also more information and cooperation for companies that want to recruit workers from abroad is needed.

III. *Initiatives of "welcoming" migrants should be extended.*

The term "welcome culture" has been widely used in the official debate on migration and integration of migrants for years and there already are good projects in this field. However, a concern of our interview partners was that they found it difficult to get in contact with Germans/German-speaking people in particular in big cities. They wished for more projects and occasions for get-togethers.

Furthermore, the rise of right-wing movements and Islamophobia not only in Germany but throughout Europe was a concern for our interview partners and experts in the workshop: They wished for a stronger role of the EU in providing a framework for an open and welcoming society and establishing a European "welcome culture".

*IV. A positive image of diversity and migrants as role models and "bridge builders" should be shown.*

Most of our interview partners criticised that, also compared to other European countries, hardly any migrants are visibly holding top positions in German companies, politics or media – due to a glass ceiling and discriminative actions. However, they stressed the importance of an open society and structures that allow minority groups to reach top positions in order to prove to others that such a career is possible and to reflect the increasing diversity of society. Mentoring programmes could be one way of achieving this. Moreover, a positive coverage of the topics migration and integration in media, i.e. not only reporting on it when there are problems, should be supported.

*V. The acknowledgement of qualifications obtained abroad should be facilitated.*

Only in 2012, the German government has passed the "Recognition Act for the procedure to assess professional qualifications". Due to federalism and different jurisdictions for different professions, Germany has a rather difficult system of acknowledging qualifications and degrees. The respective law was a first step and gives every migrant the right to have their documents checked. Information and counselling in this field should be enhanced further to make the regulations more comprehensive and facilitate the acknowledgement of qualifications obtained abroad.

*VI. Recruitment programmes should have a stronger focus on development policies and transferring knowledge to countries of origin.*

Temporary or circular migration programmes in general as well as recruitment programmes analysed in Germany are supposed to create a "triple win"-situation, i.e. advantages for the sending country, the migrant and the receiving country. From the experiences drawn in Germany and from other project countries, it can be said that there is no balance in the "triple win" in practice: The recruitment programmes in the geriatric care sector in Germany focus on getting new skilled workers for this sector which lacks sufficient qualified personnel. Migrant interview partners in the programme are offered language courses and extensive support so they can gain new skills and experiences – still the focus of the programme is on the German labour market. Interviewed experts regretted the lack of mutual learning and transferring knowledge between the countries. They suggested implementing partnerships between care facilities and schools in both countries, exchanging personnel or establishing care facilities in the sending countries and generally more cooperation between companies and organisations in the destination country as well as the country of origin. Such advantages for sending countries should be included and/or strengthened in future recruitment programmes. Therefore, partner countries have to be chosen carefully and a strong communication with the countries of origin is necessary. Furthermore, all participants/ parties involved in the programmes have to be prepared properly.

*VII. More flexible rules allowing for temporary and circular migration should be implemented.*

All people involved in the project agreed that in order to support temporary and circular migration, migration law should be flexible and allow for moving to other countries without losing the status and opportuni-

ty to move back to Germany. Positive examples in this regard – showing that mobility, temporariness and circularity exist in practice – are the right of free movement of people within the EU or transnational lifestyles of people with dual citizenship. Also experiences with the former "guest worker" programme proved that tightening rules and regulations decreases temporary migration, because migrants tended to stay in Germany when they knew there was no chance to move back once they left the country. A further step towards flexible regulations was the implementation of the EU Blue Card in Germany for highly qualified migrants – allowing them for instance to get a settlement permit faster than usual and also leaving Germany for more than 6 months without losing the right to move back. This is also an example of a positive impact of an EU directive on national law.

### 6.2. Conclusion

Even though the current political and societal debate in the fields of migration and integration is dominated in 2015 – not only in Germany but throughout Europe – by the influx of asylum seekers and refugees, a project like "Mobile Identities" was still a necessary and important part of gaining knowledge about migration and integration processes. "Mobile Identities" put the focus on one crucial aspect of migration – the temporariness. What makes migrants want to stay in or leave from a country of destination? Is temporariness wished for? Can it be forced upon migrants?

Germany has a relatively long history of temporary migration programmes and can, thus, learn from its past. Many of the former "guest workers" always had the perception of only living temporary in Germany in their minds – even though in reality, they had been living in the country for 40 years with their spouses and children. This temporariness of mind coupled with a wrong perception of temporariness on the part of the country of destination can cause long-term problems. Germany did not consider language courses or other integration measures necessary for participants of its "guest worker" programme or their families. Only in the 21st century, integration got on the political agenda.

Behind this background, research in "Mobile Identities" in Germany stressed two major aspects:

1. The importance of language and integration and
2. The necessity of having flexible legal regulations allowing for temporary and circular migration.

People change their life plans and ideas for the future and adapt them to their personal situation and circumstances in their countries of origin or destination. Migration can be temporary stay for gaining valuable (work) experiences or a permanent way of living in another country. All interview partners in the project stressed that legal regulations should be flexible to allow for changes in life paths. Knowledge of the German language was seen by most of the interview partners as one of the most important means of successfully living and participating in the country of destination. Thus, language courses should be offered for all migrants coming to Germany.

The "Mobile Identities" project has given a first insight in the topic of temporary and circular migration in Germany and has concentrated on (highly-) qualified migrants. Results of this research – in particular the

view of interviewed (temporary or circular) migrants on their life in Germany – can be used to identify fields of action and to enhance practical integration measures and strategies.

There many more open questions on this topic that would require further research in this topic – aiming at supporting countries, regions and cities in enhancing diversity, facilitating integration, learning from others and develop. For instance would we consider necessary after this research to have a stronger focus on the country of origin when implementing recruitment programmes: Mutual exchange programmes including the exchange of knowledge as well as of people should be fostered and recruitment programmes could be linked more often with development policies. Since “Mobile Identities” research was conducted in several European countries, learning from other countries’ experiences was also a valuable part of the research and should be in future.

## Annex 1: Forms of Immigration to Germany

*Information based on the Migration Report 2012[114] and the Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*)[115]

### Table 1: Seasonal Employment

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | Seasonal Employment (*Saisonbeschäftigung*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 15a Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013 |
| **Maximum duration of stay** | 6 months (within 1 calendar year) |
| **Prerequisites** | Only for businesses in the following branches: agriculture and forestry, hotel and restaurants, fruit and vegetable processing industry as well as sawmills<br>Working hours: at least 30 hours per week (on average 6 hours per day)<br>There must be an agreement between the German Federal Employment Agency and the respective agency/ ministry in the countries of origin and selection as well as placement must take place in this bilateral process |
| **Approach/ functioning** | See prerequisites |
| **Main actors involved** | Federal Employment Agency, Central International Placement Service (*Bundesagentur für Arbeit, Zentrale Auslands- und Fachvermittlung – ZAV*)<br>Employment agency/ ministry of labour in the country of origin |
| **Target group reached** | Now mainly Croatians (before: Bulgarians, Romanians, Poles, etc.) → all of them now EU citizens |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | N/A |
| **Potential future developments** | There might not be a need for a seasonal employment programme in the future in Germany anymore, since as of now, most of the target group are from countries that are now EU member states and gradually gain full rights of free movement (e.g. Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia) |
| **Other** | Latest numbers from 2011: 205,384 people (down from about 300,000 people); 2012: contingent of 8,000 people (from Croatia) |

[114] Bundesministerium des Innern – BMI (2014) *Migrationsbericht des Bundesamtes für Migration und Flüchtlinge im Auftrag der Bundesregierung* (Migrationsbericht 2012). Berlin. S. 15 – 19. Available at: http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Broschueren/2014/Migrationsbericht_2012_de.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

[115] Verordnung über die Beschäftigung von Ausländerinnen und Ausländern (Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV) (2013) Available at: http://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/bundesrecht/beschv_2013/gesamt.pdf

### Table 2: Showman's Assistants

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | Showman's Assistants (*Schaustellergehilfen*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 15b Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013 |
| **Maximum duration of stay** | 9 months (within 1 calendar year) |
| **Prerequisites** | There must be an agreement between the German Federal Employment Agency and the respective agency/ ministry in the countries of origin and selection as well as placement must take place in this bilateral process |
| **Approach/ functioning** | See prerequisites |
| **Main actors involved** | Federal Employment Agency, Central International Placement Service (*Bundesagentur für Arbeit, Zentrale Auslands- und Fachvermittlung – ZAV*)<br>Employment agency/ ministry of labour in the country of origin |
| **Target group reached** | Mainly people from East Europe (Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia) → now EU citizens |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | N/A |
| **Potential future developments** | As of now, most of the target group are from countries that are now EU member states and gradually gain full rights of free movement (e.g. Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia) |
| **Other** | Latest numbers from 2011: 2,311 people (much smaller numbers for 2012 expected) |

### Table 3: Domestic Help

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | Domestic Help (*Haushaltshilfen*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 15c Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013 |
| **Maximum duration of stay** | Up to 3 years |
| **Prerequisites** | The immigrant must have a full-time employment subject to social insurance contribution in the field of domestic and nursery work in the household of a care recipient<br>There must be an agreement between the German Federal Employment Agency and the respective agency/ ministry in the countries of origin and selection as well as placement must take place in this bilateral process |
| **Approach/ functioning** | See prerequisites |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Change of employer is possible (with approval of employment agency)<br>After leaving Germany, the respective person has to live abroad at least as long as they had stayed and worked in Germany before |
| **Main actors involved** | Federal Employment Agency, Central International Placement Service (*Bundesagentur für Arbeit, Zentrale Auslands- und Fachvermittlung – ZAV*)<br>Employment agency/ ministry of labour in the country of origin |
| **Target group reached** | Mainly people from East Europe (Poland, Bulgaria, Romania) → now EU-citizens |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | N/A |
| **Potential future developments** | There might not be a need for such a programme and bilateral agreements in the future, since the workers are now EU-citizens and have the right to free movement |
| **Other** | Numbers: almost 2,000 people in 2010; then decrease in numbers due to free movement of workers; 2012: 534 people |

### Table 4: Contract Workers

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | Contract Workers/ Workers on fixed-term contract (*Werkvertragsarbeitnehmer*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 29 (1) Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013 |
| **Maximum duration of stay** | Up to 2 years in general; maximum up to 3 years; staff in leading positions up to 4 years |
| **Prerequisites** | There has to be an agreement for workers on fixed-term contracts between Germany and the country of origin, which is the case for Turkey, Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Macedonia (and used to be the case for other East European, now EU, countries) |
| **Approach/ functioning** | Based on the bilateral agreements, companies in these countries can be (sub-)contractors employing their own staff in Germany when they have contracts with a German or EU company |
| **Main actors involved** | Federal Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs (BMAS)<br>Federal Employment Agency (*Bundesagentur für Arbeit*)<br>Companies in the countries of origin |
| **Target group reached** | Companies (and workers) in the respective countries |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | N/A |
| **Potential future developments** | Bilateral agreements were made from 1988 to 1991; most of the participating countries are now EU member states; no further agreements |

| | |
|---|---|
| | planned |
| **Other** | Data of 2012: 11,793 workers on fixed-term contracts moved to Germany (figure is down from about 95,000 in the early 1990s and 40,000 in 2003) |

### Table 5: Guest Workers

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | Guest Workers (*Gastarbeitnehmer*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 29 (2) Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013 |
| **Maximum duration of stay** | Up to 18 months (1 year with the option of another 6 months) |
| **Prerequisites** | Guest workers must have completed vocational training or have at least 3 years of work experience or have a degree from a university/ university of applied sciences; they also have to have basic German language skills and must be between 18 and 40 years of age<br>No labour market test (*Arbeitsmarktprüfung*) required<br>Bilateral agreements between Germany and the country of origin must exist |
| **Approach/ functioning** | Temporary employment of guest workers from Middle and East Europe for them to gain professional experiences and to improve their language skills in Germany → non-recurring!<br>Bilateral agreements were conducted and contingents were set (which are usually not exhausted) |
| **Main actors involved** | Federal Employment Agency, Central International Placement Service (*Bundesagentur für Arbeit, Zentrale Auslands- und Fachvermittlung – ZAV*)<br>Respective agency in the country of origin |
| **Target group reached** | Workers in specific Middle and East European countries |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | N/A |
| **Potential future developments** | Main countries of origin are now EU countries and do or will have free movement of people |
| **Other** | Data of 2012: 584 people (mainly from Croatia and Romania) – numbers are down from 5.891 people in 2000 |

### Table 6: Au-pair Employment

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | Au pair employment (*Au-pair Beschäftigung*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 12 Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Maximum duration of stay** | Up to 1 year |
| **Prerequisites** | Au pair must have basic German language skills and be under 27 years of age<br>German must be the mother tongue of the family the au pair is working for; if German is the "family language", the au pair must have a different country of origin than the host parents<br>No "priority review" (*Vorrangprüfung*)<br>Non-recurring |
| **Approach/ functioning** | See prerequisites |
| **Main actors involved** | Host families, sometimes agencies |
| **Target group reached** | Young people from all over the world |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | N/A |
| **Potential future developments** | N/A |
| **Other** | Data of 2012: 6.330 people (slight decline compared to 2011), au pairs mainly from Ukraine, Georgia and Russia |

### Table 7: Specialty Chefs

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | Specialty Chefs (*Spezialitätenköche*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 11 (2) Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013 |
| **Maximum duration of stay** | Up to 4 years (first-time approval for up to 1 year) |
| **Prerequisites** | Full-time employment in a specialty restaurant |
| **Approach/ functioning** | See prerequisites |
| **Main actors involved** | Federal Employment Agency, Central International Placement Service (*Bundesagentur für Arbeit, Zentrale Auslands- und Fachvermittlung – ZAV*)<br>And the respective employer |
| **Target group reached** | Mainly chefs from Asia |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | N/A |
| **Potential future developments** | N/A |
| **Other** | Data of 2012: 3,056 approvals, mainly to Chinese (76%), Indian (15%) and Thai (5%) chefs |

### Table 8: Staff for Nursing and Elderly Care

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | Staff for Nursing and Elderly Care (*Alten- und Krankenpflegepersonal*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 6 (2) Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013 |
| **Maximum duration of stay** | Up to 3 years (???) |
| **Prerequisites** | Qualified vocational education that meets the professional qualification needed for the employment in Germany (equivalence of professional qualifications)<br>Agreement between the Federal Employment Agency and the respective agency/ ministry in the countries of origin<br>No staff can be recruited from countries where there is a lack of people working in nursing professions |
| **Approach/ functioning** | Recruitment is done by the Federal Employment Agency<br>Agreements with Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Philippines and Tunisia<br>Modell programmes with China and Vietnam |
| **Main actors involved** | Federal Employment Agency, Central International Placement Service (*Bundesagentur für Arbeit, Zentrale Auslands- und Fachvermittlung – ZAV*)<br>Employment agency/ ministry of labour in the country of origin |
| **Target group reached** | Nursing staff in specific countries |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | N/A |
| **Potential future developments** | Ageing population in Germany → high demand of qualified staff in nursing |
| **Other** | Small numbers (141 people in 2012) + agreement with China on a contingent of 150 people and Vietnam with maximum of 250 people |

### Table 9: International Exchange of Personnel

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | International Exchange of Personnel (*Internationaler Personalaustausch*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 10 Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013 |
| **Maximum duration of stay** | Up to 3 years |
| **Prerequisites** | Person has to have a university (of applied sciences) degree or comparable qualification<br>Company must be internationally with an office in Germany |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Approach/ functioning** | Exchange of personnel within an international company<br>No "priority review" (*Vorrangprüfung*) |
| **Main actors involved** | Respective companies and local foreigners' offices |
| **Target group reached** | International companies and highly qualified staff (TCN) |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | N/A |
| **Potential future developments** | due to globalised economy very likely also a way of temporary immigration in the future |
| **Other** | Data of 2012: 7,322 people (mainly from India, China and the USA) → increase over the past 6 years |

### Table 10: EU Blue Card

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | EU Blue Card (*Blaue Karte EU*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 2 (2) Employment Regulation (*Beschäftigungsverordnung – BeschV*) of October 2013<br>Council Directive on highly qualified workers (Directive 2009/50/EG)<br>Section 19a Residence Act (*Aufenthaltsgesetz*) |
| **Maximum duration of stay** | Up to 4 years |
| **Prerequisites** | Applicant must have a completed university degree (must be approved or be comparable to the German "*Hochschulabschluss*")<br>Applicant must have a contract of employment or a binding job offer with a minimum income before applying for the Blue Card<br>In 2014 the minimum gross annual income for getting a Blue Card was 47,600€ → if this sum has been achieved there is no need for the agreement of the Federal Employment Agency for the issuance of the Blue Card<br>For shortage occupation, such as information and communication specialist, engineers, mathematicians or doctors the minimum annual salary (2014) is 37,128€ there is a need for the agreement of the Federal Employment Agency for the issuance of the Blue Card (if the applicant has a degree from a university abroad), but no "priority review" (*Vorrangprüfung*) |
| **Approach/ functioning** | Applicant who already lives in Germany with another type of residence permit can apply for the EU Blue Card at the local foreigners registration office<br>People not living in the EU have usually to apply for the EU Blue Card before they enter Germany, directing at the German agency abroad (in their |

| | |
|---|---|
| | countries of origin) |
| **Main actors involved** | Employees and respective companies |
| **Target group reached** | Third-country nationals wanting to immigrate to Germany or persons who already own a Blue Card in another EU country with the aim of getting a highly qualified job in Germany |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | - Finding a job from abroad can be rather difficult<br>+ Family members benefit as well → wife or husband and children can enter the country without German language skills<br>+ Wife/husband of the EU Blue Card holder gets free access to the employment market<br>- family members can only also immigrate when the wedding was before receiving the Blue Card<br>+ Easier conditions for mobility → card holder can live up to 12 month in a non EU state and the card will be still valid after that time (same for family members)<br>+ After 33 months and the prove of having paid social insurance/ retirement contribution, the Blue Card holder can get permanent residency permit → If the owner of the EU Blue Card achieves the B1 level of the German language, he can apply for a permanent residence permit already after 21 months (= easier access to a permanent residence permit)<br>→ interim result after 1 year: about 10,000 Blue Cards were issued, almost half of them for shortage occupations<br>→ almost half of the Blue Card holders already had another residence permit before (were already living in Germany)<br>→ almost 3,000 people newly immigrated; the rest applied for a Blue Card after having finished their university degree in Germany |
| **Potential future developments** | Most likely an important programme in the future, since Germany needs immigration of highly qualified people |
| **Other** | Blue Card programme exists in most other EU countries – with the exception of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom<br>It was implemented on August 1, 2012<br>Data of 2012: 2,190 Blue Cards were issued (two thirds in regular and one third in shortage occupations), main country of origin was India (also USA and Russia) |

### Table 11: Foreign Students

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of programme** | Foreign Students (*Ausländische Studierende*) |
| **Legal framework** | Section 16 Residence Act (*Aufenthaltsgesetz*) |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Maximum duration of stay** | Up to 2 years – can be extended<br>[+ visa up to 9 months for applying for university]<br>[+ visa up to 18 months for searching a job after finishing university in Germany] |
| **Prerequisites** | A visa for Germany before entering the country<br>German language skills (level B1) |
| **Approach/ functioning** | In order to get the visa for Germany, the applicants have to have a note of authorisation from the university or an approved university entrance certificate as well as an evidence on how to finance the first year of the studies and a confirmation of health insurance<br>After entering the country, they get a temporary residence permit – that also covers preliminary language courses or other measures |
| **Main actors involved** | Universities, students |
| **Target group reached** | Foreign students |
| **Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses** | + Positive developments during the past years: Germany is now the third most popular country for foreign students (next to the USA and the UK) |
| **Potential future developments** | Most likely also an important means of immigration in the future |
| **Other** | Data winter term 2012/2013: 282,201 foreign students studying at German universities (1993/1994: 134,391 foreign students) → among them, more than 70% obtained their university entrance certificate abroad (data includes all foreign students – also when they only spend parts of their studies in Germany) |

## Annex 2: Interview Guideline of the Stakeholder Interviews

# Interview Guideline for the Stakeholder Interviews

### *The programme: goals and approach*

- Why did you decide to set up such a programme?
- Which needs did you identify before setting up the programme?
- Who was involved in developing the programme?
- What did you want to achieve? / What are the main goals of the programme?
- How did you want to achieve the goals? (approach)
- Who are the main target groups/ beneficiaries? How do they benefit?

### *Strengths*

- What are the strengths of the programme?
- What are your main achievements?
- Did you achieve the goals you set for the programme?
- How many people participate?

### *Weaknesses*

- Which difficulties did you face implementing the programme?
- How did/ do you try to solve these difficulties?
- Could you solve the difficulties?

### *Evaluation*

- Are you satisfied with the programme?
- Would you develop and implement this programme as it is again?
    - If yes: Why?
    - If no: What would you change?

→ When interviewing stakeholders that participate in the programme: questions on strengths, weaknesses, evaluation +

- Were you involved in setting up the programme?
    - If yes: questions on goals and approach
    - If no: What do you think are the goals and approach of the programme?
- What are your experiences with the programme?

## Annex 3: Interview Questionnaire and Guideline of the Migrant Interviews

# Mobile Identities: Interview Guideline Migrants

**1) Name [or Number] and age**

| |
|---|
| |

**2) Place of origin**

| |
|---|
| |

Urban ☐ Rural ☐

**3) Education and qualification**

Primary ☐ Professional training ☐
Secondary ☐ Work experience ☐
A-Levels ☐ University ☐

| |
|---|
| |

**4) What languages do you speak?**

a) [Native speaker]
b) [fluent / good / basics / learning]
c) [fluent / good / basics / learning]
d) [fluent / good / basics / learning]
e) [fluent / good / basics / learning]

**MIGRATION TO GERMANY**

**5) When did you arrive in Germany?**

| |
|---|
| Latest arrival:<br>Former arrivals: |

**6) How long do you plan to remain?**

Less than 1 year ☐ For a long time ☐
A few years ☐ Forever ☐

| |
|---|
| |

**7) What does your remain in Germany depend on?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Visa | ☐ | Work | ☐ |
| Family | ☐ | Other | ☐ |

**8) Where did you live before you migrated?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Country of origin | ☐ | Other Country | ☐ |

**9) How did you travel to Germany?**

Route:

Means of transport:

**10) Did you know someone in Germany before you arrived here?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ |

Who?

**11) Who helped organise this migration to Germany?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No one/individual | ☐ | Employer | ☐ |
| Family/ Friends | ☐ | Organisation | ☐ |
| Government | ☐ | Other | ☐ |

**12) Is this your first migration?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ |

If not. In which city(s)/country(s) did you immigrate before? Who helped organising your previous migration(s)? In your previous migration(s), how did you travel? In your previous migration(s), who came with you?

13) **What are you experiences with migration, i.e. living (temporarily) outside of your country of origin?**

| |
|---|
| |

14) **Thinking about your current immigration to Germany, how come you choose this country? Why this city/region in the country? Would you have liked to move to a different country? Would you have liked to move to a different place in Germany?**

| |
|---|
| |

15) **What were the reasons you immigrated – generally and regarding the current immigration? Did your reasons change over time?**

| |
|---|
| |

16) **Where do you plan to go next?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Country of origin | ☐ | Stay in Germany | ☐ |
| Other country | ☐ | Other | ☐ |

| |
|---|
| |

**FAMILY, CONTACTS AND LEISURE TIME**

17) **Family: Are you married? Do you have children? Where does your family live?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Not married | ☐ | Divorced | ☐ |
| Married | ☐ | Widowed | ☐ |
| Children yes | ☐ | Children no | ☐ |

| |
|---|
| Spouse lives in: |
| Children live in: |
| Parents/ family lives in: |

**18) How do you keep in touch with your family and friends?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Phone | ☐ | Letters | ☐ |
| Internet | ☐ | Visits | ☐ |
| Other | ☐ | | |

**19) How often are you in touch with your family and friends?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Daily | ☐ | Monthly | ☐ |
| Weekly | ☐ | Rarely | ☐ |

**20) During your current stay in Germany, (how) did your family situation change?**

**21) Were there any changes in your social environment while you live(d) abroad? [family, friends, quarrels, etc.] Did that influence your plans?**

**22) Who do you spend time with in your social life?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Co-ethnics | ☐ | Germany | ☐ |
| People from other countries | ☐ | Different groups | ☐ |

**23) When did you last have time off?**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| This week | ☐ | Longer before | ☐ |
| Last week | ☐ | Never | ☐ |
| Last month | ☐ | Other | ☐ |

**24) How did you spend your time off?**

| |
|---|
| |

**HOUSING**

**25) Regarding your housing situation right after you immigrated to Germany, how was the lodging? How did you find the lodging? What connections did you have to that place? [friends, work, etc.] Who lived there with you?**

| |
|---|
| |

**26) Did your housing situation change in the course of your stay in Germany? Did you change lodging? Please describe!**

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes: How did you find the new lodging? What connections did you have to that place? [friends, work, etc.] Who lived there with you?

| |
|---|
| |

**27) How is your housing situation compared to your previous migration(s) and or the time in your country of origin?**

| |
|---|
| |

**WORK**

**28) Are you registered with government social security and health services? Which?**

Social security ☐ Health insurance ☐

| |
|---|
| |

**29) Regarding your job situation after you arrived in Germany, were you employed?**

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no: Did that change over time? Could you find a job? [Then continue with other questions!]

If yes: Please tell me about your job! How soon did you find work? What job was it? How was that job? [working conditions, contract, seasonal, boss and colleagues, etc.] How long were you in that job? Are you still in that job?

**30) Did you change your job while you live in Germany?**

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes: [Check for all other jobs in the current migration!] Where did you go and work next? Please describe! Why did you change jobs? How did you find a new job? Who helped you? What was the next job? How was the next job? [working conditions, contract, seasonal, boss and colleagues, etc.] Where was the new job? Did you need to move within Germany? How long were you in that job? Why did you leave? [voluntary/involuntary]

**31) Thinking about your former migration experiences, how were your job(s) and working conditions back then?**

**32) How would you describe the differences regarding to your job(s) and working conditions when you compare the time in your country of origin to the migration(s)?**

**33) Who do you spend time with at work?**

Co-ethnics ☐ Germany ☐

People from other countries ☐ Different groups ☐

**34) Are you able to send money to your family?**

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes:

a) By what means do you send the money?

b) How often do you send money?

Regularly ☐ At special occasions ☐

Occasionally ☐ Other ☐

c) How much money do you send?

Varies ☐ Others ☐

Proportion of earnings ☐ No Answer ☐

d) What will the money be spent on by your family?

**ASSESSMENT OF THE MIGRATION**

**35) What things will you take back in your country of origin?** (skills, ideas opportunities)

**36) What was/is happening in your country of origin during your migration(s)? [e.g. politics, crisis, recession] Did that influence your plans?**

| |
|---|
| |

**37) What was/is happening in your host country during your migration(s)? [e.g. politics, crisis, recession] Did that influence your plans?**

| |
|---|
| |

**38) Would you encourage your friends/ children to migrate the way you did?**

Yes ☐ No ☐

| |
|---|
| Why (not)? |

**39) Can you think of 5 words to describe your migration experience?**

| |
|---|
| |

**40) On balance, is what you experience in this migration what you expected before?** (e.g. work, wages, people)

Yes ☐ No ☐

| |
|---|
| What is different? |

**41) The hopes and expectations you had before your migration to Germany, did they come true? How were they compared to the reality?**

| |
|---|
| |

**42) Knowing what you know now, would you do this migration again?**

Yes ☐ No ☐

| |
|---|
| Why (not)? |

**Thank you for answering these questions!**

**Your participation makes a valuable contribution to our research!**

## Annex 4: National Workshop Report

# 1. Agenda

The German National Workshop for the EU-project "Mobile Identities" took place on April 28, 2015 at the Central Mosque in Hamburg. The workshop agenda included the following:

11:00 Welcome address

11:15 Presentation of the project "Mobile Identities"

11:30 First results from research and practice

12:00 Coffee break

12:10 Input from practitioners

12:30 First results from the perspective of the migrants interviewed

13:15 Lunch break

14:00 Discussion: temporary and circular migration as answer for the shortage of skilled labour or reproduction of former "guest worker" programmes

15:30 Summary, prospects and farewell

15:45 End of the workshop

# 2. Summary of Workshop and Discussion

The "Mobile Identities" national workshop in Hamburg was held at the dome of the Central Mosque in Hamburg, which is run by the associate partner of the project, the North-German Union of Islamic Communities (BIG). It started with **two welcome addresses**: First, Baki Ince, head of BIG's Islamic Youth Association (IJB) was welcoming the guests at the Central Mosque and talked about the history and function of the workshop location. Then, Eckart Müller-Bachmann greeted the participants on behalf of the CJD in Hamburg.

In order to get to know the **participants**, the welcome addresses were followed by a short round of introduction. The following people participated:

- Arzu Pehlivan, Working Group of Immigrant Entrepreneurs (ASM e.V.)
- Baki Ince, Islamic Youth Association (IJB)
- Bülent Güven, entrepreneur
- Eckart Müller-Bachmann, CJD Hamburg + Eutin
- Eike Klingberg, head of German Red Cross School for Geriatric Care in Braunschweig
- Fatih Yildiz, Elbcampus (Chamber of Crafts)

- Fatima Ince, North-German Union of Islamic Communities (BIG) – Muslim Girls
- Ferdaouss Adda, Elbcampus (Chamber of Crafts), coordinator for integration and language courses
- Franziska Pohl, CJD Hamburg + Eutin
- Haiko Hörnicke, Elbcampus (Chamber of Crafts)
- Petra Krompholz-Gerdel, teacher at German Red Cross School for Geriatric Care in Braunschweig
- Richard Owasuttilluan, Intercultural Migrant Integration Centre (IMIC e.V.)
- Rolf Denkewitz, Intercultural Migrant Integration Centre (IMIC e.V.) and entrepreneur
- Svenja Heinrich, CJD Hamburg + Eutin
- Sylvaina Gerlich, Intercultural Migrant Integration Centre (IMIC e.V.)

The presentation by the CJD started with introducing the project "Mobile Identities" and its working steps. Then, first results from the desk research and stakeholder interviews were presented (see PowerPoint presentation in annex).

### Input on the Programme with Vietnam in the Care Sector

In a next step, an **input from practitioners** was given. Eike Klingberg and Petra Krompholz-Gerdel, the workshop guests from the Red Cross School for Geriatric Care in Braunschweig, presented their experiences with participating in the programme "Training Nurses from Vietnam to Become Geriatric Nurses in Germany". The programme is conducted by the German Society for International Cooperation (GIZ) and is described on the **programme** website as follows:

> *"As part of a pilot project initiated in the second half of 2013, a group of 100 young people from Viet Nam are training to be care assistants for the elderly. After completing a state-funded six-month language course at the Goethe-Institut in Hanoi, the participants receive training in small groups at care homes in Baden-Württemberg, Bavaria, Berlin and Lower Saxony. During this training period, they also take part in additional language courses and intercultural programmes to help them adjust to their new lives. Regional coordinators working in the same field and mentors who speak Vietnamese support the trainees and their partner organisations in getting to grips with the job and the theory.*
>
> *This successful BMWi pilot project is set to continue, with a second batch of around 100 young people from Viet Nam starting their training in Germany from August 2015. The language training programme will begin in August 2014. The future trainees will complete a one-year intensive German language course to bring them up to level B2. In addition to learning German, the course also includes a module on specialist terminology and an intercultural programme to prepare the participants for working in a country so far away from home. […]*
>
> *This new approach uses existing labour relations with Vietnamese administrations, such as the Vietnamese Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MoLISA), and takes local trends into account. Furthermore, it creates attractive openings for investment and cooperation for German businesses. GIZ is implementing the pilot project on behalf of BMWi and in*

*cooperation with the BA's International Placement Services (ZAV). The findings of the scientifically supported pilot project are to serve as a model for recruiting foreign qualified professionals for the nursing sector in Germany.*

*The 200 young Vietnamese participants in the pilot project will be selected in close cooperation with MoLISA and with ZAV. The primary prerequisite for applicants to the accelerated training programme in Germany is a degree as College Nurse (3 years) or a university degree as Bachelor Nurse (4 years)."*[116]

The School for Geriatric Care was approached by the state of Lower Saxony to participate in the pilot programme. Their aim was to offer a shortened training (2 years instead of 3) which included a specific module for language teaching as well. The programme participants were **prepared** for their training and jobs in Vietnam already, including language courses. According to the presenters from the school, the Vietnamese nurses had level B2 German language skills when they arrived in Germany – which is not sufficient. Furthermore, the participating school and care facility did not receive much information on the selection process of the Vietnamese participants and the care system in Vietnam. In particular the latter led to misunderstandings in the beginning. However, the institutions involved (in Braunschweig the school as well as care facilities run by the Workers Welfare Association AWO) received intercultural training by the GIZ. Furthermore, the support for the Vietnamese nurses once they had arrived in Braunschweig was described as being good: They were accommodated in shared flats (and supported with their rent); the AWO's migration centre and the local German-Vietnamese Cultural Association were involved as well. There was major media coverage on the programme – but unfortunately also racist comments by readers of the local newspapers.

Concerning the issue of **language** in the training of the Vietnamese nurses, the school implemented the following: A second teacher was involved in the regular classes (team teaching), there was an accompanying further German language class and the course included the 10 Vietnamese nurses as well as 5 German training nurses (partly with a migration background). This is considered to be very helpful by the presenters and could only been made possible thanks to concessions of the practical partner/ care facilities, since it means that the Vietnamese nurses have more theoretical classes and, thus, less practical instruction/ work in the care facilities (which both is part of the training for geriatric nurses in Germany).

In a discussion with the other workshop participants, Mr Klingberg and Ms Krompholz-Gerdel explained that the Vietnamese nurses are very much welcomed and appreciated by the elderly people in the care facilities. A negative **feedback**, however, was sometimes given by lower qualified care workers, i.e. the colleagues of the Vietnamese participants (jealousy). There are intercultural 'sensitising' offers for employees in the care facilities, which are attended by about 25% of the staff – who can then act as multipliers. Furthermore, there are coaching sessions for the practical instructors of the Vietnamese nurses. Communication in the care facilities where the participants from Vietnam work is, however, does not go far enough.

[116] https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/18715.html

The care system is, according to the presenters from Braunschweig, a highly emotional field, where envy due to special treatment of a group is common.

In the programme, there is a regular **exchange** with the GIZ and meetings once a year on the federal and twice a year on the state level, so the stakeholders also get an insight in the overall programme (which is run throughout Germany). According to Mr Klingberg and Ms Krompholz-Gerdel, about 10% of the 100 Vietnamese participants throughout Germany might not pass their exams this year. For them, the GIZ needs to sort out the issues concerning their residence permits. In Braunschweig, all 10 participants will most likely pass their exams. The participants are highly socially connected among the total 100, the local groups and also through associations – which is facilitated by the programme.

In 2015, the first round of the programme will be finished and the **second round** will start. There are a few changes: The new participants will not have a shortened training, but the full 3 years and in Vietnam they have to learn German to level B2 – which is a hurdle and decreases the number of successful participants. Furthermore, in Braunschweig the practical partner will not support the participants with paying parts of their rent. The first group of participants is considered to be multipliers for the new Vietnamese nurses. The long-term aim of the programme is for the recruitment of Vietnamese nurses to gain independence. Thus, the ministry involved wants to facilitate contact between German and Vietnamese care facilities. There is, however, the danger of abuse, exploitation and commercialisation when public bodies withdraw from conducting the process and leaving the recruitment to the free market.

## Discussion

After a lunch break, the presentation of first results in the project "Mobile Identities" continued with presenting impressions from the migrant interviews (see PowerPoint Presentation in annex). After that, the workshop participants got involved and were encouraged to discuss about their experiences. The **designated topics** of the discussion were clustered according to the dimensions of "triple win": (1) Circular migration and recruitment programmes as answer to a shortage of skilled labour? (destination country), (2) Recruitment of qualified workers: reproduction of the "guest worker programme" or enhancing the wellbeing of migrant workers? (migrants) and (3) Which impact does the recruitment of qualified workers have on the countries of origin – "brain circulation" as opportunity? (country of origin). Furthermore, also the time dimensions of a migration should be included in the discussion: Temporary – circular – permanent.

Ms Pehlivan from the Working Group of Immigrant Entrepreneurs stressed the aspect of **demographic change**: Migration is necessary in a country with a declining population. But Germany has a problem with its image; countries like the U.S. are more popular for immigrants. The question is how to attract and then also keep migrants? According to research, the "3 T"s are important in this regard (technology, talent and tolerance). Ms Adda, responsible for integration and language courses at the Chamber of Crafts, posed the question if control is necessary and sees immigration as an individual decision based on varying reasons. Important in this regard are the attractiveness of the country, a sense of being welcome and also culture and language (history).

Mr Denkewitz, who is an entrepreneur and consultant, compared the situation in Germany to a private company. He used to work for a company that was almost solely Italian at the beginning. Then it set up a programme for a temporary exchange of personnel within the company, which made it more diverse. Mr Denkewitz concluded that temporary migration and exchange are possible – if it is handled in a flexible way. Mr Güven, an entrepreneur with a Turkish background, drew the attention to the historic background of Germany: "to be German" is still a part of the German identity and due to a lack of experience with (migration from) colonies the advantages of migration are not known yet in the society. He thinks it is important to present the advantages of migration in the media and to have migrants/ people with a migration background as chairmen in companies as well.

Ms Pehlivan mentioned the **swing to the right** that can be observed throughout Europe at the moment. She remarked subliminal racism in the societies and referred to the TIES research study stating that Germans without a migration background mainly stay among themselves whereas migrants or Germans with a migration background often mix with other groups. Ms Adda added that the latter might be also due to common shared experiences by migrants. Moreover, she criticised that migrants are mainly seen as workers and not as human beings, which is also reflected in the language used in debates. Ms Gerlich from IMIC, which focuses on the African community in Hamburg, talked about a "**culture of welcoming immigrants**" in the city. According to her, Germany is a country of immigration but does not see itself as such yet. This might be based on a lack of communication about migration and between the different groups. Communicating, living together, neighbourhoods and integration are important in this regard. Concerning the local African community, she remarked that African immigration has a rather long history in Hamburg, but still some African migrants live irregularly in the city; the senate does not seem to be aware of this problem. Mr Güven referred to the observed swing to the right and stated that this is due to economic problems in Europe: the native population assumes that foreigners immigrating just want money and benefits. In diverse cities, migration is accepted and he sees a difference, for instance between the eastern and western part of Germany – but also between different groups of immigrants (eastern Europeans are more accepted than Muslims). He calls migration and integration a "painful process". Mr Hörnicke from the Chamber of Crafts considers the long-term changes in Europe as a normal process: fears are normal and improvements can be seen as well. According to him, the EU should provide a regulatory framework for the societies to develop in this direction then.

With regard to the question of regulation and why countries like the U.S. are more popular than Germany, Ms Adda stated that a certain "way of life" cannot be regulated, but that incentives can be created, e.g. **role models** can be presented. Ms Krompholz-Gerdel agreed and added that diverse executive staff is important. The Vietnamese nurses, for instance, should be further trained to fill executive positions. Also Mr Güven also agreed on the importance of role models. He mentioned that countries like France or Germany currently face image problems, e.g. when movements like PEGIDA (which is anti-Islamic) are shown in the news in other countries and it seems there that a "civil war" broke out on the streets. Ms Gerlich stated that racism does exist in Germany, but that there are many good people and good examples as well – main-

ly by people who lived some time abroad as well. However, according to her "some people are like the weather" in Germany.

Asked about the debate on a **shortage of skilled labour** in Germany, Mr Hörnicke pointed out that both, immigration and workers lying idle in the country have to be considered. Mr Klingberg said that in the programme with Vietnamese care workers, both aspects are considered. The recruitment from workers from abroad is done additionally and the idea dated back to when the minster of the Interior in Lower Saxony – who later became the federal minister for economic affairs – was a man who has a Vietnamese background. It has already been the initial idea in the programme, that first different public institutions are widely involved, but later the private companies/ free market takes over. He also added that such recruitment programmes are no substitute for a necessary reformation of the health care system in Germany and are just "a drop in the ocean". Ms Adda asked if there is the danger of downgrading of wages once the public bodies get out of the programme. Mr Klingberg pointed out that there are general changes in the training of (geriatric) nurses in Germany towards assistant nurses and that then there is no need of recruiting from third countries. Mr Denkewitz mentioned that in the IT sector, there is a shortage of skilled labour, but companies mainly recruit at schools and universities and do not actively look abroad. He suggested that the Chambers could support companies in recruiting staff abroad.

Concerning the topic of **identity**, Mr Yildiz from the Chamber of Crafts suggested not using the term "migrant" anymore, since it is burdened from both sides. Ms Gerlich stated that it is difficult to define identity. She thinks that institutions like the integration advisory council could be helpful for that. When presented a quote from the migrant interviews in the Mobile Identity project, where the interviewee stated that he "does not want to be German and wants to be treated differently than Germans", Mr Hörnicke noted that this shows a healthy relation to their own roots. Ms Adda remarked that different identities can be possible and that language plays an important role as well – mainly how it is talked about different groups ("we" vs. "them").

Last, the topic of **integration** was discussed in the group. Mr Yildiz from the Chamber of Crafts and Islamic Association said that the reason for integration is that a society sets specific rules which everybody has to follow. Asked the provoking question if integration is necessary when the migration is supposed to be temporary, Mr Yildiz said no and gave the example of his parents: They have lived in Germany since the 60s (former "guest workers"), did not integrate into German society, but still live a good life in Germany. He explains that his father still is in a "psychological migration", i.e. mentally he is still in migration, even though he has stayed most of his life in Germany. Mr Denkewitz replied that interaction is very important and Mr Hörnicke added that integration is needed at least to a certain extend – mainly concerning the **language**. Mr Yildiz replied that for his parents, they got along without knowing the language. But he also said that there had been changes in society since the time of the "guest worker programmes". Now, language is very important. According to Mr Yildiz, during the "guest worker programmes" there has been "strategic misplanning from both sides" and now the different groups in society make up for this time with regard to living together.

## 3. Annex: Workshop Invitation and PowerPoint Presentation (in German)

### Einladung zum Workshop
### „Chancen und Herausforderungen temporärer und zirkulärer Migration von Zugewanderten aus Drittstaaten“

im Rahmen des EU-Projekts „Mobile Identities: Migration und Integration in Transnationalen Communities“

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,

wir laden Sie herzlich zu unserem Workshop zum Thema „Herausforderungen und Chancen temporärer und zirkulärer Migration von Zugewanderten aus Drittstaaten“ ein:

**am 28. April 2015, 11:00 – 16:00 Uhr**
**im Kuppelraum der „Islamischen Gemeinde Hamburg – Centrum-Moschee e.V.“**
**Böckmannstraße 40, 20099 Hamburg**

Das von der EU-Kommission finanzierte Projekt „Mobile Identities: Migration und Integration in Transnationalen Communities” beschäftigt sich mit dem Thema der temporären und zirkulären Migration in 5 EU-Mitgliedstaaten (Deutschland, Italien, Spanien, Großbritannien und den Niederlanden). Im Rahmen des Projektes wurden verschiedene Programme und Initiativen untersucht, die diese zunehmend an Bedeutung gewinnende Form der Zuwanderung flankieren und fördern. Ein besonderer Schwerpunkt der vergleichenden Studie lag neben den Auswirkungen einer zeitlich befristeten Migration sowohl auf die Herkunfts- als auch auf die Zielländer insbesondere auf der Untersuchung des Wohlbefindens der temporär Zugewanderten. Zu dieser Fragestellung wurden zum einen Interviews mit Entscheidungsträgern und anderen Akteuren der Programme und zum anderen qualitative Befragungen von einzelnen Zugewanderten durchgeführt.

Aus den bisherigen Ergebnissen zeichnen sich wichtige Fragestellungen und Anregungen ab, die wir im Rahmen unseres Workshops mit Ihnen diskutieren möchten: Erlaubt eine temporäre Migration eine gesellschaftliche Teilhabe? Handelt es sich hier um eine „neue" Form der Migration als Antwort auf den Fachkräftemangel in Deutschland oder vielmehr um eine Reproduktion der Anwerbung von „Gastarbeitern“? Welche Erkenntnisse lassen sich für Programme zur Förderung temporärer Migration ableiten? Wie lässt sich eine „triple win“ Situation für Zuwanderer, Herkunfts- und Zielland erzielen?

**Wir bitten um Ihre Anmeldung**

beim CJD Hamburg + Eutin, Franziska Pohl f.pohl@cjd-eutin.de oder 040-211 11 81 23

Bei Rückfragen wenden Sie sich bitte ebenfalls gern an Frau Pohl.

**Reisekosten werden durch das Projekt übernommen.**

Weitere Details zu Inhalten und Ablauf finden Sie im Folgenden.

# „Chancen und Herausforderungen zirkulärer und temporärer Migration von Zugewanderten aus Drittstaaten"

## – Programm –

**10:30** Ankommen bei Kaffee, Tee und Gebäck

**11:00** Begrüßung

**11:15** Vorstellung des EU-Projektes „Mobile Identities: Migration und Integration in Transnationalen Communities "

**11:30** Erste Ergebnisse des Projektes „Mobile Identities" aus Sicht der Forschung und Experteninterviews

**12:00** Kaffeepause

**12:10** Input aus der Praxis: Erfahrungen aus dem Programm zur „Ausbildung von Arbeitskräften aus Vietnam zu Pflegefachkräften"

**12: 30** Erste Ergebnisse des Projektes „Mobile Identities": temporäre und zirkuläre Migration aus Sicht der Zugewanderten

**13:15** Mittagspause

**14:00** Diskussion zu Aspekten der temporären und zirkulären Migration nach Deutschland, wie:

- Anwerbung von Fachkräften als Reproduktion der „Gastarbeiter"-Programme?
- Welche Auswirkungen haben temporäre und zirkuläre Migration auf die Zugewanderten, Herkunftsland und Zielland?
- Was sind die Herausforderungen der (temporären) Arbeitsmigration nach Deutschland?
- Neues Einwanderungsgesetz und/oder Verbesserung der „Willkommenskultur"?

**15:30** Zusammenfassung, Ausblick und Verabschiedung

**15:45** Ende der Veranstaltung

*Das Projekt „Mobile Identities" wird durch die Europäische Kommission, Generaldirektion für Inneres, im Europäischen Fonds für die Integration von Drittstaatsangehörigen (EIF) gefördert.*