Successes and Challenges of Local Integration Policy

Floris Vermeulen, Rosanne Stotijn and Karl Lemberg

Preface

This conference report presents the main and most relevant items discussed at the policy workshop 'Successes and Challenges of Local Integration Policy', which took place on 7 December 2006 at the Werkstatt der Kulturen in Berlin. The workshop's primary objective was to unite researchers and policymakers from different cities to discuss pressing urban integration issues. Specifically, this workshop provided representatives from Amsterdam and Berlin a chance to exchange ideas about good practices in the field of integration policies and share experiences from their respective cities. In a very open way the participants reported on the challenges they are facing and on the failures and successes of their policies and programmes. By comparing two cities in different political settings and structures, the participants were challenged to think about their own working area and working methods and learn from initiatives of other cities. Comparing Amsterdam and Berlin provided a remarkable example: the Dutch and the German capitals are mirror images of each other when it comes to the development of local integration policies.

The discussions were divided into three blocks. In the first block, researchers presented their work on local integration policy issues, supplying general concepts and providing examples intended to stimulate discussion between Berlin and Amsterdam policymakers, while the second and third blocks were devoted to discussing the policy issues of youth unemployment and enhancement of social cohesion in immigrant neighbourhoods.

This report describes an activity that is gaining in importance and one that is valued highly in the Network of Excellence IMISCOE, namely to bring researchers and policymakers together and to engage the intended public more actively in research. In dialogue researchers and policy makers can best understand each others needs and constraints and in dialogue they can best share best practices. The workshop was so well received that a follow will be organised in Amsterdam in 2008. Furthermore the organiser of the workshop has formulated a policy brief based on the results that is also published on the IMISCOE website.

Karen Kraal
IMISCOE Communication Officer

Participants

- Andreas Germershausen (Büro des Integrationsbeauftragten Berlin)
- Arja Bleeker (Dienst Werk en Inkomen, Gemeente Amsterdam)
- Arnoud Brix (Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling, Gemeente Amsterdam)

- Dirk Huiberts (Department of Societal Development)
- Floris Vermeulen (Universiteit van Amsterdam)
- Frank de Zwart (Universiteit Leiden)
- Günter Piening (Beauftragter des Senats von Berlin für Integration und Migration)
- Hasib Moukaddim (Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling, Gemeente Amsterdam)
- Holger Seibert (Instituts für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung)
- Kerstin Schmiedeknecht (Quartiersmanagement Schillerpromenade)
- Luuk Holleman (Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling, Gemeente Amsterdam)
- Maria Berger (Universiteit van Amsterdam)
- Paul Nota (Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling, Gemeente Amsterdam)
- Philipp Mühlberg (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung)
- Richard Stanton (Greater London Authority)
- Rob Bijl - *Moderation* – (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Den Haag)
- Robin Schneider - *Moderation* - (Büro des Integrationsbeauftragten Berlin)

Contents

1. Introduction

The local level has become increasingly relevant for the formulation and implementation of integration policies. In all major European cities, policymakers have to contend with diverse populations, an issue which can often lead to certain social, economical and political tensions. Research, moreover, has shown how immigrants and their descendents often feel more connected to the city they live in, rather than the country in which they dwell. Examining and evaluating this local sense of attachment may be a useful means to render integration policies more effective and, ultimately, more successful.

The policy workshop 'Successes and Challenges of Local Integration Policy', which took place on 7 December 2006 at the Werkstatt der Kulturen in Berlin, was the product of collaboration among various institutes and departments. These include the European Commission's Network of Excellence IMISCOE, the Netherlands Institute for City Innovation Studies (NICIS), the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies (IMES) of the Universiteit van Amsterdam, Der Beauftragte des Berliner Senats für Integration und Migration (The Commissioner of the Berlin Senate for Integration and Migration) and two departments of the City of Amsterdam: Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling (Department of Societal Development) & Dienst Werk en Inkomen (Department of Labour and Income).The IMISCOE Network and the NICIS Institute both financed the workshop. IMISCOE (www.imiscoe.org) provides comprehensive theoretical and empirical knowledge on immigration and integration issues that can form a reliable platform for policymaking. The purpose of NICIS (www.nicis.nl/kenniscentrum) is to gather, enrich and disseminate knowledge of urban policy in the Netherlands, as well as within a wider European context. Both organisations actively endeavour to bridge the gap between scientists and policymakers whose focus is on either immigration and integration or urban issues.

Organised by Maria Berger (Universiteit van Amsterdam), Karl Lemberg (Büro des Integrationsbeauftragten Berlin), Ulrich Raiser (Büro des Integrationsbeauftragten Berlin) and Floris Vermeulen (Universiteit van Amsterdam), the workshop's primary objective was to unite researchers and policymakers from different cities to discuss pressing urban integration issues. This workshop provided representatives from Amsterdam and Berlin a chance to exchange ideas about good practices in the field of integration policies and share experiences from their respective cities. Moreover, the workshop served as a forum in which to discuss how to encourage immigrants in both cities to become more proactive in social, economical and political participation. Two relevant integration policy issues were selected as focal points for the discussion: 1) the unemployment of immigrant youth and 2) ways to enhance the social cohesion in immigrant neighbourhoods.

It is interesting to see how local integration policies have differed not only in the past, but also well into the present. Comparing Amsterdam and Berlin provided here a remarkable example: the Dutch and the German capitals are mirror images

of each other when it comes to the development of local integration policies. Amsterdam's multicultural approach of the 1980s, with its specifically targeted policies and subsidies for ethnic organisations, has evolved into a more general approach that has no officially designated immigrant target groups. Berlin, by contrast, has evolved from its more general approach of the 1980s, which neither oversaw official integration policies nor selected immigrant target groups, to a more multicultural approach, comprising advisory councils of immigrant organisations, an official integration policy framework and an appointed Senator for Integration Affairs.

The discussions that took place during 'Successes and Challenges of Local Integration Policy' were divided into three blocks. In the first block, researchers presented their work on local integration policy issues, supplying general concepts and providing examples intended to stimulate discussion between Berlin and Amsterdam policymakers, while the second and third blocks were devoted to discussing the policy issues of youth unemployment and enhancement of social cohesion in immigrant neighbourhoods. For each block, policymakers from both cities presented a concrete policy example. In the second block, Amsterdam representatives shared their views on unemployment among youngsters, a high percentage of which is of immigrant descent. In the third block, Berlin representatives illustrated an example of Neighbourhood Management, a policy instrument meant to enhance social cohesion in immigrant neighbourhoods and to motivate the self-organising capacity of these neighbourhoods. After each block, Richard Stanton, Senior Policy Officer of the Greater London Authority, was asked to comment on the discussions and provide a third, outside view.

The participants were enthusiastic about the workshop's format, which furnished many opportunities for crucial dialogue. Combining research and practical policy examples proved a very useful way to stimulate discussion, as well as to broaden understanding of both cities' different situations, problems and policy solutions. A follow-up workshop is planned for later in 2007, to further enhance what has already been an engaging and much-needed series of exchange.

This report is the workshop organisers' collective recount of the main and most relevant items discussed at 'Successes and Challenges of Local Integration Policy'. We hold no pretences of having covered everything in this report, yet it is our hope that participants will feel that this document does justice to the intense and rewarding day that the workshop proved to be.

2. Block 1: Opening and presentations on integration policies and local developments

2.1 Opening

In his opening speech, Günter Piening emphasised the fact that immigration towards big cities is a phenomenon of all times. To borrow Simmel's famous words, cities are simultaneously homogeneous and diverse. The diversity goes hand in hand with an uneven distribution of labour, housing and education, among other things. In Berlin, the current unemployment rate of migrants is 44 per cent (compared to the 17 per cent unemployment rate among the native-born population), and school dropout rates are twice as high among migrants than among the native-born population. To some extent, this discrepancy may be explained in light of the reunification of Germany – and Berlin – and the deindustrialisation that has taken place in the metropolitan area. Such changes in political and economic circumstances affect migrants who, as a vulnerable social group, are the first to suffer. Often a result of these infrastructural shifts, the social and economic segregation of migrants consequently has a major impact on social cohesion. Thus the challenge for Berlin, as well as for other big cities, is to increase the opportunities migrants have for integrating into greater society. This, it was proposed by Piening, may be done by stimulating diversity and, at the same time, providing ample opportunities for migrants to be able to participate in different realms of society.

2.2 Frank de Zwart: Dilemma of Recognition

In his speech, Frank de Zwart focused on what he calls 'the dilemma of recognition' that all policymakers involved in integration affairs have to deal with. Many governments around the world endeavour to combat inequality by means of group-specific redistribution. Although some governments pursue redistribution that benefits groups, when considering the options for redistributive policy, they are still faced with a dilemma. Unlike pensions or health and insurance plans, targeted redistribution policies require definition, recognition and, moreover, mobilisation of the groups concerned; this accentuates ethnic and racial distinctions. Some governments fear such a side effect: though recognised as necessary to reduce group inequality, targeted redistributive policies may also promote ethnic conflict, create vested interests in group distinctions and diminish public support for redistribution – and in so doing, defeat the policies' own intended purpose. Hence, De Zwart's use of the term 'the dilemma of recognition'.
Governments try to resolve this dilemma by adjusting the category system that is used to target redistribution. There are three types of adjustment: accommodation (the multicultural approach), denial (the ideal-typical liberal solution) and replacement (a compromise). In replacement, the targets of redistributive policies

are constructed to avoid the accentuation or the recognition of inconvenient group distinctions, while still allowing for a redistribution beneficial to these groups. Replacement has become increasingly called for around the world as the disadvantages of multiculturalism become apparent, and denial is hard to sustain in the face of group inequality. Still, replacement's actual effects have been little researched and remain less understood.

De Zwart went on to explain how the three policy options differ from each other. The first policy option, accommodation (also refereed to as 'multiculturalism' or 'the politics of recognition') is meant to designate beneficiaries of redistributive policies according to membership in groups that state and society take for granted. Policymakers treat such social categories as 'real' groups, and those representatives of immigrant groups who demand accommodation do so likewise. Minority policy in the Netherlands up until the 1990s followed the accommodation approach: it was informed by the popular doctrine that integration is best served by encouraging immigrants to maintain their own cultures. Because these policies had been criticised in the 1990s for failing to promote integration and equality, the Dutch government turned to replacement. As it often turns out, governments opt for targeted policy to manage crisis situations, and for example, will follow affirmative action. Yet after the relevant target groups are identified, governments start hesitating as they fear further segregation.

The second policy option, denial, is an insistence that, despite inequality between social or cultural groups, redistribution policies do not benefit any particular demographic. Denial fits in with the ideal-typical liberal state that stresses individual rights and does not recognise any pre-existing, organic or transcendent structure in society. A textbook example of denial is the philosophy of republican citizenship that officially informs policy in France.

The third policy option, replacement, takes the form of a compromise between denial and accommodation. In this case, a government pursues redistribution that benefits ethnic or racial groups, but still constructs its own social categories, which are different in name and usually more inclusive than the 'folk' categories they replace. The purpose of such constructs is to avoid the official recognition of social divisions believed to cause the problem initially, yet to nevertheless permit redistribution beneficial to disadvantaged groups. An example of this policy option is found in India where plans have been underway to replace the traditional caste system. The Indian government has tried to counterbalance the uneven distribution of socio-economic power by designating so-called 'backward classes' eligible for affirmative action, while simultaneously still evading an outright recognition of the traditionally embedded caste system.

In practice, the new social categories that emerge from the replacement approach are exactly those that replacement aims to suppress – and, as De Zwart argues, not 'despite' the use of replacement strategies but *because* of them.

Replacement categories require vague definitions: they cannot name the social categories they address and thus target what are actually evasive administrative constructs. This impedes control over the implementation of policies, and provides ample opportunity for political entrepreneurs to mobilise collectivities, pressuring the government to recognise their claims.

In effect, policymakers find it difficult to deal with the vague definitions that replacement carries with it. On a local level, the constructed policy categories come down to the specific groups the policy tried evading in the first place. What's more, it seems hard to reach these specific groups, particularly because policy implementers are dependent on 'bottom-up' input: the category system used in redistribution policy is made according to leaders of castes, tribes and other groups who devise more elaborate visions of diversity than the most multicultural government could ever come up with. Ironically, when a government does not want to encourage diversity, accommodation is thus in fact more effective than replacement, for accommodation makes relatively clear the number of groups at stake.

2.3 Floris Vermeulen and Maria Berger: Turkish organisations in Amsterdam and Berlin

Floris Vermeulen and Maria Berger's presentation examined the possible relationships existing between: 1) the political opportunity structure of a host city with the organisational structure of an immigrant group; and 2) the organisational structure of an immigrant group with its level of political activity. The driving idea is that a positive, stimulating host-state environment promotes immigrant organisations, as well as the number and density of the networks between such organisations. Subsequently, an increase in organisations, and thus networks, creates a more 'civic' community, in which members are more politically active and entrusting.

To give a case in point, Turkish organisers arriving in Amsterdam and Berlin have encountered completely different political opportunity structures in the respective cities (even in spite of the fact that Germany and the Netherlands are neighbouring countries). First and foremost, these contrasts can be attributed to different national citizenship regimes. The Dutch citizenship regime for Turks is characterised as having been relatively open and tolerant, whereas the German regime, at least until 2000, was more closed off to Turkish newcomers. The acquisition of German citizenship by Turks through naturalisation was relatively difficult and uncommon. Furthermore, there was less tolerance for their cultural and religious differences in Berlin, as compared with Amsterdam. For in the early 1980s, the Dutch government had introduced a multicultural policy designed to integrate the growing immigrant population. The main immigrant groups were

officially classified as 'minority target groups', whose socio-economic position in Dutch society needed improvement. As described by the official report on Dutch multicultural policy in the early 1980s (*Minderhedennota*), the minority policy had two principal objectives: 1) the social and economic conditions of immigrant groups in Dutch society were to be improved; and 2) the Netherlands was to become a tolerant, multicultural society where every immigrant culture would be accepted, respected and valued. Keeping in line with this second objective, Turkish organisations became entitled to structural subsidies.

After the minority policy was implemented, the number of Turkish organisations in Amsterdam increased greatly, resulting in an inclusive network connecting both left-wing and right-wing Turkish organisations. By contrast, in Berlin there is a smaller network comprising just two main Turkish organisations, around which the rest of the network is structured. While these two organisations are connected along some channels by a unifying organisation that was established by Turkish businessmen, other disparate Turkish ideological movements remain isolated in their own networks.

Because of the dense, more all-encompassing network found in Amsterdam, as compared with the more divided network of Berlin, it might be expected that Turks in Amsterdam would be more politically active. This, however, is not the case. Although a sense of trust in the political system is indeed generated through more concentrated networks, Turks in Amsterdam are less politically active than in Berlin. Apparently, a higher number of immigrant organisations and a better-connected network of immigrant organisations do not guarantee more politically active behaviour among immigrants. The inverse also seems to hold true: low levels of trust in the political system do not necessarily lead to a politically passive group of immigrants.

In Amsterdam, Turks seem to be more optimistic about their influence in politics and have a greater sense of trust in the political system than Turks in Berlin, even though they may not be more politically engaged. A similar attitude and consequent political behaviour are displayed by the Aussiedler in Berlin. They receive more subsidies than Turkish organisations, they come across as extremely positive about German politics and as having great trust in its system, yet the Aussiedler still display very low levels of political activity.

Turkish organisations in Amsterdam, therefore, seem to be less effective in mobilising their members than those in Berlin. This may be the correlative result of the disparity between the elite of the organisation and the rest of its members, a demarcation which seems more pronounced in Amsterdam. Another important conclusion that was drawn by Berger and Vermeulen is that active participation in a migrant organisation has no negative influence on the political integration of immigrants. Members of Turkish organisations in both cities were as much – or even more – involved in host city politics than those Turks who did not belong to an immigrant organisation.

3. Block 2: Labour market integration of immigrant youth in Amsterdam

3.1 Dirk Huiberts: Labour market integration of (migrant) youth in Amsterdam: The right to work (the amsterdam policy example)

Despite Amsterdam's flourishing economy and the diminishing youth unemployment rate among migrants in general, the high unemployment rate of immigrant youth is worrisome. Of the city's total unemployed population in 2006, youth (i.e. those between the ages of sixteen and 23) comprise 72 per cent of the figure; 14 per cent are of Surinamese descent and 20 per cent are of Moroccan descent.

It is extremely difficult to reach out to these unemployed youngsters, mainly because many have severe social problems and show little interest in educational and employment programmes. Unemployment issues in the Netherlands are dealt with by both the labour office and, at the local level, by individual cities. Since 2005, Dutch cities have been responsible for providing social securities and guiding the unemployed back to the labour market. Amsterdam's current policy is that people under the age of 23 are not entitled to any form of social security. Instead, they must be enrolled at school, engaged in a trainee programme or hold a job.

Amsterdam tries to tackle its youth unemployment problem with a strict yet humane personal approach. Unemployed youngsters are tracked through youth offices or social security institutions, and through them, are assigned personal coaches. As Huiberts explained, personal attention and a positive approach with strict boundaries means everything. Moreover, Amsterdam authorities believe that it is better to circumvent needs for social benefits in the first place. The city's intensive collaboration with schools, combined with the personal guidance of its students, is therefore crucial.

Huiberts furthermore distinguished work skills from social skills, suggesting that most unemployed youngsters posses good working skills but lack

proper social skills. What's more, many of the young unemployed have a mix of personal, psychiatric or drug-related problems. As such, Huiberts believes it is important to cooperate with other institutions such as schools, social workers and the police. In other words, Amsterdam opts for an integrated approach. The basic principle of this approach is a right to work, rather than a right to benefits. In practice, this means that unemployed youth should actively participate in work projects and also receive benefits (at a level comparable to regular social security). If they refuse to participate in such projects, however, they can expect to experience cutbacks to their benefits – or no benefits at all.

Although a high percentage of unemployed youth is of immigrant background, Amsterdam authorities have intentionally chosen a general policy approach free of ethnic categories or specific target groups. Believed to be more effective than targeted policies, this strict, integrative personal approach applies to all unemployed youth.

3.2 Panel discussion

Holger Seibert

According to Holger Seibert, in Berlin there are 30.000 unemployed youngsters between the ages of fifteen and eighteen, many of whom are migrants. In line with Dirk Huiberts' presentation on Amsterdam, Seibert argued that preventing unemployment starts at school. Early school dropout strongly correlates with low job opportunities: 25 per cent of people who hold no diploma are unemployed, as compared with the 5 per cent unemployment rate among people with a university degree. As such, school-sponsored guidance should start as early as possible. Special policy attention should be given to the early years of education, especially in cases when immigrant parents choose not to send their children to kindergarten due to its high costs. These circumstances can have serious long-term consequences; attending kindergarten is a crucial early step in pursuing an education, which may prevent later unemployment.

Berlin's approach to guiding unemployed youngsters focuses perhaps more on stimulating a desire for assistance among unemployed, rather than forcing people into a job. This marks a clear departure from the strict Amsterdam approach, as described by Dirk Huiberts.

Andreas Germershausen

As Andreas Germershausen explained, Berlin's focus is also on diminishing the reliance of youth on social security, thus encouraging their entrance into educational programmes, rather than directly into work. This emphasis on education, combined with the city's lack of low-skilled jobs, might explain Berlin's

extremely high unemployment rates. Quite simply, there are not enough jobs available for the young unemployed.

Organisations dealing with unemployment issues in Berlin include the *Arbeidsagentur* and the *Jobcentres*. As in Amsterdam, school dropout rates among migrants are substantially higher than among non-migrant youth. Germershausen expressed discontent with the effort being made by the *Jobcentres*, as well as schools, in their attempts to prepare immigrant youth for the labour market. According to Germershausen: 1) Greater guidance and more assessment tests are needed to evaluate which continuing education programmes or jobs might best suit students. There is a demand for further cooperation between the different organisations with different mandates operating in this field. 2) When it comes to creating more jobs and heightening the quality of educational performance, small interventions can have success. Local authorities should therefore not neglect even modest steps to intervene. 3) In Germershausen's experience, investments in education could lead to substantial differences that improve the status of migrants in Berlin.

Paul Nota

From Paul Nota's perspective, even though small interventions, as mentioned by Germershausen, may have a significant effect in the long-term, politicians in Amsterdam want to see results right now. This leaves policymakers with no other choice but to opt for a 'crash course' in policymaking, which means coming up with clear, effective (and sometimes drastic) measures.

Nevertheless, it is important to focus on long-term education, because a better education leads to better job opportunities. The low-skill jobs that unemployed youth must often accept are seen as unattractive work for young people; an illegal career thus often becomes tempting.

Complex socio-economic problems, such as youth unemployment, can only be addressed if politicians, policymakers and others involved have a clear idea of the issue along with adequate data that empowers them to deal with the problems. According to Nota it is, it is important to change things 'out there' – in the field – were the problems occur.

Arja Bleeker

The strict yet humane personal approach that Amsterdam has fostered has shown success. According to Arja Bleeker, of the 100 unemployed youngsters that participated in the city's different labour office projects, 70 per cent of the participants are now employed. While 50 per cent may have quit their projects prematurely, these individuals were tracked as either having returned to school or continued receiving further guidance from youth workers.

In light of the fact that social skills are a crucial factor when it comes to finding and keeping a job, as Dirk Huiberts stated, Amsterdam offers so-called four-month learning camps. These camps where youth can develop such skills have been shown to enhance the general level of social skills among the target group.

Politicians and policymakers in Amsterdam must be clear about what is expected from the relevant institutions and what results should be achieved. A critical debate must take place to engender the way these institutions, such as schools or employment centres, function. One way to promote this is by approaching the media and seeking their participation.

Ulrich Raiser

The strict Amsterdam approach – no job, no benefits – could never be implemented in Germany, said Ulrich Raiser. Parents of currently unemployed migrants helped to rebuild the country after the War, a notion people in Berlin have very strong feelings about. Raiser questioned how implementation of the strict policy was carried out in the Netherlands. Raiser also emphasised the importance of talking with migrant youth, instead of talking *about* them. In conclusion, he asked why it is so hard for migrant youth to find their way from school to the labour market.

Other remarks on the Amsterdam approach

Is it really possible to measure the success of the Amsterdam policy? What will its effects be in the long run? How can we measure success – by looking down the road, say, six months after a youngster has completed a work project to see if he or she still holds a job? What about the responsibility of youth themselves? The Amsterdam policy seems to have moved away from the notion that it is one's own responsibility to get a good education and to find a job. Full responsibility has been taken over by the local state, which decides where people should work or go to school.

The individual approach of the Amsterdam policy is appealing, but it can only work in small groups. The Amsterdam policy requires a sufficiently skilled population of youth workers.

Amsterdam Response

Amsterdam aims for long-term results, but these are not always achievable. Unemployed youth usually register for work projects themselves, but recently, the city has begun to initiate the contact with youngsters.

Schools should see to it that pupils end their education having acquired basic qualifications. Doing so could improve their chances on the labour market.

There should also be policies directed at the parents of children between the ages of zero and four that address their upbringing. Such attention on childrearing could also lead to better long-term labour market opportunities for youth.

The ultimate goal of Amsterdam policymakers is for youngsters to realise that finding a good job is all about their own future, and that only they themselves can really change things. Projects and programmes can only be of additional assistance, but ultimately it is up to youngsters themselves to invest in their futures. Trying to enhance this awareness means talking with immigrant youth – not only talking *about* them. The individual-based approach promotes making contact with this group of youth and communicating with them, in such ways that will lead to improving their skills and raising their levels of consciousness.

Nonetheless, Amsterdam policymakers have to be aware that many of these young children have a very unrealistic view of their own future: they often think they will become rich and secure a good job even without a proper education. To what extent do conversations between policymakers and youngsters help us to improve policies?

Stefan Nowack
Stefan Novak brought up the importance of not just helping unemployed youngsters, but also of truly providing them with guidance. Part of this means emphasising that policymaking is about *them*, the youngsters. Doing so can, in turn, help foster a sense of mutual responsibility between youngsters and policymakers. The implemented policies set youth in motion by actually motivating them to work, rather than simply sanctioning their receipt of social benefits.

Andreas Germershausen
Germany's focus has been not only on low-skill labour, but on career development at large. In this vein, Berlin and Amsterdam share the same goals. In Andreas Germershausen's view, Amsterdam has had a stricter, and at that, perhaps more successful approach. In Berlin, image formation is also very important: policymakers don't want to send the wrong signals to youngsters.

Paul Nota had suggested that policymakers should move away from formalised discussions, which prove to present problems of representation. Instead, what could be embraced are the more informal ways of talking about how to improve policies. This means communicating with people in the field more often and letting their own voices be heard.

3.3 Richard Stanton: Summary of Block 1 and Block 2

The Amsterdam policy is characterised by the view that:
- Financial investments and an intensive individual-basis approach make a real difference. Resources are therefore of utmost importance; politicians should be aware of the fact that it takes time, money and effort to tackle these complex socio-economic problems.
- For people to enjoy successful job opportunities in the long-term, measures should be taken at an early age (from zero to four years old).
- Sanctions on benefits, along with personal motivation and real opportunities, prove most effective for everyone, migrant and non-migrant.
- All relevant institutions, such as the police, youth offices, schools, et al., should work together combat youth unemployment.

However the question remains: is a sanction on social benefits a useful instrument to significantly lower the number of unemployed youth? It could lead to short-term success, but in the long run, it could also produce distrust towards public institutions. Regardless, any attempt to tackle youth unemployment, in Berlin or Amsterdam, should focus on real opportunities. What should be primarily examined are the options people have, because they do in fact have options. An important question to pose then is: can the state have its own expectations or, for that matter, furnish real possibilities for its inhabitants?

It would only be expected, furthermore, for immigration and integration policies to impact the very expectations of those migrants already residing in the state. Changes in integration and immigration policies – and the public debate about them – give rise to uncertainties. If it seems impossible to obtain citizenship and immigrants get the feeling they will never be a real part of society, they will not make an effort to invest in society. Why would they choose to take a proactive attitude? And why should they trust that authorities are truly committed to improving their situation?

Policymakers in both Amsterdam and Berlin have stressed the need to initiate policies targeting youth unemployment at an early age. However, this has pragmatic implications; for example, parents need to be involved. It is common knowledge that many immigrant parents are hard to reach, and it is even more difficult to persuade them to become involved in matters such as education. Still, the issue is of utmost importance and needs to be given continued attention.

4. Block 3 Integration and social cohesion in Berlin neighbourhoods

4.1 Kerstin Schmiedeknecht: Quartiersmanagement Schillerpromenade (The Berlin policy example)

In recent years, some of Berlin's districts have undergone changes in social structure. According to Kerstin Schmiedeknecht, this has been the cumulative effect of economic difficulties, increasing pauperisation and migration of the middle classes – all of which have often been often exacerbated by ethnic problems. As a result, in 1999, the city government, in close cooperation with the boroughs concerned, came to designate fifteen 'areas with special development needs'. In 2001, two more areas were selected. A Neighbourhood Management (NM) was implemented in each area to help ensure that it would see long-lasting improvements, as well as contribute to securing a general sense of stability. The NM policy was implemented within the framework of the programme 'Districts with Special Development Needs –
The Socially Integrative City', as initiated by Germany's national and federal state governments in 1999.

NM is now active in 33 troubled areas in Berlin. These areas are designated as:

- Neighbourhood Management Areas (NMA), specific areas where a range of different problems may be occurring simultaneously. In these areas, a Neighbourhood Management Team establishes a small office to work together with groups such as the neighbourhood inhabitants, local entrepreneurs, housing companies and the local city department. Their aim is to collectively strengthen the area's social networks and to improve the neighbourhood's quality of life.
- Intervention areas.
- Prevention areas.

The two main problems for people who live in these areas are unemployment – in fact, many youngster go directly from school to a state of unemployment – and language difficulties .

To reach their target groups, the NM at the Schillerpromenade, in Berlin, works with so-called 'neighbourhood mothers' (*Stadtteil Mütter*). These neighbourhood mothers live in the neighbourhood, have experience with children, speak German along with their native language (mainly Turkish), and they must be unemployed. They receive a six-month education, which includes a language course in Turkish and German. The NM holds regular meetings with the neighbourhood mothers, so as to hear about what is going on in the neighbourhood.

Apart from neighbourhood mothers, Schmiedeknecht described how Neighbourhood Management Schillerpromenade works closely together with immigrant organisations, including the Şehitlik-Mosque and the Genezareth Church.

The year 2007 has been called the *Jahr des Besuchs* ('year of visitors'). Under this theme, the Quartiersmanagement Schillerpromendade has organised different

intercultural projects that seek to overcome language gaps and culture barriers, as well as to promote neighbourhood ties.

4.2 Panel discussion

In Amsterdam there is no structural vision for neighbourhood management. It is more common to subsidise single neighbourhood projects. If and when Amsterdam might work with a neighbourhood approach, it is overseen by local city departments, and not specifically from an immigrant integration perspective.

To create social cohesion or when working on migrant emancipation the question thus is: how much targeted policy is needed (in ethnic or culturally specific terms) to reach the target group?

Luuk Holleman

Luuk Holleman described how Amsterdam has programmes and projects that work to enhance the city's social cohesion, though they are not as structured and localised as Berlin's Neighbourhood Management. Following the murder of film-maker Theo van Gogh in 2004, the city of Amsterdam decided to do something that would improve – if not repair – its troubled ethnic relations: the 'I amsterdam' campaign was initiated. In an effort to avoid segregation and to increase social cohesion among all of Amsterdam's people, I amsterdam's approach is to focus on no specific ethnic target groups.

The idea behind I amsterdam is that the city's strongest asset is its citizens. According to Holleman, the diversity of Amsterdam's business community, the differing backgrounds of its residents and the wide and innovative perspectives of its citizens are the lifeblood of the city. By combining efforts and enhancing collaboration between groups and people, the goal is to fully realise Amsterdam's potential. This kind of broad-ranging project is, in Holleman's view, the best way to improve social cohesion in the city.

Paul Nota

Amsterdam's population is one that changes constantly. The average period a person lives in Amsterdam is ten years. Within this timeframe, a person usually also moves within the city. Programmes such as Berlin's Neighbourhood Management, which is established according to the inhabitants of a specific neighbourhood, are therefore unlikely to work in Amsterdam. Amsterdam used

similar types of local neighbourhood projects during the 1970s and 1980s, but the results were disappointing.

Robin Schneider
Robin Schneider emphasised the difficult position policymakers are often confronted with. On the one hand, they desire immigrant groups to increase their participation socially, economically and politically. All kinds of policy instruments have been built to encourage and enhance participation. Berlin's Neighbourhood Management is one example, but the Amsterdam approach of dealing with youth unemployment shows another. So, on the other hand, there is thus the risk that authorities may become paternalistic. Yet, as Schneider posited, to what extent is it necessary for policymakers to become paternalistic so as to enforce participation?

Frank de Zwart
Frank de Zwart wondered whether paternalism really is a problem. He expressed the belief that it is seemingly more an issue of control. To what extent do city authorities have any 'control' over groups living in a Neighbourhood Management Area anyway, he asked. Questions to follow would thus be: is it a problem to target Turks, Moroccans and others as groups, rather than as the individual inhabitants of a neighbourhood? Would they mobilise as ethnic groups? Moreover, are there other ways to improve social participation?

Luuk Holleman
As Luuk Holleman pointed out, for quite some time, Amsterdam has worked with migrant advisory boards, each of which represents a different ethnic group. This arrangement, however, has led to inadequate advisory because the members of each board were not sufficiently competent to provide solid policy recommendations.

Hasib Moukaddim
In response, Hasib Moukaddim explained how the incompetence of migrant advisory board members partly has had to do with gaps in representation. It became apparent that members were not representing a considerable part of the ethnic group in question. Yet, as hindsight has shown, it would not be realistic to expect a more thorough representation in the first place. A case in point, the diversity among Amsterdam's Turkish inhabitants is too great to be able to speak in the name of one Turkish interest, and moreover, every Turk may not necessarily

feel like representing the whole – or a specific demographic of the – Turkish population in Amsterdam.

4.3 Richard Stanton: Summary of Block 3 and concluding remarks

Richard Stanton identified three characteristic elements discussed in the policy workshop that he believes make integration policy successful:

1. Good integration programmes are, in his words, a 'pretty intensive piece of work.' Berlin's Neighbourhood Management and programmes in Amsterdam that successfully integrate immigrant youth into the labour market require a concentrated investment of effort, in terms of both personnel and financial resources. Hence, the fundamental political judgement is about just that investment.
2. The exemplary projects that were discussed throughout the course of 'Successes and Challenges of Local Integration Policy' show a strong form of devolution, a lot of power dispersed at the local level and, very notably, a fairly broad definition of success – in other words, 'quite a bit of flexibility in the way targets are defined.' This is an important asset to the approach because poorly set targets can cause many distortions in the perception of how a policy works. For example, in London the question of indicators and targets has not been properly addressed. Certain refugee employment programmes have suffered as a result. The anticipated outcome – the target – was set in a very mechanical way that failed to take into account the kinds of transitions refugees would have to make. The local approaches presented in the workshop derive strength from their very flexibility when it comes to what success may be identified as, particularly within a broad strategic framework.
3. The policies are designed to fit within a wider framework. They operate as part of a whole integration work infrastructure, while paralleling other efforts of integration policy, such as the mainstreaming of intercultural opening. It is absolutely essential that integration policy and programmes be imbedded in a framework that is of a holistic nature.

Another main area of considerable interest in this debate concerns questions of participation and decision-making. These issues of course point to the debate's problematic aspects. For example, it is difficult to look at participation only in terms of finding representative groups at the local decision-making level. Migrant communities can be very diverse even within one ethnic entity. Competition within the community among different groups claiming to represent a larger migrant group can be problematic. This has been illustrated in the failure of Amsterdam's representative structures, whereby specific ethnic interest groups

were likely to either dominate the debate or inappropriately claimed to speak on behalf of the whole migrant community. However, it should be noted that it is unclear whether this case's failure was caused by the principles of involvement and participation, or rather, by the way multicultural politics have developed into a system of inward-looking representation among competing migrant interest groups, thus creating the appearance of incompetence.

Why such problems have not occurred in Berlin was not exactly elaborated on in the discussion, but in Stanton's view, the mere prospect of success has helped migrants in some of Berlin's neighbourhoods feel they are involved in German society, and that there is, in fact, a way for people to affect local governance matters. As Stanton said speaking in general terms: 'people fight when they are making no progress.' The successful Berlin project at the Schillerpromenade exemplifies progress made.

In London, a city of enormous immigration where, at one point, 10 per cent of the European Union's net immigration was registered, the sheer size of immigration is the problem. London is home to two million people who were born abroad, more than 300 different languages are spoken there and the city has thousands of groups that represent migrant and ethnic communities. As such, the mayor is currently examining ways to involve migrants and refugees as active participants in civic activities and the policymaking process. Although translating the prevailing circumstances into participation structures appears to be quite difficult, the approach towards integration policy in London is quite simple: equality of opportunity. The key to this approach is the process of getting people involved in governance.

Even in cities with a high population turnover, to assure both high-level and quality integration, people must be given a voice. There is the obvious need for broad-based participation by migrant communities, even, for example, among refugees who cannot remain in the city for more than two years. Both pragmatically and abstractly, aspects of migrant participation have crucial implications for integration policy. First and foremost, without the voice of migrants and refugees as participants, city authorities would be virtually ignorant to all the information vital to successful integration policy development and its implementation; no data system in any city can adequately inform authorities about the real-life condition of migrants. Secondly – if not more abstractly – without a voice, in Stanton's words, 'people don't feel they have a future.' As already mentioned, the mere thought of a future that has prospects is imperative to the success of integration programmes. This was reinforced by the question Stanton posited: 'how do we make it real for young persons so that they themselves can build a role in the labour market?' Providing his own answer he said: 'by feeling they have a future in it.' This same notion is applicable in other urban issues, such as coping with crime. Crime can be combated by helping people feel that the police are *their* police. One way to do this is by giving people a say in how their

police should behave, in turn setting certain codes of conduct that consider the specific circumstances and special needs of immigrant neighbourhoods.

In sum, the issue of social, economical and political participation of immigrant groups is crucial to the many different fronts of integration. It would be very interesting to look into why different kinds of participation work in some settings, while not in others.

Annex: Workshop Schedule and Participants

Block I Opening and presentations on integration policies and local developments

- 9.00 Opening of workshop: **Günter Piening** (Beauftragter des Senats von Berlin für Integration und Migration)/ **Paul Nota** (Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling, Gemeente Amsterdam)
- 9.15 The Dilemma of Recognition: **Frank de Zwart** (Universiteit Leiden)
- 10.00 Vorstellung der Ergebnisse des komparativen Forschungsprojekts: Maßnahmen der Integrationspolitik zur Förderung sozialer und politischer Partizipation in Amsterdam und Berlin: **Floris Vermeulen** (Universiteit van Amsterdam)/**Maria Berger** (Universiteit van Amsterdam)

Block II Labour market integration of immigrant youth in Amsterdam

- 11.15 The Right to Work (The Amsterdam Policy Example): **Dirk Huiberts** (Department of Societal Development)
- 11.45 Panel discussion: **Robin Schneider** - *Moderation* - (Büro des Integrationsbeauftragten Berlin)/**Holger Seibert** (Instituts für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung)/**Andreas Germershausen** (Büro des Integrationsbeauftragten Berlin)/**Arja Bleeker** (Dienst Werk en Inkomen, Gemeente Amsterdam)/**Paul Nota** (Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling, Gemeente Amsterdam)
- 13.00 Commentary: **Richard Stanton** (Greater London Authority)

Block III Integration and social cohesion in Berlin neighbourhoods

- 14.45 Präsentation praktischer Beispiele aus Berlin: Integration in Berliner Quartiersmanagement-Projekten:**Kerstin Schmiedeknecht** (Quartiersmanagement Schillerpromenade)
- 15.15 Panel Discussion: **Rob Bijl** - *Moderation* – (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Den Haag)/**Philipp Mühlberg** (Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung)/**Kerstin Schmiedeknecht** (Quartiersmanagement Schillerpromenade)/**Luuk Holleman** (Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling, Gemeente Amsterdam)/**Arnoud Brix**

(Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling, Gemeente Amsterdam)/**Hasib Moukaddim** (Dienst Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling, Gemeente Amsterdam)
- 16.30 Commentary: **Richard Stanton** (Greater London Authority)