Learning to belong? An analysis of Germany's migrant orientation programme from an HRE perspective.

Nicholas Stone

University of Hildesheim, Germany.

Abstract: The German integration programme teaches language and knowledge about Germany to newcomers and those with migration backgrounds. This article analyses the programme and course content from a human rights education (HRE) perspective to tease out some of the inherent contradiction between teaching 'German values', purported to be one of the integration programme's goals, and teaching human rights. Incorporating HRE principles into the programme will arguably benefit learners by avoiding some of this inherent bias as well as teaching learners to challenge societal injustice. The article explores the programme structure and goals, asking what message(s) it conveys. It delves into a content analysis of the 'Politics in a Democracy' chapter of *100 Stunden Deutschland*, focusing on how human rights and discrimination are depicted. As a result of this analysis, recommendations are developed that suggest how the orientation course specifically and the integration programme more broadly can ensure greater consistency with HRE principles.

Nicholas Stone: nicholaspaulstone@gmail.com

Learning to belong? An analysis of Germany's migrant orientation programme from an HRE perspective.

Nicholas Stone
nicholaspaulstone@gmail.com

University of Hildesheim, Germany

Abstract: The German integration programme teaches language and knowledge about Germany to newcomers and those with migration backgrounds. This article analyses the programme and course content from a human rights education (HRE) perspective to tease out some of the inherent contradiction between teaching 'German values', purported to be one of the integration programme's goals, and teaching human rights. Incorporating HRE principles into the programme will arguably benefit learners by avoiding some of this inherent bias as well as teaching learners to challenge societal injustice. The article explores the programme structure and goals, asking what message(s) it conveys. It delves into a content analysis of the 'Politics in a Democracy' chapter of *100 Stunden Deutschland*, focusing on how human rights and discrimination are depicted. As a result of this analysis, recommendations are developed that suggest how the orientation course specifically and the integration programme more broadly can ensure greater consistency with HRE principles.

Keywords: Germany, human rights education, integration, immigration, orientation

Introduction

Numerous western European states have enacted some form of integration programme since the late 1990s, as notions of how to manage immigration were reconsidered and governments were challenged to address this complex task. In Germany, the state faced pressure to manage immigration integration due to a number of migration flows, each of which had left its mark on Germany society and shaped the context of the integration programme. Firstly, there was the separation of the German state into east and west and the migration of ethnic Germans from abroad and East Germany to West Germany after the Second World War. Poutrus notes that the end of the Second World War resulted in greater ethnic homogenization in European nations, particularly in Germany (2014, p. 118). The notion of German ethnicity was challenged over time, as the group from the former USSR (*Aussiedler*) were perceived as culturally different from West Germans and often spoke little or no German (Marshall, 2010, p. 10).

Another migration flow was non-German refugees. Following the Second World War, West Germany made strenuous efforts to establish its identity as a modern, liberal society, one which was a place of refuge for the persecuted (Schönwälder & Triadafilopoulos, 2006). Up until the late 1980s the predominant discourse, though challenged, was that asylum seekers to Germany were fleeing persecution and genuinely in need. This narrative changed, as public attitudes

hardened over concerns about economic ('bogus') refugees resulted in a tightening of the asylum law in 1993 (Thränhardt, 2002; Keely and Russell, 1994).

The third factor is the legacy of the guest worker programme, which had brought in millions of foreign labourers (and their families) to fuel post-Second World War economic expansion. This migration, and decades without an immigration integration policy, had produced a significant, multigenerational, non-citizenship group living in Germany (Schönwälder & Triadafilopoulos, 2006). Moreover, the mistaken belief that Germany could avoid permanent migration because the guest worker programme was a temporary economic measure blinded the state to the reality that migration would impact society (Chin, 2007). This came to a head in the early 2000s, and mainstream German politicians reluctantly admitted that Germany was, in fact, a country of immigration. Policy measures were enacted to facilitate integration into German society for immigrants and, in some cases, those with migration backgrounds (i.e. at least one grandparent who had migrated to Germany) (Williams, 2014).

The integration programme enacted in the 2005 Immigration Law focuses on teaching language skills (language course) and norms and values (orientation course). It was developed partly as a response to the fears expressed by the media and some politicians that immigrants and those with migrant backgrounds had failed to integrate into German society, instead forming parallel communities (Schönwälder & Söhn, 2009). As early as in 2001, the notion of a German 'guiding culture' (*Leitkultur*) was raised in heated public debates, premised on the belief that German culture should form a core tenet of the integration programme (Abali, 2009). It was argued that anyone who chooses to live in Germany must learn and respect inherent German values (Klusmeyer, 2001). This means that the integration programmes are as much an exercise in symbolic politics as a measure to foster societal cohesion (Caponio & Testore, 2018).

Against this background, this article seeks to analyse the orientation course from a human rights education (HRE) perspective. By analysing the courses from an HRE perspective, one can identify how the courses are constructed to convey culturally specific versus universal norms and values, as well as if and how they empower learners to challenge the bias of the majority society. It begins by providing an overview of the integration programme, including its context, structure and goals. It critically analyses the integration programmes generally, and the term 'integration' specifically. It proceeds by defining HRE, using the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education (2010). It presents a content analysis of the 'Politics in a Democracy' chapter of *100 Stunden Deutschland*, one of the most recent textbooks certified by the *Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge* (the German Federal Ministry for Migration and Refugees). The focus of the study is how human rights and discrimination are implicit or explicitly addressed in the textbook. Using content analysis, I draw on Bromley's analysis of multiculturalism and human rights to assess the textbook content's consistency with HRE.

I broadly question if the orientation course content is compatible with HRE, as defined in the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training, where education must be about, through and for human rights (DHRET; U.N., 2011). The key tenet of the orientation course is to teach national values and norms under the goal of fostering integration, while human rights, on the other hand, are universal. HRE principles could be a method to model the course material in a

manner to avoid prejudice, while providing the means to respect and encourage cultural diversity, promote democracy and realize social justice.

What is the integration programme?
The German integration programme is used by politicians as evidence that immigration is being managed and integration promoted by the state after decades of inaction towards the significant population of migrants or those with migration backgrounds. Germany's integration programme is structured into two parts: the language component consisting of 600 hours; and the orientation course, where societal values, history and the political system are taught, which has 100 hours. The orientation course originally ran for 30 hours, and was increased to 45 hours in 2007 then to 60 hours in 2011. In 2016, it was extended to 100 hours, signifying the importance placed on the newcomer's obligation to learn German values and the heightened tensions of the refugee crisis (Martin, 2016).

It is worth noting that the programme is predominately focused on language acquisition (600 hours versus 100) and is tailored to learners' needs. For instance, anyone lacking formal schooling or who is functionally illiterate may attend 300 hours of extra language study. Courses are offered to people from a non-Latin alphabet background and specifically to women, led by women, during kindergarten hours (BAMF, 2019). While 900 hours of language study is no substitute for a primary education, it is a laudable goal to teach fundamental literacy. Without it, people do not have the opportunity to realize human rights or defend the rights of others. They will struggle to achieve a life of dignity, particularly in a knowledge-based economy. UNESCO (2019) argues that 'The "multiplier effect" of literacy empowers people, enables them to participate fully in society and contributes to improve livelihoods' and that 'Literacy is also a driver for sustainable development in that it enables greater participation in the labour market; improved child and family health and nutrition; reduces poverty and expands life opportunities.' Targeting the courses to reach specific audiences can help improve the lives of families immigrating to Germany. It enables them to interact with society, to meet their daily needs and to express their desires and opinions.

The programmes are obligatory for certain groups, for instance 'If you received your residence permit after 1 January 2005 and you cannot make yourself understood in German at a simple, adequate level, you must attend an integration course.' (BAMF, 2019). Additionally, and with the threat of sanctions, if 'you receive unemployment benefit II (*Arbeitslosengeld II*) and the office which pays your unemployment benefit II requires you to attend, and you have particular integration needs and the local immigration office requires you to attend' (ibid). To note, this is not just for new migrants. The question of how and if the coercive measures would be applied in the case of non-compliance with the integration programme's attendance requirements is still a valid one, particularly after the recent extension (Joppke, 2007). When the integration programme or tests are obligatory, it means that being unable to demonstrate the language and knowledge threatens to deny family reunification, permanent residency or results in financial penalties (Carerra and Vankova, 2019; Böcker & Strick, 2011). At the end of the integration programme learners are expected to demonstrate A2 or B1 language mastery, as well as knowledge of the values, norms, legal-political system, and history, in the Living in Germany test.

For the programme to reach a large audience, it must be affordable. The

language courses cost 1.95€ an hour; they are free to anyone who is on social support or of limited means, and funding for transportation is available. In addition, learners who do not qualify for the reduced costs can be reimbursed for half the fees if they successfully complete the programme within two years. The courses can also be paid in instalments to reduce the financial burden.

What is integration and what is the goal of the integration programme?
It is reasonable to expect a concern with norms and values would be expressed by ministries and politicians when discussing the orientation course. Indeed, BAMF stresses that orientation course participants will learn 'important values in German society, e.g., freedom of worship, tolerance and equal [gender] rights' (2019). However, referring to these specific values as important ones to be taught signifies that the target audience is perceived to lack them. There is also a risk that the reality that learners may face outside the classroom does not reflect these values. Banulescu-Bogdan and Benton raise this issue, arguing:

> … values courses may celebrate equality and the rule of law, many minorities may experience discrimination or ethnic profiling by authorities; and while gender equality is held up as one of the principal reasons for restricting certain Muslim cultural practices, problems such as domestic violence are in fact endemic in many native communities. (Banulescu-Bogdan & Benton, 2017, p. 14).

They assert that orientation courses should even-handedly portray society as it exists, and base this portrayal on relevant societal values, as opposed to depicting an ideal type. Targeting a specific group, religion or ethnicity almost certainly has a negative effect not only on that group, but on all groups who are perceived to be different from the host society. The mandatory nature of the integration programme implies that someone is deficient in the skills and values the programme seeks to impart. It conveys the message that immigrants must share the values of the majority, discounting their experience and interpretation of those values, and this could dissuade some from feeling a bond with society.

Claiming a specific group holds values incompatible with that of the majority while arguing that the majority values human rights is fraught with contradictions in theory and practice. This is one of the main arguments raised by critical migration theorists regarding the use of the term 'integration'. Schinkel questions 'who' is integrating into 'what', in that integration implies some coherent entity to integrate into, i.e. society, while signifying that some people, by virtue of their (racialised) being, lack a quality that facilitates integration (Schinkel, 2018). He challenges the notion of immigration integration; through the act of researching and enacting policy one divides the population into ethnic categories whereby white citizens are considered representative of the integrated community and do not appear on the 'integration monitor' (Schinkel, 2018, p. 4). In a similar vein, Abdou argues that we should understand immigration integration '… as a phenomenon that reveals more about those who articulate ideas about integration and decide on integration measures than it does about those who are the target of integration (i.e. the migrant "other")' (2019, p. 3). A consistent criticism throughout these and other works is how poorly or vaguely defined integration is and how this allows it to be used by politicians and others, despite the criticisms levied against the term.

One recent example of political commentary elucidates that point. While discussing immigration integration, the centre-right Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union (CDU/CSU) member of the *Bundestag* Carsten Linneman (2018) claims, 'I am personally a fan of the obligatory integration agreements according to the Swiss model. Here individually tailored goals will be agreed upon, their achievement continually monitored, and the evaluation linked to sanctions or rewards' [author's translation]. There are a number of problems with this message, including the argument that someone must be coerced to integrate through sanctions or rewards (that the state must provide in order to facilitate this process). Even taking integration in this instance to mean full participation in social, economic and political life and framing it as a desirable outcome, it negates the power and inherent structural inequalities in society and defines failure to achieve integration as a deficit of the individual. It negates that someone's culture, experience, or diversity has value in the host society. Instead, their (perceived) illiberal values are viewed as hindering their integration and must be replaced by the liberal values of the majority. Perhaps most troubling is the notion that continually monitoring someone for their progress in terms of integration measurements will somehow foster this integration, rather than making it abundantly clear that the individual cannot be integrated if they lack the racialised characteristics of the majority group.

What is Human Rights Education?
The integration programme structure and goals provide some overview of the bias that the programme contains. It is important to reflect on how integration is defined and what is demanded of learners who are obligated to take these courses. The question is what would one expect to see if the programmes were constructed according to human rights education principles, and what are they? The Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education ('The Charter') states that HRE:

> means education, training, awareness raising, information, practices and activities which aim, by equipping learners with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviour, to empower learners to contribute to the building and defence of a universal culture of human rights in society, with a view to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. (Council of Europe, 2010, p. 5)

HRE is more than teaching the definitions of human rights; it is rather a matter of empowering learners with the awareness, skills and understanding to contribute to a human rights-based society. It is meant to change attitudes and behaviour, specifically in promoting human rights and linking one's own situation with that of the broader global community. This definition also argues that learners are to build and defend a universal culture of human rights, which necessarily implies a respect for and non-discrimination of diversity. Bajaj, in her analysis of HRE, asserts that though there are many interpretations, there is broad agreement on '... the need for HRE to include goals related to cognitive (content), attitudinal or emotive (values/skills), and action-oriented components' (Bajaj, 2011, p. 485). Moreover, she highlights the different contexts that drive different emphases on individual versus collective rights. Though human rights are all equally valid, she posits that depending

on the context, including the level of economic development and the political system, there is a different focus on rights, depending on what will bring about social justice. For example, sustainable development may be the focus in Latin America, while issues of discrimination against minorities may be a more pressing issue in Europe.

HRE and Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) share a common goal, though there are differences in content and focus. Regarding EDC, the Charter states that this means that education is to focus on building the attitudes, knowledge and behaviour to empower learners to exercise and defend their democratic rights. Analysing EDC and HRE, the Charter argues that:

> Education for democratic citizenship focuses primarily on democratic rights and responsibilities and active participation, in relation to the civic, political, social, economic, legal and cultural spheres of society, while human rights education is concerned with the broader spectrum of human rights and fundamental freedoms in every aspect of people's lives. (Council of Europe, 2010, p. 7)

Both HRE and EDC require learners to engage with and fulfil responsibilities linked to human and democratic rights. Osler and Starkey (2005) analyse how the international community is moving toward a common understanding of what those responsibilities should entail. They rightly argue that:

> It is relatively easy to convince individuals that they have rights, for these are strong claims that they can make in the expectation that they will receive benefits, such as protection and the provision of services. Responsibilities, on the other hand, imply not receiving but giving; not individualism but a sense of the communal and the collective.

Therefore, learners must be able to empathize with the situation of others and to value and respect diversity. Human rights are to be understood in a universal context, rather than in strictly national terms. They are global, guaranteed under the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights, and it creates a false understanding when they are associated only with citizenship rights. Learners must also recognize human rights abuses and good practices within this broader context, and acknowledge the interconnectedness of the community, economy and society with people in far corners of the world. From this perspective, the goal of HRE is to impart a sense of agency and responsibility.

Learners must be able to practise democracy and respect for human rights in and beyond the classroom. The classes should not restrict one's ability to practise those rights. It is problematic that the very institutions that must teach democratic citizenship are hierarchical and structured in a way that reflects the majority bias. In fact, scholars argue that the process of incorporating human rights into national textbooks can change the activist-oriented approach through a process of 'decoupling' (Bajaj, 2011, p. 488). These institutions may unintentionally perpetuate the same racism and implicit xenophobia seen in the broader society. Transformative HRE seeks to redress this problem, as it '… exposes gaps between rights and realities, and provokes group dialogue on the specific steps essential to closing the gaps' (Brown, 2016, p. 99). Formal education may also encourage respect and deference to authority, rather than promoting learners' rights and the responsibility to question

how the actions and policies of the state may positively or negatively affect the attainment of human rights. Osler's critique of EDC is that citizenship education programmes tend not to encourage learners to challenge or be critical of government, in part due to the goal of promoting patriotism and allegiance to the state (2009, p. 63). To teach democratic and human rights, it is necessary for learners to critically analyse how society is structured, and how its discourse can disadvantage minorities and perpetuate inequalities. One particular school of thought on human rights is the protest school, which seeks to rectify injustice. They argue that '… human rights articulate rightful claims made by or on behalf of the poor, the unprivileged, and the oppressed' (Dembour, 2010, p. 3). Consequently, if human rights education loses its activist-oriented approach, it will fail to be transformative and to live up to this goal.

Similarly, the governance of educational institutions and the learning environment should be constructed in a way that empowers learners. To be consistent with HRE, the course material should be constructed, via questions and activities, in a way that promotes human and democratic rights. This calls for participatory pedagogy and open-ended questions which enable learners to analyse an issue from multiple perspectives (Bromley, 2011). HRE is more effective in imparting wisdom and shaping attitudes when the materials and means of teaching are tailored to learners' needs. Providing them with the link between what happens abroad (the regional or global) and how this affects the local situation may help to develop a sense of solidarity. In a similar manner, Ippoliti argues that 'Educational activities should be practical – relating human rights to learners' real-life experience and enabling them to build on human rights principles found in their own cultural context' (2009, in Mahler et al., p. 12). HRE must be acceptable, i.e. culturally appropriate to learners (Brown, 2016).

Using multiple perspectives also reiterates that democratic and human rights can be understood in different ways, depending on context, provided they are consistent with the underlying principle. Learners should be taught the relatively high-level principles of human rights, but must also be able to imagine how they are practised in daily life and in different contexts. These principles are captured in a number of internationally and regionally agreed-upon texts, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, or the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. They provide tools to develop intercultural communication and understanding. Osler argues, for instance, 'The texts provide a set of principles against which we can critically reflect on our own culture, values, beliefs and behaviours and those of our fellow citizens' (Osler & Starkey, 2005, p. 167). In sum, HRE is to empower learners to fully participate in the economic, political and social levels of society and to challenge injustice and inequality. It must enable course participants to support and defend human rights from themselves and for others. It must demonstrate it respects and values diversity, ensuring the principle of non-discrimination. To be most effective, it needs to use participatory methods and link the local to the global, while remaining relevant to learners' specific contexts.

Course content analysis of *100 Stunden Deutschland*
There are five textbooks approved for the orientation course. Analysing *100 Stunden Deutschland* allows some generalizations to be made about the course material on the whole. This is because the textbooks are all approved by the same authority

(BAMF) and share a curriculum. Their structure remains consistent: each starts with politics in a democracy, followed by sections on history and responsibility, and, finally, people and society (BAMF, 2019). Though some of the examples the books use will vary, the core topics are the same and the texts are constructed to prepare learners for the 'Life in Germany' test. This reduces the range of variation across the textbooks.

In order to do the course content analysis, I use a hybrid content-discourse analysis and focus on the 'Politics in a Democracy' chapter, which is where discussions of human rights law and the constitution are predominantly found. The texts I study are written for language learners. They have simplified vocabularies and sentence structures, but I do not study this aspect. Other scholars of discourse or content analysis would be interested in the grammar, syntax and constitutive parts of communication, be they spoken or written, while I am interested in the messages the texts convey. It is important to critically analyse what those messages are, how they are constructed and what this says about the sender (van Dijk, 2007). I focus on two questions: 1) how does the text explicitly discuss human or fundamental rights and values? 2) how does the text discuss discrimination? Regarding the second question, in the 'Politics in a Democracy' chapter the text does not explicitly use the term discrimination. It rather has a topic which describes real life events and asks if they are consistent with the constitution. Many of the examples are of discrimination. The goal is to analyse the meaning behind the messages. Though a message may be understood by the writer and reader, there is much that is latent: 'Thus, the message may reveal something about the characteristics or unconscious intent of the source or about the beliefs and values of a group or culture' (Singleton and Straits, 2010).

It is beneficial to use Bromley's analysis of multiculturalism and human rights in Canadian textbooks as a foundation for that of *100 Stunden Deutschland*. She identifies four main strategies of teaching multiculturalism and human rights:

1. Framing human rights and multiculturalism as part of national identity;
2. Using pedagogical approaches that promote multiple perspectives;
3. Celebrating social and scientific figures and accomplishments as a main source of national pride;
4. Drawing on exogenous sources to affirm state legitimacy. (Bromley, 2011, p. 151)

Regarding the second strategy (using pedagogical approaches to promote multiple perspectives), *100 Stunden Deutschland* (2017) states in a foreword to learners 'All themes are presented in a way that a debate is stimulated around the content' [author's translation] (Butler et al., p. 3). Different views are illustrated in simplified language. Bromley's fourth strategy (drawing on exogenous sources to affirm state legitimacy) means the text should refer to a supranational level when discussing human rights. It is arguably expected that the orientation course textbooks will associate national identity with human rights and the rule of law, though the question is how they do so and if, as above, they focus on human rights as citizenship rights or as universal ones. The third point, regarding where and from whom Germany draws its national pride, is interesting, but outside of the scope of my analysis.

100 Stunden Deutschland allocates the largest part of the text to the Politics in a Democracy module (pp. 8-59), followed by the History and Responsibility module (pp. 60-89) and the People and Society one (pp. 90-140.) The Fundamental Rights in the Constitution section of the first module starts with the statement 'Human dignity is inviolable' and presents two images of people [author's translation] (Butler et al., 2017, p. 10). One depicts a person going through a garbage can on a street, hands up to the elbows in a blue container, and the other is of three people at a garbage dump, rummaging and collecting things to carry away. Several statements are presented and learners are expected to match the statements to the photos and compare them in groups. The statements are: 'No person should live among garbage, for every person is valuable! No one should be excluded from society'; 'People are not like things. People are also more valuable than animals'; 'If people live in garbage, this contravenes human rights and human dignity'; and finally, 'Emergency and poverty bring about resourcefulness' [author's translations] (ibid). There are three discussion starters on the left-hand side of the page, stating 'The photo shows how…', 'You can see a person who…', 'The houses in the background are a contrast to…' [author's translations] (ibid). From a HRE perspective this enables learners to compare their situations with those less fortunate. Poverty and inequality are two factors that prevent the attainment of human rights and social justice. In fact, in a discussion of human rights, democracy and development, Osler and Starkey confront these issues, asserting that 'Such inequalities create social conditions that can spawn violent political conflicts' while 'Poverty and inequality are barriers to citizenship and lead to instability' (2005, p. 27). The classroom discussion could lead to a broader exploration of human rights and justice, around the talking points. However, it is unclear how extensively the topic would be analysed and there is considerable room for the teacher to drive the discussion.

The second question under this topic is 'What exactly are the Fundamental Rights?' and the text presents Article 1 of the German Constitution (Basic Law). The text does not refer to exogenous sources for legitimacy, nor does it position human rights as being international, universally accepted principles guaranteed through the UN (or even the EU), although it explicitly states that they are the basis of peace and justice in the world. It does not clarify that human rights apply to all people in the world, rather stating 'The Constitution applies to all Germans: human rights are the basis for peace and justice in the world' [author's translation] (ibid). This is insufficient to qualify as HRE, as it appears to situate human rights solely within the German context. The text suggests, in a learning tip on the right-hand side of the page, that leaners memorize Article 1 and translate it into their mother tongue. This frames human rights as part of the national identity.

The following two pages introduce learners to additional Fundamental Rights in the German Constitution for citizens (*Bürgerrechte*) under the heading 'We are the Basic Laws' (ibid, p. 12). This in some ways dilutes the topic of human rights, as it presents civil rights and human rights side by side, rather than as separate issues. On the right-hand side, we read 'All Germans - civil rights. For foreigners, these rights do not apply. They must first become naturalised German citizens' [author's translation] (ibid). Activity 3b asks learners to work in pairs and look at examples of human and civil rights. They are required to describe how important those rights are to them. Most of the list contains human rights, with the exception of the freedom to choose one's career. The other examples are: 'that all people are equal before the law, that everyone is able to freely choose their religion, that all people should be treated

equally, that men and women have equal rights, that everyone may express their opinion freely, that no one has permission to enter someone else's home without permission' [author's translations] (ibid). These are core human rights, including equality (i.e., anti-discrimination). By encouraging learners to compare with a partner how important they feel the right is, the course provides the opportunity to appreciate a different perspective. As argued by HRE scholars, different societies place different focuses on rights and values and this activity would potentially elucidate this point, as learners compare personal contexts. It also expands the discussion of human rights, giving readers the impression that human rights and civil rights are valued in Germany.

The text continues with relevant examples of discrimination, under the heading 'Fundamental Rights: entitlement and practice' [author's translation] (ibid). The left-hand page has five pictures, starting with a man in a wheelchair on a street. This is followed by a woman holding a fake bill with 78€ written on it; two men with their arms around each other while walking in a park, with a child holding one man's hand; a woman wearing a headscarf and a white outfit; and lastly, a forbidden symbol with the text 'no fat chicks' and a caricature of a large woman behind it. Learners are asked to decide if these pictures that depict 'everyday situations' are compatible with the Constitution. The right-hand page gives examples of discrimination: Jonas, who is fired from his job as a waiter due to scars he received in a car accident; Katia, who discovers after six years of working in the same position as her colleague Tom (performing the same tasks) that she earns 500€ less; a gay couple, Holger and Max, who are refused an apartment by a landlord who always finds a pretext to avoid renting to homosexuals; Ahmad, who faces social prejudice when an elderly woman refuses to sit next to him as he 'stinks of garlic'; and Nadja, whose new boss demands that she take off her headscarf to work in the doctor's office, claiming it is 'unhygienic' [author's translations] (ibid, pp. 16-17). These are relevant as HRE examples because they depict not just overt discrimination, but how such discrimination is perceived and practised in daily life. For example, a woman paid less than her male counterpart is discriminated against if she performs equal work, and it is also apparently discriminatory when someone denies a rental unit to a same-sex couple, even without openly admitting it.

The case of Holger and Max is interesting because the victims have German names and they are not explicitly told that they are being denied accommodation because of their sexuality. It is, perhaps, the more accurate depiction of everyday discrimination in Germany, as it is not overt but practised by using other pretexts or justifications. The text reiterates this point throughout these examples. One message this conveys is that although Germany has a Constitution based on human rights and this is part of the national identity, discrimination still occurs.

The example of Ahmad is controversial as no one has to sit next to anyone else on public transit, nor was he denied entry or a seat. It would be discriminatory if he were denied the same rights as everyone else, but this situation, i.e., where he gives off a strong odour and someone refuses to sit next to him, is not in itself discriminatory. While unfortunate and unpleasant for Ahmad, this is not a human rights violation.

Nadja's example is also constructed in a manner that shows how discrimination can be hidden or denied in practice. Her new boss doesn't tell her to take off her headscarf because of his opinions about her religion, rather he argues that wearing it is unhygienic, and people working in a doctor's office must practise

hygiene. Learners have to discuss with their partners whether such situations conflict with the Fundamental Rights. This could generate classroom discussions.

The Integration Programme and HRE
There are a number of levels which need to be assessed regarding the integration programme generally, the orientation course specifically and how they relate to understandings of HRE. Starting broadly, and taking a critical approach to integration as a concept, it is apparent that the term is controversial. It raises the question of who needs to integrate and what this requires. As stated above, the requirements of integration are unachievable, since it is a perpetual state of action and any 'integration' achieved is unstable because it is racialised (non-white citizens are required to integrate). It means that only the group that is required to integrate is responsible and any failures rest on their lack of will or ability to do so. The integration programme, including an orientation course, is obligatory for certain groups, targeting people with migration backgrounds and implying a deficiency of values and ignorance of norms. This conveys a message inconsistent with HRE.

However, if we take an agnostic approach to the integration programme, there are points which are consistent with HRE. Teaching literacy does not inherently qualify as HRE, but without becoming literate, people may not be able to exercise their rights – human, democratic or otherwise. In this respect, it may be appropriate to assess the integration programme against the 4A teaching framework criteria: availability, accessibility, acceptability and adaptability. The integration programme is cost-effective and learners are financially subsidised to take the courses, which offer remediation and are designed for different groups. Teaching basic German language literacy is unquestionably necessary and beneficial for course participants and society. That said, this language level (A2 or B1) is insufficient to transform immigrants into critical thinkers. They will still struggle to attain sufficient employment at an A2 German level, and will not be able to apply for university or *Hochschule* (BMI, Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2019). In this respect, there is a limit to how effective the integration programme can be, as learners will not have mastered the language.

Learners are only taught German with the intention of ensuring they can take part in basic aspects of economic, political and social life. For instance, BAMF (2019) affirms the courses will teach participants 'to learn to write emails and letters in German, to fill out official forms, to have telephone calls, and to apply for work positions. The topics vary, depending on which course one takes' [author's translation]. Though this goal is certainly positive, it does not teach learners to be critical thinkers, to challenge societal hegemony and work for social justice; rather they are taught to be part of the dominant system. Freire argues that the goal of literacy is not just a means to an end, i.e., being able to function in society, but should empower people to question and comprehend the world around them. Specifically, he posits that 'Learning to read and write ought to be an opportunity for men to know what speaking the word really means: a human act implying reflection and action. As such it is a primordial human right and not the privilege of a few' (Freire, 1998, p. 7). He goes further, stressing that 'To be an act of knowing, then, the adult literacy process must engage the learners in the constant problematizing of their existential situations' (ibid, p. 12). In this sense, the A2 or B1 language level is insufficient for learners to question societal injustice, as described by Freire.

The text provides a granular level of detail necessary to assess how compatible the orientation course is with HRE. From the examples included here, it appears that some of the core aspects of HRE are covered; there is relevance and definitions of human rights are included. The text is less effective when civic and human rights are discussed together. Not having a distinct separation between the two leaves room for a false interpretation and may give the impression that both civic and human rights are dependent on the state, rather than human rights being endogenous to all humans. The text also fails to legitimize human rights by referring to regional or global sources, such as the EU or the UN, and this detracts from its message. In other words, if human rights are explained solely in the context of the German state, it creates the impression that they are not universal, merely German.

The goal of HRE is also to encourage empathy, understanding and agency. Human rights are explicitly discussed in a variety of contexts, including a section devoted to teaching the different ways in which discrimination can manifest itself and this, along with the open-ended nature of the activity questions, can encourage learners to appreciate human rights in different contexts. This is arguably an effective method of raising human rights and social justice issues because it uses everyday, common situations to present discrimination as an issue that affects many people. It is not one particular group that is affected by the insidious effects of discrimination and the text conveys the message that Germans with and without migration backgrounds also face this.

Using poverty as a case example to clarify and elaborate on the inviolability of the dignity of man links the local to the global. Poverty and inequality are antithetical to justice and prevent people from achieving human rights; they are issues which people may not personally experience, but are certainly aware of. Challenging learners to empathize with those who suffer such indignity is both realistic and relevant.

In relation to the classroom environment, the text contains questions and activities that encourage learners to analyse issues from multiple perspectives, though the overall approach seems more in line with a 'values and awareness model' of HRE, where the focus is on teaching knowledge without a predominant focus on inspiring activism (Tibbitts, 2002). The teacher plays a key role in facilitating and ensuring the classroom environment is intercultural (or otherwise) in practice. Arguably, some teachers may take an approach consistent with HRE, while others may focus on EDC or on an approach that enforces the notion of Germanness at the expense of universal norms, rights and values.

Conclusion

This analysis provides some insight into how the integration programme is consistent with HRE, but also how, in specific ways, it fails short of that standard. It uses the *100 Stunden Deutschland* text to perform a course content analysis though, due to length restrictions, focuses solely on one of the chapters, 'Politics in a Democracy'. It asks two main questions: are human rights explicitly discussed and, if so, how? and, how is discrimination addressed?

It would not be difficult to include more explicit references to universal human rights or to claim legitimacy from the UN or other supranational organisations. The text already focuses on the political-legal values enshrined via the German Constitution. Though the text frames civic and human rights as something inherent to Germany, rather than being universal in nature, this could be reframed

and would strengthen compatibility with HRE. Regarding the examples provided, they are mostly relevant and realistic, though some, particularly that of Ahmad, are not clear examples of discrimination and thus human rights issues. For the programme to be consistent with HRE, the classroom environment must be structured in a manner that encourages participants to become engaged not just with knowledge of human rights, but to practise them, and this depends entirely on the teacher. It needs to avoid the pitfalls of teaching facts without inspiring learners, treating them as vessels to be filled with facts, rather than sources of knowledge. It is difficult to envision this, as the structure does not lend itself to teaching critical thinking to challenge the dominant system; the goals are rather to teach a level of constitutional patriotism and allegiance to the German state. That said, the most effective way for both the text material and the environment to avoid bias while teaching norms and values is to focus on universal human rights, rather than notions of culturally specific ones. By using HRE as its core orientation and encouraging participants to acquire different perspectives it could create the opportunity for participants to become not just knowledgeable about human rights, but also willing and able to promote and support them.

References

Abali, O.S. (2009). *German Public Opinion on Immigration and Integration*. Migration Policy Institute, 1-17. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/german-public-opinion-immigration-and-integration

Abdou, L.H. (2019). Immigrant integration: the governance of ethno-cultural differences. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 7 (15), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0124-8

Bajaj, M. (2011). Human Rights Education: Ideology, Location, and Approaches. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 33(2), 481-508. https://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2011.0019

Banulescu-Bogdan, N., & Benton, M. (2017). *In search of common values amid large-scale immigrant integration pressures* (Report). Retrieved from *Migration Policy Institute.* Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/search-common-values-amid-large-scale-immigrant-integration-pressures

Böcker, A., & Tineke S. (2010). Language and Knowledge Tests for Permanent Residence Rights: Help or Hindrance for Integration? *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 13(2), 157-184. https://doi.org/10.1163/157181611X571268

Bromley, P. (2011). Multiculturalism and human rights in civic education: the case of British Columbia, Canada. *Educational Research*, 53(2), 151-164. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2011.572363

Bundesamt Für Migration und Fluchtlinge (2019). Integration Courses. Retrieved from http://www.bamf.de/DE/Willkommen/DeutschLernen/deutschlernen-node.html

Bundesamt Für Migration und Fluchtlinge (2019). Integration Courses: Approved Learning Materials. Retrieved from http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Downloads/Infothek/Integrationskurse/Lehrkraefte/liste-zugelassener-lehrwerke.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

Bundesamt Für Migranten und Fluchtlinge (2019). Spezielle Kursarten (Special Course types). Retrieved from http://www.bamf.de/DE/Willkommen/DeutschLernen/Integrationskurse/SpezielleKursarten/speziellekursarten-node.html

Bundesministerium des Innern, für Bau und Heimat (BMI) (2019). Integration Courses. Retrieved from https://www.bmi.bund.de/DE/themen/heimat-integration/integration/integrationskurse/integrationskurse-node.html

Butler et al. (2017). *100 Stunden Deutschland: Oreintierungskurs Politik, Geschichte, Kultur*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Caponio, T., & Testore, G. (2018). Civic Integration as Symbolic Policy? The Case of the Integration Agreement in Italy. In E. Bribosia, A. Rea, I. Rorive, & D. Sredanovic (Eds.), *Governing Diversity: Migrant Integration and*

Multiculturalism in North America and Europe. Belgium: Institut D'Etudes Europeennes.

Carrera, S., & and Vankova, Z. (2019). Human rights aspects of immigrant and refugee integration policies: a comparative assessment in selected Council of Europe member states. *Council of Europe Issue Paper*, [Migration Policy Centre]. Retrieved from Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository, at: http://hdl.handle.net/1814/62307

Chin, R. (2007). *The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, D. (2010). *Immigration and German Identity in the Federal Republic of Germany from 1945 to 2006.* Münster: LIT Verlag GmbH.

Council of the Europe (2010). Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education adopted according to the Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)7 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education. Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/16803034e5

Dunford, R. & Madhok, S. (2015). Vernacular rights cultures and the 'Right to Have Rights'. *Citizenship Studies*, 19:6-7, 605-619. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2015.1053791

Freire, P. (1970). The adult literacy process as cultural action for freedom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40(2). https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.40.2.q7n227021n148p26

Groenendijk, K. (2011). Pre-departure Integration Strategies in the European Union: Integration or Immigration Policy? *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 13(1), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1163/157181611X558191

Hanewinkel, V., & Oltmer, J. (2018). Integration and Integration Policies in Germany (Report). Retrieved from *Bundeszentral für politische Bildung* http://www.bpb.de/gesellschaft/migration/laenderprofile/262812/integration-and-integration-policies-in-germany

Hannoversche Allgemein. (2018). Unser Land braucht Einwanderung [Our country needs immigration]. Retrieved from https://www.haz.de/Nachrichten/Politik/Deutschland-Welt/Integrationsdebatte-Fuehrende-Politiker-fordern-ein-Umdenken

Ippoliti, E. (2009). Human Rights Education: Global Initiatives at the United Nations. In C. Mahler, C, A. Mihr, & R. Toivanen (Eds.), *The United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education and the Inclusion of National Minorities*. Peter Lang Verlag: Frankfurt am Main.

Joppke, C. (2007). Do obligatory civic integration courses for immigrants in Western Europe further integration? *Focus Migration*, 8, 1-7. Retrieved from http://www.hwwi.org/uploads/tx_wilpubdb/PB08_IntegrationCourses_02.pdf

Joppke, C. (2012). The Role of the State in Cultural Integration: Trends, Challenges and Ways Ahead. *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved from

http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/CivicIntegration-Joppke.pdf

Keely, C., & Russell, S. (1994). Responses of Industrial Countries to Asylum-Seekers. *Journal of International Affairs*, 47(2), 399-417. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/24357288

Klusmeyer, D. (2001). A 'guiding culture' for immigrants? Integration and diversity in Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(3), 519-532. https://doi.org/10.1080/136918301200266211

Macdonald, A., & Strupczewski, J. (2019). Pro-Europe vote fragments but limits nationalist gains in EU election. Retrieved from *Reuters* https://www.reuters.com/article/us-eu-election/pro-europe-vote-fragments-but-limits-nationalist-gains-in-eu-election-idUSKCN1SV0QQ

Marshall, B. (2000). *The new Germany and migration in Europe.* Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Martin, M. (2016). Living in Germany: A testing time for Merkel's migrants. Retrieved from *Reuters* https://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-germany-integration-i-idUSKCN0YG202

Osler, A. (Ed.) (2005). *Teachers, Human Rights and Diversity*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education*. England: Open University Press.

Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2005). *Citizenship and Language Learning: International Perspectives*. England: Trentham Books.

Osler, A. (2009). Human Rights Education and Education for Democratic Citizenship: Competing or Complimentary Agendas? In C. Mahler, A. Mihr & R.Toivanen (Eds.), *The United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education and the Inclusion of National Minorities*. Peter Lang Verlag: Frankfurt am Main.

Poutrus, P. G. (2014). Asylum in Postwar Germany: Refugee Admission Policies and Their Practical Implementation in the Federal Republic and the GDR Between the Late 1940s and the Mid-1970s. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 49(1), 115-133. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009413505667

Schönwälder, K., & Söhn, J. (2009). Immigrant Settlement Structures in Germany: General Patterns and Urban Levels of Concentration of Major Groups. *Urban Studies*, 46(7), 1439-1460. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009104575

Singleton, R., & Straits, B. C. (2010). *Approaches to social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thränhardt, D. (2002). Einwanderungs- und Integrationspolitik in Deutschland und den Niederlanden, *Leviathan*, 30(2), 220-249. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11578-002-0019-0

Tibbitts, F. (2002). Understanding What We Do: Emerging Models for Human Rights Education. *International Review of Education*, 48(3), 159-171. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020338300881

Triadafilopoulos, T., & Schönwälder, K. (2006). How the Federal Republic Became an Immigration Country: Norms, Politics and the Failure of West Germany's Guest Worker System. *German Politics & Society,* 24(3) (80), 1-19. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23742736

Schinkel, W. (2018). Against 'immigrant integration': for an end to neocolonial knowledge production. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6(31), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0095-1

Seythal, T. (2019). Migration pushes German population to record high of 83 million. Retrieved from *Reuters* https://www.reuters.com/article/us-germany-population/migration-pushes-german-population-to-record-high-of-83-million-idUSKCN1PJ0PA

United Nations. (2011). United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. Adopted by the General Assembly, Resolution 66/137, A/RES/66/137, 19 December 2011. Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Education/Training/Compilation/Pages/UnitedNationsDeclarationonHumanRightsEducationandTraining(2011).aspx

UNESCO (2019). Literacy. Retrieved from https://en.unesco.org/themes/literacy

van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.) (1997). *Discourse as structure and process: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vols. 1-1). London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446221884

Wagstyl, S. (2014). Germany: the immigrant influence. Retrieved from *Financial Times* https://www.ft.com/content/87b900a8-db05-11e3-8273-00144feabdc0

Williams, H. (2014). Changing the National Narrative: Evolution in Citizenship and Integration in Germany, 2000–10. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 49(1), 54–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009413505658

All web addresses are controlled as valid by January 15, 2019.