



**University of
Sunderland**

Hackett, Sarah (2011) A Learning Curve: The Education of Immigrants in Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Bremen from the 1960s to the 1980s. In: International Handbook of Migration, Minorities and Education: Understanding Cultural and Social Differences in Processes of Learning. Springer, pp. 349-364. ISBN 978-94-007-1465-6

Downloaded from: <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/id/eprint/1065/>

Usage guidelines

Please refer to the usage guidelines at <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively

contact sure@sunderland.ac.uk.

Running Head: A LEARNING CURVE

A Learning Curve: The Education of Immigrants in Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Bremen from

the 1960s to the 1980s

Sarah E. Hackett

University of Sunderland

Abstract

This paper will provide a voice to those cities previously neglected in the literature through a historical comparative analysis addressing the education of immigrants in Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Bremen from the 1960s to the 1980s. It will highlight the holistic ramifications of Britain and West Germany's two different immigration processes through an investigation of the correlation between national immigration legislation and local education policy. Its comparative nature will uncover the consequences of organic and artificial immigration in the long durée, and the benefits and disadvantages of centralised and federal administrations. The manner in which these immigrants became the recipients of changing policies will be conveyed, as well as two cities' attempts to address the cultural and social differences in the process of learning.

A Learning Curve: The Education of Immigrants in Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Bremen from
the 1960s to the 1980s

The importance of educational experiences amongst immigrant youths in Britain and West Germany remains undisputed in the literature.¹ Since the 1960s, both countries have witnessed a vast increase in the number of immigrant pupils enrolled in schools, causing the emergence of such terms as ‘educationally disadvantaged’, ‘equal educational opportunity’ and ‘multi-racial education’ (Willke, 1975; Rist, 1979b; Tomlinson, 1986). Regarding Britain, scholars have especially highlighted the problems endured by Afro-Caribbean pupils, and the educational hindrance caused by language needs and belated government responses (Taylor, 1974; Kirp, 1979a; Parekh, 1986). The literature addressing Germany concludes that immigrant schoolchildren have become concentrated in the least prestigious schools, suffered inequality within the apprenticeship and training system, and that many have left without a diploma (Wilpert, 1977; Faist, 1993; Alba, Handl & Müller, 1994). This paper will complement these works by presenting a historical assessment of the education of immigrants in Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Bremen, providing a voice to those beyond the foci of Birmingham and Berlin who, despite belonging to well established communities, have remained relatively silent in the literature. It will do so by means of an analysis of government documents from the 1960s through to the 1980s, a period for which material is readily available and one which charts vital changes in approach in both cities’ education sectors. It will start by offering an extended look at the general immigration and education policies of both countries.

Although there is no doubt that immigrant youths in Britain and Germany have traditionally endured hardships and disadvantages within the education sector, there is a fundamental difference in ideology that has shaped both countries’ immigration policies post-

1945. Britain's role as the imperial hub for a quarter of the world's surface has led to the creation of the socioeconomic and cultural entity of the Commonwealth. Depending on pre-existing links and bonds, immigrants arrived to Britain as ex-subjects of the imperial project, largely with the intention of settling indefinitely. They had the right to enter Britain and to British citizenship, and were entitled to vote as well as work in the civil service. Furthermore, the literature has emphasised the extent to which these colonial ties played a role in initial reasons for migrating (Layton-Henry, 1992; Joppke, 1996, p. 477; J. Herbert, 2008). It has been Britain's colonial history that gave way to an immigration pattern in which migrants arrived independently with social and economic aspirations. Alternatively, in West Germany, immigrants arrived as nothing short of economic pawns in the country's prospering economy. Due to its economic miracle of the 1950s, recruitment contracts were signed with eight countries (Panayi, 2000). The result was a guest-worker rotation system that generated privately negotiated economic immigration. Guest-workers in West Germany were seen as nothing more than a temporary phenomenon, a group of immigrant workers whom Herbert termed 'a reserve labour army' (U. Herbert, 1990, p. 211).

Comparisons between British and German cities with regards to immigrant experiences have rarely been pursued. One example is Boyes and Huneke's study on Turks in Berlin and Pakistanis in Bradford which, although a valuable contribution to the field, was nevertheless a comparison between two cities that had little more in common than their large immigrant communities (2004). Newcastle and Bremen, however, are home to well established South Asian and Turkish communities respectively,² and are two cities that allow for an effective comparison due to shared historical, economic and social characteristics. Both acted as major European ports, suffered economic downturns during the 1970s and 1980s, and have since become post-industrial landscapes struggling with commercial

readjustment. Most importantly, it has been argued that both cities have a strong sense of regional identity, a trait that has feasibly helped shape the experiences of their respective immigrant communities. Regarding Newcastle, scholars have established that this city sits at the centre of a region that prides itself on being a welcoming host (Todd, 1987; Renton, 2006). To the contrary, Bremen has arguably historically been home to a ‘special urban identity’ that has acted as a catalyst for jingoism and xenophobia (Buse, 1993).

Despite these claims, these cities have been largely overlooked in the literature. Bremen’s history of immigration has very much been overshadowed by its role as a centre of emigration in a similar way to the manner in which Newcastle’s has been marred by the experiences and reputation of South Shields, a North-Eastern city that has been home to a substantial immigrant population since the late 1800s (Hoerder, 1993; Lawless, 1995). However, there are certainly reasons for which this neglect should be reversed. Bremen, and indeed the whole of Germany’s, poor performance in the PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) study in 2000 has brought the German education system to the forefront of the political and scholarly agenda (OECD, 2001). Regarding Newcastle, a recent study concluded that the integration of the city’s refugee pupils largely depended on individual schools, calling into question the impact of overarching local policies and measures (Whiteman, 2005). This paper therefore has both historical poignancy and current relevance. It is through these two case studies that the extent to which Britain and Germany’s differing immigration histories lay at the foundation of succeeding education policies will be assessed, and their holistic impact on learning and social contexts revealed.

The policies adopted by both governments during the 1960s were marked by the very absence of a strategy. In Britain, there was no clear-sighted policy at a national level during this decade. As Male pointed out, the 1963 Robbins Report on higher education did not even mention immigrants, the 1963 Newsom Report dedicated less than two pages to the

educational obstacles faced by black youths and the 1967 Plowden Report devoted only six pages to immigrant children (1980, p. 292).³ In West Germany, during the 1960s, the federal government did little more than call for compulsory education to be extended to immigrant youths (Rist, 1979b, p. 357.). Furthermore, it was deemed unnecessary for education legislation to be directed at immigrant children. This was because their long-term integration was considered futile as their stay in Germany was only to be temporary. It is perhaps then not surprising that it was not initially recognised that the educational needs of immigrant children required catering for (Wilpert, 1977, p. 475).

In Britain, the 1965 dispersal policy signalled a departure from previous inactivity (Ministry of Education and Science, 1965). This policy advised that ethnic minority children should be divided amongst different schools rather than becoming concentrated in only a select few. It stated that no one school or classroom should be more than circa one-third immigrant, believing that high concentrations of immigrant pupils would prevent integration (Gillborn, 1990, pp. 145-146; Grosvenor, 1997, pp. 53-55). This policy clearly paved the way for what was to become the British government's assimilationist approach towards the education of immigrant children during the late 1960s and 1970s. This was based on the belief that immigrants should be absorbed into British society, and that the preservation of minority languages and cultures should have a much lower priority (Mullard, 1982, p. 121). It was believed that the dispersing of immigrant pupils would enable a faster acquisition of the English language as well as ensuring that schools were not transformed due to an influx of a large number of immigrants (Kirp, 1979b, pp. 272-273). It soon became apparent, however, that not all immigrant pupils were benefiting from this policy (Figueroa, 1991, p. 76). Consequently, the 1970s and 1980s witnessed a shift in Britain from an assimilationist approach to a multicultural one. This new approach was documented in the 1985 Swann

Report, which advocated a multi-ethnic school curriculum, and promoted ways in which school pupils would learn about and appreciate a variety of cultures, ethnicities and languages (Rex, 1987, pp. 13-15). Although it has been difficult to assess the exact impact of the report's recommendations, some initiatives were taken, such as an interest in increasing the number of teachers from an ethnic minority background (Arora, 2005, pp. 86-87).

Whilst Britain exchanged an assimilationist education policy for a multicultural one, federal states across Germany adopted a plethora of policies of both types. In other words, schools in some states focused more on long-term integration than those in others. Differences quickly emerged in the quality and length of German language classes, the importance placed on mother-tongue languages and culture, and access to education and training (Wilpert, 1977, pp. 476-477). Although one might assume that there are benefits to implementing local measures for local immigrant communities, many scholars have repeatedly highlighted the shortcomings of these education policies, with Rist asserting that immigrant children received a 'double message' from the German education system (1979b, p. 362). Whilst Germany's education policies towards guest-worker children undoubtedly portrayed a widespread uncertainty concerning its position as a nation of immigrants, those of Britain increasingly represented a country that arguably attempted to define itself as multicultural.⁴

Despite the fact that their approaches have differed as a result of immigration history, there is little doubt that each nation's respective debate concerning the education of immigrant children is still ongoing. The same contention that was witnessed during the 1970s with the emergence of Coard's groundbreaking work (1971) on West Indian children in the British school system, and during the 1980s with the Honeyford Affair and the Burnage High

School incident,⁵ is today seen in the debate over the wearing of Muslim veils in British schools. Similarly, the ever-present discrimination and lack of opportunities suffered by Turks in Germany's education system, as reported by scholars during the 1970s and 1980s, has more recently been reinforced by the OECD's PISA study in 2000, which concluded that Germany trails significantly behind in the education of immigrants compared to other European countries (Baumert et al., 2001; Ammermueller, 2007). It is through this paper's historical microcosmic assessments that two cities' attempts to address the cultural and social differences in the process of learning are revealed, and the impact that national immigration legislation has on local education policy exposed.

*Newcastle-upon-Tyne*⁶

Newcastle's local authority's education policies towards immigrant pupils have historically reflected Britain's role as the receiver of both organic and permanent immigration. One of the major concerns expressed during the 1960s was the acquisition of the English language. It was believed that schools with a larger number of pupils from an ethnic minority background were becoming characterised with a lower standard of English (TWAS, 5 December 1967, p. 1). As a result of this apprehension concerning the increasing number of immigrant children in the city's schools,⁷ Newcastle's local authority seems to have considered implementing the Ministry of Education and Science's 1965 dispersal policy. Although Newcastle did not have any schools that were one-third immigrant, there were two primary schools, Westgate Hill Junior and Westgate Hill Infant, that had seventy and fifty-one immigrant pupils, and which were 19.8 and 20 per cent immigrant respectively (TWAS, 5 December 1967, p. 1). Despite this concentration, however, it was decided that the difficulties posed by high numbers of ethnic minority children would be addressed within the

individual schools concerned (TWAS, 5 December 1967, p. 2). Part-time teachers were appointed to assist with language skills and the immigrant pupils' overall integration.

Although not in Newcastle, the dispersal policy was considered and introduced by local authorities across Britain. Under the measure adopted by Ealing's education authority, Asian pupils were expected to apply to a central office and be dispersed to different schools in the area (Male, 1980, p. 293). During the mid-1960s, Bradford and Southall's local authorities transported immigrant pupils to schools in neighbouring areas so as to avoid their concentration in others (Miller, 1966, p. 253). Some cities, such as Bristol, did not have to resort to the dispersal policy as racial mixing was achieved by the fact that most schools were built on the outskirts of the city, away from the centre of the ethnic population (Kirp, 1979b, p. 276). It is perhaps not surprising that Newcastle City Council did not introduce the dispersal policy during the 1960s. Firstly, compared to cities like London and Bradford, Newcastle had a very small immigrant community that was undoubtedly deemed more manageable. Secondly, although there were indeed some immigrant pupils who had little knowledge of the English language, the Education Committee was potentially assured by the fact that they were still of primary school age and therefore still young enough to acquire the language quickly. The link between age and language acquisition is stressed in the literature and the situation in Newcastle was undoubtedly less severe than that of other cities, such as Birmingham (Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003).

It is not surprising then that the situation in one particular secondary school caused much concern. In November 1967, Slatyford Comprehensive School was 10% immigrant, a figure that was significantly higher than that of any other of Newcastle's secondary schools, and was deemed as having a language problem. Out of 124 immigrant pupils, 34 spoke English to an acceptable standard, 21 had some knowledge of English and 18 had no knowledge of the English language whatsoever (TWAS, 5 December 1967, p. 3). Unlike

those immigrant children at primary school age, those arriving to Slatyford Comprehensive School were doing so with relatively few years of school life remaining. During the 1960s and 1970s, works increasingly focused on the attainment of the English language by immigrant children and the consequences of poor language acquisition are still continuously highlighted with regards to both Britain and Germany (Derrick, 1977; Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003; Von Below 2007). Regarding Newcastle, the Education Committee initially suggested that those immigrant pupils with language problems be sent to a reception centre where they would undergo intensive English language tuition until they were deemed ready to rejoin their respective classes.

This was a scheme that was implemented by local authorities throughout Britain during the 1960s, including those of Inner London, Huddersfield and Birmingham (Miller, 1966, p. 256; Loewenberg & Wass, 1997). Newcastle's Commonwealth Working Group, however, disregarded the idea, stating that it was preferable for problems to be addressed within the standard classroom. This may have been because it was believed that the school had sufficient resources to address the problem or due to the fact that reception centres were often perceived as hindering integration, rather than promoting it. According to Miller (1966, p. 255), 'some immigrant groups...have regarded the reception class as a form of segregation. Schools have found it difficult to classify immigrant children and have occasionally placed them initially in a class for retarded children'. Despite the fact that Newcastle City Council did not introduce the dispersal policy for either the city's primary or secondary school immigrant students, there was nevertheless a keen focus on the acquisition of the English language and an overall assimilation into British society. Although there has traditionally been much debate surrounding the reasoning behind the 1965 dispersal policy, there is no doubt that a provision for long-term immigration and integration lay at its foundations. In other words, whether this assimilationist position should be seen as merely the forcing of

immigrant pupils to abandon their own languages and cultures for “superior” ones pertaining to the host society, or a consequence of a fear that schools would soon become overrun with ethnic minority children, this approach was based on the idea of permanent settlement (McKay & Freedman, 1990, p. 388; Grosvenor, 1997, pp. 50-51).

This notion of long-term immigration and integration was further reinforced by the approach that Newcastle City Council adopted during the 1980s. During the second half of this decade especially, education policies across Britain were partially shaped by the 1985 Swann Report, also known as *Education for All*. It asserted that pupils should be educated in a multicultural environment and should be “mainstreamed” rather than being isolated from their indigenous counterparts (Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups, 1985; Chivers, 1987; Verma, 2007). Furthermore, this multiculturalist approach arguably influenced local government measures before 1985 with the 1981 Rampton Report, also issued by the Swann Committee.

This transition from an assimilationist education system towards a multicultural one was adopted fairly quickly in Newcastle. Schools were asked ‘to review their curricular, organisational and administrative policies to ensure they are free of any institutional racism’ (TWAS, 18 September 1985b, p. 1). Newcastle’s council focused on promoting ethnic minority language and participation, and the combating of racist incidents (TWAS, 15 March 1985; TWAS, 6 February 1984, p. 2). Twenty mother-tongue teachers, for example, were to be divided between the city’s primary and secondary schools (TWAS, 18 September 1985a, p. 3). It is, however, essential to realize that by promoting mother-tongue languages within the city’s schools, the council was in fact breaching the Swann Report, which suggested that whilst ethnic minority languages should be encouraged, they should not be incorporated within mainstream schools. (Broeder & Extra, 1999, p. 88). This was done because there was concern that not all ethnic minority children would have the external support needed to

maintain their mother tongues (TWAS, 18 September 1985a, p. 2). Overall, however, there is no doubt that it resulted in a more multicultural approach. Other measures included staff training in ethnic minority languages, courses in language teaching methodology and the promoting of language awareness in schools (TWAS, 18 September 1985a, p. 3).

A further consequence that the Swann Report had on Newcastle's local authority consisted of suggestions designed to combat racism. Anti-racism training was to be offered to Education Officers, Advisors and Head Teachers, a centralized system for the reporting of racial incidents was to be established, the curriculum was to include anti-racist teaching, and kitchen staff was to be trained for the provision of ethnic minority diets (TWAS, 18 March 1987, p. 43; TWAS, 9 July 1985, pp. 1-3). Again, these measures were not particular to Newcastle. Similar steps were also taken in Birmingham, for example, in an attempt to respect Muslim religious and cultural traditions (Joly, 1989; Ansari, 2004, pp. 318-320). It is on the reporting of racial incidents that Newcastle's local government appears to have largely focused during the following years, and the mid to late 1980s witnessed the emergence of reports that recorded racial incidents that took place within the city's schools (TWAS, 9 July 1985, pp. 3-5; TWAS, 18 March 1987; TWAS, 22 March 1988).

Bremen

As with Newcastle, Bremen's education policies regarding immigrants have also historically adhered to national mandate, but one reflecting confusion and uncertainty. Education in Germany is state-controlled and differs from one *Bundesland* to another, lacking centralised accountability and a clear integration policy (Hill, 1987; Hanf, 2001). This has resulted in each German state implementing the type of policy it prefers. In Bavaria, for example, a large emphasis was put on mother-tongue languages as it was believed that immigrants' integration into German schools would prove difficult. To the contrary, Berlin's policy prepared immigrant children primarily for a future in Germany and strove for

integration, believing that it was unrealistic by the mid-1970s to still assume that guest-workers would be returning “home” (Rist, 1979a). Still other states implemented the combined model, which promoted both German and mother-tongue languages. Bremen’s position towards the education of immigrant pupils was close to that of Berlin in that its main aim was to promote integration into German society. During the mid-1970s, Bremen’s government introduced a variety of measures addressing the education of immigrants. Like in Newcastle, this was undoubtedly linked to the increase in the number of immigrant schoolchildren, which between 1970 and 1977 had risen from just over 1,000 to an estimated 5,300. This was primarily due to family reunification, which was largely heightened by the change in allowances for children (*Kindergeld*) and the 1973 recruitment halt (Statistisches Landesamt Bremen, April 1978, p. 100). Starting in January 1975, these allowances were only available for those children living in Germany, causing many immigrants to call for their children to join them (Rudolph, 2006, p. 105).

Bremen’s approach was detailed in a state government document dating from April 1977 (Bremische Bürgerschaft Bibliothek, 25 April 1977). There were a variety of measures through which integration was hoped to be achieved, such as the promotion of day care centres amongst immigrant families and additional German language classes. On the whole, it was deemed that preparation classes were only meeting the needs of a small proportion of immigrant pupils and that more needed to be done to assist with the acquisition of the German language. Secondly, there was also an emphasis placed on the fact that not all immigrant children remained in Germany, but that some would eventually return to the Homeland. Thus, it was thought necessary that measures should extend to the maintaining of mother-tongue languages and native cultures. This was to be done at day care and youth centres. It was the policy in Bremen that mother-tongue language instruction was the responsibility of the countries of origin. However, the local government assisted with the

organisation of language classes and expressed a desire to incorporate mother-tongue lessons into the city's schools if and when possible.

Bremen was by no means particular in providing for the learning and maintaining of mother-tongue languages. Krefeld and the state of North-Rhein Westfalia separated German and non-German children for some school subjects and brought them together for others, thus promoting teaching in both German and mother tongues. Other areas, such as Lower Saxony and Baden-Württemberg, permitted immigrant children to choose their mother-tongue language as their first foreign language in schools. The aim was for children to learn these languages whilst also receiving the same education as their German counterparts (McLaughlin & Graf, 1985, pp. 247-248; Beck, 1999, p. 8). The fact that these disparities existed between different German states was not only evidence of a lack of a national policy, but also of the uncertainty surrounding the future of the country's guest-workers. Differences also existed between the approaches taken in Bremen and Newcastle. Firstly, whilst Newcastle seemed keen to tackle problems within the respective schools, Bremen involved day care and youth centres. This might have been because Bremen's schools alone simply could not implement all necessary measures. After all, many of the measures suggested in the April 1977 report, such as the involvement of parents and the hiring of extra workers of a Turkish background, would have been much more difficult to implement within mainstream classrooms. Secondly and most importantly, there is a fundamental difference between the two cities' types and chronology of approach. Whilst Newcastle's local authority was pursuing only long-term integration already by the late 1960s, Bremen, despite having opted for the integration model, was nevertheless considering immigrant youths' return to the Homeland still during the late 1970s. Again, this reflects the grassroots legacy of Britain and Germany's immigration histories.

A government document of 1980 detailing recommendations regarding the situation

of immigrant youths in Bremen's schools records what appears to be a more enhanced focus on integration into German society and stresses the desire for German and immigrant children to sit side by side in the same classroom (Bremische Bürgerschaft Bibliothek, 1 September 1980). The acquisition of the German language was to be further promoted so that immigrant youths would be able to attain a good quality school-leaving qualification, something that has always been perceived as problematic amongst ethnic minorities in Germany (Alba et al., 1994; Worbs, 2003). In the document of September 1980, Bremen's Secretary of Education suggested a dispersal policy similar to that proposed in 1965 by the Ministry of Education and Science in Britain. In Britain, the policy stated that the number of immigrant pupils in either one school or classroom should not exceed one-third of the total number of students. In Bremen, however, as in Berlin, the figure suggested was 20% (Rist, 1979a, pp. 251-254). Whilst Newcastle did not have any schools that approached the one-third limit, Bremen had a number of schools that exceeded 20%. In the school year of 1979-1980, there were a total of 344 classes that were 20% or more immigrant, constituting 17.9% of the city's classrooms (Bremische Bürgerschaft Bibliothek, 1 September 1980, p. 8).

The dangers and shortcomings of dispersal policies have been well documented and there were additional measures that Bremen's local authority suggested implementing at this time (Jancke, 1976). These included an increase in the number of teaching posts in the city's schools in order to support the learning needs of immigrant children and the tackling of compulsory school attendance. For the school year 1979-1980, notification regarding compulsory school education was provided in mother-tongue languages for immigrant parents. Additionally, it was decided that immigrant parents applying for *Kindergeld* had to provide confirmation of compulsory school attendance. The results of these measures were seen almost immediately. With regards to vocational schools, for example, the percentage of registered students increased from 65% in 1978-1979 to 80% in 1979-1980. These measures

mark a clear contrast with the situation in Newcastle and Britain as a whole where, although the literature has often depicted language problems and poor government responses, there has never been widespread poor attendance at compulsory school age. There is little doubt that, overall, ethnic educational inequality has historically been more evident in Germany (Baumert & Schümer, 2001; Kristen, 2006).

Changes were also proposed within schools. Additional help was to be provided for pupils whose German was not advanced enough to allow them to participate in regular classes. Preparation classes were to be available for those youths whose German was very basic. It was decided, however, that pupils should not stay in preparation classes for more than two years as the aim was for them to become integrated alongside their German counterparts as quickly as possible. In schools with smaller numbers of immigrant pupils in which preparation classes were not available, support groups were to be formed and, although they would still take part in mainstream classes, special assistance provided (Bremische Bürgerschaft Bibliothek, 1 September 1980, pp. 14-15). Some immigrant pupils were to be able to choose their mother-tongue language as a school subject instead of a foreign language, a measure that was not particular to Bremen, but was offered in other German states (Broeder & Extra, 1999, p. 82). Concern was expressed over the type of schools that the city's immigrants were attending. Scholars have repeatedly highlighted the three different tracks of German secondary education, consisting of *Hauptschule* (minimum or elementary education), *Realschule* (intermediate education), both of which often preceded apprenticeships, and *Gymnasium* (grammar school), which lead to university, and argue that immigrant youths, especially Turks, became concentrated in the lower school classifications (Frick & Wagner, 2001; Kristen & Granato, 2007). These concerns and policies all reflect the long-term legacy of Germany's guest-worker rotation system.

Conclusion

There are several conclusions that can be drawn from this bureau-political study of immigrant education in Newcastle and Bremen. From the 1960s to 1980s, both cities implemented a variety of policies. Whether these took the form of after-school centres, an intensified focus on the English and German languages, or ways in which to guarantee employment, it rapidly became clear that they were only satisfying a segment of the immigrant pupils' ethno-cultural needs. Both cities have been home to immigrant youths who have found themselves torn between two educational cultures. This has resulted in learning not being confined to the classroom, but rather being pebble-dashed across both cities in the shape of mosques and temples, religious youth centres and family-run businesses, which acted as conduits of indigenous cultural education. In other words, Newcastle and Bremen's immigrant youths have found themselves adhering to assimilationist or integrationist policies whilst still pursuing cultural self-determination. This illustrates not only the breach between host government policies and immigrant needs, but also the extent to which it can influence the learning process.

Nevertheless, Newcastle appears to have encountered fewer obstacles with regards to immigrants and education than much of the literature suggests. The 1965 dispersal policy that played such a role in Inner London and Bradford was never introduced in Newcastle, and the consistent educational underachievement so widespread across Britain never witnessed (Tomlinson, 1991; Modood et al., 1997). This might possibly have been the result of Newcastle's comparably smaller immigrant community. Whilst some cities were confronted with classrooms that were overwhelmingly comprised of immigrant pupils during the 1960s and 1970s and thus adhered to national mandate, Newcastle was able to address any issues arising within schools and did not need to implement all elements of the assimilationist model in an attempt to promote the English language and culture.

It initially appears as though the same conclusion might be drawn regarding Bremen. This is a city that has never been at the centre of the abundant literature addressing immigrant educational underachievement in Germany (Gang & Zimmermann, 2000; Schierup, Hansen & Castles, 2006, pp. 159-160). Furthermore, the September 1980 government report highlighted how Bremen surpassed other German cities regarding the number of immigrant youths attaining a school-leaving qualification (Bremische Bürgerschaft Bibliothek, 1 September 1980, p. 16). Yet by the 2000s, the PISA results certainly told a different story. The 2000 study concluded that immigrant pupils in Bremen trailed significantly behind their German counterparts regarding reading literacy scores. The 2003 study reached similar conclusions for the city-state of Bremen in mathematics, reading literacy and the usage of the German language (Prenzel et al., 2005, pp. 267-98). In fact, Germany as a whole performed well below the OECD average in all three test subjects with regards to both German and immigrant pupils. Many reasons have been offered for this poor performance, especially in reference to immigrant pupils, such as the strong link between socioeconomic status and educational performance, or the fact that the German school system requires pupils to be streamed at an early age, often before immigrant youths have reached an adequate level in the German language (Kristen, 2000; Worbs, 2003).

It has also been suggested that immigration law has had an impact on PISA results with traditional immigration countries, such as Australia and Canada, performing better than their European counterparts because they have tended to choose immigrants with a good educational background and those who are able to contribute to the country's economy (Entorf & Minoiu, 2004; Ammermueller, 2007). The UK, however, appears to be an exception to this paradigm, which Entorf and Minoiu (2004) suggested is down to a high influx of Western migrants. However, maybe this result should not be as surprising as Entorf and Minoiu (2004) claimed it to be, and perhaps Western migrants are not the sole reason for

it. In the same way that immigration law has impacted upon the PISA results of Australia and Canada, there is no doubt that it has also done so for those of Britain and Germany. The legacy of Britain and Germany's immigration histories and policies are seen in both Newcastle and Bremen. Many immigrants who arrived in Britain during the 1940s and 1950s for the long-term had experienced the British education system, were familiar with British culture and many regarded Britain as a natural second home (Favell, 2001; J. Herbert, 2008). This was often coupled with the entrepreneurial and educationally proactive culture of the subcontinent. In Germany, to the contrary, guest-workers arrived as temporary relief to the country's full employment economy and took part in an immigration scheme that involved few social provisions or costs on behalf of the German government (Panayi, 2000; Green, 2004). This has doubtlessly enforced social limits on the holistic process of learning.

These case studies have demonstrated the long-term ramifications of two very different immigration histories, but have also exposed factors that could inform modern immigration and integration policy. Newcastle has disclosed the benefits of a smaller and more manageable immigrant community, whilst Bremen has revealed the struggles surrounding the integration and education of immigrant youths in a Germany that claimed it was not a nation of immigrants. Whilst it is apparent that Germany's official denial hindered the integration of immigrant youth, it must be recognized that this renunciation is slowly being reversed. The Immigration Act of 2005, for example, included the promotion of integration amongst immigrant communities, whilst the German Islam Conference of 2006 paved the way for increased dialogue between the German government and the country's immigrant population. These developments combined with the PISA results will undoubtedly secure the education of immigrant youth a place on the German political agenda. In Britain, the Muslim Council of Britain, for example, has been pursuing similar goals for more than a decade. It is certainly the conclusion of the research here that this should continue and

increase.

Newcastle and other British cities' local authorities prepared for the permanent integration of immigrant youths from the outset, whilst Bremen's government's ability to implement local policies for local immigrant communities as a result of Germany's federal administration was overshadowed by the ambiguity surrounding the country's guest-workers and Germany's continuous claim that it was not a country of immigrants. It appears as though, in both cases, the legacy of national immigration histories prevailed, rendering the differences between Britain's centralised and Germany's federal administrations practically redundant. Education policy in some areas like Bavaria did not even consider the integration of immigrant youths and even those cities that did, such as Berlin, have been criticised for pursuing assimilation rather than multiculturalism, and for not accommodating the needs of immigrant pupils. In other words, whilst Britain's history and policies created a paradigm for educational stability, Germany's led to a sense of uncertainty and obscurity. It appears that the shadow of the suitcase not only fell on Southampton dockside and Munich central station, but across fifty years and into the classrooms of contemporary immigrant schoolchildren.

References

- Alba, R.D., Handl, J. & Müller, W. (1994). Ethnische Ungleichheit im deutschen Bildungssystem. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 46, 209-237.
- Ammermueller, A. (2007). Poor background or low returns? Why immigrants in Germany perform so poorly in the Programme for International Student Assessment. *Education Economics*, 15(2), 215-230.
- Ansari, H. (2004). *'The infidel within': Muslims in Britain since 1800*. London: C. Hurst.
- Arora, R. (2005). *Race and ethnicity in education*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Baumert, J., Klieme, E., Neubrand, M., Prenzel, M., Schiefele, U., Schneider, W., et al. (2001). *PISA 2000: Basiskompetenzen von Schülerinnen und Schülern im internationalen Vergleich*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Baumert, J. & Schümer, G. (2001). Familiäre Lebensverhältnisse, Bildungsbeteiligung und Kompetenzerwerb. In J. Baumert, E. Klieme, M. Neubrand, M. Prenzel, U. Schiefele, W. Schneider, et al (Eds.), *PISA 2000: Basiskompetenzen von Schülerinnen und Schülern im internationalen Vergleich* (pp. 323-407). Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Beck, E. (1999). Language rights and Turkish children in Germany. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 33(2), 3-12.
- Boyes, R. & Huneke, D. (2004). *Is it easier to be a Turk in Berlin or a Pakistani in Bradford?* London: Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of Industrial Society.
- Bremische Bürgerschaft Bibliothek. (25 April 1977). *Antwort des Senats zur kleinen Anfrage der Fraktion der FDP vom 1. März 1977 (Drs. 9/445) Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer* (Drucksachen Band 3 9/451-9/620 March 1977-October 1977, Bremische Bürgerschaft Landtag 9. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 9/484).
- Bremische Bürgerschaft Bibliothek. (1 September 1980). *Bericht über die Lage der schulpflichtigen Kinder von Ausländern* (Drucksachen Band 2 10/251-10/450 June

1980-March 1981, Bremische Bürgerschaft Landtag 10. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 10/300).

Broeder, P. & Extra, G. (1999). *Language, ethnicity & education: Case studies on immigrant minority groups and immigrant minority languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Buse, D. (1993). Urban and national identity: Bremen, 1860-1920. *Journal of Social History*, 26(3), 521-537.

Chivers, T.S. (Ed.). (1987). *Race and culture in education. Issues arising from the Swann Committee report*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

Coard, B. (1971). *How the West Indian child is made educationally sub-normal in the British school system: The scandal of the black child in schools in Britain*. London: New Beacon for the Caribbean Education and Community Workers' Association.

Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups. (1985). *Education for all: The report of the committee of inquiry into the education of children from ethnic minority groups*. London: HMSO.

Derrick, J. (1977). *Language needs of minority group children: Learners of English as a second language*. Windsor: NFER.

Dustman, C. & Fabbri, F. (2003). Language proficiency and labour market performance of immigrants in the UK. *The Economic Journal*, 113(489), 695-717.

Entorf, H. & Minoiu, N. (2004). PISA results: What a difference immigration law makes. *IZA Discussion Paper*, 1021.

Faist, T. (1993). From school to work: Public policy and underclass formation among young Turks in Germany during the 1980s. *International Migration Review*, 27(2), 306-331.

Favell, A. (2001). *Philosophies of integration: Immigration and the idea of citizenship in France and Britain* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Figueroa, P. (1991). *Education and the social construction of 'race'*. London: Routledge.
- Frick, J. & Wagner, G. (2001). Economic and social perspectives of immigrant children in Germany. In E. Currie & T. Wunderlich (Eds.), *Deutschland, ein Einwanderungsland?: Rückblick, Bilanz und neue Fragen* (pp. 299-326). Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
- Gang, I. & Zimmermann, K. (2000). Is child like parent? Educational attainment and ethnic origin. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 35(3), 550-569.
- Gillborn, D. (1990). *'Race', ethnicity & education: Teaching and learning in multi-ethnic schools*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Green, S. (2004). *The politics of exclusion. Institutions and immigration policy in contemporary Germany*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Grosvenor, I. (1997). *Assimilating identities: Racism and educational policy in post 1945 Britain*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hackett, S. (2009). The Asian of the North: Immigrant experiences and the importance of regional identity in Newcastle-upon-Tyne during the 1980s. *Northern History*, 46(2), 293-311.
- Hanf, T. (2001). Education in a cultural lag: The case of Germany. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35(3), 255-268.
- Herbert, J. (2008). *Negotiating boundaries in the city: Migration, ethnicity, and gender in Britain*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Herbert, U. (1990). *A history of foreign labor in Germany, 1880-1980: Seasonal workers, forced laborers, guest workers*. (W. Templer Trans.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. (Original work published 1986).
- Hill, A. (1987). Democratic education in West Germany: The effects of the new minorities. *Comparative Education Review*, 31(2), 273-287.

- Hoerder, D. (1993). The traffic of emigration via Bremen/Bremerhaven: Merchants' interests, protective legislation, and migrants' experiences. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 13(1), 68-101.
- Jancke, E. (1976). Zur schulischen Situation der Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer in Berlin. *Forum*, 4, 94-99.
- Joly, D. (1989). Ethnic minorities and education in Britain: Interaction between the Muslim community and Birmingham schools. *Muslims in Europe*, 41.
- Joppke, C. (1996). Multiculturalism and immigration. A comparison of the United States, Germany, and Great Britain. *Theory and Society*, 25(4), 449-500.
- Joppke, C. (1999). *Immigration and the nation-state: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirp, D. (1979a). *Doing good by doing little: Race and schooling in Britain*. London: University of California Press.
- Kirp, D. (1979b). The vagaries of discrimination: Busing, policy, and law in Britain. *The School Review*, 87(3), 269-294.
- Kristen, C. (2000). Ethnic differences in educational placement: The transition from primary to secondary schooling. *MZES Working Paper*, 32.
- Kristen, C. (2006). Ethnische Diskriminierung in der Grundschule? Die Vergabe von Noten und Bildungsempfehlungen. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 58(1), 79-97.
- Kristen, C. & Granato, N. (2007). The educational attainment of the second generation in Germany: Social origins and ethnic inequality. *Ethnicities*, 7(3), 343-366.
- Lawless, R. (1995). *From Ta'izz to Tyneside: An Arab community in the North-East of England during the early twentieth century*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

- Layton-Henry, Z. (1992). *The politics of immigration: Immigration, 'race' and 'race' relations in post-war Britain*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Loewenberg, M. & Wass, B. (1997). Provision for the development of the linguistic proficiency of young immigrants in England and Wales and France: A comparative study. *Comparative Education*, 33(3), 395-409.
- Male, G. (1980). Multicultural education and education policy: The British experience. *Comparative Education Review*, 24(3), 291-301.
- McKay, S. & Freedman, S. (1990). Language minority education in Great Britain: A challenge to current U.S. policy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(3), 385-405.
- McLaughlin, B. & Graf, P. (1985). Bilingual education in West Germany: Recent developments. *Comparative Education*, 21(3), 241-255.
- Miller, H. (1966). Race relations and schools in Great Britain. *Phylon* 27(3), 247-267.
- Ministry of Education and Science. (June 1965). *The education of immigrants*. (Circular 7/65). London: HMSO.
- Modood, T. (2007). *Multiculturalism: A civic idea*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Modood, T., Berthoud, R., Lakey, J., Nazroo, J., Smith, P., Virdee, S., et al. (1997). *Ethnic minorities in Britain: Diversity and disadvantage*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Modood, T. & May, S. (2001). Multiculturalism and education in Britain: An internally contested debate. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35(3), 305-317.
- Mullard, C. (1982). Multiracial education in Britain: From assimilation to cultural pluralism. In J. Tierney (Ed.), *Race, migration and schooling* (pp. 120-133). Norfolk: Thetford Press Ltd.
- OECD. (2001). *Knowledge and skills for life: First results from PISA 2000*. Paris: OECD.
- Panayi, P. (2000). *Ethnic minorities in nineteenth and twentieth century Germany: Jews, gypsies, Poles, Turks and others*. Harlow: Longman.

- Parekh, B. (1986). The concept of multicultural education. In S. Modgil, G. Verma, K. Mallick & C. Modgil (Eds.), *Multicultural education: The interminable debate* (pp. 19-31). London: Falmer.
- Prenzel, M., Baumert, J., Blum, W., Lehmann, R., Leutner, D. Neubrand, M., et al. (2005). *PISA 2003: Der zweite Vergleich der Länder in Deutschland – Was wissen und können Jugendliche?* Münster: Waxmann Verlag GmbH.
- Renton, D. (2006). Hostility or welcome? Migration to the North East of England since 1945. *Paper in North Eastern History*, 15.
- Rex, J. (1987), Multiculturalism, anti-racism and equality of opportunity in the Swann Report. In T.S. Chivers (Ed.), *Race and culture in education. Issues arising from the Swann Committee report* (pp. 1-16). Windsor: NFER-Nelson.
- Rist, R. (1979a). On the education of guest-worker children in Germany: A comparative study of policies and programs in Bavaria and Berlin. *The School Review*, 87(3), 242-268.
- Rist, R. (1979b). On the education of guest-worker children in Germany: Public policies and equal educational opportunity. *Comparative Education Review*, 23(3), 355-369.
- Rudolph, C. (2006). *National security and immigration: Policy development in the United States and Western Europe since 1945*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Schierup, C., Hansen, P. & Castles, S. (2006). *Migration, citizenship, and the European welfare state: A European dilemma*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Statistisches Landesamt Bremen. (April 1978). *Schulbesuch und Schulerfolg ausländischer Schüler* (Statistische Monatsberichte der Freien Hansestadt Bremen, 30. Jahrgang).
- Taylor, F. (1974). *Race, school and community*. Windsor: N.F.E.R.
- Todd, N. (1987). Black on Tyne: The black presence on Tyneside in the 1860s. *North East Labour History Society*, 21, 17-27.

- Tomlinson, S. (1986). Political dilemmas in multi-racial education. In Z. Layton-Henry & P. Rich (Eds.), *Race, government & politics in Britain* (pp. 187-203). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Tomlinson, S. (1991). Ethnicity and educational attainment in England: An overview. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 22(2), 121-139.
- Tyne & Wear Archives Service. (5 December 1967). *Immigrant pupils in schools* (Commonwealth Immigrants Working Group of Planning Committee 19 Sep. 1966-6 May 1968 MD.NC/149).
- Tyne & Wear Archives Service. (6 February 1984). *Co-opted members* (Local Government and Racial Equality Sub-Committee of Corporate Joint Sub-Committee 18 March 1983-17 July 1985, Local Government and Racial Equality Sub-Committee MD.NC/162/1).
- Tyne & Wear Archives Service. (15 March 1985). *The Swann Report: Digest of the report of the Swann Committee on 'Education for All'* (Local Government and Racial Equality Sub-Committee of Corporate Joint Sub-Committee 18 September 1985-15 July 1987 MD.NC/162/2).
- Tyne & Wear Archives Service. (9 July 1985). *Report of racial incidents* (Local Government and Racial Equality Sub-Committee of Corporate Joint Sub-Committee 18 March 1983-17 July 1985 MD.NC/162/1).
- Tyne & Wear Archives Service. (18 September 1985a). *Mother-tongue teaching report on the schools language survey conducted in Newcastle-upon-Tyne schools* (Local Government and Racial Equality Sub-Committee of corporate Joint Sub-Committee 18 September 1985-15 July 1987 MD.NC/162/2).
- Tyne & Wear Archives Service. (18 September 1985b). *The Swann Report* (Local Government and Racial Equality Sub-Committee of Corporate Joint Sub-Committee 18

- September 1985-15 July 1987, City of Newcastle-upon-Tyne Education Committee, Schools Sub-Committee and Racial Equality Sub-Committee MD.NC/162/2).
- Tyne & Wear Archives Service. (18 March 1987). *Monitoring of racial incidents in schools* (Local Government and Racial Equality Sub-Committee of Corporate Joint Sub-Committee 18 September 1985-15 July 1987 MD.NC/162/2).
- Tyne & Wear Archives Service. (18 March 1987). *Strategies for combating racism – head teachers' courses* (Local Government and Racial Equality Sub-Committee of Corporate Joint Sub-Committee 18 September 1985-15 July 1987 MD.NC/162/2).
- Tyne & Wear Archives Service. (22 March 1988). *Monitoring of racial incidents in schools* (Local Government and Racial Equality Sub-Committee of Corporate Joint Sub-Committee 6 August 1987-16 March 1988 MD.NC/162/3).
- Verma, G. (2007). Diversity and multicultural education: Cross-cutting issues and concepts. In G. Verma, C. Bagley & M. Jha (Eds.), *International perspectives on educational diversity and inclusion. Studies from America, Europe and India* (pp. 21-30). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Von Below, S. (2007). What are the chances of young Turks and Italians for equal education and employment in Germany? The role of objective and subjective indicators. *Social Indicators Research*, 82(2), 209-231.
- Whiteman, R. (2005). Welcoming the stranger: A qualitative analysis of teachers' views regarding the integration of refugee pupils into schools in Newcastle upon Tyne. *Educational Studies*, 31(4), 375-391.
- Willke, I. (1975). Schooling of immigrant children in West Germany, Sweden, England: The educationally disadvantaged. *International Review of Education*, 21(3), 357-382.
- Wilpert, C. (1977). Children of foreign workers in the Federal Republic of Germany. *International Migration Review*, 11(4), 473-485.

Worbs, S. (2003). The second generation in Germany: Between schools and labor market.

International Migration Review, 37(4), 1011-1038.

Footnotes

¹ This paper will simply refer to “Germany” from this point onwards.

² According to the censuses, Newcastle’s Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi population stood at 1,202 in 1961, 2,697 in 1981, 3,457 in 1991 and 5,704 in 2001. However, these figures include only those people born in India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, and not any descendants born in Newcastle. The real figure of this immigrant community, therefore, was undoubtedly much higher. This information has been provided by the Office for National Statistics (ONS). The microfilm containing the data for the 1971 census has been misplaced and this information can, therefore, not be accessed. Bremen’s immigrant community has traditionally been much larger. In 1979, the state of Bremen had an immigrant population of 41,700, the vast majority of which were from some of the former recruitment countries (Turkey, Yugoslavia, Portugal, Italy, Spain and Greece). By 2001, the state’s immigrant population had risen to 79,000. Furthermore, as was the case throughout Germany, it was Turks who constituted a large proportion of this figure as a result of family reunification. These statistics have been obtained from the Bremische Bürgerschaft Bibliothek (City Parliament Library of Bremen) and the Statistisches Landesamt Bremen (Statistical Land Office of Bremen).

³ The Robbins Report considered the future of higher education in the UK, the Newsom Report assessed the education of less able pupils and the Plowden Report examined primary school education.

⁴ For an introduction to the claim that Germany is not a country of immigration, see Joppke, (1999, pp. 62-99). For an introduction to multiculturalism in Britain, see Modood, (2007).

⁵ The 1985 Honeyford Affair took place in Bradford and consisted of a headmaster publishing various articles that challenged the concept of multicultural education. In the 1986 Burnage High School incident, an Asian boy was murdered as a result of a racist attack.

⁶ See also Hackett, (2009).

⁷ According to the Education Committee document of 5 December 1967, in November 1967, there were 585 immigrant pupils in Newcastle's schools. This was an increase from 348 in January 1964.