Discrimination in Munich Schools in the Guest Worker Regime: The Intersection of Language, Nationality and Gender

Mona Bergmann & Ulrike Fettke

Summary: After the recruitment stop of guest workers in 1973, a high proportion of migrants lived in Munich and faced a separating, marginalizing schooling situation. Using an intersectionality approach, we show how migrant pupils were particularly marginalised by the overlapping social categories of language, nationality and gender. According to our empirical observations for the period from the 1970s to the 1980s, the segregation into nationally homogeneous dual-language classes reproduced a structure of social exclusion. Our findings illustrate how past schooling policies have doomed the educational and occupational opportunities of a generation of guest workers' children. As some of the discriminatory grievances can still be seen in today's neoliberal conjuncture of racism, the results shed new light on contemporary (Bavarian) school policies towards migrants.

Keywords: Intersectionality, social exclusion, dual-language classes, educational discrimination, migration

Titel: Diskriminierung im Bayerischen Schulsystem an der Intersektion von Sprache, Nationalität und Gender während der 1970er und 1980er Jahre. Eine Münchener Fallstudie

Zusammenfassung: Nach dem Anwerbestopp für Gastarbeiter im Jahr 1973 sah sich ein hoher Anteil migrantischer Mitbürger:innen in München einer ausgrenzenden Schulsituation gegenüber. Mit Hilfe des Intersektionalitätsansatzes zeigen wir für das Schulsystem in München im Zeitraum der 1970er und 1980er Jahre, wie migrantische Schüler:innen über die zusammenwirkenden sozialen Kategorien Sprache, Nationalität und Gender marginalisiert wurden. Die Beschulung in national homogenen *Zweisprachenklassen* reproduzierte eine Struktur der gesellschaftlichen Ausgrenzung, womit die damalige Schulpolitik die Bildungs- und Berufschancen einer Generation reduzierte. Da es auch heute noch ausgrenzende Strukturen gibt, werfen die Ergebnisse ein neues Licht auf die (bayerische) Schulpolitik gegenüber Migrant:innen.

Schlüsselwörter: Intersektionalität, Soziale Exklusion, Zweisprachenklassen, Bildungsdiskriminierung, Migration

1 Introduction: The educational situation of immigrants in Germany

Education is an important marker for a person's social status. The German federal education system has been criticized in school performance studies for reproducing and amplifying social inequities, especially for immigrants (Ha 2016a: 181). Segregating education measures point to persisting institutional racisms (Dean 2020: 310), like intentional allocation of students into different elementary classes according to markers like foreign names or ethnicities and special integration courses for immigrants (Ha 2016a: 180). Separate schooling is being

discussed again, although it had already counteracted social inclusion during the guest worker regime half a century ago.

In 1972, the Bavarian capital started a schooling model of dual-language-classes [*Zweisprachenklassen*] that existed for almost two decades. Students were divided into nationally homogeneous groups, expelled from regular classes and predominantly taught all subjects in the official language of their country of origin, whereas German was taught as a second language. Following ministerial guidelines of the Conference of Ministers of Education [*Kultusministerkonferenz (KMK)*], these classes became the regular form of schooling for students of guest worker parents in all of Bavaria by 1976 until the end of the 1980s. As numbers illustrate, more than half of the dual-language class-students failed at the general final exams in the first years in Munich (Kristen 1978) showing that this generation was only granted limited chances for education.

The educational separation during the 1970s and 1980s in Munich has not yet been examined with an intersectionality approach. A perspective of intersectionality allows for an examination of how individual dispositions of immigrant students were turned into social disadvantages by the educational system. In sociology, the catholic daughter of working class parents from the countryside has long been the generic pars pro toto for showing that educational chances depend on certain social characteristics (Dahrendorf 1968). The Munich case complements the criteria of social exclusion in education with migration-related markers and thereby also provides a new perspective for current debates in education politics. Structural racisms in educational institutions are commonly justified with the merit principle of performance.

After an introduction of the intersectionality approach and the research design applied (Chapter 2) the Munich case (Chapter 3) is illustrated. Then, the discriminatory effects of the Bavarian schooling practice on the guest workers' children are highlighted. The analysis is carried out along the social markers nationality, language and gender (Chapter 4). Lastly, the findings are theoretically framed and connected to debates on educational (in)equity (Chapter 5) and a conclusion (Chapter 6) is drawn.

2 Theoretical frame and research design

By applying an intersectionality perspective on empirical material from Bergmann's masters thesis (2017), the marginalization of guest workers' children by discrimination in the education system becomes evident.

Firstly developed by Crenshaw (1989; 2004) in studies of Black Feminism and Critical Race Theory, the concept allows analysis of the intersection of social categories that produces unique forms of discrimination and oppression. The approach stresses the discrimination of societal groups along certain social dispositions (Walgenbach 2009; Chebout 2011) generated by hegemonic structures of power and leading to unequal political representation (Ganz/Hausotter 2020: 19). The social dispositions may develop and overlap in complex ways (Scherr 2012: 3) and have to be considered in the context of their social conditions and processes of construction (Rodríguez 2011: 78 f). The intersections of social categories entail specific inequities that reproduce the social structures, practices, and identities they consist of.

Hence, it is important to reflect on their context of discovery (Kallenberg/Müller/Mayer 2013: 26) as well as their historical and cultural conditions (Degele/Winker 2009).

The most commonly analyzed categories are race, gender, and class (Degele/Winker 2009; Hill Collins/Bilge 2016: 79). Intersectional studies are often criticized for taking personal identities for granted. The mere selection of categories in advance of investigation by the researcher carries the risk of reproducing dominant power dynamics. This can be met by reconstructing political contexts, decisions (Crenshaw 1989), and processes of knowledge production.

For Degele and Winker (2009), focusing on the individual level and on qualitative data enables a closer, agency-centered comprehension. The precarious positions of migrants are framed by societies' capitalist logic of profit maximization. Only those who assimilate into society unobtrusively are able to live relatively undisturbed – albeit within the given framework. Structures of power work on the level of symbolic representation and identity constructions (Degele/Winker 2009: 50) justifying the exploitation in the lowest segments of industrial jobs (Karakayalı 2008:106 f.; Bojadžijev, 2012: 186 f.). In order to avoid deriving conclusions from structural information only (Degele/Winkler 2009), our study relies on assemblage-oriented mapping (Rodríguez 2011: 96 f.; Schwertl 2013: 113) of empirical material that documents schooling decisions of the time.

The empirical material consists of a body of around 250 archival documents and 13 narrative expert interviews with central migration and education policy activists. With qualitative interpretative interview analysis and qualitative mapping of documents we trace the educational situation of guest workers' children and its dynamics in the City of Munich during the 1970s and 1980s through the points of view from that time. The archival material substituted the questioning of affected former students that were not systematically locatable. It was limited by the availability in archives. It encompasses political documents and publications of initiatives providing information about the education of the guest workers' children: Reports of the Bavarian school board, the Munich School Committee, City Council protocols, resolutions of the Munich *Ausländerbeirat,*[1] resolutions and leaflets of the Bavarian umbrella organization of educational migration work [VIA e.V.] as well as documents of Munich migrant and educational initiatives and local media publications. Two thirds of the archival documents were acquired by a keyword search in the Munich city archive and another third via a grassroots educational initiative's archive.[2]

As there was no possibility to systematically contact those who had been students in the dual-language classes or their parents, we included expert interviews with (former) education professionals and activists in our analysis. The interviewees had been involved in the civic and educational support of the guest workers and their children during the 1970s and 1980s and some of them had been affected by the separation in schooling themselves. We evaluated seven semi-guided interviews of Bergmann's thesis (2017) as well as six narrative video interviews from a chronicle of contemporary witnesses [*Münchner Pioniere*], that both queried education and migration experts on their personal and professional experiences.

On the basis of this material we conducted an assemblage following the pervasive logics and structures (Schwertl 2013: 118) of discrimination. Thereby, we reconstructed the proc-

1 The *Ausländerbeirat* (foreigners' council) has meanwhile been renamed to Migrationsbeirat in Munich and is an advisory council that represents the interests of the foreign population of a municipality or city to advocate inclusion at the municipal level.

2 InitiativGruppe e.V.

esses and categories that intersected and produced social exclusion in the case of the Munich education of guest workers' children. The most prominent categories of discrimination derived from the empirical corpus are language, nationality (with an ethnicity-dimension), and gender. Language plays a great role in justifying, organizing and implementing the dual-language classes. Furthermore, the empirical corpus divides along the guest worker nationalities (Italian, Greek, Turkish, Yugoslavian and Spanish). Groups of guest workers are often referred to by nationality whereas there are no clear references to the category of ethnicity – though some discriminatory mechanisms work via an interplay of both. Gender – as the most common social marker – has always played a great role for education. We are aware that we analyze this intersecting institutional discrimination in education from a hegemonic position of white academics, from which we cannot fully disconnect ourselves and our findings.

3 The education of the guest workers' children in the city of Munich

The time of observation represents the second migration cycle and migration regime of 20th century Germany (Bojadžijev 2012: 245 f.) characterized by the stop of immigrant worker recruitment in 1973, repatriation politics on the side of the state as well as discussions about family reunification and civil rights by immigrants. In Germany, the recruitment agreements started in 1955 to create a temporary work force for industrial jobs during the economic boom. Guest workers came from Turkey, Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Spain as well as other Southern European countries like Portugal. Unexpectedly, many working immigrants decided to stay, bringing or founding families in Germany – thus becoming part of the resident population. As a result, the numbers of students of foreign-born parents rose in the years to follow (Kischkewitz/Reuter 1980: 25–30).

Compared to other West German states, the educational system of Bavaria and its capital Munich is an extreme case due to especially discriminatory dynamics (Sendlmeier 1986: 56 ff., Hunger 2001: 132). To illustrate the Munich case, the educational situation of migrants in Germany at the time and the Bavarian *Sonderweg*[3] (Karakaşoğlu/Linnemann/Vogel 2019: 8) are presented, followed by a description of the situation in Munich.

3.1 Educational situation of migrants in Germany

Following increasing work migration within Europe, a 1960 UNESCO-agreement against discrimination in educational systems compelled receiving states to guarantee the same educational standards for foreign residents as for their own citizens (UNESCO 1960). However, in Germany, specific educational guidelines and strategies for the schooling of non-German citizens were not evolved until the beginning of the 1970s. German federal states have sovereign educational systems and are responsible for implementing the directives of the German educational ministerial conference respectively. The federal education system is criticized for historically producing unequal outcomes (Rist 1978).

In 1971, the KMK made the education of migrant children a separate topic for the first time and issued guidelines for policies regarding school organization and educational in-

3 Special pathway

struction of immigrant children in the German federal states with the dual aim of integration in Germany and reintegration possibilities in the countries of origin (Karakaşoğlu/Linnemann/Vogel 2019: 7 f.). The KMK-recommendations suggested preparatory classes in short and long form as well as special classes for students of foreign-born parents. Interestingly, the guidelines concentrated on elementary school and lower secondary education only. They did not include recommendations for higher secondary education – thereby already indicating discrimination (ibid.).

The West German States fostered three different approaches in the implementation of the 1971-KMK-guidelines (Röhr-Sendlmeier 1986: 56 f.). Tränhardt (1991) observes that the educational achievements and the number of immigrant children who acquired higher qualifications developed very differently in the federal states during the four decades of the West German republic. The inequities were particularly significant in terms of the success levels of immigrant students (Hunger 2001: 135). It was shown that students with foreign born parents in general have been more adversely affected by differences in federal school systems than children of German parents (Tränhardt 1991: 417).

While Berlin, Lower-Saxony, Saarland, Schleswig-Holstein, and later also North Rhine-Westphalia focused on integrating the students with foreign born parents in regular classes, Hamburg, Hesse and Rhineland-Palatinate chose a dual strategy to enable both integration into the German education system and reintegration into schools in the home country. In contrast, education politics in Baden-Wuerttemberg (since 1975) and Bavaria mainly focused on repatriation (Röhr-Sendmeier 1986: 56 f) by implementing segregated classes for children of foreign-born parents.

3.2 The Bavarian *Sonderweg*

The Bavarian *Sonderweg* started with the education acts of 1957 and 1961 allowing for the exclusion of children from school in case their German skills were considered insufficient (ibid.: 52). Following the KMK-guidelines, dual-language and preparatory classes were introduced. For the dual-language classes, students were divided into nationally homogeneous groups to teach them in the official language of their country of origin. German was taught as a second language with 8 lessons per week. The school ministry recruited foreign teachers for the national homogenous classes, often on temporary working contracts. Allowing special curriculums meant less comparable diplomas, loopholes for anti-democratic content (ibid.: 60) and extra teaching materials, like school books in the respective languages. This meant financial expenses and complex organizational work for the communities (Bavarian Association of Cities 1971).

In the course of their diverging implementation, the KMK-recommendations were reformulated in a new resolution on education for children of foreign workers in 1976 and supplemented in 1979. The goals of revision were to include, i. e., the Bavarian *Sonderweg* into the common federal guideline (Röhr-Sendlmeier 1986: 59), to foster the first language skills of children with foreign languages in German schools in favour of a regulation oriented towards the return of the children to their so-called home country (ibid.; Karakaşoğlu/Linnemann/Vogel 2019: 8):

"However, in the context of the dual task of a) integrating into the German environment and b) creating the conditions for reintegration into the home country, the Recommendation pays increased attention to the second objective." (Secretary's Office of KMK 1976: 3)

Recommendations in the 1976-edit also worked towards a more frequent and longer separation of children of foreign nationalities from German children, e. g. by prolonging preparatory classes to two years (Karakaşoğlu/Linnemann/Vogel 2019: 8 f).

Generally, the KMK-guidelines also allowed to teach children with foreign mother tongues in regular classes under the requirement of providing supplementary German as well as supplementary mother tongue instruction, "in case at least twelve pupils are expected to attend on a sustained basis" (StMUK 1979). Yet, the school registration numbers, e. g. for Munich, show that these supplementary courses had rarely been established (Munich School Committee 1977). Instead, when preconditions like a certain number of students of the same nationality were not met (Schulreferat 1972: 2), students from different school catchment areas and even several school years (especially the higher years) were pooled together (StMUK 1974: 2; Mitgliederversammlung IG e.V. 1978: 3). In case the nationally homogenous classes could not be filled, this could result in pooling all non-German students in a separate class (Bavarian State Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs 1976a).

Although in practice, there were specifications regarding the transition to (German) mainstream classes, such separate forms of education developed into a kind of "parallel school branch" (Krüger-Potratz 2019: 395). As a consequence, compared to 56 % of students with German parents, only 17 % of students of foreign-born parents graduated from secondary school in Bavaria in 1985, the lowest number in the Federal Republic of Germany (Hunger 2001: 125).

3.3 The Munich case

Munich was (amongst Augsburg and Nuremberg) one of the cities that first established national homogenous model classes in 1972 as well as other types of special model classes for students of foreign-born parents. In Germany, migrant groups are predominantly located in metropolitan areas (Lutter 2016: 128), turning federal state capitals to important places of politics and integration. Munich has always had one of the highest percentages of foreign residents in Germany up until today. At the beginning of the period investigated, more than 88,000 guest workers lived in Munich (Dunkel/Stramagglia-Faggion 2000: 9) which had a total population of 1.3 million. In comparison to the rather restrictive immigration politics of Bavaria, the Social Democratic city council in Munich often proved to be more liberal. Yet, being an immigrant city had often been rendered a problematic issue in Munich, keeping a mostly culturalist – at times culturally racist – discourse towards migrants in local politics (Hess/Moser 2009: 15).

In accordance with the Bavarian Educational Ministry, the Munich school policy aimed at giving the guest workers' children access to the school system, while simultaneously keeping open the option of their repatriation (Bavarian State Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs 1976a; Herbert 2003: 238).

The number of students with foreign nationalities was especially high in Munich, rising from around 8,000 in the school year 1973/74 to over 10,000 in the 1980s (Schulreferat 1973: 1; Schulreferat 1982). Dual-language classes were predominantly set up for guest worker

nationalities without their own private schools (Turkish, Yugoslavian and Italian) in Munich. Turkish students represented the biggest national group in Bavaria as well as Munich (StMUK 1976; Via LV Bayern 1983: 2).

Student nationalities in Munich

	School year	Turkish	Yugoslavian	Italian	Greek	Spanish	Other non-German
Student numbers	1973/74	1.313	819	652	267	204	820
Dual-language classes	1974/75	17	9	9	-	-	-

Own illustration (Schulreferat 1973:3; 1974)

After the model character ended with the 1976-edit of the KMK, the numbers of dual-language classes rose until almost two thirds of the students of foreign-born parents went to nationally homogenous classes (StMuK 1976). The numbers of dual-language classes only started to decrease after the second migration cycle and the guest worker regime by the end of the 1980s. Compared to these numbers, in the school year 1982/83 around 12,500 students with guest worker parents still attended Munich public schools, of which 7,000 already went to regular classes while 5,500 remained in national homogenous classes (Jungfer et. al. 1983: 2).

4 Inequalities by intersections of language, nationality and gender in the Munich case

Altogether, restrictive Bavarian politics of education were an orientation for decisions on the German federal level for a long time, giving Munich's school system a special position. The model was implemented in a way that rather ensured 'trouble-free lessons' for German pupils instead of focusing on qualifying the children of foreign-born parents (Krüger-Potratz 2019: 395).

4.1 The role of language in education

Language was an important dimension of inequity as imposed decisions about language proficiency, a lack of parents' inclusion and impediments for attending higher education bereaved the children of chances for exploiting their potential in diplomas in Germany and abroad. Proficiency in many languages and mastering of more than one mother tongue were not considered a resource by educational institutions and authorities. Instead, mastering the mother tongue of the parents' home-countries was an unquestioned requirement.

"I was blindsided when I was told that it is important to learn your mother tongue first, and that you need, let's say, 7–8 years, then you should learn German. And I come (…) from the Dolomites. I couldn't understand [that] at first,

because we spoke Rhaeto-Romanic, that is Ladin, at home, in kindergarten we learned Italian, then in elementary school Italian and German, and then later in high school English was added, so practically we were always confronted with five languages somehow, and it was no problem at all for us. So it was difficult for me to understand at first, practically, until of course it was quite clear that this was a political decision." (Interview 1)

Yet, contrary to the aim of the dual-language classes, some children were not taught in (any of) their mother tongue(s) at all (Bergmann 2017: 29) as they often became enrolled in nationally homogeneous classes without a check of their language skills (Bußer et al. 1981: 38). The mother tongue of Turkish Kurds, who were mostly enrolled in the Turkish classes, was predominantly not Turkish but Kurdish (Interview 1, 2014; Interview 5, 2017). Children from Yugoslavia had many different mother tongues and did not always speak the official language, Serbo-Croatian.

The decision, whether children were allocated to nationally homogenous classes or to regular classes, or whether they would be able to attend higher education, was often taken by institutions on behalf of the foreign-born parents, e.g. by teacher recommendations (StMUK 1974: 6). Thereby, the subjective impression of teachers and the institutionally estimated language skills played a greater role than KMK-guidelines intended (Jungfer et.al. 1983: 2).

Additionally, language excluded many parents from well-informed decision making: For example, there was no bilingual information available in Munich about the secondary school system in the respective national language (Schulreferat 1978: 5). A multilingual letter handed out to parents by the schools informed about the dual-language classes, but did not mention the parents' right to object (Geiselberger 1974) and information evenings about dual-language classes for parents at schools were often only held after the registration date for the dual-language classes in Munich (Scharnagl/Schulamt 1974). In the 1980s, the school department started offering consultation hours for Turkish and Yugoslavian parents held by compatriots with limited opening hours (Schulreferat 1983: 7) incompatible with working shifts of industrial workers. An international counseling center with contact persons speaking Romanian, Greek, Italian, Serbo-Croatian, and Turkish was not set up until 1985.

For changing from dual-language classes to regular classes, no official procedure existed (Ausländerbeirat 1982: 1). For allocation into higher education, besides the general referral certificate [*Übertrittszeugnis*],[4] there were special prerequisites German students did not face: A written recommendation by the class teacher[5] and a high grade[6] in German that could even outrank the grade point average of the *Übertrittszeugnis* (Schulreferat 1983: 1).

According to the official rationale, an education in their mother tongue would give the children "a sense of achievement" (Interview 4, 2017), facilitate success in school, and best prepare the children for their anticipated resettlement to their home country in later life (Meier 1980). The Bavarian education ministry also stresses the importance of first properly acquiring one's (supposed) mother-tongue for mental-emotional development and national identity formation (Röhr-Sendlmeier 1986: 58). The educational requirements of the German school system and the pressure for integration were considered too high for the immigrant children (StMUK 1974: 3), indicating that their abilities were perceived as deficient. This points at a culturalist rationale of racism that contains an imperative to assimilate (Bojadžijev 2012; Karakayalı 2008).

4 Referral recommendation to Realschulen and Gymnasien
5 Pädagogisches Wortgutachten (Schulreferat 1983: 1)
6 Grade 1 or 2 out of 6 in the German grading system

In theory, the curricula of the dual-language classes were designed as content hybrids to give the students the possibility to either receive a German diploma or to later return to schools in their parent's home country. In practice, the children lost the connection to both options as the content met neither of the two requirements (Bergmann 2017: 30) as insufficient resources amplified the problems (MV IG e.V. 1978: 2). A constant lack of foreign teachers and school books for the national classes is documented (Schmid 1981), especially in the first few years after their introduction (StMUK 1974: 3). Thus, sometimes school books from the countries of origin were used, which did not comply with the final German exams (Bußer et. al. 1981: 41). Moreover, due to a shortage of teachers in the 1970s in Bavaria (Schulreferat 1973: 9), both native language and German classes for foreign students often were cancelled – to the benefit of German regular classes (Röhr-Sendlmeier 1986: 53).

In Munich, learning German only to an insufficient level caused more than half of the dual-language class students to fail at the general final exams (held in German) in the first years of the nationally homogenous classes (Kristen 1978). This had implications for their entry into the labor market. Of a total of 593 students of foreign nationality leaving secondary school in 1981 in Munich, only one third (174 students) achieved a qualifying lower secondary school diploma, whereas half of the German students graduated with a qualified diploma (Schulreferat 1981: 1).

Subsequently, a separate graduation was introduced for the nationally homogenous classes to ensure higher graduate numbers. Unintendedly, this worsened the situation of graduates from dual-language classes as their exam soon became known as sub-prime throughout Munich's employers (Bußer et al. 1981: 97f). As a result, compared to graduates from regular classes, graduates from dual-language classes had a harder time finding jobs and apprenticeships (Jungfer et al. 1983: 2). The number of young immigrants that were not able to find an apprenticeship doubled from 1,000 in 1978 to 2000 in 1981 (City of Munich 1981).

In summary, language was an important dimension of discrimination dooming the professional careers of a generation. It coincided with the dimensions nationality, and, for girls, gender – as further analyzed below.

4.2 The role of nationality in education

On the basis of nationality, documented in passports and by associations of names, students were taken out of regular classes, pooled, referred to dual-language classes and demoted. Non-German parents were treated as if unqualified for decision making. Discrimination by nationality affected some groups in particular.

A 1981 report of an activist organization includes copies of parents' letters and enrollment notices that document cases of children born in Germany and native in German language that were recommended to be taken out of regular school or enrolled in a dual-language class on the basis of their passport (Bußer et al. 1981: 38). Our interview partners recount similar situations:

"I wanted to enroll my daughter in German school normally, and then the director comes and says: No (...) you can't just enroll your daughter here. I say: Why? She: There are [no] dual-language classes here. And I say: But my daughter can speak German. [The teacher:] Well, I don't know if she can speak German. Then I say: Please talk to her, she speaks perfect German. And then they enrolled her. So this happened every time – I know what problems the foreigners actually had, yes". (Interview 2)

Another documented practice is the assignment to special needs schools [*Sonderschule*] in case, a) foreign parents refused to accept the dual-language class model, b) the children would have had to repeat a school year of standard class several times, c) there were no languages classes assigned to the nationality of a student or d) to avoid long routes to school. In the cases documented, the parents often didn't even know what *Sonderschule* was but instead felt happy to have such a "clever kid" (Interview 3) going to a *special school*– which, e.g. in Turkey, was a label for higher education schools (ibid.).

Such automated enrollment practices based on nationality were often justified by highlighting "that it would be good for the child, because it would have a sense of achievement. (…) They didn't want to say: we want to get rid of the child because it's too hard for us here and we don't have time and that slows down the class." (Interview 4). The separation in school was justified by the supposedly

> "different needs of Algerian, Italian, Greek, Yugoslavian, Spanish, Portuguese and Turkish children and adolescents, who come from very different linguistic, cultural and social worlds. (…) A corresponding pedagogical conception can only do justice to the given diversity, which results from the different linguistic and cultural origins, the desire to stay or to return, by an equally diverse pedagogical and school organizational framework" (Maier 1980: 1–2).

This culturalist argumentation contains a "compulsion to identity" (Bojadžijev 2012: 245) and concludes that the German classes would overtax the children whose balanced personality development is only possible through a sense of achievement in a native-language, self-cultural environment.

Assignment to a certain type of school differed also across nationalities: In Munich's general schools around 12 percent of the students had foreign-born parents – compared to only 3 to 4 percent at the middle and grammar schools (Munich School Committee 1978: 157). Additionally, different bilateral policies between the parents' country of origin and Germany played a role. Greek and Spanish students in Munich had overwhelmingly been educated in separate Greek schools[7] and Spanish classes in international schools respectively (Schulreferat 1973: 5). The schools and classes were supervised by the respective governments. They provided curriculums and graduation diplomas comparable to those in Greece and Spain. Therefore, dual-language classes mainly existed for the three biggest foreign nationality groups without separate schools: Turkish, Yugoslavian, and Italian students.

According to interviews and archival documents, Turkish students were particularly likely to suffer discrimination in school (by steady allocation to dual-language classes, relegation as well as among peers in class) and when looking for work (GEW BV Oberbayern 1982). In proportion, the greatest number of nationally homogenous classes existed for students with Turkish passports (Schulreferat 1973; 1982), e.g. of 5,300 students with Turkish passports in 1981/82, almost three quarters (3,305) attended Turkish homogenous dual-language classes and only 1,995 went to regular classes (Schulreferat 1982). Accordingly, finding a job or apprenticeship after school proved especially difficult for this group: For example, of 1,805 unemployed foreigner leaving Munich schools in 1981, 1,453 were of Turkish nationality (City of Munich 1981) and only less than a third (608 of 2,061) of graduates of Turkish origin found an apprenticeship in 1982 (VIA-Landesverband Bayern 1982: 1). At the same time, the Munich foreigners' registration authorities established a quite restrictive practice concerning the renewal of working permits, especially for Turkish guest workers (Loy 1983: 7f.).

7 In the school year 1973/74, only around 300 Greek students (~10 %) enrolled in German schools, whereas 2.370 Greek students attended the private Greek schools (Schulreferat 1973: 5).

Concerning the parents' representation in school, Turkish parents were the most poorly represented group. In comparison, there were institutions reflecting the interests of Hispanic parents, Greek parents, and Italian parents, like patronati[8] (Bergmann 2017: 49). Authorities often interpreted the guest worker parents' general lower visibility as a lack of interest and commitment (Bergmann 2017), which they considered as evidence of an imminent intention to return to their home countries (Kollender 2016: 49). Likewise, the absence of immigrants in parents' associations and other German institutions was attributed to their "foreign origin" (Kollender 2016: 49).

Yet, the interviews and documents show, compared to German parents, the working immigrants faced higher hurdles for participation in school boards or otherwise. The hurdles were scanty information, language barriers and a climate of xenophobia, the employment of both parents in a full-time job as well as uncertain future possibilities resulting from limited residence permits (Bergmann 2017: 34f.).

4.3 The role of gender in education

In terms of education, job possibilities, and role expectations, girls of foreign-born parents were more marginalized than boys. For them, language, nationality, and gender culminated in a specific discrimination.

Notably, immigrant women were confronted with restrictive identity constructions. On the one hand, they faced role expectations by their families, and on the other hand, they faced prejudices by German society of being culturally determined and suppressed. Some parents with strictly religious, patriarchal backgrounds did not approve girls and boys playing together in school breaks, making participation hard for their daughters and reinforcing prejudices:

"A father, his seven-year-old daughter had played with the boys with the hand, allowed her to go to school only with gloves, because the teacher refused that she then no longer plays with the boys. The next day the girl came to school with gloves on." (Interview 3)

There were no guidelines for teachers to react appropriately to such situations. Educational institutions seldom intervened but often rather sustained discrimination. As a result, girls of foreign born parents had a harder time finding an appointment compared to boys of the same nationality or German girls, as they faced double discrimination on the apprenticeship market (Via LV Bayern 1982). Even for educational social work, girls seemed to be harder to include, as they were harder to reach and their participation fluctuated more (Multi-Cultural YC Westend 1989: 2). Additionally, social workers describe the situation in the international youth center at the time as predominantly characterized by a "male culture" (ibid.).

Three of our interviewees referred to the guest worker's children as "a lost generation" and stressed that this came especially true for girls with Turkish passports. The highest number of illiterates in Munich at the time have been Turkish women from rural areas (Bergmann 2017: 49). German politics and society conceptualized Turkish born women and their daughters as returnees without a perspective (Fachbasis 1984: 27ff.), stripping them of their (professional) prospects in both societies and making a career in an under-paid female occupation or becoming a housewife more likely.

8 Patronati are foreign organizations of Italian trade unions, of which around 8 existed in Munich in the time of observation (e. g. ACLI and CGIL-Scuola)

All in all, the precarious positions of girls and women from Turkey in the Munich education system were produced by "the complex entanglement of different relationships" (Rodríguez 2011: 90) and show that discrimination via certain social dispositions do not merely accumulate but are an outcome of social value coding (ibid.).

5 Discussion of empirical findings

The findings of the Munich case fit to observations that working migration is predominantly associated with a loss of social and cultural capital as the migrants take up positions in the lower income brackets in the receiving society (Karakayalı 2008). Their children face restricted chances of education. The Bavarian school system institutionalized inequities among students based on language, nationality, and gender – the social position of the guest workers' children was produced by the complex entanglement of different relationships. Consequences of which were lower chances to admission into higher education, less valuable diplomas, and lower chances of entering the job and apprenticeship markets in Munich.

The education of the guest workers' children coincides with the culturally racist integration discourse of the 1970s and 1980s (Ha 2016b). This rationale presented separate schooling as the best solution for the children's well-being, an argumentation line found in many documents of school administration and the Bavarian ministry (Röhr-Sendlmeier 1986: 57f.). In the observed timespan, and until today, migration has been interpreted in a conceptual context of nationality and national society (Lutter 2016: 132) in which the attribution of characteristics like language and culture plays a great role. The undifferentiated assignment of persons and groups to the category 'foreigner of a certain nationality' as well as the ascription of a typical culture and behavior related to nationality was based on assumptions of sociocultural homogeneity constituted by the nation-state (Lutter 2016: 134). In this narrative, culture is assigned to either ethnicity or, more frequently, a specific nationality. Thereby, nation is conceptualized as a cultural container (Hess/Moser 2009: 16), which dominates in the education politics of Bavaria during the time.

According to culturalist thinking, migrant women and girls were often perceived as suppressed and passive, following their husbands with temporary occupation, finally being destined for motherhood and family life in their home countries (Bojadžijev 2012: 103f.). This does not match the overall historic situation as the share of female guest workers was high and many of them were the ones sustaining their families' livelihoods (Goeke 2020: 55ff.) and resembles the commonly criticized acknowledgment of the work situation of white women only (hooks 1984). Ultimately, this resulted in a disinterest in the enforcement of rights for girls of foreign born parents by educational institutions.

Additionally, in the Munich case, nationalities with stronger diplomatic relations secured better education for their emigrants via private schools, whereas nationalities that were coded as especially far from the hegemonic cultural value system (Rodríguez 2011: 90), e.g. pupils with Turkish nationality, faced especially severe segregation and discrimination based on prejudices. Structural racism (and sexism) in educational institutions is often accompanied by neoliberal arguments that justify segregation on the basis of the merit principle of performance without the explicit use of racist patterns of interpretation (Kollender 2020: 185).

Such structures of hegemonic normality produce social exclusion based on constructed cultural values and may be traced by intersectional analysis. The perspective sensitizes for established power relations, hegemonic positions and hidden structural (neoliberal) racisms (Rodríguez 2011: 81ff.) dominant in the German education system that follows the neoliberal merit principle (Kollender 2020: 184f.). The Munich case confirms that according to Degele's and Winker's (2009) framework those conceptualized as guest workers' children were assigned to marginalized positions in education outside hegemonic normality by their social dispositions.

Limitations of the Munich case are the confined availability of empirical material, and the time interval between the time of observation and the analysis. This implies that the perspectives of certain actors could not be taken into account, as the empirical material only provides indirect information about the students' individual experiences and the subjective views of persons in decision-making positions. Current studies on education and intersectionality (i.e. Lörz 2019; Wellgraf 2011) make it seem likely that the influence of social status and income interact with the examined categories of discrimination, which could not be analyzed by use of the available material. Despite these limitations, our analysis provides a critical perspective on former and contemporary education of migrants in Munich and Bavaria.

The strengths of the Munich case are the identification of past political decisions that caused discriminatory practices and structures in the education system and how these relied on intersecting social markers. The study confirms that "in the process of continuous homogenization of learning groups (…) those are sorted out who deviate from the expectations of normality and thus the school's normality expectations and would thereby increase the complexity of the tasks to be mastered" (Radtke 2008: 667). Discrimination does not happen uniformly against migrants but is rather based on conceptions of "normality, i.e. about expectations of the (…) pupil role" (ibid.) which disproportionately often does not match children with the combination of a certain nationality, gender, and language. The guest workers' children were conceptualized as "deficient" (Ha 2016b: 117) students and treated differently on basis of their deviation from hegemonic society.

The negative impact of the dual-language classes on chances for gainful employment became a starting point for a more comprehensive social exclusion (Diewald/Pollmann-Schult 2009). Until today, challenges of inclusion possibilities become reformulated as assimilation problems in rationales of cultural racism (Lutter 2016: 134). This reflects constructions of hegemonic "normality" (ibid.). Exclusory mechanisms are mostly based on social dispositions that do not correspond to the construct of hegemonic normality. Strong mechanisms of exclusion in schools were still observed in recent PISA studies (Ha 2016a: 179). The social implications of discrimination in education are of the utmost importance for the city level because unemployment, lack of educational opportunities, and inadequate social systems cause the accumulation of exclusions and show in spatial terms (Häußermann/Kronauer 2009).

Thereby, the Munich case updates Dahrendorf's (1968) markers for low socio-economic positions by pointing to the importance of language and nationality. Children of foreign-born parents had more obstacles in exploiting their potential in school than children of German parents with low socio-economic status, as they suited the construction of hegemonic normality in school even less.

6 Conclusion and implications

With the intersectionality approach, we followed structural discrimination in education affecting the guest workers' children in education during the 1970s and 1980s in Munich. Education politics established exclusive structures based on the interacting social dimensions of nationality, language, and gender.

To date, there has been a lot of improvement and awareness for diversity in the education systems of the Federal German States. However, social differences are still reproduced in education by separating students on the basis of presumed skills – that are actually socially constructed collective agents (Krüger et al. 2010: 8). In this context, a perspective of intersectionality sensitizes for students' different capabilities, needs, and interests. In education, there is the basic necessity for a more thorough assessment of individual resources and their respect in education. Separate and special classes as well as special integration courses cannot be recommended as marginalization reproduces social exclusion.

Munich's education policy during the guest worker regime is a reminder that there is still a long way to go in the German education system to overcome deficit-oriented attitudes towards students with migration experience and to develop a resource-oriented perspective on migration as a normality.

References

Bergmann, Mona (2017): Die Initiative ergreifen: Politiken aus der Selbstorganisation verändern in München die Schul- und Ausbildungssituation der ‚zweiten Generation'. Unpublished master thesis, Munich: Chair of European Ethnology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University.

Bojadžijev, Manuela (2012): Die windige Internationale. Rassismus und Kämpfe der Migration. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Boos-Nünning, Ursula (1981): Muttersprachliche Klassen für ausländische Kinder: Eine kritische Diskussion des bayerischen "Offenen Modells". In: Deutsch lernen. Zeitschrift für den Sprachunterricht mit ausländischen Arbeitnehmern 81, 2, S. 40–70.

Chebout, Lucy (2011): Wo ist Intersectionality in bundesdeutschen Intersektionalitätsdiskursen? – Exzerpte aus dem Reisetagebuch einer Traveling Theory. In: Smykalla, Sandra /Vinz, Dagmar (Hrsg.): Intersektionalität zwischen Gender und Diversity. Theorien, Methoden und Politiken der Chancengleichheit. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, S. 43–57.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé (1989): Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine. In: The University of Chicago legal forum, 139, S. 139–167.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé (2004): Intersectionality. The Double Bind of Race and Gender. Interview mit der Zeitschrift Perspective. Retrieved from: http:// http://www.abanet.org/women/ perspectives/ Spring2004CrenshawPSP.pdf (accessed 05.02.22).

Dahrendorf, Ralf (1968): Bildung ist Bürgerrecht. Plädoyer für eine aktive Bildungspolitik. Hamburg: Wegner.

Dean, Isabel (2020): Bildung – Heterogenität – Sprache. Rassistische Differenz- und Diskriminierungsverhältnisse in Kita und Grundschule. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Degele, Nina/Winker, Gabriele (2009): Intersektionalität. Zur Analyse sozialer Ungleichheiten. Bielefeld: transcript.

Diewald, Martin/Pollmann-Schult, Matthias (2009): Erwerbsverläufe in Ostdeutschland – Inklusion und Exklusion seit 1989. In: Stichweh, Rudolf/Windolf, Paul (Hrsg.): Inklusion und Exklusion. Analysen zur Sozialstruktur und Sozialen Ungleichheit. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, S. 139–156.

Dunkel, Franziska/Stramaglia-Faggion, Gabriella (2000): Zur Geschichte der Gastarbeiter in München. München: München Verlag.

Ganz, Kathrin/Hausotter, Jette (2020): Intersektionale Sozialforschung. Bielefeld: transcript.

Goeke, Simon (2020): "Wir sind alle Fremdarbeiter!". Gewerkschaften, migrantische Kämpfe und soziale Bewegungen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland der 1960er und 1970er Jahre. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.

Ha, Kien Nghi (2016a): "billig und willig" – Arbeitsmigrations- und Integrationspolitik aus postkolonialer Perspektive. In: Ziai, Aram (Hrsg.): Postkoloniale Politikwissenschaft. Bielefeld: transcript, S. 173–190.

Ha, Kien Nghi (2016b): Deutsche Integrationspolitik als koloniale Praxis. In: Ha, Kien Nghi/al-Samarai, Nicola L./Mysorekar, Sheila (Hrsg.): re/visionen. Münster: Unrast, S. 113–128.

Häußermann, Hartmut/Kronauer, Martin (2009): Räumliche Segregation und innerstädtisches Ghetto. In: Stichweh, Rudolf/Windolf, Paul (Hrsg.): Inklusion und Exklusion. Analysen zur Sozialstruktur und sozialen Ungleichheit. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, S.157–173.

Herbert, Ulrich (2003): Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.

Hess, Sabine/Moser, Johannes (2009): Jenseits der Integration. Kulturwissenschaftliche Betrachtungen einer Debatte. In: Sabine Hess/Binder, Beate/Moser, Johannes (Hrsg.): No integration?! Kulturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Integrationsdebatte in Europa. Bielefeld: transcript, S. 11–26.

Hill Collins, Patricia/Bilge, Sirma (2016). Intersectionality. Malden: Polity Press.

Hooks, Bell (1984): Feminist Theory. From Margin to Centre. Boston: South end press.

Hunger, Uwe (2001): Bildungspolitik und institutionalisierte Diskriminierung auf Ebene der Bundesländer. Ein Vergleich zwischen Baden-Württemberg, Bayern, Hessen und Nordrhein-Westfalen. In: Lale, Akgün/Thränhardt, Dietrich (Hrsg.): Integrationspolitik in föderalistischen Systemen. Münster: Lit-Verlag, S. 119–138.

Kallenberg Vera/Müller, Johanna M./Meyer, Jennifer (2013): Introduction: Intersectionality as a Critical Perspective for the Humanities. In: dies. (Hrsg.): Intersectionality und Kritik. Neue Perspektiven für alte Fragen. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, S. 15–35.

Karakaşoğlu, Yasemin/Linnemann, Matthias/Vogel, Dita (2019): Schulischer Umgang mit transnationaler Migration und Mobilität. Rückschlüsse aus Empfehlungen der Kultusministerkonferenz seit den 1950er-Jahren. In: Transnationale Mobilität in Schule Arbeitspapier 2019, 2, S. 1–23.

Karakayalı, Serhat (2008): Gespenster der Migration. Zur Genealogie illegaler Einwanderung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Bielefeld: transcript.

Kischkewitz, Peter/Reuter, Lutz-R. (1980): Bildungspolitik zweiter Klasse. Ausländerkinder im Schulsystem der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Frankfurt a. M.: Rita Fischer.

Kollender, Ellen (2016): "Die sind nicht unbedingt auf Schule orientiert." Formationen eines ‚racial neoliberalism' an innerstädtischen Schulen Berlins. In: Movements. Journal für kritische Migrations- und Grenzregimeforschung, 3(1), S. 39–64.

Kollender, Ellen (2020): "Und das nenn' ich Nehmermentalität." Rassistische Adressierungen von Eltern in der Schule im Kontext des sozialstaatlichen Aktivierungsdiskurses. In: Akbaba, Yalız/Bello, Bettina/Fereidooni, Karim (Hrsg.): Pädagogische Professionalität und Migrationsdiskurse. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, S. 167–190.

Krüger, Heinz-Hermann/Rabe-Kleberg, Ursula/Kramer, Rolf-Torsten/Budde, Jürgen (2010): Bildungsungleichheit revisited? – eine Einleitung. In: Dies. (Hrsg.): Bildungsungleichheit revisited. Bildung und soziale Ungleichheit vom Kindergarten bis zur Hochschule. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, S. 9–21.

Krüger-Potratz, Marianne (2019): 100 Jahre Grundschule – 100 Jahre Umgang mit nationaler, sprachlicher und ethnischer Differenz. In: Zeitschrift für Grundschulforschung, 2019, 12, S. 383–398.
Lörz, Markus (2019): Intersektionalität im Hochschulbereich: In welchen Bildungsphasen bestehen soziale Ungleichheiten nach Migrationshintergrund, Geschlecht und sozialer Herkunft – und inwieweit zeigen sich Interaktionseffekte? In: Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 22(1), S. 101–124.
Lutter, Andreas (2016): Jenseits von Assimilation und Multikultur? Herausforderungen migrationspolitischer Bildung in Deutschland. In: Linguistik online, 79(5), S.127–137.
Radke, Frank-Olaf (2008): Schule und Ethnizität. In: Helsper, Werner/Böhme, Jeanette (Hrsg.): Handbuch der Schulforschung. Wiesbaden: Spinger VS, S. 651–672.
Rist, Ray C. (1978): Guestworkers in Germany: the prospects for pluralism. New York: Praeger.
Rodríguez, Encarnación G. (2011): Intersektionalität oder: Wie nicht über Rassismus sprechen? In: Hess, Sabine/Langreiter, Nicola/Timm, Elisabeth (Hrsg.): Intersektionalität revisited. Bielefeld: transcript, S. 77–100.
Röhr-Sendlmeier, Una M. (1986): Die Bildungspolitik zum Unterricht für ausländische Kinder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland – Eine kritische Betrachtung der vergangenen 30 Jahre. In: Deutsch lernen, 11(1), S. 51–67.
Scherr, Albert (2012): Diskriminierung: Die Verwendung von Differenzen zur Herstellung und Verfestigung von Ungleichheiten. Paper presented at the Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Vortrag 36, Plenum Diversity und Intersektionalität. Retrieved from: http://www.portal-intersektionalität.de (accessed 20. 02. 2022).
Schwertl, Maria (2013): Vom Netzwerk zum Text. In: Hess, Sabine/Moser, Johannes/Schwertl, Maria (Hrsg.): Europäisch-ethnologisches Forschen. Berlin: Riemer, S. 107–l26.
Thränhardt, Dietrich (1991): Länder-Differenzen in der Bildungspolitik. In: Wollmann, Hellmut (Hrsg.): Die alte Bundesrepublik. Kontinuität und Wandel. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, S. 409–419.
Walgenbach, Katharina (2007): Gender als interdependente Kategorie. In: Walgenbach, Katharina/Dietze, Gabriele/Hornscheidt, Antje/Palm, Kerstin (Hrsg.): Gender als interdependente Kategorie. Opladen: Budrich, S. 23–64.
Wellgraf, Stefan (2011): Hauptschule: Formationen von Ethnizität, Klasse und Geschlecht. In: Hess, Sabine/Langreiter, Nicola/Timm, Elisabeth (Hrsg.): Intersektionalität revisited. Bielefeld: transcript, S. 119–148.

Empirical Sources

Ausländerbeirat München (1982): Gespräch beim staatlichen Schulamt (Herrn Sikora) am 10. März 1982.
Bavarian Association of Cities (1971): Unterricht für Kinder Ausländischer Arbeitnehmer. Entwurf an das Bayrische Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus. Az. 202/1, Nr. 728/70 vom 22. 06. 1971.
Bußer, Irmgard/Hoffmann, Fritz/ Runggaldier, Giovanna (1981): Situation der ausländischen Schüler in muttersprachlichen Klassen in München. In: Informationen zur Ausländerarbeit, 81(1), S. 23–45
Fachbasis München (1984): Internationales Mütterzentrum. In: Informationen zur Ausländerarbeit, 84(8), S. 27–50.
Geiselberger, Irmgard (1974): Einschulung ausländischer Kinder in muttersprachliche Klassen. Letter to Scharnagl, Wilfried, München: Schulamt München, 26. 04. 1974.
GEW BV Oberbayern (1982): ‚Türkische Kinder werden ausgesondert, abqualifiziert und abgeschoben – GEW Oberbayern erhebt schwere Vorwürfe gegen Münchner Schulbehörden‘, 82(1), S. 1–2.
Kristen, Ursula (1978): “In München geboren – verloren”, Münchner Stadtanzeiger, 11. August 1978.

Interview 1 with a former manager of an educational grassroots organization for migrants (1976–1980), who is also a former member of the Munich Ausländerbeirat, 19.09.2014, video chronicle Münchner Pioniere.

Interview 2 with a former member of an educational grassroots organization for migrants (1979–1999) and co-founder of a foreigner's parent's council for guest worker parents, 24.09.2014, video chronicle Münchner Pioniere.

Interview 3 with the former second Chair of the Munich Ausländerbeirat (in the 1970s and 1980s), also member of the Committee A1 for education children, youth and family. 18.04.2017, suppl. 11.03.2023.

Interview 4 with a manager of the Caritas academy of nations, graduated Sociologist and educational consulter, formerly active in an Italian Educational Association for guest workers in the 1980 s. 20.04.2017.

Interview 5 with the chair of a Kurdish Association for Ethnic Minorities in Munich, 28.04.2017.

Jungfer, Hedda et.al. (1983): Schulunterricht für ausländische Kinder. Antrag an den Bayrischen Landtag vom 03.02.1983.

KMK – Kultusministerkonferenz (1976): Neufassung der Empfehlungen der KMK "Unterricht für Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer". Beschluss der KMK vom 8.4.1976. Kultusministerkonferenz. Bonn.

Secretary's Office of KMK (1976): Mitteilungen und Informationen des Sekretariats der Kultusministerkonferenz, 76(3), vom 29.4.1976.

Loy, Elfriede (1983): Am Beispiel Münchens: Ausländerpolitische Wende. In: Informationen zur Ausländerarbeit, Fachbasis München, 6(83), S. 7–12.

Maier, Hans (1980): Kultusminister Prof. Hans Maier bei der Beantwortung der Interpellation: Nicht das ausländische Kind hat sich den vorgegebenen Bildungswegen anzupassen! Unser Bildungswesen muss sich ändern, um diesen Kindern gerecht zu werden. In: StMUK (Hrsg.): Interpellation ausländische Kinder und Jugendliche, München.

Mitgliederversammlung IG e.V. (1978): Resolution zur Situation ausländischer Kinder in Münchner Grund- und Hauptschulen. München.

Munich School Committee (1977): Bekanntgabe: Schüler- und Klassenzahlen der öffentlichen Grund-, Haupt- und Sondervolksschulen für das Schuljahr 1977/78. München: Schulausschuss.

Munich School Committee (1978): Ratsprotokoll. Stenographic report, 05.07.1978, München.

Multi-Cultural YC Westend (1989): Besondere Problemstellungen im vergangenen Arbeitsjahr. Bericht.

City of Munich (1981): Was die ausländischen Jugendlichen lernen. München: Münchner Rathaus Umschau.

Scharnagl, Wilfried/Schulamt München (1974): Muttersprachliche Klassen. Zum Schreiben vom 7. Juni 1974. Letter to Geiselberger, I., IG e.V., 25 July 1974.

Schmid (1981): An das staatliche Schulamt: Schulbücher für zweisprachige türkische Klasse. Brief vom 30.10.1981.

Schulreferat, München (1973): Ausländerkinder; Stand der Beschulung. Ruf 12/578. Bekanntgabe im Schulausschuss vom 12.12.1973.

Schulreferat, München (1974): Meldung für Schülerzahlen ausländischer Klassen 1974/75 und 1975/76, Stichtag Meldung: 1.10.1974.

Schulreferat, München (1978): Beschluss des Schulausschusses vom 19. April 1978 – SB. Realschulbesuch für Ausländerkinder. Ruf 215/8243. Antrag Nr. 1054 von Frau Stadtrat Clarita Kuch vom 28.02.1978.

Schulreferat, München (1981): Beschulung ausländischer Kinder in München im Schuljahr 1981/82. Beschluss des Ausländerbeirats der Landeshauptstadt München vom 13.12.1979, Anträge Nr. 3 und 5. Ruf 233/6293, 7.12.1981.

Schulreferat München (1983): Übertritt in weiterführende Schulen (Ausländer in die Eingangsklassen). 41(4).

StMUK – Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus (1974). Unterricht für Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer. Letter to Rudolf L., Evangelische Jugendsozialarbeit, 17. 07. 1974.
StMUK (1976): Die Zahl der ausländischen Schüler an bayerischen Grund- und Hauptschulen ist weiter angestiegen, Information des Pressereferats, München, 25. 03. 1976.
StMUK (1979): Unterricht für ausländische Schüler, III A 2–4/91 480 KMBl.
UNESCO (1960): Übereinkommen gegen Diskriminierung im Unterrichtswesen vom 14.12. 1960. In: Gesetzesblatt von Baden-Württemberg (1964), H.7, S. 107–109.
Via e.V. Landesverband (Via LV) Bayern (1982): Beschluss zum Thema: Ausländische Kinder und Jugendliche – Was wird nach der Schule Eisbrecher. Informationen von und für Initiativgruppen in der Ausländerarbeit, Vol. 82 No. 3, 4–9.
Via LV Bayern (1983): Daten zum Schulbesuch ausländischer Kinder – Beiblatt Antrag des VIA-Landesverbandes Bayern zur Situation ausländischer Kinder an bayrischen Schulen (VIA-Generalversammlung am 22./23.1.1983 in Regensburg), redaktionelle Überarbeitung der IG e.V. München.

Kontakt:
Mona Bergmann M.A.
Technische Universität München
mona.bergmann@tum.de

Dr. rer. pol. Ulrike Fettke
Technische Universität München
ulrike.fettke@tum.de