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**1. Introduction**

Starting with the first Anwerbeabkommen in 1955, many migrants started to come to Germany seeking work. Between 1955 and 1973 recruitment agreements were made between Germany and the following countries: Turkey, Italy, Greece, former Yugoslavia and other South European countries. The aim was to bring temporarily more work force for industrial jobs which had been created during the time of the German Wirtschaftswunder. Yet, most of the migrant workers stayed for a longer period than they had been expected to – after several years, many had founded families in Germany and decided to stay. The migrant working population thus became part of the resident population.

The educational system is an important factor of inclusion or exclusion of social groups and differed across the federal states of Germany. A comparative analysis shows, that e.g. Berlin had an educational system proving to be mostly integrative and supportive towards immigrant children whereas Bavaria had an overwhelmingly separating system (Rist, 1978) perpetuating the discrimination against the guest workers’ children. Between 1970 and 1990 grassroots initiatives established an organizational structure intended to improve the situation of the former guest workers and their children in a sustainable way. In this article, we want to shed light on the role of women in these movements, using Munich as an example. Drawing on findings from a master thesis (Bergmann, 2017) this paper seeks to show the significance of grassroots initiatives in altering the educational situation of migrant children and the role of women in those grassroots politics. Using the concept of autonomy of migration and highlighting the perspective of migrants as active subjects, Bergmann conducted a policy analysis of the grassroots policies emerging around the second generation’s education in Munich. The analysis reconstructs the negotiation processes and pathways of migrant-related education incentives and policies by these initiatives. Therefore, she used a triangulation of methods. To study the negotiation processes, Bergmann conducted seven qualitative and semi-guided expert-interviews with actors of migrational and educational work. Additionally, she analyzed six qualitative video interviews from a chronicle of contemporary witnesses (“Münchner Pioniere”), documents of education authorities and publications of educational initiatives from the Munich city archive and the archive of the Initiativgruppe as well as local media puplications from the 1970s and 1980s. What Bergmann's master's thesis did not explore in depth, but which we consider an important field of research, is the particular role of migrant women in these initiatives and as actors in migration politics as a whole. Based on Bergmann’s proceedings and findings, we propose the intersectionality approach to analyze the role of female migrant workers in the grassroots initiatives’ emergence since the concept stresses the conditions of social inequality and sheds a light on their agency for change.

To reconstruct the initiatives’ emergence, we start by outlining Munich as an outstanding case and by introducing the intersectionality approach. We continue by highlighting the situation of (female) guest workers in Germany from the 1970s to the 1990s. During this period, it became clear that most of the children of the first guest workers, the so-called second generation, would remain in Germany.

After that, we illustrate the educational situation of the second generation and look at Munich, where initiatives began to engage in the education of migrant youth. As many guest workers finally brought their children or founded families in Germany, the education of this so-called second generation became a political issue. As the authorities of the German federal states decide about their respective educational systems, different education models appeared throughout Western Germany - with Bavaria choosing a separationist model. Simultaneously, the Bavarian capital, Munich had been the city with the second highest share of guest workers in Western Germany in our period of study. In this setting and with the engagement of female migrant workers a long history of independent grassroots initiatives and groups of educational social work emerged in Munich in order to mitigate the disadvantages. In our argumentation, we stress the situations and engagements of female migrant workers. By this, we intend to a) illustrate their role for the social mobility of migrants and b) show their social discrimination on a structural level. We aim to show how people who are discriminated in multiple ways organize themselves to improve their situations. The organizational structure that grassroots initiatives established in the 1970s and 1980s had not existed before and the initiatives filled a vacuum in terms of policy measures. Today, they have become an integral part of the city. One of their successes is the institutionalization of some of their educational efforts.

**2. Intersectionality**

The concept of intersectionality as developed by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989, 2004) and Lucy Chebout (2011) and further elaborated by Katharina Walgenbach (2012), focuses on the interaction of social categories such as race, gender and social class. The intersectionality approach emerged from studies of Black Feminism and Critical Race Theory. Today, it is mostly applied in Gender Studies. There is an ongoing debate about its theoretical status.

Crenshaw (1989) studies juridical trials in which women of color were discriminated against in multiple ways. She observed that the women experienced discrimination from multiple perspectives, as females, as workers and as blacks, since they were denied the right to speak on behalf of each of the collectives. Crenshaw concludes that the inequality of the women of color is multidimensional whilst their experienced discrimination is merely unidirectional (Crenshaw, 1989). Several similar studies followed in which feminist approaches were heavily criticized for, among other things, being exclusionary of women, non-white, disabled, queer, and non-Christians (Walgenbach, 2007). Among these studies, there is consensus that the categories of inequality are constructed within processes of knowledge production by agents with certain characteristics in specific situations. These constructions entail inequalities in power relations of subjects and objects and reproduce social structures, practices and identities that make historical and cultural aspects important (Walgenbach, 2012). As a result, critics claim that scientists should take into account the categories of the historical and social contexts of inequalities (Degele/Winker, 2009).

While Bührmann (2009) classifies intersectionality as a pre-paradigmatic approach, Walgenbach (2012) refers to Kuhn’s characteristics of paradigms to grant the intersectionality approach the paradigm status and the predominant theoretical conceptualization of intersectionality in European studies (Walgenbach 2012). Like Walgenbach we treat intersectionality as a paradigm because want to keep in mind the historical, post-colonial and anti-racist approach of these studies.

According to this approach, exploration and understanding of inequalities in working conditions, living conditions and education as well as their implications must take into account that the inequalities and the corresponding discrimination interact and double back on more than one social category. Conversely, the scientist at work has to take into account that these categories (can) overlap in complex ways (Scherr, 2012, p. 3). The interdependence of the categories shapes specific characteristics of inequality and the corresponding discrimination (Schultz, 1990).

Traditionally the categories race, class and gender are dominant in U.S. debate. However, in the European debate, age, sexuality, and nation are dominant categories (Davis 2008). Current studies stress that the categories of inequality and their implications for power relations are located on multiple levels affecting social structures, processes and mechanisms. The interactions of these categories may reflect back the subjective level in various ways (Walgenbach 2012).

Taking into account the history of emergence of categories of inequality like that of female guest workers, we refer to the social and political situation of the guest workers in Germany, especially Munich and the situation of the “second generation” in the Bavarian educational system. Through this perspective, we intend to analyze the self-organization and grassroots initiatives that evolved around the education of this generation in Munich and the role of women. To describe the local circumstances of female migrant workers’ involvement, we illustrate why the city is an outstanding case from several perspectives.

We are well aware that we are regarding the work of the initiatives from a hegemonic position. In her work, Bergmann, as a German from Munich, interviewed pioneers of migration work who had become Munich residents years ago and were looking at what had happened from a retrospective perspective. We cannot disconnect ourselves and our findings from this hegemonic position.

**3. Case study selection**

In our period of study Munich has to be understood as an exceptional case of migrant self-organization in the education of the second generation for its high percentage of foreigners, the relative extreme structure of the Bavarian educational system, Munich’s special political situation and its local structure of educational and work initiatives.

The time of observation includes the end of the guest worker regime with the recruitment stop in November 1973 and stretches to the de-facto abolition of the right of asylum in 1993. The time span represents a movement cycle of German migration history (Bojadžijev, 2012, p. 148) characterized by an active refrain of integration activities and finally more dedicated measures perpetuating the marginal position of migrants for about two decades.

Munich has always had one of the highest percentages of foreigners in Germany up until today. At the beginning of our studied period, in 1969, around 88,000 guest workers lived in Munich (Dunkel and Stramagglia-Faggion, 2000, p. 9) with a total population of 1,3 million. This led then mayor Hans-Jochen Vogel to declare Munich an “immigrant city” in 1970 – a stark contrast to the contemporary West German immigration politics and the restrictive Bavarian federal politic directions.

Regarding the educational policies in Germany, where the federal states have sovereign educational systems and implement the directives of the German educational ministerial conference on their own accounts, the Bavarian educational politics may be considered a relative extreme. Uwe Hunger shows, that different educational policies lead to significantly different levels of school success and thus to different levels of integration success (Hunger, 2001, 135). Compared to 56% of Germans, only 17% of migrant students in Bavaria graduated from secondary school in 1985. In the other states, this proportion was between 22% and 37% (Hunger, 2001, p. 125). According to Hunger, Bavaria maintains by far the most discriminatory and segregating schooling model throughout Western Germany (Hunger, 2001,132). In Munich's general schools around 12 to 13 percent of the students were foreigners - compared to only 3 to 4 percent of migrant students at the middle and grammar schools (Munich School Committee, 1978, p. 157).

This contrast describes – in an abridged way – the immigrant politics of Munich: On the one hand, Munich has been the capital of the federal German state with the overall most restrictive (or no) integration laws in many areas of politics. On the other hand, the city council had always been ruled by the opposition (Social Democrats) to the Bavaria’s federal government party (Christian Social Democrats) who sometimes focused very different immigrant policies, especially in coalition with the Greens. This political situation made Munich a stage for the negotiation of unique political measurements in the field of migration. Munich became one of the first cities in Germany to integrate and implement integration politics on a municipal level thus acknowledging the permanent immigration of guest workers in an early stage – even though being an immigration city was often rendered a problematic issue, keeping a mostly culturalist discourse towards the immigrants in the local politics (Hess and Moser, 2009, p.15). Overall, we suggest that the dedicated work of the initiatives for migrant education contributed to a quicker institutionalization of some educational measures in Munich.

According to Çağlar and Schiller, whether migrants organize themselves in an independent structure or in existing networks depends on the structural framing of the respective place (Glick Schiller and Çağlar, 2011, p.3, pp.65). If there are already inclusive non-migrant structures, the self-ethnic organization is not necessarily the path of first choice. In Munich, an overall structure of "self-ethnic organization" (Matterei, 2005, p.186) of migrants had already evolved before our period of study, which started to differentiate its offers in the educational sector in the 1980s. Yet, a parallel network of newly founded ethnic-national and locally founded German and multiethnic initiatives emerged to exclusively cover the school education sector in the early 1970s.

**4. Social and political situation of guest workers**

From the 1970s to the 1990s, overall German migration politics and especially Bavarian school politics were characterized by a refrain from active integration activities. Many welfare state organizations and some political parties from the left started to call attention to the question whether Germany needed to be redefined as a country of immigration. Yet, the German policies and politics towards the guest workers remained restrictive and focused on their supposed recurrence to their home countries. By 1976, the government (led by the Social Democratic Party) and the Bundesrat (dominated by the Christian Democratic Union) deployed a federal-state commission[[1]](#footnote-1) to define a strategy for this – still quite unspecified – field of politics. Essentially, the commission defined Germany’s immigration politics as “integration on revocation” (Herbert, 2003, p. 238, p.245), confirming that Germany is no immigration country (ibid.). Given this definition, the following guidelines defined German immigration politics from 1976 until the first immigration law came into effect in 1990: minimize the immigration of guest workers, support resettlement into their home countries and encourage the ecological and social integration of residing guest workers (Green, 2004, p. 38, Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung 1982). Besides pending discrimination and conflicts at the work place, the rejection of the idea of a permanent immigration of the guest workers led to the emergence of three main social conflict lines: the living conditions of the guest workers in Germany, the contact between guest working families and Germans as well as the integration of the guest worker‘s children into the German educational system (Herbert, 2003, pp.233-234).

The intersectionality approach designates ethnics, gender, nationality and class as categories of inequality and shows how they co-produce an inferior power position of (female) guest workers in German society. In contrast to common assumptions, the share of female guest workers was high. Sometimes women migrated first to Germany, getting their husbands to join later. Historically, female working migrants were in an especially vulnerable position: they underwent discrimination on the grounds of their ethnicity and nationality, but also via their gender. Female guest workers received extra low industrial wages. Overall, guest workers were mostly employed in the lowest segments of industrial jobs (Karakayali, 2008, pp.106-107), Bojaǆijev, 2012), even if they were skilled workers. In the 1970s, lower wage categories for female workers still existed, the Leichtlohngruppen. Most female guest workers were employed in these low wage categories, making them earn 30-40 percent less than their male colleagues (Bojaǆijev, 2012, pp.162-163). Their occupation was often perceived as temporary because German society perceived them to be destined for motherhood and family life in their home countries (ibid., p.103). This did not take into account that women with families who came as guest workers before or without their husbands were the ones sustaining their families’ livelihoods. This argumentation resembles the commonly criticized positions of traditional Feminism that relies on an only acknowledgment of the work situation of white women (Hooks, 1984).

**5. The Situation of the “second generation” in the Bavarian educational system**

In the 1970s, Bavaria introduced a separational schooling system, which, together with the socioeconomic situation of the guest workers, reinforced the exclusion of migrant parents and students, especially females. Starting in 1972, Bavaria set up native-language model classes for immigrant children to teach these children in separation from German children (Boos-Nünning, 1981). By this separation, the Bavarian ministry of education and cultural affairs intended to facilitate the lessons for children with a non-German mother tongue. Besides, the intention was to prepare the children for their anticipated recurrence to their home country, arguing that an education in their mother tongue would best fulfill this purpose. The decision whether an immigrant student was able to follow lessons in German was upon the class teachers and sometimes the German teachers alone (Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterrricht und Kultus 1974, p.6). By 1979, the separate schooling became mandatory for children that were recommended by their teachers and for children whose parents wanted them to be taught in their own mother tongue (Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterrricht und Kultus, 1979).

The separationist model divided the students into nationally homogeneous groups to teach them all subjects in the official language of their country of origin, with German being only taught as a second language with 8 lessons per week. In the school year 1979/80, there were 80 Turkish-speaking classes, 33 Yugoslavian classes (language of instruction: Serbo-Croatian) and 15 Italian classes (Deffner, 1979) – the numbers increased to over 200 such classes in the following years. Due to the end of the guest working regime, the number of native-language classes started to drop by the end of the 1980s. Greek classes did not exist during that time, as there were four Greek schools established in Munich under Greek supervision. This model had been negotiated bilaterally between the Greek government and the Free State of Bavaria who shared the operating costs. The Greek second generation students were taught curricula and awarded degrees corresponding to the Greek school system that were fully recognized in Greece. It is apparent, that the separationist model institutionalizes inequalities among German and foreign students with different mother tongues who would not develop the same German skills with or make friends with German classmates – among other aspects of exclusion.

In fact, the Bavarian educational system of those decades performed rather poorly concerning the qualification of immigrants: comparative analysis shows that the educational achievements of children and the number of higher educational qualifications had developed very differently in an inner-West-German comparison from the 1950s to the beginning of the 1990s. In this context, the differences in educational policies and the school systems of the federal states had an even greater impact on migrant children than on German children (Thränhardt, 1991, p.417).

The nationally homogenous education led to multiple problems. For example, there was further discrimination within the separationist model since some children were not taught in their mother tongue at all. Especially children from Yugoslavia had many different mother tongues and did not always speak the official language. Moreover, Serbo-Croatian as well as the mother tongue of Turkish Kurds enrolled in the Turkish classes was not Turkish

Furthermore, empirical evidence shows that immigrant children had often been enrolled in the nationally homogeneous classes without a check of their language skills or even when good German skills were apparent or German was their mother tongue. A documentation published by a social initiative in 1981 describes 12 respective cases (including copies of letters from parents to the schools as well as enrollment notices (Bußer et al., 1981). Moreover, the documentation of the social initiatives shows that in cases in which not enough students enrolled for a certain mother-tongue-class, those students did not get transferred to regular classes. Rather, several school years were pooled together, especially the higher years (Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterrricht und Kultus 1974, p.2, Mitgliederversammlung der Initiativgruppe - Betreuung von ausländischen Kinder e.V. 1978, p.3), or the respective students were downgraded to schools for kids with special needs. The latter option was justified by highlighting the importance of a sense of achievement for the foreign students – thus covering up the overextension of the school system (Bergmann, 2017, p.28). The practices of student pooling, downschooling and refraining from language level testing reveals nationality as a further category of inequality. It did not only separate the migrant students from German peers in age but also affected the level of learning supervision and the school careers of the migrant students, at least by level of graduation diploma.

With the main intention of the schooling being the preparation of the students for a future life in their home country, German school authorities seemed not to be equally interested in an equivalent graduation diploma for the “second generation” of guest workers. The insufficient German that the guest workers’ children learned at school caused more than half of the foreign students in Munich to fail at the final, general exams (held in German) in the first years of the bilingual classes (Kristen, 1978). The number of young migrants that could not find an apprenticeship in Munich doubled from 1978 to 1971 from around 1000 to 2000 (Landeshauptstadt München, 1981). Subsequently an separate graduation was introduced for the bilingual classes – which worsened the situation as this final exam became soon known as sub-prime throughout Munich’s employers (Bußer et al., 1981, pp.97-98). According to the intersectionality approach, there is an interplay of nation, mother tongue and class. The stigma that coincided with a bilingual graduation diploma or no diploma at all as well as nationality, ethnicity and mother tongue doomed the professional careers of the second generation.

What is more, the information towards the immigrant parents proved to be insufficient in many cases (Bergmann, 2017, pp.32-33). Before the mother-tongue classes were introduced in all of Bavaria following the ministeral’s conference regulations of 1976, the first mother-tongue model classes were introduced in Munich in 1974. Yet there were only scanty informations for the parents about the separation model. For example, a multilingual letter handed out to parents by the school informed about the introduction of bilingual classes, but it did not make clear that the parents had the right to refuse the separation (Geiselberger/Initiativgruppe - Betreuung von ausländischen Kinder e.V. 1974). Information evenings at the schools were only held after the registration date for the mother-tongue classes (Scharnagl and Staatliches Schulamt München, 1974). Even after the full establishment of the mother tongue model in 1979, the informational situation did not improve significantly. For example, the official information brochure provided by the Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs advertised the model of bilingual classes in the length of two full pages, whereas just five lines inform about the possibilities of attending a regular class (VIA-Landesverband Bayern, 1983 p.9, Bußer et al., 1981, p.23). An additional problem posed language barriers: Although the Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs provided multilingual information for parents, the city of Munich did not offer bilingual information. An international counseling center with contact persons speaking Romanian, Greek, Italian, Serbo-Croatian and Turkish, was not set up until 1985.

In the 1970s and 1980s, immigrant parents were hardly organized in the parents' councils of their childrens’ schools. Schools and authorities often interpreted the guest working parents’ lower visibility as a lack of interest. This supposed lack of commitment was seen as evidence of an imminent intention to return to their home countries (Kollender 2016, 49). Moreover, the absence of immigrants in parents' associations and other German institutions was attributed to their "foreign origin" (Kollender 2016, 49). This interpretation may be explained with the culturalist-thinking conjuncture of racism that dominated the 1970s and 1980s. In this culturalist-thinking, female migrants were often perceived of as those suppressed by their partiarchal cultures. Thus, the invisibility of immigrant mothers in student councils confirmed the prejudices. In fact, there were several reasons for the absence of migrant mothers: Often both parents had to work in a full-time job to sustain their families living. Language barriers and a climate of xenophobia mostly prevented the participation in a school council, especially by mothers. Moreover, uncertain future planning possibilities due to limited residence permits withheld migrant parents from time investments for school boards (Bergmann 2017: 34f).

What is more, female immigrant students were an especially marginalized group. Especially for female migrants, the separationist model proved to be a precarious situation – without any professional prospects either in Germany or in their home-countries, a career in an under-waged classical female occupation or becoming a housewife became ever so likely. The situation also differed between the respective ethnic groups – for young Turks it was particularly hard to find an apprenticeship or a job in Munich. For example, only 608 of 2061 graduates of Turkish origin were in an apprenticeship in 1982, (VIA-Landesverband Bayern 1982: 1). Turkish women thus became an especially precarious group: While the German society often perceived and discriminated them as supposedly supressed by their Turkish culture, not much support came from Bavarian or municipal authorities to improve their situation in Germany. They were at the same time conceptualized as returnees without a perspective in the German society – stripping them of their possibilities in both societies.

To sum it up, the second generation was unequal by an interplay of the categories nation, ethnicity and mother tongue, age, gender and class. To understand the implications and discriminatory effects the Bavarian school system had on individuals, it would be necessary to further elaborate the interdependence of these categories of inequality.

**6. Self organization and grassroots initiatives in Munich and the role of women**

The guest workers had only limited possibilities of political participation as political rights like suffrage and acquisition of political mandates are restricted to citizenship. To articulate their interests and to enforce improvements of their working conditions, living conditions and educational situations, working immigrants eventually organized themselves.

Particularly in the 1970s, neighborhood centers and associations were founded among immigrant groups, mostly of the same ethnicity, which were oriented towards the migrants' country and region of origin and initially focused on sociocultural work (Bojaǆijev 2012: 213-218). In Munich, the foundation of “cultural centers” for Spanish and Greek guest workers was even supported by welfare associations. Yet there was a hidden discriminatory agenda in play: By offering such meeting points, the city intended to remove the visibility of the working migrants from the cityscape, especially frequented areas like the central station (Hess 2014: 50) – thereby contributing to further separation. The foundation and joining of their own organizations became crucial for many migrants as they experienced retention on the side of German associations. Even in church charities where they stayed outsiders, seldom entrusted with any mantles (Elias, 1993, p. 124, Mattere, 2005, p.187). Their own centers and associations thus not only served as socio-cultural meeting places, but also helped migrants to cope with everyday practical tasks (Matterei, 2005, pp.186-187), including financial assistance, counseling services or language courses (Weiss and Thränhardt, 2005, pp. 20-22). Examples for Munich are the Greek House or the Kurdish Association for Ethnic Minorities.

In Munich, the separating schooling of the second generation in Bavaria stipulated the emergence of grassroots initiatives and the involvement of migrant associations in self-organized, supplementing educational offers. These grassroots initiatives strove to fill a void where government and state-run institutions did not offer adequate programs or solutions. The originally culturally oriented migrant associations began to set up education-specific services such as tutoring and homework assistance (Matterei, 2005, p. 186). As the existing associations did not reach all migrant groups to the same extent, some migrant communities formed their own educational initiatives, e.g. the Italian association CoAsIt – Italian Assistance Association Mission Statement. Further initiatives emerged in Munich’s local population that later managed to successfully include and empower migrants in offering educational support. An example for this is the Initiativgruppe zur Betreuung ausländischer Kinder e.V. founded in 1971 by members of the youth organization of the Social Democratic Party as a homework supervision for guest worker’s children.

A further look into the initiatives’ work highlights the role of the mothers. Underlying problems of the children and families became apparent within the homework support. The school problems were often symptoms of structural challenges that required additional support services. Many children needed socio-pedagogical and, in some families, psychological support. As a result, some initiatives like CoAsIt expanded their teams of tutors into interdisciplinary teams with sociological, psychological and pedagogical trained personnel. In addition, parental and school involvement became necessary in order to be able to reach the children and to prevent educational problems: To establish an awareness of the special needs of migrant students at school, the initiatives started school visitations and initiated cooperations with schools or single teachers. It emerged, that schools and teachers were largely overburdened. Only at the end of the 1970s, school authorities began to provide in-service training for teachers. Initially, these did not go beyond weekly or weekend seminars (ibid, pp.63-65). Many children would not come to the initiatives on their own account. It was important to reach their parents. In most cases, the mothers sent the children to the homework supervisions and acted as caretakers in the migrant families (Bergmann, 2017, p.49). To reach and involve the mothers, some initiatives like the Initiativgruppe founded a “womens project” recognizing the special needs of females. The organization observed that there were many analphabets among the migrant mothers, especially Turks stemming from rural areas. Analphabetism added another stigma to their migrant status in the German society. Yet these women were often unable to attend official state-provided language courses, as the time and length of the courses collided with their family tasks. As a result, the Initiativgruppe’s women project started to offer language and writing courses in combination with a kindergarten-facility. Simoultaneously, these courses were designed to enable the parent-school communication.

Since the transition from school to working life was accompanied by special discriminatory hurdles, the initiatives’ pursued successive accompaniment of the children and adolescents on their path through life. Therefore, for example, the Initiativgruppe, started a youth project in 1977 that primarily geared towards young people in the transition from school to work life (Bergmann 2017: 46).

Meanwhile, the number of foreign students and undergraduates in Munich increased via family reunification. This lead to a rising number in support offers and programs aimed at immigrants in Munich, e.g. career counseling, advanced education, special programs aiming at female occupation, support with everyday tasks like legal advice, communication with authorities, translation assistance, a.o. The increase of consulting areas was due to the lack of other counseling services and the insufficient information about existing counseling services. It might also be due the fact that it is easier to confide in people with whom a relationship of trust already exists – migrants who were already familiar with an initiative look for answers and assistance in this network. Another important factor for low-threshold accessibility was the participation and activity of migrants themselves considered as door openers for the organizational access of migrant initiatives (Bergmann 2017:).Furthermore, immigrant women – in the role of mothers – founded some of these initiatives themselves. Foreign parents, especially mothers, were definitely aware of the relevance of their children's education and realized that it was not enough to rely on the school system In 1985, Münevver Schnackenburg, a women migrated from Turkey, together with other Turkish mothers, initiated the Ausländischer Elternverein München e.V. (AEV), a Turkish school council in 1983. The organization is still active today.

The Munich case shows, that especially the consistent commitment of single personalities, often women, and the use of inofficial pathways helped to build a network of initiatives. This network changed the educational situation of the second (and third) generation. In the policy field of education, the initiatives were even able to set the direction for future and further measures: Via constant negotiations with political leaders, intensive public relations work and public articulation of their needs and demands, these very positions of Munich's migration work have found their way into the political discourse (Bergmann 2017: pp. 70-71). Through their networking, policy making and inventive programs the initiatives contributet to an organizational structure that had not existed in Munich before but persists until today. Munich, for example, even has an umbrella organisation where most of the migrants associations and initiatives are unionized: The MORGEN-association, founded as a mere network in 2011 and turned into a registered society in 2015. Nowadays, there is neither a differentiated national-ethical nor a general multi-migrant organizational structure but rather a mixture that has built into a network of many parallel and subsidiarily working associations in Munich.

**7. Discussion and further research needs**

We observed, that nationality, ethnicity, mother tongue and gender are relevant to the societal productions of female migrant workers. Despite their longtime multifold discrimination, the female migrant workers organized themselves for education.

Many female guest workers faced a twofold construction of their female role –role expectations by their families and construed social construction as dependent, culturally determined and suppressed migrant women by the German society.

What has to be studied in more detail is the agency of migrant women in the foundation and work of those grassroots initiatives, the interaction of the identified categories of inequality and the corresponding reflection of the categories on the individual level. Further research is needed on the differences between several generations as well as various ethnic or local groups of migrants. In our analysis, it remained unclear, if the female migrant workers experienced further discrimination in their engagement or on the political level. These are promising subjects for migration and intersectionality research since historical studies on migration have been rather patronizing towards women. The case of Munich approves to show the circumstances in which migrant women played integral parts in education and social mobility propects. To study the conditions of female migrant engagement, future research may compare the agency of female migrant workers and the contemporary educational initiatives in the Munich case to Bavarian cities without a respective mobilization and cities with more favorable conditions like Berlin. Since these questions require combinations of historical and individual information, qualitative methods like interviews and content analysis might approve to be fruitful approaches to answers.

The intersectionality approach unveils multi-level mechanisms of racism and discrimination. Using intersectionality as a perspective on migration, the very unique migration experience of a certain group, e.g. the female guest workers in Germany, could be analyzed in a way that takes the nexus and the power relations between social categories like ethics, gender and social class and their interplay on multiple levels into account (Walgenbach, 2012, p.25). In different areas of life and society, discriminatory distinctions can come into effect in different ways. For example, the educational disadvantage of (German) girls at primary and middle schools has largely been overcome in Germany, while on higher educational levels significant disadvantages for girls and women are still significant (Scherr, 2012, p.7). Furthermore, existing studies show a considerable extent of ethnic discrimination in the allocation of teaching positions, which clearly goes beyond institutional discrimination in schools, while ethnic distinctions are largely inconsequential for the possibilities of political participation (ibid.). Thus, the intersectionality approach could give way to new explanations for the development of certain initiatives and help building future policy measures.

**8. Summary**

With the intersectionality approach we trace structural categories of inequality back to the worker recruitment agreements between Germany South-East European countries and the following time of the schooling of a so-called second (and third) generation of migrants in Munich. The relevant categories of inequality which interact to put the guest workers and their children into an inferior power position in German society are: nationality, ethnics, gender, class, mother tongue.

Our analysis shows that migrants played an important role in improving schooling conditions of migrants and their prospects for social mobility and inclusion while state activities remained segregating for a long time. Within the Bavarian separationist schooling system, the Munich case with its high ratio of migrant in the city population is an outstanding example. In this case, initiatives showed a high potential for political mobilization. The independent initiatives – either founded by migrants themselves or run with migrant participation – filled a gap in state or municipal policies and actions. They became pioneers and trendsetters in municipal educational programs aimed specifically at migrants and non-German population. Due to this support and the increasingly broad municipal and state funding, some practical educational measures of the grassroots initiatives have found their way into city politics and turned into official institutional structures that still exist today.

Our research also sheds a new light on contemporary (Bavarian) school policy towards migrants. Some of the discriminatory grievances can still be seen today, e.g. a lack of sufficient remedial teaching and significantly more early drop-outs of migrant students from a secondary school career compared to German students.

With the high numbers of refugees arriving in 2015, a new debate started on how to better “integrate” migrants in the German education systems. With our analysis we want to show that educational separationism leads to further alienation and exclusion that reproduces structures of inequality and exclusion for generations. Segregating policy measures tend to foster prejudices and xenophobia on the side of those who are advantaged. Those who are disadvantaged might experience longtime discontent and frustration from social immobility. Conflict theory stresses that without possibilities for change there might be associated conflicts that might escalate with devastating results (Coser, 1970). Against this backdrop, the initiatives’ network in Munich shows that inclusive grassroots measures are feasible with civic engagement. The Munich case might serve as a role model for state-induced, but less top-down produced policies.

**List of References**

Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterrricht und Kultus (1974), “Unterricht für Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer“, letter to Rudolf L., Evangelische Jugendsozialarbeit, 17.07.1974.

Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterrricht und Kultus (1979): Unterricht für ausländische Schüler, III A 2-4/91 480 KMBl.

Bergmann, M. (2017): “Die Initiative ergreifen: Politiken aus der Selbstorganisation verändern in München die Schul- und Ausbildungssituation der ‚zweiten Generation‘“, unpublished master thesis at the cahir of empirical cultural studies/european ethnology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich, Munich.

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