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Introduction

A well-developed literature has demonstrated how globalization and neoliberalization across the world have left their imprint on cities. But, over time, scholars have also realized that “the response to economic forces, while generally in a market-oriented direction, was not uniform within western cities” (Fainstein 1997, p. 295). Diversity is a theme that is closely tied up with globalization and neoliberalization. Globalization contributes to mobility, trade, and communication and, thus, diversity in people and various interactions. At the same time, diversity is also identified with the celebration of sociocultural heterogeneity and recognition of claims to equality of previously disadvantaged groups. Which view of diversity is more salient among urban actors? Do market-oriented responses to diversity predominate city life? Are they antagonized or complemented by justice-oriented approaches? This article discusses responses to the challenges posed by increasing diversity in an important European country, Germany.

“Diversity” in this article is used in a broader sense as encompassing a number of developments. Over the past few decades, new sociodemographic and cultural differences have emerged or become more prominent, partly due to immigration. In the big (West) German cities, for example, between 16% and 49% of the population were in 2011 immigrants or the children of immigrants. Since 2009, inward migration to Germany has reached levels not seen since the early 1990s, with a higher proportion of immigrants now originating from Asia and Africa (Bundesministerium des Innern 2016). Given the sharp rise of numbers of asylum seekers arriving in Germany since 2014, diversification is likely to continue, and all large German cities are bound to be affected. Immigrants have brought with them and developed differing lifestyles, languages, value systems, and religious practices. But immigration is not the only basis of a pluralization of the forms of life, of cultural preferences and norms. Examples such as the declining relevance of the once standard family with children living in one household, and the broadening scope of what life in old age means, illustrate that sociocultural heterogenization can be understood as a broader phenomenon.

Furthermore, minority groups have become more visible and have vocal advocates demanding recognition, participation in the life of cities, and their share of the resources. Most bigger cities in Germany, where this study was conducted, now have their annual Gay Pride or Christopher Street Day parade—roughly 40 years after the first bigger gay rights demonstration took place in a German city (Gammerl 2010). In the 2000s, it has become common that mayors and other prominent politicians take part in such events and, thus, underline the legitimacy of minority claims. Disabled people have also
organized more publicly and increasingly demand visibility and access to all services and resources. International legal frameworks such as the European Union antidiscrimination legislation and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, in force since 2008, have strengthened their rights to participate in all spheres of social life and put pressure on public institutions to ensure the preconditions for inclusion.

Explicit “diversity” policies, having emerged as a public commitment of big international companies, are now omnipresent in the public sphere of many countries. “‘Diversity’ is an essential requirement, a must-have, a sine qua non for contemporary institutions and their public face,” Steven Vertovec wrote (2012, p. 302). In Germany, diversity has been embraced by the chancellor and the president. Public campaigns at the national and local levels propagate that diversity is beneficial (Schönwälder and Triadafilopoulos 2016). In August 2007, the government launched a campaign “Vielfalt als Chance” (Diversity as Opportunity) that encourages a view of ethnic and cultural diversity as an economic resource of outstanding importance. The Council of Europe, to give one example at the supranational level, has initiated the “intercultural cities” program that reviews measures to promote diversity at the city level and diffuses information about them in a large international network (Wood 2010).

Thus, from a sociological institutionalist perspective, a discursive and normative environment exists that potentially impacts on urban actors who may “mimetically” adapt to perceived standards to ensure legitimacy (see Deephouse and Suchman 2008; Meyer 2008, p. 794). In fact, all big German cities have signed the Charta der Vielfalt (Diversity Charter; www.charta-der-vielfalt.de)—a program that exerts soft pressure on urban actors to at least consider adjustment. German cities implement a range of policy measures to address the diversity of their population. For example, all large German cities make publications available in other languages than German, many have introduced diversity trainings for their staff, revised their recruitment strategies, and run campaigns (advertisements, posters, competitions) to underline the city’s diversity (Martínez-Ariño et al. 2018). However, “diversity” may mean different things to different actors, and the strategic orientation of interventions may differ.

This article focuses on the mind-sets, that is, ideas and orientations, of a range of important urban actors. One contribution of this study to the existing literature is the extension of this perspective to a set of actors that encompasses civil society as well as political and administrative leadership, in accordance with urban governance theory (e.g., Stoker 2000). Ideas and orientations regarding diversity are likely to provide the cognitive roadmap, appropriate categories, models, and basis of legitimacy for concrete actions,
as sociological institutionalists have long argued (Hall and Taylor 1996). The decentralized German federal system of government grants German cities substantial independence from federal and regional authorities, as well as competences and resources in areas such as economic development, cultural policies, and housing that allow independent policy making (Bogumil and Holtkamp 2013). They are also important employers. High independence and significant competences vis-à-vis other levels of government may create interesting empirical variation across German cities. How do cities and urban actors respond to the challenges arising from increased societal heterogeneity, claims for recognition of specific groups in the population, and an environment in which diversity is framed as beneficial to society? Do they embrace diversity, or do they resist it? What understanding of diversity characterizes their responses? And to what extent are orientations across cities different, that is, shaped by local conditions?

The literature offers controversial assumptions (see references in section “Determinants and Specifics in Urban Developments: Controversial Views in Literature”). With regard to “diversity” as a political program, commentators disagree whether it is at its core a means to serve business interests and to obscure inequality and discrimination, or, rather, whether it represents the affirmation of plurality and the recognition of minority claims for participation (Ahmed 2012; Sauer 2007). These alternatives correspond to a distinction in the literature between more market-oriented development paths and more social-welfare and justice-oriented paths that may distinguish the developmental trajectories of cities. Indeed, urban scholars have called for policies that “help craft a just diversity in cities” (Fincher and Iveson 2011, p. 410). The main research question of this article is whether the response to diversity in German cities is driven by economic or social-justice logics. To what extent are these even sharply contrasting logics? And does one or the other predominate among key actors in specific cities demonstrating a response to specific local conditions?

This article presents selected results of a comparison of 20 cities within one national context. Such a wide-ranging comparison is not very common, and among other things, we hope to contribute to methodological debates about the comparative study of urban phenomena (see Denters and Mossberger 2006). Overall, we aim to contribute to a better understanding of political responses to a major current challenge and of the extent and character of variation at the local level—a dimension “critical to any understanding of [the] contemporary governance” of diversity (Syrett and Sepulveda 2012, pp. 239–240; see also Amin 2002).

Empirically, our analysis draws on a survey of urban actors in the 20 largest German cities, conducted by the Max Planck Institute for the Study of
Religious and Ethnic Diversity. We conceptualize “city” for our purposes as a set of relevant urban actors. This approach reflects the widely held conviction that local policy today is not only shaped by local administrations, mayors, and local councils, but that a range of local actors is involved in urban governance (Benz et al. 2007; Geddes 2005; Hambleton and Gross 2007; Le Galès 1995; Lowndes 2001; Swyngedouw 2005).

Following this introduction, the second section of this article discusses relevant literature. In the third section, we first explain our data and method and then turn to the presentation and analysis of empirical results. Drawing on controversial assumptions on the role of cities and the main factors shaping their development trajectories, we ask to what extent we see differences in the perception of diversity and the favored responses. We discuss, in particular, to what extent “diversity” is framed as an aspect of the economic development of the city or understood in other terms as well, for instance, as the recognition of difference. Do we see a polarization between cities that opt for responses aiming to improve the city’s competitive position in a global market and others that follow social- and justice-oriented ideals? A fourth section offers the conclusion.

Determinants and Specifics of Urban Developments: Controversial Views in the Literature

A literature dealing broadly with the underlying logic of urban responses to diversity—understood in the broader sense as outlined above and not just as a synonym for immigration—is at an early stage (see Arapoglu 2012; Collins and Friesen 2011; Fincher et al. 2014; Landry and Wood 2012; the Divercities project, https://www.urbandivercities.eu). In the urban planning literature, “diversity” has often been studied with a normative focus on how planning should respond to increasing population heterogeneity (Fainstein 2005; Fincher and Iveson 2011), and to a lesser extent on how urban policies, in fact, respond, or which actors are crucial in shaping such policies. More empirical work is needed to establish whether accommodating diversity is an operating principle meaningful to and broadly accepted among city actors, and what city actors understand by the term “diversity.”

An extensive literature exists dealing with immigrant incorporation. While there has been evidence for important differences between more assimilationist and more multicultural urban responses to past immigration, the role of cities and their relative independence is controversial. One strand of scholarship focuses on the nation-state and dominant citizenship conceptions as determining societal responses (Bertossi and Duyvendak 2012; Finotelli and
Michalowski 2012; Van Reekum et al. 2012) and another stresses the key importance of cities. Many scholars insist on the relevance and peculiarity of the local, or of cities, in the context of immigrant incorporation. Often, cities are assumed to be different because local authorities and local political actors are more pragmatic and, as a consequence, more accommodating in their dealings with immigrants than the more principled and ideological national level (Poppeelaars and Scholten 2008; Schiller 2015).

Influential strands of scholarship have emphasized the extent to which urban policies are nowadays shaped by the economic logics of globalization and neoliberalism. David Harvey’s notion of the “entrepreneurial city” (Harvey 1989a, 1989b) captured an understanding of the city as subjected to a neoliberal reordering of politics and society. Since the 1980s, “neoliberalism has defined the broad trajectory of urban restructuring,” as Peck, Theodore, and Brenner argued (2013, p. 1091). They also diagnosed a “widespread subordination to competitive logics” (Peck and Theodore 2012, p. 20). At the same time, several authors have more recently emphasized that such general pressures should not be misunderstood as an “iron law” leading to uniform outcomes, and that neoliberalism should not be used as a broad-brush explanation for urban policy (Pickvance 2011, p. 78; Le Galès 2016). Peck, Theodore, and Brenner (2013, p. 1093) have pointed at the “unevenly developed geographies of neoliberalisation.”

A school of thought particularly influential in Germany regards every city as unique and presupposes that locally specific schemes for perceiving, feeling, acting, and interpreting exist (Frank et al. 2013). Such schemes are also assumed to shape perceptions of diversity (Barbehön and Münch 2016). So, if we should not expect uniformity but variation, how exactly might cities differ more systematically? Some suggestions have been developed, although discontent with the state of comparative study is widespread (see, for instance, Kantor and Savitch 2005). Glick-Schiller and Çağlar (2009) have argued against both those who limit their enquiries to “the historical particularities of each city” and those who in their view generalize too quickly, taking one city as exemplifying a national whole. As they contend, the “dynamics specific to locality” should be acknowledged, and cities should be studied according to the way in which they are “embedded within differential power hierarchies” (Glick-Schiller and Çağlar 2009, pp. 182–83, 187–88).

The analyses presented here follow the work of authors who have discerned two types of strategic orientations in cities, one that is described as more unequivocally market-oriented and another that places more emphasis on maintaining welfare-state structures and realizing nonmarket-oriented aims. Pierre (1999) identified “progrowth” and “welfare” regimes of urban governance with different policy objectives, protagonists, and instruments of
governance, while Kantor and Savitch (2005, p. 143) contrasted “social-“ and “market-“ oriented developments as “polar opposite kinds of urban strategies.” Similarly, Prigge and Schwarzer (2006) have distinguished between “market-oriented” strategies and strategies that centrally aim to ensure a social balance. Adopting a somewhat different view, Hartmut Häussermann (2010) has argued that a “growth regime” and an “integration regime” may not represent distinct strategic orientations of whole cities, but coexisting orientations within cities. He, thus, pointed at a potential hybridity (Gross 2016) that may characterize cities. Indeed, Kantor and Savitch (2005) also recognized that apart from more clearly market- or social-centered cases, there may exist hybrid combinations of the two orientations.

How do urban responses to diversity in German cities reflect these different lines of argument? Are economic considerations predominant, or is diversity an issue that provokes responses mainly driven by social and ethical orientations? Or do we find that hybrid combinations of justice and economic logics are typical? Do we find marked differences between cities, and, if yes, what patterns do they follow?

Urban Responses to Diversity: Data and Method

The empirical results we will now present stem from a survey of urban actors in Germany’s 20 largest cities conducted by a team at the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity. The field period ran from April to July 2015. Respondents were offered both a paper and an online questionnaire consisting of closed- and open-ended questions. We understand our survey responses as capturing perceptions and cognitive orientations, the shared definitions of the social reality that, “often latently, underlie coordinated action” (Deephouse and Suchman 2008; Schimank 2007, p. 165).

Our sampling could not draw on a predefined population. In each city, we identified and targeted the set of composite actors (“komplexe Akteure”) involved in local politics and in diversity-relevant fields. This was done in several steps: Based on the literature, we developed criteria for the selection of actors and drew up a preliminary list. We then checked whether they existed, as local actors, in the 20 cities. The exact form of otherwise comparable organizations may differ, for instance, in the case of employers’ organizations. We only included actors with a minimum level of organization, such as an office and identifiable representatives. We do not capture shorter-term forms of social mobilization. We then sent the head of the organization (sometimes a general secretary) the questionnaire asking them to respond in their function as leaders of the organization (for a similar methodology, see Baglioni and Giugni 2014).
We targeted political actors (leaders of main parties and council factions), the city government and administration (mayors and heads of departments), organizations representing the local economy and labor-market policy (employers, chambers of commerce), selected trade unions, social-welfare organizations (Caritas, Diakonie, etc.), and local bodies representing groups commonly associated with diversity (such as large immigrant organizations, councils for the disabled, senior citizens, and immigrants, gender-equality representatives).

The data set comprises 445 completed questionnaires, which represents a response rate exceeding 45%. For the individual cities, the response rates range from 36% to 58% (for technical details, see Moutselos et al. 2017). Respondents were informed that both individual characteristics and city names would be anonymized for data analysis. This helps reduce social desirability bias and increases the response rate. To avoid priming respondents in favor of a specific opinion and to reduce social desirability bias, respondents were provided with cues to both sides of a controversial position (see Table 1). For each city, the set of respondents is heterogeneous and includes different types of actors. We also use weights in city-level data comparisons presented below to avoid the disproportionate representation of one or the other type of actor in a given city compared with the overall surveyed population of urban actors (resulting from differing response rates).

**Empirical Findings: Economy or Justice**

In the following analysis, we use four survey questions: one about the benefits of diversity for the city and another about the challenges it involves, a third on directions in which the city should develop by promoting particular aspects of diversity (or not), and a fourth about opinions on more equal representation in city councils and the public service (see Table 1). We present results for all urban actors first, and then discuss similarities and differences across the 20 cities, using correlation analysis, testing for differences between mean percentage shares, and exploring the existence of coherent diversity orientations through principal component analysis (PCA).

**Diversity: Embraced or Rejected?**

This section explores to what extent urban actors embrace diversity as a beneficial development for their cities or see it as troublesome. First, we test whether urban actors share our assumption that diversity or diversification is a current and relevant issue for cities. Asked whether they thought that their city had become more diverse over the past 20 years or rather, not changed much, a large majority said their cities had become more diverse. Across the
20 cities, the percentage share of those who believe that their city is now more diverse than 20 years ago was at least 72%, and in seven cities above 95% (the overall share was 92%). As answers to open questions reveal, “diversity” is often associated with immigration, but also understood in broader ways.

Is this perceived development altogether seen as positive or negative, should it be embraced and shaped or resisted? We use three survey questions to explore this. We asked the respondents how, in their view, their city specifically was benefiting from diversity—if at all—and, second, in what ways

Table 1. Survey Questions and Items Used in This Article (Translations from German Original).

1. We nowadays often hear that diversity is an opportunity. How exactly does your city profit from an increasing diversity? Please reply by naming a couple of key points.
   In addition, respondents could tick: It does not profit.
2. Diversity is often perceived as a challenge or even a burden. In what ways is diversity (also) a burden for your city specifically? Please reply by naming a couple of key points.
   In addition, respondents could tick: It is no burden.
3. There are different ways in which cities can respond to the challenges of demographic change and an increasing diversity of the population. Which of the following options should your city choose? Please evaluate differing strategic options according to their suitability for your city:
   - Retain the relative homogeneity of the population.
   - Present itself as disability-friendly.
   - Attract people who wish to practice an alternative lifestyle.
   - Attract qualified labor from abroad.
   Answer options: not suitable, rather not suitable, maybe suitable, rather suitable, very suitable.
   Variables derived from question above and used in the analysis were coded as binary with “1” corresponding to options “rather suitable” and “very suitable”; “0” corresponding to remaining responses.
4. Below, we list a number of controversial views on local political issues. Please let us know which of these views you rather agree with. Here, we are interested in your personal opinion. (Answer options: I rather agree with a/c. OR I rather agree with b/d.)
   - Recruitment to the local administration should only be based on suitability and ability. OR
   - In recruiting to the local administration, attention should be paid to increasing the share of previously disadvantaged groups.
   - The city council should, through its members, reflect the diversity of the population. OR
   - It does not matter what background the members of the city council have, important is only that they do their job well.
it was experiencing problems. By offering these contrasting perspectives, we aimed to avoid priming respondents toward a positive perception of diversity. Respondents could enter open-ended answers that were coded by the research team. Furthermore, we used a question on suitable or unsuitable responses of the city “to the challenges of demographic change and an increasing diversity of the population.” Here, we offered a number of options, including one suggesting that the city should “preserve the relative homogeneity of the population,” that is, counter trends toward diversification (Figure 1).

Most respondents see benefits for the city as well as problems arising from diversity. However, a noteworthy share of 25% rejects the view that diversity is a burden for their city (one respondent, for example, wrote, “Diversity is not a burden—it is the social and financial challenges people are exposed to that constitute the problem”). Further types of comments suggest that actors who see challenges do not necessarily perceive diversity as a negative development. Thus, for an additional 7%, the challenges lie in the need to adapt inadequate institutions. In total, 12% of the respondents named the attitudes of long-term residents as the problem, that is, the inadequate acceptance of diversity rather than diversity itself.
In contrast, only 5% of the respondents rejected the suggestion that their city benefits from diversity, and another 6% could not name any specific way in which the city might benefit. In eight out of 20 cities, there were no respondents who denied that diversity offers benefits, while there was only one where the percentage was more than 10%. When combined with the previous question, these results suggest that a positive view of diversity—one of benefits rather than burdens—is more salient among urban actors.

This conclusion is further confirmed by the finding that “preserving the relative homogeneity of the population,” that is, a strategic option aiming to prevent further diversification, has more opponents than supporters among urban actors. Actively opposing diversity is not a policy option that enjoys majority support. Still, the optimistic picture of diversity acceptance among urban actors is somewhat clouded by the finding that a substantial minority (33% of overall respondents) considered “preserving the relative homogeneity of the population” a suitable option for their city. Interestingly, many respondents that hold this view simultaneously acknowledge that the city benefits from diversity. And the (tetrachoric) correlation coefficient between denying diversity benefits and being in favor of preserving the homogeneity of the population is only weakly positive, 0.271. Thus, even though urban actors have, on balance, a positive view of diversity as related to their city, a substantial minority seem to doubt that further diversification is desirable.

Contrary to what one might expect, a look at the perceived burdens to the cities does not help understand why some actors would prefer to preserve the relative homogeneity that exists. The most-often mentioned kind of burden is on social services and infrastructure, such as schools and housing. Undesirable values or behavior (5%), criminality (4%), and conflicts do come up, as does a declining social cohesion (together 13%). However, mentioning the three latter burdens does not correlate with wanting to preserve homogeneity. Apparently, doubts as to further diversification are not necessarily part of a consolidated anti-diversity position. While such doubts exist among a sizable minority, overall positive attitudes to diversity predominate.

Economic Versus Social- and Justice-Oriented Logics: All Urban Actors

We will now explore further to what extent economic and market logics or social- and justice-oriented considerations determine responses to diversity. We first analyze answers to an open-ended survey question about the benefits of diversity for the individual cities. As one might expect, many respondents regard diversity as beneficial with regard to economic and labor-market related effects. This view was represented in every one of the 20 cities. Our
respondents often just entered keywords such as “workforce” or “skilled labour.” Some pointed at an increased dynamic of the economy and more specifically, to creative and innovative input due to diversity. In other cases, diversity was described as increasing the attractiveness of the city as a location for business; due to diversity, the city was more attractive for investment, highly qualified people, and tourists. Overall, 41% of respondents mentioned some form of economic or labor-market related benefits of diversity.

As indicating a market-oriented perspective, we use two further items, both from the same survey question about strategic options for the development of the city. Attracting “skilled labour from abroad” was very popular across the board (almost 80% of all respondents, with less variation across cities than other items), which can be interpreted as evidence of a strong influence of economic considerations. We also consider attracting “individuals willing to practice an alternative lifestyle” as part of a perspective that sees diversity in terms of its economic benefits. This aim can be interpreted as part of a strategy targeting an economically beneficial creative class and promoting creativity (Florida 2005). As our results show, urban actors in big German cities are often unsure whether a promotion of alternative lifestyles is desirable. Opposition was not pronounced (only in four cities did more than 20% find this not suitable), but in the individual cities, typically, a weighted share of more than 20% (in some cases, up to 40%) was unsure. Overall, 55% found this a suitable strategy for their city, but many respondents are apparently not convinced of the benefits of lifestyle diversity. In fact, of the three items we use as indicators of a market-oriented view, only two correlate. Attracting skilled labor weakly correlates with both mentioning economic benefits of diversity and favoring alternative lifestyles. But the latter does not correlate with mentioning economic benefits, so favoring alternative lifestyles should not be regarded as part of a market-oriented view.

Looking at urban actors across the 20 big German cities, our findings suggest that they do not see diversity only—or even mainly—in terms of its contribution to the competitive position of the city in the market. Below, we will investigate whether in some of the cities, such perspectives dominate. Overall, while economic considerations are important, urban actors do not describe the benefits (and costs) of diversity only in economic or wider utilitarian terms. Answering our open question about how the city benefited from diversity, if at all, about one-third of our respondents (32%) pointed to positive effects on the political culture or prevailing attitudes in the city. Respondents entered keywords, such as “openness to the world” and “tolerance,” or described diversity as countering racism or right-wing mobilization. Sometimes, the same respondents also referred to economic and labor-market benefits of diversity, but more often they did not. Several other
benefits of diversity were mentioned, such as “more choice for residents,” “a livelier cultural scene,” “demographic gains,” and an unspecified “increase in attractiveness of the city.”

Altogether, diversity is often perceived as a complex phenomenon with positive effects in different fields. But does this also mean that we find significant support for concepts of a “just diversity,” for responses that go beyond passively appreciating diversity and aim to ensure a more equal distribution of urban resources and more equal representation of the different parts of a diverse population? Our evidence is mixed.

We use three survey items to assess the influence of justice perspectives. First, we again present results from the question about strategic orientations of the city. Urban actors were, as one option, asked whether the city should present itself as disability-friendly. We interpret this position as expressing ethical, justice-oriented views. It found almost unanimous support among urban actors. More than 86% considered this a (very) suitable option—an astonishing finding if one expects a profit-oriented strategic thinking. Only 3% openly opposed such an orientation, and 11% were unsure about the suitability of such a policy. We contend that these responses show a widespread normative consensus across cities, which may derive from a normative (and partly legal) standard established at the national and international level. Indeed, both in Germany and the European Union, the demand for inclusion of people with disabilities has recently been underlined by new initiatives.10

In addition, we asked questions that tested whether respondents not only generally appreciate diversity, but are also willing to support interventions aiming to ensure more justice. Here, we offered pairs of contrasting opinions. One item concerned the composition of the city council. The view that city councils should, through their members, “reflect the diversity of the population” found considerable support; 58% agreed with this position. This statement may reflect a general preference for socially representative political bodies as well as, more specifically, support for higher immigrant representation. In German cities, the underrepresentation of those with immigrant background on political bodies has over the past decade become a publicly debated issue (Schönwälder 2012; Schönwälder et al. 2013). The contrasting position that the only thing that matters is “that the councillors do their job well,” while their backgrounds are irrelevant, was supported by 38%, that is, a sizable minority.

There was far less overall support (41%) for “making the local administration more representative of the population.” Local authorities are important employers; social workers, firefighters, and gardeners may be public servants. An astonishing 54% supported the view that only suitability and qualifications should matter in appointments to the local administration. We tested
whether opposition against more equal public employment is shaped by those representing city administrations, but this is not the case, and opposition is strong even among those representing disadvantaged groups. Overall, the pro-diversity perspective as regards the composition of the local administration is not well-established. Still, at the level of individual respondents, support for making the administration more representative tends to correlate with support for a more representative council. However, both positions do not correlate with support for making the city disability-friendly, as the latter position is invariably popular among respondents. There does not seem to be a well-consolidated pro-justice position—although two of the three demands we tested found majority support.

To summarize the results, we found a considerable appreciation of the economic benefits of diversity and very high support for attracting foreign labor. Furthermore, some justice-oriented consequences of diversity, such as accommodating the disabled and representing societal diversity in municipal councils, are largely accepted positions, while public employment is a more contested field. At the same time, the analysis so far raised doubts as to whether a market-oriented and a justice-oriented perspective are clear alternatives. We will now investigate further whether we find agreement in the responses within cities and if so, whether the 20 cities differ with regard to having a pro- or contra-diversity stance and with regard to a more economic- or a more justice-oriented perspective on diversity.

The 20 Cities: Do They Have Coherent Positions on Diversity?

So far, we have looked at urban actors across all 20 big cities. We found that a positive evaluation of the effects of population diversification predominates and that views that emphasize the economic aspects of diversity, as well as demands for interventions in favor of previously disadvantaged groups, find considerable support, albeit with noticeable differences between the items. We now turn to the question whether cities, or more precisely the urban actors of the cities as a group, differ markedly in their responses to diversity. While the sets of actors in each city obviously include representatives of different groups and interests, we may assume a certain degree of consensus reflecting the specific problems or culture of the city. As discussed above, scholars assume that cities may have more market- or more social- and rights-oriented outlooks. Are such hypotheses confirmed in the case of responses to diversity?

Table 2 provides a summary of shares of respondents agreeing with specific statements related to diversity, as well as the range of respondent shares agreeing with the statements across the 20 surveyed cities. As the last column (interquartile range) demonstrates, there is remarkable variation across the 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Average Per-City Share of Urban Actors in Agreement (%)</th>
<th>Minimum (%)</th>
<th>Maximum (%)</th>
<th>Interquartile Range (Q3–Q1) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity has no benefits&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity is no burden&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City should preserve homogeneity</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity has economic/labor benefits&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City should attract skilled labor from abroad</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City should accommodate alternative lifestyles</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City should be disability-friendly</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City council should reflect diversity</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase share of disadvantaged groups in public employment</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source.* MPI-MMG CityDiv Survey.

*Note.* N = 445 (clustered in 20 cities). MPI-MMG = Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity; CityDiv = Cities and the Challenge of Diversity.

<sup>a</sup>Indicates summarized answers to open questions as explained in the text above. Data weighted so that actor-type share in each city equals actor-type share among all respondents. The interquartile range measures the variability of average shares of respondents in agreement with a particular survey item in each city. While minimum and maximum values might be outliers, the interquartile range captures midrange variation.
cities on several of the items tested here. This is true for whether diversity is not seen as a burden at all, whether it is seen as entailing economic or labor-market benefits, whether alternative lifestyles should be accommodated, and whether diversity should be represented in city councils and recruitment to the public service. In contrast, as already noted for individual respondents, a consensus seems to exist across cities around an acceptance of existing benefits of diversity, the need to attract skilled labor from abroad, and the wish to accommodate the disabled. While there is one outlier city where about a quarter of urban actors deny that diversity has benefits for their city, this opinion is otherwise little represented across the cities. The cities vary somewhat as regards the need to recruit skilled labor from abroad, with minimum support at about 60%. Presenting the city as disability-friendly is supported by majorities everywhere; there is only one city where support is below 75%.13

In addition, we examine whether individual cities demonstrate a coherent position on diversity orientations and interventions. Are there clearly pro- and anti-diversity cities? Are there cities whose actors overwhelmingly endorse market-oriented or, in turn, justice-oriented approaches to diversity? We find limited evidence for such hypotheses. One might expect that being in favor of preserving the homogeneity of the city population and stating that diversity is no burden for the city are contradictory positions, but in fact, there is only a very weak negative correlation between the two items at the level of city shares. There is also no correlation at the level of city shares between mentioning economic benefits from diversity and wanting to attract skilled labor from abroad, therefore, a consistent market-oriented position is hardly identifiable.

City actors seem to form more coherent views on justice-driven diversity interventions: Cities with higher shares of respondents in favor of representing minorities in the municipal council are more likely to also feature higher shares of actors in favor of recruiting more persons from previously disadvantaged groups for the local administration. However, such positive correlations do not hold for other justice-related items such as presenting the city as disability-friendly. This latter position is not typically associated with support for political representation of immigrants and more equal employment—at least not more strongly than with contrasting views.

We reduce our criteria to two measures for both perspectives to test whether now the picture becomes clearer. We retain the survey items on whether cities have economic/labor benefits from diversity and whether they should attract skilled labor from abroad as the relevant criteria for a market-oriented approach. Further, we retain the question items on whether the city council should reflect the diversity of the population and whether the city should increase the share of disadvantaged groups in public employment as the relevant criteria for a
justice-oriented approach. Our selection is based on a PCA that identified two latent components (eigenvalue above 1) and yielded higher component loadings for the aforementioned items. This method is more robust to survey items with invariant responses, such as the question on accommodating disability that reflects, as noted already, a normative consensus.

Figure 2 demonstrates that even with the reduced number of survey items, only some cities tend toward a justice or economy orientation and that differences remain moderate, with only one city having a mean component score higher than 0.5 on either Principal Component Axis. There are five cities where support for both having a council that reflects diversity and increasing the share
of disadvantaged groups in public employment is more pronounced than in the other cities (with a mean component score above 0.2). We may regard them as the justice-oriented cities. In contrast, there are four cities where both the emphasis placed on economic benefits of diversity as well as the option to recruit skilled labor from abroad have more support than in the rest of the sampled cities. We may regard them as the market-oriented cities. However, most cities cluster close to 0, that is, do not show a clear tendency toward either a justice-oriented or an economy-oriented perspective. Altogether, the analysis confirms a picture of little developed contrast among the surveyed cities. The little pronounced variation in coherence of orientations does not invite a sharply contrasting categorization. Rather, this lends support to the assumption of hybridity in urban strategies.

Conclusion

This article set out to investigate how urban actors in big German cities respond to the challenge of sociocultural heterogeneity, demands for recognition by a range of minority groups, and the recent elevation of “diversity” to a feature of mainstream policy. We, thus, take a wider perspective than previous immigration-centered literature and account for recent developments. Furthermore, by including responses from 20 German cities, we offer a comparative perspective on differences and similarities across cities within one national context. Such wide-ranging, systematic comparisons are rare in the literature. By not just surveying mayors or leading representatives of the local administration, but a broader set of urban actors, we account for the shift from government to governance, that is, the development of governance networks at all state levels and in various policy fields. We also represent cities more broadly through their complex actors, rather than just looking at their core government actors.

As the analysis presented here demonstrates, Vielfalt, or diversity, is a concept familiar to urban actors and is generally understood as relevant for urban realities. Furthermore, while it is not surprising that worries regarding the burdens on the welfare state exist, it is remarkable to what extent urban actors in 2015 Germany associate diversity with benefits for their city. In a country that only 15 to 20 years ago often interpreted immigration as a negative and unwelcome phenomenon, a wide-ranging reorientation has occurred toward a generally positive attitude to immigration and diversity (see also Pütz and Rodatz 2013). The widespread acceptance of diversity as positive reflects a political reorientation at the national level in Germany and its strong impact on local-level actors. The spread of pro-diversity campaigns in various, national and international, contexts in all likelihood contributed
to the acceptance of this perspective across cities. The ways in which diversity benefits are interpreted and the acceptance of normative orientations, such as the need to include the disabled, underline the influence of a broader cultural environment on urban actors.

Diversity is celebrated for its assumed economic benefits—as suggested in the management discourse—but this is not the only benefit urban actors expect. Vielfalt is not a one-dimensional concept for them. They also see diversity as a factor that has a positive effect on the political culture of the city and that contributes to a better quality of life of residents. This multifaceted interpretation of diversity and its effects suggests that one-sided economic perceptions may not be dominant. Indeed, across urban actors, both economic- and justice-oriented interventions find considerable support. Further research should investigate to what extent the repercussions of the refugee mass arrival, early signs of which were visible at the time of this study, and the rise of right-wing populism, as evidenced by the 2017 German national election, change the framework.

Looking at cities, or the specific sets of urban actors in the 20 cities, we found hybridity rather than coherent and polarized approaches. We started from the assumption that, given specific local conditions, city-specific perspectives and strategic orientations may dominate among urban actors. In fact, there is variation across the cities regarding the weight accorded to different implications of diversity and regarding support for particular interventions but a polarization between perceptions of and strategic orientations toward diversity in terms of their position in a global market or social- and justice-oriented criteria does not seem to exist across big German cities. This observation lends support to Häussermann’s (2010) hypothesis of a coexistence of different logics as opposed to assumptions of a more one-sided strategic orientation and to similar findings of hybridity in European cities by Kantor and Savitch (2005). Cities altogether do not seem to see a trade-off between market- and justice-oriented approaches to diversity and the need to prioritize one or the other.

We suggest two possible interpretations: First, the increased sociocultural heterogenization and the positive evaluation of diversity in mainstream politics are relatively recent developments. The overall results of our analysis may indicate an unconsolidated policy field and uncrystallized views. Actors have adopted a general view of diversity but a political process leading to agreed and coherent orientations for action is little developed. Possibly, the cities where we found some trend toward either a justice- or a market-oriented perspective have to an extent undergone such processes.

Second, the assumption that diversity is likely to be subsumed to a market-oriented strategic orientation of a city, or, in other cases, a more justice-oriented
logic, may be misleading, at least for German cities. Previous studies have already shown that urban governance is less dominated by economic forces in European welfare states than it is in the United States. Both the more solid financial base and political independence of urban government as well as a long-standing consensus over social rights may support the influence of justice-oriented perspectives. Further research is needed to investigate in what ways and under what conditions the hybrid orientations are translated into practical policies.
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Notes

1. These are cities with at least 100,000 inhabitants. In the cities of former East Germany, immigrant shares are lower, typically around 6 to 8% (Statistisches Bundesamt 2013).
3. Here, the term “integration regime” characterizes an orientation of policies toward the social integration of the city and an administration acting in the interest of disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods.
4. We excluded Berlin, Bremen, and Hamburg because they are regional states and, thus, equipped with other powers and political structures than local authorities.
5. Anonymized data will be made publicly available at the GESIS Data Archive for the Social Sciences (http://www.gesis.org/en/services/data-analysis/data-archive-service/). Further files are available upon request.
6. We follow a terminology suggested by Scharpf (1997, chap. 3). The term covers corporate (korporative) actors that have some degree of formal organization and collective actors, that is, looser umbrella structures or social movements.
7. Some organizations may have local offices but mainly formulate claims at the national level. We excluded those.
8. Of five answer options, we summarize those considering the option “eher sinnvoll” and “überaus sinnvoll,” that is, rather and very suitable or appropriate. For reasons of analytical clarity, we do not include in our summarized findings the median option “vielleicht sinnvoll,” that is, maybe suitable.
9. Furthermore, the latter position does not correlate with opposition to a diverse council and more equal recruitment; survey answers discussed further below.

11. The tetrachoric correlation between the two items is 0.546.

12. The Interquartile Range (IQR) was preferred over standard range to demonstrate the spread of mean shares of positive respondents in a way that is unaffected by outliers.

13. Herein, particular social norms may prevent respondents from taking a position of hostility toward the disabled although the survey item is not about a general position toward disability.

14. This correlation is, instead, weakly positive and at the level of individual respondents.

15. The findings are also confirmed by a top- and bottom-quartile analysis of city shares for the different questionnaire items.

16. A preliminary regression analysis of the more pronounced diversity positions on potentially influential contextual factors, in this case the share of foreign-born, the unemployment rate, and the political balance, yielded a weakly positive association between the share of foreign-born and a more pronounced justice orientation, but was otherwise inconclusive.

17. We employ a term Jane Mansbridge (2000) uses for uncrystallized interests and their representation.
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