## Legal and methodical issues in situation testing in Germany

Alexander Klose Büro für Recht und Wissenschaft

## Situation testing in Germany

- Until the Equal Treatment Act(Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetzes, AGG) 2006:
  - Situation testing was almost unknown and barely used to fight
- In recent years
  - Anti-discrimination offices have been using situation tests, especially in the leisure sector (night clubs)

  - Research studies are being carried out in the fields of housing and labour
- Jurisprudence
  - First judgments of lower courts
  - No rulings by federal courts

# Sector 1: Leisure





@ Maren Beßler / Pixelio

## Sector 1: Night Clubs

- · Anti-discrimination Office Saxony (2011)
  - Face-to-face testing in night clubs in Leipzig
  - 6 complaints concerning racial admission control
  - 500 € damages
- Anti-discrimination advisory center "basis & woge" in Hamburg (2012)
  - Face-to-face testing in 8 night clubs around the Hamburger Reeperbahn
  - Test subjects with African and Arab origin are denied access, in some clubs they are already rejected in the

# Sector 2: Housing



## Sector 2: Housing

- · Kilic: Discrimination against migrants in housing
  - Test subjects with / without Turkish background
    - First Level: Written request via Internet (200 / 200)
    - Second Level: arrange an appointment by phone (11/19)
    - Third Level: apartment tour (4/9)
    - Fourth Level: contract offer (1/4)
- Planerladen e.V.: Unequal treatment of immigrants in the housing market
  - Phone (2009): 19% of the agents treated the "Turkish" test
  - person worse than the "German" (n=482)
    Writing via Internet (2007): 42% of the agents only answered the "German" and not the "Turkish" test person (n=151)

# Sector 3: Employment Stellenmarkt - Stellenmarkt When the sin of our higher party and the first party an

© Thorben Wengert / Pixelio



## Sector 3: Employment

- Kaas/Manger: Ethnic Discrimination in Germany's Labour Market: A Field Experiment
  - Written (2010)
  - n = 528 tested companies
  - Test person with / without a Turkish background (name)
  - Applying for an internship as part of management studies
  - 40% of the "German" but only 35% of the "Turkish" identities received positive feedback

## Proposal for a typology

- Purpose
  - Individual case-related: enforcement of anti-discrimination law in a particular case.
  - Research studies: measuring the extent of discriminatory practices in a society
- Reason
  - Proactive: discrimination should be exposed and brought to justice
  - Reactive: evidence should be obtained in known cases of discrimination
- Methodology
  - Paired: checking whether individuals who differ only in the tested characteristic are treated differently
  - Non-paired: repeat discriminatory conduct in the presence of witnesses

$\begin{array}{c} \text{Methodological Requirements} \\ \text{classical experiment} \\ \text{experimental group:}  t_1 \\ \text{control group:}  t_1 \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{stimulus} \\ \text{placebo} \\ \text{t}_2 \\ \end{array}$	
paired testing $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
Legal requirements  Criminal law Falsification of documents: forgery of application documents (eg CV, diploma)? Fraud: impersonation with intent to deceive Civil law Compensation for lost profits and wasted working time? Further legal requirements competition law: interference in the operation of the tested company? labour law: illegal surveillance of employees? data protection law: testings carried out by public authorities	
Testing and burden of proof  22 Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz - Beweislast Wenn im Streitfall die eine Partei Indizien beweist, die eine Benachteiligung wegen eines in 1 genannten Grundes vermuten lassen, trägt die andere Partei die Beweislast dafür, dass kein Verstoß gegen die Bestimmungen zum Schutz vor Benachteiligung vorgelegen hat.  Sec. 22 General Act on Equal Treatment - Burden of Proof	
Where, in case of conflict, one of the parties is able to establish facts from which it may be presumed that there has been discrimination on one of the grounds referred to in Section 1, it shall be for the other party to prove that there has been no breach of the provisions prohibiting discrimination.	

# Testing and burden of proof

- · Lower standard of proof in two ways
  - Instead of main facts (eg causality) only circumstantial facts must be proven.
  - It is sufficient if the court considers the weight of circumstantial evidence counts as proof for the main facts.
- · Legal consequence: shifted burden of proof
  - The "other party" has the opportunity to prove to the full satisfaction of the court that the provisions for the protection against discrimination have not been violated.

## Testing procedures as evidence



Housing





- Is it highly probable, the different characteristic was the ground for the unequal treatment of the subjects?
- Similarity of the inidviduals (apart from the tested characteristic)
- Relevance of the individual circumstances for the particular contract
- Presence of other evidence (eg, discovery of a token argument)

## Testing procedures as evidence



ora



- Creation of test identities which differ only in the most relevant characteristic
- Recruitment of test subjects in terms of "external" and "internal" characteristics
- Rehearsal of the relevant information for the application, the conversation and reactions to possible requests
- Documentation of the testing process through logs, reports and supervision

#### Conclusion

- In Germany situation testing is still an untapped opportunity to ease the burden of proof for people who are victims of discrimination.
- There are methodological standards for the performance of testing procedures.
- Testings that meet these standards are consistent with criminal law, competition law and labour law and can serve as evidence for the existence of discrimination in accordance with sec. 22 AGG.

D		
RAMS	iinina	ULIDETIONS
1101110	ui iii iy	questions

- Dealing with non-binary attributes (eg, age)?
- Ethical concerns? Deception? Public perception?
- (Re) Construction of difference?
- Implementation of situation testing by state (antidiscrimination) agencies
- · Humiliation of the test persons
- Assessment of the amount of the claim for compensation

-	