Article

Policies of media and cultural integration in Germany: From guestworker programmes to a more integrative framework

Çiğdem Bozdağ
Kadir Has University, Turkey

Abstract

After the arrival of the first labour migrants in Germany in the 1960s, a gradual change in the perception of migrants in German politics took place: from guests (*Gastarbeiter*) and foreigners (*Ausländer*) to citizens as members of a new form of 'us' that is constructed within diversity. These transformations were reflected in Germany's migration-related policies throughout recent history. This article focuses on media-related policies for cultural integration, which go hand in hand with the developments in the general migration policy framework, analysing different phases after the 1960s. In general, we observe an increasing institutionalization of integration policies, a more comprehensive understanding of the role of the media for integration purposes and a diversification of measures, even more rapidly after the enactment of the Immigration Act in 2004. Cultural diversity is now emphasized as an enriching factor for the German mediascape. However, there continues to be a need for long-term policies in order to improve media diversity in practice.

Keywords

Cultural diversity, Germany, integration, media policies, migration

Introduction

In a recent speech, the German President, Joachim Gauck, called for a 'new form of "us"' by referring to a 'unity of the difference' and more understanding of cultural diversity.[1] This illustrated Germany's significant progress in terms of recognizing cultural diversity

Corresponding author:
Çiğdem Bozdağ, Yeni Medya Bölümü, İletisim Fakültesi, Kadir Has University, Kadir Has Kampüsü (Cibali), Kadir Has Caddesi, 34083 Cibali, Istanbul, Turkey.
Email: bozdagcigdem@hotmail.com

to be part of its nation. German society has long been reluctant to accept that migration has irreversibly transformed the country socially, economically and culturally. Accordingly, migrants who arrived in the 1960s were considered at first to be 'guests' and then later on 'foreigners' living in Germany. This reluctance in accepting the impact of migration resulted in the lack of systematic policies to foster integration and cultural diversity for a long time.

It was only in the 1990s, with the new immigration flows coming from the former Soviet bloc countries, that the importance of migration to German society was widely recognized. It took another decade – and also the influence of the 11 September 2001 (9/11) attacks in the United States – for the Immigration Act to officially declare Germany as an immigration country. This recognition came with new measures and institutions to foster integration. The concept of integration itself evolved over time from a more assimilationist perspective towards a broader understanding of social cohesion.

In line with the transformations in the general policy framework, media policies related to migration have also changed since the 1960s, as we will analyse. Whereas, earlier, 'guestworker' programmes addressed migrant groups separately to connect them with their homelands, there has been a shift in their focus over time towards issues about Germany. Furthermore, contemporary debates about the role of the media in integration have a more comprehensive outlook asserting that cultural diversity should be reflected as the 'normality' of society at all levels of the media.

This article is organized in sections that correspond to the different periods in the history of migration in Germany since the 1960s. Each section deals with general policies of integration in a specific period as well as media-related policies and programmes. As a matter of fact, the history of migration policies should be thought of as a continuous process, rather than in separate phases. Therefore, this division should be seen as a practical one for marking key transformations in German policies of integration.

Beginnings of labour migration in Germany: *Gastarbeiter* Radio in the 1960s

The 1960s was a period of massive labour migration to Germany. Despite the high number of incoming migrants, integration was not on the political agenda as migration was seen as a temporary development for the sake of the economic boom. Hence, instead of aiming for integration, initial migration-related policies focused on, first, providing migrants with an orientation to Germany; second, bridging them to their homelands and, third, protecting them from the influence of radio stations from the Soviet bloc.

Immigration to West Germany in the post-war period started with the return of *Aussiedler* (ethnic Germans), who fled from Eastern European countries, and the *Übersiedler*, who escaped from East Germany (Bauder, 2008: 96). Germany's immigration law provided citizenship on the basis of descent by blood relations stemming from the principle of *jus sanguinis* (Raiser, 2003: 4). Migrants who were not of German descent started arriving in Germany in the 1960s through recruitment agreements with various countries in an optimistic environment of industrial development. Accordingly, the initial waves of the migration movements, far from being seen as problematic, were seen as a positive sign of an economic boom (Lucassen, 2005: 151).

These migrants were supposed to be temporary workers as implied in the often-used term, *Gastarbeiter* (guestworker; Lucassen, 2005: 151). Their contracts forbade family reunification and were actually limited to just two years (Lucassen, 2005: 148). In this context, the topic of their integration was only marginally discussed; therefore, no systematic policies were made to address this issue. The main concern was that they would contribute to Germany's economy by doing their jobs properly. They were not expected to blend into society. Cultural policies regarding audio-visual media during this period were also influenced by this perception.

The first foreign language programmes by public broadcasting services, known as 'guestworker' programmes, were planned by the overarching Association of Public Broadcasting Corporations (ARD) and produced by its sub-organizations in various federal states, as, for example, the Westdeutscher Rundfunk (WDR) or Radio Berlin Brandenburg (RBB) (Sala, 2009: 28). WDR prepared the first Italian- and Turkish-speaking radio programmes in 1961 and 1964, respectively (Becker, 1998: 4; Sala, 2009: 28), which reached a significant portion of their target groups (Bayer, 2013: 130). These first radio attempts were followed by foreign language television shows such as *Unsere Heimat – Ihre Heimat* (*Our Home – Their Home*) of the WDR in 1965 and *Nachbarn in Europa* (*Neighbours in Europe*) of the Zweites Deutsches Fernsehen (ZDF) (Kosnick, 2000: 325; Weber-Menges, 2006: 127). They were both broadcast in languages spoken by migrants (Italian, Greek, Spanish and Turkish) in short slots.

The above-mentioned 'guestworker' programmes were intended to provide orientation for social life in Germany by offering information on housing, insurance or medicine (Weber-Menges, 2006: 125–126). The audience also expected this type of assistance from these shows, as is apparent from letters from the listeners (Kosnick, 2000: 322). Aside from this orientation help, these radio shows were thought to act as a bridge to the homelands of the migrants so that they would not feel estranged when they returned to their homeland from Germany (Sala, 2009: 28). Therefore, most of the contents on these programmes were imported from the migrants' homelands (Bayer, 2013: 130).

These radio shows were introduced in a Cold War context, which was described as a 'war on the airwaves' (Becker, 1998: 4; Kosnick, 2000: 321). Indeed, different radio programmes from the Eastern Bloc, which were broadcast in different languages spoken among the 'guestworkers' in West Germany, addressed these audiences: for example, Radio Prague broadcast programmes for the Italians and Spaniards (Kosnick, 2000: 321). Furthermore, the construction of the Berlin Wall had caused fears among the migrant workers, who were not familiar with the situation in Germany (Kosnick, 2000). The first public service radio programmes were then planned to familiarize the 'guestworkers' with Germany's issues and to protect them from the political influence of the propaganda from Eastern European countries (Kosnick, 2000: 321; Sala, 2009: 28).

The *Türkenproblem* in the 1970s and 1980s and the fear of *Überfremdung*

The first integration policies, at that time meaning the assimilation of migrants, were introduced in the 1970s when it became clear that immigration was not simply a matter of economic planning because labour migration had radically changed Germany's social

structure. However, more attention was paid to the need for migrants to return to their countries of origin. At this point, Germany was yet not considered to be an immigration country in the public discourse (Baringhorst, 2013: 46). As the return of the migrants to their homeland was still an important issue on the political agenda, media programmes addressing migrants preserved their aim of connecting migrants with their homelands. However, especially in the 1980s, this began to change when the content of public service foreign language programmes started to focus more on minority issues and bridging cultures within Germany.

The oil crisis in 1973 reversed the optimistic environment of economic development in Germany, leading to the abolishment of international recruitment agreements (Carle, 2007: 151). Many of the 'guestworkers' returned to their countries, while around 2.6 million – most of them of Turkish origin – remained in Germany (Forum Integration, 2009: 10). At this point, the government's aim was to stop newcomers, encourage the return to the homeland of those willing and integrate those who decided to stay through family reunions (Borkert and Bosswick, 2007: 161). Those who settled in Germany were not referred to as 'guestworkers' any longer, but as 'foreigners'. However, they were still excluded from the concept of the German nation (Kosnick, 2000: 330).

Due to the large number of Turkish migrants, their concentration in certain city quarters and the Islamic faith of many, they were especially singled out as the main problem (Lucassen, 2005: 151–152). Accordingly, *Überfremdung* (over-foreignization) and the *Türkenproblem* (the Turkish problem) became central topics in public debates about migration and in media coverage, leading to discussions about integration policies (Lucassen, 2005). However, the introduced measures were rather vague and insufficient. For example, when Heinz Kühn was appointed as the first Commissioner for Integration in 1978, one of his first acts was writing a memorandum with the recommendation of urgent and comprehensive measures to support the integration of migrants so as to avoid future problems (Baringhorst, 2013: 46). Nonetheless, his recommendations did not have considerable political impact. Although the coalition of 1982 included integration as a political aim, it was only vaguely suggested; instead, the agreement emphasized the controlling of immigration and the support measures for returning immigrants. For its part, the grand coalition under the chancellorship of Helmut Kohl, who believed that assimilating Turks in such high numbers was not possible, passed a Return Law in 1983 (Carle, 2007: 151).

Despite the emphasis on integration in the 1970s, public service foreign language programmes continued to focus on topics related to the countries of origin of the different migrant groups (Kosnick, 2000: 325–326). However, they were not addressing the lone 'guestworker' anymore, but migrant families (Kosnick, 2000: 327). Furthermore, surveys showed that migrants were still interested in content about their homelands, and this content was considered just as useful for identity orientation of the second-generation migrants in getting to know their parents' countries and cultures (Kosnick, 2000: 328). Based on these arguments, the homeland orientation of foreign language programmes was considered as being in accordance with the general policy framework, the main objective of which continued to be the return of the migrants.

Soon after the beginning of foreign language programmes, public broadcasting institutions realized that broadcasting about the migrants' countries of origin was not an easy task due to political conflicts (Kosnick, 2000: 323). Some of these programmes were

produced by migrants themselves and were very critical of the political regimes in their countries of origin. Other programmes, especially TV shows such as *Neighbours in Europe*, broadcast content which was produced by homeland institutions often reflecting pro-government perspectives (Kosnick, 2000: 326).

In the 1980s, public broadcasting institutions started to show unease with these conflicts related to homeland politics and aimed to avoid 'political indoctrination' by relying less on state broadcasting from these countries (Kosnick, 2000: 326). This became clear after the military coup in Turkey in 1980. ZDF refused to broadcast film material produced by the Turkish state television in which military leader General Evren was calling Turks living abroad to report criticisms of the regime (Kosnick, 2000). After this incident, ZDF modified its programme and introduced a German-speaking moderator. German public channels' programmes also started to focus more on minority issues in Germany (Bayer, 2013: 134; Kosnick, 2000: 326).

In the second half of the 1980s, in a context characterized by increasing hostility against immigrants, different conferences were organized by public broadcasting institutions and by the Deputy of the Federal Government for the Integration of Foreign Employees and their Families to discuss the issue of foreigners and mass media (Kosnick, 2000: 328). The discussions that were held in these conferences marked a transformation in the understanding of integration. It became evident that integration was a matter that concerned the majority of the society and not only migrants. Hence, more emphasis was placed on both the media's potential in increasing the dialogue between different cultural groups and in decreasing hostility directed at 'foreigners'. Towards the end of the 1980s, more shows emerged with this intention and addressed both migrants and Germans (Bayer, 2013: 134), such as the foreign language show with subtitles, *Wir bitten um Aufmerksamkeit* (*We Ask for Your Attention*), on ZDF (Bayer, 2013: 130). *Neighbours in Europe* also started to include subtitles. Its director defined it as 'a colorful magazine for the multicultural society' (Kosnick, 2000: 329). Furthermore, the CIVIS Media Prize was introduced in 1988 to reward radio and television programmes that supported 'understanding with foreigners' (Forum Integration, 2009: 16).

In the 1970s and 1980s, there was a slight increase in competition between programmes offered by public broadcasting services and programmes from the migrants' homelands (Weber-Menges, 2006: 127–129). Turkish newspapers, which had been made available in Germany since the beginning of labour migration, opened offices in Germany and started to include separate pages on minority issues in Germany (Weber-Menges, 2006). Furthermore, video recorders became widespread in the households of migrant families in the 1980s sparking a new niche market for videos. These new transnational forms of media production and consumption did not strongly influence the use of public service programmes among migrants, but this picture was going to change radically with cable television and satellite technology (Kosnick, 2000: 331).

Ambivalent policies in the 1990s: Media as symbols of discrimination and instruments of integration

The fall of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany were the key developments that influenced migration policies in Germany in the 1990s (Eckardt, 2007: 239). Both the

'return' of the *Aussiedler* (people of German descent living in different countries) and the arrival of other immigrants from former Eastern Bloc countries challenged the myth that Germany was not an immigration country (Baringhorst, 2013: 47; Bauder, 2008: 97). Along with the economic problems created by these new immigration flows and the reunification, increased hostility against 'foreigners' and racist attacks in different forms emerged.

In this context, debates about the status of migrants in Germany were polarized between those in favour of multiculturalism wishing to grant more cultural autonomy to the different ethnic and religious groups and others in favour of a uniting German *Leitkultur* (guiding culture) (Carle, 2007: 152; Klusmeyer, 2001: 527). Based on these different positions, integration meant celebrating and preserving differences for some and the adoption of the German *Leitkultur* for others. This polarization also influenced policies about integration and media. Whereas some celebrated multicultural formats representing the constituent groups in society such as Radio Multikulti, others feared possible 'media ghettos', leading to a compartmentalization of different groups in society.

The fall of Eastern European regimes had drastically changed the demographic structure of Germany (Raiser, 2003: 4–5). In the 1990s, 10 million migrants from these countries entered Germany, over two million of them were *Aussiedler* (Eckardt, 2007: 236; Hepp et al., 2011: 35). Thus, the myth of Germany as an ethnically homogeneous nation was increasingly challenged through these developments (Bauder, 2008: 97). Although the *Aussiedler* were considered to be 'Germans' by descent, most of them were socialized in former communist countries. The cultural differences introduced by these immigrants raised questions about the ideal 'German culture'.

Aside from demographic changes, economic problems also emerged after Germany's reunification and led to national populist and extreme right-wing movements and acts of racial violence, especially in former East-German regions (Stehle, 2012: 168–169). Members of these movements attacked houses of asylum-seekers in Hoyerswerda (1991) and Rostock-Lichtenhagen (1992) and of Turkish migrants in Mölln (1992) and Solingen (1993). These attacks shook the belief that Germany was a tolerant society towards foreigners and opened a space for discussions about cultural differences and multiculturalism (Eckardt, 2007: 239; Stehle, 2012: 167) and prompted the Green Party and the Leftist Party to include multiculturalism as part of their programmes (Kruse et al., 2003: 142).

In this context, reforms were introduced to foster integration of migrants into Germany: In 1990, a new foreigners' law eased attaining German citizenship and participating in the social welfare system (Vogel, 2010: 44). However, there were still concerns that these new rights would lead to more immigration (Eckardt, 2007: 238). These concerns led to another law in 1993 regarding asylum policies, aimed at reducing the flow of refugees to Germany (Carle, 2007: 152; Vogel, 2010: 44). The red−green government that came to power in 1998 planned to liberalize Germany's immigration laws, despite these conservative positions in society as will be discussed in the next section.

While the immigrant population in Germany became much more diverse in the 1990s, Turkish immigrants continued to be seen as a problematic group, as the fears raised by their consumption of Turkish satellite television illustrated. TRT International, the state channel for the Turkish population in Europe, was accessible through cable connection from 1990 onwards (Kosnick, 2000: 331). Later on, satellite technology made all channels from Turkey available, thus radically changing the media consumption patterns of

Turkish immigrants (Aksoy and Robins, 2003: 89ff). Satellite dishes became symbols of the alleged separation of Turkish migrants from the rest of society, supposedly maintaining them in a 'media ghetto' (Bayer, 2013: 136).

In addition to satellite technology, private ethnic press and media in Germany became more diversified (Weber-Menges 2006: 133–134). Second- and third-generation immigrants did not feel that the foreign language programmes in German media fully addressed the problems they faced. Thus, they were looking for content that reflected their lives (Bayer, 2013: 134). As a result, different immigrant cultural productions emerged, which were also reactions to hostility towards foreigners, as, for example, the Turkish hip-hop culture or Feridun Zaimoğlu's novels (Stehle, 2012: 171–174). There were also television productions of different migrant groups in the open channels and new ethnic media targeting immigrants to open new markets (Horz, 2011: 360; Weber-Menges, 2006: 129–131). For example, Radyo Metropol FM was founded in 1999 in Berlin as a private German-Turkish radio station broadcasting in Turkish and started to broadcast in other regions with a high Turkish population such as Stuttgart, Koblenz and Mannheim. Similarly, Radio Russkij Berlin was created in 2003, dedicated to the Russian-speaking *Aussiedler* in Germany.

The aforementioned developments in media technologies and markets, combined with a change in consumption habits among migrants, influenced the public service foreign language programmes (Becker, 1998: 5–6). Whereas 91 per cent of Turkish migrants knew about these programmes in 1991, this percentage dropped to 19 per cent in 1996, which indicated the need for reform (Becker, 1998). Accordingly, a reform commission was implemented in WDR (Becker, 1998: 5). Afterwards, new programmes were introduced and old ones were transformed. For instance, *Neighbours in Europe* started to produce its own content in 1992 and stopped import of content completely in 1995 (Becker, 1998: 334). Revealingly, another TV show, initially entitled *Our Home – Your Home*, whose name was clearly based on clear-cut boundaries and out of date, was renamed *Babylon* (Kosnick, 2000: 334). The multilingual Radio Multikulti originally created in 1989 was shut down in 1991 due to financial problems, but was reintroduced in 1994 as a new concept in this context (Morawska, 2008: 1423–1426).

Following the example of Radio Multikulti, whose aim was to give different cultural groups in Germany a voice (Bayer, 2013: 136), other local public broadcasting services followed suit, such as Radio Funkhaus Europa, which aired in 1999 through cooperation with Radio Bremen and WDR as an all-day radio channel for integration (Zambonini, 2007: 39). These programmes still addressed different migrant groups separately through foreign language programming (Bayer, 2013: 139). In the 2000s, the emphasis shifted from these types of separate programmes to a comprehensive framework that applied to all media in Germany, as will be discussed in the next section.

The 2000s: Between securitization and more comprehensive integration policies

Despite the fears caused by 9/11, the 2000s in Germany have been a period in which the concept of integration has been transformed to include the idea of cultural diversity (defined as differences based on ethnicity and religion) as being part of German society.

However, the ideal of a united 'German nation' still presents itself as an overarching concept to provide social cohesion despite these differences. Accordingly, the focus of discussion about the role of media for integration shifted from specific foreign language programmes towards a more comprehensive perspective, arguing that the cultural diversity of society should be reflected in the entire German mediascape, as stated in the recent integration plans.

The beginning of the 2000s in Germany was marked by a debate on the reform of the immigration planned by the red−green government, which came to power in 1998 (Bauder, 2008: 99). The government's draft was found too liberal by the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and Christian Social Union (CSU), who were willing to preserve the ideal of a German 'guiding culture'. This idea of a guiding culture was proposed by CDU politician Friedrich Merz as a key to social cohesion and integration in Germany and caused heated public debates. While this notion was opposed by members of the greens, leftists and the Social Democratic Party (SPD), it was supported by several members of the CDU, including Angela Merkel (Manz, 2004: 492).

The 9/11 attacks happened during these debates about a new immigration law and were interpreted by the conservatives as a sign that the immigration law should not be liberalized (Kruse et al., 2003: 132). Subsequently, the first draft of this law was declined in parliament in 2001. Instead of liberalization of immigration laws, a process of securitization began in Germany, the main targets of which were Muslim communities, who were increasingly perceived as a 'threat' for security and social cohesion (Faist, 2004: 2). New anti-terror laws were introduced to control migrant organizations and media, especially those of Muslims (Kruse et al., 2003: 132; Topal, 2008: 811). Out of the 24 articles of the Law on Fighting Terrorism in 2002, six were devoted to foreigners, which shows that the lawmakers perceived a direct linkage between migration and terrorism (Diez and Squire, 2008: 575). News coverage also began to represent migrants from Islamic countries more often on the basis of their religious identity and as a danger to social security (Ehrkamp, 2010: 14).

The red−green coalition eventually succeeded in passing the new Immigration Act in 2004 (Eckardt, 2007: 244). Although the act had lost most of its reformative aspects, it still marked a significant turning point regarding the migration history in Germany as it officially recognized the country's immigration status. This recognition was followed by different measures and institutions for integration, implemented by the grand coalition that came to power in 2005: The position of Commissioner for Integration was transformed to a state ministry under the federal chancellor (Forum Integration, 2009: 36); different commissions and working groups were built at the national and state levels. Some of the measures were also related to European Union (EU) legislation as was the case with the Equal Treatment Law of 2006 for preventing racist discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin, gender, religion, world-view, age or sexual identity (Bayer, 2013: 33).

From 2005 onwards, the Merkel government took important steps in favour of a more systematic framework for integration policies. However, the CDU–CSU preserved their conservative line towards migration and the ideal of a 'guiding culture' to a certain extent. For instance, they introduced controversial measures in 2006 in which a citizenship test became obligatory in order to have family reunions or to attain German citizenship (Carle, 2007: 153). Despite the fact that these tests have been criticized for

their essentialist and ethnocentric character with the argument that even most Germans would not be able to pass them, they continue to be applied.

In the 2000s, integration has been transformed from a one-sided concept calling for the adaptation of migrants to a comprehensive understanding of integration as social cohesion, involving all segments of the society. With this understanding of integration, new forums were introduced to increase dialogue between different cultures (National Integration Plan (NIP), 2007). As of 2006, annual integration summits are organized to bring policymakers, media workers and representatives of migrant organizations together (National Action Plan Integration (NAPI), 2012: 10). However, these dialogue forums are also criticized by some as being hierarchically organized in the sense that the government decides on who attends the forums as well as on the recommendations to be concluded at the end. One example of this is the annual Islam Conference[2] for representatives of Muslim institutions and other groups. Various legal Muslim organizations that were perceived as fundamentalist and as a threat to society were excluded from this conference.[3]

Despite these critiques, the integration summits led to the preparation of the NIP, which was a comprehensive framework for integration complete with recommendations (NIP, 2007: 4). As a result, a new plan entitled NAPI was announced in 2012 with the motto, 'Improve Cohesion – Realize Participation' (NAPI, 2012: 1). The NAPI basically dealt with similar issues as NIP, but it was more specific in naming concrete actors to take the recommended measures.

The role of the media in integration was one of the core points discussed in these summits. From these emerged in 2006 a commission for media and integration with the objective of 'Mak[ing] use of diversity' (Forum Integration, 2007). It published a report in 2007 that called for the development of programmes representing cultural diversity as the norm and discussing the potentials and problems of the immigration society, pleaded for an increased involvement of migrants in media production by improving educational opportunities for jobs in the media sector and ruled that ethnic media in foreign language should not be presented as agents of separation, but, instead, as important actors for integration (Forum Integration, 2007: 5,7). These recommendations were included in the NIP and later in the NAPI.

Some of these recommendations for increasing media diversity in Germany were turned into practice especially by the public broadcasting institutions, which have introduced new programmes to reflect the diversity of society: ARD developed a series called *Turkish for Beginners*, which is the story of a bi-national German-Turkish family; the famous TV show *Tatort* introduced in 2008 its first commissar with a Turkish background; WDR started to organize events for Muslims during Ramadan and SWR introduced 'Islamic Word', a section on its website for Muslims or those simply interested in Islam (Forum Integration, 2007: 10).

Public channels have been all the more attentive to these diversity policies in the light of increasing concerns about legitimizing their institutions in the eyes of immigrants, whose proportion in the whole population is growing and who are becoming ever more important as taxpayers and financial contributors to public broadcasting. There is also empirical evidence for the increasing relevance of the 'German' media for different migrant groups (for an overview, see Hepp et al., 2011: 46ff). Accordingly, private media groups that have started to integrate diversity management into their strategies

see immigrants as potential target groups: The Axel Springer publishing house has a department for diversity issues, while Pro7 and SAT1 organized 'Tolerance Day' in April 2011 (NAPI, 2012: 322).

Despite this celebration of diversity in the public and private media sector, there are still problems in the practice of cultural diversity in the media. One of these problems is related to the surveillance of the production of ethnic media, especially after the introduction of the anti-terror laws (Horz, 2011: 359ff). For example, the content of open channels, which constitute a platform for migrant media, has been controlled more strictly after 9/11. The producers have been asked to provide translations for the content broadcast, which has increased their production costs (Horz, 2011). Although the integration plans recognize the important role of minority media, in practice, they are still treated as a potential threat.

Another problem regarding media diversity is the underrepresentation of migrants in the production and decision-making processes of the media. Whereas the proportion of migrants in the whole German population is around 19 per cent, it is only around 3 per cent among media personnel (Bayer, 2013: 157). In order to redress this, different programmes that aim to support the integration of migrants in media production were introduced in the public broadcasting sector and by foundations such as the scholarship programme of the Heinrich Böll Foundation. Furthermore, private programme makers and activist groups lobby in favour of cultural diversity in the media – like the Neue Deutsche Medienmacher (New German Media-Makers), who gathered in 2009 with the intention of increasing the visibility of migrants in the media sector. While these initiatives are important steps towards a more diverse media environment, there is still a need for long-term policies in order to improve the situation.

Conclusion: 'A new form of us' in the media

Germany has *de facto* been an immigration country since the beginning of labour migration in the 1960s. Immigration to Germany continues today, especially from the new EU countries such as Poland, Bulgaria and Romania, and this movement will ostensibly continue to shape the future of German society. As Joachim Gauck said in his aforementioned speech, the German nation should say farewell to the idea that 'there can be a homogeneous, closed and to a certain extent one-colored Germany'.

Despite the long-lasting reluctance to recognize this fact, German politics have come a long way in accepting the cultural diversity of the society and in developing adequate policies. Additionally, the ideal of a German nation as an 'imagined community' remains a strong reference point for the idea of integration. However, integration is not understood as a form of one-sided assimilation to a German 'guiding culture' anymore, but as a concept that has consequences for all members of society. Policies and measures that aim to increase dialogue among different groups in society and the overall representation of diversity in the media sector can be seen as signs of this transformation.

This transformation is of course not a linear one and there still remain more conservative voices as well as racist discourses about immigration. For example, the bestseller book by Thilo Sarrazin entitled *Deutschland schafftsich ab* (*Germany Is Abolishing Itself*), which included race-based arguments about the reluctance of Muslim communities

to integrate into the German welfare system, caused a heated debate in 2010 about the 'parallel societies' of immigrants. Merkel made her contribution to this debate by stating that 'the approach of Multikulti – now we live near each other and are happy about each other – has failed, has absolutely failed',[4] in reference to previous policies of immigration by the red−green coalition during 1998–2005. She advocated a unifying German 'guiding culture', a *Leitkultur*, instead.

Despite these backlashes in the migration debate, discourses about a 'new' German nation imagined as a culturally diverse community are increasingly finding place. Christian Wulf's presidential address in 2010,[5] declaring Islam to be part of Germany, or the celebration of the multicultural national team[6] in the World Cup of 2010, and Gauck's speech constitute good examples of this. Furthermore, there are important steps taken to include migrants in political decision-making processes. The first CDU member of parliament with a Muslim background was elected in 2013 and the first federal minister for Affairs of Integration, Migration and Refugees with a Turkish background, Aydan Özoğuz, was appointed in the grand coalition afterwards.

In correlation with the shift of general migration policies, there has been an opening towards cultural diversity and a more diversified and comprehensive policy framework of migration-related media policies. The NIPs from 2007 and 2011 emphasize the role of media in integration and argue for cultural diversity in media production, consumption and representation. Hence, today, diversity and integration in the media are not only discussed in the framework of separate foreign language programmes but also in the overall supply of public broadcasting institutions, as well as in the private media sector.

This discursive recognition of the ideal of a culturally diverse mediascape is an important step; however, there is still strong empirical evidence for the biased representations of migrants in the mainstream media, underrepresentation of migrants in media production, and hostile and stereotypical perceptions of each other among different cultural groups in society (see, for example, Beutke, 2013: 19; Ehrkamp, 2010: 27). There is still a lot to achieve, and long-term media-related integration policies are needed in order to represent and live a 'new form of us' in the German mediascape. It is crucial to continuously question the power relations between the different parts of this 'us' and understand who is allowed to speak and enter dialogue and who is excluded from decision-making processes in order to achieve a truly democratic conversation.

Funding

Notes

1. http://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article128295653/Joachim-Gauck-beschwoert-ein-neues-deutsches-Wir.html (accessed 24 September 2014).
2. http://www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/DIK/DE/Startseite/startseite-node.html (accessed 24 September 2014).
3. See, for example, http://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/zeitgeschehen/2013-05/islamkonferenz-muslime-praevention (accessed 24 September 2014).

4.   http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/integration-merkel-erklaert-multikulti-fuer-
     gescheitert-a-723532.html (accessed 24 September 2014).
5.   http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/deutschland/wulff-rede-im-wortlaut-der-islam-gehoert-
     zu-deutschland/3553232.html (accessed 24 September 2014).
6.   http://www.dw.de/die-multikulti-elf-wir-sind-ein-team/a-5670809 (accessed 24 September
     2014).

References

Aksoy A and Robins K (2003) Banal transnationalism: The difference that television makes. In:
    Karim KH (ed.) *The Media of Diaspora*. London: Routledge, pp.89–104.
Baringhorst S (2013) Stand und Perspektiven der Migrationsforschung. In: Schimany P and Von
    Loeffelholz HD (eds) *Beiträge zur Migrations- und Integrationsforschung*. Berlin: BAMF,
    pp.44–63.
Bauder H (2008) Media discourse and the new German immigration law. *Journal of Ethnic and
    Migration Studies* 34(1): 95–112.
Bayer J (2013) *Media diversity in Deutschland. Kulturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven auf jour-
    nalistische Praxis*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität
    München. Available at: http://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/16086/ (accessed 24 September
    2014).
Becker J (1998) Multiculturalism in German broadcasting. *Journal of the World Association for
    Christian Communication*. Available at: http://www.waccglobal.org/en/19983-migrants-ref-
    ugees-and-the-right-to-communicate/868-Multiculturalism-in-German-broadcasting–.html
    (accessed 24 September 2014).
Beutke M (2013) Faktensammlung Diskriminierung. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung. Available at:
    http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xbcr/SID-F5113000-2B65F178/bst/xcms_bst_
    dms_38767_38771_2.pdf (accessed 24 September 2014).
Borkert M and Bosswick W (December 2007) *Migration policy-making in Germany – between
    national reluctance and local pragmatism?* IMISCOE (International Migration, Integration
    and Social Cohesion in Europe, Research Network) Working Paper 20. Available at: http://
    dare.uva.nl/cgi/arno/show.cgi?fid=96878 (accessed 24 September 2014).
Carle R (2007) Citizenship debates in the new Germany. *Society Abroad* 48: 147–154.
Diez T and Squire V (2008) Traditions of citizenship and the securitization of migration in
    Germany and Britain. *Citizenship Studies* 12(6): 565–581.
Eckardt F (2007) Multiculturalism in Germany: From ideology to pragmatism and back? *National
    Identities* 9(3): 235–245.
Ehrkamp P (2010) The limits of multicultural tolerance? Liberal democracy and media portrayals
    of Muslim migrant women in Germany. *Space and Polity* 14(1): 13–32.
Faist T (2004) The migration-security nexus. International migration and security before and after
    9/11. *Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations*
    4/03: 1–18. Malmö: Malmö University Press.
Forum Integration (2007) Nationaler Integrationsplan Arbeitsgruppe Medien. Vielfalt nutzen.
    Abschlussbericht und Materiallen. Available at: http://www.migration-online.de/data/ag_6_
    medien_endbericht.pdf (accessed 24 September 2014).
Forum Integration (2009) Ein Amt im Wandel. 30 Jahre Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für
    Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration. Available at: http://www.bundesregierung.de/
    Content/DE/Publikation/IB/2009-05-28-amt-im-wandel.html (accessed November 2013).
Hepp A, Bozdag C and Suna L (2011) *Mediale Migranten: Mediatisierung und die kommunikative
    Vernetzung der Diaspora*. Wiesbaden: VS, Verl. für Sozial-wissenschaften.

Horz C (2011) Challenged media participation of diasporas: Iranian productions on public access TV channels in Germany. *Iranian Studies* 44(3): 360–380.

Klusmeyer D (2001) A 'guiding culture' for migrants? Integration and diversity in Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27(3): 519–532.

Kosnick K (2000) Building bridges: Media for migrants and the public-service mission in Germany. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 3(3): 319–342.

Kruse I, Orren HE and Angenendt S (2003) The failure of immigration reform in Germany. *German Politics* 12(3): 129–145.

Lucassen L (2005) *The Migrant Threat: The Integration of Old and New Migrants in Western Europe since 1850. Studies of World Migrations*. Urbana, IL and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Manz S (2004) Constructing a normative national identity: The Leitkultur debate in Germany, 2000/2001. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 25(5–6): 481–496.

Morawska E (2008) The recognition politics of Polish Radio MultiKulti in Berlin. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34(8): 1323–1335.

National Action Plan Integration (NAPI) (2012) *Nationaler Aktionsplan Integration*. Forum Integration. Available at: http://www.bundesregierung.de/Webs/Breg/DE/Bundesregierung/BeauftragtefuerIntegration/nap/nationaleraktionsplan/_node.html (accessed 24 September 2014).

National Integration Plan (NIP) (2007) *Der Nationale Integrationsplan*. Forum Integration. Available at: http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/StatischeSeiten/Breg/IB/2006-10-27-ib-nationaler-integrationsplan.html (accessed 24 September 2014).

Raiser U (2003) Mapping minorities and their media: The national context – Germany. Available at: http://www.lse.ac.uk/media@lse/research/EMTEL/minorities/papers/germanyreport.pdf (accessed 24 September 2014).

Sala R (2009) Fremde Stimmen im Äther. Wie das 'Gastarbeiterradio' zum demokratischen Problemfall wurde. *WZB-Mitteilungen* 129: 28–30.

Stehle M (2012) White ghettos: The 'crisis of multiculturalism' in post-unification Germany. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 14: 167–185.

Topal C (2008) Surveillance in Germany after 9/11. *European Societies* 10(5): 809–883.

Vogel W (2010) Die Migration im Hintergrund. Strukturen der Integrationspolitik in Deutschland. In: Baasner F (ed.) *Migration und Integration in Europa*. Baden-Baden: Nomos-Verlag, pp.43–56.

Weber-Menges S (2006) Die Entwicklung der Ethnomedien in Deutschland. In: Geißler R (ed.) *Integration durch Massenmedien: Medien und Migration im internationalen Vergleich*. Bielefeld: Transcript, pp.121–146.

Zambonini G (2007) Der Westdeutsche Rundfunk – Integration als business. In: *Medien und Diversity DOSSIER*. Heinrich Böll Stiftung, pp.39–41. Available at: http://www.migration-boell.de/web/diversity/48_1217.asp (accessed 24 September 2014).

Author biography

Çiğdem Bozdağ is an Assistant Professor in the Department of New Media at the Kadir Has University since September 2014. From September 2013 till August 2014, she worked as a postdoctoral researcher as the Mercator–IPC fellow at the Istanbul Policy Center of Sabanci University, where she carried out a research project on intercultural networks in schools through Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). She completed her PhD in the field of Communication and Media Studies at the University of Bremen and worked as a lecturer and a research assistant there. Her main research and teaching interests include intercultural communication, globalization, education, new media and migration studies.