Land Use Impacts of Turkish Migration to Europe: The German Case (Wiesbaden and Dortmund)

Nihan Özdemir Sönmez
Metin Şenbil
Ertan Göral

1. Introduction

Identity, and to a certain extent ethnicity, has been fundamental source of meaning throughout human history. It is a basic element of social recognition as well as of social discrimination. Locally based identities, in this context, have their expressions in spatial terms too. Their recognition, on the other hand, has shown an uneasy pattern in many contemporary societies through modernisation and post-modernisation periods. The experience of migrants living in western capitalist societies since the World War II has particular importance in this regard. In the context of asserting local identity, the experience of Turkish workers in Germany starting from simple urban demands on living conditions and ends up at conquest of local enclaves, deserves a close scrutiny. Today, three generations of Turkish citizens live in Germany. Majority of them have become adapted to the life in Germany. Migration to Germany is still continues with marriages and a tiny flow of workers. Reverse migration to Turkey was popular among first generation of guest workers.

Almost all of the migrant workers were without proper knowledge of the society they were heading to in 1960s. Christian culture and open society has shaken migrant workers' cultural and religious alignments. In time, population increase of the Turkish nationals in Germany has produced neighbourhoods predominantly mixed with Turkish culture. One way contemplate that these neighbourhoods have changed in land use and activities in order to fit to the Turkish customs, social and religious institutions. This retrospective study tries to explore the underlying dynamics of land use changes mainly caused by Turkish nationals to Germany, as guest workers first and permanent residents later.

The study is conducted by interviews with open ended questions with Turkish nationals in Germany, two cities, i.e. Wiesbaden and Dortmund. By retrospective and recall questions, we tried to entangle how social institutions and social cohesion have worked in transforming the land use pattern and activities that more or less satisfies the communal needs and sustain relationships. And also find out how local and/or central authorities' responses have changed towards these demands through time. Moreover, we also try to explore the effects of land use decisions on the society too. Whether the Turkish communities start to become inward

looking and semi-open, restricting itself to its neighbourhoods after respective land use changes in Germany or not is another aspect of the study we are trying to uncover.

2. Theoretical Framework: Spatial Aspects of Identity

Discussions of identity and space have become prominent in critical geography, in recent years (Massey, 1999, Castells, 1997). Identity can be defined as people's source of meaning and experience. It is primarily shaped by awareness of distinction between 'self' and 'other' (Castells, 1997).The construction of identities is an ongoing process which is nourished by complex synthesis of history, geography, biology, collective memory, religious affection etc. However, in the last stage, it is the power relation which predominantly shapes the identity. In other words, there is no such thing as a place or an identity by itself, but these are simple constructions of discourses and practices. Nevertheless, this does not deny the existence of spatial identities, but criticises it's often essentialist character by emphasising underlying power structures (Lefebvre, 1991)).

For Castells, the social construction of identity always takes places in a context marked by power relations. He goes on to argue that there are three forms of identity formation. These are:

"*Legitimizing identity*: introduced by the dominant institutions of society to extend and rationalize their domination *vis a vis* social actors,

Resistance identity: generated by those actors who are in positions/conditions devalued and/or stigmatized by the logic of domination,

Project identity: when social actors, on the basis of whichever cultural materials are available to them, build a new identity that redefines their position in society and, by doing so, seek the transformation of overall structure.." (Castells, 1997:8).

Through the complex procedure of identity formation, identities can start as resistance identity and later turn into a project identity and finally by the enforcement of institutions of the society it becomes legitimizing identity.

For the minority/ethnic groups this process is much more complicated. Ethnicity has a spatial aspect and always been associated with discrimination. To keep and sustain identity in a given territory is not an easy task especially for the ethnic minorities formed by immigrants. There are two alternative accounts explaining the immigrants' position in an alien environment. These are spatial assimilation theory and ethnic stratification theory.

The spatial assimilation theory emphasises the importance of the length of a stay in the host country (Massey, 1985). Assuming that socially and economically better positions can be obtained by a significant period of time, in due course immigrants can therefore obtain better living conditions in spatial terms. Studies on immigrants showed that better social and economic position in society would lead to moving better neighbourhoods where native residents dominantly live, making spatial assimilation much more easier.

The ethnic stratification theory, on the other hand, brings forward the importance of discrimination in social, economic, and spatial terms. Ethnic minorities are usually excluded from labour market making them disadvantaged in housing market as well. "This is evident also from studies showing that minority ethnic groups are more or less forced to buy a substandard dwelling when they are rejected by landlords in their attempt to get access to a rental dwelling" (Özüekren, Ergöz-Karahan, 2010:359). Concentration of a certain ethnic group in a certain spatial enclave increases the level of segregation not only socially but spatially too.

In short, for ethnic minorities, complex procedure of identity formation is heavily associated with the space. The level of interaction between identity and space, on the other hand, determines the levels of representation of identities in space. This would end up either in spatial assimilation or in ethnic stratification.

3. Turks in Germany

3.1. Historical Background

Migration of Turkish citizens to Germany dates back to the late 1950s. Transformation to capital intensive production in agriculture by the introduction of Marshall Aid[1] played an important role in dramatic increase in unemployment in rural areas. Majority of those jobless peasants migrated to the big cities like Istanbul and Ankara while some others tried their chances in abroad. These pioneering workers went to Germany by the initiatives of German firms with the idea of a temporary stay. Later on "emigration agreement" signed between Turkey and Germany in 1961, and workers started to be sent officially. "Although Turkey signed similar agreements later with other European countries, immigration figures to those countries have always been lower than to Germany" (Özüekren, Ergöz-Karahan, 2010:356).

Increasing demand for migrant labour in a rapidly growing economy caused masses to migrate to Germany from Turkey and some other less developed European countries like Portugal, Spain and Italy as well. However, "1973 oil crisis" put an end to the easy migration to Germany. Before 1973, migrants can easily bring their families to Germany without any restrictions. After this time immigration issues in Germany became more and more difficult. However, the number of Turkish citizens has continued to increase no matter how hard it became. During the 1970s few of these pioneering immigrants had to return to Turkey because of redundancies. Others stayed and by the help of the relatively loose family unification regulations in 1974 the number of Turkish citizens living in Germany reached to 1 million.

[1] Marshall Aid, offered to European countries in 1947, was rooted in American interests to revive the European economy as a strong trading partner, and to strengthen Europe politically against further Soviet expansion westward. Turkey was included Marshall Aid programme in 1948 with the political intentions. Marshall Aid was used mainly modernization of agricultural sector which employed 80% of the population. Under the Plan the number of tractors increased from 2,200 in 1948 to 26,000 in early 1952, more than one for every two villages, leaving most of them jobless in their own villages.

Starting from the 1980s pattern of migration to Germany has changed. Political asylum seekers fled to Germany and to other European countries just after the 1980 Military Intervention with the hope of reaching easy citizenship rights. Similarly, in the 1990s many asylum seekers run away to Germany with ethnic reasons.

At the beginning of the 2000s, there were almost 3.8 million Turks living in the European Union making them the largest foreign population. Around 2.5 million of them were living in Germany, the largest Turkish community in Europe. In 2004, the share of foreigners living in Germany's large cities was 8.1%, while only Turkish nationals constituted the 2.1% of them alone (Table-1).

Table 1. **Foreign citizens and Turkish citizens in cities with more than 500 000 inhabitants and in large West German cities (100 000+) with at least 15 per cent foreign citizens, 2004**

City	*Population (total)*	*Foreigners (total)*	*Foreigners (share of population)*	*Turkish nationals (share of population)*
Berlin	3 387 828	454 545	13.4	3.6
Hamburg	1 715 225	244 401	14.2	3.5
München	1 273 168	282208	22.2	3.3
Köln	1 022 627	192 156	18.8	6.7
Frankfurt/M.	655 079	165 600	25.3	4.8
Stuttgart	590 657	127 560	21.6	3.8
Dortmund	**588 860**	**79842**	**13.6**	**4.8**
Essen	588 084	62 511	10.6	2.9
Düsseldorf	574 541	100 990	17.6	2.6
Hannover	515 841	75 152	14.6	3.8
Duisburg	503 664	75 194	14.9	8.3
Nürnberg	495 302	94 495	19.1	4.3
Mannheim	307 499	60 735	19.8	6.4
Wiesbaden	**272 591**	**47 837**	**17.5**	**4.2**
Mainz	184 502	32 019	17.4	3.7
Ludwigshafen	167 410	34 155	20.4	6.2
Heilbronn	121 320	24 734	20.4	7.5
Pforzheim	118 847	20 335	17.1	5.0
Ulm	120 107	19 688	16.4	4.8
Offenbach	118 233	37 084	31.4	6.1
Fürth	112 492	17 401	15.5	4.9
Germany	82 500 849	6 7 1 7 115	8.1	2.1

*Source:*Schönwalder and Söhn, 2008:1445

3.2. Development of Turkish Settlement Pattern in Germany

History of Turkish people in Germany can be investigated in five periods according to their settlement patterns in Germany. The first period falls to 1960s when the Turkish were generally confined to guest houses (i.e. heim). "Turkish guestworkers (men and women) moving to Germany travelled by train from Istanbul to Munich and hence to their final destinations. As soon as they arrived, they were mostly housed in workers' hotels (*heim*) provided by employers" (Özüekren, Ergöz-Karahan, 2010:360). Their social and cultural as well as religious needs were satisfied by ad hoc solutions, generally confined to guest houses. At that time they lived in an isolated manner in a totally alien environment. In general their relations with the Germans were poor because of language deficiencies as well as hard working conditions.

In 1970s, guest worker flow to Germany slowed down. However, families began to reinstall themselves in the German soil and the number of second generation Turkish population started to increase. Families began to seek proper accommodation in the cities. This was the beginning of recognition era of Turkish ethnic population in Germany. This period marks the beginning of the German society getting to know Turkish ethnic population. And for the first time, Germans realised that they had to come to terms with living together. Turkish families, on the other hand, began to seek proper accommodation opportunities in the cities, both economically and socially. Since they still felt disadvantaged, they tried to live in a close vicinity with other Turkish fellows or if possible with their relatives. "The first generation tends to have very little education, do not have a specific profession, are classified as being labourers and tend to speak a rather poor German. Their social contribution to the German community is somewhat limited. The first generation tend to be rather ignorant about discrimination, because they do not feel the need for greater integration. Their group of comparison are their friends and family back in Turkey, who, from an economic point of view, are worse off than they are" (Kılıçlı, 2003:3).

Their vulnerable position in the society heavily affected their choice of living together with other Turkish nationals. In Berlin, for instance, many Turkish families started to live in relatively cheap rundown areas, especially in Kreuzberg. "But gradually politicians started to express their dissatisfaction about the concentration of Turks in particular neighbourhoods such as Kreuzberg, claiming that this concentration of former guestworkers in particular areas might hinder their integration into the host society. This resulted in regulation limiting the moves of foreigners into 'concentrated' boroughs, including Kreuzberg" (Özüekren, Ergöz-Karahan, 2010:363).

1980 Coup D'etat in Turkey caused a flow of Turkish immigration seeking political asylum. Unlike the guest workers of the 1960s, there were no ready jobs waiting them in industrial sector. Although started from 1970s, increasing service sector job opportunities absorbed some of the new wave of Turkish immigrants in Germany. On the other hand, 1980s marked the beginning of the increasing number of Turks getting into various businesses as employers. The closure of the heavy industries after the 1980s helped the acceleration of this process too. In spatial terms, economically strengthened Turkish immigrants started expressed their demands more explicitly. Apart from housing needs, social, commercial, educational, and religious necessities of Turks in spatial terms put the pressures on both local and central governments. "Germany began to realise that the social consequences and aspects of migration had up until the mid to late 1980s not been considered. Play-schools, schools, public authorities as well as health service facilities found that they were not equipped to handle the special needs of this part of the population" (Kılıçlı, 2003:1).

The 1990s worked in two ways. Firstly, faith based organizations increased their activities among Turkish population. The dominant Sunni sect in favour of the faith based organizations provoked the others, namely Alevis. Secondly, Germany witnessed another flow of political asylum seekers escaping from ethnic based civil war in Turkey. Turkish society in Germany began to crack on the lines of ethnicity and religion while Germany was uniting. Besides, German unification, the rebuilding of the East Germany and the collapse of the Iron Curtain

released millions of people seeking and demanding westerns ways of life and welfare in Germany too. “An important dimension of social change among the Turkish population within Germany is the development of Turkish entrepreneurs which accelerated in the 1990s. Between the period 1985 to 2000 the number of Turkish entrepreneurs went from 22,000 to 59,500. This indicates an increase of 170 % equalling an average annual growth rate of 7 %”(Kılıçlı, 2003:2).

Europeans views on Islamic ethnic populations changed during the 2000s after the 9/11terrorist attacks, and USA gave a wake-up call to all European countries for closely monitoring Islamic populations. Besides, all host societies in Europe developed “Islamophobia” in various ways; Germany was no exception to this. Besides, expansion of the European Union to the ex-communist countries increased ethnic diversities in European Union. All of these put the Turkish population in a difficult position with various outcomes in terms of land use dynamics.

4. Land Use Impacts of Turkish Migration to German Cities

4.1. Research Methodology

Field research was conducted in two German cities, Dortmund and Wiesbaden, where Turkish nationals have been living in since the early 1960s. Dortmund is one of the large cities of Germany with nearly 600 000 population. Turkish nationals constitute about 5% of this total. Dortmund has historically been an industrial area but now it is home to a number of medium-sized information technology companies. Wiesbaden is a city in southwest Germany and the capital of the federal state of Hesse. It has about 270,000 inhabitants. Wiesbaden hosts a number of international companies with its German or European headquarters. Apart from service sector there is also an industrial park specialized inpharmaceutical and chemical industry.

Empirical basis of this study are qualitative in-depth interviews carried out with different representation groups of Turkish nationals living in Dortmund and Wiesbaden. The analysis of interviews concentrates on the question of whether the Turkish communities become inward looking and semi-open, restricting itself to its neighbourhoods after respective land use changes in Germany as ethnic stratification theory suggests or they have been spatially assimilated.

Totally 30 interviews were undertaken, 16 in Dortmund, and 14 in Wiesbaden between March 28–April 4, 2012. Some of the interviewees are individuals in a family (8 in Wiesbaden) or individuals (22 individuals) at traditional Turkish coffee-shops called “kıraathane” in Turkish. Generally, interviews were conducted with groups in round table fashion. Open questions were asked in an order while conserving about life in Germany. The interviewers, the second and the third author of this paper, set the stage by providing information about the purpose of the study. In order to settle a historical reference point in time for recalling the past, a short account of coming to Germany is demanded first. The aim of the first question is to mark a

reference point in time and form a retrospective timeline into the past. When the first round ends, an interviewee whose recall is more detailed is selected for the next question: where did you stay/live when you first came to Germany? As some of the interviewees who had difficulty in recalling the past seem to remember, the answer helped them recall the details of the past.

a. Wiesbaden

b. Wiesbaden

c. Dortmund

d. Dortmund

Figure 1 Scenes from interviews.

At that point, the questioning then goes to the quest of this paper: did you move to a new location in order to be close to other compatriots? If so, can you give the details? When a common ground is formed, questioning goes in order to explore further details: how did the land use in your environs changed in order to meet your cultural, social and other needs? Commercial and cultural as well as religious activities are more thoroughly scrutinized during the conversations. Some of the following questions probe group behaviour of Turkish

immigrants in the city. Whether ethnic or cultural alignment is an important factor of moving or engaging activities in the city or not is one aspect of probing questions in the round table conversations.

The rest of the conversations try to unearth intergenerational differences between first, second and third generations of Turkish ethnic population. Some of the observations are also carried out by the interviewers in the field. Families were instrumental in this, because generally three generations can be observed in family group gatherings.

4.2. Findings of Case Study

One of the most controversial issues in Germany regarding ethnic populations is the ghettoization of ethnic groups in the cities and emerging parallel society of Turkish population in Germany (Schönwalder and Söhn, 2009). As regards ghettoization, we have found no traces of residential areas predominantly populated by Turkish. There are different explanations. The first one is economical. The first comers never thought of living close by and forming Turkish neighbourhoods, because they always maintained their contacts at their work places. Instead they were keener to economize on living conditions in Germany, and transfer whatever saved to Turkey. Turkey is abundant of building investments of the first comers. Instead Turkish development is found on non-residential activities in the later years. Of course, there are minor differences between different households. As the first comers were mostly single persons, they prefer to live in “heim” guesthouses attached to the work places. When families are formed, an appropriate housing is found relative to the work location, because most workers were bounded by agreements of working pledges.

On the other hand, widespread automobile ownership in Germany made house locations relatively less important in the city. In the later years, life of the households generally centred on the work locations too, but less intensively than before. Care of the children, schooling of them increased daily household chores. Therefore, home location decisions become more complex in time. But in always, economizing on living conditions in Germany dominated all decisions. This was mostly due to temporary nature of working in Germany; many thought that they would work for several years in Germany, and return to Turkey relatively richer. When the nature of staying in Germany turned into permanent nature, the living in Germany demanded Turkish social and cultural alignments too. This changed the land use in various ways too.

During temporary states of mind in Germany, Turks did not integrated to the German society. Besides, relatively rural origin of the Turkish families in Germany prevented them from utilizing opportunities of a modern welfare state fully. Therefore, in all conversations the second generation is generally tagged as a problematic generation in various ways. Although decreased significantly in the third generation, problems of school drop-outs, drug use, petty crimes etc. were generally associated with Turkish youngsters.

But in terms of parallel societies, there are certain indications of emerging traces of parallel societies between Turks and Germans, at least in their minds. Regarding this, a cynical view has just begun to flourish among the Germans (Schönwalder and Söhn, 2009).This is mostly

due to the permanent nature of the Turkish ethnic population in Germany. However, we have found no traces of ethnic neighbourhood formation because of parallel societies in Germany.

In fact, parallel societies are maintained in dresses, living conditions, customs and mostly in religious practices. The psychological shift in the western societies after 9/11 terrorist attacks approached all Mohammedans, whether non-religious or religious, into potential terrorist. This has generally worked well for Islamic faith organizations in Germany. They were very successful in gaining clients from all sorts of Turkish people with different backgrounds as they found these organizations as the sole supporters of their "honourable" existence in Germany. Yes, contacts of Turkish population with the German population are gradually decreasing in terms of daily activities as Turkish run businesses increase in Germany. But this does not mean parallelism similar to black-white separation in North America.

Although there are no "Turkishtowns" similar to Chinatowns, one can find Turkish enclaves, generally formed around mosques. These enclaves include a *cami* (mosque) where prayers are carried out, lodging for priest, and commercial premises that support the enclave economically. In fact, this type of organizing commercial activities around religious activities, partially supporting them, has historical roots in Turkey known as '*vakif*' (trust funds) formations. These enclaves support Turkish ethnic population in various ways, and form islands or refuge sites as little Turkeys.

Most of these enclaves visited during field work economically sustain themselves by renting its non-religious parts to commercial activities. Enclaves include Turkish cafe shops for males called as "*kıraathane*", barber shop, retail shop etc. along with a religious site, which is mostly a mosque. Especially, a barber shop is very handy for Turks with short hair and beards styled in Turkish Sunni way. *Kıraathane* is place to chatter with fellow compatriots and have religious talks with others. Imam maintains strong ties with Turkish practicing religion. Central position of imam is inherited from pre-republican era and pre-modernization era. Imams in rural areas still have central position in maintaining social order. As the first comers are predominantly from rural areas, *imam* in a Turkish enclave is a cherry on the pie that supports and feeds Turkish nationals, especially the male first comers, with all sorts of religious information.

"*Kıraathane*" in these enclaves is the place where pious Turk can find Turkish tea and have a talk with fellow Muslims too. These Turkish style rest houses in Germany were rare in the past, all Turks were employed. Instead, there were Turkish style cafes serving alcohol, populated after work shifts. The number of these cafes increased after the influx of refugees seeking political asylum from 1980 coup d'état in Turkey. Retail shops in these claves predominantly offer products of Turkey and *halal* food. Effects of this are twofold. While commercial premises attract Turkish population to a certain extent, Turkish enclave guarantees and enjoys patronage to a certain extent, at least in certain products, from the Turkish population.

Another form of Turkish land use effect in German cities might be the formation of commercial stripes. From interviews, we have found that there is an ecological process in terms of land use dynamics regarding Turkish commercial stripes (along certain streets)

mainly starting from 1990s. This trend is generally started with the closure of heavy industries employing Turks. Most blue collar Turkish workers have switched to tertiary jobs or formed their own businesses targeting their compatriots.

The development is generally initiated by a grocery store or a supermarket. Entrance of a market operated by a Turk and offering various sorts of Turkish products, e.g. tea, feta cheese, olives, signifies a potential Turkish commercial development nearby. As bilingual market attracts all kinds of people, be they fluent in German or not, the street and its close vicinity becomes a potential customer base. Streets relatively accessible by Turkish population, scattered in the city, forms a comparative advantage in becoming a Turkish commercial stripe.

a. An old “heim”

b. Turkish supermarket in a Turkish Enclave

c. Turkish commercial stripe in Wiesbaden

d. Starting point of commercial stripe

e. Supermarket in commercial stripe

f. Turkish bakery in commercial stripe

Figure 2 Examples of Turkish land use effects.

These streets with central positions and relatively with low rent levels are potential stripes for Turkish commercial development. These streets are found to be generally in the transition areas from commercial zones to residential areas of the city. Turkish commercial stripes contain carpet shops, travel agencies, call centres, coffees, doner/kebab houses, garment shops, jewellery shops, photo shops, shops offering garment for special events, e.g., circumcision, haj, marriages, etc. Composition of these stripes is affected by the composition of the Turkish population directly.

Among these commercial uses, Turkish restaurants show a certain degree of freedom from this ecological process as they serve for all of the population. Similarly, shops that offer traditional artisanal goods such as kilims and carpets are also scattered in the city. Both of these commercial uses attract customers from all ethnic origins. On the other hand, shops that offer Islamic garments predominantly locate at Turkish commercial stripes. Uses that specialize on the population such as photography studios for special events also locate on these stripes. Commercial stripes follow ecological processes such as invasion and succession, competition and accommodation. One another finding is that initiation of the stripe formation with a grocery store/supermarket offers a potential development. As other commercial uses for Turkish ethnic population comes to the vicinity, commercial uses for German population begins to lose customer base, which is an indication of moving out from the street.

5. Concluding Remarks

The experience of ethnic minorities in western capitalist societies has shown an uneasy development pattern. Turkish minorities, the largest foreign population in European Countries (almost 5 million), are no exception in this regard. Their 50 years encounter demonstrate a line starting from total alien in an unknown environment to a rooted citizens on their own rights. Turks in Germany deserve much more scrutiny since nearly 3 million Turks live in Germany today.

Identity formation and its maintenance for migrant population have different features than that of people living in home countries. As discussed earlier, the procedure of identity formation can start as resistance identity and later turn into a project identity and finally by the enforcement of institutions of the society it becomes legitimizing identity. The position of Turkish citizens can be regarded as between the project identity and legitimizing identity since the enforcement process of institutions has not been finalised yet. This is partly because of the enormous differences between two different cultures (namely Muslim and Christian) and partly because of the ignorance of German policy makers about the nature of the identity formation pattern.

Similarly, today's spatial expression of Turkish identity in Germany can be considered neither spatial assimilation nor ethnic stratification. Their location preferences have always been dominated by economic concerns. As we mentioned before, there are no "Turkishtowns" similar to Chinatowns in German cities ethically segregated from the rest of the city and the society. In spite of this, spatial assimilation cannot be applied to Turkish minority either, since

they mostly live in spatial enclaves formed around mosques. This rather peculiar land use formation prevent Turkish minority to live in a so-called "parallel society" as well. The latest development, as Turks sustain their position economically in German soil and become business investors, which reveals itself in the emergence of commercial stripes neither jeopardise their cultural, religious or national identity, nor make them ethnically segregated.

In short, Turkish presence in Germany exemplifies rather different pattern than other minorities. This is partly because of strong relationship with home country and partly because of their fortified position in German society both economic and social terms established in time. Although there is a perception among Germans that Turks are living in a "parallel society", in reality this is not the case since Turks integrated into the social and economic life intensely. However, whether the role of the religious organisations and the hostility among some Germans could change this situation in time, still remains to be seen.

References

Castells, M., 1997, *The Power of Identity*, Oxford: Blackwell

Kılıçlı, A., 2003, "EU-Turkish Relations Dossier: Turkish Migrants in Germany, Prospects of Integration", *Interim Report submitted to Obs-Observatori de Política Exterior Europea (Observatory of European Foreign Policy)*

Lefèbvre, H., 1991, *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Massey, D., 1985, "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Emprical Review", *Sociology and Social Research*, 69 (3), pp.315-350

Massey, D., 1999, "Philosophy and Politics of Spatiality: Some Considerations", in *Power-Geometries and the Politics of Space-Time*, Heidelberg: Department of Geography, University of Heidelberg, pp. 27-42.

Özüekren, S. and Ergöz-Karahan, E., 2010, Housing Experiences of Turkish (Im)migrants in Berlin and Istanbul: Internal Differentiation and Segregation", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36 (2), pp. 355-372

Schönwalder, K. and Söhn, J., 2009, "Immigrants Settlement Structures in Germany: General Patterns and Urban Levels of Concentration of Major Groups", *Urban Studies*, 46(7), pp.1439—1460