

EVERYDAY URBAN PUBLIC SPACE



EVERYDAY URBAN PUBLIC SPACE

Turkish Immigrant Women's Perspective

ALLEDAAGSE STEDELIJKE OPENBARE RUIMTE

Perspectief van de Turkse Immigrante Vrouw

(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Universiteit Utrecht op gezag van de rector magnificus,
prof. dr. W.H. Gispen,
ingevolge het besluit van het college voor promoties
in het openbaar te verdedigen op
dinsdag 13 juni 2006 des middags te 12.45 uur

door

Eda Ünlü Yücesoy
geboren op 17 september 1970
te Kırıkkale, Turkije

Promotor: Professor Dr. A.M.J. Kreukels
Co-promotor: Dr. P.L.L.H. Deben

EVERYDAY URBAN PUBLIC SPACE

Turkish Immigrant Women's Perspective

EDA ÜNLÜ YÜCESOY



Het Spinhuis
2006

This publication have been made possible by:
Van Eesteren-Fluck en Van Lohuizen Stichting
Gemeente Enschede, Dienst Stedelijke Ontwikkeling en Beheer

Distribution in the USA, Canada, Latin-America and the UK
Transaction Publishers – www.transactionpub.com

ISBN 90 5589 273 4

© 2006, Het Spinhuis Publishers, Amsterdam

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, nor transmitted into a machine language without written permission from the publisher.

Correction of the English Text by Kathryn Kranzler
Dutch translation of the summary by Bart de Jong
Cover design by Seda Ünlü and Eda Ünlü-Yücesoy
Maps and graphics by Seda Ünlü and Eda Ünlü-Yücesoy
Photographs by Eda Ünlü-Yücesoy and Erwin Scholten (picture 8.1)
Typeset by BoekVorm, Amsterdam

Het Spinhuis Publishers, PO Box 960, 7301 BE Apeldoorn, The Netherlands, www.spinhuis.nl

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PREFACE & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Urban Planning and Urban Public Space	2
	Turkish Immigrant Women and Urban Public Space	4
	Terminology and Orientations	4
	Questions for Research	6
	Organization of the Book	7
2	WOMEN IN TURKISH SOCIETY	9
	Introduction	9
	Exploring the Social Constructions of Urban Public Space in Turkish Society	10
	Turkish Immigrants in Europe and the Netherlands	21
	Turkish Immigrants in Dutch Society	23
3	EVERYDAY URBAN PUBLIC SPACE	31
	Introduction	31
	Urban Public Space as a Social Construct	33
	The Everyday Life and Urban Public Space	36
	Spatial Practices and the Everyday Urban Public Space	39
	Boundaries and Urban Public Space	40
	Conclusion	47
4	A RELATIONAL APPROACH TO URBAN PUBLIC SPACE	49
	Introduction	49
	The Relational Approach	51
	Bringing Everyday Practices up to Urban Public Space	53
	Social Capital and Urban Public Space	56
	Habitus, Habitat and Urban Public Space	59
	Turkish Immigrant Women's Habitus	61
5	RESEARCH DESIGN AND INTRODUCTION TO THE CASE OF ENSCHEDE	63
	Introduction	63
	Qualitative Research Approach	63
	Case Study Research	65
	The Case of Enschede	68
	Conclusion	85

6	CATEGORIES AND URBAN PUBLIC SPACE USE	87
	Introduction	87
	Turkish Women and Their Role Repertoire	88
	Religious Affiliations; Alevi and Sunni Women	95
	Language, Media, and Travel; Orientations	97
	Social Networks	101
	Turkish Women’s Culture of Housing	106
	Conclusion	111
7	MAPPING SOCIAL RELATIONS IN URBAN PUBLIC SPACE	113
	Introduction	113
	Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft	114
	Navigating in Turkish Women’s Social Networks	115
	Placing Social Networks into the Everyday Urban Public Space	122
	Urban Ties and Urban Public Space	128
	Reflections on the Culture of Housing	130
8	CONSTRUCTING THE URBAN PUBLIC SPACE; BELONGING AND DIS-BELONGING	133
	Introduction	133
	The Home	134
	The Neighborhood	140
	The City	148
	Conclusion	158
9	CONCLUSION	161
	Introduction	161
	Relational Approach to Urban Public Space	162
	Categories of Turkish Immigrant Women and Use of Urban Public Spaces	164
	Relational Contexts and Spatial Practice	166
	Experiencing the Everyday Urban Public Space	168
	Concluding Notes	170
	ENDNOTES	173
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	179

LIST OF TABLES

2.1 Migration from Turkey: Migration Reason and Sex in 2002 (percentages)	24
2.2 Educational Attainment of Those between 15-64 Years-Old and Not-Having-Schooling in 2002 (percentages)	24
2.3 Educational Attainment of Turkish Immigrants in 2002 (percentages)	24
2.4 Comparing Socio-Economic Position of Turks in Dutch Cities (percentages)	26
2.5 Percentage of Turks Who Have Contacts in the Neighborhood with People of Their Own Ethnic Group or With Indigenous Dutch People by Municipality and Ethnic Group, 1998 (percentages)	27
5.1 Age Groups in Enschede (in percentages)	78
5.2 Spatial Distribution of Non-western Inhabitants in Enschede (higher than 26%)	80
5.3. Neighborhoods with High Turkish Concentration, Percentage of Social housing, and Economic Profile of Inhabitants	81

LIST OF FIGURES

3.1 Analytic representation of public-private continuum	96
7.1 Mapping social relations in urban public space	114
8.1 Categorization of urban public spaces in three spatial scales	134
8.2. Comparing Two Public Spaces in Enschede City Center	154

LIST OF MAPS

5.1 Location of Enschede	69
5.2 Phases of Enschede urban growth	70
5.3 Neighborhoods with high concentrations of non-western inhabitants in Enschede	80

LIST OF PHOTOS

5.1. Post-WW II Residential development in Enschede, Deppenbroek	73
5.2 Residential patterns in Wesselerbrink	76
5.3 Residential patterns in Wesselerbrink	76
8.1. The Square	155
8.2. The Market	156
8.3. Engagement in the neighborhood market, Wesselerbrink	156



PREFACE & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the last days of October 1999 when I arrived at the Netherlands, I was committed to the idea of studying urban public space for my Ph.D., yet my intentions were by far related to working on it as a social science research project and less so to studying Turkish immigrant women. The idea of studying 'urban public space' developed with time during my graduate studies at the Department of City Planning, Middle East Technical University in Ankara, while working on my master's thesis in urban design, searching for the relationship between different forms of physical and symbolic variety, characteristics of use and users in three residential areas of that city. During the two and a half years of my enrolment in the Ph.D. programme at the same university, I investigated 'urban public space.' I was encouraged to pursue academic training abroad to further my Ph.D. studies and I applied to Utrecht University. In my first days in Utrecht, I had proven theoretical insight from an urban design perspective and a will to study urban public space as a meeting place for all citizens in the city, where various cultural groups come together and interact. Looking back, however, I see that my view was naive and optimistic. Five years living in Enschede and working on this study turned out to be the most challenging and constructive phase in my life, where the realm of sociological studies and ethnographic research began to unfold, and my Dutch proficiency expanded. What I had previously conceived as a side work/supplement in my profession later became a new direction for it.

Starting with the preparation of a research plan, Ton Kreukels devoted a great amount of time and energy to help me find my way. I wish to express my gratitude to him as my *Promotor* for his invaluable supervision at every step of the research and completion of the final product. He followed the research closely and probed questions in our refreshing, challenging, and motivating meetings. His expert advice and critical comments were most inspiring and encouraging. Leon Deben joined this study in the later phases as my *Co-promotor*. Being a meritorious critic, he made a significant contribution to the study. I owe my sincere thanks to him for his careful reading, enthusiastic feedback on the research, and his excellent judgments for improving the quality of the study.

Many people and several institutions were involved over this long period of research and study. I would like to thank each of them for their support along the way.

First and foremost, it is heartrending that two people, Raci Bademli and Rene Verhoeff, who were involved substantially in different periods of my graduate career, were unable to share the final moment with me. With his academic and professional work, Raci Bademli was the role model for many young city planners at Middle East Technical University and I feel privileged to have worked with him as his Ph.D. student and a colleague. When I arrived at Utrecht University to pursue my graduate studies, Rene welcomed me sincerely. Without his encouragement and support, I would never have come this far.

I would like to express my appreciation to all my respondents for participating in this study, opening their homes to me not only as a researcher, but also as a guest and answering patiently my endless questions.

It would have been impossible to complete this study without the support of local institutions, in Enschede and Twente. I would like to acknowledge the role of Steunpunt Minderheden Overijssel, which provided me with not only access to several important local resources and key informants but also working space. Selma Süslüoğlu-Schuurman was exceptionally helpful from the first day I met her. Thank you for all your assistance and friendship. My sincere thanks are to Henriette Ruiz Peraita, for her endurance and help throughout the research, and to Marleen Visser, for her pleasant companionship, both as a researcher and friend. I would like to thank all of my SMO colleagues, who surrounded me warmly with their friendship. Christine Rischmann from the municipality of Enschede deserves special thanks for devoting her valuable time to arranging meetings and finding addresses for me. Many thanks should also go to the planners, administrators, social workers, and other persons I was able to meet in Enschede in preparing the research and later evaluating the results. I would also like to thank Utrecht University Planning Department's *Planologische Theorie Groep* for their interest and engagement in stimulating and constructive discussions on my research.

My heartfelt thanks are due to City and Regional Planning Department of Middle East Technical University, where I initiated this study in the first place. I am always honored to be a graduate of this Department and a colleague of its people. My friends and colleagues, especially Nil Duruöz Uzun and Petek Kovanci Shehrin, and members of the department continuously supported me in this long process.

A special word of thanks is due to Kathryn Kranzler, not only for providing effective and subtle assistance by improving the English in the manuscript, but also making this process smooth. It was a great opportunity and joy to work with her. I would also like to thank Bart de Jong for translating the summary into Dutch.

Herman Kok deserves special thanks for not only encouraging Can and me with the idea of pursuing our Ph.D. in the Netherlands, but also for his warm companionship in the memorable days in Budapest and Antwerp. I would like to express my gratitude to Peter Huijing and Trudi van Rooijen for their kind interest, support, and friendship, starting from the very first day that I met them in the Netherlands. I hope that our excursions in Turkey and the Netherlands will continue as before.

With friends, life in Enschede was never lonely. After moving to Istanbul, their wholehearted welcome each time I visited Enschede made me acknowledge my sec-

ond home there; Bedankt Laurens and Marieke, Anton and Anemiek, and Gracias Miguel and Sonia. Many thanks also to Mako, Karin, Arturo, Hendrik-Jan and Judith, for their warm friendship. I also owe special thanks to fellow Turkish Ph.D. students in Enschede, Caner, Huseyin and Belgin.

My *paranimfen*, Tuna and Marie-Jose, I am privileged with your invaluable friendship and support all these years, thank you very much for sharing this day with me.

Last and not least, I am indebted to my parents and my sister, for their dedicated support, understanding, encouragement, and endurance throughout my life; and to Can, for the infinite love and support he has given me ever since we met. His guitar tunes at home not only cheered me up during the long hours of work on this study, but provided the best companionship along the way.

This book is dedicated to my family and Can.

Eda Ünlü Yücesoy

April 2006, Istanbul



INTRODUCTION

Eminent in the contemporary debates in urban studies literature is the endurance of the urban public space. As the pace of economic and technological change accelerates, urban social and cultural life alters dramatically; space, time, and movement acquire new meanings. As urban landscapes, spatial expressions of economic, demographic, and technological developments change, so do the urban public space (Burgers, 2000), its arrangement, use and perception. The place of urban public space in this framework is ambivalent; while due to the increasing privatization and commercialization, the 'narrative of loss' has dominated the thinking of the urban public space, attraction and allure have turned the urban public space into a rewarding economic asset. The narrative of loss characterizes the loss of proper connection between places and the loss of meaning (a.o. Sennett, 1977; Sorkin, 1992; Zukin, 1995), signaled in the growth of consumer society with high surveillance and the privatization of all scales of social life. While the qualities of existing and new public spaces, such as being shared, sociable, and democratic, are largely questioned, the public/private distinction both literally and figuratively blurs in favor of the private. The publicness of urban public space is no longer an indispensable quality. In addition, new urban developments, the urban sprawl and changing expressions of commercial developments in the form of intra-urban thematic parks and shopping malls at the edge of cities, lead to a further rupture: the 'urban' and 'public space' do not necessarily call to each other.

The contemporary urban public space is seen as functioning in the opposite direction: rather than unite, bind, and proliferate, it is argued to be exclude, displace, and marginalize particular social groups, especially immigrants and ethnic minorities. Urban public space becomes fragmented, capsularized, and conflicted rather than shared, sociable, and democratic.

Placed in this lively debate, this study sets out to re-place the potential of urban public space as a unique spatial setting, framing a vision of social life in the city, a meeting place, and social staging ground. Urban public space cannot be seen as a void; on the contrary, it is a social construct, representing a variety of social and spatial practices, contesting and conflicting interests and actions, identity displays and struggles. The social construction of an urban public space creates a multivalent representation deriving from users' meanings, experiences, social and spatial practices. Users are social actors engaged in the continuous process of place-making, exploring, negotiating, and appropriating the urban public space. Experiencing the urban public space, then, becomes not a simple experience of a physical setting, but a distinc-

tive social reality. In that sense, with acknowledging the urban public space as a social construct, this study promotes it as a binding field, created by different users' co-presences.

Urban Planning and Urban Public Space

Three main lines of research can be identified concerning relationship of urban planning with public space, representing different ontologies of public space and different perspectives of handling the phenomenon and its foundation elements. First of all, public space may refer to physical space and to the variety of ways that it is configured. This perspective, represented with scholars mainly originated from architecture and urban design (a.o. Bentley et al., 1987; Vernez-Moudon, 1991; Cooper Marcus and Francis, 1990), sees the public space as an enclosure, i.e. what constitutes the public space and how its framing elements determine the level of use of the public space, and a container, i.e. the type, size, and kind of activities and how land-use patterns affect the state of the public space; the predominating land-use activity (commercial, ceremonial, recreational); the mode of its use, whether it is a place for staying in (activity space); or, a channel of movement for people or vehicles, or both; and the particular ways of enclosing and defining space resulting in outdoor public space, interiorized outdoor or indoor public space.

Second, public space represents a political space, as in the works of Arendt (1958) and Habermas (1991), a distinctive field of action. Here a viable public space is a prerequisite for a good functioning of civic society. Arendt's view of the public space in relation to citizenship and political community studies is based on the 'common', 'it is what we hold in common, and it is what we make for ourselves' (Glazer and Lilla, 1987). Public space in this sense has no specific location and is structured much more by institutions, organizations, and movements rather than by physical boundaries. Studies following Arendt's view demonstrate the important role of public space in the processes of active participation and collective decision making, since it is the especial arena of conceptualizations about and representations of the city relating to the identity of the city and citizens. Likewise, Habermas's public space is the sphere of communicative action, based on the critical and rational dialogue between free and equal citizens. Although this conception of public space is purely symbolic, public spaces -in the physical sense- become crucial manifestations of these places of meeting and dialogue between different cultural groups, diverse lifestyles, and diversities and, they can be manifested in marches, demonstrations, mass meetings, collective celebrations, as well as citizens meeting in cafés, clubs, and academies, in the city.

In addition to these two major lines of approaching public space, a third approach refers to interactional and experiential space, defined and mediated by social conventions, rules and regulations, and symbolic boundaries. Mainly developed by urban sociologists and geographers (Jacobs, 1961; Sennett, 1970, 1977, 1990; Lofland, 1973; Fyfe, 1998), public space is related first of all to sociability among citizens and it is a

sphere of broad and largely unplanned encounter. Here, urban public spaces are considered to be at the core of the urban experience; the parts of the city in which everybody can come together to meet, to communicate, and to conduct business, or just to enjoy the sights and sounds of the urban area, and to be anonymous in the crowd.

Following predominantly the third line of research, this study adopts an interface approach dealing with the spatial and social characteristics of urban public spaces from the users' perspective. Within this framework, two points are important in the analysis. The first one is the meanings of urban -physical- public space; the second, the patterns and characteristics of the social relationships of people who use and experience urban public spaces. The former express themselves in the meaning of publicness and privateness and in their representation as the main boundary constructions that are constantly defined and redefined by various public interactions that actively restructure the urban space. Public space, then, is not fixed in space and time, but constantly is subject to change as a result of the reorganization and reinterpretation of the physical space by different users. The latter, also in relation to the former, is related to the users' identifications, constructions, and experiences. Based on their interactions, people prefer some places, some attributes of these places, the publicness or privateness of these places for a desired activity or intercourse. The social construction of urban public space, the meaning and spatiality of publicness and privateness, is articulated in the spatial practices.

The very best urban public spaces, according to Worpole and Greenhalgh (1996), have rhythms and patterns of use of their own, being occupied at different times by quite different groups. Urban planners and designers have for a long time tried to introduce successful designs of urban public spaces for *all* people at large. The users of urban public spaces have considered as autonomous and rational individuals, therefore, general designs can be made to address *all* citizens as a broad homogenous overarching target group; particular cultures, the local or different characteristics of users have barely been taken into consideration. Yet, in the last two decades, urban planning has been more directed to 'managing our co-existence in shared space' (Healey, 1997, p. 3), acknowledging the multivalent and polyvocal urban lives. As it values multiple publics or heterogeneous public (Sandercock, 1998), a perceptive recognition of the characteristics of people whose attitudes and behaviors are different, divergent, and not predictable and definable in traditional ways has become crucial.

In this framework, the immigrant perspective of urban public space can make important contributions to the urban public space phenomenon. First of all, it challenges the contemporary image of simplistic public space into a polyvocal description of the ways people use and interact in public space. With this new narrative, the core characteristics of urban public space can be seen from a different light. Second, since urban public space is a social construct, various relational contexts produce various conceptions and interpretations, and accordingly various spatial practices. Understanding immigrants' conceptualizations and interpretations of urban public space can be seen as a potential for accommodating social exchange and social relations between them and other groups. And finally, in relation to the second one, the

immigrants' incorporation into the new setting can be traced with their patterns of use of urban public spaces. Degrees of attachment and associations with urban public space can give important clues about the immigrant life, which in turn provides the basis for social cohesion and integration into policies and programs.

Turkish Immigrant Women and Urban Public Space

Migration is, according to King (2003), a human link between places. It stretches particular forms of social relations across space; from social relations of production to personal social networks. Migration involves place, constant place-making process of immigrants. Migrants shape the nature of urban space in the cities in which they settle (King, 2003). It also challenges the use of urban public space, representing from changing streetscapes and shopping areas, for instance, ethnic shops and areas, to manifestations of cultural activities, such as festivals and parades. According to Esveldt and Traudes (2001), while most of the contact between Dutch natives and foreigners occurs at work, more than half of these encounters take place in the street. In that sense, analyzing Turkish immigrant women's use and appropriation of everyday urban public spaces reveals the potential for accommodating social exchange and social relations between them and others. Detailed insight into their spatial patterns of appropriating urban public space reveals the particular social and spatial contexts into which they are embedded. The positive or negative attitudes and preferences are framed in relation to these relational contexts. In addition, it is in these relational contexts that boundary definitions and frames of references are developed, leading to the various conceptions and interpretations, and accordingly various spatial practices, of Turkish women. Urban public spaces are places where they have also made social identifications and classifications of 'we' and 'they'. These identification and classification processes are continuous as the users' social constructs change over time in each place with other users. It is in the urban public spaces that they make major confrontations and negotiations with 'they': defining and redefining their place in the city and new society.

Analyzing immigrant women's conceptions and experiences of urban public space, challenges the contemporary image of simplistic public space in a polyvalent/multivalent description of the ways people use and interact in public space. With this new narrative, urban public space gains its core characteristics as places in principal open to everybody.

Terminology and Orientations

The everyday usage of the term 'urban public space' connotes to a large extent definitions based on legislative qualities of publicness and privateness. Since the open public parts of cities, streets, squares, parks, and playgrounds are all embraced in this definition, the physical demarcations of boundaries, ownership, and possession

make it legible for users. From the street in front of our house to public institutions, the urban public space signifies literally the parts of the urban area that are open and accessible to everyone. In this definition, public space is the opposite of private space, privately owned and/or controlled. This definition is quite functional, especially when the ontological differences are emphasized: public property or public good vs. private property or private good. However, urban public space also denotes a peculiar social and spatial setting, spaces of sociability where social encounter, can and do take place. Here publicness refers to co-presence and sociability and we can talk about a diffusive and mixture of overlapping of publicness and privateness.

In this sense, urban public space covers many kinds and degrees of publicness and privateness in relation to their functions in social life. Instead of a dichotomous relationship, Lofland (1998) proposes a trichotomous distinction; the public, the parochial, and the private. Parochial signifies “a sense of commonality among acquaintances and neighbors who are involved in interpersonal networks that are located within ‘communities’” (p. 10). For Lofland, while “the private” connotes household and intimate networks, such as friends and kin, “the parochial” represents neighborhood, workplace, or acquaintance networks, and “the public” is the world of the street, occupied by strangers (*ibid.*). Yet she also admits that this division is still far from matching the complexity of the real world. For the sake of precision of analysis, it can be best projected as they form a continuum, along which particular circumstances can be ordered, ranging from the more public to the more private. In that sense, urban public spaces cannot be defined as static objects, because of ownership or physical characteristics. On the other hand, social characteristics do accommodate publicness and privateness, and are decisive for the description of the urban public space; the proportions and densities of relationship types present signify the urban public space. A street can be a public space, but at the same time, when two friends meet and have a chat, for them, it is no longer a public setting. Thus, we experience the urban public space with varying degrees of publicness and privateness, based on our perceptions, conceptions, and the relational context. For Carr et al. (1992), the ‘publicness’ of spaces consists of five kinds of spatial rights: access as the right to enter and remain in a public space; freedom of action as the ability to carry on activities in the public space; claim as the ability to take over the space and resources in it; change as the ability to modify the environment; and ownership as the ultimate form of control.

In this framework, publicness and privateness form the major boundary definitions of social life. In the everyday routines, we live in and pass through these boundaries and accordingly spaces, and we feel and behave appropriate accordingly. In the daily life, we have learned to cross these spheres and adjust ourselves. Depending on the various forms of social relations and the variety of degrees of publicness and privateness, the urban public space takes on a moving, shifting, and fluid character.

Public spaces are places in which a range of people can interact with other people they do not necessarily know and in which they can engage a range of public and private activities. By urban public spaces, I refer to, like Lofland (1973, 1998), those areas of the city that are legibly open to everybody: streets, parks, and places of public

accommodation. In this sense, not only open-air public spaces, but also public buildings and public sectors of semi-private and semi-public buildings are also considered urban public spaces. In this sense, the definition of urban public space extends to the indoor spaces of consumerism and leisure, like shops, cafes, restaurants, theatres, and cinemas, as well as the institutional sectors of education, health, administration, care services, such as schools, hospitals, banks, and city hall. This conception incorporates ordinary urban public spaces on the agenda, the routine and banal places and related spatial behaviors that are experienced in everyday life.

Questions for Research

With reference to the general aim and the main themes of this study, the main research question is formulated as follows:

How are urban public spaces used and experienced by Turkish immigrant women?

This study aims at analyzing the use, experience, and appropriation of urban public space by Turkish immigrant women. Based on a qualitative research methodology, the case research is conducted in the city of Enschede, a mid-sized city in the east of the Netherlands. Under this formulation, the following three themes and related questions are identified.

A: The meanings and conceptions of urban public spaces are explored from a historical perspective. Past experiences with habits of use of public spaces are important to understand the processes of social relations influencing the patterns of use of urban public spaces.

A1. How are Turkish women's public space experiences shaped in time both in relation to specific historical background and to specific traditions?

B: In order to elaborate their spatial behavior, the second theme focuses on their social relations in Dutch society, social networks, habitus of social interactions, and qualities of relationships in which spatial behavior is embedded.

B1. How do Turkish women appropriate urban public spaces, in relation to different activities and different spheres of life? Which characteristics are important for them?

B2. How do the relational contexts in which Turkish women are embedded influence their spatial practices? What are the reflections of these contextualities?

C: Everyday experiences expose different constructions of urban public space and reflect inclusive or exclusive spatial practices. These daily experiences, formed in different spatial scales, reveal the spatiality of social identification, belongingness and dis-belongingness.

C1. Which characteristics of public spaces are important for Turkish women?

C2. How do Turkish women experience different scales of urban public spaces? How are they associated with urban public space?

Organization of the Book

This introduction is followed by a brief historical review on the social position of Turkish women, assessing the social, cultural, and political history of the women's issue in Turkish society and related conceptions of urban public spaces, starting from the Ottoman era to the present. While it builds on acknowledgement of Turkish women as social actors, the processes of social meaning attribution and social identification in relation to conceptions and perceptions of urban public spaces are revealed. Designed to provide an informative framework, Chapter Two also contextualizes Turkish immigrant women, giving an overview of their general characteristics in the Netherlands, of the urban public space phenomenon, providing background information for the Enschede case study.

The discussions in Chapter Three and Chapter Four form the theoretical and analytical framework. Chapter Three is about the everyday urban public space, a counter-reading to the demise of urban public space. Concomitant notions of urban public space as a social construct and the everyday are elaborated in order to recognize the variety of uses and users of urban public space. As the primary accounts of the relational approach of urban public space are seized, further discussions of this chapter operate towards a rather analytical analysis of the ontological qualities of the urban public space, giving more insight into the concepts of publicness and privateness as principal boundary constructions with reference to how they act to influence the way spatial contexts are created and represented. The theoretical analysis of the relational approach of urban public space is introduced in Chapter Four. Here, by building predominantly on the works of Charles Tilly and Pierre Bourdieu, the relational approach is promoted to analyze different constructions of urban public space through spatial behavior and activities that constitute everyday life. In the transition from the theoretical framework to the empirical analysis, Chapter Five expands upon the research design and the Enschede case study, elucidating the structure of the empirical analysis.

To look at the social construction of the everyday urban public space by Turkish women, in the first chapter of the empirical analysis, in Chapter Six, categories of Turkish women are exposed with reference to social identifications and interaction and different patterns of spatial behavior. Starting with the conventional categories of lifecycle and socio-economic position, the discussion proceeds to categorical differences in terms of religion and transnational processes. Later, the discussion gravitates to the context of social networks of Turkish immigrant women to elaborate how personal networks mark the boundaries of privateness and publicness and are articulated in various conceptions and experiences of the urban public space. Having argued these categories on individual and relational characteristics, this chapter closes with a more spatial analysis of Turkish women's culture of housing, the relationship between their habitus and habitat. Then, by undertaking an extended discussion of the Turkish women's social networks and ties, Chapter Seven focuses on the relational contexts, embodying and expressing Turkish women's social world, in order to unfold different constructions of the urban public space and related pat-

terns of spatial behavior. These relational contexts also expose their public social identities, reflected in diverse manners of use and appropriation, the nature of relations, and the kinds of activities in which they participate in the urban public space.

Chapter Eight dwells upon the Turkish women's everyday practices in different spatial scales, home, neighborhood and the city center, highlighting different constructions of urban public space as reflections of different formation of everyday belonging. The forms of belongingness and dis-belongingness are articulated in the relational construction of everyday urban public spaces, in which the boundaries of use and appropriation are continuously constructed, negotiated, re-constructed, and expressed. Chapter Nine, the last chapter, evaluates the general outcomes of the study and underlines the importance of further interpretation in a variety of fields of research and policy.

WOMEN IN TURKISH SOCIETY

Introduction

When people talk about Turkish women who have migrated, they concentrate on differences, such as the headscarf, and look upon them as beings outside any historical development, as slaves of tradition. When, for example, a ‘Turkish girl’ is mentioned, everyone knows for a fact that they are ‘locked up at home’, that they are ‘virgins when they marry’, and that they cannot attend school because they must look after their younger brothers and sisters. This stereotyping of girls or young women from Turkey means that if they dress differently from the way people expect them to, if they do not wear a headscarf, have blue eyes or an interesting job, they are described as ‘not typical’ or ‘already integrated’. It seems almost impossible for a Turkish woman to define herself in a way that does not correspond to a stereotype (Akkent, 1995, p. vii).

The term ‘Turkish immigrant woman’ often implies a cultural reference, representing a specific social category of passive, needy, and backward woman and disregarding their diversity. At the same time, this reference assumes that they are victims of the cultural and historical processes and restrictive traditions, which have a uniform influence on them. In that sense, their disadvantaged positions are seen as a consequence of Islamic culture, traditions, and strong community structures, which are to a certain extent taken for granted to understand their spatial behavior patterns. This study, however, takes a different position. Rather than seeing them as a totality and a homogeneous group, it builds on studying women as active social actors in every social process, constructing and sustaining their everyday lives, even if they are not always conscious and purposeful in their actions.

Since this study approaches urban public spaces as social constructs that are formed, developed, sustained and/or abandoned in relation to a variety of social, cultural, political, and historical processes, the recognition of women’s roles as social actors in these processes is important. Due to this, the following part contextualizes historical and political processes of social meaning attribution and identification in relation to conceptions and perceptions of urban public spaces.

Designed to provide an informative framework, this chapter is divided into two parts. In the first part, I shall briefly discuss the representation of urban public spaces and related conceptions in Turkish society, starting from the Ottoman era to the present. The historical roots of social conceptions and perceptions of urban public spaces in relation to the position of women in Turkish society are introduced con-

cisely. However, it should be mentioned that covering all the historical, political, social, cultural, and economic processes and transformations with which women in Turkish society have been faced from the second half of the nineteenth century until today would be an impossible task for this study to offer. As such, it only offers an introductory framework with which to observe how the women's issue in Turkish society has evolved and how a variety of discourses have been influential on Turkish women. It also represents changing discourses about the 'Turkish woman'; how tensions between Westernists and Traditionalists on national advancement and cultural change have been closely linked to the 'woman' issues in Turkish society and have constantly used the woman's issue in a symbolic manner.

In the second part, the discussion proceeds to the Dutch context, in which Turkish women act as an immigrant category. It should be noted that discussions in the two parts are contextually different, therefore there is a separate concluding text at the end of each part. While the former builds on a social-historical framework starting from the late Ottoman period to the present day, the latter is rather a site-specific characterization of Turkish women. Yet their collaboration helps to form a hermeneutic ground for the analysis of Turkish women's spatial behavior patterns in the urban public spaces.

Exploring the Social Constructions of Urban Public Space in Turkish Society

Until the beginning of the twentieth century, Islamic principles and regulations based on Islamic law governed Ottoman social life. In the Islamic tradition, the male and female spheres and spaces were quite distinct and differentiated from each other. Islamic cities, as Amirahmadi and Razavi (1993) state, were generally "constituted on the basis of patrimonial authority, religious, cultic, and ethnic affiliations, professional and community organizations, and strict gender segregation" (Zubaida, 1989, cited in Amirahmadi and Razavi, 1993, p. 2). The precise social division was exposed and marked by a set of architectural and spatial necessities and distinctions. "What Islam required was some way of dividing functions and places on the basis of gender and then of creating a visual screen between them" (Abu-Lughod, 1993, p. 20) The residential quarters with dead-end streets, blind courtyards, neighborhood passageways represented 'private' (female), on the other hand, commercial quarters, the mosque, and the bazaar represent 'public' (male). Thus, public and private spaces were differentiated in relation to descriptions/ conceptions of male and female spaces. Men, who were directly associated with the "public" were at the same time related to the notions of equality, reciprocity, unity, aggregation, brotherhood, trust, honor and the like. Women, on the other hand, were naturally the outsiders of this male "public" and were associated with isolating and excluding concepts, such as inequality, lack of reciprocity, segregation, suspicion, and inferiority (Mernissi, 1985). These reverse notions suggest a social division according to sex, which, as Mernissi (1985) also states, reflects the division between those who hold authority and those who do not, those who hold spiritual powers and those who do not. In the same

vein, Göle (1999) maintains that it is more appropriate to suggest that the Islamic social organization was based on the limitation and prohibition of social encounters and promiscuity between the sexes, rather than on the exclusion of women.

Studies on a general Islamic city concept are criticized strongly especially after the influential book of Edward Said's *Orientalism*, as leading to homogenous images of Muslim society and urbanism. Said (1979) calls into question the underlying assumptions that interpret the Orient as opposite of the Western world, a discursive reality in which the actual Orient is absent, and rather is presented by the West. For him, this homogenizing, totalizing discourse creates impressions and representations of a whole, such as Arabs and Muslims, and at the same time, binary oppositions. Largely ignoring the dynamic variety of human experience, Said argues that this conception leads to biological generalizations, cultural constructions, and racial and religious prejudices. Indeed, increasingly scholars (Amirahmadi and Razavi, 1993; Abu-Lughod, 1993; Yerasimos, 1996) argue that because of the nature of Islamic law, which is based on the Qur'an, sayings of the prophet, and interpretations of the religious intellectuals, every Muslim society develops its own regulatory frameworks. In that sense, for the analysis Turkish women's conceptions of public spaces, we can no longer merely assume that only Islamic traditions were affluent. One has to take into account the particularities and variations in Turkish society and cultural traditions¹.

Women in the Ottoman period

The Western portrayal of the Ottoman Turkish woman, if not completely, was associated closely with the Harem. Western writers, painters, and travelers were fascinated by the plethoric exoticism (Schick, 1998) of the Harem as a place of female oppression, where women lacked power and were slaves and men were forbidden. The term 'harem' simply refers to the domestic space of the Ottoman family, the 'home', where seclusion and privacy both for men and women were maintained. In fact, it was brought into the life of the Ottoman ruling class after the conquest of Constantinople (1453), as a part of the adaptation of bureaucratic and institutional characteristics of Byzantine society². In the Harem life, women could only meet with other women and had social contact with only men from their own families. The social life of women in the Harem was limited to reproduction and domestic labor. It should be noted here that Harems were only common among the wealthy and upper class in Istanbul, and unlike the common belief, it did not penetrate to the rural areas in Ottoman society. Çaha (1993) states that the adoption of Harem institution also can be seen as a strategy for the establishment of a strong state and social order, in such a way that it justifies the complete exclusion of women from social and economic life.

A parallel and functional equivalent of the private and public domains can be observed in the separation of *mahrem* from *namahrem* in the Islamic tradition (Ilyasoğlu, 1998). The duality of *mahrem/namahrem* connotes the formulation of the sex roles and sex mores, sorting out the forbidden/allowed for both men and women. From choosing legitimate partners for marriage to identifying strangers

with whom one should avoid contact, the duality encircles a lawful domain where the interactions of men and women are regulated. “The visibility of women outside the *mahrem* (i.e. private, my addition) sphere and the risk of exposure to the sight of men were perceived as the causes of ‘intrigues’ that violate the order of societies in which Islamic culture predominates” (Göle, 1999, p. 72).

In Ottoman society, women as a social category received a great deal of attention from the state authority (Çaha, 1993). In the sixteenth century, a large number of imperial edicts were proclaimed to regulate women’s lives mainly in public spaces with an extensive range of concerns: the clothes they wore, their appearance in public, and their relations with men in their social lives. One imperial edict on the regulations of dress in the public spaces of Istanbul says:

...certain brazen women have begun to be seen in the streets in finery, affecting all kinds of innovations in their garments and giving strange bizarre shapes to their head-dress in imitation of shameless women, in order to corrupt the population. Their audacity in lifting the veil of virtue in defiance of decrees to the contrary: their improvisation of modes of dress, which violate all notions of propriety (*i.e. modesty; as the most important principle of Islam, my addition*); and appearance in diverse unseemly costumes, has reached the stage where even women of virtue have begun to fall under their influence. These outlandish clothes are prohibited... If any woman is seen out in the streets or in excursion places wearing one of these newfangled *feraje* with a white collar, the collar will be cut there and then in public, and if any person persists in wearing them and offends for a second or third time, they will be exiled to the provinces. (Tuğlacı 1985, cited in Çaha, 1993, pp. 96-97)

Through the imperial edicts, also the action spaces –the radius of movement in activity areas- of women were defined. The meeting places of man and women in Istanbul were organized through those imperial edicts in a way that it was forbidden for women to go to distant leisure and recreation places and excursions of young women together with young men in boats, as well as visits to the ‘clotted-cream shops’ and promenading. The edict related to the ban to go to distant amusement places was worded as follows:

From now on, women are prohibited to go to distant amusement places in carriages. Those women who go to these places, despite the prohibition, and those men who take them with their cabs, will be exiled from Istanbul (Koçu, 1972, cited in Çaha, 1993, p. 97).

In another edict, to the boat officer of Istanbul, it was declared that “as announced before, confine the excursion of young women together with boys in boats and proclaim this edict to all the boatmen” (Koçu, 1972, cited in Çaha, 1993, p. 98). These imperial edicts were reinforced and justified through the Islamic doctrines in order to convince people and were significantly effective in the streets of Istanbul, particularly influencing Muslim women with their styles of clothing.

The last decades of the nineteenth century witnessed a series of changes in the Ottoman society mainly because of the modernization efforts of the state. With the

proclamation of a reform charter, known as the *Tanzimat* (1839), a purposive modernization process of the Ottoman Empire began. In this framework, the position of Ottoman women in society, woman's social condition and role, started to be questioned in the framework of "the efforts of the government to create new institutions with the aim of educating women, and the roles given to women in modernization of the Ottoman society" (Çaha, 1993, p. 102). Significant attention was given to the education of women. Although there were women writers, poets, calligraphers, as well as founders of libraries, primary and religious schools, and *wakf's* (religious foundations), who from time to time challenged the state authority and were active in the public life of Ottoman society, the education of Ottoman women was quite limited. They could have education only up to the age of puberty and only in the specific primary schools³, which were only found in the main urban centers.

With the initiation of modernization goals and the official recognition of the importance of women's education and participation in public life, the regulation of education was improved in favor of women; women's high schools, mainly vocational, and universities were established, and women could be employed or work voluntarily. Most importantly, the old imperial edicts which had organized women's daily life and activity spaces were abolished. In addition, legal position of Ottoman women improved with regulatory changes such as in the Land (1858) and Civic (1857) Codes. With these improvements, especially in Istanbul and in the main urban centers, the traditional social roles of Turkish women started to change. It should be noted that these changes were very influential for women who were living in Istanbul and the larger urban centers in the Empire. Since the women who were living in urban areas were subjected to the official restrictions through imperial edicts and regulations, they were the ones who suffered most. Consequently, they had wholeheartedly embraced these changes⁴.

With assuring women's education, their being integrated into social life and their visibility in the streets, the Ottoman political elite of that time aimed at creating a symbolic link with Western civilization and overcoming the existing social and cultural problems. It should be noted that this modernization project was not welcomed by all segments of the population, but the opportunities that it created allowed the public to question and discuss its implications (Arat, 1998). In the last part of the Ottoman period, the women's issue was seen as the decisive factor of the political duality that the Empire had to face, Islam/the West or traditional/modern. Göle (1999) rightly argues that the position of women is the determining factor of the dualities, such as Islam/ the West, traditional/ modern, equality/ difference, and public/ private. "While for the Westernists equality between sexes and the participation of liberated women in the public realm is a prerequisite of 'social development', for the Islamists, the exit of women from private life, *mabrem*, is an attempt to undermine existing communitarian rules, which may result in the moral decay of society" (p. 30).

The Westernists attacked the existing Islamic law and Islamic tradition and declared that it should be replaced by a completely new western and modern one, giving equality to women. They idealized the future of Turkish society on Turkish

women, accentuating the familial roles and promoting women's new roles in public life. Some moderate ones gave importance to the adaptation of technical aspects of western civilization and saw that the inferior position of women originated not from Islam but from the present conditions of Ottoman society. On the other hand, Traditionalists strongly argued that society should immediately return to Islamic law and the education of women must not serve for their being articulated into public life but rather for raising more religious generations at home. Therefore, they supported the restriction of women in the private sphere, as the central keepers of the secret life of the family (Çaha, 1993). Although the developments in the first part of the twentieth century had important effects on the structure of society and the position of women, the opposition among Westernists and Traditionalists was manifested continuously in debates and survived in politics and women's issues.

Women in the early Republican period

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Turkish society experienced a series of radical changes, where the quite long lasting -600 year- Ottoman period ended and a new Republic (1923) was established; the national identity of the new state was declared as Anatolian Turkish, and the political structure was announced as Republican, Secular, and Democratic. The major concern of the new government was to create a modern nation with new cultural values and norms, which were based on Western culture and truly rejection of the Ottoman tradition. In this sense, the liberation of Turkish women became the main goal of the modern Turkish state and women's roles in all spheres of life were affected.

Göle (1999) argues that the new government considered women as agents to reach Western civilization. They would symbolize modern Turkey in the international arena and would raise children who would carry the Republic forward to catch up with advanced societies. New regulations concerning women's position in society were taken as a symbol of being westernized and as an indicator of a radical break from the traditional life. In order to accelerate the new reforms and regulations, their main aim was to make women gain a 'social visibility'. "The visibility of women in the urban arena and their companionship with men beyond the confinements of 'isolation' and segregation, the organization of dances, visits to confectioners' shops in early evenings, riding horses, and similar 'foreign' customs were all appreciated and constituted the new features of the early republic" (ibid., p. 65). Changes in social visibility can be portrayed as re-regulation of the boundaries of *mahrem/namahrem*, the private and public, domains. The new Turkish state encouraged women to change their physical appearance in public with the abolition of the dress codes (removal of the veil), and to expose themselves in urban and public spaces with the companionship of men and women in the same space.

Women's participation in public life and their appearance in social life signified the consolidation of civilization. Women's separation from their domestic life and the abolition of previous gender boundaries meant that the life, which had been regulated by Islam, began to come under the influence of Western values (Çaha, 1993).

The concepts that liberated women from the old traditional values and norms, and women who approved of the modern way of life, were often associated with the 'civilized', whereas the opposite way of life was labeled 'uncivilized'. While a combination of images of the new Turkish woman was produced by the new government, such as 'an educated professional woman' at work, 'a socially active organizing woman' as a member of social clubs, 'a biologically functioning woman' in the family fulfilling reproductive responsibilities as a mother and wife, the social and public roles of woman were considered superior to the traditional private duties (Durakbaşa, 1998). Women's education and paid employment outside the home were regarded as the only ways to intervene in the gender segregation and traditional views on women.

The late Ottoman and early Republican times brought important social and cultural changes, which directly affected women's lives. The pace of change was rapid, especially in Republican times and many Turkish women succeeded in taking part in the economy and obtained education. The reforms pertained most effectively to legal and formal aspects of social life and were able to change the roles, life styles and status of women, especially in urban areas and the relatively higher social classes. The government expected that "elite women residing in large cities were to be the model of modern women for rural women to emulate" (Erman, 2003, p. 672). However, the reforms were not extensive and lead to according to Incirlioğlu (1998), the broadening polarization of the Western/modern/civilized and Muslim/traditional/uncivilized with the 'rural versus urban' dichotomization, appearing as "two distinct images: the underdeveloped, uneducated, religious, traditional, village women – oppressed and repressed at different levels – and the Westernized, educated, secular, modern, city women" (p. 218).

Women in Turkish society today

The reforms and laws enacted in relation to the foundation of new Turkish Republic aimed at the emancipation of women. In 1927, only 4.7% of Turkish women were literate, while the rate for men was 17.4%. These percentages increased tremendously in 1985; 68% for women and 86% for men. With the initiation of the education campaign in the early years of the Republic, opportunities in education and employment began to be provided to women and in the case of elite women, higher education and careers were even demanded. However, the effects of these reforms were limited mostly to upper and middle-class women living in large cities (Erman, 2003). Women living in rural areas, particularly in rural eastern and south-eastern Anatolia lacked the opportunity to participate in modernizing Turkey. Despite the efforts of some educated women who took the missionary role of educating women in the more isolated regions, the gap between the educated, modernized, professional women living in the big cities and the illiterate women living in villages has widened (ibid.). "Disparities between the urban centres and rural areas, between the developed western and the underdeveloped eastern regions, and between the social classes still determine women's educational opportunities" (ibid., pp. 674-675). For

example, attendance in middle school for girls living in cities is 38.71%, whereas for those living in villages, it is 29.64%. In addition, although primary school education for girls became obligatory nationwide, almost one fourth of adult Turkish women are still illiterate. Illiteracy among women is mostly found in rural areas of the eastern and south-eastern provinces. In addition, after the eight decades of the Republican period, it can be argued that women's participation in the educational system still lags far behind men's⁶.

Some scholars (Erman, 2003; Çaha, 1993; Göle 1999; Kandiyoti, 1991) argue that although the Republican government aimed at emancipation of women, education in traditional gender roles continued to be encouraged by the state. For example, the Girls' Institutes, which provided advanced study for women graduates of vocational schools, were established in 1945 to improve their skills in cooking, sewing, and the like, and to prepare them for their roles as wives and mothers in the modern world (Erman, 2003). Conceivably this is the reason that Turkish women at work occupy mostly jobs that are extension of domestic work and motherhood⁷. On the other hand, a recent study shows that the majority of employed women work because of economic reasons, otherwise, they wish to leave their jobs. Education, as an occupational accomplishment, is often viewed as a means to achieve social mobility, rather than economic security (ibid.).

Today, the participation of women in the labor force is low. Only 34% of the female population participates in the labor force, versus 75.3% of men (SIS, 1998). According to the labor registrations, 15.2% of women living in urban areas are in the labor force, while in the rural areas, this rate increases to 44.4%. Erman (2003) rightly states that these figures do not cover women who are working in the informal sector in big cities. Women work mostly in agriculture (70%), then second in service sectors (19.4%) and finally, in industry (10.6%). In rural areas, almost 80% of women work as unpaid family laborers in the fields as an extension of their housework. In urban areas, however, women have more opportunities and more variety in the types of jobs they can obtain. Educated, professional women⁸ hold important posts in both public and private sectors, in the arts and sciences.

Following Tekeli (1995), three broad groups, with regard to social-cultural orientation, can be identified in today's Turkish society. The first group is the traditional rural culture, in which the remnants of a feudal world-view are still effective. The status of women, in this culture, is generally low and the family –in most cases, the extended family- does not accord children the right to determine their own future. Social values keep both the family and the individual under strict control. The classic patriarchy, which is characterized by “extremely restricted codes of behavior for women, rigid gender segregation and a powerful ideology linking family honor to female virtue” (Erman 2003, cited from Moghadam, 1993, p. 672) is the dominant feature of this group.

The second group consists of the urban segments of society, which have more or less internalized modern/Western values. This group can be seen as the opposite of the first one, since the family and the individual appear to have more autonomy and women have achieved a more equal status with men.

The third cultural group, called the 'new urban' by Tekeli (1995), sits at the intersection of traditional and modern groups. This group is represented largely by rural-urban immigrants, who have left the village and traditional lifestyle, yet are unable to leave behind their traditional culture and relations. Especially, migrant women, who came to the big cities for better lives as a result of rural-urban migration, are unable to break the traditional village life in the city (Erman, 2001b). On the one hand, they prefer the city to the village, saying that city women are freed from the tiring dirty work of the village as well as from its strict social control and they want to move to the city to become housewives in nuclear families. On the other hand, since most migrant women have limited education and work in unskilled, low-paid jobs without job security, it becomes very difficult to surmount prevailing traditions. In that sense, employment brings very limited autonomy and power. Erman (2001b) shows in her research on rural-urban migration in Turkey that patriarchal structures prevail in the city through various strategies:

... by presenting the city as a threat to the morals of the family and to the traditional notion of women's 'honor', patriarchy tries to contain women inside their migrant communities, and by defining women's employment as insignificant, and as an extension of their role as housewives, it renders women's economic contributions to their families invisible. ... migrant communities with their own cultures and locally-embedded set of social relations, the housewife ideology, and the social constructions of women's paid and unpaid work play a significant role in the reproduction of traditional patriarchy in the city" (ibid., p.130).

In addition, as the people from the same region cluster in the same urban neighborhoods, they create the patriarchal village culture in the city, complete with the social control of relatives and neighbors over "their" women (ibid.). Within this group, women and children are subjected to social and familial pressures that are much more severe than those experienced in the first group, the rural culture. The value conflicts, contradictions, and ruptures become more apparent. As Kağıtçıbaşı (1975) argues, the deeply remaining social tradition in the unconscious minds of women in the urban context creates a form of identity and value crisis. Being mismatched with the modern norms and values, being an autonomous individual becomes a negative notion.

Another important process that needs to be discussed in this discussion is the growing prominence of Islamic radicalism, which has taken place in the 1980s not only in Turkey but also in other parts of the world, and its influence on Turkish society. The already established struggle between Westernists and Traditionalists has become more and more pronounced in the form of Modernists versus Islamists. Particularly starting with the 1980s, although contradicting the former relative de-Islamicization of Turkish society, the Islamic radicalism and related emergence of recognition claims to become one of the most striking features of Turkish society. A significant number of women have chosen to adopt a more traditional Islamic role and returned to a more orthodox Muslim life. Moreover, Acar (1995) argues that the contradiction of the family life with the role imposed upon women in the public life

has caused some women to turn back to Islam and the veil. Some women assert that the past reforms gave harm to women and men by minimizing the role Islam should be playing in their lives. Islamist women appeared as a separate act group and became visible in their demonstrations, protesting against the state's ban on wearing the *turban* (the headscarf) in official places, including universities. With such protests, many traditional, lower middle class women became active in the public realm, which was seen as a genuine men's sphere by the Traditionalists (Erman, 2003).

A few concluding remarks can be made about the Turkish family. Tekeli (1995) sees Turkish society quite differently from Western societies in terms of the stability and power of this institution. The Turkish family is often characterized as being authoritarian and patriarchal; especially rural or low-income families are described as having clear role differentiation, the supremacy of male over female family members, and a well-established power in the hands of the father. In general, marriage is seen as the key to founding a family. The average age at marriage is especially low in the rural areas. Generally speaking, traditional values that organize relations between men and women still shape the marriage institution. The most widespread form of marriage is the arranged marriage, sometimes also called marriage based on viewing the bride⁹. On the other hand, marriage based on mutual arrangement between the bride and the groom is quite rare and only specific to urban culture. Today, the majority of Turkish families live in nuclear households. The patriarchal-extended families, though few number, can be found mainly in the Black Sea region and Central and Eastern regions (Timur, 1972). Another substantial family formation is the transient-extended¹⁰ family. Both extended family types are characterized as three-generation families, but the difference comes from who the head of the family is, the father or the son. Due to the conventional association between economic resources and authority, power and social status are concentrated in the hands of the male heads of the households. Some scholars (Tekeli, 1995; Kandiyoti, 1995) argue that the Turkish family is subjected to change; many women support the idea of sharing housework between men and women and have their own incomes. They become active in politics, contrary to the traditional dictum 'women should be busy with their homes and leave political matters to men'. Although in the nuclear family, husband-wife relations are relatively more egalitarian in participating in the decision making, the most universal characteristic of all types of Turkish families seem to be the subordination of women (Timur, 1972). Patriarchal relations dominate inter- and intra-family relations. Although the nuclear family has become the norm, as Tekeli (1995) argues, the ideal of the extended family is still alive, since most people tend to include their relatives in social events and leisure activities and display solidarity with them.

In addition, as an important and distinctive feature, to Ortaylı (2006), in the traditional social structure, the Turkish family was embraced by the *mahalle* (neighborhood) in a sense that the family was part of the neighborhood as a distinct administrative unit which had its own social, legal, and economic regulations, as well as calamity and public order instruments. Residing in a neighborhood was only possible with the consent of all the neighbors. In the case of violation of social

codes, an unwilling deportation was possible. A consistent and uniform organization was aimed to create and sustain harmonious neighborhoods. In the period starting with the *Tanzimat*, the neighborhood unit lost all of its legal and economic status, yet with regard to social regulations, even in some parts of the big cities, they remain to this day.

Traditional and Modern Urban Public Spaces

The establishment of the Turkish Republic was the instance of a fundamental break with the past forms of society and caused the abolition of a number of elements of the traditional society. Modernization involved a process of secularization and that meant leaving behind the traditional, religious life style. Many traditional elements are still in the process of disintegration, yet some maintain their value in some segments of society. A modern discourse on woman has emerged, but it overlays rather than displaces the old classical and traditional formulations and relations of gender.

In the traditional Ottoman city, as easily observed in the configuration of streets, such as cul-de-sacs, blind alleys, the conflict between private and non-private¹¹ space seemed to have been resolved in favor of the private and left to the spontaneous activities of the inhabitants (Kuban, 1996). The organic street pattern of the pedestrian city can be considered as the clearest expression of its socio-cultural structure; inhabitants did not have specific places to socialize or being in public. Neighborhoods, as enclosed spaces of different religions and religious sects, can be considered as spaces of 'an introverted religious culture' (Işın, 2001). Organized around a religious, cultural or ethnic identity, religious communities were housed in different neighborhoods. Established as small-scale residential quarters, neighborhoods were also autonomous administrative units. The division of the urban area into neighborhoods can be seen as a practical measure aimed at preserving the integrity of the religion (Işın, 2001), but more importantly, with eliminating any contact between different ethnic groups, a cohesive closed community and durable social order of its own were almost guaranteed. In the Ottoman neighborhoods, the public spaces devised for the gathering of crowds were highly gendered. The courtyards of the mosques and coffeehouses were only for men, the environs of fountains and housework places were for women. It was also possible to see women around the bazaars, market places, and religious tombs, either accompanied by male members of the family or in group. In that sense, Ortaylı (2006) argues that although the public visibility of women was low, their spatial activity patterns were diverse and dispersed in relation to conduct of daily household chores.

Two important places of social gathering for male inhabitants were placed in the neighborhood centre: the mosque and the coffeehouse. After the daily ritual of prayer, a visit to the coffeehouse was also a daily ritual for men, since the coffeehouse was a source of information, especially when illiteracy rates were high and other means of communication were scarce. Rumors, daily matters of politics and life were shared. They were the places where cultural values and norms were reproduced, ethi-

cal, social, and even political subjects /matters were discussed. Although the popularity of coffeehouses diminished over time, they are still popular in rural areas.

As far as a public, social meeting, space is concerned in the urban environment, perhaps *mesira*² grounds can be counted as representative. The *mesira* grounds were located on the outskirts of the city, distant open green fields for recreation. They were “anonymously appointed and partially organized public grounds” (Aslanoğlu-Evyapan, 1993, p.1). Citizens visited the *mesira* grounds in groups; public places for collective activity. The way people entertained themselves at *mesira* grounds was not individualistic, instead the aim of such gathering was to spend time collectively with a group of people from the same socio-cultural background.

With the modernization efforts of the state in the last decades of the nineteenth century, urbanization in the Ottoman Empire accelerated, especially in Istanbul, and adopting a European life style became the vogue. Changes in the daily life started to be visible in the neighborhoods and districts, which previously had been enclosed spaces where daily life survived within closed communities. Before the nineteenth century, the neighborhoods had been quite homogeneous in structure, in which “Islam, Christianity, and Judaism were the factor that demarcated everyday life into basically separate living spaces; meanwhile, communities of people from different sects of the same religion also led to the emergence of everyday life an even narrower ghetto phenomenon” (İşin, 2001, p.74) on the neighborhood scale. One of the main consequences of modernization efforts was the integration of Muslim and non-Muslim populations. As previous restrictions in social life were mostly abolished, different ethnic groups, living in their own districts and having distinct religious identities, could all mix and constitute a new daily routine (Uludağ, 1998). Mingling Muslim and non-Muslim populations especially affected the young and women, who were attracted to the ‘chic’ and modern quarters full of new social practices and experiences in hotel lobbies, restaurants, theatres, cafes, or parks. Yet it should be noted that this transformation did not spread throughout the entire city of Istanbul or to other big cities. Old customs and traditional lifestyles were alive in some other districts. However, this integration created a cultural transformation and a new dialogue among inhabitants of the city, which consequently led to new conceptions of the public and private spheres.

Another reflection of the modernization period was the first appearance of public spaces in the modern sense of the word. Urban public parks, resembling the Western counterparts of the ‘park movement’, began to appear alongside the *mesira* (Aslanoğlu-Evyapan, 1993). In the modernization period, the bureaucratic elite and the upper-class society in the Ottoman cities tried to emulate the Europeanized life style, as the Ottoman modernists believed in the universality of the European myth; not only in its technological advance, but also its advance in socio-cultural life (Uludağ, 1998). Therefore, the newly-designed parks in the central districts can be seen as an effort to adopt a new urban culture and expand modern way of life, aiming at changing traditional social and spatial patterns.

The urban public parks were seen as the symbols of the westernized life style and as a way of initiating new social and spatial practices. As Aslanoğlu-Evyapan (1993)

notes, the *mesira* served the traditional people in Anatolian towns and in Istanbul, while the western style town parks were where the foreigners and the Turks, adapting a westernized life style, met their recreational needs. Unlike the gendered and temporal uses of *mesira* (groups of ladies, mainly housewives on workdays and for family excursions on weekends during daytime), modern urban park were the places where the families had their evening strolls to scrutinize the town (ibid.), to see and to be seen. In that sense, the *mesira* and other old public spaces represented personal, traditional, religious society, whereas the new commercial streets and public parks were the seats of the modern life, based on impersonal, urban, and secular society.

Conclusion I

In this section, a review of women's social position in Turkish society was presented to undergird a skilled and thorough reading for the meaning and conceptions of urban public spaces from the standpoint of Turkish immigrant women. From a historical perspective, starting from the Ottoman times, the social processes and traditions of the appropriation of urban public space were explored together with the influential dynamics of Turkish society from imperial regulations to the modernization of cultural norms and values in society. Such a historical contextualization of Turkish women's spatial practices is particularly valuable in exploring immigrant women's use and experience of urban public spaces, especially when migration cannot be seen only as a flow of people from one country to another, but as a complex process of place-making. In the following section, the discussion shifts to the migration context. In order to form a hermeneutic ground for the analysis, Turkish women's migration stories in the Netherlands and their main characteristics as an immigrant category are explored at length. The mainstream migration literature on Turkish immigrants in Europe is largely male-oriented. The literature on the migration experiences of Turkish women is scarce, probably under the assumption of their participation in the migration process as passive movers, following their husbands and fathers; a picture quite familiar to the patriarchal structure of the community. However, recent research on rural-urban migration in Turkey (Erman, 1997b, 2001b) points to women's active roles in the migration decision-making and establishment of their lives in the new environment. Whether active movers or passive followers, international migration is a powerful process that relocates individuals in new settings, with new sets of relations, new social, physical, economic, and political contexts and that brings gains and losses for Turkish immigrant women.

Turkish Immigrants in Europe and the Netherlands

The presence of a large Turkish population in Europe and the Netherlands is to a large extent related to the guest labor migration process in the 1960s and 1970s. The migration history of Turks in the Netherlands is not much different from that in other West-European countries¹³. The migration and settlement process of Turks

gives us some clues about their orientations and their participation in the host societies. In general, three main stages can be identified in this process (van Kempen and Ozuekren, 1997; van Kempen and Bolt, 1997). In the first period of the labor migration stage in the 1960s, many Turks came to the Netherlands as guest workers¹⁴. There was a limited number of women guest workers among the single male workers. The Turkish guest workers were seen as an economic asset from which both Turkey and the host countries could benefit (Abadan-Unat, 2002). Thus, a guest worker implied a 'man' and a formal guest worker¹⁵. Turkish women, i.e. any female guest workers, in this framework were considered as a dependent and passive category¹⁶. In this period, guest-workers were seen in a quite optimistic light, emphasizing the macro-scale economic advantages that the sending countries could cope with the excessive unskilled labor, while the receiving countries could deal with the booming economy and consequent shortage of labor. However, some scholars (Castles and Kosack, 1973) point out that the uneven distribution of guest workers concentrating in sectors, especially the low paid, low skilled, low ranked, and hard working, could have different consequences. Likewise, Penninx (1989) criticizes the attitude of Dutch authorities as benevolent and passive in this period.

In the 1970s and 1980s, structural changes in the economies of West European countries and the oil crisis of 1973 put an end to the demand for workers. Previously guest-worker welcoming countries started to place more and more restrictions on the flow of workers from Turkey. At the same time, the very same economic processes influenced Turkey and there was even greater demand to go abroad (Abadan-Unat, 2002). In this period, there was a remarkable increase in illegal workers. In addition, the economic problems in Turkey played an important role in workers not returning home. Many Turkish workers took their families to Europe and the family reunification stage in the host countries started; the population of Turkish women in this period doubled. Besides, many Turks, who came as tourists, followed their relatives, already working and living in the Netherlands, as a step to staying, sometimes illegally. Today, family reunion is seen as the ideal type of migration from Turkey to the Netherlands, notably driven by the Turkish offspring¹⁷ to marry Turkish relatives. With the growing amount of family unifiers, Turks form the biggest group of foreigners / immigrants in the Netherlands (CBS, 2003).

Finally, the last period, starting with the 1990s, can be called the settlement stage, as many Turks decide to stay in the host country. As van Kempen and Bolt (1997) state, higher investments in housing and business and lower frequency of trips to the homeland can be seen as an increasing orientation and settlement process of Turks in the Netherlands. In the 1980s and 1990s, a lot of attention was devoted to the disadvantaged position of immigrants. At the same time, stigma and prejudice, related to Turkish women in the host societies, such as traditional, passive, and needy, developed (Erder Köksal, 1993; Abadan-Unat, 2002). In this period, research points out especially the increasing trend of social segregation of Turks in cities as an integration and cohesion concern for the European welfare states¹⁸.

Turkish Immigrants in Dutch Society

According to the recent population figures of the Central Statistic Bureau, Turks form the biggest immigrant group in the Netherlands with an approximate number of 309,000 (CBS, 2003). The Turkish population in the Netherlands is quite young: 32% are between 0-14 years old and 40% are between 15-35 years old (Martinez, et al., 2002). In addition, on average Turks are younger than the native Dutch (average age is 25.3 and 38.9, respectively).

Following CBS's categorization of immigrants in the Netherlands, Turkish immigrants can be grouped into five categories. When categorizing foreigners, first, they divide the population group into two: first-generation and their offspring. Those 18 years or older at migration time are categorized as first-generation immigrants. Those younger than 18 years old and those born in the Netherlands belong to the offspring group. The first-generation is then divided into two categories; before and after 1980. For the Turkish group who came to the Netherlands before 1980 can be characterized as those who came to the Netherlands as guest-workers or in relation to work and as a result of the chain migration. This group also covers those who came as tourists and stayed illegally and perhaps worked illegally for some time. The year 1980 is conceived as the last year of the official family reunification process of the former guest workers from Turkey. In addition, in September 1980, there was a military intervention in Turkey. Starting from 1980, because of the military coup, many Turks asked for political asylum from the Dutch government and later, Turks with Kurdish and other ethnic origins also sought political asylum.

In the offspring group, there are two categories: those born in the Netherlands or who came to the Netherlands before 6 years old are called the second-generation. Those who migrated to the Netherlands between their 6th and 18th years are called in-between-generation. The fifth group is called marriage-immigrants. This term has been adopted recently with the necessity to categorize the growing number of Turks who came to the Netherlands to marry with the offspring of the Turkish guest workers. Turkish men and women from the second generation tend to have their partners from Turkey. In that sense, family formation and reunification processes continue. Gijsberts, et al. (2004) state that statistics show less difference between migration reasons from Turkey between men and women. However, it should be noted that restrictions in Dutch immigration policies have changed the pattern of migration, especially after 1980s. Coupled with the economic instability in Turkey, many have discovered that family formation and reunion are the only gates open to Europe. In addition, the preferences of offspring, especially among young men, choosing their partner with same ethnic, even place-specific, origin have accelerated this migration pattern and the share of Turkish women in this category (Table 2.1).

The socio-economic position of Turks in the Netherlands is quite weak. The educational level of Turks lags behind that of native Dutch and other immigrant groups, namely Surinamese and Antillean (Dagevos, et al., 2003). Particularly Turkish women are less educated than their male counterparts (Table 2.2). Of the adult Turkish women, the majority had at maximum basic general education, among which 19%

had no education at all. The rest followed secondary education, vocational or high schools, and only 3.3% had high-vocational and university education. However, research on educational attainment also shows that the duration of stay in the Netherlands, the point at which immigrant children have entered the Dutch education system, socio-economic background and family composition, and high concentrations of immigrant children at schools have important effects (Penninx, 1989). Therefore, these statistics should be taken into consideration carefully. In addition, as shown in Table 2.3, the difference of educational attainment among generations is striking. The educational achievement of second generation women is higher than that of men and that of the first generation.

TABLE 2.1 Migration from Turkey: Migration Reason and Sex in 2002 (percentages)

	women	men
Work	3	10
Asylum	4	10
Family reunion	19	22
Migrated with a family member	1	1
Family formation –marriage	70	54
Study	2	2
Other	2	2

Source: Gijsberts, et al. (eds) (2004), p.16.

TABLE 2.2 Educational Attainment of Those between 15-64 Years-Old and Not-Having-Schooling in 2002 (percentages)

<i>educational attainment</i>	TURKISH		DUTCH	
	women	men	women	men
basic education	61.2	43.1	9.9	8.9
elementary vocational school	18.6	26.8	25.4	20.4
secondary vocational school	16.8	22.0	41.2	43.0
high vocational school/university	3.3	8.1	23.5	27.8

Source: Dagevos, et al. (2003), p.49.

TABLE 2.3 Educational Attainment of Turkish Immigrants in 2002 (percentages)

<i>educational attainment</i>	first generation		second generation	
	women	men	women	men
basic education	65	47	10	11
elementary vocational school	17	24	27	34
secondary vocational school +	18	30	63	55

Source: Gijsberts, et al. (eds) (2004), p. 36.

Structural changes in the Dutch economy in the late 1970s and 1980s led many former guest workers to lose their jobs and to become dependent on social welfare benefits. Especially with the disappearance of some sectors in particular regions, such as textile in Twente, where many unskilled and semi-skilled Turks used to work, the unemployment rate among Turks rose to five times higher than that of the Dutch in 1991 (van Kempen and Bolt, 1997). In general, the labor market participation of Turks is lower (51%) than that of other immigrants (Surinamese and Antilleans) and natives groups (70%). Women's participation in the labor market is even worse: only 27% of Turkish women are working, mostly those from second generation. On the other hand, it should be noted that in general, women's participation in the Dutch labor market is also not extensive; only 59% of native women work (Dagevos, et al., 2003).

Turks' access to the labor market is particularly difficult. In 2001, the unemployment rate among the Turkish economically-active population is three times more than that of the active Dutch population (Martinez, et al., 2002). In addition, the share of long-term unemployment among Turks is two times higher than their Dutch counterparts and other immigrants. Penninx (1989) states that the level and nature of the jobs held by employed immigrants is in general significantly lower than that of Dutch workers. Turks, together with Moroccans, occupy the lowest level of jobs; 85% or more have unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. As van Kempen and Bolt (1997) state, because of the concentration of Turks in production-related jobs and low skills in service-related jobs, it is difficult for them to change jobs and find employment in attractive sectors (sectors with high-qualified jobs, good salaries, and permanent contracts) of the Netherlands' ever-expanding service sector. Although the reduction of unskilled and low-skilled jobs and low educational level are often said to be the reason for the disadvantaged labor participation, recent research shows that among the high educated, while the unemployment of non-western immigrants is 10% and that of Turks is 8%, the unemployment of the natives is 3% (Martinez, et al., 2002). This rate is almost identical for the low educated: while the unemployment of non-western immigrants is 13%, the unemployment of the natives is 5% (CBS, 2003). Thus, either high educated or low educated, the unemployment disparity between Turks and natives is maintained.

Unlike the large presence of Turkish entrepreneurs in Germany, the amount of Turks with their own businesses seems lower in the Netherlands. However, among first generation immigrant entrepreneurs, Turks form the biggest group¹⁹ with a share of 18.3% in total immigrant entrepreneurs (Tillaart, 2000). They are mostly 'internally oriented' and target Turkish customers (Van Kempen and Bolt, 1997). Due to the disadvantaged labor positions, most Turks live with at the minimum wage level (*ibid.*). The rest are dependent on unemployment or social benefits, which means that their income is considerably below the minimum wage level. In addition, Turkish women are much more dependent on social benefits than other immigrant women (Dagevos, et al., 2003).

In general, Turks are concentrated in the regions of West Europe where they initially found work (van Kempen and Ozuekren, 1997). At first, Turks settled in the

big cities of the Netherlands, such as the Hague, Rotterdam, and Amsterdam, as well as the regions of Twente and Limburg, where there was a growing demand for industrial labor. In this sense, not only the capital cities but also medium-sized cities, and even small villages attracted Turks to reside. Within the cities, Turks are generally concentrated in areas where low-priced social housing is abundant. They mainly live in the west part of the Netherlands (59.8% of the total Turkish population); of these group 35.5% live in the four big cities, *Randstad*, of the Netherlands. The second agglomeration regions are in the south, in the Limburg region, in Breda and Tilburg, and in the east, in Twente region, in Enschede, Deventer, and Almelo (Martinez, et al., 2002). As far as the differences between Turkish agglomerations in big cities of the Netherlands is concerned, as Table 2.4 shows, Turks in Enschede seem to be much more economically deprived than the rest, as the unemployment rate in Enschede is higher than in other big cities and they rely more on social benefits.

Although the distribution of Turks in the Netherlands points out certain concentration areas, they are not residentially segregated as compared to the residential segregation figures of Blacks in the U.S. (in a form of ghetto) or of Turks living in Kreuzberg, Berlin. The residential segregation in the Netherlands is fairly low (van Kempen and van Weesep, 1998). The level of segregation is highest in the Hague and Rotterdam, but the segregation index of Turks in Amsterdam is comparable to that found in middle-sized cities, such as Enschede. To van Kempen and van Weesep (1998), this connection can be explained with the similarities of the housing stock in many of the concentration areas in middle-sized towns and big cities. In addition, the completion of new residential areas, with relatively high numbers of native inhabitants, next to some of these concentration areas makes the segregation statistics problematic. Yet they point out a crystallization of ethnic patterns in Dutch cities.

TABLE 2.4 Comparing Socio-Economic Position of Turks in Dutch Cities (percentages)

	Education		Unemployment*		Income		
	<i>max.basic education</i>	<i>high voc./ university</i>	Turks	city level	work	<i>social benefit</i>	<i>other</i>
The Hague	70	3	23	5	59	30	11
Amsterdam	68	4	21	6	55	35	10
Rotterdam	59	4	25	7	54	37	8
Utrecht	68	6	11	5	63	25	12
Enschede	69	3	30	6	47	41	12
Eindhoven	62	3	12	6	61	33	6

* Unemployment rates of 1998

Source: compiled from Martens and Weijers (2000), p.44, 62 and 74.

According to these scholars, these low segregation levels are mainly the result of the welfare state arrangements in the housing market. Research on the housing careers of Turks in the Netherlands (Bolt, 2001; Van Kempen and Bolt, 1997) reveals that their choices of residential areas and the housing units are related to the con-

strained-oriented situation. Because of their weak economic status, many Turks have to reside in immigrant-concentrated neighborhoods where the social housing opportunities are abundant. Research (Bolt, 2001; Van Kempen and Bolt, 1997) shows that although Turks do not desire to live in these neighborhoods because of the bad images of the concentration areas, such as high criminality and social disorder, as well as the negative effects of social control, they have to accept to reside in what is available to them. According to the researchers, the immigrant-concentration pattern in the Dutch cities reflects anything but the distribution of social housing areas in the cities.

Having said that Turks are not very much segregated residentially does not mean that they are also not segregated socially. A recent study (Gijsberts and Dagevos, 2005) shows that Turks have a strong orientation towards their own ethnic group; they mostly seek their social partners/ relations from the same group; “Two out of three Turks living in the Netherlands have a predominantly Turkish circle of friends and acquaintances” (p.105). Together with a gradual decline of frequency of social contacts of the Dutch native population with ethnic minorities in the last ten years, they point out that Turks have the widest social distance from the native Dutch population among the main immigrant groups in the Netherlands. They emphasize the significance of the steady rise of dense immigrant-concentration neighborhoods in the big cities, especially in the Randstad area, and continuing high influx of Turkish marriage migrants in this tendency. As shown in Table 2.5, Turks living in the Randstad cities seek their contacts mainly in their own group at the neighborhood level; however, the high percentages of ethnic social orientation in the middle-sized cities, like Enschede and Eindhoven are also noteworthy.

TABLE 2.5 Percentage of Turks Who Have Contacts in the Neighborhood with People of Their Own Ethnic Group or With Indigenous Dutch People by Municipality and Ethnic Group, 1998 (percentages)

	<i>Contacts with own ethnic group</i>	<i>Contacts with Dutch</i>
Amsterdam	45	25
Rotterdam	40	11
The Hague	50	24
Utrecht	42	26
Eindhoven	42	25
Enschede	51	30

Source: Martens and Weijers (2000), p. 102.

While Turks are observed as socially-segregated, on the other hand, it should be noted that these social patterns may also have other dimensions, such as age, generation, gender, education, occupation. Some research points out that traditional values and norms prevail even in the second generation: young Turkish men have fairly more traditional views on the division of roles between men and women than those of young Turkish women (Martinez, et al., 2002; Dagevos, et al., 2003). One reason

can be that they mostly identify with their own group and these groups are often formed around a closed social circle. Some research, on the one hand, emphasizes that as the generations pass, immigrant offspring's patterns of leisure time and space use would be similar to that of the natives (Jókövi, 2000a, 2000b). Likewise, in a study on social orientations and participation of youth in Rotterdam (Phalet et al., 2000), similarities with regard to ideas about value orientations, such as ethnic tolerance and personal values are found among Turkish, Moroccan and Dutch young women. Keune, et al. (2002), on the other hand, point out that education, life phase, and daily occupation make the difference for the second generation Turkish men and women in their free-time/ leisure behavior in the big cities of the Randstad.

The importance of mixed neighborhoods, rather than homogeneous immigrant-concentration neighborhoods, for social integration also is advocated by researchers (Gijsberts and Dagevos, 2005). It is argued that both native Dutch and ethnic minorities come into contact more often if they live in a mixed neighborhood. "Where there is the opportunity for contact, as in mixed neighborhoods, this is also more likely to take place" (p. 106). In the same vein, Müller (2005) suggests that positive interactions and relations among immigrants and native Dutch inhabitants happen with due understanding of each others' culture. Yet, he points out complicated differences in the meanings of social actions in intercultural relations.

Although research on Turkish immigrants' social relations and cultural orientations is limited, we can argue that migration patterns, i.e. chain vs. individual migration, and religious affiliations, are highly influential. Chain migration tends to be more intensely involved in family, kin, and village networks. Most migration to the Netherlands emerged as chain migration. Those who migrated from the same area tend to live close by to each other and sustain their relations with spatial proximity. Chain migration is built upon group solidarity and permits at least the partial reconstruction of family and village networks abroad. Depending on its extent of efficiency, chain migration may also tie the migrant and his family into interactions back home. This trend can be traced in the arranged marriages of the second generation. The village community, though geographically distant, continues to exercise certain social control over its members abroad.

Religious affiliation also acts as a criterion for social relations. Although Turks seem to be mingled with each other, as in the case of ethnic organizations and associations, the boundaries among religious affiliations are clearly drawn. While Sunni (the orthodox Islamic sect) groups have organized activities mainly for their own community, mostly related to the religious and community matters, Alevi (the more liberal Islamic sect) organizations have focused on a variety of cultural practices, folklore, and customs of Anatolia, the assortment of Turkish culture with peculiarities. Significant is that these two religious groups draw clear boundaries between themselves and almost never participate into each others' activities.

However, statistically, the Turkish community is known to be better structured than other Muslim communities in the Netherlands and to have a more homogeneous character (Slomp, 1988). The Turkish 'Inspraak Orgaan' (TIO), a consultative body, is set up by the Dutch government includes the TIFC (Turkish Islamic Cultural

Federation), The Turkish Islamic Centre in the Netherlands, the Turkish Sports Federation, and the HTIB, the Turkish Labor Union. It should be noted that although these organizations function as immigrant motivations, they cannot be seen as separate from religious affiliations and related political divisions. After the abolition of Islamic law in Turkey, the Turkish state established a monopoly on Islamic activities, covering all mosques, Islamic schools, and other Islamic institutions. Due to the monopoly of the *Diyanet*, the Directorate of Religious Affairs, over religious activities, other Islamic movements and related institutions have been at best tolerated and at times, explicitly suppressed in Turkey. However, their situation altered drastically with the migration of large numbers of Turks to countries where the *Diyanet*'s restriction of religious activities had not yet reached. As Doornik (1995) argues, many of the first Islamic institutions in the Netherlands and Germany adopted an ideological line which rebelled against *Diyanet* policy. The *Milli Görüş*, a Sunni religious-political movement, is the best known example of this type of organization in Europe. These religious organizations show a great diversity in relation to interpretations of Islam, political and ideological aims, and relations with the host country²⁰.

It should be noted that both the *Diyanet*'s and other religious organizations roles are, on the one hand, related to the religious needs of the Turkish immigrants abroad, and on the other hand, assumed functions, providing assistance within the community and enabling members to contact with the host society, whether positively or negatively. Mosques are no longer places solely for the performance of traditional functions as in Turkey, their roles go beyond religion. Doornik (1995) observes that in Amsterdam mosques, sports classes are offered for its members to participate in Dutch national competitions. Also, some of them offer Dutch-language courses and bicycle-riding courses, as well as courses designed especially for women introducing Dutch norms and customs pertaining to food, medicine, and health. Sunnis can be observed as a well-organized group, especially with the growth of the *Milli Görüş* movement in Europe in the 1990s. They have established formal religious organizations, such as mosques, men's, women's, youth organizations, and more. On the other hand, as Wilpert (1989) argues, formal religious organizations are less significant for the Alevi, since their religious organizations are not based on mosque and Quran courses. For them, it has been difficult to evoke new kinds of formal institutions abroad. However, the Alevi religious-ethnic identity provides strength to their informal social networks, which appear to be extremely efficient despite the extensive mobility and fragmentation caused by migration.

Conclusion II

In this section, the process of Turkish (guest) migration and the position of Turkish immigrant women in the Dutch context were introduced. These accounts reflect only a small piece in the larger picture of the Turkish experience of the entire migration reality. Migration is a complicated process; a displacement leads to new placements and processes of place-making. It cuts migrants off from places, relationships,

and contexts, while at the same time, connecting two previously distinct places, that of origin and that of residence. It can be seen as an opportunity, allowing people to be liberated from community structures with new possibilities for asserting their identities. Traditional community values and norms can also be challenged in the new setting. While patriarchal relations can be unraveled slowly, women can acquire adaptive strategies to participate in the broader society (Köksal, 1986, 1988). On the other hand, migration can lead more restrictions on women as they are attributed with the symbolic role of carriers and bearers of ethnic group identity (Akpınar, 2003). While men are held culturally responsible for the definition of social norms related to women's behavior, women are seen as actors responsible for the transgression of group boundaries. Therefore, traditional social codes, such as 'honor' and 'women's virtue' have become more influential than ever.

It also should be mentioned that the Turkish immigration to the Netherlands cannot be seen as identical to that of Turkish immigration to other parts of Europe: local and transnational dynamics and a variety of experiences have not created the same forms of identities and belongingness. For instance, according to a recent study on Euro-Turks (Kaya and Kentel, 2005), Turkish migration to Germany and France has produced distinct adaptation and integration strategies in the political sphere, so that a variety of incorporation strategies have been constructed. Based on these strategies in different spheres of life in relation to the dominant immigrant integration discourses, they point to differences in attitudes between the German and French Euro-Turks, where those living in France are more attached to laïcist and Republican values and those in Germany are more religious and more closed. In the same vein, they highlight the generational and socio-economic differences in the process of the formation of social and political identities and belongingness. Parallel to this, Çağlar (2001) argues that belonging to an urban space rather than a nation or ethnic culture/communities is common among the Turkish youth of Berlin. "They are struggling to inscribe their presence in the urban space beyond the given terms (namely ethnic) and conditions of visibility available to them. These places become an arena for the reimagination and negotiation of Turkish immigrants' sociality and belonging to Berlin beyond the given categories of ethnicity and community" (p. 609).

Most Turks in the Netherlands are of rural origin (from villages or small towns), and directly implanted into Dutch urban life without previous urban experience. This has profound effects on their conceptions and interpretations of the urban life and urban spaces, creating a duality between places of origin and departure and places of settlement and arrival. While migrating, they also carry their own perspectives of place-making with them; the habits, customs, and norms of use of spaces. Thus, the social relations and meanings attached to previous experiences of spaces and places are carried to the new setting. In the new environment, some of the daily routines of the homeland are preserved and sustained, yet new practices are also constructed and new places are habituated, while some old customs and habits prevail, some others are abandoned or replaced by new ones.

EVERYDAY URBAN PUBLIC SPACE

Introduction

Since the 1960s, urban studies and planning literature have addressed the urban public space ideally as a place of framing a vision of social life in the city, a vision for those who interact there everyday, a common place and a social staging ground. As used interchangeably, the public space is considered to be at the core of the urban experience; the parts of the city in which everybody can come together to meet, to communicate, and to conduct business, or just to enjoy the sound and sight of urban area, be anonymous in the crowd (a.o. Jacobs, 1961; Sennett, 1970, 1977, 1990; Lofland, 1973; Fyfe, 1998). One feels the 'pulse' of the city in the urban public space, as Raymond Williams writes:

I have felt it again and again; the great buildings of civilization; the meeting-places; the libraries and theatres, the towers and domes; and often more moving than these, the houses, the streets, the press and excitement of so many people, with so many purposes. I have stood in many cities and felt this pulse... this identifiable and moving quality: the centre, the activity, the light (Williams, 1973, p. 273, cited in Kasinitz, 1995, p. 5).

However, this idealization of urban public space increasingly has been overshadowed by the narrative of loss or the end of public space. The changing structure of cities and urban areas, economic, demographic and technological developments have had significant effects on urban public space, from organization and design to use and experience, from function to maintenance and administration (Burgers, 2000). With the growth of the service economy and globalization, particularly intense emplacement of leisure-oriented developments in urban public spaces, they are argued to be losing their traditional political and social functions. In addition, previously city-centered activities, such as cultural, commerce, leisure and entertainment have moved outside the city borders, competing with the inner-city to attract users; public and private enterprises and developers and challenging the conception of urbanity. In the urban area at large, new public places have emerged as transient spaces for traffic, communication, and consumption. Rather than a place of social encounter, these places of flows, movement and transitional zones are referred as 'non-places' (Augé, 1995), i.e. places of no identity, no history, and no urban relationships. These new public 'non-places' lead to a different conception and relationship between the public space and urban life.

Among the essential characteristics of the urban public space, accessibility and openness fit comfortably with the narrative of loss in the contemporary world. The growing consumer society with its high levels of protection and privatization of all levels of social life is argued to be alienating people from public life and public experience in the city (a.o. Davis, 1990; Sorkin, 1992; Zukin, 1995). Sorkin (1992) proclaims the 'end of public space' in the modern city; the globalization of space and time, the obsession with security, surveillance, and control, and the increasing tendency of simulacra have led to the homogenization, privatization, and aesthetization of the public space. Likewise, Zukin (1995) aptly observes that privatization makes people more secure but less free. These semi-public/semi-private spaces appear to be 'public spaces' because many people use them for common purposes, such as shopping and entertainment, but safety concerns and privatization are argued to be excluding, displacing, and marginalizing particular social groups.

Not only the physical structure but also population composition has been influential in the portrayal of the narrative of the loss of public space. The excessive growth of service economy workers has contributed to the dynamics of urban public space by virtue of their lifestyle (Burgers, 2000). The urban public space, providing many functions at the same time, such as retail, recreation, and leisure activities, has been designed to be attractive for all types of consumption patterns, but more importantly, they become places for expressions of users' identity (Oosterman, 1992, 1993). In addition, changes in the demographic structure of cities are not only limited to the growth of the new working class, but to the rising percentage of immigrants, especially in West European cities. Growing immigrant concentrations in particular parts of the cities lead at the one extreme to growing fear of isolation, safety, and marginalization of urban public space, in relation to the concerns of social exclusion and segregation (Madanipour et al., 1998; Burgers, 2000). On the other hand, proliferation of ethnic business precincts, commodification of all ethnic-cultural products from food to music, together with the new architectural styles, different designs of the houses and places of worship, in the western streetscape cities generate an urban diversity, which is increasingly acknowledged by city boosters as a vital resource for the prosperity of cities and a potential catalyst for socio-economic development (Bodaar and Rath, 2005).

Sennett (1977) looks at the problem of the devaluation of urban public space and the deformation of public life differently than other scholars and makes what is probably the sharpest criticism, pointing out a general withdrawal from public life by the members of contemporary society. For Sennett, the public and private spheres of social life are critical for sustaining each other. Similarly, Bahrtdt (1961) identifies the polarity between the public and the private as vital and ideal-typical in characterizing the special nature of the European city.

A city is a settlement in which the whole of...life has a tendency to polarize, i.e., to take place either in the social aggregate state of the public sphere or in privacy... The stronger the polarity and interaction between the public and private spheres is, the more urban is...the life of a settlement (Bahrtdt, 1961, cited in Siebel and Wehrheim, 2003)

In his much acclaimed book, *The Fall of Public Man*, Sennett (1977) argues that the withdrawal from public space is related closely to the changes in the social patterns in public spaces, weakening the participation of citizens in public life and their taking part in mere formal duties, only when necessary and doing so only passively. The loss of public life is related closely to the breaking up of the complementarity of the public and private spheres, the increased privatization of society. He points out 'sealed communities', as modern citizens maintain their network of personal relations within physically and visibly segregated social worlds in their efforts to cope with the modern way of life (Sennett, 1990). Likewise, Maffesoli (1996) claims that modern society has created a new kind of social unit, which he calls 'tribes': "groups distinguished by their members' shared lifestyles and tastes" (p. x). He argues that contemporary socialization is related to rituals, i.e. the rituals of consumer-society, such as eating and drinking in cafés and restaurants, the cultural events of stadiums and concert halls, dancehalls, festivals, and markets. The modern social life, for Maffesoli, is "marked by membership in a multiplicity of overlapping groups in which the roles one plays become sources of identity which ... provide temporary identifications" (p. xii). Lifestyles and tastes are more and more pronounced as leading new collectivities and bonding between individuals, as well as heading to segmentation and segregation. Urban public spaces, in this framework become more than ever important as sites representing differences and diversities, places of bindings and contestations.

Urban Public Space as a Social Construct

Sennett's (1977, 1990) account of devalued public space is based on conceiving space as a social entity, constructed socially rather than as a sole container of social activities. Starting with the 1970s, a number of scholars (a.o. Lefebvre, 1991; Harvey, 1969, 1991; Gregory and Urry, 1985; Pred, 1982; and Massey, 1994) have challenged the way the relationship between space and society are conceptualized. Before that, the spatial was considered as an autonomous sphere and spatial relations and spatial processes were argued to be producing merely spatial distributions. The geography of industry, for example, was interpreted simply as a consequence of geographical location factors. Contrary to this understanding, it was argued that all the spatial relations and spatial processes were actually social relations taking a particular geographical form. In order to explain the geography of industry, the wider economy and social and political processes were also to be taken into consideration.

Lefebvre (1991) was the first to acknowledge the social construction of space, discussing elaborately the production of space through the analysis of social relations. He argued that no space could claim to be socially neutral. By saying 'space is political and strategic', he pointed out both the complexity and contradictory nature of space, permeating with social relations and the social production of space, where groups appropriated it in order to manage and exploit it. Acknowledging space as a social construct took the view of space/spatiality as not an objective or subjective

structure, but rather a social experience (Lefebvre, 1991). In that sense, the experiences of space, according to Harvey (1991) were not static properties, but active practices. “Spatial practices derive their efficacy in social life only through the structure of social relations within which they come into play...they take on their meaning under specific social relations of class, gender, community, ethnicity, or race and ‘get up’ or ‘worked over’ in the course of social action” (p. 222-3). Space was a conception constructed by way of people’s social practices in their involvement with the world (Simonsen and Bærenholdt, 2004). The spatial restructuring of the late 1980s and 1990s with globalization, on the other hand, made it plain that the social was also spatially constructed. The spatial organization of society was also decisive in social relations and processes. Today, the interpretation of the social and the spatial as inseparable and of space as a social construct are accepted widely in the fields of sociology and geography.

For our analysis of the urban public space, an ontological clarification is needed at this point. According to Low (1996) and Richardson (1982), space as a social product and space as a social construct refer to two different but closely interrelated and mutually complementary domains of analyzing space in social science research. First, space as a social product implies the operation of power relations through which all aspects of life, whether economic, political or cultural, are negotiated (Gottdiener, 1985). It also connotes, according to Low (1996), the historical emergence and political and economic formation of space. With regard to this, Tilly’s comparison of differences in the spatial structures of the Medieval European Trading City, the Nineteenth-century Manufacturing City, and the Traditional Islamic City presents different and contrasting reflections of social relations and processes that produced distinct social organization, spatial formation of cities, and urban public spaces:

The medieval European trading city with its legal freedom, its governing corporation of merchants, its centre preempted by a church and a city hall, both strategically near a vast marketplace and fairground, fed by tortuous streets blending shops and houses, the coal-burning nineteenth century manufacturing city with its dominant factory area and central business district, its sharp separation of home from work, its geometric lines of transportation, and its incredible ebbs and flows of internal traffic ... the traditional Islamic city; fortress, market, and central mosque placed at the intersection of two of the very few streets cutting through the entire city, quarters originating as the settlements of different tribes and nationalities living unto themselves (often walled off from each other) ... hectic mixtures of land use, an unending tendency for private uses to take nominally public space, an absence of formal arrangements for municipal government, a religious-intellectual elite, the *ulema*,¹ mediating among the quickly shifting factions of the city and speaking sultan on behalf of its population (Tilly, 1974, p. 46).

In the same way, Burke (1993) argues that spatial differences in cities cannot be reduced only to the differences of cultures and religion, such as between Christianity (especially Catholicism) and Islam, however their distinct spatial organizations reveal differences in Christian and Muslim conceptions of religious and secular activities in

social and political life. He points out differences in a social and cultural framework of spatial structures and spatial practices in “local concepts of the public and the private, linked to traditions of autonomy and community at the level of the city, the quarter, the ward or the parish” (p. 37). Many scholars (Weber, 1966; Murvar, 1966; Abu-Lughod, 1993; Lapidus, 1969; Burke, 1993; Yerasimos, 1996; Cerasi, 1999) argued that the inward-looking Muslim city is inevitably distinct from open-market Western city. The spatial formation of the Islamic city reveals important social features of Muslim culture; the inward-looking houses and housing clusters as an expression of the Islamic idea of the family, absolute privacy and modesty; the meticulous hierarchy of public and private areas of the city as an expression of strict gender segregation; the lack of civic space as an expression of the lack of civic culture. Cities generally lacked autonomy, guilds exercised economic but not political functions and the autonomous quarters, as groups of ethnically homogeneous neighborhoods were related to the high segmentation of urban society. While the Islamic city can be seen as the product of Islamic Law, maintaining and safeguarding religious values, the Western city is characterized as the product of an enterprising secular society, and the free flow of people with the market economy.

Second, space as a social construct denotes more the phenomenological and symbolic experience of space as mediated by social processes such as exchange, conflict, and control. Through people’s social exchanges, memories, images, and daily use of the physical setting, the space transforms into scenes and actions that convey symbolic meaning. Deriving from the symbolic interactionist perspective, developed by Blumer (1969, cited in Heiss, 1981), spaces are constructed by people responding on the basis of what these spaces mean and, accordingly, that the meaning of these spaces arises out of the negotiated experience of social interaction. Blumer offers three basic premises of symbolic interactionist perspective. The first one is that people’s perceptions and definition of the situation are significant. People “act toward things on the basis of the meanings the things have for them” (*ibid.*, p. 2), regardless of the facts. Second, the meanings of things are derived from the social interaction that one has with one’s fellows. Based on the previous interactions and experiences of similar encounters, people apply definitions and perceptions to the situation. In other words, the meanings are developed in social interaction. And last, people select, check, suspend, regroup, and transform meanings in the light of the situation in which they are placed and the direction of their action. Definitions of the situation/thing/person guide action, but the process involves more than the application of established meanings. This conception is important for the analysis of public space because people/users as social actors/agents construct and reconstruct spaces based on their own realities and meanings, and experiences.

This conception has strong implications for my concerns of urban public space analysis. First of all, we can no longer presume a uniform, single public space for all citizens to come together. There are various and different public spaces in the city based on the users’ identifications, constructions, and experiences. Based on their interactions, people prefer some places, some attributes of these places, the publicness or privateness of these places for a desired activity or intercourse. Urban public space

is not a sole container of people, activities, and social relations, but a social construct that is perceived, used, and experienced each time and place by its users. It is a lived space for people through a set of complex social relations. Second, the meaning of what is public is constantly redefined by various public interactions that actively restructure the urban space. Public space is not fixed in space and time, but is constantly subject to change as a result of the reorganization and reinterpretation of the physical space by different users.

Acknowledging the socially constructed meaning is important in analyzing contemporary urban public space, particularly when concerns of loss, fragmentation, and incivility darken the very essence of it. In this study, the emphasis is primarily on the conception of socially constructed meaning and behavior. The constitution of space through social relations and material social practices, i.e. the relational view of the space, prioritizes analyses of how space is constituted and given meaning through human endeavor (Simonsen and Bærenholdt, 2004). In the same vein, Richardson (1982) argues that people's experiences of public space are closely related to their constructions of being-in-the-place. The relations between people and compiled incidents are 'situational' (Goffman, 1963) and "micro-dramas that are not merely *in* the place, but are *of* each place, interactions that either incorporated or challenged the definition of the situation being proposed" (Richardson, 1982, p. 424). Experience, therefore is not a simple experience of physical setting, but a distinctive social reality. The symbolic and experiential constructions of public space create a variety of public spaces in the ways people control, experience, and think about them. When people enter a public space, they read the spatial characteristics, interpret the social environment and experience 'its phenomenological presence' (ibid.). Public space as a totality, i.e. the physical layout, appearances, arrangements, thematic uses, demography, social codes, and social conducts conveys meanings for the users.

The Everyday Life and Urban Public Space

Parallel to the conception of space as a social construct, another reply to the narrative of loss of public space came from some scholars (Crawford, 1995, 1999; Deutsche, 1996, cited in De Clercq, 2001), stating that the negative impressions of public space depend on a too narrow and normative definition of both 'public' and 'space' that "derive from insistence on unity, desire for fixed categories of time and space, and rigidly conceived notions of private and public" (Crawford, 1999, p. 23). They argue that the traditional public spaces, the 'real public spaces' and evidence of an 'authentic urbanism,' such as the Greek agora, the Roman forum, and the Parisian boulevard, were structured with a significant exclusion of certain social groups, such as women, slaves, and workers. The 'real public spaces' were based on the various levels of exclusion in order to be able to function. For that reason, Crawford (1995, 1999) calls for an alternative logic for the analysis of contemporary modern urban public space, a new way of conceptualizing public space based on lived experiences of various groups or counter-publics, who compete with each other in the urban environment.

The public sphere is based in contestation rather than on unity; it is created as much by conflicting interests and violent claims as by reasonably debate. In that sense, Crawford identifies 'alternative public spaces' as sites of public expression, such as the practices and customs of street vendors and the homeless in Los Angeles. Though Crawford's formulation has its roots in the political theory (Arendt, 1958; Habermas, 1991), it has an indirect yet influential linkage to the sharing of places and face-to-face interactions among individuals, similar to Sennett's accounts (1977, 2000). It offers a framework of an alternative perspective of urban public space, recognizing the diversity and difference that stem from the lived experiences of everyday public spaces.

The 'everyday' simply describes the lived experience shared by urban residents, the banal and ordinary routes, such as commuting, working, relaxing, moving through city streets and sidewalks, shopping, buying and eating food, and running households. For Crawford (1999), everyday space "stands in contrast to the carefully planned, officially designated, and often underused spaces of public use that can be found in most American cities" (p. 9). Thus, the everyday is connected to the unplanned, unconscious, and un-specialized activities. According to two eloquent advocates of the everyday, Lefebvre (1991) and De Certeau (1984), though the everyday connotes passivity, and unconsciousness, there is "something extraordinary in its very ordinariness" (Upton, 2002). Though the everyday comprises seemingly unimportant activities, the everyday life, constructed through the repeated activities and conditions that form the routines, give crucial information about how "a fabric of space and time defined by a complex realm of social practices, a conjuncture of accident, desire, and habit" (Crawford, 1999, p. 8). Moreover, for the conduct of everyday life, Friedmann (1999) accentuates on the small lived spaces of the city where meanings are created wherever the built environment and the rhythms of social life coincide.

Institutions and organizations, from schools to businesses, from shops to entertainment centers, from state institutions to voluntary organizations, form an important fabric of everyday life. Though they are often considered parts of a system of services and amenities, their influence on the everyday life and urban public space is manifold. From temporal to organizational characteristics, from physical appearance in the urban built environment to symbolic representation, they not only influence the organization of daily activities, but also the patterns of use and appropriation of urban public spaces. In a broad sociological sense, institutions and organizations, *corporate actors* following Coleman (1990), are inherent in every activity bridging the public and the private (Kreukels, 1999), and regulate the everyday. Everyday interactions, such as transactions at post offices or at school, can give important information on social structure. In that sense, for Blokland (2003), these interactions, especially in the context of public and institutional familiarity, can bear the potential for the creation of community bonds.

Everyday life is considered so fundamentally important by geographers that Pred writes, "it is at the scale of actual human practices that a society is reproduced and that its individuals are socialized" (Thrift, 1981, cited in Pred, 1982, p. 158). Based his

analysis of 'life paths in time-space', Hagerstrand (1975) was among the first who emphasized the vitality of daily time-space behavior. His main idea was to examine the whole set of individual biographies, beginning with the daily routines of movement and extending to the movements of the life span, presenting how individual's spatial activity is governed by constraints and not by independent decisions by spatially or temporally autonomous individuals. His depiction of the individual biographies is regarded as datum for considering the time-space dimension of social practices.²

Everyday life is to a large extent composed of repetitive social relations and routines. Upton (2002), with reference to studies in psychology, argues that the personal and social meanings of human agency are learned in the give and take of everyday life. "The navigation of everyday spaces, the ordinary, unexceptional sites of most of our sensory and intellectual experiences, is the primary arena within which selfhood and personhood are forged. Repeated individual actions become practices and clusters of practices become social formations" (p. 718). Likewise, for Giddens (1995), the regular or routine features of encounters, in time as well as in space, represent institutionalized features of social systems. The daily life routines involve people in more or less constant face-to-face interaction with others and thus make up the bulk of social activities. Routine is, in that sense, as Giddens (1995) argues, a "predominant form of day-to-day social activity which is vital to the psychological mechanisms whereby a sense of trust or ontological security is sustained in the daily activities of social life" (p. xxiii). Routines and repetitive social relations are placed in urban public spaces; for instance, the sidewalk or street that we use and pass by everyday when we leave home to go to work, shopping, or any purpose.

In sum, urban public spaces are important constituents of everyday lives of urban inhabitants. Whether unnoticed or consciously appropriated in a broader frame of spatial practices, the everyday uses and experiences of urban public spaces, provide a dynamic perspective of looking at the different spatial experiences of diversity of groups. In that sense, urban public spaces can be considered as the connective tissue that binds daily lives together. The city is then based on the socially constructed nature, "created out of the demands of everyday use and the social struggles of urban inhabitants" (Crawford, 1999, p. 10). A careful analysis of everyday life regarding urban public spaces gives important information about how different users use and experience therein, and also how they conceptualize urban public spaces. The use of everyday public spaces, such as sidewalks, streets, parks, schoolyards, and parking lots through lived experience, in infinitely recurring activities, such as commuting routes and trips to the supermarket or school, leads to a new understanding of urban public spaces, which serve as primary intersections between the individual and the city. "The endless repetition of everyday routines sets routes and links places in the city to events recurring daily, weekly, monthly, or annually" (Reijndorp, 1993, p. 147). In the same vein, De Certeau (1984) argues that senses of belonging and attachment are built on the bases of everyday ritualized uses of space and changes in time as the everyday experiences grow and their effects are accumulated.

Spatial Practices and the Everyday Urban Public Space

The everyday life perspective offers a valuable framework to acknowledge the variety of relational worlds wherein the processes of domination and exclusion of individuals are embedded. Healey (1997) points out that through the context of our relational worlds, that is, “our attitudes and values, and the interests we have in our local environments, in where things are, and our demands, and needs with respect to how we move around in space and make use of the built and natural environment” (p. 98), and through categorizations and classifications, and making divisions between ourselves and others, “we articulate the abstract structures which surround us, in our assumptions about what to do and how to do it” (p. 98). Power is carried with us in our daily activities and spaces. In, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, De Certeau (1984) locates power relations at the very core of everyday experiences. He deciphers everyday practices as power relations divided between the dominators and dominated, strategies and tactics, and place and time. Strategies, based on place represent the practices of those in power. On the other hand, tactics, as the ‘art of the weak’, are incursions into the field of the dominators. Without a ‘proper’ place, tactics are based on time, such as seized opportunities, cleverly chosen moments, and rapidity of the movements, and can alter the organization of space and challenge the ‘proper’ places in the city. For De Certeau, everyday practices are shaped to a certain extent as processes of appropriation and territorialization.

Another prominent scholar who builds his social theory on the grounds of the everyday life, conceiving it as a struggle and conflict where relations between culture, power, and social differences are structured and structuring the practices, is Pierre Bourdieu (1986, 1990). By looking at the minutiae of daily life, the everyday choices of everyday life, he contends to a fine understanding of the relational politics of power, where domination or oppression, legitimacy or subjection are produced and reproduced in the overarching framework of structural organization. In his concepts of habitus, field, and various forms of capital, which will be elaborated in detail later, he shows permeating power relations in every aspect of social practice. Following Bourdieu, Upton (2002) defines everyday life as “the nexus of spaces and times that repeatedly trigger bodily habits and cultural memories, the *habitus*” (p. 720) and points out the importance of knowing how the everyday life works; “through bodily memory instilled by repeated action in organized time and space” (ibid.). This connection is crucial in that we can trace how and in which ways the everyday life and relations therein are imbued in the physical space and how we carry power in our everyday, trivial activities.

This recognition has important consequences for the urban public space; for different groups at different times, the urban public space is perceived and used differently. Everyday life, the actions and interactions it involves, reflects and exposes vigilant differences, represented in terms of gender, lifestyle, class, and ethnicity. Gender is an important feature in a way that, for Bondi (2005), it appears as an integral, ubiquitous and taken-for-granted aspect of urban life, animating the everyday practices. In the everyday activities, gender influence space and the way it is experienced. At

the same time, as Massey (1994) argues, space is important in the construction of gender relations and in struggles to change them. "From the symbolic meaning of spaces/places and the clearly gendered messages which they transmit, ... spaces and places are not only themselves gendered but, in their being so, they both reflect and affect the ways in which gender is constructed and understood" (p. 179). Thus, as reciprocal dynamic relations full of symbols and power, space becomes both an objective parameter and a subjective category affecting people (Emmenegger, 1997).

Acknowledging space as reciprocal dynamic relations full of symbols and power, wherein differences, like gender, class, and ethnicity are imbued in representations and social constructions bring a new perspective to conceptualize the everyday urban public space. These differences are not simply variables to be measured, but a set of social relations. On the basis of the lived experiences of various groups or counter-publics, the everyday urban public space becomes an arena in which power relations compete with each other. Diversity and difference are represented in the urban public spaces with variety of rhythms and patterns of use, being occupied at different times by different groups. In this framework, avoidance and participation, withdrawal and placement are articulated in the relational frameworks, in which boundaries of use and appropriation are continuously constructed, negotiated, re-constructed, and expressed.

Boundaries and Urban Public Space

Conceiving everyday urban public space as a social construct and an everyday arena of constant struggle and identification/representation positions different groups, based on gender and ethnicity (in our case Turkish immigrant women) as active social actors, whose social relations with space, both locational and transnational, influence their boundary constructions in urban public spaces as mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. Because of the fluidity of these relations and boundaries, there is a continual process of social and spatial ordering, which positions them into a variety of sets of social relations. In each urban public space, based on these boundaries, their spatial behavior and experiences are shaped, improving or intensifying the disparities pronounced. It should be noted that the social relations in urban public space act as mechanisms of social identification, marking boundaries who is in and out, not only between ethnicities, nationalities, and religious groups, but also within the community itself.

Spatial boundaries are often considered as physical or social barriers that define the space and its use. These boundaries reflect differentiation, both physically and socially, and their features permit us (as users) labeling and classification. Low (2000) asserts that boundaries imply the territories of influence, "perceived to be bounded or distinct because the activities and people within the territory are distinct from the people and activities outside of it" (p. 154). Boundaries define the inside and the outside, inclusion and exclusion. Since they are related with the territories of influence; they are the marked transitions from one sphere of control to that of

another. Boundaries form a non-verbal communication (Rapoport, 1977), providing information for behavior. People process this information and the process of coding and decoding influences patterns of social interaction.

Physical boundaries are more easily noticeable, like a fence or a wall, or changes in the pavement than social and symbolic boundaries. Lamont and Molnar (2002) make a distinction between social and symbolic boundaries. While social boundaries are those that refer to economic, physical and political position, symbolic boundaries are related to moral and cultural boundaries. They are not mutually exclusive; they overlap.

Lamont and Molnar (2002) define symbolic boundaries as conceptual distinctions made by social actors to categorize objects, people, practices, and even time and space. They also separate people into groups and generate feelings of similarity and group membership. "They are an essential medium through which people acquire status and monopolize sources" (ibid., p. 168). Symbolic boundaries can rely on codes, such as symbolic, cultural, and social, which are interwoven in the boundary-making process. For instance, among the Bedouins, cultural codes like honor, modesty, shame, disgrace, are also symbolic boundaries for women, determining the patterns of social interaction, and turn into social and spatial boundaries that marks the gender in urban public space (Fenster, 1997).

For Lamont and Molnar, symbolic boundaries exist at the intersubjective level; however, social boundaries are manifested in groupings of individuals. When symbolic boundaries are agreed upon widely, they can retain a constraining character, and eventually influence the pattern of social interaction in important ways. When they are shared and established, symbolic boundaries may then turn into social boundaries. They work in categorization of social and collective identifications, underlying the difference between 'I' and 'you', and 'we' and 'they.' In other words, symbolic boundaries are then translated into identifiable categorizations, such as race, gender, and social classes. Categories, in that sense, are defined on the bases of socially negotiated boundaries and changing relations across those boundaries. Social networks make it possible to generate these shared and distinct definitions, leading to categorization and difference. Lamont and Molnar (2002) argue that examining symbolic and social boundaries allows us to capture the dynamic dimensions of social relations, as groups compete in the production, diffusion, and institutionalization of alternative systems and principles of classifications. Boundaries, at the same time, indicate the order and organization of perception of groups into social categories as they mark inclusion and exclusion. In that sense, understanding how boundaries work acts to reify and reinforce social categories, both in the formation and sustaining processes, becomes crucial.

If public space is a social construct, then these symbolic and social boundaries are always in play, among individuals and groups, constant in competing, struggling, negotiating for articulation of differences and communalities and patterns of appropriation of public spaces.

Social and symbolic boundaries can be cultural and follow the cultural rules of difference and differentiation, but this should not imply that they are statically

cultural, or constant, like biological theories of cultural differences. In that sense, Barth's (1969) conception of boundary, based on a relational approach, is worth to mention, emphasizing that feelings of communality are defined in opposition to the perceived identity of other racial and ethnic groups.

Of the basic boundary constructions in public space, publicness and privateness play an important role in the social construction of urban public space. These notions, publicness and privateness, are used to refer to much broader concepts; the entire range of places, people, and activities that constitute the public and private dimensions of social life. As argued above, for Bahrdr ([1961]1998, cited in Siebel and Wehrheim, 2003) and Sennett (1977) the polarity between and complementarity of publicness and privateness are the most important characteristics of urban life. Social life in general can be argued as being divided into two main spheres, the public and the private. In our everyday routines, we live in and pass through these spheres and accordingly spaces, and we feel and behave however is appropriate. How we define the situation or object becomes crucial to how we act (Lofland, 1973). In daily life, we learn to cross these spheres and adjust ourselves. In the public and private spaces, we maintain different kinds and sorts of mental and behavioral states, sometimes among intimate friends and relatives, and sometimes among strangers.

Through the morphological characteristics and organization of space, defining some places as private and others as public, individuals know which places are open and accessible not only for them but also for the presence of others. In the organization of public and private spaces, there can be physical means used in order to address users. Signs, boundaries, fences, walls and gates inform the users/potential users how to regulate their behavior while moving through public and private spaces. There are also temporal characteristics, such as the opening hours of shops, shopping malls, and market places as well as day and night. The symbolical characteristics, such as territorial means, can also influence behavior. These complex systems of codes, manifested physically, psychologically, and socially, imply the publicness and the privateness of a space and of a situation. Various definitions and descriptions of publicness and privateness can lead to different actions of individuals.

Publicness and Privateness: Basic Frameworks and Characteristics

The understanding of what is 'public' or 'private,' for Weintraubb (1997), lies in knowing with what it is being, explicitly or implicitly, contrasted and upon what basis the contrast is being drawn. Any conception of 'public' or 'private' makes sense only as one element in paired opposition. On the most general level, two main criteria on which the public/private distinction can be drawn are distinguished; the first one is *Visibility*, as what is hidden or withdrawn versus what is open or revealed. The second is *Collectivity*, as what is individual, or pertains only to an individual, versus what is collective, or affects the interests of a collectivity of individuals. In the social science literature, there are a number of ways in which these criteria can be perceived and a number of ways in which they can be combined to understand various forms of public/private distinction. Based on the complex web of understandings and con-

conceptualizations, for Weintraubb, four general frameworks in which the discussions of public and private take place in social analysis can be identified.

The first framework, the liberal-economist model, sees the public/private distinction predominantly related to the distinction between the state administration and the market economy. The use of public/private distinction in this framework mainly involves the question of jurisdiction; the sphere of public authority of the state versus the sphere of formally voluntary relations between private individuals, which is in general conceived in terms of the market. Disputes over the dimensions of public jurisdiction and public interest, for example, whether particular activities or services should be left to the market or be subject to government intervention, can be seen as the main components of arguments. The second framework, the civic perspective, on the other hand, sees the public as the arena of political community and citizenship, as distinct from both the state and the market. Here the public sphere is perceived as a process of active participation in collective decision-making, based on the notions of solidarity and equality. In the first framework, 'public' can be seen as mainly a derivative of the administrative state, whereas in the civic framework, public life also draws attention besides authority and interest concerns. In this framework, we can specify Arendt's conception of 'public realm' and Habermas's conception of 'public sphere' as representing the significant accounts of characterization and theorization of this sphere of social life. Weintraubb (1997) argues that in these two frameworks, the real conceptual interest, is usually defining 'public,' and 'private' is to some extent considered as a residual category. On the other hand, in the third, the feminist framework, conceptual starting point is the 'private', and the public is a residual category. Feminists focus on the distinction between family and civil society, the larger economic and political order, emphasizing the gender-linked nature of the public/private distinction in terms of social structure and ideology. The family is generally considered as the private realm; therefore the public/private distinction mostly refers to public/domestic distinction.

Last, the fourth framework is related closely to urban social life, an account of public life based on sociability, as distinct from the household and intimate relations. Public/private distinction is based on the separation of the family and intimate relations from the public and impersonal relations; the personal, emotionally intense and intimate domain of family, friendship, and the primary group versus the formal, institutionalized secondary groups and relations. In this framework, public/private distinction entails a very different conception of public space than the other three. "This is a space of heterogeneous coexistence . . . , a space of symbolic display, of the complex blending of practical motives with interaction ritual and personal ties, of physical proximity coexisting with social distance" (*ibid.*, p. 303). Following this last framework, this study adopts a contextual definition of publicness and privateness, on the basis of the degree of controlling the interactions with other people and/or spaces.

Though Weintraubb's depiction of public/private distinction provides a contextual basis in exploring the definition and conceptualization of 'public' and 'private', Benn and Gaus (1983) warn us about the wide range of meanings and definitions

attributed to the public and the private. The wide range of diversity of activities and practices, together with cultural differences, can blur the definition between a public or private one. To clarify this, they identify three broad types, which constitute the dimensions of publicness and privateness. These are access, agency, and interest, which are also three dimensions of social organization. "For even a culture without public/private distinction would still require some way of so ordering its relations and activities that it could recognize, discuss, explain, or justify the allocation of access to information, resources, etc., the capacities in which agents enjoyed that access, and in whose interest it was used" (p. 7). Accessibility is often considered as the main characteristic of publicness. Benn and Gaus (1983) further divide it to four sub-dimensions; the first one is physical access; public spaces are public because it is open for everybody to physically be present in them. Besides physical access, it also covers access to activities and intercourse within. A public space can be open to everybody, but not the activities going on there; for example, a meeting of friends in a public square, or a family picnic in a park. Third, access to information affects the level of publicness and privateness. It involves controlling information about oneself and managing one's appearance in the public. "Information that is made public is available to the public at large or to any interested member of the public. Our 'public face' is thus that we allow anyone to see, our 'private side' is that to which we restrict access" (ibid., p. 8). The last sub-dimension is access to resources. Particularly in the political analysis, this becomes important whether the control of access is public or private. Subsequently, the agency is related largely to the status of the agents. The basic distinction lies in the position of the agent acting publicly or privately. The agency becomes critical, especially when the agent can influence the access to resources. Thus, the standpoint of agents, whether they are acting privately or on behalf of a community, makes a difference to the nature and consequences of their actions. In the same way, the third dimension, the interest, plays a major role. Whose interest is concerned? Are the agents acting on the basis of their own individual interest or a common interest?

According to Benn and Gaus (1983), these dimensions of publicness and privateness provide us with the means to pick out certain of our environment's features and describe them, so that we are aware of the distinction between 'public' and 'private' in the related contexts, situations, and occasions in our social life. Nevertheless, what is public and what is private cannot be determined only with these dimensions. There are also accompanying characteristics of publicness and privateness. Publicness and privateness necessarily presuppose norms and any related behavior is related contextually to some particular norms.

Reading a letter without the permission of the recipient or the sender is a breach of privacy if and only if it contravenes a social norm. In a culture which had no norm restraining that sort of action but allowed anyone to read whatever material came his way or put constraints only on the reading of arcane religious material, a letter could never be described as 'private' because, if the concept of privateness could be formulated at all, it would have to be in a way that excluded its application to letters (ibid., p. 11).

Thus, publicness and privateness are related closely to social norms. To describe an object or a situation, for example, as 'public' implies that it satisfies some of a bounded set of conditions specified in the norms. Publicness and privateness are also related to descriptive characteristics. A garden is private, because it bears the marks of privateness; there are fences around. In addition to the normative and descriptive uses, publicness and privateness has a prescriptive use. Because the garden is private, it is forbidden to enter it. The prescriptive use is much related to the normative characteristics; it invokes norms of the 'public' or 'private' and prescribes a consequent attitude or behavior.

Benn and Gaus (1983) state that the difference between descriptive and prescriptive characteristics of publicness and privateness bears directly on whether the relationship between 'public' and 'private' is dichotomous or continuous. In some contexts, publicness and privateness constitute a continuum along which different degrees of publicness and privateness can be ordered. A beach can be very private early in the morning, but when more people come in the following hours, it become less private, and more public. In the dichotomous contexts, on the other hand, the opposition is based on a yes/no kind of distinction. For instance, if that particular beach is private property, then there is no way that it becomes public, unless the owner gives permission. In addition, they also emphasize the bi-polar and multi-polar characteristics of publicness and privateness, besides the continuous or dichotomous relationship. An urban park is often considered 'public', i.e. open and accessible for everybody, but some users of the park may engage in a personal or intimate relationship, for example, groups sitting on the benches, picnicking with friends, a social setting close to the strangers. Also in some cases, public institutions may restrict publicness, relating to a particular and institutionalized form, like religion, health, government, for the sake of which the restriction is imposed. In that sense, publicness is considered as a residual category and as related to a particular context.

To conclude, from the analysis of Weintraubb's public/private distinction and the portrayal of Benn and Gaus's dimensions of 'public' and 'private,' it can be argued that definitions and interpretations of publicness and privateness are very much related to the context in which they are embedded. Contextual definitions of publicness and privateness lead us to elucidate more, especially in the analysis of social relations and interactions in the urban public space, in a way in which not only social exchanges among strangers, but also a set of emotional and meaningful ties are imbued in the context. When the urban public space is seen as a social construct, these expressive and meaningful ties become crucial.

Publicness and Privatness: Spatial Reflections

Following the arguments above, Sapsford (2000) depicts publicness and privateness as process rather than a static structure of a taken for granted categorical distinction or a natural way of viewing the social world; a social process that is something we do to ourselves and to each other. Deeply embedded in the social contexts, there exist

an infinite variety of combinations of different degrees and kinds of the public and private. In this framework, the very general formulation of the division of the social world just into ‘public’ and ‘private’ oversimplifies how people actually live and experience their lives (ibid.).

The portrayal of social relations in relation to the ‘public’ and private’ shows the primary and simple dichotomies in order to highlight the differences between them. In reality, the public and the private form a continuum of spheres, activities, people, and places, rather than a dichotomous organization along the concepts of public and private, and many public spaces actually have hybrid characters, mediating between degrees of publicness and privateness. For the sake of analytic purposes, on the other hand, various degrees of publicness and privateness can correspond to various spatial scales, modes of encounter, the nature of social relations, and social identification; different relational domains, as Figure 3.1 presents.

FIGURE 3.1 Analytic representation of public-private continuum

	←	most Private		most Public	→
Spatial scales		body	home	neighborhood	city
Modes of encounter		personal		interpersonal	impersonal
Social relations			primary informal exclusive intimacy	secondary formal openness anonymity	
Social identification			we	they	

In a public-private continuum, the core of privateness can be located in the body, at the one edge. The body covers the innerspace of subjectivity and the mind -the ultimate private sphere of an individual- and the psychological-physical space in the immediate surroundings, the personal space. Social psychologists argue that social constructs are related deeply to human body and mind and that the very basic differentiation of the self and outer world starts from this dimension. On the contrasting edge, publicness can extend beyond the city, to the national and international scales, as much transnational cultural and political studies shows.

The scope of this study is formed along the spatial scales of the home and the city. The city, following the classical urban sociologists, as the social experience of the public, generally is characterized as the ‘world of strangers’, where notions like formality, anonymity, aloofness, and impersonality, govern the relations therein. The notion of the public calls for segmental and secondary relations, in which one encounters ‘them’. In contrast, home calls for privacy, primary, warm, intimate relations, where one encounters the similar and special ‘we’. The housing cluster and the

neighborhood stand in between the two distinct social worlds of relations. The neighborhood stands as a porous and tenuous spatial unit, enabling both confrontation with the 'them' and the creation of the 'we'. Notwithstanding these provisions of spatial scales, public/private interplay is discernable in all everyday spatial practices.

Up to this point, the conceptions of publicness and privateness have been represented in a rather natural (non-cultural) perspective, yet they can be in fact quite culturally specific, reflected through symbolical uses and patterns of use of space. For instance, De Mare (1993) describes the ritual actions with which seventeenth century Dutch housewives turned the threshold, an area which included the front house, *voorhuis*, and the doorstep as well as the pavement, not only into a location for displaying cleanliness and order, but also a clearly delineated demarcation zone between the public and private spheres.

The public sphere conception of the Dutch has a quite different nature regarding the home, in a way it penetrates into the private space of the family. Open curtains in the living room, visible from the street, shows a different attitude as far as the relationship between the individual and the public sphere is concerned. 'Look our curtains are open! We have nothing to hide!', the living room becomes a proscenium stage on which individuals present themselves, conscious of the fact that they have an audience (Bollerey, 1993). There is a symbolic contact between the inhabitants of the house and the passers-by on the street. On the other hand, in Muslim societies, because of the strict privacy concerns of the family and home, any form of contact between the home and the outside has to be avoided. Yet from the ornaments and architectural details of the housing unit, outsiders can be informed about the inhabitants (see literature on architecture of Islam, Mortada, 2003). Likewise, Van der Horst and Messing (2003) argue that inter-ethnic relationships in the neighborhood often find place through the acquisition of material objects by the inhabitants. Especially in ethnically heterogeneous neighborhoods, these material objects can be used to transmit personal information about the inhabitants to the public. Like Bollerey (1993), they point out the open-curtains of the living room of the Dutch inhabitants, contrary to the semi-open curtains of the Turks and strictly closed curtains of the Moroccans. Symbolic boundaries are transported from one cultural context to another (Lamont and Molnar, 2002), when people migrate to a new country. In the case of chain migration, they not only endure, but also become more effective in the new setting, especially when symbolic boundaries continue to be shared among generations and fortified through interactions.

Conclusion

Acknowledging everyday urban public space as reciprocal dynamic relations full of symbols and power, wherein differences, like gender, class, and ethnicity are imbued in representations and social constructions, brings a new perspective to look at the phenomenon of urban public space. It is a powerful perspective in a way that it is

based on the lived experiences of various groups or counter-publics, exposing a domain of struggles for inscribing their identities and presence in urban public space. Diversity and difference are represented in a variety of contested spatial practices and conflicted claims, whereby the everyday social life is also revealed.

Rather than analyzing urban public spaces with contrasting definitions and spatial behavior, this study approaches urban public spaces as representing a variety of degrees of boundary constructions, defined and conceptualized by users in a dynamic process. Instead of treating boundaries as taken-for-granted categories of an absolute opposition such as a public/private dichotomy, this study analyzes them as embedded in the processes of spatial contexts (both in place-making and appropriation) and in continuous interaction. The significance of contexts and the social relations within, particularly social ties have seen as significant by relational analysts in describing differences and varieties between social groups and their social behavior. Furthermore, urban public spaces cannot be seen only as absolute independent entities, such as parks, squares, streets by their own, but as a network of spaces, i.e. a variety of associations and attachments made in a variety of scales of urban public spaces.

With this approach of the socially constructed nature of public space, I promote this study with the relational approach (a.o. Tilly, 1998; Bourdieu, 1986, 1990, 1998), presenting an analysis of the social relations, ties, networks, and cumulative processes, that constrain, shape, or frame the spatial behavior and use and experience of public spaces on the one hand, and how different the kinds and natures of urban public spaces condition social relationships, interactions, and networks on the other hand. The following chapter deals with the analytical bases of the relational approach to urban public space.

A RELATIONAL APPROACH TO URBAN PUBLIC SPACE

Introduction

Following the arguments of the classical urban sociologists Simmel (1902), Wirth (1938) and Tönnies (1957), urban public space has generally been characterized as a 'world of strangers' where formality, anonymity, aloofness, and impersonality govern relations therein. Their crumbling illustrations, conceivably related to the rapid social transformations of their era, – about the social relations of urbanites as being impersonal, superficial, transitory, and segmental – picture urbanites as reserving indifference and a blasé outlook, and immunizing themselves against the claims of others (Martindale, 1958). At the one extreme, public spaces are conceptualized as densely packed sights and sounds that they generate 'stimulus overload', with which the urban population can only cope by 'shutting down' or 'turning off'. In relation to this, urban social life is characterized by the substitution of secondary for primary contacts, the weakening of kinship ties, the declining of the social significance of family, the disappearance of the neighborhood, the undermining of the traditional basis of social solidarity (Wirth, 1938). Accordingly, urbanites ignore one another and interact "almost subliminally, demanding nothing of each other, making no contacts with each other, merely passing near each other" (Strauss, 1962, cited in Lofland, 1973, p. xvii). However, in the sixties, Gans (1982) has challenged these generalizing notions of impersonal, superficial, and provisional social relations in the so-called 'loss of community' formulation, by demonstrating the strength of web of face-to-face interaction and community life with personal and collective relations in an urban neighborhood. Likewise, Jacobs (1961) has promoted the social qualities, challenging the conformist perception of public interaction by emphasizing the social conventions and interaction order in the urban public space. Recognizing webs of social linkages in public spaces and tacit conventions that govern behavior in public and sustain social order, they have restored sociability in the core of urban studies literature.

The current literature on the user characteristics of urban public space, to a large extent, is based on the assumption of individuals whose actions are based on individual rational choices with value-maximizing purposes. Placed in a *Gesellschaft*-like social setting, free from kinship or ascribed relations they can make choices in such ways as to maximize outcomes. Out of the available possible choices, they are considered as participating in what is the most suitable activity for them; the nature or

the kind of places, times, and social relationships. In addition, age, gender, daily occupation, cultural, and social factors highly influence the use and experience of urban public spaces. The demographic characteristics or life stages are influential in a way that the meaning of urban public spaces is constructed. While the preference of teenagers for public spaces is more related to places to 'hang out', seeking freedom and autonomy (Lieberg, 1995), elderly hunt for more surveillance and security (Siebel and Wehrheim, 2003). Gender is also an important category, not only for cultures practicing gender segregation (Fenster, 1997; Peleman, 2001a), but it is relevant for Western society as a whole as well (Bondi, 1998; Day, 2000). In a neighborhood of Barcelona, Ortiz et al. (2004) argue about the particularity of the use characteristics of public spaces in terms of age, gender, and socio-cultural background and accordingly emphasize the similar experiences of the sense of place for native Spanish and immigrant women.

Ethnicity and culture are often seen as an influential factor for the perception and experience of urban public space. Jókövi (2000a, 2000b) discusses the cultural influences on the recreational uses of public spaces, stating that because of differences in belief, culture, tradition, and income, the use of urban and rural open public spaces of Dutch natives and immigrants are quite distinct in terms of their free-time, activities, expectations and experiences. Hooghiemstra (1997), in the same vein, points out that due to the restrictions of religion on Muslim teenager girls in the Netherlands, their public space behavior patterns and activity spaces in the city are much more constrained than those of their Dutch peers. In all of the aforementioned works, culture, religion, and tradition are conceptualized as a 'given' structure, imposing rules for action, and people just follow them. Having highlighted particularly cultural constraints and limitations, in the framework of the use of public spaces, women, in this special case they are the Muslim women, are considered as a dependent category wherein culture and religion restrict them from doing certain things and dictate that they behave and act in that way.

However, differences, according to relational approach, are deeply embedded in the social relations. The relational approach provides a framework according to which culture and tradition, gender and class, as embodied by individuals (Bourdieu, 1986, 1998), forms and is formed through social relations. Instead of an autonomous sphere 'in which ideas change ideas', Tilly (1998) treats culture as shared understandings and representations; "actors operate within frames of understanding constructed by previous interactions; anticipating one another's responses on the basis of those frames and modifying their strategies as a consequence of shared experiences" (p. 20). In the following parts, I will elaborate on the theoretical bases of the relational approach to urban public space, relying highly on the works of Charles Tilly and Pierre Bourdieu. In order to elaborate on the meaning and experience of the urban public space by analyzing the patterns of spatial behavior and practices of Turkish immigrant women, the focus will be on the social construction of the urban public space, where differences are constructed and represented in terms of variety of uses and appropriation patterns.

The Relational Approach

The relational approach emphasizes that social structures need to be understood relationally, that is to say, it acknowledges social life in terms of relations, interactions, and bonds among individuals rather than the particular characteristics of the individuals. The strength of the relational approach, as Emirbayer (1997) argues, lies in its focus on the processes and dynamics of social life and of unfolding relations. As Tilly (1998) states, relational accounts in the social science have been explored since Simmel and Pierce, but have remained a minority movement in social science as a whole, as “individualisms and holisms continue to reign” (p. 21). In his book, *Durable Inequality*, he develops a relational framework, arguing the importance of ‘bonds, not essences’ in the analysis of long-lasting differences among social groups. Though Tilly’s work is related mainly to the historical inquiry in macro-sociology, it provides a constructive framework that is based on relational realism, which is transactions, interactions, and social ties serving as starting-points of spatial analysis.

The relational approach enables us to elaborate the differences to the construction of space through spatial behavior and activities which constitute everyday life. Its particular concern of social and spatial processes makes it significant in a way that how social relations are inscribed in space. Bourdieu (1998) sees relational thinking as “a philosophy of action designated at times as *dispositional* which notes the potentialities inscribed in the body of agents and in the structure of the situations where they act or, more precisely, in the relations between them” (emphasis as original, p. vii).

Tilly (1997) argues that the relational approach deals with social relations in terms of (a) exhibiting considerable regularities; (b) impinging strongly on the attributes, behavior, identities, and consciousness of human beings; (c) constituting through ties/connection and regularization larger structures, such as groups, organizations, and societies. In that sense, social interactions in the repetitive and routine activities of individuals become very important. This is not to say that only repetitions and routines are crucial, yet social relations in repetitive activities and daily-life routines, located in time-space, can have regularized consequences in the boundary-making processes for the individuals who engage in those activities. Tilly (1998) argues that differences, categorical differences, created and sustained relationally, are embedded in the nature and characteristics of the social interaction. Instead of individual properties, he emphasizes the significance of bonds: “how transactions clump into social ties, social ties concatenate into networks, and existing networks constrain” (ibid., p.21). Social networks do not necessarily determine social action, but rather *create a context* that facilitates or impedes social interaction (emphasis as original, Bosco, 2001, cited in Vertovec, 2001).

In his analysis of social interaction, Tilly (1997, 1998) schematizes the social ties in relation to scripting and shared local knowledge and he argues that through these dimensions, social interaction differs. Scripting can be defined as the explicit models that are known by the parties who are involved in the social interaction. It is important during the interaction because it has to be available jointly to the participants. Lofland (1998) also points out the importance of some scripts during the stranger

interaction in the public spaces, such as cooperative motility, civil inattention, audience role prominence, restrained helpfulness, and civility toward diversity. Scripts are closely related to person-to-person connections. Shared local knowledge, on the other hand, is related to familiarity, experience, and acquaintance. Local knowledge (Geertz, 1983) is contextual, because it develops in interaction among people with the objects and situations of a social setting that are specific to a local context. It is powerful because it develops out of experience, real, everyday experience, with the situation in question. For Yanow (2004), acquiring local knowledge is a kind of expertise, expertise on the basis of everyday knowledge, residing in intimate familiarity and understanding the particulars of the situation. Local knowledge guides us to evaluate the setting and elaborate on the patterns of interaction in the urban public space, in a wide range of possibilities, from whether we choose the form of interaction in question to how we know which behavior is appropriate for the specific public setting. We can argue that each public space in the city acknowledges a different degree of scripting and local knowledge and accordingly a variety of social interaction/relationship possibilities and patterns. In everyday life, individuals as agents construct public spaces based on meanings, definitions, and activities while they are interacting with others in the social settings. Depending on the individual's possession of scripting and local knowledge, he or she perceives urban public space differently and ascribes to it a sense of belonging or strangeness.

Tilly (1998) emphasizes that social categories are defined through social interaction among parties with the available scripting and local knowledge. Because of the local variations on the scripts and local shared knowledge, each social setting produces some unique characteristics available only to its habitués, specific relational characteristics for the members of the categories. The symbolic boundaries are enacted accordingly; ethnicity, gender, and community membership do the boundary work, defining ties and locating distinctions between members of different categories. Once they are established, "it lends itself to serious relational work" (ibid, p. 72). Categories start to do the work of distinction, in a way Bourdieu (1986) defines in his book, *Distinction*.

In the original work, Tilly (1998) builds a relational theory of historical process on these categorical relations and categorical inequalities, long-lasting, robust, and resilient differences. Though the direct application of Tilly to this study is limited, I appropriate his concepts of the relational conception of categories and the relational processes of boundary construction to my analysis. Tilly's conception of seeing categories as relational is important for spatial analysis in a way that it enables us to see the various ways that categorical networks, social relations that construct boundaries, boundaries of inclusion and exclusion as discussed in Chapter Three, are embedded in space through use and appropriation and how such spaces are made into social spaces as the articulations of social relations. In this framework, we can argue that the patterns of uses and experiences of urban public space reflect not neutral facts, but social relations deeply embedded in the spatial structures.

Another prominent advocate of the relational approach, Pierre Bourdieu, recognizes social relations among actors as being structured by, and in turn contributing

to the structuring of, the social relations of power among different categories (Hillier and Rooksby, 2005). As an analytical representation of the relational approach adopted here for the analysis of urban public spaces from the perspective of Turkish immigrant women, Bourdieu's theory of practice and two of his key concepts, habitus and social capital, are appropriated to explain their spatial behavior, as firmly embedded in a dialectical relationship between culture, structure and power, and their specific ways of conceptualizations of the urban public space that are related to structural properties of their everyday life contexts.

Bringing Everyday Practices up to Urban Public Space

Understanding urban public space as a social construct calls for the conception of people's social practices together with their involvements: a sense of one's place. In that case, spatial practices in urban public space can be seen as closely related to users' own definitions, conceptions, and meanings, the contextual nature of one's sense of one's place and others' place. This proposition originates from Bourdieu's relational view of the practice; 'I act because of who I am,' not because of a rational interest or set of learned values. "As a body and a biological individual, I am in the way that things are, situated in a place; I occupy a position in physical space and social space. I am not *atopos*, placeless" (emphasis as original, Bourdieu, 2000, p. 131). He defines *topos*, or place, as the site agent 'takes' place or exists, briefly, as a localization, or relationally as a position. In exploring the interdependence of human agency and social structure, Bourdieu defines a sense of one's place, an embodied sense of place, as the *Habitus*, a system of dispositions to a certain practice. It refers to the "embodiment of individual actors of systems of social norms, understandings and patterns of behavior" (Painter, 2000; cited in Hillier and Rooksby, 2005, p. 21). Bourdieu (2000) introduces habitus as the mediating link between objective social structures and individual action, and discards both mechanical determinism of structuralist approaches and finalist accounts of rational, calculating agency of rational action theory.

Habitus can be interpreted simply as the basic system of knowledge that people normally use in their daily lives, i.e. the habituated practices of individuals. As such it is a cultural system that originates from society's daily life activities. Bourdieu (1986) sees the habitus as a generative principle of distinct and distinctive practices, which is unique to every individual, as well as a system of classification of distinct practices.

One of the functions of the notion of habitus is to account for the unity of style, which unites the practices and goods of a single agent or a class of agents. The habitus is the generative and unifying principle which translates the intrinsic and relational characteristics of a position into a unitary life style, that is a unitary set of choices, persons, goods, practices" (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 8).

Bourdieu (2005) defines habitus as “a system of dispositions, that is of permanent manners of being, seeing, acting, and thinking, or a system of long-lasting (rather than permanent) schemes or schemata or structures of perception, conception, and action” (p. 43). He sees that human behavior has unity, like a lifestyle, which may be recognized in the manner of speaking, of dressing, of walking, of inhabiting, yet by emphasizing this unity, he does not adopt a monolithic view of human behavior. Behavior is open and diverse, but within limits. Dispositions do not lead necessarily to a determinate action, they are “revealed and fulfilled only in appropriate circumstances and in relationship with a situation” (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 149). In other words, habitus is not a determining structure; on the contrary, it is generative, open to improvisations, which establishes an active and creative relation between individuals and their world. Individuals interpret social situations differently because of their habituses; their own dispositions, preferences, perceptions, and appreciations on various social occasions. Habitus as a system of acquired dispositions function (a) as categories of perception and assessment or as classificatory principles; and (b) as being the organizing principles of action, meaning that constituting the social agent in his true role as the practical operator of the construction of objects (Bourdieu, 1989).

Hence, habitus shapes our perceptions; giving “expression to certain meanings that things and people have for us, and it is precisely by giving such expression that it makes these meanings exist for us” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 58). We can argue that different conceptualizations of urban public space, in this framework, are related closely to the habituses of individuals. Taylor (1993) states that habitus encodes a certain cultural understanding. In this sense, it has an expressive dimension.

Children are inducted to a culture, are taught the meanings which constitute it, partly through inculcation of the appropriate habitus. We learn how to hold ourselves, how to defer to others, how to be a presence for others, all largely through taking on different styles of bodily comportment. Through these models of deference and presentation, and hence of what is valuable and good are encoded (ibid., p. 58).

Habitus thus can transmit culture, pass on social norms, customs and values. For example, social codes related to public space can be passed on from one generation to another. Yet Bourdieu (1986) argues that the habitus is an open system of ‘durable and transposable dispositions’; meaning that the habitus is not static. It is durable because it is inscribed in the social construction of the self and transposable because it can be used from one social field to another (Calhoun, et al., 1993). In this way, one social construction can influence another action in another field and vice versa. The habitus forms the behavior of individuals in which they are dealing with familiar and new situations; at the same time habitus evolves through their experiences. Hence, habitus involves constant improvisations.

An important characteristic of the habitus is that it is constituted through past experiences both individually and collectively, and based on the experiences of social practices. Calhoun (2000) suggests that habitus is something that is acquired through repetition, like a habit. Yet Bourdieu (2005) asserts that habitus is never a mere principle of repetition; that is the difference between habitus and habit. As a dynamic

system of dispositions that interact with one another, it has, as such, a generative capacity; it is a “structured principle of invention, similar to a generative grammar able to produce an infinite number of new sentences according to determinate patterns and within determinate limits” (p. 46). Reflecting personal accumulated space-time experiences and inheritances, *habitus* enables us to use the knowledge coming from past experiences to direct spatial behavior. But it should be noted that it is not only rules – social norms and values – but also improvisations that people develop throughout their lives as a ‘sense’, a sense of how to act. Skills and knowledge can be important, but for Bourdieu, the experience and knowledge embedded in the ‘socially informed body’ is more important. The challenge of Bourdieu’s *habitus* is that it is not a constant thing, but one requiring constant improvisation. Bourdieu (2005) firmly argues that *habitus* is not something natural or inborn, but the product of history: “that is of social experience and education, it may be changed by history, that is by new experiences, education or training” (p. 45). Though dispositions are long-lasting and they tend to perpetuate, to reproduce themselves, improvisation guides our actions, originating from experiences we have had. This improvisation then turns into a sense, a sense of how to fit effectively into social and cultural practices (Calhoun, 2000).

Therefore, *habitus* can be regarded as an objective basis for regular modes of behavior and also for the regularity of modes of practice. Practices are predicted and known, because “the effect of the *habitus* is that agents who are equipped with it will behave in certain way in certain circumstances” (Bourdieu, 1998, p.77). Certain meanings attached to spaces are then important for the realization of practices, such as using public space as places for meetings and sociability, and exchanging information with strangers. While being in public spaces, such as street, squares, parks, playgrounds, people are aware of the fact that they are going to be, even as a group, among strangers; that they are going to see and be seen.

Bourdieu makes distinctions between individual and group *habitus*es, yet it is possible that a group can consist of individuals with similar *habitus*es. Though the *habitus* is formed with social practice, variations in particular social positions occupied in social fields are limited. Therefore, those who occupy the same field may have similar *habitus*es. In this framework, *habitus* implies a ‘sense of one’s place’, and at the same time, a ‘sense of the place of others’. Thus it constructs categorical identifications.

Habitus as a system of schemata of classification, is objectively referred, via the social conditionings that produced it, to a social condition; agents classify themselves, expose them selves to classification, by choosing in conformity with taste, different attributes (clothes, food, friends, etc) that go well together and that go well with them or, more exactly, suit their position. To be more precise, they choose, in the space of available goods and services, goods that occupy a position in this space homologous to the position they themselves occupy in social space. This makes for the fact that nothing classifies somebody more than the way he or she classifies (ibid., p. 131).

Based on their similarities of habituses, they may act similarly and, in turn, reproduce the culture of their shared social fields through practice (Bourdieu, 1986). In this way, we identify ourselves and others; classifying and categorizing 'we' and 'they'. For example, when we talk about the use of public spaces by such groups as women, teenagers, and immigrants we are not only describing these groups' characteristics, but also describing their specific ways of appropriating the public space as opposed to other groups' ways. We locate them in relation to others. Therefore, their practices in general seem to be distinct from other people's practices. Thus, our perceptions and evaluations, related to the urban public space are continuously 'socially constructed'.

Bourdieu (2005) warns us that habitus should not be considered in isolation, rather it must be used "in relation to the notion of field which contains a principle of dynamics by itself as well as in relation to habitus" (p. 47). Rather than existing in a vacuum of social relations, the habitus is structured and structures social fields. A field can be described as a social system in which actors play out their engagements with each other (Hillier and Rooksby, 2005) and functions with its own logic of rules. Societies are composed of a large number of social fields. Each field is a space of conflict and competition as actors struggle to achieve their objectives, since fields are structured by relations of power among individuals and institutions that occupy strategic positions within it (Friedmann, 2005). Within a field, there are certain dominant practices, arisen from the power relations and legitimacy of some practices, as well as practices of marginalized status. The dominance is achieved through the accumulation of various forms of capital that are currently valued within the field. In other words, the struggles in a field are closely linked to forms of capital; to be precise, about which forms of capital are legitimate. Besides economic capital, Bourdieu identifies different states of cultural (as embodied, objectified, and institutionalized) and social capital. Yet his powerful formulation of capital relies on the symbolic dimension, symbolic capital, as an umbrella term incorporating the other three forms of capital. Conceived as a form of power, as legitimate demands for recognition, deference, or obedience, symbolic capital melds into practices of, what Bourdieu calls, 'symbolic domination'. In that sense, "capital exists and acts as symbolic capital in its relationship with a habitus predisposed to perceive it as a sign" (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 242). In sum, habitus, the durable, transposable, structured (and structuring) dispositions of individuals, works together with the necessary legitimate capital in a given social field. As we will see below, habitus is critical since it is constructed through, i.e. in accruing different forms of capital to be facilitated in the field, and in turn constructs capital.

Social Capital and Urban Public Space

Social capital, in the social science literature, becomes increasingly a positive creative, yet convoluted, concept which takes on a plethora of applications, from booming ethnic enterprise and its value for educational attainment strategies for

immigrants, from the battle against crime in the streets to economic success of regions and cities, from rebuilding of neighborhood communities to accessing the job market. Therefore, subject framing is necessary to locate its heuristic value and novelty to our analysis.

The first systematic analysis of social capital was produced by Bourdieu, who conceptualizes it as the accumulation of the actual and potential resources that an individual can possess because of his/her membership in a durable network. He defines social capital as “the aggregate of the actual and potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 248, cited in Portes, 1998, p. 3). Bourdieu’s formulation of social capital is instrumental, “focusing on the benefits accruing to individuals by virtue of participation in groups and on the deliberate construction of sociability for the purpose of creating this resource” (Portes, 1998, p. 3). It is produced through formal and informal practices of social relationships and based on exchange, which is important establishing and reproducing social relationships that are directly usable in the short or long term (Bourdieu, 1985, cited in Portes, 1998). Social capital is grounded on the relationships between actors, or between an individual actor and a group.

Another prominent scholar of individual/actor-based social capital is Coleman (1988), who defines it mainly in relation to its function as “a variety of entities with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain action of actors, whether individuals or corporate actors, within the structure” (p. 98). Social capital enables certain actions of individuals who are within the structure and is created by rational, purposeful individuals who build social capital to maximize their individual opportunities. In Coleman’s formulation, dense networks are crucial for the emergence of social capital.

The main difference between these two formulations of social capital lies in the conception of process. For Coleman, social capital is created by rational, purposeful individuals who build social capital to maximize their individual opportunities. It is like a contract: individuals must have trust that others will reciprocate their actions and will feel some social obligation to do so (Pope, 2003). This can have important effects on the conception, use, and experience of urban public spaces; trust and reciprocity are important for participation in activities, especially for those who are in marginal and disadvantaged positions in the society. Yet it should be noted that the motivation of the individual or aggregated individuals matter in the accumulation of social capital. On the other hand, Bourdieu sees social capital as part of a broader framework of the formation of social processes. As mentioned above, Bourdieu (1986) uses the term capital to include that existing in both material and symbolic forms, i.e. cultural capital, educational capital, economic capital, social capital, but more importantly symbolic capital, the accumulation of which determines location in social space. Symbolic capital, can be interpreted as prestige, reputation and respect, is all embracing and overlaps the other kinds of capital.

These forms of capital can be accumulated and converted from symbolic forms to more material economic forms. However, these transfers do not happen at the same

rate of exchange and volume. For instance, financial capital is more easily transferable to the next generation, whereas the conversions and transfers of cultural and social capital are rather difficult. On the other hand, the social capital accumulated through the building of social connections may be converted into economic capital through the access that it provides to business exchanges, customer relations, as well as a possibility of employment. It can be argued that cultural, educational, and economic capitals have more direct effects; the accumulation of these capitals contributes participation, although the amount and quality of these capital formations can be different. Cultural capital should be understood not only as covering objectified forms of cultural goods, such as books, instruments or art works. Bourdieu's formulation of cultural capital also embraces embodied cultural capital, and exists in the form of long lasting dispositions of the individual. Embodied cultural capital, according to him, is distinguishable in the everyday use of the body, such as eating habits, clothing, as well as the body language. More importantly, embodied cultural capital is evident in the everyday actions of the individuals while communicating and exchanging messages.

In addition to these two formulations of social capital found in the social science literature, a conceptually different formulation comes from Putnam (2000). Social capital is a social 'civicness' in communities and is defined in relation to the features of organizations, such as their networks, norms, and trust, facilitating action and cooperation for mutual benefit. Putnam places social capital in the frame of collective engagement, as a "level of associational involvement and participatory behavior in a community and is measured by such indicators such as newspaper reading, membership in voluntary associations, and expression of trust in political authorities" (Portes, 1998, p. 18). Though Coleman's formulation sees social capital as an individual asset, both Coleman's and Putnam's formulations of social capital refer the production and reproduction of social processes within and between groups in society that allow individuals to draw on 'collective capital.' Thus, social capital, according to Putnam and Coleman, is understood as an asset that can be used in a particular direction, for example, in political and economical work. On the other hand, in the original Bourdieu formulation, social capital as an accumulated resource and "the profits which accrue from membership in a group are the basis of the solidarity which makes them possible" (*ibid.*, p. 3). Social capital does not belong to the individual, but to the community; in other words, membership in a group provides each of its members with the backing of the social capital. With this membership social relationship, individuals are allowed to claim access to resources possessed by their associates and their accrument is highly related to the amount and quality of these resources (*ibid.*).

Social capital exists in the individuals' web of relationships and inheres in the structure of their relationships. In order to possess social capital, "a person must be related to others, and it is those others, not himself, who are the actual source of his or her advantage" (*ibid.*, p. 7). Moreover, Portes (1998) argues that the motivations of the recipients and of donors in exchanges mediated by social capital make the difference in the meaning of social capital. These motivations reveal the core pro-

cesses that the concept of social capital seeks to capture. Based on the division of consummatory versus instrumental motivation, he identifies four sources of social capital, each leading to different consequences in effect; while reciprocity exchanges and enforceable trust are sources driven by instrumental motivations, value introjection and bounded solidarity are sources of social capital, embarked upon by consummatory motivations. In return, based on the different motivations, recipients of social capital can get different outcomes, such as family support, norm obedience and network-mediated benefits, but as well as excessive claims on group members, restrictions in individual freedom, negative effects of social control. Since it is based on the aggregate resources of the individual's possession, social capital can be facilitative, as well as impeding.

As an additional important feature, Vertovec (2001) points out that a full appreciation of social capital requires an awareness of the forms and conditions of its embeddedness. The concept of 'embeddedness' in a social network was first introduced by Granovetter (1985) to explain the social situatedness of economic actions. On the basis of this conception, Portes (1995) developed embeddedness further in terms of two forms: relational embeddedness and structural embeddedness. While the former involves actor's personal relations with one another, including norms, sanctions, expectations, and reciprocity, the latter refers to the different scales of social relationships in broader structures. Vertovec (2001) pinpoints two important and interconnected implications of embeddedness. As the first one, he refers to Massey's (1994) concept of 'power-geometry' whereby social relations are viewed as geographic and networked at a variety of scales from household to the international arena. "The power individuals hold relate to how they are variously embedded in networks of relations found at these various scales" (Vertovec, 2001, p. 12). He connects this to his second point, emphasizing its particular importance in the transnational studies, whether having networks only in their own locality or local ethnic community or networks crossing borders. Transnational networks represent a "*qualitative disjuncture* between different regulatory and socio-cultural environments" (emphasis as original, Dicken et al., 2001, cited in Vertovec, 2001, p. 12). Embeddedness appears as an influential factor, especially for immigrants in a way that the roots of relational constructs of space can be local and at the same time transnational.

Habitus, Habitat and Urban Public Space

Considerable research has charted the complex and dynamic manner in which habitus acts as structured and structuring dispositions of individuals in sociological analyses in the fields of education, sports, law (Gates, 2002; Harcourt, 2002; Noble and Watkins, 2003). Yet in professions related to place-making, urban planning and design, there has been little consideration of Bourdieu's social theory and his key concepts. Only recently have a few scholars shown interests in the studies, mainly related to the participation of the planning process (Healey, 2000, 2005; Sandercock,

2005). For Hillier and Rooksby (2005), it is perhaps due to the fact that Bourdieu's view on the role of physical space and its relation to habitus is difficult to discern, on part because nowhere in his work does he treat the subject in detail. On the other hand, Bourdieu implied the relationship between habitus and habitat in some parts of his work. Friedmann (2005) maintains that in Bourdieu in fact makes the relationship apparent by saying that "the structure of social space is *inscribed* in physical space" (p. 331, fn. 8). Habitus creates the habitat in the sense that it forms "specific preferences for more or less adequate use of habitat" (ibid.). Bourdieu's habitat conception is highly compatible to that of Grünfeld (1970), who theorizes the habitat embracing both the physical structures, housing, recreational, cultural, and economic facilities to be used by the inhabitants, and the social structures, which operate in relation to the physical framework. Habitation implies the use of the habitat. For Grünfeld, people choose their habitats in relation to the sources available to them. In other words, they prefer certain habitats to fulfill their expectations and preferences.

Habitus can also be conceived as the system of practices by which people understand the order in their society and their place in that order. Through social practices, this knowledge is acquired. Social space is so constructed that agents who occupy similar or neighboring positions are placed in similar conditions and subjected to similar conditionings and therefore have every chance of having similar dispositions and interests, and thus of producing practices that are themselves similar. The dispositions acquired in the position occupied imply an adjustment to this position, what Goffman calls the 'sense of one's place'. It is this sense of one's place which, in interactions, leads people whom we call...common folk, to keep to their common place, and others to 'keep their distance', to 'maintain their rank' and to 'not to get familiar' (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 127-128).

This knowledge can be, in turn, used in practices, beliefs, and objects as well as the physical characteristics. As Dovey (2005) argues, the connections of habitat to habitus are found in the ways in which space frames social practice. For instance, the traditional Islamic urban layout reflects patterns of open and restricted movement, and accordingly open and closed areas of the city for social conduct. The house, as the most private unit in the urban system, often was located in a blind alley or dead-end street, designed as the medium for protection of the family from strangers, especially men, since the privacy of the family and women was the main characteristic of social order. The house and the blind alley were women's realms; women's action radius was limited to those places. Bourdieu (1990) emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between habitus and habitat; if the habitat shapes the habitus, the habitus also shapes the habitat. At the risk of feeling 'out of place', individuals who move into a new space try to fulfill the conditions that the space requires of its inhabitants (ibid.).

Thus, the morphology of habitat and habitus are related closely. The use of urban public space, in this sense, can be interpreted as the interplay between two systems; the physical and social layout of the urban public space and the spatial arrangement of practices, on the one hand, and the habits, beliefs, and attitudes for spatial behav-

ior on the other. If habitus can be interpreted simply as the basic system of knowledge and attitudes that that people normally use in their daily lives, i.e. attitudes, beliefs guiding spatial behavior in urban public space, habitat also can be seen as manners of use and appropriation of urban public space. Habitat is the corporal manifestation of habitus, revealing various meanings of space and time.

Turkish Immigrant Women's Habitus

As discussed above, the relational approach sees culture as social constructions, embodied by individuals (Bourdieu, 1986, 1998), and shared understandings and representations from shared experiences (Tilly, 1998). Habitus expresses certain cultural understanding and provides the transmission of culture from one generation to another. Parallel to the cultural transmission, social codes, customs and values are also transmitted. Thus, habitus can be transferred because it is inscribed in the social construction of the self. Yet, as Bourdieu (1986) also warns us, since it serves as a generative principle that makes constant improvisations, so that the habitus forms the behavior of individuals in which they are dealing with familiar and new situations, at the same time habitus evolves through their experiences.

Friedmann (2005) argues habitus is forced to change due to migration.

Migration typically involves a massive readjustment of migrants' habitus. Migrants who move from a rural village into the metropolis, looking for work in building construction or in factories have to learn not only new skills but also a new work discipline, a new rhythm of life, a new sense of time. They may struggle with a new dialect or language. Their senses are bombarded with a range of impressions which have to be absorbed and interpreted (*ibid.*, p. 318).

Immigrants' habituses need to be adjusted to the new setting. As they learn to adopt new practices in the particular social fields, such as work or school, traditional habitus can be carried on in the other fields, like family and community, and even be enforced by them. This is more prevalent for the offspring, children of immigrants, who are more exposed to social fields, like school, for appropriating a new habitus. Here the problem lies in tensions between the new and traditional habituses.

The group, or collective, habitus is also important in the acquisition of new habituses. Related to the social fields and capitals acquired or needed to be acquired, some habituses may change and generate new practices, such as the employment of migrant woman, but at the same time, some habituses prevail, such as the sanctions on women's virtue or honor.

Khoury (1997) sees habitus as cultural individual practices constrained by hierarchies of power, gender, class, or locality. Habitus, for her, denotes the set of attitudes and common-sense outlooks that shape the actions of individuals in their use of space. With regard to this, Turkish immigrant women's patterns of use, experience, and appropriation of urban public space can be seen as produced by their specific habituses. Yet such an explanation would be restrictive in a sense that it may over-

simplify the variety and complexity of practices and at the same time over-determine the role of subjective structures.

The discovery of Turkish immigrant women's habituses requires the delineation of the social fields that structure the habitus and also are structured by it and of the accumulation of legitimate capitals that the specific field necessitates. In that sense, their habitus can be defined as their personal accumulated space-time experiences and inheritances, their geographical background, cultural origins, and social networks. Habitus gives Turkish women a sense not only of what the newcomers have carried with them and might have adapted in the new context, but also to what the offspring have learned to cling.

This study promotes a relational approach to urban public space by utilizing Bourdieu's habitus and social capital and Tilly's social interaction model as conceptual tools to analyze Turkish women's patterns of use, experience, and appropriation of urban public space. In the following chapters, first the Enschede case study and research designed are introduced. After that, the Turkish women's social construction of urban public spaces in Enschede is elaborated in the presentation of the Enschede case study itself and its findings in line with the analytical framework described in this chapter.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND INTRODUCTION TO THE CASE OF ENSCHEDE

Introduction

In this study, the central research question is to explore the use and experience of everyday urban public spaces by Turkish immigrant women. It emphasizes the socio-spatial qualities and meanings attached to urban public spaces, highlighting the users' perspectives, i.e. their own definitions, conceptions, and interpretations of urban public spaces, therefore for the empirical research, a contextual and exploratory analytical perspective is needed. The research is designed to have a qualitative character rather than a quantitative one. Qualitative research strives for depth of understanding, "to understand the nature of that setting; what it means for participants to be in that setting, what their lives are like, what's going on for them, what their meanings are, what the world looks like in that particular setting; and in the analysis to be able to communicate that faithfully to others who are interested in that setting" (Patton, 1985, cited in Merriam, 2002, p. 3).

Qualitative research is a contextual research based on exploration and discovery. It involves an interpretive and naturalistic approach in a way that researchers work things in their natural settings, and interpret the findings terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003). It concentrates on the socially constructed nature of reality, the relationship between researcher and the subject(s), and the situational constraints that shape inquiry (ibid.). Having conceived of public spaces as social constructs, this study investigates the spatial and social characteristics of the urban public spaces on the basis of Turkish immigrant women's meanings, conceptions, and understandings of the given context.

In the following section, the discussion will precede in detail to the qualitative research design, the case study approach and qualitative research methodologies, after which the case of Enschede, the design of the data collection and analysis will be introduced.

Qualitative Research Approach

Qualitative research provides important ways of analyzing the discursive construction of everyday life through lived experiences. First of all, with qualitative research, it is possible to bridge people's past experiences to the present by exploring the

historical circumstances of life within a social group. This is especially important when tracing the urban public space meanings and conceptions as the previous experiences in the homeland (town or village in Turkey) can also be influential and need to be considered thoroughly in the analysis in order to gain better insight into their experiences. This is particularly valid for first generation and marriage-immigrants, whose migration took place when they were at relatively older ages. The second-generation women in that sense have a different position from that of their mothers. It can be argued that Turkish cultural/traditional social codes of public space, as well as values and norms, are transmitted to them from their families and the Turkish community, yet this is only partly true. Community relations, whether the relations among people are close-knit, so that people exercise considerable pressure upon each other to conform to the image and approved opinions and attitudes sustaining that image and disposing the rest, are influential in a way that they experience the specific context of the Dutch/Enschede version. In addition, their temporary and provisional involvements in Dutch society (at least through institutions such as schools) add a different dimension in a way that they can closely observe different people's, especially peers, attachments to different public spaces, different social constructions of urban public spaces. At the same time they place themselves and others in society; their dispositions are formed in a relational process. Therefore, the second strength of qualitative research for our analysis is contextuality, the recognition of relations and processes within.

Qualitative research implies in most of the cases an inductive reasoning, i.e. researchers generate and test theory from the analysis of their data, rather than a deductive reasoning, i.e. using data to test or falsify a pre-existing theory. This is often referred to as the 'grounded theory' (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) approach; that is, a theory must emerge from the data or, in other words, a theory must be grounded in the data. In qualitative research, the data can come in the form of words, images, impressions, gestures, or tones that represent real-world events or everyday experiences, rather than statistical data or other means of quantification. The focus is on the symbolic or phenomenological aspects by which meaning is expressed in one's communications and actions, as is characterized by 'symbolic interactionism'. Since the focus is on meaning, qualitative researchers portray the situation based on the contextual characteristics, in which the meanings and processes are embedded. This requires 'thick descriptions' (Geertz, 1973), documenting not only the behavior or event, but also the context of practices and discourses that take place. Rather than seeking causal determination and prediction, and generalization of findings, qualitative researchers seek illumination, understanding, and extrapolation.

With regard to these concerns, the reasons for choosing the ethnographic case study approach will first be given and then the theoretical concerns about the empirical research will be discussed. To start with, approaching urban public spaces as social constructs necessitates embracing the interweaving of sociality and spatiality. Herbert (2000) emphasizes particularly the strength of ethnographic research in geography, enabling the researcher "to explore the complex connections that social groups establish with one another and with the places they inhabit, cultivate,

promote, defend, dominate, and love” (p. 564). As Turkish immigrant women are chosen as the subjects of this study, an ethnographic research is appropriate for investigating the spatial and social characteristics of urban public spaces on the basis of their meanings, conceptions, and understandings of the given context. He further argues that ethnography is a “uniquely useful method for uncovering the processes and meanings that undergird sociospatial life” (p. 550). Adopted in the everyday life context, ethnography can be once more valorized, since it elucidates the particulars of the everyday and processes in everyday movements and contexts of human action (ibid.).

On the other hand, it should be noted that since the focus of ethnographic research is often a small community and the culture of a chosen group is brought under study, ethnographic research is criticized for overestimating cultural perceptions and displays on the basis of a single case study. The representativeness (typicality/atypicality) of the selected group and the researcher’s qualities as an ethnographer are considered to be the most important qualities for the validity and reliability of the research. However, as Jackson (1985) argues, rather than representativeness, making inferences from the case material is the criterion for judging the validity of the research. He refers to the logical relationship between characteristics rather than their representativeness or typicality. Following Mitchell (1983, cited in Jackson, 1985), he affirms this logicity as “to be judged from the adequacy with which the wider social context is specified” (p. 171). The analytical strength of the research material lies in the recourse to sociological principle.

Case Study Research

The empirical research has been designed as a case study. Case study research traditions originate from the Chicago School of Sociology and the anthropological case studies in the early twentieth century. A number of prominent qualitative urban studies (among others: Whyte, 1981, *Street corner society*; Gans, 1982, *The urban villagers*; and Anderson, 1990, *Streetwise*) have also utilized the case study as a form of research methodology. The case study is the preferred strategy when “a ‘how’ or ‘why’ question is being asked about a contemporary set of events, over which the investigator has little or no control” (Yin, 1984, p. 20), especially when a holistic, in-depth investigation is needed. The case study is a methodology of a multi-perspective analysis. This means that the researcher considers not just the perspective of the actors (informants), but also the relevant groups of actors and the interaction between them. Therefore, case studies are process-oriented, flexible, and adaptable to changing circumstances and dynamic context.

Case studies can be of a single or multiple-case design. It is stated often that multiple-case studies are better for theory building, whereas single cases are used to confirm or challenge a theory or to represent a unique or extreme case (ibid.). On the other hand, single cases are argued as ideal for their revelatory character, with which an in-depth knowledge can be achieved. Single-case studies can be holistic or

embedded; in the latter, the case study involves more than one unit of analysis. Whether a deep, holistic single-case study or one where multiple cases are used, the case study approach emphasizes detailed contextual analysis of a complex social phenomenon. Flyvbjerg (2004) states that the main objective of the case study is to achieve the greatest possible amount of information on a given phenomenon, therefore representativeness becomes less important in a way that in some instances atypical or extreme cases may reveal more information than the typical and average cases. In addition, the case study approach is strong representing in reality due to reporting the actual behavior. These characteristics give the case study approach the main strength; recognizing the complexity and embeddedness of social reality.

Another key aspect of the case study approach is that it enables the triangulation of data collection and multiple analysis methods, thereby reliability and validity concerns can be ensured. Qualitative research involves the use and collection of a variety of empirical materials: case study, personal experience, life story, interview, artifacts, cultural texts and productions, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts that describe the setting. Qualitative researchers study patterns with these empirical materials in their natural settings and attempt to interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003). In this interpretive activity, there is no privilege of one single methodological practice over another, as qualitative research is inherently multimethod in focus. This multimethod approach, also referred as 'triangulation' (Denzin, 1970), allows researchers to collect data with different methods and provides explanatory insights from varying methodologies. Multiple methods can be used to secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question.

The case study approach is subjected to a number of criticisms. The first one is related to limited generalization, or in other words, its inability to provide a generalized conclusion. This dependency on a single case leaves this approach open to charges of being 'microscopic', as it lacks the depth of statistical analysis would ensure it. However, the generalization aimed from a case is not statistical, but analytical (Yin, 1984). Generalization can be achieved in a form of testing an existing theory or hypothesis within a case (*ibid.*) or of naturalistic generalization from known cases applied to an actual problem situation by making comparisons (Stake, 1995). Glaser and Strauss (1967) point out a third mode of generalization, an inductive theory generation that is based on data from within the case. On the other hand, some proponents of the case study approach (especially in education research, Bassey, 1981) point out the importance of relatability rather than scientific generalization. Relatability can be characterized as the degree of fit, i.e. others can relate to the subject matter or to the conclusions reached. 'Thick descriptions' (Geertz, 1973) are crucial in this framework to judge the issues of fit.

Compared to the quantitative study of a large, representative sample of a population of interest, qualitative researchers seek to acquire in-depth and intimate information about a smaller group of people. In order to gain in-depth information, qualitative research necessitates the involvement of the researcher in the setting and with the participants. This may have two shortcomings. The first shortcoming is

that the intense exposure of the researcher in study may bias the findings. Patton (2002) advocates the use of triangulation to strengthen the study. Engaging multiple methods is argued as leading to trustworthiness, rigor, and quality (Golafshani, 2003).

The second shortcoming is related to over-identification with the subject or researcher subjectivity. Since there is interaction between the researcher and the people (informants/respondents/others) and the setting, certain kinds of epistemological assumptions have to be made beforehand (Mason, 1996). Using structured interviews can minimize the possibility of 'bias', yet cannot eradicate it. Likewise, researchers as participant observers are at the same time 'knowers' of that particular situation because of shared experience, participation or a shared standpoint with the researched. For Giddens (1982, cited in Flyvbjerg, 2004), this gives strength to case study research in a way that "the condition of generating descriptions of social activity is being able in principle to participate it. It involves 'mutual knowledge' shared by observer and participants whose action constitutes and reconstitutes the social world" (p. 15). In addition, Herbert (2000) argues that the researcher's subjectivity is an analytic asset in ethnographic research. Especially in observations and participant observations, the subjectivity makes it possible for the researcher to interrogate his/her subjective experience within a milieu and the subjective reactions it engenders. Thus, the researcher/observer should be able to comfortably place him or herself within the context being studied. At the same time, the researcher should be aware of subjectivity, in order to avoid casting off preconceived notions and theories. In this framework, measures related to validity and reliability need to be taken into account.

Concerns of validity and reliability in case study research are related closely to data collection (Yin, 1984). The methodologies of data collection and analysis need to be used systematically and properly. Sampling is an important aspect to achieving validity. Sampling, any selection process operated by the researcher on respondents, unit(s) of analysis or setting, however, is not alone sufficient for validity (ibid.), yet sampling choices can have multiple consequences for validity. In case study research, there are three kinds of validity concerning the research: construct validity, internal validity, and external validity. Construct validity requires the researcher to use the correct measures for the concepts being studied and internal validity demonstrates that certain conditions lead to other conditions and requires the use of multiple pieces of evidence from multiple sources to uncover convergent lines of inquiry. The last one, external validity, reflects whether or not findings are generalizable beyond the immediate case or cases; the more variations in places, people, and procedures a case study can withstand and still yield the same findings, the more external validity. While multiple sources of evidence can be established to strengthen construct validity and internal validity, techniques such as cross-case examination and within-case examination along with literature review help ensure external validity. Reliability, on the other hand, refers to the stability, accuracy, and precision of measurement. Reliability can be achieved by the creation of a database consisting of survey notes, interview journal, and the detailed steps of data collection and measures. Maintaining the

chain of evidence facilitates to ensure the validity and reliability in the case study research. In addition, as discussed above, the competence of the case study with which the wider social context is specified maintains the validity criterion.

Before going into the details of the case study research, the grounds for choosing Enschede as the research setting need to be emphasized. First of all, as mentioned in Chapter Two, the major spatial concentration of Turks is in the western Netherlands, where almost 60% of Turks live. Of this group, 35% live in the four big cities, in *Randstad*, and the second concentration is in the east, the Twente and Overijssel region with the cities of Enschede, Almelo, and Deventer. Most of the research on immigrants and Turks has been conducted in the cities in *Randstad* (a.o., Bolt, 2001; Campbell, 2000; Keune et al, 2002). With regard to this, it should be mentioned that there are not high segregation differences between large and small cities in the Netherlands. As far as Turks are concerned, the level of segregation is highest in the Hague and Rotterdam. The segregation index of Turks in the neighborhoods of Amsterdam is comparable to that found in middle-sized cities, such as Enschede (Van Kempen and Van Weesep, 1997). Thus, the Enschede case forms a part rather than a particular instance itself. This research study in Enschede has in that sense an added value to the current literature on the Turks and immigrants in the Netherlands by focusing on the medium-sized city of Enschede.

Second, the research approach, qualitative research, necessitates an active and reflective role for the researcher (Mason, 1996) in order to conduct the research efficiently. As I had lived in one of the neighborhoods that was selected for participant observations for five years, and as a foreigner in the Netherlands, Enschede was the city that I knew much better than other cities in the Netherlands. As this research has both a revelatory and analytical case with regard to the spatial behavior of Turkish immigrant women, it is significant not only in doing research itself, but having in an extensive knowledge of the setting; especially considering not just the perspective of the actors (informants), but also the relevant groups of actors and the interaction between them. In the following section, we will take a close look at the case study in Enschede in the light of the aforementioned concerns.

The Case of Enschede

Preliminary Remarks on the Urban Development of Enschede in relation to Dutch Urban Planning Practices

Enschede is a medium-sized city, with a population of 150,000 inhabitants, in the east of the Netherlands (map 5.1). Beyond its municipal boundaries, the city serves a large area; the broader area/region in which it and neighboring cities form the functional unit referred to as TwenteStad, and recently forming a EURegio. In a broader economic networking region, the city of Enschede is related to the cluster of two German cities of Munster and Osnabruck.



MAP 5.1 Location of Enschede

Enschede can be characterized as one of the few classical Dutch industrial cities. The industrial past of the city has deeply influenced the spatial form of the city. Although the history of the city¹ goes back to late fourteenth century, the major development of the city was due to the growth of the textile and manufacturing industries in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Enschede has a concentric urban form; a circular street pattern in the city centre with radial road networks connecting the neighborhoods to the centre. The spatial layout of the city reflects different patterns of urban development, which can be identified as having occurred in four periods. As shown in Map 5.2, the first period reflects a traditional city structure, in which the city grew organically from an egg-like medieval structure into an industrial city. At the end of this first period, the old city walls were to a large extent demolished, since the city had boomed with the textile and manufacturing industries and the increasing number of working-class inhabitants. Starting with the introduction of

housing act in the Netherlands in the period leading up to World War II, the second period of urban growth (1901-1939) can be identified. The third period covers the aftermath of World War II, the rebuilding period (1945-1970), since the city was almost completely destroyed at the end of the war. Growth in this and the following period was in principle different from that of the previous periods. And as the last period, peripheral/suburban urban development starting with the 1970s can be identified as leading the city into its present-day form. In the following part, these different periods of urban growth are elaborated in relation to the broader city planning principles and practices operative at that time.



MAP. 5.2 Phases of Enschede urban growth
I. Traditional city form, up to the late nineteenth century
II. Pre WWII urban growth (1901-1939)
III. Post WWII urban development (1945-1970)
IV. Peripheral / suburban development, after 1970

The pre-industrial Enschede comprised the central square in front of the main church and surrounding housing with a circular street pattern. Starting from the nineteenth century, Enschede was one of the major cotton textile-manufacturing centers in the Netherlands, attracting substantial numbers of migrants from other regions in the Netherlands, mainly Drenthe and Friesland. While the textile factories were located in empty plots in or near the city, rows of workers' houses were built near factories, forming typical early working class neighborhoods such as de Krim, Sebastopol and het Overschot.

However, the housing stock in these workers-neighborhoods was not sufficient for the increasing numbers of blue-collar and white-collar textile workers in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth centuries. The city had an increasing housing shortage, just like other industrial centers in the Netherlands. It was in this period that strict regulations and measurements were enacted in order to improve the deteriorating housing conditions. With the introduction of the Housing Act², the Netherlands gave an important incentive to the construction of social housing (Musterd, et al., 1998). The main idea behind the Housing Act was to improve social housing, *Volkshuisvesting* (Van der Cammen and de Klerk, 2003), especially in cities with growing housing shortages for the working class, such as Enschede, Tilburg and Dordrecht. The Housing Act also provided instruments to make the clearance of derelict buildings in the slum areas possible.

In the late nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, almost all industrial cities in the West were severely affected by extremely unhealthy living conditions, particularly in the neighborhoods where the steady growth of the working class and the poor concentrated. In order to overcome these problems and accommodate developing new forms of transportation in the city, a number of ideas emerged from prominent city planners and architects (a.o. Ebenezer Howard's the *Garden City*, Tony Garnier's the *New Industrial City*) and to a certain extent, their ideals were adapted to Dutch urban planning. Among them, although never realized as a complete city, the *Garden City* became an important aspiration for both the architecture and urban design of the new housing areas. The emphasis was laid on the creation of a healthy environment with rows of single-family houses with gardens at the front and back. The garden-city neighborhoods were created not only in big cities, such as Vreewijk, Rotterdam and Tuindorp, Utrecht, but also in mid-sized cities with a steady working-population growth, such as het Lansink in Hengelo and Pathmos in Enschede. 'A balanced community' was the goal with the provision of healthy, comfortable, and inexpensive – affordable by the working classes – housing (Van der Cammen and De Klerk, 2003).

In Enschede, the worsening conditions of city living, the high rates of pollution, the lack of basic services, and the increasing housing shortage, together with the devastation of the entire city by a fire stemming from a workers' house in the late nineteenth century, gave impetus to the development of city in terms of building new housing estates for the working class with better housing facilities and provided the necessary traffic circulation. The urban development in this period can be characterized as carefully planned gradual redevelopment of the city based on the pre-fire

structure and expansion of the existing urban pattern; the neighborhoods re-built with keeping the previous structure and the city expanded from its egg-like centre – growth of the city beyond its centre with provisions for a ring-road surrounding the centre – to the surrounding agricultural land. New neighborhoods outside the ring-road with spacious green areas were created to accommodate the expanding population. It was also in this period that the clearance of slum-like early working class neighborhoods, such as de Krim and Sebastopol, was initiated.

It should be mentioned that while new housing estates were built with better living conditions for workers and families, these new neighborhoods were also designed for a particular type of inhabitant. The construction of a new type of functional Dutch city was underway with a strict separation of functions, as well as with a socio-economic segregation of its inhabitants. While single-family houses with spacious green areas and representatives of villa-parks were built in the 1920s for the upper-working class, the new middle-classes of entrepreneurs and managers, in the north, in the neighborhoods of Zeggelt and Zwik and in the west in Stadsmaten and Horstlanden-Veldkamp; row-houses with rather limited facilities were designed for the lower-working classes in the east, in het Lindenhof (1920s), and in the south-east, eastern parts of Hogeland (1930s). It was also in this period that the first large-scale urban park was initiated by an owner of textile-factories in the west, Volkspark in Stadsmaten. It was also in this period that the first garden-city neighborhood for the working class, Pathmos (1914-1928), was built.

After the ostensible recovery from the problems of the industrial cities, modernist functional city planning started to be highly influential in Europe, following the declaration/publication of Le Corbusier's *The Contemporary City for Three Million People* (1922) and meetings/congresses of the CIAM (Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne). Le Corbusier's plan for the modern functional city was related to not only a functional separation of land uses, but also a distribution of land-uses following a rigid scheme of socio-economic segmentation. "Workers would live in modestly equipped apartments in tall apartment towers built on a uniform grid of streets with 48% of open space on the ground space, while the upper classes would live in more comfortable apartments with 85% percent of the ground space left open" (Wegener and Fürst, 1999). However, in the following years his functional city vision was elaborated in favor of homogeneous functional zones, rather than spatial hierarchies. Attended by all of the prominent architects and planners in Europe, the CIAM Functional City was proclaimed during the 4th meeting (1933). The manifesto, also known as the Athens Charter, was based on the idea that cities should be designed with separate, functionally zoned areas for housing, work, and recreation, all tied together by high-speed transportation. CIAM principles were to a large extent related to the new urban growth. The existing traditional/historical areas had also been addressed in a way that they could either be demolished or preserved as archaeological zones. In the following years, especially in the post-WWII urban development, the CIAM concepts of 'light, air, and green' were considered as effective city planning principles to meet the growing housing demand in Dutch cities.

By the end of WWII, Enschede was almost completely destroyed. The third period (1945-late 1960s), the post-war urban development in Enschede aimed largely at the redevelopment of the destroyed city, both at the renewal of the old existing housing and at the construction of new neighborhoods to ease the immediate housing shortage. Most of the pre-war functionalist urban design ideas, of the open and functional city, related to the Charter of Athens and related CIAM concepts, were realized in the renewal of the destroyed neighborhoods and the development of new neighborhoods. In addition, Doevendans, et al. (2002) state that while the CIAM principles and the functional city were particularly influential, another approach, under the influence of the Delft School, was also eminent, especially in the mid-sized cities of the Netherlands. Portrayed as a romantic approach in favor of the image of village as a counter-reaction of the CIAM thought, neighborhoods were planned as ‘pillars’³ that function as smaller and more natural communities. Doevendans, et al. (2002) argue that the manner of dialectics of rational/functional and romantic/intuitive approaches and the resulting compromise solutions was essential to the development of Dutch urbanism in this period.

In Enschede, the existing traditional pattern in the central areas was largely preserved, yet the unfavorable design characteristics such as curved and narrow streets with obscure corners were improved in favor of the grid pattern. The Delft School approach was particularly eminent in Enschede in the architecture of the new buildings, such as the Town Hall (1933) and the New Church (1932), in the center and



PICTURE 5.1. Post-WW II Residential development in Enschede, Deppenbroek

design of nostalgic open spaces in front of them. In the third period, new residential areas and rows of buildings were built in semi-closed or open block formations, forming relatively small neighborhoods with a mixture of high-rise and medium-rise apartments with single-family houses. The neighborhoods in the north, Deppenbroek, in the north-west, Tweekelveld, in the south, Cromhoffsbleek Kotman and Boswinkel, and in the south-west Stadsveld were planned in the early 1950s with the principle of 'light, air, and green'; a mixture of housing types, according to strict traffic regulation with efficient connection to the city centre and other neighborhoods and spacious green areas. These neighborhoods were realized in their entirety by the end of the 1960s. The functional city was achieved also in relation to the upshot of the pillar-based approach.

Meanwhile, although the early congresses of the CIAM stressed rigid functional zoning and a single type of urban housing, at subsequent meetings CIAM members reacted against inflexible and mechanical concepts of orderly planning and the neglect of urban life in the city. In the 10th meeting of the CIAM (1956), from which those who attended came to call themselves as Team 10, the lack of relationship between the buildings and their surrounding contexts was criticized strongly with regard to the real urban experience along with the absence of public space in the city. Declaring that the relations between things and among things are of greater importance than the things themselves, Bakema, a pioneer of Team 10, attempted to integrate life, dwellings, work, and recreation in the neighborhood. His plans for Alexanderpolder in Rotterdam, based on the idea of a city organized as a series of interlocking social circles, starting with the family home and extending up to the neighborhood to the city as a whole, reflects a constant interplay between the public and private domains within linear mass-produced buildings which facilitate individual mobility (Mumford, 2002). Although his plans were not fully realized, the ideas of Team 10 were to a large extent represented/grounded/formed the forthcoming urban development, the so-called Dutch *wijkgedachte*, the integral neighborhood unit planning.

The *wijkgedachte* or community concept was introduced in post-WWII urban planning in the Netherlands in order to remedy the social and cultural disconnectedness of its inhabitants (Van der Cammen and De Klerk, 2003). Inspired by C. Perry, an American pedagogue and city planner, the concept of 'neighborhood unit' aimed at the formation of coherent communities manifested both physically and socially. The neighborhood unit was considered not as an organizational result of city planning, but as a focus for and stimulus of community development. It was believed that an impeccable relationship exists between the physical and social characteristics. While the social basis was composed of the promotion of neighborliness and face-to-face interaction among people living in the same neighborhood, the physical basis was to create the necessary built environment enabling the desired social interaction and creation of community in the neighborhood. The idea of the community was place-based. Van der Cammen and De Klerk (2003) state that although the neighborhood unit was the most effective the social-spatial concept of post-WWII urban development, it was more utilized as a spatial structuring principle

and framework for the facilities rather than adopting the original concept completely. Notwithstanding these, *wijkgedachte* was influential until the 1980s in new residential developments of the Dutch cities.

The late 1960s and early 1970s can be identified as Enschede's last period of urban growth. In the early phases of this period, the city expanded mostly to the south and a little to the north, where new suburban/peripheral neighborhoods were built, reflecting the modern ideas of urban planning and design, yet the conceptual design was different from those built in the late 1950s and 1960s. In the south, the most notable is Wesselerbrink, a good example of implementing modern planning approaches and of the concepts of the *wijkgedachte* and *wooneenheden*⁴, which were designed on the basis of the concept of the 'brink'⁵. The brink concept can be characterized as follows: every unit/cluster/community has its own centre and depending on the scale of the unit/cluster/community, there are facilities for shopping, education, or green units for the benefit of the inhabitants of the unit/cluster community concerned. The high-rise gallery apartments along the main roads and around the shopping centre divide the neighborhood into four parts. In the most clusters in the north, the brink concept had been realized, yet due to the financial problems and changed design approaches, the planning was not completely realized throughout the neighborhood. It should be noted that the Dutch social housing tradition from the post WWII onwards has marked neighborhood development in Enschede and was also prominent in the development of Wesselerbrink.

Neighborhoods, developed in the 1970s in the northeast and northwest, namely Stokhorst and Bolhaar, were mainly for middle and high income residents living in the low-rise housing areas, neighborhoods with a mixture of row-houses, semi-detached and single houses. Starting with the 1980s, the major residential development was in the southeast and southwest, namely in Stroinkslanden and Helmerhoek, following the previous planning approaches. Although they were not designed exactly on the basis of *wooneenheden*, the neighborhood unit planning ideals were still eminent in the cul-de-sac structure and curved streets enclosing the housing units.

In the late 1970s, restoring the city centre with its historical, cultural, and social characteristics gained importance in Dutch cities. The idea was related severely to restoring the European city ideal: the compact city. The promotion of social interaction in public spaces was one of the important characteristics of the European compact city, so that the core of the urban identity could be preserved. In this period in Enschede there were renewal projects, such as the renovation of old industrial areas into dense social housing quarters, and the re-arrangements of public space in the central areas. In these new arrangements, design considerations were aimed to promote social interaction among inhabitants and users, therefore the *Woonerf*⁶, a subsequent idea of the *wijkgedachte*, introduced as a design concept and implemented in many inner-city neighborhoods, where street can be again a play area for children and a social environment for inhabitants.



PICTURE 5.2 AND 5.3 Residential patterns in Wesslerbrink

Another important development that should be mentioned in these years was the arrival of the guest workers' families to Enschede and the beginning of the process of their settlement in the Netherlands. When the guest workers first arrived in Enschede in the late 1960s and early 1970s, they lived in barracks or dormitories near the factories where they worked. With the family reunions, Turks began to take part in the social housing schemes, which were already overloaded. The only available social housing units that could fit their relatively frail financial status were in the early post-war neighborhoods, the housing units left by the social climbers to live in newly planned neighborhoods on the outskirts of the city. Therefore, starting with the 1970s, these neighborhoods become the areas where the Turkish immigrant families became concentrated.

The period starting with the late 1970s until the 1990s was not the best of times for Enschede; the city lost its status as one of the major industrial centers of the Netherlands. Due to the competitive textile industry abroad, production dropped, almost all of the textile factories were closed and the city's economic development fell below that of the rest of the country. While unemployment rates began to rise, social unrest grew. Urban development projects, a.o. renewal and redevelopment of the city centre, new housing areas were either partly realized or stopped. The city almost went bankrupt.

However, until the first part of the 1990s, the population growth was slow yet steady, to a large extent driven by the family formation process of Turkish immigrants. With the abolition of the relative closure with Germany in the middle 1990s, the Schengen agreement of the EU, Enschede started to flourish slowly, predominantly due to economic subsidies from the Dutch government and European Union and agreements for economic networking with the nearby German cities. As the German population residing in the city began to rise, the city also began to attract many German daily tourists from the border towns. In 2004, the city attracts on average 17.000 German tourists every Saturday, 29% of the total visitors to the city center (Gemeente Enschede, 2004). Increasingly not only commercial facilities, but also cultural facilities started to be designed to attract more and more Germans from the border towns. At the same time, competition between the neighboring Dutch towns, such as Hengelo and Oldenzaal, began to heat up in order to attract more visitors/tourists to the city. Changes in the entire Dutch urban planning approach towards a network of cities in regional and super-regional context are played an important role.

Before finishing this part on Enschede urban development, a rather recent urban residential development in relation to the network of cities policy in the Netherlands needs to be mentioned. The representatives of these new developments can be found in the east of Enschede, the VINEX neighborhoods of Eschmarke, and in the inner-city neighborhood of Roombeek⁷. In the 1990s, the Supplement to the Fourth National Policy Document on Spatial Planning, also known as VINEX, a new housing development emerged in relation to the urban compaction policy designed to meet regional needs for housing, employment, care, and urban facilities on a regional scale, aiming at curbing the growth in mobility by locating new development areas

near or within the boundaries of the cities (Snellen, et al., 2005). VINEX housing can be characterized as more consumer- and profit-oriented housing units, specifically designed to match the lifestyles of the housing consumer, and can be considered as a remarkable shift from a long-lasting public-programmed and social welfare-oriented urban development policy. With regard to these, Van der Cammen and De Klerk (2003) argue that the recent spatial policies in the Netherlands shows a change of seeing urban planning and design not in terms of fundamentals of social and political programmes, but of instruments to achieve them.

Turkish Inhabitants in Enschede

Starting from the 1950s, Enschede attracted many immigrants. The first guest workers were mainly from western Mediterranean countries, such as Italy and Spain. Later in the late 1960s, Turkish guest workers arrived. Unlike the general immigration trend to the Netherlands, Enschede did not receive many immigrants from former Dutch colonies such as Suriname and Antilles. The immigration to Enschede was to a large extent related to work and employment of needed workers and laborers; in the second half of the 1960s, the yearly flow of immigrants was 500-700 workers. The explosive growth of the number of the foreign labor ended at the end of 1970s.

As far as the number of foreigners considered, of the total 150,000 Enschede inhabitants, 27.12% are non-natives. Turks are the majority of the non-western population; 5.7% of the total population of Enschede and 40% of the non-western immigrant inhabitants of Enschede. Compared to the native Dutch inhabitants, the Turkish population is quite young (Table 5.1). Among the Turks, there are particularly less people above 65 and the share of the 0-9 age group is especially high.

TABLE 5.1 Age Groups in Enschede (in percentages)

<i>Age groups</i>	<i>Native Dutch</i>	<i>Turkish</i>
0-9	10.7	18.37
10-24	20.05	27.44
25-44	28.78	37.78
45-64	25.26	13.23
65 +	15.17	3.17

Source: compiled from I&O Research 2001c, p.15.

Compared to other Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands, the Turks in Enschede have a weaker socio-economic position (with respect to especially those who live in Randstad and in the southern parts of the Netherlands). Among Turks, the average education level is quite low; almost half of the Turks have only finished primary school. Based on a limited resource, it can be argued that the Turks in Enschede are more dependent on social benefits, have high unemployment rates, and lower edu-

education levels. The employment of Turks in Enschede lags behind that of the Dutch. The unemployment rates were 16 and 9.2%, respectively. These two figures were far above the national average, 6.6%, in 2004 (Gemeente Enschede, 2005). On the other hand, according to a Turkish community politician, these characteristics should be taken into consideration with reference to the regional disparities among Dutch cities. Turks' relatively marginal and degraded position can also be closely related to the weak socio-economic conditions of Enschede. Other cities with high Turkish immigrant populations are much stronger in both social and economic terms when compared to Enschede. Based on the regional income research done by CBS in 1998, the standard household income of Enschede inhabitants is much lower than the national average and that of cities where Turks are agglomerated. Comparing income classes, the low-income groups are over-represented in Enschede. This reflects itself in neighborhood level, ironically, while some neighborhoods score highest in the national scale, such as Stokhorst and Zwering, neighborhoods like Boswinkel and Stadsveld, those with higher numbers of non-western inhabitants, are even much below the general Enschede level (I&O Research, 2002).

Non-western inhabitants of Enschede are concentrated in some neighborhoods instead of dispersed throughout the city. Major non-western concentrations are in the neighborhoods of Cromhoffsbleek, Kotman, Deppenbroek, Wesselerbrink, Stroinkslanden, and Pathmos, where at least 25% of the inhabitants are of non-western origin (Table 5.2, Map 5.3). Although in the Netherlands in general, there are no examples of immigrant ghettos literally, the concentration of low-income social housing in certain neighborhoods enables the creation of pronounced immigrant clusters. As stated above, in the late 1970s, most of the neighborhoods that had been built in the pre-war and early post-WWII period had a dynamic of mixture of different groups and high rates of interchanging tenants. While social climbers left these neighborhoods to live in the suburban areas for spacious housing units with their families, the relatively old residents stayed and students and guest workers' families started to replace the leavers. As the number of leavers increased, so did the number of guest workers' families residing in the neighborhood from the 1980s onwards.

TABLE 5.2 Spatial Distribution of Non-western Inhabitants in Enschede (higher than 26%)

<i>neighborhood districts</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>neighborhood districts</i>	<i>%</i>
Cromhoffsbleek, Kotman	44.2	Wesslerbrink NE	31.4
Deppenbroek	37.3	Pathmos	30.7
Wesslerbrink NW	36.5	Laares	29.5
Wesslerbrink SW	32.2	Stadsveld N, Bruggert	28.2
Wesslerbrink SE	31.7	Twekkelerveld	27.4
Stroinkslanden S	31.6	Stadsveld S	26.8*

Source: I&O Research, 2001b, p. 21

*I&O Research, 2000, p. 21



MAP 5.3 Neighborhoods with high concentrations of non-western inhabitants in Enschede

TABLE 5.3. Neighborhoods with High Turkish Concentration, Percentage of Social housing, and Economic Profile of Inhabitants

Neighborhoods	Turkish concentration (1)	% social housing (2)	economic profile (3)		
			unemployed	social benefits	GSD benefits
Deppenbroek	360	52.1	13.1	24.7	15.3
Wesselerbrink, SW	256	65.7	12.2	36.4	16.3
Cromhoffsbleek, Kotman	248	69.4	19.7	27.1	19.2
Stadsveld N., Bruggert	240	50.9	8.8	21.2	9.2
Wesselerbrink, SE	214	57.8	11.4	28.8	14
Laares	204	60.9	14.3	32.2	17.3
Stadsveld S.	200	56.6	10.4	26.4	9.6
Wesselerbrink, NW	188	67.9	13.1	15.2	20.4
Twekkelveld	175	70.5	12.2	22.9	12.7
Boswinkel, De Braker	165	39.8	8.7	26.0	7.9
Hogeland, N	164	54.5	9.7	26.1	8.7
Stroinkslanden S	163	76.6	9.5	31.7	15.7
Wesselerbrink, NE	153	81.3	11.1	29.5	15.1
Enschede	100	39.9	7.9	22	9.2

Sources:

(1) Concentration-index of 150 or higher (Enschede = 100). (I&O Research, 2001b, p. 23)

(2) Housing belongs to the Housing Corporations in 2000. (I&O Research 2001a, pp. 16-17)

(3) Economic indicators, based on the labor market participation percentages, do not represent the share of the population in that specific neighborhood, but the general neighborhood level in 1999. (I&O Research, 2001a, pp. 24-25)

– unemployment is based on the registrations to the Labor Office.

– the percentage of not-working relies on the numbers of people who are insured by the Ziekenfonds, due to receiving social benefits from unemployment, arbeidsongeschiktheid, and temporary benefits of AWW.

– GSD (*Gemeentelijke Sociale Diensten*) benefits can be translated as municipal social services, regulating social security and executed locally by city councils.

Turks are overrepresented in the neighborhoods that were built in the early post-WWII period, such as Deppenbroek, Cromhoffsbleek, Kotman, Stadsveld-Bruggert, Laares, Stadsveld S, Twekkelveld, Boswinkel-de Braker, and Hogeland, N. (Table 5.3). These neighborhoods have predominantly social housing units and low economic profiles, compared to the Enschede average. Yet it would be false to assume that these neighborhoods are alike. Based on the personal interviews, it can be stated that first generation Turks live predominantly in the early post-WWII neighborhoods such as Deppenbroek, Stadsveld, Laares, and Hogeland. In these neighborhoods, although the average duration of tenancy statistically is given as eight years (I&O Research, 2001a), these are neighborhoods in which many Turkish families settled when they arrived in Enschede and live as yet in general. Suburban/peripheral neighborhoods, like Wesselerbrink and Stroinkslanden, are those with more second-generation Turkish inhabitants.

Qualitative Research Strategy in Enschede

In light of these preliminary investigations of Enschede, qualitative research is designed to elaborate the everyday urban public space from Turkish immigrant women's perspective. In this framework, the following questions form the basis of the empirical research:

- Which characteristics of public spaces are important for Turkish women to use and experience the urban public spaces in Enschede?
- Which socio-spatial qualities are decisive for Turkish women regarding public space and what characterizes these places in relation to different activities and different spheres of life?
- How do the planning and design of urban public space influence Turkish women's patterns of use, appropriate and experience?

The empirical data were collected in Enschede for two-and-a-half years, between November 2001 and March 2004, based on the information through participant observations, observations, semi-structured interviews and visual and written documents from various local institutions.

As mentioned in the previous section in this chapter, sampling is important for the validity and reliability of the research. For that reason, an information-oriented sampling selection was followed. I approached the informants for interviews largely by using the snowball method. Snowball sampling can simply be defined as identifying respondents who are then used to refer researchers on to other respondents. Through chain referral, social networks of identified respondents may provide a researcher with an infinite set of potential contacts. Snowball sampling provides a means of accessing 'hidden' groups; however, the nature of similarity within social networks may mean that 'isolates' are ignored (Atkinson and Flint, 2001). In addition, only those who are friendly and willing to share her ideas, thoughts, and feelings participate in the research.

In order to overcome the problem of the selection bias, Atkinson and Flint (2001) suggest initiating a number of chain referrals. They also point out the significance of several discrete chains with fewer links, particularly where any inference about a wider hidden population is considered important. Snowball sampling is favored in order to gain informant's trust since Turkish women are reluctant to speak to strangers (I was warned by the key informants about a political and religious polarization among the Turkish immigrant population in Enschede, as in other cities in Europe). Encountering some women, either from the closed-social groups or particular religious sects, was difficult and provided with the help of the chain referrals of the key-informants and community organizations. In order to achieve a representative group of Turkish immigrant women, many personal and professional contacts were utilized to approach new informants. Some contacts were made for me by Turkish women's organizations and neighborhood organizations in Enschede. Other names were supplied by the respondents themselves. Six of them approached me, hearing from others who had participated in the study. Almost all of the informants wholeheartedly welcomed me, except one or two ambivalent cases because of their political

concerns related to Turkey's foreign affairs. Unlike my expectations of openness and willingness, Alevi and highly educated women were reluctant to participate in the personal interviews. Their participation was maintained mainly through participant observations to the community events and informal interviews. All the respondents expressed their appreciation of the research mostly for the fact that a Turkish female researcher from Turkey was doing a post-graduate study at a Dutch university. In addition, having interviewed in their native language made them feel comfortable to be more expressive.

At this point, it should be mentioned that there were some limitations in the sampling. Those Turkish women, whose presence in the Netherlands is for a definite period of time and who have a limited-time residence permit, like student and visitor visas – even if it exceeds a six-month period –, were not included in the fieldwork. In addition, because of the political concerns, there are no respondents from the various ethnic groups of Turkey⁸, such as Kurds, Arabs, and Christians, yet respondents have different religious affiliations and brotherhood organizations, such as Alevi's and Sunni's.

Although unstructured open interviews are in general regarded as an important part of qualitative research, semi-structured interviews were favored in this study. The main reason for utilizing semi-structured interviews was pragmatic, saving time for the interview and analysis. Another advantage of the semi-structured interview was that since there was, although limited, freedom for flexibility in the question order, it allowed the respondent talk freely in the event she was keen on conversation. There was also room for respondents to introduce new variables and concepts to the research. Another advantage of the semi-structured interview was that language was used effectively in a way that it facilitated control over the informant's interpretations to questions, as well as the researcher's interpretation of answers. In the semi-structured interview, both interviewer and respondent/informant can interfere with the interview process to prevent confusion or misunderstanding of a question or concept. For instance, in most of the interviews with the first generation Turkish immigrant women, the word 'social' was not used, because every time they heard the word, they would confuse it with the use of the word in another context, that was by Turks in the Netherlands in the Turkish language related to the meaning of 'sociale dienst'⁹ and related connotations.

Forty-seven Turkish women were interviewed for two and a half hours in relation to their use and experience of various spatial scales of urban public spaces in Enschede. In these semi-open structured interviews, they were also asked about their orientations to Dutch society, their contacts with Turkey, their cultural orientation, and their social networks. The interviews were done mainly in Turkish and Dutch and took place in the informant's houses with the exception of a group of teenager girls, who were interviewed in a group session. The group session was not organized as a focus group; however, a number of issues regarding urban public space use were broadly debated. They were interviewed in a voluntary organization, which they attend every Saturday mornings. This was the only time that the interviews were tape-recorded. In general, tape-recording was not favored by the informants. After

the interviews, notes were written based on the talks. I tried to keep a journal, taking down notes of the interviews and views of observations. To maintain higher validity concerns and verify the interview results, the research material also covers fourteen interviews with the key informants and professionals and management personnel, who worked with the Turkish community and organized activities for Turkish and other foreign immigrants, from municipal, government, and voluntary organizations in Enschede.

My fieldwork also included observations and participant observations. Participant observation as a qualitative research methodology encourages researchers to immerse themselves in the everyday activities of the people whom they are attempting to understand. It refers to a process in which a researcher establishes a many-sided and long-term relationship with the people in their natural setting. In that sense, it is an important component in ethnographic research, demanding an ample understanding and the full engagement of the researcher. An advantage of participant observation is that there is an opportunity to get closer to the people in the study and share a common experience. This experience on the one hand enhances the researcher's insight into the situation and on the other hand helps to approach more people with building relationships. In order to form a healthy relationship and built trust with the people, I made my identity as a researcher explicit and assumed my role as 'the participant researcher role' (Lofland and Lofland, 1984).

The main participant observations were made in the neighborhoods of Enschede; Deppenbroek and Wesselerbrink, and the city center. Further, I visited the activities of the Turkish women's organizations, tea-morning gatherings, women's matinees, informative meetings of various government and neighborhood community centers (*wijkwelzijn*), as well as the periodical regular home meetings of women. Also observations were made in the neighborhood shopping centers, the weekly central and neighborhood market, the streets of the city centre and the two neighborhoods, major city parks, neighborhood and small parks, green areas, children playgrounds, and school fronts.

Sharing the same nationality and speaking the same language provided me and my respondents with some degree of comfort yet certain differences and tensions came out during the research process. I was to some extent aware of some social, cultural, and political issues possibly presenting problems during the research (due to the religious, political, and ethnic struggles in Turkey). On the other hand, as Herbert (2000) discusses, researchers needs to be reflexive about how their own cultural and intellectual positions shapes their apprehensions and discussion of data. I assume that my background has to some extent influenced the way I conducted this research.

As concluding remarks, first I would like to emphasize two key issues with regard to the presented data analysis of this study. First, unlike quantitative research, where numbers and what they stand for are the material of analysis, qualitative analysis is based on discerning, examining, categorizing, comparing, recombining and interpreting patterns and themes, where words and narratives are the material. As stated above, all of the interviews were conducted in Turkish and Dutch. English transla-

tions were provided by myself. One of my key informants, who is of half-Dutch half-Turkish origin and works as an advisor on immigrant issues regarding Turkish inhabitants in the Overijssel region, helped me translate some words from Dutch to Turkish and Dutch to English. For the sake of precision, the translations are not interpreted in order to give true accounts of the respondents' real experiences. In that sense, while quotations are made from interviews, some Turkish and Dutch words are kept in the original in order to preserve minutiae. Second, qualitative evaluation does not also follow discrete stages like data collection, processing, and later analysis. It has more an iterative nature, in a way that from beginning to end, at all stages of the research study, additional questions may emerge or new connections can unfold in order to get a full understanding of the study subject. However, as Yin (1984) maintains, there should be an analytic strategy, to lead conclusions; whether relying on a theoretical propositions and then analyzing the evidence based on them or developing a case description. In addition, causal relationships can be analyzed. These strategies are called pattern-matching, explanation-building, and time-series analysis (ibid.). In this research, pattern matching is used as a strategy where the analysis relies on the theoretical and analytical framework presented in Chapter Four, Relational Approach to the Urban Public Space.

Conclusion

As discussed in the first part of this chapter, qualitative research, especially the ethnographic case study, offers an exclusive methodology for the exploration of the processes and meanings through which everyday life is maintained. As ethnography examines what people do as well as what they say (Herbert, 2000) in a given research context, providing a firm ground for analysis. Analyzing these processes and meanings illuminates how differences, such as gender, ethnicity, and class are constructed and reconstructed in daily life and alternately how these differences pattern daily life. As this study looks at urban public spaces in terms of exploring the user's meanings and social constructions of them, this insight into the processes and meanings become crucial deciphering the interwoven context of the social and the spatial.

Urban public spaces can have a variety of meanings for Turkish immigrant women in their daily lives. Much of the meanings and conceptions of the urban public spaces are closely related to their constructs of the way they perceive the world and their senses of themselves and the places of others in the world. As the attitudes and values, interests, demands and needs are defined in the context of their relational worlds, and the greater the differences in their relational worlds become, the more various and different the patterns of use and appropriation of the urban public space become. Young or old, single or married, profane or devout Muslim, in their commitments and engagements in the Turkish community, strong or weak orientations to the wider society are influential in the way that urban public spaces are perceived and conceptualized by Turkish women. Thus, ethnographic perspective enables us

to retain the individual agency by recognizing differences and similarities and to unfold the relational constructions of the urban public space.

On the other hand, the processes and meanings behind the spatial formation of the built environment and urban public space can also have important reflections on the users. Schendelen (1997) states that Dutch urban planning from the start has had two main goals: to care for social hygiene and health and to establish social order by means of physical planning. A third aim has been added over the years, “a careful planning of space because of its increasingly limited availability resulting from conflicting interests” (p. 111). These three goals have also been active – with changing degrees of fit – in the aforementioned urban residential growth patterns in different periods in Enschede, exposing a variety of approaches for urban public space, especially design configuration of the relationship between the public and private.

The neighborhoods where Turks are concentrated, to a large extent were built in the early post-WWII period, according to the principles of the CIAM and the functional city. Today, the design frameworks of particular planning approaches, especially those related to the post-war urban residential environments and social climate they generated, have come under heavy attack. For Boomkens (1999) there are two major consequences of the CIAM functional city. First, by implementing the ‘light, air, and green’ principle instead of concentric urban growth, the intrinsic characteristics of what makes the urban and ‘rural’ distinctive disappears. The interweaving of green and at the same time vacant spaces with densely built housing areas blurs the line between urban areas and rural villages; the emptiness of green areas and over-planned urban areas become silent as if they are villages and the homogeneity of the monoculture in the neighborhoods resembles the closeness of the local/agrarian culture. Second, the functional zones of work, living, traffic, and recreation break the time-space integrity of urban life-styles. He further argues that these put the crucial characteristics of urbanity at risk, and that the openness and spontaneity has disappeared.

While searching for the characteristics and socio-spatial qualities of urban public spaces important for Turkish women to appropriate, utilizing ethnographic case study research helps to explore the competence, both positive and negative, of these neighborhoods and the social-spatial frameworks given. In that sense, analyzing the relational constructions of their specific spatial behavior patterns help to decode the mingling of the social and the spatial.

CATEGORIES AND URBAN PUBLIC SPACE USE

Introduction

A relational approach to urban public space takes a view of individuals not as autonomous subjects with individual preferences, but as formed within social contexts. The emphasis is on the social relations within which they live and the social world within which they construct their identities and their relations with others. People construct various categories constantly on the shared understandings of who we are, who they are, what divide us, and what connects us (Blokland, 2003). A category, according to Tilly (1998), consists of a set of actors who share a boundary distinguishing all of them from and relating all of them to at least one set of actors visibly excluded by that boundary (p. 62). In that sense, Blokland (2003) differentiates a category from a 'collectivity', since collectivities are related to some sense of togetherness or cohesion, from which they uphold their common values. A category can be defined, at the very basic level, as a group of people sharing a certain characteristic that sets them apart from others, regardless of whether they perceive themselves that way (Tilly, 1984; cited in Blokland, 2003). Individuals cannot escape these categorisations because it is sometimes others who ascribe them to these categories. Although gender, age, religion, education, and occupation can all work in establishing various categories, the importance of categories, according to Tilly (1998), is that they are not specific sets of people or unmistakable attributes but movable social relations. Categories are not static, but fluid; they are relational and are construed in contrast with one or more other categories (Blokland, 2003).

In the following part, Turkish immigrant woman categories and the variety patterns of use, appropriation, and experiences of urban public spaces in Enschede are presented. These categories cannot be the sole determinants of their spatial behavior, however, the contextual and relational involvements as inscribed/embedded in these categories are significantly influential. To start with, the discussion launches with the so-called traditional categorical distinctions such as lifecycle (generations) and socio-economic (income and education) position, reviewed with reference to the roles (Hannerz, 1980) that are fulfilled, accomplished, and enacted in the urban public space. Later, religious affiliation and orientations are incorporated to the analysis to reveal the ways different religious sects, language, media, and frequency of travels to the homeland form a social context, a frame of reference that is effective in the ways that Turkish womens' spatial attitudes and behavior are

formed. After this point, the discussion gravitates to the context of the social networks of Turkish immigrant women to elaborate how personal networks mark the boundaries of privateness and publicness and are articulated in various conceptions and experiences of the urban public space. Having argued these categories on individual and relational characteristics, lastly the discussion takes a more spatial turn. Turkish women's culture of housing is interrogated with regard to how urban public spaces are conceived and appropriated as important parts of their habitat.

Turkish Women and Their Role Repertoire

In daily life, the Turkish woman performs many activities related to, what Hannerz (1980) calls, her role inventory. A woman can be a mother, a wife, a student, a worker, a neighbor, a devoted Muslim, as well as a stranger in the crowd; she takes on each of these roles at various times, in various settings and domains. When individuals exhibit somehow the same and consistent behavior in a particular situation, then we can assume that they take on the same role. All of the roles of a single individual are called a role repertoire. "People have many roles; the kinds of purposive involvements which make up an individual's round life we call his role repertoire" (p. 102). Related to their role inventories, for Hannerz, the social life of the city dwellers can be divided into five domains: a) Household and kinship, b) Provisioning, c) Recreation, d) Neighboring, and e) Traffic. These five domains are relatively differentiated, yet the boundaries between these domains cannot be very well drawn. Depending on the role repertoire, a domain may subsume several others, "some domains involve external as well as internal contacts" (p. 103).

Hannerz's domain labels refer primarily to roles, rather than relationships or situations. However, in the case of provisioning, because the role definitions are related closely to the nature of relationships, it may refer to the relationships or situations in which the role is accomplished. Hannerz sees the differentiation and identification of these domains as a requisite of urban living. The folk society, where kinship organizes so many activities and the domain of kinship tends to subsume several others, can be regarded in that sense as the opposite: "roles typically stretch across many domains and consequently are not so closely identified with any single of them" (ibid.). Hannerz argues that the typically urban relationships may be prevalent in connection with the roles in the domains of provisioning and traffic and may be quite atypical in relationships within those of domesticity and recreation. Therefore, the forms and degrees of interrelationship among roles are of importance both within and among domains.

Generations

Hannerz's portrayal of role inventories is quite powerful in describing roles, fulfilled in specific domains, and patterns of spatial behavior in the urban space. The role repertoire can reflect particular stages of life, which in turn influences the way public spaces

are used and experienced by Turkish women. Different stage of life categories roughly correspond to the generational categories of Turkish women. According to the latest categorization of foreigners in the Netherlands (CBS, 2003), the Turkish immigrants are grouped into five categories: first generation = 1980¹, first generation > 1980, marriage-immigrants², between-generation³, and second generation⁴. The majority of Turks belong to the second generation of immigrants (26%). The second biggest group is the first generation of Turks, with 23% before 1980 and 21% after 1980. The percentage of between-generation is also high (20%). The marriage-immigrants form the smallest category, with 11% (Dagevos et al., 2003).

In this study, partly following the CBS grouping, Turkish women are categorized under four groups; the first generation (both = 1980 and > 1980), the marriage-immigrants, the second generation (all offspring of the first generation: between-generation, and second generation), and the third generation (children of the offspring). The first generation women are mainly above 50 years old. They came to the Netherlands in their late 20s and 30s. Marriage-immigrants are relatively young, but we can divide them into two groups, based on the stage in the life cycle; above 35: the stage of having grown children, and between 20-35: the stage of starting families and stage of having young children. The second generation of women shares the same age characteristics as the marriage-immigrant group. And the third generation is quite young, starting from the pre-school stage to young adulthood.

First Generation

The majority of Turkish women came to the Netherlands as a result of the family reunion process. Yet there were also small numbers of women guest workers. Of the eight first generation respondents, only one had migrated to the Netherlands as a guest worker. However, among the eight women interviewed as part of the first generation, three had worked previously in textile manufacturing. It is notable that as none of them had worked in Turkey before, in their home towns. Their employment in the Netherlands can be seen as a positive contribution for challenging traditional gender roles and the emancipation of women. Through these low-skilled jobs that they had been able to find in Enschede, they had left their homes and entered public for the first time. However, the following examples are illustrative to show how they had experienced 'working life' in Enschede:

There were many Turkish women working in the same textile factory in my neighborhood. Every morning at 5:00, we met to walk together. It took us 20-25 minutes by walk, and we were singing in the streets all together. (b. 1950, 32 years in NL)

Almost everybody was Turkish in my department and I knew most of them before getting the job, because we were living in the same apartment or the same street.

There were Turks who spoke a little Dutch, so they were translating what our Dutch boss was saying; there was no need to talk to him or others. (b. 1955, 34 years in NL)

They lived in the same neighborhood and commuted everyday together to work, where they also worked together. Most of them found jobs in the factory when they heard about openings from friends and relatives, or friends and relatives arranged the

job. Since they all lived closeby, the work environment was not socially much different than that of the neighborhood. Thus, all the roles that were executed in fact were immersed merely in the domain of family and kinship. There was no differentiation of social life with regard to the roles fulfilled in different domains, using Hannerz's terms. Although they worked outside the home and commuted every day, i.e. were visible regularly in public spaces, they never came out of the circle of family and neighbors. Because most of them had also brought the other members of the family with them from the homeland (brothers, sisters, cousins, as well as more distant relatives), and they all resided in the same neighborhood within close proximity, and if possible on the same street even in the same apartment block. For those who did not work and stayed at home, life in Enschede was not much different what it had been in a Turkish village or town.

Strong family and kin relations still influence their future orientations and decisions. Today, many first generation Turkish immigrants stand at the point of making decisions about whether to stay in or leave the Netherlands. On the one hand, they are fully oriented towards Turkey, but on the other hand, as their children prefer to stay, most of them have developed a pattern of living in Enschede six months a year, and the other six months in the hometown.

What more can I do in life? All of my children are here, what am I going to do without them? Well, I have brothers and sisters in Turkey; Enschede is the best place for me.

(b. 1947, 23 years in NL)

We are foreigners here and we are foreigners there, you know they call us *Almanci* (Germanised Turks) in Turkey. In life, the only important thing is your family. (b.

1950, 32 years in NL)

Neighborhood has a prominent role in the spatial activities of daily life; short walks outside the house to get air, regular visits to the homes of Turkish neighbors and other family members for socializing, regular visits to the shopping center and the weekly market for household chores, all in the neighborhood. For those who have decided to stay in the Netherlands and whose command of the language has reached a certain degree, activities in the community centre and organizations for elderly people offer opportunities, opportunities to be more involved in the neighborhood. In that case, if they are willing to participate in an organization -a women's organization, consisting of peers- it should also be located in the neighborhood. In addition, this fixation on the neighborhood is closely related to their low spatial mobility.

Regarding mobility, walking -short distances- and the family car are the most utilized means of transport. To a certain extent, all respondents reported that they never went out alone, even if the activity in which they were engaged was not related to the interests of with the person with whom they were accompanied; there was always someone to be 'with', in most cases one of the members of their family. They needed to be assisted by a family member or a friend in the public space. Lack of language skills and spatial knowledge are the most pronounced reasons for this dependence; on the other hand, it should be noted that behind this bias could also be the belief that 'elderly should be properly cared for and looked after'.

First generation women's visits to the city center are rare; hospitals and elderly organizations -particularly oriented to facilities for the elderly Turkish population- are the only locations that they can spatially identify. Their spatial literacy is based on these institutions; other places in the city center are identified in reference to these places.

Marriage-immigrants and the Second Generation

Although the guest-workers immigration and related family reunion processes officially ended in the early 1980s, a steady rise in the number of Turkish immigrants has signaled a new wave of immigration to the Netherlands. Called 'marriage-immigrants', these immigrants are partners of the offspring of the first generation immigrants. Turkish second generation immigrants are more inclined to have a partner from Turkey (Hooghiemstra, 2003). Turkish marriage-immigrants are the biggest group when the other immigrant groups in the Netherlands are concerned (Dagevos, et al., 2003). It is noteworthy that there is no gender difference in this process and socio-economic variables barely influence partner choices. Hooghiemstra (2003) argues this process as more dependent on social and personal factors.

To a large extent, most of the marriage-immigrant respondents of this study share the same social characteristics with the first generation; they come from rural Turkey, have limited educations, and are unskilled. Their command of Dutch language is poor and they are mainly housewives. Those with higher educations and university degrees from Turkey are not employed, mainly due to the lack of their Dutch language skills. Among the twelve marriage-immigrant women interviewed, only two work. On the other hand, there are two main differences separating this group from the first generation. First, familiarity with the urban environment and foreign language command, i.e. the ones from major cities in Turkey and ones who can speak -even a little- German or English, have things easier, especially at the beginning in adjusting to daily life in Enschede. They do not depend as much on the family members and immigrant networks as the first generation did. Second, their participation in or willingness to form voluntary organizations is higher than the first generation. Therefore, they are not neighborhood bound and their opportunities for spatial mobility are high. Of the twelve women interviewed, nine had driving licenses and six drove their own cars (besides the family car).

Offspring of the first generation, the second-generation women, form the biggest group in the study. Of the 21 women interviewed, eight were born in Enschede, six had come to the Netherlands before they were six years old, and five had come during adolescence. Two had grown up in Germany. The level of command of Dutch made the major division in this group. Those who were born or came to the Netherlands in childhood had the opportunity to develop their language, to follow education, and find work. Those who could not learn Dutch could only find work in low-skilled service sectors, such as cleaning and house-keeping, and as they do not favor these jobs, they are by and large housewives. When the groom is the newcomer, i.e. male marriage-immigrant, the wife takes on the roles of the husband for some time until he gets used to the new environment. Temporarily, their role rep-

ertoire becomes shifted. Since most newcomers do not speak Dutch, the woman does the necessary work, and in most cases she becomes the breadwinner for the household. This, in some instances, creates tension in the family, as the classic familial roles are challenged.

From the group of the offspring, only four out of the 21 were single. As stated in Chapter Two, marriage is a stable and powerful institution in Turkish society and traditional values that organize relations between men and women still shape the marriage institution. Characterized as authoritarian and patriarchal, for Turkish women forming a family means the creation of a new social unit; relying no longer on personal relations, but building new social relations as a family. Most offspring raised in the Netherlands who have Dutch or other foreign friends mentioned losing their ties with the Dutch context and forming new contacts with couples of the same age and families, in most cases Turkish ones, because of their partners' deficient command of Dutch. In this sense, forming a family means shifting to a different social context. Family gatherings, visits, and picnics then become the most pronounced activities, and they must be engaged in as a family. They start to be more housebound as they have children, and more home-centered in the activities related to the public spaces, since proximity to home becomes a decisive factor. Having children affects the kinds and variety of places visited and as daily life becomes formed around home, the neighborhood shopping centre, neighborhood community centre, parks, and playgrounds in the home cluster become the most frequented places. On the other hand, when the children reach a more manageable age, the mother's activities start to be more diverse than before. New roles can be created, such as taking part on school committees, participating in informative meetings related to family care and raising-up the children, and volunteering in the children's organizations.

Third Generation

Third generation Turks are either still children or in puberty. Most of them⁶ were born in the Netherlands and are being educated in the Dutch school system. In this study, only those who were above 16 were included in the interviews. At the time of the interviews, they were all students of secondary and higher education and living with their families.

From the early years of childhood until the end of secondary school, the use of outdoor environments and public spaces gradually increase. Probably, for the first time, the margins of 'being outside of home' are drawn:

In the street, you speak Dutch with other children even if they are Turks, but at home, you speak Turkish. You realize at this young age that you are living in two worlds.
(b.1981, b. in NL)

Children play outdoors: they use the street in front of their homes extensively. The range of the use is limited to the home cluster and close neighborhood. In addition, as they attend schools in the neighborhood, their routine mobility between home and school provides them with conceiving of the streets in a way that is different from that of the adults. Their knowledge of urban area starts to grow from the fam-

ily home to the neighborhood of friends, and institutions like schools and leisure centers. The range of use public spaces, in these teenage years, extends from the neighborhood to the city centre and other neighborhoods. As the role differentiation of young adults, after 16 years old, increases, the share of their role repertoire, taking place within the urban public spaces also increases. The social circle grows to people from school, a frequented organization, and work. In addition, reaching puberty means that the role repertoire may expand; activities, places and partners in accomplishing activities start to be differentiated. Particularly leisure activities become diverse; while shopping becomes more of an activity with friends (girlfriends) in the city-center, and other recreational activities such as picnicking, visiting theme parks, recreation centers, as well as ethno-religious activities are with the family.

The third generation's social circle is rather a heterogeneous group, especially when compared to other generations; however, frequently seen hang-out peers are Turkish. Saturday is the day to meet with friends and stroll in the streets of the Enschede center. In most cases, shopping streets are chosen as the places to spend time, where there can be spontaneous meetings with other friends and acquaintances, as well as with strangers.

Old Dutch ladies like to talk with everybody around them, ha, ha...if you sit somewhere and if there is an old lady around, it's hundred percent sure that she will start a conversation by saying, isn't it a lovely day? They are always like that, ready to talk ... and we reply to them, sometimes, we talk about other things ... then when we leave the place, if we come across them again in the street, they usually do not recognize you ... It's like that, their way. (b. 1987, b. in NL)

In their teenage years, Turkish women's spatial behavior patterns become more complex, as the social identification processes, both in terms of gender and friendship, start to pave the way. Turkish girls spend less time outdoors than other girls and boys (see also; Hooghiemstra, 1997). With reaching puberty, in Turkish families, the culturally specific role distinctions between men and women become more and more pronounced. In these years, some families decide to have their daughters stay with their relatives in Turkey, ranging from the summer months to a couple of years, so that they learn Turkish culture and customs better and 'don't get their minds confused with two contrasting cultures'. Especially in more religious families, the coexistence of men and women in the Dutch social life appears as a threat. In addition, some social norms and values are better learned and assimilated in Turkey. Yet the codes and norms for appropriate behavior in public are sometimes confusing and contradicting.

After a group interview, a girl asked me, "Why are some things that you do in the street considered inappropriate in Turkey?", she was curious in the sense that these inappropriate actions did not make sense to her. It was also confusing for me, as a researcher, to find out what she really meant by 'some things'. She then explained to me that when she wanted to have an ice-cream when they were out in her parents' town in Turkey, that her cousins told her that eating an ice-cream in the street was inappropriate for a respectable and decent girl. Some behavior in public could con-

vey certain meanings and her reputation could be put at risk. This example reflects a similar portrayal of relations of what Elias and Scotson (1994) argue. One's concept of the norms of a community are not abstractions or generalizations from a collection of individual opinions, but rather they are "formed in connection with a continuous interchange of opinions within the community in the course of which exercised considerable pressure upon each other to conform to the common image of the community in speech and behavior; ... as long as they had enough power they acted as guardians of the community image and the approved opinions and attitudes" (p. 6). In that sense, it is not only that the codes of public behavior for a respectable woman there are apparently different than those in Enschede, but also that she has to identify herself with the code of that place there in Turkey and act accordingly. In this case, most young women are encompassed by the socially approved models for their conduct set by other people, mainly kin, and for most of them, this is a contradiction with their upbringing and lifestyle in Enschede.

Income and Education

Income and education influence to a certain extent Turkish women's social participation and role repertoire. Most Turks in the Netherlands live at the level of minimum wage (Van Kempen and Bolt, 1997). A majority of Turks are dependent on social benefits, meaning that their income is considerably below than the level of minimum wage. In addition, Turkish women are much more dependent on social benefits than other immigrant women (Dagevos, et al., 2003). The Enschede framework does not dispute this statement, however, the fact that because of the regional economic backwardness, Turks in Enschede may score lower on economic indicators than Turks in Dutch cities should also be taken into consideration. Of the 47 women interviewed, 13 were employed in both part-time and full-time jobs, six mentioned that they were doing well enough not to work and the rest were dependent on social benefits, either having benefits from previous work or from their partners.

By and large, income influences the conceptual framework of affordances in the urban public space. Many mention the high cost of going out. Most public spaces were not reachable for them, but only for rich.

In Turkey, everybody can go out regardless of having money in their pocket or not. Here you have to be very well prepared before you step out. (b. 1961, 23 years in NL)
 In my town, there stand many benches along the coast and after dinner if you take a walk there, you may sit on one of them. The person sitting next to you can be poorer or richer than you, it doesn't make any difference, but here...errrr, everybody is apart, divided. (b. 1967, 19 years in NL)

Since they engage mostly in activities with family members, the more financial resources they have, the greater the possibility is for all family members to go out.

In the past, we usually went to the cafeterias, *doner*⁷ places, when there were only two of us, now, it's getting difficult, three children and us, very expensive. That's why the first thing we do on holidays in Turkey is to go out. It's cheap there. (b. 1962, 31 years in NL)

The level of educational achievement among Enschede's Turkish women is not extensive. Of 47 women interviewed, five had no diploma of primary education, and three of them had learned writing and reading in Enschede. On average, the second-generations' educational attainment was higher than that of the marriage-immigrants and first generation. A recent research finding on immigrants' use of public facilities in Randstad cities is interesting to mention at this point. Keune, et al., (2002) argues that educational attainment makes little difference for young Turkish women in their use of public spaces, mainly because both the highly-educated and poorly-educated have had limited free-time to allocate to activities outside. Though in this research, the conception of free-time is not examined critically, we can argue that the concept of 'free-time' is also a relational construct. Various cultures define and value 'free-time' differently from each other. Moreover, not only the level but the style of education is influential. Education, or varying investments in and commitments to education is a part of the cultural capital possessed. For Turkish women, except for the language and economic concerns, education level, especially for the third generation, makes a difference in the appropriation of cultural activities, yet only to a certain degree. Despite this limitation, the acquisition of better language skills plays an important role. Moreover, given the established connection between high education and employment, education influences patterns of use and the appropriation of urban public spaces to a certain extent.

Religious Affiliations; Alevi and Sunni Women

Though the diversity of Turkish religious affiliations and groups, as well as their influence on women's daily lives and social practices can be another topic for research, here I would like to describe some of the basic differences among Turkish immigrants in order to represent the counter images of a homogenous and identical Islam. As described in Chapter Two, due to Islamic Law, in the Ottoman period Turkish women were subjected to regulations and restrictions, not only in terms of the dress and social codes that they had to obey, but also locations and the nature of social exchanges that they should follow. The representation of Turkish women in Dutch society, as well as in the Western world, is formed largely on this image, based on the regulations of Islamic Law at that time. Islam as a restricting religion forms the basis of many studies in analyzing Muslim women's spatial behavior patterns (a.o. Peleman, 2001a, 2001b; Hooghiemstra, 1997). Those who do not fit in this picture, for example, those who are not veiled or wearing head scarves, are considered to be modernized or integrated, if not regarded as anomalies. On the other hand, as mentioned in Chapter Two, in the course of the modernization process of Turkish society, particularly after the abolition of the Ottoman Empire and all its institutions

and the proclamation of new regulations with regard to the daily life, religion has lost its primary status as playing a regulatory role for many Turks. Yet at the same time, due to the limited penetration of reforms to the entire society, together with the socio-economic instabilities, and growing prominence of Islamic radicalism, especially since the early 1980s, a significant number of women have adopted a more traditional Muslim life.

Though there are a range of religious sects and different groups exist in Islam, as far as Turkey is concerned, we can categorize two main religious affiliations: Sunni and Alevi, in which the names refer to blanket terms for a large number of different heterodox communities, actual beliefs and ritual practices of which, as well as geographical distributions and languages, are different. Although there is no census available about the population with regard to religious affiliation⁸, the majority of Turks in the Netherlands (as well as in Turkey and Europe) are Sunni⁹, portrayed as rather conservative and traditional. The Alevi sect differs from the conventional Sunni in many aspects: daily prayer, fasting during Ramadan, and Hajj are alien practices for many Alevis. Alevism is often characterized by the ideals of equality, justice, and respect and its more liberal attitudes towards women. These ideals are said to empower Alevi women as they have a more respected status than that of Sunni women. Alevi women do not need to be veiled and the gender segregation supposedly is not practiced. Research on Alevi and Sunni rural-urban migrant women in Turkey shows that Alevi women are more free, modern, and progressive, whereas Sunni women are much more group-oriented and conservative (Erman, 2001b). However, as Erman (1997) argues, Alevis exist within the overarching patriarchal Turkish culture and cannot be free of its influence. Especially in rural areas, patri-local arrangements place young village women in a highly subordinate position.

Ethno-religious polarization among Turkish immigrants in Enschede, like other cities in the Netherlands and Turkey, is remarkably widespread. Since Sunni and Alevi sects, above all, signify different positions, power relations, and community bonds, there exist numerous religious sub-groups, such as the Suleymanci, Nurcu, Milli Görüşçü under the Sunni, and Bektaşî and Zaza, under the Alevi sect. What distinguishes some of these is not so much the differences in belief but the political affiliations of the groups. Some of the Sunni groups named, founded mainly in Europe, have expressed open opposition to the secularity of the Turkish state. Some Alevi groups, on the other hand, because of their Kurdish ethnicity, have established a distance from the Turkish migrants. Alevism and Sunnism are often regarded as opposing political and social positions; Alevis often accuse Sunnis of being a backward community whose goal is to bring Islamic Law back to Turkey, while the Sunnis accuse the Alevis of not being Muslim and enemies of the state (because of the prejudice that Kurdish people are Alevi). For many Sunni women, participation in any activity definitely is confined to the relevant organization and other related relevant participants; for some it should not be in conflict with notions of Turkishness and for others, any religion interference should be avoided.

In Enschede, the Alevis and Sunnis have grouped around different ethno-religious organizations. Despite their religious and political differences, community-building

is a common notion of these religious organizations. From grocery stores inside mosques to special activities for women, from organizing festivities (a Turkish cultural week with concerts, movies, and speeches) to designing a variety of courses (sports, crafts, and folklore), members and regulars can benefit from variety of services and activities. It is remarkable that they not only have limited institutional contact with each other, but also rarely show interest in participating in activities across the borders of the particular ethno-religious group. Although in-depth research is needed to go further, it can be argued that Sunni women are very keen on these institutions that maintain a close and tight-knit community. Of the three Turkish women's organization in Enschede, two belong to Sunni sects. These organizations, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter Seven, influence the patterns of participation of Turkish immigrant women in the larger Dutch society and public life, as well as patterns of use of urban public spaces.

It should be noted that there is also a generational difference in the conception of the ethno-religious sects. First generation women seem to value this categorization little. The aforementioned bias on the Alevi-Sunni distinction, marked through generations as two different worlds that exist apart, partly dissolved in the migration process since they shared a common migration destiny, a kind of fate-fellowship. In the neighborhood community center activities, Alevi and Sunni first generation women participated in activities together. Yet for the second generation and marriage-immigrants, the Alevi-Sunni difference is more pronounced.

Language, Media, and Travel; Orientations

The major attraction for Turks to migrate to the Netherlands was at the beginning purely economic, working abroad for a couple of years, saving money to improve their futures, and going back to Turkey. However, due to various circumstances, as also discussed in Chapter Two, the road to the Netherlands for many has turned out to be one-way. While most guest-workers have chosen to stay, a growing number of Turks have willingly migrated to the Netherlands on the available – legal – grounds. Ogan (2001) calls Turks in the Netherlands a diasporic community with regard to their high aspirations of transmitting their cultural heritage. She affirms that they continue to retain their Turkish identity through a collective memory that is refreshed continuously from using the Turkish language, from exposure to a variety of Turkish media, either from Turkey or other European Turkish communities, from their regular trips back to Turkey, and from their daily interactions.

Of the 47 women, five women spoke not a word of Dutch; and 14 women said that their command of Dutch was very poor. Among the second generation, there are many women who think their Dutch command worsened in time, because of not using it regularly. It is interesting to see that those who do not speak Dutch are looked down on by the fellow Turkish women. Especially for the young, who are in their 30s, this is seen as a deficiency. In order not to be looked down in the Turkish community, even if they know a few words in Dutch (such as numbers, and words of

greetings), they say “*idare ediyorum*” (I manage), at the same time emphasizing the value/appreciation of speaking Dutch in the public.

The degree of Dutch language command brings a major division about Turkish women’s willingness to engage in daily life, in everyday social encounters. As the level of Dutch command increases, their daily life activities becomes easier to accomplish and their participation in the Dutch society improves. As far as the public spaces are concerned, the main reflection of the lack of language command is the avoidance of social situations where even a few Dutch words need to be spoken: in the street, in the public transport, in the market. Hence, because of the fear of losing face, they keep themselves at home.

When I first arrived, I barely went out even for daily things, shopping, etc., what would I say if someone talked to me? If something like an accident or emergency situation happened, well no way, I’d rather stay at home and get bored. (b. 1967, 19 years in NL)

An average command of Dutch, knowledge of few words and contexts that they are used, positively influences Turkish women’s everyday lives. In that sense, fleeting relations can occur with the neighbors, Dutch or other immigrant groups, and they cope with the daily spontaneous social contacts them.

I don’t speak Dutch, but I understand a little, few words or nods are enough for example when I bring food to them during our festival, I say few words ... or in emergency situations, for example, my neighbor next door now and then forgets her key inside the house and she comes to us and jumps over the fence to enter her house from the backdoor. We don’t need to speak a lot; we have some sort of neighborly contacts (b. 1943, 23 years in NL)

Besides the everyday use of language in social relations, language, according to interactionists, refers to more than the memorization of dictionary definitions or simply the learning of to what a symbol refers. Language acquisition involves the idea of learning the meaning of the symbol and learning a set of attitudes toward that symbol (Heiss, 1981). Hence, language acquisition involves the learning of meanings. Although within the scope of this study it is very difficult to affirm whether this makes a theory with regard to Turkish women’s spatial behavior patterns towards urban public spaces, it is interesting to note how they talk about the desired quality of a public space. Without any exception, all respondents emphasized that a desired place of socializing should be like a “*çay bahçesi*” (tea garden), indoors or outdoors, a bounded area, both “*ailecek gidilebilecek*” (able to go with the family) and open to everyone. And a *café*, a word that in fact refers to a quite similar functional setting like *çay bahçesi*, however connotes a place that belongs to Western culture.

Café and *çay bahçesi* are two yet totally different places, it is in the Dutch culture, not in ours. (b. 1961, 23 years in NL)

Well, in fact, they are not very much different, but different, I don’t know exactly why, but I feel different. (b. 1981, b. in NL)

Second, the media is an important medium with regard to social and cultural orientation for immigrants, yet its influence on attitudes and behaviors should be regarded in a rather limited framework; under certain conditions and with certain kind of people at certain times (Ogan, 2001). In her research on Turkish immigrants' use of the media in Amsterdam, Ogan (2001) argues that immigrants use of the media, especially the media from Turkey, influences to a certain extent the cultural change, the ways of construction of social meaning and definition of reality. "Viewers tune out most or all of the Dutch television and print media and only attend to messages on Turkish television or in the Turkish press. When audiences make that choice, they are deciding to define reality and construct meaning from messages that originate in the Turkish culture and not in the Dutch culture" (p. 118).

The media attainment of Turkish women shows in a variety of ways that they are attached to Turkey or the Netherlands, as well as orientations in their daily life. In this framework, a difference has been made with regard to the influence of the media in a wider context and in a micro or place-based context. These have different influences and outcomes, yet they are interconnected. Regarding the former, following Appadurai (1996), the media transform the field of mass-mediation, offering new sources and new disciplines for the construction of imagined selves and imagined worlds. "The availability of images, scripts, models, and narratives that come through mass mediation (in its realistic and fictional modes) make the difference between migration today and in the past" (p. 6). In this context, Appadurai (1996) talks about deterritorialization, i.e. cultural flows that are free of being situated within geographic territory of nation-states. Turkish women can watch all available, more than twenty- Turkish channels via satellite and access all sorts of media, books, newspapers, and music, through the Internet in their homes in Enschede. The majority of the respondents emphasized that 'they feel at home' when they watched Turkish channels.

Before these channels were available, I always felt that I was half here and half there...

I missed Turkey a lot, but now, these channels make me feel better and I don't miss a lot. (b. 1967, 30 years in NL)

With all these series, movies, and programs, home is here. (b. 1943, 23 years in NL)

For Appadurai (1996), the media and migration work together to weaken the ties between culture and place and creates rupture, yet a productive and positive instability, evoking new interconnectedness and reflexivity, new forms of re-territorialization in new cultural contexts.

The Turkish media provide Turkish immigrant women in Enschede with information not only about Turkey, the homeland, but also about the Turkish community in the other cities of the Netherlands and the rest of Europe. Some prominent Turkish newspapers have daily European editions distributed throughout Europe. Although the name of the newspaper and some columns of the journalists remain the same, the news is entirely related to the Turks in Europe, mainly in Germany, as well as the advertisements. All Turkish channels broadcasting in Turkey are available through satellite. In addition, there are those broadcasting from Germany and Brit-

ain with diverse interests, ranging from a 24 hour a day wedding ceremony channel, broadcasting selected Turkish weddings of the Turkish community in Germany; to MED-TV, a banned Kurdish television station. Media, on the one hand create 'a feeling of home', and at the same time enable them to see 'present' Turkish society both in Turkey and in other European countries. Through the media, they realize Turkey is not the same country that they left twenty years ago. In other words, what is imagined and what is real is contested. This creates rupture, yet, for (in Appadurai's terms), a productive and positive instability, leading to the creation of new identities that are made resources available by the universal access to media images.

Second, the place-based/local media influence Turkish women's public space as they develop the image and perception of places and the entire city. Of special interest is that even if they watch Turkish channels all the time, they keen on following the news related to Enschede and environs and not much about the other parts of the country. *Huis aan Huis*, a weekly newspaper distributed freely to all city inhabitants in Enschede, and RTV Oost, a local TV channel, are the most followed Dutch language media tools, even for those who have a low Dutch language command. Regarding the public spaces, their concerns are mostly about safety matters and image of the specific place.

A lot of things happen on Friday and Saturday nights in the centre, every week they write about it. Lots of teenagers and youngsters get together, get drunk and cause trouble, no one controls them, they get into arguments, fights... nowhere in the centre is safe. (b. 1955, 34 years in NL)

We used to go to Volkspark to picnic, then I saw in the newspaper (*Huis-aan-huis*) that Volkspark is the place where gays meet and have sex. Why should I go there again? (b. 1961, 23 years in NL)

In sum, the media, both in a wider and place-based contexts, are influential for the formation of identities and spatial practices.

Third, the frequency of travel to the place of origin also can be considered as an indication of Turkish women's social and cultural orientations. Mainly emigrated from rural Turkey, continuing close relations with the place of origin can indicate continuing strong attachments to the place, culture, and traditions, prevailing social networks and patterns of relations, as well as prevailing community structures. I did ask how frequently they had traveled to Turkey in the previous five years and it was rare to hear that they had not made almost any trips to Turkey at all. In that sense, the participants of this research are more homogeneous when it comes to travel than on the other dimensions discussed here. Almost all replied that they traveled to Turkey alternate summers (once in two years) for about six weeks – during the entire school holiday period. Traveling once in two years was not their intention, but due to the fact that limited finances made it difficult to cope with the travel expenses of the entire family. For the first generation and most second generation and marriage immigrants, traveling to Turkey means going 'home', spending a couple of weeks with family and friends. On the other hand, traditions that were thought to have been left far behind had to be faced.

It's so different there in the village of my husband... it is a small village near Yozgat and everybody is so close to each other, so that when we are there, the family always keeps their eyes on you. "– Where are you going? – To the market. – No, no, let the children go to the market, you don't need to." Once I wanted to sit on the balcony and have some tea, but they said no, it's not appropriate, because the house is just in front of the mosque- and people going to the mosque could see me... well, I did not say anything, but there they live strange lives. (b. 1976, b. in NL)

The level of education and employment can make the nature of the 'home' travel conceptually different. Those who are highly educated see their trip home as an opportunity to travel within Turkey, to visit touristic places along the west and south coasts. Especially among the second generation, this is not unusual; dividing the holiday into two parts, visiting the family and then having their own holiday at the seaside. Although I did not intentionally ask about their leisure and holiday preferences in the Netherlands and abroad, I believe that further research would reveal more about the changing perceptions and transitions about the meaning of leisure and vacation among the generations and different socio-economic status of Turkish immigrants.

Social Networks

Like other immigrant groups, social networks are crucial for Turkish women in the new setting for emotional and material support. Apart from being sets of relational links through which Turkish women can gain access to material resources, knowledge and power, different networks or relational webs embody and express social worlds through which local knowledge flows, framing how people think and give value (Geertz, 1983). It is in the context of these worlds that social identities are constructed and categories are represented. While some social network ties are defined as strong, like primary relations, i.e. family and close friends, whereas some others are considered as relatively weak, secondary relations, i.e. acquaintances, individuals that are known indirectly. It is argued that the set of people made up of individuals with acquaintances comprises a low-density network, whereas the set consisting of the same individual and close friends or family is densely knit. In that sense, the secondary relations, the weak ties, are considered as less likely to be socially involved with one another than the primary relations, the strong ties. However, this view has been challenged by Granovetter (1973, 1983), arguing that weak ties are as effective as strong ties in the community organization, especially in diffusion of influence and information, mobility, and employment opportunity. He argues that many weak ties provide greater opportunities for employment and mobility and for the adoption of changes, and encourage complex role sets for individuals. Strong ties, on the other hand, generate local cohesion. In this framework, Turkish women's relational webs are important in a way that conceptions of publicness and privateness are constructed socially and embraced within. They are manifested in urban public spaces

as spatially structured patterns of social encounter. In the following part, I will adopt Hannerz's (1980) classification of personal networks to illustrate how different personal networks influence the use and appropriation patterns of urban public spaces, and how these relations -strong and weak ties- are articulated in the conception of urban public spaces. Through these modes of networks, i.e. Encapsulated, Isolated, Segregated, and, Integrated, Turkish women can put roles together in different ways in their repertoires, select among alternative alters¹⁰, make or not make disclosures.

Encapsulated

Encapsulated is probably the most extensive form of network for Turkish women regardless age, income, and education. Hannerz (1980) describes encapsulation as the "ego has one dense network sector, connected to one or more of his roles, in which he invests a very high proportion of his time and interest" (p. 256). It means that relations within a close-knit, fairly small network are not very selective and involve very frequent contact between members (Blokland, 2003). The peer groups and Turkish ethno-religious voluntary organizations are the main illustrations of encapsulated relations in Enschede.

The peer group (Gans, 1982) consists of people of the same gender who are roughly the same age and at a similar stage in their lives. Common interests and shared values are more important than kinship ties, therefore, while it may include family members, it may not necessarily be based on kinship. Ethnicity, related to political orientation, is important. The peer group is like a self-contained world in which people focus entirely on each other (Blokland, 2003). Peer groups were formed at first as a natural consequence of the guest-migration process. When the guest-workers arrived in Enschede, they were in the same life-cycles. In addition, in most cases they came from the same region. Therefore, with the family reunion process, the arrival of other family members to Enschede, the very first social networks of first generation Turkish women ran parallel to those of the husbands' and were based on *Hemşehrilik*¹¹. It should also be noted that the guest-migrants first lived in dormitories or houses as groups of men. With the family reunion, they could move to their own houses with other family members. In that sense, after residing in their homes, Turkish women found opportunities to build their own social relations and in that way they could have social contacts with other immigrants from all regions of Turkey. When they moved into their own houses, they started to build relations with their close Turkish neighbors, who had experience with the same process of migration.

In my neighborhood at that time, there were seven-eight Turkish families in the same row. They were also alone here, like us, we became friends, we were close neighbors, it was like being in Turkey, -one prepares tea and calls the others-, and we visited one another's homes every day. (b. 1950, 32 years in NL)

Peer group members meet several times a week. It can be in a form of set routines; regular periodical meetings¹². They spend a lot of time together, to keep each other company. Home is the sole socializing place as peers meet mainly at each other's home.

Peer groups influence the overall way of looking at things, circumstances and new things. Institutions and organizations that facilitate the group interactions are secondary to the peers. Participation at a community centre or an association activity is a decision on which all members of the peer group shall agree. The example of learning to ride a bicycle is illustrative.

I grew up in a village, where only some of the boys had bicycles, apart from that what's the use for a girl or woman to ride a bicycle? When I came here, I didn't even think about it, riding a bicycle, a Turkish woman of my age, and then one day we heard that at the community centre, they had opened a course for immigrant women to learn cycling. Some time later, one day at a gathering we decided to go and take a look, maybe that would be interesting for us, then the next day we went there, and we altogether started. (b.1947, 23 years in NL)

Another form of encapsulation can be found in the ethno-religious voluntary organizations in Enschede. Based primarily on ethnicity and religious affiliation, the three women organizations in Enschede at the time of the fieldwork provided a variety of services as well as enabled women to get out of their homes, expand their social networks, and exchange knowledge and information. Yet these organizations at the same time set clear boundaries between those who were members and regulars and others. In the next chapter, more detailed consideration will be given to peer relations and ethno-religious voluntary organizations.

Isolated

The isolated are those whose networks are limited and of low density and have a small role repertoire. By and large, there are no significant relationships, or at least very few personal disclosures are made, and they do not expand to other domains. Among the isolated, a differentiation can be made between those that are voluntarily isolated and those that are forced isolated. The former consists of women who have consciously isolated themselves. Personal circumstances may play a role, such as financial problems or a divorce, as well as motives to be outside of the community.

The Turkish community here is very tied to each other. They want to know everything about you, your private affairs, what you are doing, where you are going, etc., then they gossip about you, I hate that. Sometimes you come across Turks in the supermarket or in the street. I think a small greeting is more than enough. Well, I don't have also Dutch or friends from other groups. I have a sister and now she has moved to Apeldoorn. Now I'm alone here. Maybe I will also move to Apeldoorn. I prefer to be outside of all these groups. My mother was also like me. We never have had any Turkish or Dutch friends or any visitors at home. I guess you become the person that you see from your parents. (b. 1968, 29 years in NL)

The second group, the forced isolated, can be found mainly among the new arrivals of the marriage-immigrants. The very first years of their arrival, they are 'stuck at home', in most cases in the homes of the parents-in-law. Staying with parents is

usually related to the weak economic condition of the young married couple and the shortage of available housing, but also to a certain extent, it is the family's desire to 'keep an eye' on the bride.

In the first years, I wanted to go out, to the neighbors' houses, or to the meetings at the community centre, or simply go out to get fresh air, but my parents-in-law never let me to leave the house alone. They never let me have my own friends here in Enschede. My mother-in-law was always saying; 'you have many sisters-in-law. We are a big family. This should be enough for you!' (b. 1974, 11 years in NL)

For the second generation and marriage-immigrants, the parents or parents-in-law wield power by restricting interaction with other girls, both Turkish and other immigrants or Dutch. Interacting with other immigrant women is considered to be a threat to the tight-knit Turkish community, by making friends with other young immigrant women, who may become open to the flow of other/foreign norms and may challenge the norms of her own ethnic community. These relations are considered to be 'eye-openers' and thus must be prevented. Hence, isolation brings the withdrawal of the individual from personal contacts. Since the information channels are almost closed, they cannot access, or can have limited access to the facilities around them.

Segregated

According to Hannerz (1980), the line between segregated and encapsulated is thin. Segregated personal networks comprise not one but several rather distinct clusters. An individual can choose from a network of different people to satisfy different needs; sports, shopping, and recreation. As Granovetter (1973) states, the encapsulation of an individual by his network happens when the network is composed only of those to whom he is tied directly. Therefore, he distinguishes encapsulated as having stronger ties, and segregated as having weaker ties. "The fewer indirect contacts one has, the more encapsulated he will be in terms of knowledge of the world beyond his own friendship circle" (ibid. p. 1371). The segregated tends to keep her contacts apart.

With my Turkish neighbors, we usually meet at home, you know, the regular afternoon visits or visit the park near by. I usually go out to the centre with my friends from SIVE (a women voluntary organization). They don't know each other, and I don't want to combine these two groups. (b. 1960, 20 years in NL)

Another difference between the segregated and encapsulated is that the segregated may not be as dependent as the encapsulated in their actions and activities. She can be mobile without having to ask for permission; for instance, decision to participate in the courses of learning how to cycle, the illustration that I gave for encapsulated networks, becomes her own choice.

One day I saw the neighbor of my friend cycling, I could not believe that, a Turkish woman on a bicycle, then, I thought why shouldn't I do it? What's wrong with me? If she can do it, I can do it! The next day, I went to the community centre to learn cycling. (b. 1951, 26 years NL)

For the segregated, locality is not an important issue for the establishment and continuation of their personal networks. It is neither the home cluster nor neighborhood. The contacts are apart; they are prepared to adapt themselves to new patterns as they move on to other contexts. Blokland (2003) calls the segregated also social climbers because they are able to mobilize their contacts at their convenience. Since they have dispersed and focused networks, their spatial literacy is the highest and most specialized among these four groups.

Integrated

The Integrated are those whose networks spread among domains without very strong tendencies to concentration in any one. They have specialized relations but not to the same degree as the segregated or encapsulated. They give special attention to their Turkish friends and acquaintances and the Turkish community, but not as the segregated and encapsulated do. Here the important point is involvement. They are not very much involved in any personal network, only to a degree to their family. For Hannerz, integrated can have a rather "routinized round of relationships and do little to develop new links out of occasional encounters" (p.259). To a large extent, the employed second generation maintains such networks.

I work full-time, so that I do not have time either for my friends or the neighbors, I can just take care of my children. Well, I try to do things with people, but I do not have time to sustain close relations with friends or neighbors. During Ramadan, if I find time on Sundays, I attend a religious meeting so that I can see my relatives and friends. (b. 1967, 23 years in NL)

The activity radius of the integrated is a little greater than that of the encapsulated, but not as extensive as that of the segregated. Using active and potential relations, they may get various types of social support from the variety of networks.

Turkish women's social networks show not only that their network compositions vary considerably, but also that these personal networks show the variety of ways of conceiving the social world and the composition of social contexts within their attitudes and behavior are formed. Analyzing their social networks anthropologically enables us to access processes of construction of meaning and of the habitus; how Turkish women understand themselves, the others, and their place in the society.

Turkish Women's Culture of Housing

For Rapoport (1977), the built environment is a form of non-verbal communication; a code decoded by users (through providing cues for behavior) and therefore, it is closely linked to culture. The built environment, in that sense, can be seen in terms of congruence, whereby people try to match their characteristics, values, expectations and norms, as well as behaviors to physical environments, and concurrently the physical environment can reflect their culture of habitation. The term 'habitat' embraces both the physical structures – housing, recreational, cultural, and economic facilities to be used by the inhabitants – and the social structures, which operate in relation to the physical framework (Grünfeld, 1970), everything belonging to habitation. People choose their habitation in relation to the sources available to them. Grünfeld uses the term 'habitat' embracing the unit of the home and its immediate environment; some neighborhoods, kind and style of housing, facilities and services can be favored in expense of others. For him, the house is an instrument for self-expression rather than a commodity for passive consumption. In that sense, preference for a certain habitat is a consequence of a certain life-style.

For Turkish women in Enschede, reliability, neatness, and decency are the most valued characteristics in their housing environment. To a large extent, they are sufficiently satisfied with their dwellings and neighborhoods, yet this is true only for those who live in the new working class neighborhoods. The higher percentages of lower class Dutch inhabitants in the old working class neighborhoods (especially high crime rates and social unrest) are seen as a disadvantage.

Among Turks in the Netherlands, single-family housing is found to be the most desired dwelling unit (SmartAgent Company, 2001). The large family sizes, the culture of living, and firm separation of facility areas, such as the separation of kitchen and living room, are factors named affecting this choice. According to the SmartAgent research, Turks, in general, are keen on the presence of their own cultural elements in the neighborhood, such as Turkish shops, special butchers, groceries, travel agencies, and religious services. In addition, they are willing to have recreational facilities in the neighborhood and, as Liempt (2001) shows, they intensively and frequently make use of these neighborhood public spaces. SmartAgent research points out the strong orientations of Turks towards the neighborhood, regardless of age, gender, or socio-economic position. Although there are variations among generations, their habitat preferences are mainly directed to live with *gelijkgestemden* (people like themselves). This reflects itself in the differences of choices of first generation families seeking more Turkish elements in the neighborhood, having allotments (*volkstuintje* or *moestuin*) nearby, living in the average Dutch working-class neighborhoods. On the other hand, the upwardly mobile Turkish middle class, the second generation of highly educated and high economic profile Turks, prefer to live in more 'decent' neighborhoods, regardless ethnic origin with the people of the same social and economic characteristics.

Like all other cities in the Netherlands, Turks in Enschede are concentrated in neighborhoods where social housing is abundant. Turkish neighborhoods in Enschede

can be characterized in three types; inner-city, post-WWII, and suburban/peripheral. Although Turks are highly dependent on social housing associations, whose decisions for allocation of housing are decisive, their housing choices still do reflect certain lifestyles and habitat preferences.

Inner-city Neighborhoods

As built in the heydays of industrial growth as working-class districts, inner-city neighborhoods, such as Getfert and Ribbelt, can be characterized as row-houses with narrow streets, limited greenery and play facilities for children, and mixed residential and commercial uses, and moderate traffic (both pedestrian and vehicle). As mentioned in the previous chapter, following the general trend in other Dutch cities in the 1970s, most streets in these neighborhoods were transformed to *woonerfs*, allowing a more social climate for the users. Particularly, old singles (single second generation) prefer these neighborhoods since their spatial mobility is limited: they neither use car or public transport, nor bicycle and a person who can carry her to the places is not present. Proximity to the city centre, particularly being nearby to institutions like hospital and elderly health facilities and frequented ethno-religious organizations, is the most pronounced feature behind this preference. In addition, limited spatial mobility leads them to spend a lot of time in the vicinity of the home; walking in the home cluster as a physical activity, visiting peers in the same neighborhood.

In the inner-city neighborhoods, where streets are more than a transit space for vehicles, they are much more appreciated and used intensively as a setting for social relationships together with all other users; social contacts with neighbors and children playing outside, as well as strangers passing-by. Though their Dutch language command is low, they socialize more with people in the street. All social exchanges happen just in front of their house, either in the form of small chats or greetings.

I am very happy here, I go everywhere and I do not need anybody. The neighborhood is nice, people always greet and talk to each other. There are many people every time in the street so that I never get scared. (b.1961, 23 years in NL).

On the other hand, the physical qualities of the housing in these neighborhoods are poorer than those in the post-WWII and peripheral/suburban neighborhoods. As the dwellings are quite old, there happen always problems with the maintenance and infrastructure, especially heating. In addition, they are found to be small for the populous Turkish families.

Post-WWII Neighborhoods

Post-WWII neighborhoods are those, which were built largely on the modernist planning principles due to the housing shortages during the rapid paced reconstruction process. They were built as working-class neighborhoods with strict functional zoning and traffic regulation. They were to a large extent built by housing corporations. Thus, the social housing stock in Enschede is largely in these neighborhoods, such as Velve-Lindenhof, Deppenbroek, Hogeland, Boswinkel, and Stadsveld. In that sense, the strong agglomeration of Turks in these neighborhoods is a likely result.

The first generation Turks value these neighborhoods highly. It is more the social rather than physical characteristics of the habitat that are important. Almost all of the first generation have lived in the same neighborhoods since they arrived in Enschede. Therefore the strong family networks that emerged in the course of the migration process and over time create a social environment that is not much different from that in Turkey. Such a social setting gives them confidence. As such, it represents a community image identical to that of Turkey and at the same time safeguards the continuation of community norms and values into the future. They often call the neighborhood their second homeland and plan never to leave. For some of the second generation and the marriage-immigrants, the presences of other family members and their mutual dependence (taking care of the elderly and children) have led them to stay in the same neighborhoods. For these groups, proximity to the family is as important as the housing unit.

On the other hand, generally the offspring's preference for housing is different than that of their parents. The physical characteristics of the housing unit become more important, such as single-family house with a spacious living room, kitchen, and back garden. Yet still those whose social networks are with the peers in the neighborhood are more bound to specific neighborhoods, as 'the home feeling' is the most valued characteristic; they give special value to the presence of other Turks in the neighborhood.

Among the second generation and marriage-immigrants, those who are traditional and conservative and whose social networks are encapsulated tend to live in the neighborhoods where Turkish characteristics are strongly articulated. In post-WWII neighborhoods, such as Deppenbroek and Stadsveld, they have the possibility to continue to live in a 'Turkish' way, like in Turkey. Suttles (1968) also states that by 'sticking together' and focusing on relationships in their own ethnic group, it is easier for immigrants to define their identities and to survive in a heterogeneous society. In the post-WWII neighborhoods, the long duration of tenancy enables them to form and sustain clusters of rather homogeneous interaction systems. By appropriating space for themselves, their lifestyles and identities, as well as peculiar residential uses, become more visible and, perhaps non-problematic. In this way, they are not going to come into contact with Dutch culture, social habits, or norms. Neither washing cars in the street, nor picnics in the neighborhood park are disputed among neighborhood inhabitants. The social mechanisms of bonding, especially social control then can be easily practiced.

This is a neighborhood where everyone looks after each other and cares for each other. For example, if I see a Turkish boy loitering around, I say right away, 'don't you have better things to do?' and if I see him, for example, smoking a cigarette, then I immediately tell his mother... and I know that other people here (Turkish people, *my addition*) would do the same, if it were one of my children as well.

– *So, you think other people may not likely take such an action?*

No, no, it is what we are, we care for each other. (b.1953, 23 years in NL)

Those who live in some streets in Deppenbroek, in the ones looking at each other, for example in Ganzediepstraat, see inside of the each others homes, so that you have to be always careful. (b. 1979, b. in NL)

Strict functional separation, especially mono-functional housing clusters enables the creation of enclaves, socially and culturally stable units. For upwardly mobile Turkish women, the presence of these clusters in the neighborhood is often considered an obstacle.

I never let my children play outside and we have almost no relations with the Turks here in Deppenbroek, they are at the same point as when they came to the Netherlands 20 years ago. Yes, we live in this neighborhood only because we found the best house we could afford. (b. 1968, 32 years in NL)

Suburban/peripheral Neighborhoods

The suburban/peripheral neighborhoods¹³ in Enschede to a certain extent represent similar design principles as the post-WWII neighborhoods. As they were built in the early 1970s, strict segregation between functions is manifested in the design concerns, such as high-rise apartment blocks along main traffic arteries, and low-rise residential dwellings with controlled traffic. In terms of housing characteristics, the post-WWII and suburban/peripheral neighborhoods are also quite similar. However, the duration of tenancy and heterogeneity among the Turkish inhabitants make them conceived differently. In the northern and eastern post-WWII neighborhoods, the duration of the tenancy reaches for some twenty years and most of the Turks there are guest-workers and families. On the other hand, in the southern suburban/peripheral neighborhoods, such as Wesselerbrink, tenancy the duration of habitation by Turks is relatively short -ten to thirteen years- and largely inhabited by Turks who belong to a different ethnic group and strongly disagree with their association with the Turkish identity. On the other hand, if spatial mobility is not a matter of concern, second generation and marriage-immigrants favor these housing areas due to the physical characteristics of the dwelling units, like three and four room single-family houses with extensive gardens and two and three room multi-storey apartment blocks with spacious green areas in between. Yet in most cases the physical characteristics are not enough.

We wanted to buy a house in Deppenbroek. We tried a lot to find one there. I grow up in Deppenbroek, then we bought this house here and I cannot get used to it here yet...

– *Is it different from Deppenbroek?*

No, no, Deppenbroek and Wesselerbrink are almost the same. The houses are very similar. Many Turks also live here, but they are different...I don't know why, but the Turks in Deppenbroek seem to me much nicer... Don't get me wrong, my neighbors here are also very nice people, but there, it's different. There it's like Turkey, like home. (b. 1974, b. in NL)

Suburban/peripheral neighborhoods are valued much, also due to the majority of middle-class Dutch inhabitants. The mixed housing ownership styles, the proportionate share of social housing tenants with homeowners make the socio-economic image/profile of the neighborhood better for them, especially when the concerns mainly lie for the offspring. Social contacts with Dutch neighbors are much appreciated, even in the form of greetings and fleeting relations.

As far as the open public spaces in the neighborhood are concerned, territorial concerns are much more called for. The strict functional separation of activities, such as living and recreation, living and traffic, in the post-WWII and suburban/peripheral neighborhoods highly influence over-use and under-use of spaces. Most playgrounds and parks in the peripheral/suburban neighborhoods can easily become places of disorder, as they are only frequented by gangs and youth groups, or become territorialized by other ethnic groups. The inner-city neighborhoods are, on the other hand, much more functionally and ethnically diverse, so that staging territorial claims is rather difficult.

(showing the small playground just in front of the house) I have never seen any children playing here, only teenagers come together. They drive fast, make a lot of noise, sometimes they drink alcohol and then they leave all the garbage to the park... We usually go to other playgrounds, there are many playgrounds, so that you can choose, but a lot of them are like this. (b.1969, 15 years in NL)

That park was used to be nice. It was empty but green. Then they put benches, and then all the teenagers started to hang out there. You don't know the people living here, gypsies ... Dutch gypsies. You cannot say anything to any of them; they are like gangs. Always ready for trouble. I always tell my sons and daughter-in-law not to use that path when coming home, we never do. (b.1960, 20 years in NL)

When we first moved to Wesselerbrink, we were frequent visitors of the park, sometimes with friends (neighbors) and children, sometimes with family after work. When the days are longer in the summer you can stay long outside, it's only five minutes away. When we moved here, this neighborhood was a nice neighborhood, few foreigners, mostly Dutch. Then they arrived, people think they are Turkish, but no, they call themselves Suryoyo's¹⁴. Now it's their neighborhood, their park. (b.1951, 26 years in NL)

Grünfeld (1970) states that a specific population structure of a given area gives to that area the stamp of a specific sub-cultural life-style, while on the other hand the ecology of the residential area not only helps to maintain that style but functions also as an additional factor in shaping the particularity of that life-style. Turks living in the post-WWII neighborhoods, such as Deppenbroek and Stadsveld, are characterized as lower profile than and looked down by the ones living in the inner-city and suburban/peripheral neighborhoods.

If you want to live in a Turkish community like you live in Turkey, Deppenbroek is the best place for you. They are closed and intimate. They live as if they are living in

Turkey in a village. Mainly newcomers live there. You hardly dare look from a window. People who choose to live there like it this way, but I don't. Wesselerbrink is much better in that sense. Mostly second generation, who were born and raised here, educated, and social Turks live there. (b. 1981, b. in NL)

To summarize, for the first generation in general, rather than the physical characteristics, social qualities are important for habitation. Proximity to family and peers are the basic requirement for the housing, together with green and recreation areas close by and shopping centers within walking distance are valued. As family and 'care' facilities are of major importance in their daily lives, it is not surprising that parks and playgrounds, where they can meet with peers while children are playing and shopping centers in the close vicinity, where they can fulfill the daily household chores, have become important characteristics.

For second generation and marriage-immigrants, on the other hand, physical characteristics are much valued, mainly due to the family composition. Among for those whose social networks lie mainly in the family and kinship, similar tendencies like the first generation can be expected. Rather than a heterogeneous neighborhood, they prefer to live in neighborhoods where the characteristics of the Turkish community are visible. Peripheral/suburban neighborhoods, on the other hand, mainly attract young upward mobile families, mainly for the relatively new housing units and distance to the Turkish community in the north of Enschede, in Deppenbroek. Those who wish to remain distant, but not completely break off ties with the community prefer the peripheral/suburban neighborhoods.

Conclusion

The categories of Turkish women reveal the variety of patterns of use, appropriation, and experiences of urban public spaces in Enschede. They at the same time represent socially negotiated boundaries and the process of boundary construction, defining the boundaries of social identification. Categorical identifications mark the boundaries of 'we', 'who belong together', the private, and 'they', 'who does not belong to us', the public.

The 'we' and 'they' constructions influence their conceptions of publicness and privateness in different contexts. Turkish women position themselves and others based on these categorical identifications: the perception of the others, as strangers or those who have the potential to share the same public space. These identifications facilitate in social attachments and approvals, as well as detachments and refusals. Through making comparisons, they place themselves in relation to those in whom they perceive differences and similarities. In some contexts, 'we' may connote Turkish as opposed to 'they', the Dutch, or the Western, whereas in other contexts, 'we' may imply a small group of bonding as opposed to the Turkish community in Enschede. 'We' can be related to generations; i.e. age or period or process of migration, as in the case of many marriage-immigrant women who want to be distanced

themselves from the 'rural' first generation or 'Germanized' or 'lost' second-generation Turkish women; the roles enacted in social life, i.e. mothers as opposed to single women, the employed as opposed to housewives, those who are detached from the Turkish community as opposed to those who are involved in the Turkish ethno-religious organizations, and so forth; the political orientations and religious affiliations, i.e. Traditionalists vs. Westernists, Sunnis vs. Alevi; and personal social networks, whether it is women seeking participation among peers or family members as opposed to among other individuals available. In addition, 'we' is also closely related to habitat, the culture of housing. The concentration of Turks in the neighborhoods where social housing is abundant and where the housing styles are almost identical (row houses or apartments) gives at the first sight a picture of an homogeneous immigrant neighborhood. However, because of the diversity of immigrant Turkish groups, based on place of origin or ethnicity, the habitat marks the boundaries of distinction and social identification.

There are some streets of Deppenbroek where mainly traditional Turks live. I would not want to live there even they gave it for free. (b. 1978, 23 years in NL).

Especially for second and third generation women, social qualities of habitat are significant, because they are the ones whose behavior is controlled and judged most, and in turn, they are threatened with being expelled from the community.

Turkish women's specific spatial practices are to a certain extent engendered in the contextual and relational involvements as embedded in these categories. Thus, analyzing these categories offers us the ground to assess the significant social bases for association and differentiation, which will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

MAPPING SOCIAL RELATIONS IN URBAN PUBLIC SPACE

Introduction

A relational approach to urban public space emphasizes the inseparability of individuals from the relational contexts within which they are embedded. These relational contexts embody and express individuals' social world; framing, to a certain extent, how they think and behave. It is also in these relational contexts that identities are constructed and reflected in the diverse manners of use and appropriation, the nature of relations, and the kinds of activities conducted in the urban public space. These relational contexts are embodied and expressed in the urban public space through a variety of spatial practices and, at the same time, these diverse spatial practices reflect different relational contexts.

In this chapter, I portray Turkish women's social relations with regard to the relational contexts in which they are embedded. Diverse social relations unfold different constructions of the urban public space and various patterns of spatial behavior. It is through these processes that social relations are inscribed in space. On the other hand, considering the fluidity and divergence of social relations in everyday urban public spaces, problems arise in terms of how to trace Turkish women's social relations there. The complexity of the social relations, not only between individuals and groups, but also a mass of different and sometimes conflicting positions and processes, and the variety of ways that people make use of and experience public spaces make the analysis quite complex. Therefore, in order to do that, I use 'mapping' in a different sense than the ordinary use of the term in the city planning and urban design disciplines. I adopt 'mapping' in the way that Pile and Thrift (1995) use it, meaning way-finding, as in the process of "visiting in turn all, or most, of the positions one takes to constitute the field... (covering) descriptively as much of the terrain as possible, exploring it on foot rather than looking down at it from an airplane" (Mathy, 1993, p. 15, cited in Pile and Thrift, 1995, p. 1).

In the following part, I will explore Turkish women's conceptions of urban public spaces in relation to the social identifications and spatial associations that they make in their everyday lives. Their social relations, on the one hand, influence their perceptions of the community/setting/ situation and, on the other hand, influence their conceptions of publicness and privateness, the boundaries and related spatial behavior patterns in the urban public space.

FIGURE 7.1 Mapping social relations in urban public space

<i>Identification</i>	<i>Social relations</i>	<i>Spatial scale</i>
we	primary groups	
	* intimate others – family members and kin	home
	* peer groups	neighborhood
	* women organizations	city
they	secondary groups	
	* others – strangers in the public	neighborhood
	* public institutions	city

As shown in Figure 7.1, social identifications, the constructions of ‘we’ and ‘they,’ are related closely to social relations with primary and secondary groups. The primary groups, ‘we,’ consist of intimate others, such as family and kin, peer groups, and women’s organizations and may extend to *Gemeinschaft*, whereas the secondary groups, ‘they,’ Dutch society at large, are often referred to as *Gesellschaft*. While the former is often referred to as a way of life characterized by small, traditional communities, primary-group relationships, and intergenerational stability, the latter is a way of life common in modern cities, involving contractual relationships, voluntary social bonds based on rational self-interest, and instrumental behavior. This chapter aims at mapping these social relations and unveiling their spatial reflections.

Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft¹

Tönnies (1957) formulates the *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* on the qualities of the essence and the tendencies of being bound together, based on the contrasting characteristics of natural will and rational will. Natural will is “whether it be what is contained on the one hand in the simplest relationships resulting from desire or inclination, from love or habit, or on the other hand from reason or intellect contained in the feeling of duty” (p. 10). Whereas in the rational will, an abstract contract relationship is sought, “as separate, hitherto, and otherwise independent, as strangers to each other, and perhaps even as hitherto and in other respects inimical persons” (ibid.). On the basis of natural will, *Gemeinschaft* suggests relations of kindred individuals, or the domineering ‘we-feeling’ that bind people in voluntary, social, and reciprocal relations, referring to the traditional Village society. On the contrary, *Gesellschaft* signifies rational will and impersonal association, referring the money-based society of strangers in the City. In the *Gemeinschaft*, personal social relationships are bound by tradition and a strong sense of social belonging. There exists a type of social solidarity based on intimate bonds of sentiment, a common sense of place (social as well as physical) and a common sense of purpose (Kasinitz, 1995). Characterized by a high degree of face-to-face interaction in a common locality among people who have generally had common experiences, *Gemeinschaft* implies strong sense of social norms and rare (low or absent) individual deviation. There is

a high degree of social consensus and behavior is governed by strong but usually informal institutions such as the family and peer group. *Gesellschaft*, on the contrary, is composed of rational, self-interested individuals joined together by contractual relationships. Relationships between people tend to be impersonal, superficial, and calculating, and self-interest is the prevailing motive for human action. Social solidarity is maintained by formal authority, contracts and laws (Kasinitz, 1995).

Though the original formulation of Tönnies presupposes that *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* are found interwoven in all kinds of social associations, they are often used as dichotomic, also referring correlation between other paired oppositions, such as rural vs. urban, traditional vs. modern. Urban life, the social complexity of the city is generally referred as *Gesellschaft*. Accordingly, much research on the urban public space automatically assumes that people's relations in public, the basis of conceptions of publicness and privateness, are in a *Gesellschaft* character, where 'strangers interact in the public space'. This assumption stems from the characterization of 'urban' social life or 'urbanity as a way of life' (Wirth, 1938), such as the substitution of secondary for primary contacts, the weakening of kinship ties, the decline of the social significance of family, the disappearance of the neighborhood, the undermining of the traditional basis of social solidarity. However, this conception has been challenged by scholars (Gans, 1982; Anderson, 1990), pointing out that the *Gemeinschaft* kind of social bond can be found in the city, regardless of their bind to a place or tradition. His depiction of Italian immigrant peers in a working-class neighborhood provides us with a different conceptual framework – that has been before –, that a city can be composed of a collection of *Gemeinschafts*. In the same vein, Coleman's (1990) description of modern society, based on a system of two parallel organizational structures: primordial social organizations, such as family, kinship groups, neighborhoods, placed-based communities, and religious groups; and purposive social organizations, such as economic organizations, firms, trade unions, professional organizations, and government, is helpful to map different social relationships that an individual conducts in different social domains.

Navigating in Turkish Women's Social Networks

Turkish women's social relations, from their personal networks to commitments and involvements in these relations, have important consequences on their spatial behavior. In the light of the discussion above and when urban public space is conceived as a social construct, the characteristics of the social networks of the users with regard to the tendencies towards *Gemeinschaft*-like or *Gesellschaft*-like relationships have important reflections and consequences in terms of using and appropriating the urban public space. As presented in Chapter Six, categorical differences reveal the variety of patterns of use, appropriation and experiences of urban public spaces. Turkish women's personal networks depict the role of social networks as opportunities and constraints for their spatial behavior patterns. Yet alone it is not sufficient. Spatial behavior is conditioned to an important extent by their embeddedness in

social ties in these networks, i.e. contextual and relational involvements as inscribed/embedded in these categories. In other words, their embeddedness in social networks, as discussed in Chapter Four, is exposed in tendencies/orientations towards *Gemeinschaft*-like or *Gesellschaft*-like relationships.

To start with, three kinds of social relations that Turkish women make use of in urban public space are considered as significant in leading to *Gemeinschaft*-like associations. The first one is family, comprising the roles to be fulfilled, such as mothering and care. Second, peers, forming encapsulated social relations that lead the members to act in an orchestrated manner; and third, women's organizations, based on the strong identification of the members from non-members. These relations at the same time reveal the spatial relationships of *Gemeinschaft*-oriented habitus.

Family and Care

Family is probably the most important social institution in Turkish society. Turkish women traditionally are expected to give priority to the family over other things; priority of roles as the 'mother' and the 'principal care-taker' and norms related to these roles (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1975, Erman, 2001b). To the extent that women's lives are tied to the family, i.e. family relationships are structurally predominant, they only have simple relationships, a simple relational system, or restricted role-sets (Coser, 1986). For Turkish immigrant women, this simple relational system works in two ways: on the one hand, there is this system of families as promoting bonds of solidarity and giving emotional support to each other in the new country. On the other hand, since almost all relationships take place within the family social framework, women cannot come out of this familiar and constant relational system. In addition, following Coser (1986), a simple relational system does not necessitate that Turkish women become conscious of – and reflect on – their own roles in relation to others, because these roles and relationships are largely a matter of custom and habit. This rather simple social roles/role differentiation has diverse effects on their spatial behavior and patterns of use of urban public spaces.

Turkish women's maternity and care commitments are reflected strongly in the activities conducted in the urban public space. Starting from monitoring children playing in the front of the house to paying a visit with children to some place that they want to go to, either to the neighborhood playground or a fast food restaurant in the centre, most of the young Turkish women's activities are directed by their children's needs and wishes. Their focus on 'care' leads their presence and experience of public spaces differently.

Everyday we go out to the playground or park. My daughter loves it. At home, she gets bored and she wants to be out. So, everyday even if it's raining, we're out. Sometimes I call my friends who have also small children. It's not that I love to go there. Children are happy to play together and we talk about ordinary things, that's it.
(b. 1972, 11 years in NL)

We usually go on Saturdays to McDonalds, because my children want to go. Even if we have nothing to do in the centre, we go to McDonalds, hmmm, apart from that, we never go anywhere to eat. It can be unsafe. You never know, they may put pork meat. (b. 1972, 26 years in NL).

Their social interactions in public also are related to their 'mother' roles; meeting with other mothers in the street while walking everyday to their children's school, or in the schoolyard while waiting for them to come out; exchanging greetings and positive neighborly feelings while walking in the street with the children. Their roles as the 'mother' and the 'principal care-taker' provide the interaction ground. The experiences of the street as a social setting are then expressed.

While going to the shopping mall or to the market (in the neighborhood), if it is early noon, you see a lot of old people going out in the street. There is a *bejaardenhuis* (elderly home) over there. Most of them are nice people. They smile at us, sometimes pinch my daughter's cheek. There are also those grumpy ones, they get on your nerves, but not a lot; anyways...that street is nice. (b. 1973, 10 years in NL)

The role of child caregiver is not limited to the young Turkish women. Grandmothers also follow the same path through the wishes of their grandchildren.

Every Wednesday is my turn to look after my grandson. We go to places as he wishes. Therefore, every Wednesday afternoon, I go to the *speeltuin* (playground) with him. (b.1955, 34 years in NL)

Day (2000) argues that the moral of 'care' creates constraints on women's use of public spaces, "by encouraging women to put others first and by reinforcing women's responsibility of care giving" (p. 103). These constraints include, among others, limited time (e.g. household, child-care responsibilities constraining whether, when, and how long women use public spaces), limited social interaction (e.g. prioritizing other family member's needs, for instance those of children and husbands, in extended family relations, or those of in-laws as well, preferences limiting women's own social interaction in the public space), and limited opportunities (e.g. avoidance of some places because of the fear for children's safety).

My husband doesn't like to go out. Although it's been five years, he cannot get used to living here. He always complains about the weather, people, the high cost of living, the crowds, etc. We never go to the centre, he doesn't like it. Sometimes on the weekdays we go to the neighborhood shopping centre, because he doesn't like it in the weekend, it is crowded then. He likes animals, so that we usually go to visit zoos. At first I had no idea, now I also like it, watching animals. (b. 1978, b. in NL)

I used to go to the cinema every two weeks, but now, no, my husband barely speaks Dutch. He can cope with the everyday things, but he says he doesn't understand English and he doesn't want to follow the Dutch subtitles. So, we neither go to the cinema nor the theatre. (b. 1978, b. in NL)

On the other hand, family and care related activities are not necessarily constraining, they also can help positive experiences and contributions in the urban public space. Like the citation above, the presence of small children can prompt positive interactions between strangers in the street. The opportunity to establish relationships with strangers arises and the public space becomes warm (Müller, 2002) through the exchange of assistance and affection. This kind of interaction with strangers is valued highly.

With some people I come across often, I recognize them, and if they recognize me and we greet each other, sometimes we wave hands from a distance. I like it a lot, they see you and react. These are usually old Dutch ladies and men, they are really nice. With foreigners and young Dutch people, it never happens. (b. 1969, 15 years in NL)
It's always nice to see and greet people in the street, once you do it often. The Dutch are willing to stop by and start to chat. They like to talk in the street, so we sometimes talk, but not too long. It's nice, and then you know that people are interested in you. (b. 1967, 14 years in NL)

Peers

The peer group, described by Gans (1982), consists of people of the same gender who are roughly the same age and at a similar stage in their lives. Common interests and shared values are more important than the kinship ties, therefore, while it may include family members, it may not necessarily be based on kinship (Blokland, 2003). In the Enschede case, there is an inclination to neighborly relations for the first generation of Turkish peers, whereas marriage-immigrants are more grouped according to kinship ties and ethnicity. For the second generation peers, religion, kinship, and neighborly relations are at work together, but their peer relationship history is different from those of the other two. The second-generation women describe their peer relations in the school years in the Netherlands as quite different. They had many Dutch and foreign friends and schoolmates. Today, most have lost contact with their non-Turkish peers from school, and their new peers are all Turkish.

In the formation of peer groups, ethnicity related to political religious orientation is also an important dividing field, except for the first generation. As also discussed in Chapter Six, the Alevi/Sunni difference is a significant categorical distinction. In that sense, a Sunni woman is much keener on peer relations than an Alevi woman. Alevis are more community-oriented and regularly organize meetings where women and men can join together. Therefore, it can be stated that strict gender segregation leads Sunni women to have weightier peer relations. In that sense, the home-boundness of Sunni peers is a logical consequence. It should also be noted that differences in employment and language command are also important in the structure of peer relations.

Blokland (2003) argues that the peer group is like a self-contained world in which people focus entirely on each other. Peer relations act as a support mechanism, as discussed in Chapter Six, so that Turkish immigrant women are able to cope with the

changes in the new settings. Although it is a close-knit community and women do not act individually to meet their social needs, peer relations, through reinforcing their solidarity, make it possible for women to adapt themselves without conflicting or challenging the expectations of the community. Once a young woman has established herself, especially for the newcomers of marriage-immigrants, in a peer group, strict control from family and community loosen up.

Before, my parents-in-law interfered a lot in my personal life. They were scared that I would leave him after I saw the life in Enschede, and they put a lot of pressure on me, much more than my own parents do. Now, luckily, I have my own friends ... well, most of them are my sister-in-law's friends, but since they know them, they let me do things together with them. (b. 1974, 11 years in NL)

My sister and I, we are very close, and we do everything together, and all of our friends are the same, so, if one of us is bored, then we go out, take a walk or go shopping. No one from our families objects to this, we are here in the same neighborhood, what can happen? When I got married, my husband was quite surprised to see that I would come home from a friends' house at 1:00 a.m. and my parents did not say anything. They trust us. (b. 1978, b. in NL)

For all peers from all generations, home is the main meeting place and peers like to explore outside 'home' together. Yet the places of exploration are different in terms of generations. The meaning of 'peer' for the first generation is to do all outside home things together, being as a real companion in all activities conducted.

We do everything together. If she (pointing her friend, who was also present during the interview, although she did not want to participate in the research) needs to go to shopping, and then we go. It's not that I have to do shopping for myself, she calls us, and we (four-five women) go to the shopping mall, so everyday there are things to do, places to go.

– *Don't you go to these places with the help of your husband or other family members?*

– No, my husband doesn't like to do shopping, go out or wander around. He always stays home. Sometimes we walk around the neighborhood.

– *And the city centre?*

– No, no. Carsi (meaning the city centre) is not safe for us, and what would we do there? Where would we go? We have everything we need here, in the neighborhood.

(b.1943, 23 years in NL)

While the first generation peers make use of the neighborhood, third generation peers are more center-oriented, they usually meet at home and head to the city center. For the second-generation and marriage-immigrants, peer relations refer at the same time to participation in women's organizations, which are discussed in the following section. Peer relations often extend from Turkish women to their families to even organizations. In addition, it is interesting to note that Turkish men also form peer groups and organizations and they are often composed of the spouses of the women peers. In the following section, women's organizations as extensions of peer relations in Enschede are discussed.

Turkish Women's Organizations

The recent development of the Turkish women's organizations in the Netherlands, at the first sight, seems to be a part of the empowerment process of Turkish women of all generations. Although in early 1980s, there were only few organizations – mainly mosques – that Turkish women come together to large extent religious purposes (Sunier, 1999, Speelman, 1988), late 1990s witnessed the growth of Turkish women's organizations almost in all cities.

Turkish women's organizations² aim at improving Turkish women's position in Western society by promoting opposition against the pressures of the ethnic minority position. Fatma³, a devout Turkish woman who played an active role in founding of one of the religion-oriented women organization, says that most Turkish women are not aware of the real meanings of the teachings, ideas, and values of Islam. Because most of them are less educated and never followed any informative religious course, they are not aware of their parts in the family and social life, and, as a result, are not aware of their rights. By means of lectures and sessions on Islam, these organizations also help to assert their rights and their identity and improve their status.

These ethno-religious activities have important indirect functions. These mainly refer to socialization, bringing together women who otherwise have few contacts outside the family, and exchanging knowledge and information, increasing the social networks. They also provide a setting for activities such as sport and daily child-care, that most women find very appropriate for their beliefs and customs. Providing the members with social and emotional support, they serve not only the woman, but her entire family.

I go there for my sons. My mother didn't do anything. She was always at home, worrying. I grew up like that... No friends, nothing to do, no idea... I don't want my sons being like me. I also send them to the teenage group of the same organization, and they should know more about being Turkish, being Muslim, Turkish culture. They make friendships there. (b. 1968, 29 years in NL)

When a woman gets into these organizations, she can get help, like in the form of support for her children's education⁴, and follow courses and informational meetings in the areas in which she needs further knowledge. Either directed to their families, especially related to child care (baby-care, learning about the Dutch education system to follow their children's education) or ethno-religious activities for them (Arabic courses, religious and cultural information lectures and sessions), these organizations aim at improving Turkish women's knowledge of their own culture and religion. Especially the first generation is keen on attending these activities.

I have never had any religious education, only what my mother taught me in the village. Women never go to the mosque in the village; there you work in the field and then work at home. We were blind in the village. Home to work, work to home, they (she means her parents and in-laws) didn't give permission to go to the mosque and listen to the imam. They were afraid of me having my eyes opened. (b.1943, 23 years in NL)

For the conservative Sunni women, these women's organizations act as agencies to deal with the public life in the highly institutionalized Dutch society. The members of these organizations point out that they cannot find any place in the established institutions, since their 'culture' is different and their needs are not well understood. Especially the preference of gender segregation and conceptions of publicness and privateness mark these cultural differences. Many Sunni women think that Dutch organizations and women's meeting places to a certain degree conflict with Turkish life style and principles. For instance, with regard to access to sports clubs for Turkish women;

The municipality has arranged a women's-only session in one of the swimming pools in Enschede. That's very considerate, but it's not enough. Still, there are men around; in the entrance, as a receptionist or a cashier, and besides, the swimming pool is watched by cameras, so he can see us. (b. 1961, 23 years in NL)

I don't think you can go to a fitness center without men being around. You do exercises and your body movements can sometimes be called intimate thoughts, aren't they? Why should I do it in front of strangers? (b. 1979, b. in NL)

The same consideration is valid also with regard to services:

When I first came here, I was so surprised to see that hairdressers are mixed. How can I go there? (She wears headscarf in the public) Okay, if I request, maybe they will offer a private space for me, but I would never do that. Instead, with friends we went to a hairdresser-course in the *buurthuis* (community center), so we take care each other. (b. 1967, 13 years in NL)

On the other hand, through visits to museums, art galleries, and historical monuments, cultural activities like theatres and cinemas, these organizations act to connect the Western culture to the Turkish culture. Since most of the members have encapsulated networks, peers or family members, these organizations are the only medium through which to make use of the opportunities in the city. At the same time, these organizations act as gate-keepers: they control the influence emanating from the outside.

The last remark can be made with regard to the social and political standpoints of these women organizations. SIVE (Çağrı and İlkadım) and OTIVO, are of Sunni origin and supported by the Turkish men's organizations in Enschede and Europe. All the participants are tied by kinship, *Hemşehrilik* or they are neighbors. As a tight-knit group, their husbands and male members of their families also are formed a Turkish men's organization, which they call a 'brother' organization. Men's and women's organizations cooperate in organizing many activities, ranging from the speeches of invited speakers from Turkey to dinners and picnics. The activities range from sports (aerobics, self-defence) to religious gatherings (regular Qur'an reading sessions, religious book reviews) and are strictly group-cohesive; that is, the participants are either members of the organizations or regulars.

Placing Social Networks into the Everyday Urban Public Space

The predominance of primary relations in the everyday domains of the family, peer, and woman organizations demonstrates the degree of involvement/commitment of Turkish immigrant women to the *Gemeinschaft*; of the family and Turkish community. On the basis of this, four subsequent and interrelated reflections on the spatial practices and particularly on the use and appropriation of urban public spaces can be identified.

First of all, the supremacy of primary relations implies restrictions in spatial conceptualizations. As Coser (1986) also argues, this is neither the physical space limited to the home nor the social space restricted to the family or kin. Boundaries between the public and the private can be blurred and spatial recognition and identification become restricted. Thus, strong primary ties are reflected in staying close to home and making less use of physical space and therefore remaining inhibited in the spatial conceptualization (*ibid.*). Especially for the first generation, being strongly tied to the family and Turkish neighbors, their spatial action radius is quite limited around home. The conception of the neighborhood is related closely to the homes of other family members and close neighbors. The city itself is like a black box; available only in urgent situations, for example, to go to the hospital or police. Even in that case, their accessibility is bound to an accompanying family member(s).

Second, in relation to the first one, the limitations of spatial conceptualizations lead to individuals alienated from city living and avoiding the experience of being in public. That is, although they know about the places and are even acquainted with the places, since these places are not a part of their relational space, they cannot map them. In other words, due to the limited spatial conceptualizations, their spatial literacy cannot develop effectively.

Third, anonymity cannot be achieved in a social setting where everyone is connected to each other. Perceiving everybody in public as a potential significant other, social control is felt in every place; therefore, intimacy and familiarity become highly attained qualities.

You cannot just go into some public place. Someone will for sure see you or he or she know about it and then they start gossiping. 'Oh, the daughter of X or wife of X was there. She is becoming Dutch'. Your name is at stake. There is always a Turk around. (b. 1962, 31 years in NL)

If I am with a friend, I can go everywhere. No problem. But why should I go anywhere alone? I don't understand what you would do if you don't know anybody? What good is that? (b. 1978, 10 years in NL)

And last, in the light of the discussions above, the supremacy of primary relations facilitates the durable restrictive traditions of the appropriation of urban public space; the power relations of gender, roles, and community prevail in the new setting. Yet the supremacy of primary relations can offer opportunities, as briefly introduced in the case of the participation in women's organizations. First generation and marriage-immigrant Turkish women can only come out from the private domain and engage a public activity via these organizations. Thus, these organizations are

the only available medium for participation in social and cultural life in the Netherlands. In that sense, it can be argued that although all of their social relations are with significant others and in primary character (Gemeinschaft-like ties), this gives them the only opportunity to interact beyond their primary relations, offering them to stage them in a Gesellschaft-like environment.

The following examples are related to sport facilities designed by the Enschede municipality to increase the participation of non-western immigrants. Some scholars (Campbell, 2000, Ruckert, 1992) emphasize the close relationship between such services and the neighborhood and their peculiar needs of gender segregation. The necessity or success of these services can be a subject of another study, but the following illustrations are from a participant observation from one of these services and an interview with a professional, showing the conception of presence in the public space in a Gemeinschaft.

All of the women were running to warm-up for the session. It was the usual run inside the hall before we started the warming-up. It was in late April and the weather was exceptionally warm for normal Dutch April days. Our instructor had all of sudden asked us “why don’t we go out running? The weather is so nice, and we can run in the park nearby instead of doing exercises inside, let’s do something different!” Some agreed by moving their heads. Some, on the other hand, said “that’s difficult for us, we have to change our clothes again” (meaning changing the gym clothes and wearing the ‘outside’ clothes – with a scarf), and the instructor replied, “you don’t need to, we are going to make the gym course outside this time, no need to change, because these are the appropriate clothing for gym.” Then they – the opposition – discussed privately and said, “No, no, we don’t want to go out.” Then a little later, “if you say beforehand, one of the next times, we can do it, but you have to say it before.” Our instructor agreed, but did not understand the reason, “well, if they don’t want to do it, it’s okay”. (Fitness class in one of the halls of a primary school in Wesselerbrink, April 2003)

Since these women have a clear distinction of clothing for inside and outside, the private – in this case, semi-private – and the public, and there are codes of clothing for public, veiled and appropriate for modesty and honor (not showing the female parts of the body), it may mean defying the name – reputation – and disobeying the norms and values of the community. The habitus sets the boundaries. However, these boundaries are not constant, “the habitus produces practices that reproduce the regularities of experience while slightly adjusting to the demands of the situation” (Gates, 2002, p. 4). The following example shows how Turkish women first feel constrained, but later can adjust them.

It was very important for them not be seen with jogging clothes in the city or neighborhood, anywhere; therefore we arranged a car to pick up them with normal clothes, then we went to the forest, where no one was around, then they changed their clothes, we went jogging, and they changed their clothes again. They were all friends, knew each other very well, but they were afraid of being seen by others. (Turkish sport instructor organizing a jogging activity specifically for Turkish women, March 2002)

With the adjustments they make, they cope with the situation and adapt themselves in their own way. Turkish women's habitus can be seen at the root of the ways in which they conceptualize themselves in various urban public spaces in relation to others; how they perform and represent their social relations and as well as how they transform and adapt them.

In sum, *Gemeinschaft*-like ties construct two kinds of spatial associations in relation to urban public spaces. First, enabling 'we' identifications, 'our' public spaces become differentiated from 'their' public spaces, arousing positive territoriality (for those who are in control) concerns such as home feeling, positive imagination and place attachment, as well as negative ones (for those who feel they are controlled) such as avoidance, retreat, and lack of social acceptance. Second, the more Turkish women are involved in *Gemeinschaft*-like relations, the more they seek private and semi-private/semi-public characteristics. Familiarity in that sense becomes the most desired quality of the urban public space.

Territory and Territoriality

Territory can be simply defined as the individual's or a group's continuous exertion of control over a particular part of physical space. The very basic definition of territory therefore is related to the ownership, occupancy of controlling or possessing a part of space. According to Altman (1975, in Madanipour, 2003), an environmental psychologist, three forms of territory can be identified on the basis of the duration of occupancy, the cognitive impacts on the occupant and the others in generating a sense of ownership, the amount of personalization, and the probability of defending it when violated. As the first one, primary territory is, either rented or owned, such as home, the private, personalized space; an individual who have the possession rights have the absolute power and control. The second territory has a moderate level of control, as the occupant is not the owner/possessor, but a qualified user. Individuals may personalize the place to some extent during their period of occupancy, and this, in turn, gives them some power over the space, for example, a frequented neighborhood park, or a restaurant. This secondary territory also can be called parochial (Lofland, 1973, 1983). The third level, for Altman, is the public territory, where the degree of control is very low or absent, and can be personalized only in a temporary way. These forms territories with varying degrees of territorial senses that give clues to individuals to guide their behavior and activities.

Sack (1987) describes territoriality as something more than senses that guide activities. His conception is related more to the social action, "the attempt by an individual or group to influence, affect, or control objects, people and relationships by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area" (p. 19). Having located territoriality in a social process, it is a strategy for establishing differential access to things and people (Sack, 1983). For Sack, the reasons and definitions of territoriality can be diverse; from defense of an area to the circumscription intent of things in space, from degrees of territoriality to hierarchical forms of territoriality. In addition, there are various ways in which territoriality can be asserted; from legal rights to cultural

norms and prohibitions about the usage of areas. Though these reasons form territoriality, their different combinations are used in territorial behavior.

Some spatial activity patterns can be related to the territoriality of senses, in Altman's approach, and at the same time, some others, such as avoidance, are related to the territorial strategies of classification, in Sack's approach. Territoriality classifies things into categories, such as 'ours' and 'theirs'. Different social categories come across and there emerges a competition for appropriation.

They sit on the benches and gossip about everybody, "look who's coming, isn't she the daughter of ... what is she doing ..., etc." I never walk between them; it's their gossip place. (b.1978, b. in NL)

Before we used to go to the park to have picnic on sunny days. It's only five minutes away, after work, with children, sometimes with neighbors. When we moved here, this neighborhood was a nice neighborhood, a few foreigners, mostly Dutch. Now, you see it has turned into a neighborhood of Suryoyo's. Now they use the park for picnics. Suryoyo men wander around, women with babies walk ... we don't go. It's their park. (b.1950, 28 years in NL)

Furthermore, territoriality, in Sack's terms is related more closely to the general conception and orientation to society. This is called the displacement of attention or 'law of the land' tendency. This tendency makes the territory appear as the controlling agent and thus conceals the real dominance structures (Peleman, 2003). Mostly, it is expressed as 'you may not do this *here*' (Sack, 1983).

I cannot imagine myself sitting in a café in the centre of Enschede, ha ha. In Turkey I go, no problem, but here people may think '*wat krijgen we nu!*' (what we get now!) And, you know, probably it's because of my headscarf. (b. 1967, 14 years in NL)

Communication makes this kind of territoriality explicit, as it involves statements about possession and exclusion.

I don't like to go out to the centre or around the neighborhood. Because of my headscarf and dark-colored dresses, I think that I attract too much attention. People think that I don't understand their body language while they are moving their hands and arms as if the weather is too hot –not necessarily in the summer- or they murmur loud or sometimes they talk openly. They think I don't understand Dutch. (b. 1977, 10 years in NL)

Territoriality can also be defined as attachment to place and space largely in terms of fear, protection, exclusiveness and preservation. In that sense, Soja's (1971) definition of territoriality emphasizes demarcation and distinctiveness.

Territoriality is a behavioral phenomenon associated with the organization of space into spheres of influence or clearly demarcated territories that are made distinctive and considered at least partially exclusive by their occupants or definers. Its most obvious geographical manifestation is an identifiable patterning of spatial relationships resulting in the *confinement* of certain activities in particular areas and the *exclusion* of certain

categories of individuals from the space of the territorial individual or group. (emphasis as original, 1971, p.19)

Territoriality is an indicative of a sense of place. Territorial conflicts of appropriation can lead to avoidance and withdrawal, especially for those who are controlled – the weak and disadvantaged. Yet people can employ tactics to appropriate public space. As discussed in Chapter Three, everyday practices are shaped to a certain extent as processes of appropriation and territorialization; power relations divided between the dominators and dominated, strategies and tactics, and place and time. In relation to the scale of the urban public spaces, though a detailed account will be elaborated in the following chapter, most Turkish women's appropriations rely on seized opportunities and on cleverly chosen moments, like visiting the shopping mall in the neighborhood when 'it is quiet', in the early mornings on the weekdays, or walking in the neighborhood or in the park just after dinner, before it gets dark and before the Dutch neighbors let out their dogs. In that sense, their territorial strategies for the appropriation of urban public spaces is based on 'tactics' (De Certeau, 1984) regardless of the scale and kind of space in question.

Familiarity

People can engage in a variety of activities in a variety of public spaces, placed in daily-life. Some public spaces may then be avoided, whereas some others are promoted on top of others. The presence in urban public spaces necessitates encounters in which individuals engage in situations of co-presence, the social interaction. In his analysis of social interaction, Tilly (1997, 1998) schematizes the social ties in relation to scripting and shared local knowledge and he argues that through these dimensions, social interaction differs. Defined as the explicit models, scripts are important during the interaction because it has to be available jointly to the participants. Shared local knowledge, on the other hand, is related to the familiarity, experience, and acquaintance. It is contextual, because it develops during interactions among people with objects and situations in a social setting that are specific to a local context. It is powerful because it develops out of experience, real, everyday experience, with the situation in question.

For Tilly (1998), various social interaction patterns require different amounts of scripting and shared local knowledge; where the parties have neither scripts nor substantial local knowledge to guide them, they ordinarily avoid social interaction, where a little farther to scripts and local knowledge, shallow improvisations occur (that allow people to eye one another on the street, occupy adjacent seats on subways, or exchange money for a newspaper); where scripts are extensive and local knowledge inadequate, we can speak of thin ritual (ceremonies, special occasions, remembrance services); where extensive scripting come together with abundant shared local knowledge, intense ritual happens (intense ritual gives participants plenty of opportunity for nudges, touches, instructions, an whispered comments within its sacred forms); where there are almost any scripts but plentiful local knowl-

edge, deep improvisation happens – the local knowledge it deploys often includes recollections of shared scripts –, finally where some scripting combine with some local knowledge routine social interaction takes place (ibid.). Possibly, for those who are not familiar with the scripts and local shared knowledge –or those whose possession is not enough- fail to incorporate in social interaction, leading to avoidance. Thus, familiarity needs both the understanding of scripts and local knowledge. As we are familiar with the rules and models of engagement in a social relationship, we sustain them easier. Also if we are familiar to certain context, we may adjust it smoothly. Familiarity becomes a crucial element for social interaction.

On the other hand, familiarity in the urban public space often calls for a private characteristic, such as high levels of acquaintance and intimacy. However, Milgram (1977), a social psychologist, develops the concept of the Familiar Stranger as a social phenomenon for interaction in the public space. Familiar Strangers are individuals that we regularly observe but with whom we do not interact. They form a border zone between people we know and the completely unknown strangers we encounter once and never see again. Since we encounter them regularly in familiar settings, they establish our connection to individual places. The Familiar Stranger is akin to what Blokland (2003) calls public familiarity, arising when independent anonymous people keep encountering each other. The public familiarity is closely linked to social identification; the visibility of other people's actions supplies knowledge for social distinctions of 'we' and 'they'. Also, public familiarity offers the opportunity of promoting secondary relations to primary ones, as well as formal to less formal. The more amount of time spent in public, the more public familiarity arises.

The degrees of personal-interpersonal-impersonal relations do not necessarily follow the private-public continuum. The very private realm of home, as the space of personal relations, can be sometimes converted to the space of interpersonal relations through visits, meetings, and gatherings. In the same way, a frequented sport hall or a bench in a park can become a setting for two close friends exchanging their personal thoughts without making the space less public. In this sense, between the privateness, i.e. intimacy and the publicness, i.e. anonymity, there stands semi-private/semi-public, i.e. familiarity. Intimacy characterizes social relations where people exchange a large amount of personal information, whereas anonymity denotes social relations where people act without supplying personal information beyond what is superficial or strictly necessary to facilitate the operation. Between these, familiarity exists between the extremes of spaces of anonymity and intimacy and characterizes social relations in which those involved know enough about each other to establish their respective social positions.

All Turkish women value familiarity highly. This, on the one hand, implies that they look for social contacts in public, and on the other hand, suggests that unfamiliarity may lead to total avoidance. The forms of familiarity can be physical and social. For immigrants, it is social not only related to the interaction that takes place, but also related to habits, reminding the habitual social environment in the country of origin.

What are you going to do when you are out? Look at the canal here (showing the small canal in front of the house). If this was in Turkey, then there would be vendors or small shops, a lot of people walking along it, may be a tea-garden. Look it's empty there. There is nothing here, why do you go out and just walk along? (b. 1961, 23 years in NL)

There is no place here that you can go with your family, like a tea garden in Turkey. Oh, that's the thing I most like about Turkey. Everywhere tea gardens, families, friends gather there. It's so nice. (b. 1978, b. in NL)

The quest for familiarity, as the citations above presents, can be related to the previous experience, the equivalence of social scripts and schemes, and possessions. In that sense, familiarity imbues in habitus, reflecting certain qualities and practices for spatial preferences.

Urban Ties and Urban Public Space

As modern urban life is conceptualized as *Gesellschaft*, urban social relations are, at the simplest level, conceived to be among strangers (Simmel, 1902) and social interaction implies anonymity, aloofness, impersonality, and superficiality. However, it should be noted that as Grönlund (1993) argues, twentieth century sociology has focused almost entirely on the interaction between and inside groups and classes as collective phenomena and not very much on the interaction of individual strangers. Recently, some urban researchers (Müller, 2002; Lofland, 1998) have raised interest in the social responsiveness that can take place also among strangers in public space. The randomness and coincidence in the anonymous public space can also lead to 'warm' relations among strangers in the urban public space. In the midst anonymous and fleeting relations, personal and intimate dimensions also can be found among strangers in public (Müller, 2002).

Contrary to *Gemeinschaft*, where the boundaries between publicness and privateness are blurred, *Gesellschaft* refers to a sharp contrast between the self and others, also between the family and other social institutions and the greater degree of role differentiation. In that sense, publicness and privateness are formed as separate domains in a way that public and private spaces can be conceived as highly differentiated. Urban public spaces are then meeting places with strangers and places of acknowledgement of diversity and difference.

Among the Turkish women interviewed, the young Alevis most enjoy the complexity of public spaces and have a positive attitude about being in the public. This is to a certain extent related to their relatively better socio-economic position, differentiated role repertoires, and loosened community ties. It should be noted that the migration history of the Alevis is different from that of the Sunnis. Although there are no statistical data available, from their oral history, the migration of Alevi guest workers was as individuals from different parts of Turkey, whereas the Sunnis were recruited in groups. Therefore, from the very beginning the Sunnis have been able to

keep their personal networks from the place of origin; however, the Alevis have almost cut their all personal ties and established new ones. The Sunnis are keen on keeping their kinship relations in Enschede. Encapsulation sustains traditions, and old prejudices and practices prevail. Being far from the primary ties, the young Alevis' way of looking at cultural differences is noticeably differentiated:

Before, they used to say, 'do not have a relationship with Sunnis' with the fear that they might harm you. I guess before, these distinctions were sharp in the village. Marrying with Sunni was taboo. For example, if one has a Sunni boyfriend, the old consider she is one of the 'lost ones'. Maybe there are still some people who think the same way. I have had many Turkish friends here, Alevi and Sunni, it doesn't matter. (b. 1967, 16 years in NL – previously lived 10 years in Germany)

The more women's social roles differentiate and disperse throughout various domains of social life, the more the spatial conceptualization of urban public spaces widens. Increasingly more Turkish girls, also among Sunnis, are pursuing higher education and preparing to be active in the skilled-labor market. Especially among the third generation Turkish women, the separation of spheres of social domains, such as work and home, Dutch and Turkish, are increasingly pronounced. Since they are aware of the disadvantaged position of their parents in the social space, they are challenging and negotiating the boundaries not only within their families and the Turkish community, but also within Dutch society.

My father is a Hadji, he's a devout Muslim. Although he is not harsh, he has limited our activities from time to time. For example, he has never said anything about our trips to the centre (she and her elder sister), but going to a cinema is strictly forbidden. I think he also has never been to a cinema. He thinks it's dark, and many things are happening there in the dark ... (giggling), but what can you expect? They are from the village. These stories have been told to them. Anyway, I have gone secretly to the movies several times. Then I think a year ago, I told him that I'd been there. He didn't say anything. Above all, he trusts us not to do anything to damage his or our reputation here. Now, I think maybe slowly we (meaning all Turkish women) can try to find our way here; we have to decide what's right and what's wrong. (b.1980, b. in NL)

Previous urban experience has influenced the way the public space is recognized and appropriated. The following statement is from a marriage-immigrant, who grew up in Istanbul.

I like to be in the streets in the centre, whatever the time. I like watching people walking slow, fast, looking around, etc. We usually go to the centre every weekend, sometimes a couple of times during the week. Sometimes I go with a friend, but in the evenings, usually with my husband. We sometimes stop by a *kroeg* (pub) to look if people we know are there or just see with who we are going to meet. (b. 1976, 4 years in NL)

In terms of social relations, the experience of public space becomes different. Turkish women, who have more *Gemeinschaft*-like ties, tend to discover the city together. Their experience of public spaces is strongly socially oriented and only secondarily

focused on exploration. On the other hand, those who have more *Gesellschaft*-like relations see urban public spaces a setting where they can build new social contacts, and seek new identities. As income and education levels increase, they easily can act as articulate consumers. The use of public space becomes instrumental. Regular contact with strangers in public enables them to develop familiarities and to increase a sense of belonging.

If we (foreigners) are more out in the centre, the places that seem 'Dutch' will no longer be like that, we get used to them and they will get used to us. I usually go out with my colleagues and friends. Well, sometimes the feeling is different, but since we are going out with my colleagues, things that were strange and dull to me before are now normal and I enjoy it a lot. (b. 1979, b. in NL)

Sometimes when we sit in a patisserie in the *Çarşı*¹, and some Dutch women start talking to us, about weather, or people ... at first I had no idea why they wanted to talk, we had nothing in common. They knew that we were foreigners. Talking to strangers is nice, it's like they accept us ... of course, the same can happen in Turkey, but then we are all Turkish, he? (b. 1987, b. in NL)

In sum, the characteristics of Turkish women's social networks with regard to the tendencies towards *Gemeinschaft*-like or *Gesellschaft*-like social relations have important influence in the appropriation patterns and experiences of urban public space. While strong primary relations with family and community help immigrants to keep the traditions, customs, and the social codes that they have brought from the places of origin, *Gesellschaft*-like ties help to challenge traditional structures, such as patriarchy. But these social relations should not be seen as distinct. For example, on the one hand, the moral of 'care' can be seen as constraining Turkish women's use of public spaces, because of giving priorities to children and family members. On the other hand, in the urban public space, there are infinite possibilities for social interaction, either fleeting or involved.

Reflections on the Culture of Housing

Gemeinschaft-like and *Gesellschaft*-like associations are also reflected in Turkish women's culture of housing, in particular in their housing preferences and choices of neighborhoods. As discussed in Chapter Six, Turks' preferences and choices for housing are closely related to their orientations, aspirations, personal and community characteristics (SmartAgent, 2001). Described as group-oriented, introvert and bound to religious/ethnic norms, Turks in the Netherlands have give strong importance to the neighborhood in which a house is located, such as whether there are households from same culture, whether it is oriented strongly towards central and peripheral neighborhoods (not solely suburban), and they favor the presence of Turkish elements in the neighborhood. According to SmartAgent, Turks in Overijssel, on the other hand, complement the general picture, except for their preference to

live in peripheral and suburban neighborhoods. Another important characteristic of Turks is the strong orientation to single-family dwellings.

Single-family housing in suburban neighborhoods (especially the pronounced U.S. suburbs, Hayden, 1996) has been argued by feminist scholars as isolating women and excluding them from the public sphere. Suburban neighborhoods, preferred as ideal settings for children, increase women's isolation from the general experiences of urban life. The house is associated with the women's realm of domesticity, maternity, and dependence, as distinct from the male public sphere outside. Being inside the house, women are restricted to a narrow range of roles and spaces. The clear separation of the family from the outside world and the distinction between the public and the private are considered as the source of women's oppression, which is structured and institutionalized in unequal roles and opportunities for men and women (Madanipour, 2003). Similarly, Grönlund (1993) sees the development of single-family housing as promoting *Gemeinschaft*.

Although the main housing preference of Turks is closely related to the availability of social housing in a neighborhood, social framework is more influential in the housing decision. The next chapter deals with the significance of social relations in the home cluster and neighborhood in detail, yet the following citations are illustrative.

I have lived in this house for 28 years, and last year the company decided to sell it and luckily we were able to buy it. In time, my sisters have also moved here, with one of them, there are just four houses between us. When my son got married, he found a house on a back street. Now he also has opened a business in the shopping centre. My life is here. I have never thought of leaving this house or moving to another neighborhood. All of my family is here. What would I do somewhere else? Maybe the house could be better, or much comfortable, but no, no, we are here together. (b. 1955, 34 years in NL)

We bought this house last year, but I cannot get used to living in this neighborhood. I grew up in Deppenbroek and all my family, friends, everybody is there. When I go there, I feel at home. Not necessarily seeing my family or friends, every face in the street tells me that I know that person, well, in fact not, but it feels like that ... '*thuis voelen*' (feeling at home/at ease), do you understand? I wish we could find a house there in Deppenbroek (b. 1974, b. in NL).

Gemeinschaft-like associations help immigrants maintain the traditions, customs, and social codes that they brought from their places of origin. It helps them to maintain their traditional structures, such as patriarchy. Suburban or peripheral neighborhoods, in that sense, can be seen as natural grounds for orienting *Gemeinschaft*-like associations. Castells (1993) argues that the spatial choice for housing, the preference for suburban or city neighborhoods, of the professional middle class, is connected closely to the structure of the household. In relation to the economic roles played by women in the household, there is more likely an orientation towards the central location, however, the more patriarchal the family, the more likely the withdrawal to the suburb to raise children.

In addition, it should be emphasized that the location of the available social housing stock in certain neighborhoods can foster the development of several Turkish *Gemeinschafts* or *Gemeinschaft*-like associations, as they are concentrated in particular in neighborhoods (first generation-low economic profile Turks in the northern neighborhoods, and second generation-social climbers in the southern neighborhoods) and share more or less similar habituses. In that sense, the habitat and habitus are interwoven in a context within which they can work to strengthen traditions, customs, and social codes brought from the homeland.

CONSTRUCTING THE URBAN PUBLIC SPACE; BELONGING AND DIS-BELONGING

Introduction

Turkish women's everyday practices in various scales of urban space highlight different constructions of urban public space, reflecting different formation of everyday belonging. According to Fenster (2004), everyday belonging can mean, as it is in dictionary meaning, to be rightly placed or classified to or fit in a specific environment, or something associated with past and present experiences and memories and future ties connected to a place. Everyday belonging brings us close to Bourdieu's habitus. Reflecting personal accumulated space-time experiences and inheritances, habitus enables us to use the knowledge coming from past experiences to direct spatial behavior. And it is not only rules, social norms and values, but also improvisations that people develop throughout their lives as a 'sense', a sense of how to act. "The habitus of every individual inscribes the inherited parameters of modification, of adjustment from situation to position which provides the legacy of a new situation" (Robbins, 2000; cited in Leach 2005). Thus, it can be argued that forms of belongingness and dis-belongingness, such as avoidance and participation, withdrawal and placement, are articulated in the relational construction of everyday urban public spaces, in which boundaries of use and appropriation are continuously constructed, negotiated, re-constructed, and expressed.

Based on a plain categorisation of urban public spaces in the spatial scales of home, neighborhood, and the city centre, a variety of the levels of associations that Turkish women make with the city and Dutch society are depicted in this chapter. Through the use and appropriation of these public spaces, they form different social constructs of urban public space, based on the variety of perceptions, habits of use and social identifications. In this framework, this chapter represents the reciprocal relationship between habitus and habitat.

Each urban public space in these spatial scales marks different facilities and activities, as well as distinct social and spatial qualities (Figure 8.1). Therefore, the control, conduct, and experience of these urban public spaces are diverse. The categorization of urban public spaces in three spatial scales¹ suggests a variety of degrees of publicness and privateness, of modes of social encounter and of association with space. It should be noted that the categorization does not exclude the complexity of social reality happening in the everyday urban public spaces; it is employed only for the empirical analysis. The experiences and appropriation of public spaces become

diverse and differentiated, as people are not necessarily bound to their homes for establishing their personal relationships and also the city does not necessarily mean spaces of impersonal relationships. On the one hand, very personal niches can be found in the city, as will be shown in the following part; on the other hand, quite impersonal and public social relations can be established at home, such as in the cases of tele-shopping and participation in Internet forums.

FIGURE 8.1 Categorization of urban public spaces in three spatial scales

<i>spatial scales</i>	<i>social and spatial qualities</i>
– home	spaces of privacy, intimate, exclusive, closed and personal relations
– neighborhood	spaces of semi-private / semi-public, interpersonal relations
– city centre	spaces of public, impersonal relations

This chapter has two parts. The first part, the home and the neighborhood discusses the uses and experiences of urban public spaces as personal and interpersonal relations. The second part examines the ‘situational’ and impersonal constructs of public spaces in the city centre. In the first part, urban public spaces are places of one-on-one interaction, whereas the second part is more about images, perceptions, and attitudes. Another difference between these two parts is related to the planning and design concerns of urban public spaces. Recently, central public spaces have become increasingly specialized in recreation and amusement, as cities have been increasingly competing to attract more visitors and entrepreneurs. The users have been increasingly considered as (the sole) consumers, i.e. individuals oriented towards the fulfillment of their needs. On the other hand, the neighborhood public spaces have come to be considered as the communal spaces where the neighborhood inhabitants form a community, since the neighborhood and community are seen as almost identical (Madanipour, 2001, 2003; Blokland, 2003). Therefore, it can be argued that the assumptions of the planners and designers about these two general types of public spaces are quite different: in the home cluster and neighborhood, their concerns are mainly about the community, whereas in the centre, it is the individual/consumer.

The Home

Home can be seen as the main component in the fulfillment of a deficiency in Maslow’s hierarchy of human needs (Maslow, 1970). Besides being a physical unit providing shelter, home stands for safety, enabling individuals to establish stability and control in their lives. It is a symbol of love and belongingness, being the centre of the family or intimate relations, as well as an indicator of social status. That is, house ownership is often regarded as a matter of positive self-esteem gained by accomplishment and by recognition from others. Besides these basic characteristics,

home also provides an accommodation for cognitive and aesthetic needs and for self-actualization; it is an expression of self.

Home is often considered as a territory to be defended, a personal space. It is at the same time a social place where inhabitants can engage in social life. Home, as the social unit of the family, is a place of intimate and close relationships. Home, on the one hand, is a private, intimate space that is separated, and protects its inhabitants from the public impersonal outside (Madanipour, 2003). On the other hand, it is the centre of intimacy, “permitting us to lose our inhibitions and expose ourselves to one another” (Nagel, 1998, p. 5). Since it is the place where identities are shaped and privateness is created, home also acts like a boundary mediating between the public ‘outside’ and the private ‘inside’.

Home divides the stranger and the familiar, unwanted and wanted, impersonal and personal. However, it would be misleading to consider the home as an entity entirely isolated from the outside. On the contrary, inside the home, it is possible to trace a continuum of relationships from the most private to the most public (Madanipour, 2003). Starting from the front of the house, which is the most public point, to the bedroom, likely the most private point, there is a continuum of varying degrees of publicness and privateness. In addition, although home epitomizes the private and the intimate, the variety of family relations and composition, and the culturally specific habitation of interior space makes privacy and intimacy quite complex and contested notions. For Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands, privacy concerns, such as the separation of guests in the house, separate living room and sleeping place, an enclosed kitchen, separate bath and toilet, are among the preferred qualities (SmartAgent, 2001). Rapoport (1977) argues that public and private domains are related closely to social and cultural systems of interaction and withdrawal. Since these systems are culturally specific, the habitation patterns are therefore specific to cultures. For him, this is evident from the sole architecture of the houses to the general layout of the cities. In cultures, where the privacy is the most crucial element, as in Japanese and Muslim cultures, houses are designed for extreme privacy from the outside; even noise and smells must not penetrate.

Hence, the home, as the most private scale, reflects the identity of the inhabitants through a variety of habitation manners and styles. Through open or closed curtains, satellite dishes, various ethnic ornaments and decorations, the identity of the inhabitants are exposed (Van der Horst and Messing, 2003). At the street level, one can perceive whose house it is. Dutch residents keep their curtains open, not only during the daytime, but also at night to show their living rooms to passers-by. Moroccans keep their windows all closed, and Turks prefer them half-opened, half-closed. Home as the centre of the private domain thus opens itself to the public. Apart from these passive exhibitions, there also can be intense identity displays in the home environment, in the extension of the home, for instance the street and the housing cluster. These displays take place mainly in the semi-public/semi-private spaces. The contradictions among users’ conceptualizations of publicness and privateness become visible in these spaces.

The expanding Turkish community started to manifest itself more openly and self-consciously in public. On sunny days the women and children would group together on street corners and green areas. The men repaired their cars on the street. Neither of these activities was in line with the privatized living culture of the established residents. ... The combined 'openness' and 'privateness' of 'modern' Dutch participation culture ... came into conflict with the closed and collective character of 'traditional' ethnic minority cultures. (Mommaas, 1996, p. 206)

The home thus becomes the place of construction, identification, and expression of 'we'. The differences of the culture of housing and lifestyles become more visible when immigrants appropriate space for themselves.

Private to Semi-Private/Semi-Public: From Home to Home Extensions

Many scholars (Abu-Lughod, 1968; Mortada, 2003) argue that the importance of the privacy of the Muslim home reflects itself not only in the architectural characteristics of the house, but also the social characteristics attributed to the house itself. Home is the sole socializing place for women, and men are categorically excluded. Rapoport (1977) also makes another important distinction in terms of the conception of privacy, that is, "the privacy is for the group, not the individual" (p. 200). Since the traditional Muslim cities were also ethnically segregated and the neighborhoods were ethnically homogenous, the privacy of the house, i.e. the realm of the women, could easily extend to the street; the public street became private. The home cluster, as a group space, i.e. the semi-private/semi-public spaces around the house, therefore, gains importance for women to socialize and sustain the daily relations.

In her study of *gecekondu*² neighborhoods in Turkey, Erman (1998) shows the importance of semi-public/ semi-private spaces in migrant women's daily lives. The semi-public/semi-private spaces are outdoor spaces just in front of the houses; in other words, they are the extensions of the houses. Migrant women appropriate these places for gathering as groups, doing housework – washing clothes and making preparations for cooking –, demonstrating domestic abilities in order to gain recognition and respect from neighbors. Because they gather informally, they keep the pathway in front of the house clean. While the house enters the street, the 'outside' is transformed into the 'inside'. "Since in traditional societies, women are associated with the house, and the semi-public/semi-private spaces in the neighborhood are extensions of the house, these spaces are socially defined as belonging to women" (ibid., p. 44). The appropriation of the semi-public/semi-private spaces in Turkish squatter neighborhoods form a potential for women to develop informal relations and increase contact with neighbors and prevent them from feeling lonely and isolated in their new environment. These spaces of daily meetings, occasional talks, and chats, on the one hand, enable migrant women to acquire a kind of support and emotional relief system and, on the other hand, act as a means of control over neighbors, especially young women (ibid.).

The housing of Turkish women in Enschede is not comparable to the rural migrants in Turkey, yet the social environment and significance of the home and home cluster have similar characteristics. Home and home clusters are the principal socialization places for all Turkish women, regardless of the life-cycle. All primary social contacts are placed at home through frequent visits of family members, and the informal and formal visits of friends. These formal regular afternoon meetings, on the one hand, strengthen the social networks, and on the other hand, extend their networks with the new participants.

The conception of the semi-private/semi-public space in front of the house is related to the neighbors and their image. For those who live in working-class neighborhoods, which were built in the post WWII period, such as Velve-Lindenhof, the space in front of the house is considered an un-appropriate place to socialize, because only the uncivilized Dutch, the Dutch 'gypsies' (referring to the lower class Dutch men 'gypsies') sit and drink alcohol there. The use of front space for these purposes is totally against 'decent' Dutch culture.

You never see a normal decent Dutch person sitting in front of their houses and drinking alcohol, also no Turkish men do that ... They are only those who are vulgar, uneducated, and unemployed, sitting in front of the house and drinking beers.
(b. 1960, 20 years in NL)

On the other hand, in suburban neighborhoods, where the socio-economic position of the inhabitants is a little higher, Turkish women are willing to use the front space, the semi-private/semi-public space for gathering, working their handcrafts, drinking tea, and talking, while the children play in the street. The space between the home and the street also becomes a social space not only for the participants, but also the street passers-by through greetings and short conversations among neighbors.

Sometimes we do place the chairs just in front of the house, me and my neighbors. We sit and talk. When the weather is good, it's nicer to be out than inside. Then you see people around.

– *Do you also use this place with your family, for dinners or family visits?*

– No, no, it's just us women. Only neighbors, not friends (b.1969, 15 years in NL).

Hence, the front of the house is gendered; it is reserved only for women. Men usually spend time outside the home or neighborhood, in a specific place for men, like a coffeehouse, or they stay inside the house. The presence of men in front of the house is considered inappropriate, breaking the codes of deference and modesty.

The design of the neighborhood, i.e. the physical layout of the home front, is important. If the house is located on a small and narrow street with little traffic, such as *brinks* or cul-de-sac streets, the intention to use the front space for daily activities and meetings increases. The public street may take on a semi-public/semi-private characteristic, yet it sustains the quality of being public, as a place of fleeting relationships. The anticipation of front space use diminishes gradually for those living in row houses along the major roads, and in apartments. Here, it should be noted that the allocation of front space, such as a reserved front-garden space in architec-

tural design, has indirect influence for appropriation for social contacts. As a semi-private/semi-public space in designs, it acts as a transition zone between the public street and the private home. This front space often functions as the mask of the home, giving it a façade of properness, such as well-taken care of vegetation and a clean entrance, giving clues about the decency of the inhabitants.

On the other hand, for those living in single family houses, instead of the front, the back garden or the back of the house and apartments balconies become semi-private/semi-public space. They consider the back of the house as semi-private because of the well-established boundaries. Visual privacy is often achieved through high fences. It is semi-public. Because noises can be heard, they must be careful with the words spoken – whether Turkish or Dutch – and because they can be seen from other houses, proper clothing should be worn since visual privacy is not fully achieved. The same features are attributed to balconies as well, yet the meanings attached to these semi-private/semi-public parts of the home can be different as one move from one cultural context to another. The following example illustrates whether a balcony can be considered a private or public space.

When I go to our village in Turkey, my father-in-law never lets me be on the balcony. Once I wanted to drink tea alone on the balcony, and he was quite angry with me. There their customs are different, then my husband told me that because the balcony faced the mosque, his father was concerned about other men seeing me on the balcony. (b. 1976, b. in NL)

Thus, because the contexts are incompatible, a private activity in a semi-private/semi-public space can be considered as happening in public and is thus, in that instance, an improper activity.

Home Territories

Though home is the principal place where the primary social relations take place, close, intimate, and primary relations can also be found in the urban public space. Because of the nature of interaction, Lofland (1973) argues about the presence of home territories in public spaces. Home territories also can be considered as privatized pockets of urban public space, in relation to the degrees of privatization. The home territory is a “relatively small piece of public space which is taken over – either by individuals acting independently or by an already formed group acting in concert – and turned into ‘a home away from home’” (p. 119). Home territories, according to Lofland, are created to challenge the anonymity of the public space through knowing some of the people with whom the space is shared. A certain degree of familiarity – with people and places – is needed to cope with the anonymity and strangeness of the public space.

Urban public spaces around the home provide Turkish women expanding their home environments with the creation of home territories. Parks in the vicinity can offer opportunities to create home territories, especially for first generation Turkish women who visit the parks with their peers.

Sometimes we are bored with staying inside the house. You know, if you visit each other everyday, then it gets boring with time, depending on the weather, in summer and spring ... well, it's not too much, the amount of warm days. We talk on the phone 'shall we go today to the park?' if everyone agrees, we go to the park together. We sit and talk, like we are in each other's homes. It's nicer. We usually bring tea and small pastries with us. You know in our culture, you should prepare things for visitors. The one who supposed to host us at home brings the tea and stuff, or sometimes we share, so it's like home there. (b. 1951, 26 years in NL)

It should be noted that not all the parks and green areas provide possibilities for the creation of home territories for Turkish women. Suitable places are learned and tested on every visit; therefore suitability is granted with extensive local knowledge and rising familiarity. They ensure appropriate times and patterns of uses of others.

We usually go to the park during the long summer evenings, when there's still light. At that time, there are also other families walking and entertaining their children. Also, at that time, people who let their dogs out in the park are few. During the day, it's nice, but the old Dutch people usually come in the morning and afternoon, later teenagers come in groups. For us, late afternoon, say around six, is quite good to go there. (b. 1951, 26 years in NL)

The life cycle of the woman is important in appropriating these spaces. The parks and playgrounds are frequented especially by the first generation, as well as by younger second generation and marriage immigrants. All of these age groups use these places, yet the frequency of use, the size of the groups, and the duration of stays are different. Older women tend to sit on the same benches, especially in the day time, when the park is quiet. For the younger women with children, the frequency and duration are closely related to the children's wishes and needs. The middle-aged women with grown-up children do not favor these places, but take only short walks with their family members.

The creation of home territories through appropriation of parks by older women also acts as a control mechanism that is sometimes quite intense for the young and unmarried.

The old women in the neighborhood visit almost everyday in the park here. When I walk through the park, they start talking to me. They can easily guess that I'm Turkish (showing her scarf and her face). They ask me what I am doing, where I am going, as if they are my family, my grandma... (b. 1979, b. in NL)

I hate to walk home through the park, when I go back from work. All the Turkish women sit in the park and gossip. They are almost everyday there, as if the place is their own. They always sit on the same benches and gossip about everything. Sometimes I change my way. I don't want them talking about me, or anybody in my family. (b. 1978, b. in NL)

In addition to the parks, some distant places can be a home territory, yet with a difference; the full control of the place is in their hands, since they rent the place for

private uses. The *volkstuin* or *moestuin* (rented small-scale agricultural places on the outskirts of the city for growing vegetables and plants) is a place exhibiting home-like characteristics in terms of relations and meanings attached. For Turkish women, these places, on the one hand, provide the necessities of the family: seasonal vegetables and other plants that they like, where they can keep a rural atmosphere in the city. On the other hand, it enables them to have a social meeting place, another semi-public/semi-private space, where they can meet with their family members and friends. The *volkstuin* need not to be in the neighborhood, although it is highly preferred to be by Turkish women, especially for those whose spatial mobility is quite low. Especially in the summer, they spend the day in their own *volkstuin*, working with the plants, hosting their visitors, and visiting their friend's *volkstuinten*.

When I first came here, my neighbors (Turkish, my addition) were telling me nice stories about their *moestuin* and how they had enjoyment with the other gardeners ... having lunches altogether, tea afternoons. They went there together and they spent the whole day together. This year I also rented one. (b. 1967, 19 years in NL)

The most important feature of the use of urban public spaces around the home and those exhibiting home characteristics in terms of social relations is that these spaces are strictly gendered. Not only the religious women, but also profane women mention an 'understanding' in conducting activities with other women. In this sense, home is strictly a 'feminine' space.

The creation of home territories is strategic for Turkish women, especially for first generation and marriage-immigrants. On the one hand, the appropriation of public spaces like these, i.e. the creation of home territories, helps them to preserve their habits and customs in Dutch society. In this sense, these territories also can be seen as "a blessing for those who tend to carry-out their traditional gender roles and rural ways of life in their new environment. They ... provide a niche for rural migrants to carry out their rural habits and activities" (Erman, 1998, p. 45). It can be further argued that the 'rurality' and 'Turkishness', i.e. traditions, customs, and habits that they brought from the place of origin, as a particular way of appropriation of space, are preserved. In addition, these places help Turkish women to reproduce traditional gender roles, as well as gendered practices. On the other hand, with home territories, it is possible for Turkish women to stage themselves in the public space, revealing their own social norms of conduct. In this sense, Turkish women's home territories also can be seen as domains of exposure in which they claim the public space.

The Neighborhood

The neighborhood is an important spatial unit for immigrants because beyond the home, it is the neighborhood where they can create particular places of their own. For immigrants, coming from diverse backgrounds, the neighborhood provides a setting in which they can settle, exploit, and form their new lives in the host country. Starting from the individual housing unit extending to the city, the neighborhood

stands in the medium of multiple dimensions associated with the private and public realms. In this sense, as a spatial unit, it mediates between home and the city, i.e., between 'we' and 'they'. In the neighborhood, they mark their place in the city.

In the urban studies literature, neighborhoods where the majority of inhabitants are immigrants or foreigners are often called mixed communities, in the mildest sense, ethnically-segregated, and in the extreme cases with extreme segregation, ghettos. In particular, American scholars (Galster and Killen, 1995) point out the negative impacts of such neighborhoods on people's life chances; the more the residential proximity of same-origin immigrants, the lower the employment rate, and the greater chances of growth of poverty. Bonacker (1982) states that one central feature of immigrants and a working-class community is the common use of outside areas as a physical extension of their home. Meeting and talking in the streets and special places become an important aspect of social life, because of their strong identification with their local district. Based on her research on Turkish immigrants in Hamburg, she argues about the importance of the ethnic composition of the neighborhood for immigrants' social affiliations, aspirations, and behavioral patterns. As their social interaction is limited to a great extent to the immediate neighborhood, they are trapped in their own community and the chances for social integration are low. Thus, immigrant neighborhoods are seen as ethnic niches where a culture of poverty may result from excessive concentrations of immigrants, who take unemployment and welfare benefits for granted and lack role models in their surroundings (Murray, 1984; cited in Blokland, 2003). The distribution of inhabitants, participation in neighborhood associations, community centers, places of worship, and the presence of economic, education and cultural institutions are all considered as components of the neighborhood's positive or negative influence on immigrants. However, some other scholars (Germain, 2000) argue that there are multiple dimensions associated with the neighborhood, which have different meanings and affects residents in different ways.

Studies on the use of public spaces by Muslim women, for example, Moroccan women's participation in leisure activities in Antwerp neighborhoods (Peleman, 2001b) and the free time use of public spaces by Turkish and Moroccan teenager girls in the Netherlands (Hooghiemstra, 1997) argue the spatial implications of Islam – that religion restricts access to public space for Muslim women. In the Muslim city, neighborhood is conceptualized as a buffer territory between the house (private) and the city (public). In this sense, it mediates between the domain of women (private) and the domain of men (public). According to Abu-Lughod (1993), the opposition of public and private is reflected clearly in the spatial structure of Islamic cities, as also discussed in Chapter Two; the residential quarters with dead-end streets, blind courtyards, neighborhood passageways represent 'private' (female), on the other hand, commercial quarters – the mosque and the bazaar around them – represent 'public' (male). Through the design of the blind alley or dead-end street, the protection of the family from strange males is achieved and the neighborhood is also an extension of the home and the family. Thus, the neighborhood is not only an administrative division or clustering, but also a means of social ordering.

Traditionally, neighborhood is a very important social area in daily life for Turkish women. The neighborhood is conceived of as identical with feelings of togetherness and solidarity. Even the family is embraced by the neighborhood, as pointed out in Chapter Two. Strong neighborly feelings, not necessarily reinforced by kinship ties, are counted as very important. Neighbors where no family ties are present, form a social district community just as strongly. "Don't buy a house but a neighbor!" is a very common Turkish proverb. The neighborhood traditionally is conceived of as the public of the women's world. They meet each other, talk, and gossip. An outsider is recognized immediately and the neighborhood can be easily controlled by all the inhabitants.

The home cluster, as discussed above, comprises much of the neighborhood use for Turkish women in Enschede. Therefore, it is very difficult to draw the boundaries where the home cluster ends and the neighborhood starts. With the semi-private/semi-public characteristics, the neighborhood can be conceived socially as an extension of the house. Yet the neighborhood public spaces are different than those in the home cluster, exhibiting different degrees of publicness and privateness. They are argued to be the places of interpersonal relations rather than personal relations. Scaling up from the home, the neighborhood public spaces represent different social constructs of Turkish women.

Conceiving the Neighborhood: Are Turkish Women "Urban Villagers"?

The majority of Turkish women in Enschede are of rural origin (coming from either villages or small towns), directly implanted in the Dutch urban life without any previous urban experience. This has had profound effects on their conceptions and interpretations of the general urban area and neighborhood.

Gans (1982) talks about the urban villagers of the Italian Americans in Boston's West-End. Similarly, Lofland (1973) describes 'an urban village' as a neighborhood "a home territory writ large" (p. 132). An urban village roughly corresponds with living the personal world in the midst of urban anonymity. Ethnicity is an important binding element, yet not the sufficient one. All of the first generation respondents have lived in the same neighborhood since they came to Enschede. Among the Turkish immigrants, *Hemşehrilik* is an influential institution and a powerful tie. Coming from, for example, a town in the eastern Black Sea region implies traditions, habits, and customs very different from those of a town in the western or central Black Sea region. Because of the dispersed geography of Turkey, every village has its own cultural, social, and religious traits. In the migration process, they have brought their own social and cultural traits. In addition, the selection of guest workers from the same regions, even from the same village, has helped them to form, if not keep totally, their social networks in the line of *Hemşehrilik*. For the Turkish women, therefore, who arrived a decade after their husbands to the Netherlands, the first social networks ran parallel to those of their husbands' and were based on the *Hemşehrilik*. Later, as they started to settle, they might build their own social relations with other Turkish women who live in the neighborhood. However, most

Hemşehrilik relations have continued. In addition, since most Turks can only afford 'social housing' in certain neighborhoods, they have found housing in the same neighborhoods. *Hemşehrilik* has not perished. On the contrary, it has strengthened in time with living in the same neighborhood.

Hemşehrilik as a social institution still exists, not only in Enschede, but in all cities whether the migration has been international or national. In *gecekondu* neighborhoods in Turkey, many scholars (Erman, 1997a; Şenyapılı, 1981) point out the importance of *Hemşehrilik* with other primordial ties that help maintain village values in the urban environment. Together with family, it encapsulates traditional values, such as the female members of the family as the honor of the men. Although there are no statistical data available, my respondents talked about the concentration of *Hemşehri's* in their neighborhood, pointing to its significance of reinforcing the community relations and maintaining traditions. They also pointed out the presence of *Hemşehri* communities in different cities of the Netherlands, especially the neighborhoods of Hengelo and Oldenzaal. *Hemşehri* communities act as catalyzers for the formation of urban villages, since they are keen on keeping their relations based on the same place of origin, as well as their peculiar social and cultural characteristics, traditions and customs.

The urban villagers' entire round of life can be covered within the limits of the neighborhood or within the limits of their personal relations. The first generation and marriage-immigrants can be seen as urban villagers, since the neighborhood corresponds to their whole life in Enschede.

Enschede is Deppenbroek for me. Here you can find everything. No need to go to the centre. Well if you are very sick, you need to go to the hospital, but here we have a doctor, dentist, everything, in the shops,. What more do you want? Clothes, food, everything. (b. 1953, 23 years in NL)

I usually go out in the neighborhood to have a walk with my children. They are bored at home, and we walk together in the streets, to the shopping mall, to the market. My husband works hard, and on the weekend either he rests or he meets with his friends. With the children it's very difficult to go to the city, without a car, impossible, and also I don't need to, we have everything here in Wesselerbrink. (b. 1978, 23 years in NL)

Limited spatial mobility and the abundance of all necessary services in the neighborhood pave the way to the creation of 'urban villages', especially in the suburban neighborhoods. In addition, since the first generation and marriage-immigrants tend to form their social relations with peers, the encapsulated networks help them to conceive the neighborhood as a sufficient spatial unit. Most likely, this is why the level of satisfaction with the neighborhood and housing area is high among the respondents. They leave the neighborhood once a year for a trip to the city centre or to another city, for emergency cases or to visit family or relatives, with the help of the family members and friends.

The demographic composition of the neighborhood influences the creation of 'urban villages'. The neighborhoods with high proportions of Turkish immigrants provide Turkish women, especially peers, with social climates very similar to their

places of origin in Turkey. Probably because of their previous lives in Turkey, where they experienced neighborliness strongly, they give special significance to the feeling of neighborliness, neighborly relations, and their neighbors.

In my neighborhood at that time, there were seven to eight Turkish families in the same row. They were also alone here, like us. We became friends. We were close neighbors. It was like being in Turkey, one of us prepares tea and calls the others. We visited each others' home every day, we went on picnics together. (b. 1950, 32 years in NL)
 When I first came to Enschede, I lived two years in Meeuwenstraat and there we had very good relations with our neighbors (Turkish). When I moved to Poterstraat, my neighbors had also moved here, to the same street, wherever one neighbor goes, the others followed. Now we are apart (because of the firework disaster, they were placed on another street in the same neighborhood) but none of us went far. I am very happy here, I have never thought about leaving this neighborhood. We will all come together again. (b. 1953, 23 years in NL).

The conception of the neighborhood as an urban village has important consequences for conceiving publicness and privateness. In heterogeneous neighborhoods, where there are high proportions of Turkish enclaves⁴, everyone is 'a significant other'. When they are out, Turkish women are visible everywhere and all of their actions are watched.

I think if I lived in Deppenbroek, I wouldn't do many of the things that I do now. There everybody knows each other; it's like a neighborhood in Turkey. What you do every day is known and discussed; why you go to one shop, but not the other, why you go out, etc., it's like they keep records of you. (b. 1979, b. in NL)

For those who want to keep their traditions and customs, these neighborhoods, the urban villages, are the perfect places to continue the habitual-traditional social environment. The patriarchal lines continue and the new comers or offspring are not alienated from the traditional values and norms, which are represented, continued, and strengthened by the elderly. The ethnic networks, especially the kin-related ones, which originally functioned as support mechanisms, prevent offspring from testing alternative life-styles in the Dutch context and perpetuate the traditional norms of gender interaction. In that sense, women's presence in the public easily can be scrutinized as to whether it is intruding on Turkish traditions, customs and values.

Once I had on make-up to go to our neighbor – I was quite young, and I didn't wear make-up a lot then, and just for fun I did it –, then one of the Turkish guys in our neighborhood saw me, he was driving a car, and he stopped and started to ask questions like, 'Where was I going? Why was I wearing make-up? What was the occasion?' etc. I didn't and still don't know him. Well, he was one of the guys from the neighborhood. They usually do that. It happened to a lot of my friend. It's not bad. They are watching us everywhere; in the neighborhood, in the city. I mean they care about us; girls and women. They watch you all the time. (b.1975, 26 years in NL)

Routines in the Neighborhood

Everyday routines and repetitions, as discussed in Chapter Four, are important in a sense that the social relations in repetitive activities and daily-life routines, located in time-space, can have regularized consequences in the boundary-making processes for individuals who engage in those activities. These routines of everyday life help the formation of Turkish women's spatial literacy and the construction of spatial knowledge in the neighborhood. They do not conceive of the neighborhood as a totality, in its administrative borders, but as an area of routine activities and known faces. The daily routines are related closely to their role inventories and related activities in the neighborhood, such as frequented streets, parks, and shopping areas. Mothers go shopping in the morning; they meet with other mothers in the schoolyard, while waiting for their small children to come out for lunch; then they return them to school for another two hours; after school they walk home with them, the weather is suitable, a trip to the park; then walking home again. In the neighborhood, they use the same streets probably several times a day, so that they know everything; who lives in that house, whose car that is, the old lady was not sitting in the usual place today, is there anything wrong, they broke the glass wall of the bus-stop again. Routines provide a sense of place and a sense of control, and at the same time a sense of belonging and attachment.

Knowledge or sense of place arise from routines, and helps them develop familiarity both for the places and for the other users. In this sense, the anonymity of the urban public spaces has been broken or at least decreased. They decode the urban public space, testing their presence in public all the time, as well as struggling with the negative territorial concerns.

I know very well when I can walk the sidewalks of the park. There stands in the late afternoon usually the teenagers, intimidating foreigners all the time. So, you know when to pass, you don't let get your nerves down. (b. 1960, 20 years in NL)

Familiarity decreases from the private home to the public city. Places are avoided as the fear grows toward the unknown.

Those streets in the center, I don't know what exactly is going on there, narrow, twisting. You never know if you will come across a coffee house or some inappropriate place to be. I usually make a detour if I have to pass that area. It's difficult I know, even yesterday, I was in a hurry, but I walked around, took me an extra 15 minutes. (b. 1978, 10 years in NL)

Through knowing the places, Turkish women are able to develop 'tactics' (De Certeau, 1984) to use. Each public space has its own proper times to appropriate. Similar to the use of the neighborhood park, as discussed in the previous part, the shopping centre has the 'social times,' daytime on the weekdays, especially in the early afternoon hours 'when it is quiet.' This knowledge is gained with engagement of the traveling packs and establishment home territories in public.

Traveling Packs: Mobile Home Territories

The protective privacy of the home territory or urban village, according to Lofland (1973), is place-bound. The familiar and interpersonal domain of the neighborhood, to a certain degree, accommodates home territories yet it becomes problematical in the anonymous and impersonal domain of the city. To cope with the complexity and aloofness of the city, the solution is to take privacy along with one (*ibid.*).

Many scholars (Liempt, 2001, Jókövi, 2000a, 2000b, Campbell, 2000) note the Turks' inclination to use urban public spaces while in groups. Regardless the location of the public space in question, elderly women mention the 'with' person or persons, while using specific public space, yet, for instance, for most of the first generation, the short walks around the home cluster can be two, whereas shopping trips to the neighborhood market and the neighborhood shopping mall are composed of four to five women together.

This 'with' persons can be family members, close neighbors, or friends. Lofland (1973) calls the group with 'with' persons, traveling packs, or mobile home territories. Traveling packs are composed of people who know each other very well, who identify with one another, and who reciprocally ensure mutual protection and self-confirmation. They provide all the reassurance and support necessary. For Lofland, the sufficient size of traveling packs vary depending upon "a number of factors such as the size of other groups also present, the dimensions of the space itself, or the amount of leeway allowed by the setting in what is considered acceptable behavior" (*ibid.*, p. 138). Thus, the size of traveling packs can be different depending on the scale of appropriation of urban public space. On the other hand, familiarity, as discussed in the previous chapter, is also influential in a way that, for instance, while for a familiar and small-scale environment, such as a neighborhood shopping center or a hospital, a relatively small size of traveling pack is appropriated, and for an unfamiliar environment, such as visits of a museum or an urban park, the size of the traveling pack increases.

Traveling packs are usually composed of family members and/or peers. They also can be considered as reflections of encapsulated networks; since the encapsulated have strong ties (Granovetter, 1973) and are dependent on each other.

We see each other everyday; sometimes we go out shopping, sometimes we stay inside. If there is an activity to do, first we meet at home, and then go out, we never meet outside. Yes, we do everything together. Even if I don't need to, I go shopping with them, so that I know that they will come with me. (b. 1943, 23 years in NL)

I have a friend and we do everything together. You know our community here. If they see you alone, then they start gossiping. With a friend you're always safe... but may be not, I don't know really, if they want they may gossip about you... I feel better outside with a friend. (b. 1962, 31 years in NL)

With my friends we always meet at our home, it's near the center. Then we go out. Our house is like a meeting point. When everyone arrives, then we go out. I don't like to be alone in the centre. What if someone sees me and says 'oh, daughter of Ayşe', what's she doing here alone?' They may think I am doing something secret and naughty. (b. 1984, b. in NL)

The traveling packs are territorial strategies for Turkish women to occupy public space which they call 'their' areas. When they establish this type of territory, they can deal with the detachment caused by moving into the domain of strangers. On the one hand, they feel 'safe' in public because the people they are with provide the necessary knowledge and foundation to conduct their activities. These social capsules influence the course of knowing and experiencing the neighborhood or the city, the familiarity and orientating information needed for appropriating the public space. One respondent (a marriage-immigrant) said that when she first arrived she could not go out alone, not even to the supermarket two streets away. At first it was very difficult for her to distinguish her apartment block from the others. "All houses and apartments were the same; yes, there are numbers on each block, but from a distance, when you walk on the street, it is very difficult to tell them apart". One day she saw a Turkish girl in the street and immediately talked to her. This was her first social contact after two years of living in the neighborhood. With these contacts, she started to get to know the neighborhood and the city.

With the neighbors (Turkish), we do everything together; sometimes we go to the shopping centre, even if I have no need to go. Sometimes we go to the neighborhood park, to the city. Before, I was alone and I would not dare, but when you're with some people, it's normal. (b. 1967, 19 years in NL)

Though Lofland (1973) sees traveling packs as another method of avoiding the city while living in it, I think that for Turkish women it is rather a strategy of 'exploring the city with their own way'. With traveling packs and the creation of home territories, Turkish women eliminate any need for concern about establishing their identities with the strangers, as well as discovering stranger's presence with them. In addition, they can reduce the negative concerns of their communities as the acknowledged 'with' persons provide reassurance and support when necessary. As a group, they can avoid unwanted contact. Through the repetitive use of mobile 'home territories', their spatial knowledge grows and, as in the case of many marriage-immigrant women, they start to get used to 'how it is being in the public'.

Use of Car: Enlarging Spatial Knowledge and Mobility or Moving Private Capsules?

An important characteristic of the first generation is that they do not use public transport while they are outside of the home cluster; in most cases, the car of the family or relative is needed for mobility. As they need the full assistance of their families and friends, all first generation Turkish women complain about not having driving licenses or cars of own; if they had cars of their own, they could easily move

about the city. As opposed to the first generation, almost all second-generation and marriage-immigrants have driving licenses and more than half of them possess their own cars. Although they are economically quite vulnerable, having two cars in a household is not an exception among second generation Turkish families. At first glance, this may imply that the women's daily practices reach beyond their own neighborhoods and that they are able to freely move about the city, as well as in other cities. On the one hand, having a car opens possibilities to enlarge their spatial activities, but on the other hand, the car is an extension of the personal space, private realm. Likewise, Lofland (1998) sees the use of private cars as a tool for the creation of urban villages.

The automobile has a particularly interesting and significant characteristic: it allows its passengers to move through the public sectors of the city encased in a cocoon of private space. It makes it possible for one to encounter the city at the same time one is avoiding it. And it makes possible a linking of widely dispersed urban spaces to such a degree that, for all practical purposes, they are spatially contiguous. ... (t)he urbanite, by using the automobile, can guide himself about the city, can restrict his routing about the city, in such a way that *he almost never has to enter any truly public space*. (emphasis as original, p. 136)

A Turkish woman with her own car can go from home to the homes of her friends, from home to work, from home to the activities in which she participates with her friends or family, as in the case of voluntary organizations, without any contact with others in the public. She moves entirely in personal and intimate relations, between home-like territories, although the space can be public or semi-public, and stays in her private world. At first glance, their spatial radius seems to be enlarged, but driving enables her to expand her private world, therefore her interaction in the public stays personal. However, it should be stated that driving enables her to discard the image of the traditional Turkish woman, dependent on her husband in every activity and challenge the community norms that are, in some cases, even stronger than those in Turkey. They also develop a special kind of spatial knowledge of the city, which is, in most cases, only related to the location of visited friends, frequented shops and places.

The City

In recent years, urban public spaces in the city centers have become increasingly specialized in recreation and amusement and furnished in order to comfort users (Van der Wouden, 1999). The user of the public space has become the consumer, i.e. oriented towards the fulfillment of his or her leisure and entertainment needs. At the same time, central public spaces are idealized by many urban policy makers, planners, and designers as 'real meeting places' and 'democratic places', where all kinds of people from different origins can come together in a civilized way (Oosterman, 1992; cited from Vierde Nota over de Ruimtelijke Ordening 1988). This idealization pre-

sumes that as citizens gather in urban public space, they learn to respect different behaviors and cultures (Crowhurst-Lennard, 1984, cited in Oosterman, 1992). Thus, urban public spaces should have not only a meeting function, but also a disciplinary one as well. Through designs and various ways of surveillance, especially central public spaces have turned out to be quite disciplinary spaces. Sennett (1977) sees disciplinary and pedagogising public spaces as leading to the collapse of public life in the modern city. Space allocations, activity zoning and public-private control measures have turned public spaces into highly managed spaces and the users and the uses are then limited. Some scholars (Beauregard, 1993) argue that the decline of public space is closely related to the view of the 'white, male, and middle-class' dominated media, so that their concerns have generalized understandings of public space. Immigrants, who may have different orientations and associations with the urban life than native inhabitants, are often considered outsiders and under-users of central urban public spaces. For the new comers, the major confrontations and negotiations with 'they' are made in the city and especially in central public spaces.

Social Relations in Central Urban Public Spaces

As argued in Chapter Three, a relational approach to urban public space highlights the processes of how space is constituted and given meaning through human endeavor (Simonsen and Bærenholdt, 2004). Users' experiences of urban public space, in this framework are related closely to their constructions of being-in-the-place. Their experiences are not merely an experience of a physical space, but a distinctive social reality. This conception is related closely to the performance of the individuals and the displayment of their identities, which are formed in the interaction process through negotiation and validation.

Performance in the public space, according to Goffman (1972), founder of the dramaturgical model, is very much like the performance of actors on a stage. Using the metaphor of Theatrical Performance, he explains people's social behavior in public spaces, i.e. people are constantly involved in different dramas, changing their roles and performances in different situations. He assumes that the 'audience' consists of people who observe the behavior of others, the 'roles' are the images people are trying to project, and the 'script' consists of their communication with others. People's social behavior in public is simply an impression-management in front of others. There are two regions of this performance stage: onstage, 'front region', and a backstage, 'back region'. In the front region, where the performance is given, a moral conduct, a social acceptance by the society is expected to be maintained. On the other hand, in the back region, "the suppressed facts make an appearance" (Goffman, 1990, p. 114) and "the performer reliably expects that no member of the audience will intrude" (ibid., p. 116). Based on implicit or explicit expressions (in Goffman's terms: Given, the verbal or direct gestural communication or Given-off, the wide range of actions and expressions of non-verbal communication, like looks, stares, and body movements), people sustain their presence and conduct their performances both in the front and back regions.

Goffman's standpoint is germane to Bourdieu's habitus and social theory in a way that they both show the element of improvisation and adaptation, rather than simple rule-following and introduce agents as dynamic figures in the social order (Calhoun, 2000). They both emphasize the ways in which social action shapes social structures. Following Goffman and the admirers of the dramaturgical model, public space can be seen as a setting where the action takes place, a passive component, but also as a setting that brings the two together and creates participation and two-way communication. Public space then plays an active role in the performance. In other words, performance is not only related to the actors, the users of the particular public space, but also to the space itself.

When Turkish women make use of urban public spaces, they read the spatial characteristics, interpret the social environment and experience "its phenomenological presence" (Richardson, 1982). Public space as a totality, i.e. the physical layout, appearances, arrangements, thematic uses, demography, social codes, and social conduct, conveys meanings for the users. For that reason, public space is construed in each time, by users, and for each use differently. Therefore, public spaces, as given settings, can only be differentiated, contrasted, and identified by context, arrangement and theme.

... what constitutes a setting and define its limits lies not so much in the isolated setting but in the manner in which physical and thematic features distinguish ... that setting from the others ... in this, material settings resemble a series of semantic domains, domains which, as people literally enter them, provide a preliminary understanding of the interaction going on around them and, consequently of the situation developing before them" (ibid., p. 424).

The Market and the Square: What Difference Does It Make?

The following discussion is based on the analysis of two squares in the centre of Enschede. These two squares were chosen mainly for two reasons. First, they are examples of two distinctive representations of central public spaces; the Oude Markt, – after this point, it will be called as the Square –, as the representative of public spaces of leisure and entertainment developed in the last two decades; and the H.J. van Heekplein as the Market, which according to Bahrtdt (1961), is the earliest and the most prevailing form of public activity. Second, in the Dutch urban studies literature, Turks and immigrants are considered as underrepresented in central public spaces, except the market places (Keune, 2002). Their relatively weak socio-economic position, cultural differences, community pressures, social control, and gender segregation are considered as the rationale for their absence. However, they are present in other places; shopping streets, small squares, some cafés, brasseries, and fast-food restaurants, especially McDonalds. The difference that a public space makes, I will further argue, is the social relations and occasions of that particular public space, in which the diversity of public space constructions of users are in contest.

The Square

In the last two decades, one of the major characteristics of central public spaces can be called amusement and pleasure, where individual leisure and entertainment dominate the use of the city centers (Zukin, 1995; Oosterman, 1992). In the Netherlands, as well as in other European countries, cities have promoted the use of the centre as 'amusement park' in order to attract their inhabitants, who left the downtown areas to live in suburbia. A substantial increase in the use of city centers and public spaces as 'societal territories' and 'special meeting places' has been manifested in the growth of sidewalk cafés (Oosterman, 1992, 1993). The use of public space for entertainment and amusement is best experienced in the sidewalk café, the 'pleasure dome,' where an important quality of public space, 'social traffic,' has been restored. The old and long forgotten social characteristics of urban public space are alive again; watching people go by, the entertainment of street life, and enjoyment of the city atmosphere, spontaneous meetings, and the spectacle of being in the public. As a result, sidewalk cafés are on the rise throughout the Netherlands. With the chairs placed towards the street, the audience (Goffman, 1972) roles are established; often companionship is appreciated to discuss the appearances of other people who pass by. It is the spectacle that attracts people, expressing ideas without getting involved with anybody passing by. The café also becomes a place for spontaneous meetings between people who know each other to keep up one's personal network, as well as meetings between strangers. In addition, the café turns into a place of display, where personal matters can be showed off. In sum, Oosterman (1992) suggests that in the modern city, people use public spaces in the centre not to meet strangers or be among the strangers, but to enjoy the spectacle provided by them. Exposition reigns in the modern central urban public space.

The Market

Bahrtdt (1961) calls the market the earliest and most prevailing form of public activity. The users of the market are perfect strangers to each other and the market does not permit the identification of the individual; only "a partial choice of contact-making among all those who attend the market as buyers and sellers. The seller cries his wares to all that can hear him. The buyer goes from stand to stand. It is possible for direct contacts to be made between people who do not know one another, that is to say, where no one knows exactly how to classify the other" (ibid., p. 27). The Market provides a special social setting, where social conducts between people are regulated according to specific social codes, customs, and conventions. The interesting point here is that almost everywhere around the world, almost all cultures, the culture of the market is quite similar and shared. The cultural and social boundaries become invisible or at least soften or dissolve for a moment. Bahrtdt describes the special character of social life and behavior in the market places as "voluntary, fleeting social contacts conducted according to strict rules, made between individuals who are almost unknown to each other and at the same time with the possibility of ignoring the social stratum to which these individuals otherwise belong" (ibid.).

For Bahrtdt, the most important characteristic of the 'public' type of social relationship is the incomplete integration, "a freedom of social purpose for the individuals, who can choose with whom, in what manner, and for how long they keep up the contact" (ibid., p. 29). In the market, the users (both buyers and sellers) know and are prepared for the rules of their face-to-face contacts. Incomplete integration allows people to dispose of any prescribed and familiar connections. The contacts are direct but unmediated, meaning social distance is noticeable and preserved, but this distance is not bridged because of the fleeting nature of the contact. There is no room for the development of intimacy or displacement of personal details.

... what difference does it make?

Around the egg-like historical core of the city of Enschede, the Square has developed in time as a natural meeting place with all the circular pedestrian roads from the commercial streets leading to it. Occupied by café's, restaurants, and terraces, it has become the leisure centre. This image has been reinforced with the cultural facilities nearby, such as theatres, cinemas, and concert halls. Several times a year, activities, such as a second hand CD and LP market, bazaar, sports events, folk dances, concerts, parades are organized not only for citizens, but also for visitors. The residents of nearby cities also come to visit the Square, emphasizing the circular shape being much sociable and pleasant than the rectangular ones.

During the weekdays, except Tuesdays⁶, the Square is quiet; few tables in the terraces are occupied, a limited number of people pass by the square while going to the shopping or other commercial streets. On the weekends, the Square becomes lively, full of people, students, families, singles, couples, and tourists. Friday and Saturday nights are reserved for the young. The Square also hosts public performances, like concerts, parades, entertaining events. On sunny and warm days, the terraces are full, almost all tables under the sun are occupied and meanwhile passers-by's check these places with a quick look to see if there is anybody they know. The unified experience in the Square is the entertainment and leisure of the individual. With its circular shape, the Square provides the very best setting for the individual to play the audience role.

Apart from visiting a café, walking in the square implies the very same effect. In the square, people are quite conscious of being in the presence of others and they act accordingly. In other words, they present themselves as 'being onstage' (Goffman, 1972), where people maintain the appropriate appearance as they interact with others. On stage performance necessitates maximum impression management, since, like in the theatre, the performance takes place on the stage, in front of the audience. While the audience observes, roles are taken by people and based on scripts, verbal as well as non-verbal communication with others, the performance has been achieved. The Square, the cultural, leisure, and entertainment core of the city, implies certain social qualities and profiles to the users to obey or perform.

At first glance, all of the places seem to be the same; café's, restaurants and terraces, and the experiences of the users are unified, but soon one sees that each place is different and probably that's why the same people go every weekend to the same

places in the square. Some places attract students and the young, others attract foreigners, and still others attract families with small children. Some people go to the same café every weekend, because they are used to it; the people there, waiters and waitresses, furnishing, both indoors and outdoors, view from the square from a table. In the Square, the nature of interaction necessitates that people either observe or be observed. The cultural and social boundaries are being drawn, so that it becomes easy to distinguish 'who is in' and 'who is out'.

A kind of silent convention marks each place as having its own type of users and accordingly to accommodate certain social conducts, such as De Blauwe Kater for students and locals, SamSam for foreigners, Jansen-en-Jansen slightly for adults who like Blues and Rock and Roll, and the Penny for natives⁷. Thus, in the Square, territories are clearly marked. As Oosterman (1992) shows, the patrons of a sidewalk café personalize it to some extent during their period of occupancy and this, in turn, gives them some power over the space. Meeting with friends and showing themselves off provide a home territory (Lofland, 1973), where they set the rules of the game. With routine visits to the places, on the one side, a kind of public familiarity is achieved, and on the other side, these places acquire their image with the users' profile. As argued in Chapter Seven, varying degrees of territorial behavior give clues to individuals to guide their activities. This knowledge, a territorial awareness that a particular place belongs to others, impede Turkish women from entering this domain for fear that their presence in the Square could turn a negative experience; they could have to face social disapproval, which could take the form of comments, tuts, stares or glares.

I cannot imagine myself sitting in a café in the Square. People would think what is this Turkish woman doing here? Probably they would look at me (she shows her scarf) and I am sure of it that I would not enjoy those looks. (b. 1974, b. in NL)

This kind of sense of a territory also can be related to the 'stigmas' in society (Goffman, 1972), like this woman thinking that with her appearance, especially her scarf, she is devalued in the society.

On the other hand, while Turkish women may be visible in few places in the city centre, they are discernible in the Market. Hearing Turkish words, placed arbitrarily between Dutch words, is common. Turkish women are seen selecting vegetables and fruits, despite the '*niet aanraken maar kijken*' (don't touch, just look) sign, actively engaging in bargaining, and waiting in the stands. The Market area is rectangular in shape and the space has divided into strips of goods with lining market stands. There is a small gathering place in the centre surrounded by sandwich and fish stands. Here, there are few seating places provided. Market users walk along the lining stands and have one-on-one relations with the vendors within the nature of the commodity. The basic market activity requires that people acknowledge each other's presence. It is in this sense a focused participation based on the necessities shared by the participants. In the market; the commercial context defines the nature of the social interaction; the nature of social conduct is known and the codes are shared by all the parties.

In the Market, everyone seems to be interested only in buying and selling products. Being at the edge of the centre, they are away from the ‘front regions’ (Goffman, 1972). There is no need to manage impressions, or at least, when compared to the Square, one can minimize the impression management task. The social interaction happens away from the view of an audience and the Market becomes, in Goffman’s terms, a back stage, where the Turkish women can have their offstage performances. There is even a room for improvisations.

In the market, you buy your things, no one cares about you. The only thing is that you are a customer... you can even make jokes – I don’t think that I can ever do that in Turkey. (b. 1972, 26 years in NL).

The Market and the Square represent two different experiences of being in public space in the Enschede centre (Figure 8.2). These experiences are related closely to the performance of individuals, the displayment of their identities, which are formed in the interaction process through negotiation and validation. In this interaction process, as argued in Chapter Four, Tilly (1998) argues that social interaction patterns require different degrees of scripting and shared local knowledge. In that sense, each public space in the city acknowledges different degrees of scripting and local knowledge and accordingly a variety of social interaction/relationship possibilities and patterns. While the scripts connote explicit models that are known by the parties involved in the social interaction, the local knowledge describes contextual knowledge driven out expertise on the basis of everyday knowledge, residing in intimate familiarity and understanding the particulars of the situation. In this framework, it can be argued that depending on the individual’s possession of scripting and local knowledge, they perceive urban public space differently and connect to it a sense of belonging or strangeness.

FIGURE 8.2. Comparing Two Public Spaces in Enschede City Center

	<i>The Square</i>	<i>The Market</i>
Function	leisure and entertainment	market exchange
Participation	disengaged observation	engaged/focused participation
Boundaries	<i>social</i> <i>symbolical</i> categorization polarized	no categorization neutral
Social relations	personal public (home territories)	public (incomplete integration)
Nature	individual	commodity
Physical	circular indoors + outdoors	rectangular outdoors
Images	homogeneous Dutch	heterogeneous all inhabitants

The Square represents the fun city public space, where leisure and entertainment carve the space. With chairs placed towards the center, users can watch the Square and passers-by without any intention to get involved with them. Complicity in disengaged observation is further supported by the circular layout, providing an appropriate setting for those who are on stage and those who play the audience role. As leisure and entertainment are accentuated functions, the form, function, and users suit all nicely in this theatrical performance of urban public space. In the Square, users need possession of a considerable amount of scripts and knowledge about the social context, so that they can either perform as a passer-by or a member of the audience in order to participate in this performance. Another aspect is that users may also choose the potential-audience, for those she/he believes to be interacting in that social setting.

On the other hand, the Market represents a social setting of and for the market exchange, in which both the buyers and sellers engage during the interaction. As the nature of attention is on the commodity, the amount of scripts and local knowledge necessary for social conduct are rather elementary. Thus, together with their different functions and planning and design outcomes, these two public spaces reflect different patterns and kinds of social interaction, necessitating different amounts of scripts and local knowledge. When the possession of both dimensions is insufficient to incorporate in social interaction, it leads to avoidance. At the same time, these scripts and local knowledge can also be culture-specific. This is particularly important to discredit or valorize performances.



PICTURE 8.1. The Square



PICTURE 8.2. The Market



PICTURE 8.3. Engagement in the neighborhood market, Wesselerbrink

Turkish Women's Social Meanings of the Market and the Square

Turkish women's descriptions of the Market and the Square enable us to understand how social meanings are coded deeply in the public space. The negative qualities, such as crowded, artificial, and teenagers' territories, connote places of retreat, whereas positive qualities, like quiet, *gezellig*, and natural imply places of interaction and exposure. The more the particular place evokes negative characteristics, the more it is avoided, and the more it is avoided, more the use becomes a taboo; unthinkable for presence.

Religiously conservative women think the 'watching people pass by' violates their social customs, cultural values and norms, particularly the code of modesty both for men and women. The code of modesty is an important feature for Muslims in the public space or outside their houses (Mortada, 2003). According to sources of Islamic Law, Muslims in public should lower their gaze and guard their modesty. Mortada (2003) states that the Islamic Law also disallows the use of streets and thoroughfares for public meetings, and prescribes the rights of using them, among others, the avoidance of staring and saluting back to those who salute. Watching and being watched lead to unwanted contact with a stranger, either in the form of eye contact or a just a blasé look, leading to the invasion of privacy and intrusion of modesty.

I don't understand how people enjoy looking at other people. What's the use of it?
(b. 1976, 6 years in NL)

The presence of Turks, including men, in the square and places near the Square, means that they no longer belong to the Turkish community and they are ones who have lost their identity. For religious women, the presence of men and women together in the public do not exist in Turkish culture and apart from necessary situations, such as work, health, and school, should be avoided. On the other hand, they feel no offense in the market, because they call the Market a 'natural' place. The social relations in the market, the gender divisions or relations between different sexes are followed within the market culture. In addition, alcohol use in a place erects another barrier, since it is strictly forbidden in Islam.

On the other hand, second generation religious Turkish women have different views of 'forbidden' public spaces in the centre. The more their social networks are segregated, the more their appropriation of public space and experiences of publicness and privateness vary.

It depends on who you're with. If I go to the cafés in the centre with my Turkish friends, we cannot enjoy it. They, may be me also, become strange, cautious, I don't know, not normal. What if someone sees us? What if they think we are doing bad things, etc. It's always turning in your mind. But, if I go to a café with my friends (Dutch) from work, then it's really *gezellig* (nice, comfortable, cozy). I like it a lot.
(b. 1979, b. in NL)

Hence, second generation religious women negotiate the boundaries of public space, attempt to dissolve the symbolic boundaries both on the Turkish side and on the

Dutch side. Their presence in the public space necessitates playing with the social codes, which they think can resolve through the mutual understanding of each culture. Their exploration is directed by increasing the local knowledge and scripts necessary for social interaction. The most frequented public places are at the periphery of the center, outside the Square, around the surrounding circular pedestrian streets with ethnic shops, restaurants, and foreign community centers. They value heterogeneity highly for the user characteristics. The main difference between the first and marriage-immigrants and second generation is that while the former favor Turkish elements, the latter prefer diversity.

The community pressures are felt more when the social network is closed. The cultural norms of using public spaces, i.e. traditional conceptions of publicness and privateness, are represented, continued, and strengthened through closed, strong social relations. The more the social networks are encapsulated, the less chance there is for change. The segregated networks, on the other hand, help them to test alternatives and challenge the religious-traditional codes and predispositions of segregated interaction between men and women.

Conclusion

Analyzing Turkish women's patterns of use and appropriation of everyday urban public space points out belongingness and dis-belongingness as expressed in their daily practices in different scales of urban space. For Fenster (2004), a claim over public space is one of the expressions of belonging in everyday life. The potency of these claims determines the degree/volume of belonging.

The three main spatial scales examined in this chapter represent the degree/volume of belonging, their involvements and attachments, as their social practices become *implicated* (Gow, 1995; cited in Waterson, 2005) in the physical space. The home environment and home territories represent the strongest form of these claims over the public space; from the part of casual daily communication to demarcations of legal rights, from exposure to social norms of use and privatization to specific gender practices. The 'home' represents habitualized practices and places of conformity and manipulation. Since claims are staged openly, it is the place of interaction. In the neighborhood, while claims over the public space are not as strong as those over the 'home', it can be seen, to a limited extent, as an extension of the home. Since the knowledge about the public space is high, there is room for appropriation, for developing tactics to use. The neighborhood represents familiar practices and places of improvisations and contestation. In the neighborhood, Turkish women negotiate the boundaries of public space.

In this chapter, Turkish women's experiences of the city were examined in a way that was analytically differently from that of the analysis of their experiences in the home environment and the neighborhood. While the latter is concerned with the one-on-one interaction, the former is related to their 'situational' experiences, related to their performances and decoding of social meanings inscribed in the public space.

In that sense, their spatial interaction patterns in these two different settings and related appropriation strategies are different. The places of interaction and retreat are defined closely in relation to the relational contexts and acquisition of local knowledge and scripts.

Their involvements and attachments, the way that they are connected to public spaces in Enschede, reveal the meanings of these places, mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion, of retreat and interaction. Their involvements, at the same time, expose their specific senses of place, their habitus; relational frameworks of embodied dispositions.



CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study examined urban public space as a unique spatial setting, a meeting place and social staging ground. The basic premises of this study were twofold. First, it conceptualized public space as a social construct, rejecting the depictions of urban public space of the deterministic approaches, such as environmental or cultural determinism, and promoting the reciprocity of physical, social, and symbolic space. Various relational contexts produce conceptions and interpretations of urban public space, and various spatial practices. The depiction of everyday spatial practices and the variety of conceptions and interpretations of urban public space maintain to recognize the plural lives of urban inhabitants, the multi-facetedness of their connections, orientations, and involvement with urban life. Recognizing urban public space as a social construct maintains two important understandings, first acknowledging the plentifulness of urban public spaces; each urban public space has rhythms and patterns of use of its own, constructed at different times by different groups. Based on their identifications, constructions, and experiences, people choose some places, characteristics, but each time they re-construct them. The urban public space, secondly, becomes a place of reciprocal dynamic relations full of symbols and power, wherein differences, like gender, class, and ethnicity, are imbued in representations and social constructions. Since they are based on the lived experiences of various groups or counter-publics, the struggles for appropriation also are revealed; diversity and difference are represented in a variety of contested spatial practices and conflicted claims. This leads us to the second premise, the valorization of the actors who are in charge of constructing the urban public space in their everyday lives.

Instead of looking at users as given and at urban public space as a physical entity, this study elaborated users as social actors engaged in the continuous process of place-making, exploring, negotiating, and appropriating. In everyday life, individuals as social actors construct public spaces based on meanings, definitions, and activities while they are interacting with others in this particular social setting.

With placing urban public spaces at the core of everyday life, i.e. the analysis of everyday uses and experiences of urban public spaces, this study is positioned in a dynamic perspective of exploring the spatial experiences of the diversity of individuals and groups. Based on the lived experiences of various groups or counter-publics who compete with each other in the urban space, urban public spaces become sites

of conflict and contestation. At the same time, the everyday perspective of the urban public space reveals everyday attachments and belongings through the use of everyday public spaces, such as sidewalks, streets, parks, schoolyards, and parking lots, in infinitely recurring activities, such as commuting routes and trips to the supermarket or school, leading to an understanding of urban public spaces which serve as primary intersections between the individual and the city.

The analysis of Turkish immigrant women's use and experience of everyday urban public spaces identified them as social actors whose dual social relations with space, both locational and transnational, influence their boundary constructions in urban public spaces as mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. Because of the fluidity of these relations and boundaries, there is a continual process of social and spatial ordering that positions the Turkish immigrant woman in a variety of sets of social relations. In each urban public space, based on these boundaries, their spatial behavior and experiences are shaped, improving or intensifying the disparities pronounced. Their social relations in and with the urban public space act as mechanisms of social identification, defining, establishing, and sustaining boundaries between who is in and out, not only between them and other ethnic groups and natives in the broader social context, but also within the Turkish community itself.

By exploring the use and experience of everyday urban public spaces from Turkish immigrant women's perspective, this study promoted the everyday urban public space as a binding field, accommodating host-immigrant encounters and social exchanges among diverse groups in society, and as a place of struggle and contestation; where different identities are represented and compete for the continuous process of place-making and appropriation of the urban public space. The analysis of the everyday spatial behavior patterns of Turkish immigrant women revealed how they transform the city in their daily acts and how they make the city in their own terms. These everyday connections to the city are carved in the minutiae of spatial encounters.

Relational Approach to Urban Public Space

In order to elaborate Turkish women's complex pattern of identifications, constructions, and experiences of urban public spaces, the relational approach was adopted as the theoretical framework. The theoretical bases of the relational approach to urban public space are elaborated on the works of Charles Tilly and Pierre Bourdieu. While Tilly's social interaction framework were appropriated in the conception of categories and the relational processes of boundary construction in social interaction, Bourdieu's social theory provided the analytical framework: especially his two key concepts, habitus and social capital, were adopted to interpret the differences in Turkish women's attitudes and spatial practices in the urban public space.

Tilly's conception of seeing categories as relational was important for spatial analysis in a way that it enabled us to see the various ways that categorical networks – social relations that construct boundaries, boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, as discussed in Chapter Three – are embedded in space through use and appropria-

tion and how such spaces are made into social spaces as the articulations of social relations. When urban public space is conceptualized as a social construct and an arena of contestation and conflicting identities and representations, boundaries and the construction of boundaries are the important means to locate the dynamics of exclusive and inclusive social and spatial practices. Boundaries should not be considered as definitive barriers, yet they define the inside and the outside, inclusion and exclusion. In the process of the social construction of urban public space, symbolic and social, as well as physical boundaries are in play for the articulation of differences and communalities in the appropriation of public spaces. Since they are also related to the territories of influence, they are the marked transitions from one sphere of control to another. As a form of non-verbal communication, they provide information, which in turn influences patterns of social interaction, for spatial behavior.

Patterns of uses and experiences of urban public space reflect not neutral facts, but social relations deeply embedded in the spatial structures. Bourdieu's theory of practice and two of his key concepts, habitus and social capital, were appropriated to elucidate Turkish women's spatial behavior, as firmly embedded in a dialectical relationship between culture, structure and power, and their specific ways of conceptualizing urban public space that are related to the structural properties of their everyday life contexts.

In this framework, the review of women's social position in Turkish society, provided in the first part of Chapter Two, portrays the structural contextualization of meanings and conceptions of urban public spaces from a historical perspective, starting from Ottoman times to today. Because migration cannot be seen only as a flow of people from one country to another, but a complex process of place-making and re-identification, this review helps us to understand many of the characteristic features of Turkish immigrant women in Dutch society. Depicted within the broader framework of the changing social dynamics of Turkish society from imperial regulations to the modernization of cultural norms and values, from family structure to social-cultural orientation, Turkish women's past experiences, meanings and conceptions of publicness and privateness, as manifested with regard to habits of use, social norms and codes, and social practices give us the portrayal of Turkish immigrant women's habitus. In that sense, the interviews quoted in the text showed peculiar traces of past meanings and conceptions of spatial relations.

The significance of contexts and the social relations within, particularly social ties, networks and processes have been seen as significant by relational analysts in describing differences and varieties between social groups and their social behavior. By adopting the relational approach, Turkish immigrant women are seen as active social actors constructing and reconstructing urban public spaces based on their own realities and meanings, derived from the conflicts and coalitions of appropriating the urban public space. The relational approach enables us to unfold the frames of references in which Turkish women place and re-place themselves and others in a variety of public spaces in the city. Through their social relations, constructed, laid down,

interacting with another, decaying, and renewing in their everyday lives, Turkish women identify urban public spaces differently and appropriate them accordingly.

To further elaborate on Turkish women's spatial behavior in urban public space, a two-layered analysis was followed, focusing on their social networks, the habitus of social interactions, and the qualities of the relationships in which spatial behavior is embedded. The first analysis covered the categorical description of Turkish women in appropriation of urban public spaces in relation to different activities and different spheres of life and the characteristics important for them. The second part of the analysis focused on the relational contexts in which Turkish women are embedded that influence their spatial practices and the spatial reflections of these contextualities, where social networks are articulated as spatial associations that Turkish women make in their daily lives in urban public spaces and manifested in patterns of appropriation of different scales of urban public spaces. Here, the competence of Turkish women's habitus and habitat is reflected in variety of patterns of appropriation of urban public spaces. In this framework, the urban public space can be portrayed as a network of places of attachments/detachments, participation/withdrawal, and interaction/retreat, where the struggles and contestation over appropriation of public space are manifested.

Categories of Turkish Immigrant Women and Use of Urban Public Spaces

Categories of Turkish immigrant women reflect socially negotiated boundaries of their contextual and relational involvements as embedded in the urban public space. While the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion are constructed, they at the same time start to work as social identification, not only for Turkish women, but also in our perception of them. These identifications facilitate social attachments and approval, as it is in participation and involvement and also social detachment and refusal, avoidance and separation. They at the same time signify 'a sense of place', and 'a sense of the place of others', the habitus.

Before starting the last discussion on categories, it should be mentioned that these categories can be grouped in two sets. The first set of categories of Turkish women, starting from lifecycle (generations) and socio-economic (income and education) position, religious affiliation and orientations, and cultural orientations related to the use of language and media and frequency of travels to Turkey, portray an analysis of social categorization on the basis of individual social characteristics, while the second set, such as the social networks of Turkish immigrant women in an anthropological sense and the culture of housing, depict an analysis of social categorization on the basis of relational characteristics.

To start with, generational categories are to a large extent related to their role inventories and related social domains. The least differentiated role inventories are found in the first generation and marriage immigrants, compared to the second and third generation. Though migration history and personal qualifications, such as education and occupation, make differences in their role repertoires, the social lives

of the first generation and marriage-immigrants are subsumed to a large extent in the domains of household and kinship. Their lack of Dutch language skills, insufficient social and spatial knowledge limits them to the household domain. On the other hand, it should be stated that in the long run, marriage-immigrants are more likely to emerge from this domain and differentiate their role repertoires. Their initiative senses in the establishment of and participation in women organizations and willingness to achieve higher spatial mobility engender new opportunities. The social domains related to the role repertoires of the second generation are more differentiated than those of the first two, yet in the long run, they are embraced more and more into the domain of kinship, the Turkish community in Enschede, especially due to the on-going family formation process of export brides and grooms. They, together with their partners, are eventually drawn into the Turkish community and lose their previous relations with the broader society. For the third generation, the process is more or less the same as that of the second generation. The older they get, the more they are exposed to the traditional social codes of the community, yet they to a certain extent challenge these structures. Income and education, as socio-economic categories, influence the conceptual framework of participation in the urban public space. Due to their low economic profile, many activities are difficult for them to afford. Educational attainment makes a difference in terms of the possession of cultural capital, as the education level, as well as the command of language, increases, so does involvement in cultural activities, like going to the cinema and the theatre.

Religious categories reflect themselves in a variety of ways in terms of using, experiencing, and appropriating urban public space. Religious sects, Alevi and Sunni, appear as dividing field inside the Turkish community. Interestingly, the political reflections of these divisions are more influential than the division itself and are more pronounced by the second and third generations and marriage-immigrants. The Alevi and Sunni division is exposed mainly in the ethno-religious organizations and their activities. Another categorical difference is made in relation to language, media, and travel to Turkey, as a sign of orientations to Dutch or Turkish society. They also imply transnational-contextual exposure. Together with religious affiliation, they form a social context, a frame of reference that is effective in ways that Turkish women's spatial attitudes and behaviors are formed.

Categories of Turkish women's personal networks are important as sets of relational links – both strong and weak – through which Turkish women are able to gain access to material resources such as getting help with daily chores, but more importantly, these personal networks embody and express social worlds through which local knowledge flows, framing how people think and give value. Turkish women's relational webs are important in a way that symbolic and social boundaries of conceptions of the public and the private are constructed socially and embraced within them. The sub-categories of encapsulated, isolated, segregated and integrated social networks form the relational contexts within which Turkish immigrant women are imbued. As characteristics of appropriating urban public spaces, while encapsulated are more place-bound and therefore territorially sensitive, segregated are context-bound and they are familiarity sensitive. Anonymity can only be valued by the

integrated. Discussed in detail in Chapter Seven, these relational contexts highly influence the relational construction of boundaries and of the habitus, how different Turkish women understand themselves, others, and their places both in the Turkish community and broader Dutch society.

Categories of Turkish women's culture of housing give clues about congruence: how urban public spaces, especially related to the home cluster and neighborhood, work in relation to their habituses. By comparing the spatial practices of the inhabitants of inner-city, post-war, and suburban/peripheral neighborhoods, the characteristics of use, experience and appropriation were addressed in relation to some of the categories described above. The preference of a specific habitat is found to be more related to the life stage and personal networks. Life-stage is important in a way that proximity to the family and friends, familiarity to the neighborhood, and limited opportunities of spatial mobility for the maintenance of the daily chores make first generation women prefer a certain habitat, whereas for the second generation, comfortable accommodation for her family is the only criteria. Though statistically further needs to be proven, the relative dispersal of second and marriage immigrants in the new social housing areas in the suburban/peripheral neighborhoods can be described on this basis, contrary to the concentration and long tenancy of the first generation in the post-war neighborhoods. On the other hand, personal networks are decisive for the preference of habitat, as especially the encapsulated first generation sticks to place-bound relations.

These categorical differences articulated in the relational constructions of urban public spaces mark the boundaries of 'who belong together', 'we', the private and 'who does not belong to us', 'they', and the public. The boundaries enacted in these categories are either malleable or lasting, depending on the related contextual references, yet Turkish women's specific spatial practices are to a certain extent engendered in the contextual and relational involvements as embedded in these categories.

Relational Contexts and Spatial Practice

In relation to the discussions above, categories of Turkish women provide us with a basis for identifying the relational contexts within which they are embedded. These relational contexts embody and express their social world, their social identifications and spatial associations. The kind and nature of Turkish women's social networks, especially relative valorization of the primary or secondary relations in the everyday life, are significant in their appropriation patterns of urban public spaces. In this framework, their social relations are depicted with regard to the orientations to *Gemeinschaft*-like and *Gesellschaft*-like associations. Of particular attention is given to the relations leading to *Gemeinschaft*-like associations.

The valorization of primary relations in the everyday domains of the family, peer, and women's organizations demonstrates the degree of Turkish immigrant women's involvement in and commitment to the *Gemeinschaft*-like associations, family and kinship relations and Turkish community. On the basis of this, four

subsequent and interrelated reflections on the spatial practices and particularly on the use and appropriation of urban public spaces can be identified. First of all, the supremacy of primary relations implies restrictions in spatial conceptualizations. Second, in relation to the first one, the limitations of spatial conceptualizations lead to individuals alienated from city living and avoiding the experience of being in public. Third, anonymity cannot be achieved in a social setting where everyone is connected to each other. Perceiving everybody in public as a potential significant other, social control is felt in every place; therefore, as the fourth, intimacy and familiarity become highly valued spatial qualities. Thus, the supremacy of Turkish women's primary relations are found to be restrictive in conceptualization and appropriation, alienating and discarding anonymity from the experience of urban public spaces. It facilitates the durable restrictive traditions of the appropriation of urban public space; the power relations of gender, roles, and community prevail in Enschede.

However, the supremacy of primary relations can offer opportunities, as discussed in detail in Chapter Seven in the case of the participation in women's organizations. First generation and marriage-immigrant Turkish women can only come out from the private domain and engage a public activity via these organizations. Thus, these organizations are the only available medium for participation in social life in the Netherlands. In that sense, it can be argued that although all of their social relations are with significant others and primary in character, this gives them the only opportunity to interact beyond their primary relations, offering them to stage in the public. Since, the primary group-oriented women engage in every activity as a cohesive group, they discover the city together. Their experience of public spaces is strongly introverted, as in the cases of group picnics in the parks or their participation in the activities in the organizations. Thus, the role and influence of women's organizations is crucial in a sense that they govern the interaction between Turkish immigrant women and the public. The formation of a community of disclosures or enclosures, to a certain extent, is dependent on these organisations' social, cultural, and political standpoints, controlling information and interaction.

Gemeinschaft-like relations lead mainly two kinds of spatial associations. First, enabling 'we' identifications, 'our' public spaces become differentiated from 'their' public spaces, arousing positive territoriality (for those who are in control) concerns such as home feeling, positive imagination and place attachment, as well as negative ones (for those who feel they are controlled) such as avoidance, retreat, and lack of social acceptance. Second, the more Turkish women are involved in Gemeinschaft-like relations, the more they seek private and semi-private/semi-public characteristics. Familiarity in that sense becomes the most desired quality of the urban public space. These two spatial associations to a certain extent work together, such as whether familiarity can be place-based or formed on the basis of excessive-primary relationships; it helps Turkish women form positive territorial feelings in the shape of constructive representations and affirmative place attachments. At the same time familiarity provides the basis for exploring urban public space through tactics and strategies, developed for appropriating it.

On the other hand, the abundance of secondary contacts promotes social interaction with others and leads Turkish immigrant women to question and challenge the traditions and social and cultural codes that their community brought when they migrated. They see urban public spaces as settings where they can have more interactions, and seek their new identities. In that sense, they are able to negotiate the norms and values of both the Turkish and Dutch sides with the community. As income and education levels increase, they easily can act as articulate consumers. The use of public space becomes instrumental. Regular contact with strangers in public enables them to develop familiarities and to increase a sense of belonging.

Gemeinschaft-like or Gessellschaft-like associations also have strong implications for Turkish women in their housing preferences, their choices of neighborhoods, and their culture of housing. As mentioned earlier, those who have encapsulated personal networks have certain preferences for habitat where they can live with the same-kind-of Turks (same age, income, and political orientations,) and favor strongly the existence of Turkish elements (a mosque for Turks or even better, for the inhabitants of that housing cluster). On the other hand, strong orientations to particular neighborhoods due to social characteristics, such as first generation-low economic profile Turks in the northern neighborhoods, and second generation-social climbers in the southern neighborhoods, refer to more or less similar habituses. In that sense, the habitat and habitus are interwoven.

Experiencing the Everyday Urban Public Space

Experiences in the everyday urban public spaces reflect the close relationship between habitus and habitat. As argued in Chapter Four, if habitat is conceived as peculiar ways of habitation, manners of use and appropriation of urban space, then in relation to the analysis of the daily experiences of Turkish immigrant women, habitus can be seen as governing framework of spatial interactions. Turkish immigrant women's experiences expose different constructions of urban public space and reflect inclusive or exclusive spatial practices, and as such, they reveal the spatiality of social identifications. It is argued that the characteristics of social identifications in different scales of urban public spaces show the interplay between various forms and the nature of urban public spaces, various forms of constructions of publicness and privateness, and more importantly how difference and order in the city are constructed by spatial practices.

Home refers to habitualized practices and places of conformity and manipulation. The home environment and home territories represent the strongest form of claim that Turkish women make over public space, from the part of casual daily encounters to determining the properness of space, from privatized family use to specific gender practices. Since claims are staged openly, it is the place of interaction. In that sense, the home environment and home territories offer opportunities and possibilities for social interaction, mainly because they are in control. These spaces are extremely important for first generation and newcomers among the marriage-immigrants.

In the neighborhood, while claims over public space are not as strong as the home, it can be seen, as in the case of potential urban villagers, as an extension of the home. Since knowledge about the public space is still high, at least manageable, there is a room for appropriation. The neighborhood, in that sense, represents familiar practices and places of rituals. It should be noted that for those whose social networks are place-bound, such as encapsulated peers, as discussed in Chapter Seven, there exist quite porous boundaries between publicness and privateness. When everyone is a significant other, there is no room for being in the public as an experience. A step down from claiming the urban public space, the larger neighborhood is the place where Turkish women start negotiating with the public, through tactics for appropriating it (at particular times) and strategies for exercising their presence (in the peripheral locations of the city centre). In order to negotiate the urban public space, they look upon public spaces where the process of 'othering' is under-represented. The urban public space then becomes a place of shallow improvisations and contestation. In that sense, as they become more literate in spatial codes and social conduct and as familiarity grows, they start to challenge and contest the boundaries of dominant-subordinated, insider-outsider, and they-we. It should be noted that particularly the second generation and marriage-immigrant women with differentiated role repertoires are able to (and willing to) command these negotiations in urban public space. Although Turkish women who have closed social networks and single roles are represented in backstage places like home and home territories, propinquity, physical proximity with rising familiarity, enables them to start negotiating.

These aforementioned experiences of urban public space are closely related to accommodation in the urban public space. When urban public space is experienced as place to stay, then urban public space becomes an arena of tensions and struggles, taking place along the lines between participation and withdrawal, attachment and detachment, belongingness and dis-belongingness. The creation of home territories and appropriation of traveling packs are then strategies to deal with the contested nature of the urban public space. Yet this accommodation based description/experience does not embrace other forms and degrees of publicness and privateness can be found in the urban public space, such as, as discussed in Chapter Eight, the use of the private car. These moving private capsules do also reflect certain characteristics of the habitus, yet it is difficult to recognize the relationship with the habitat. A connection can be made with regard to routines, as the routines are closely related to the construction of spatial knowledge and acquisition of spatial literacy.

Another reflection of habitus governing spatial interactions is in Turkish women's spatial preferences and performances in the city center. Analyzed in relation to the dominant spatial practices of other users, Turkish women's spatial behavior patterns in the city center portray the ability of their habitus to decipher and interpret the necessary information (scripts and local knowledge) for social interaction in order to navigate in the two specific spatial contexts. These two contexts reflect different patterns and kinds of spatial interaction, within which tensions between familiar vs. extemporaneous relations convey discrediting spatial meanings. As Turkish women's experiences in these two public spaces in Enschede center expose different construc-

tions of urban public space, they at the same time reveal the spatiality of their habitus, manifested in the spatial practices related to involvement and disengagement.

Having analyzed Turkish immigrant women's conceptions and experiences in urban public spaces in Enschede, this study challenges the contemporary image of simplistic public space into a polyvocal/multivalent description of the ways people use and interact in public space. Understanding users' conceptualizations and interpretations of urban public space also can be seen as a potential for accommodating social exchange and social relations between them and other groups. These conceptualizations and interpretations establish the bases of the nature of social interactions, leading to participation or withdrawal, and at the same time, are grounded in previous social interactions have taken place in urban public spaces. Thus, a mutual understanding of processes of interpretations and interaction is needed.

Turkish women's use and experiences of urban public spaces in Enschede in general are not inclusive and facilitative for interacting with others in public, but are not totally exclusionary, turning them into a Turkish space as well. There are kinds and degrees of participation and withdrawal for each group in each urban public space, as discussed throughout the study. In that sense, insight into the spatial patterns of appropriating different urban public spaces can offer a basis for social cohesion and integration. When urban public spaces are evoked as networks of spaces with different qualities and natures of social interaction, it is possible to identify the strategies and contexts with and in which policy makers and designers take action.

Concluding Notes

Although the significance of urban public spaces is acknowledged by planners, designers and urban policy makers, the users' perspective has received little attention. To a large extent, urban public spaces are conceived of as mere containers of activities and people. Immigrants, if not seen as marginal and disadvantaged, are often regarded as a group with a unique culture, comprising all the members of the group. As such, their avoidance of, participation in, withdrawal from and placement in urban public spaces are evaluated as a cultural characteristic. However, looking at Turkish women's particular ways of using, experiencing, and appropriating everyday urban public spaces from a relational view allows us to see the beyond the activities engaged. It reveals the diversity of Turkish immigrant women's spatial practices, formed in different relational contexts.

This study opens a new framework on Turkish immigrant women, arguing the dynamic relational process of constructing spaces, based on their own meanings, articulations, and representations of social identification and spatial attachments. The emphasis is on the active work of conceiving and interpreting the social relations through which Turkish women create and transform urban public space. The everyday life perspective provides more focus on what living in a place means (Healey, 1998). In that sense, the study of Turkish women's conceptions of everyday public

spaces provides planners and policy makers with deeper knowledge on not only how these women think about, use and value their living spaces, but also, and more importantly, how they 'flourish', i.e. how they define, express, and utilize their rights and needs while creating and transforming spaces. Therefore, 'potential' public spaces, those constructed by planners from above within certain social and cultural conditions, may become 'effective' public spaces (Gans, 1968).

For planners and policy makers the everyday life and relational view offer new ways of thinking about urban life and how inhabitants do live. Seen from a planning perspective, it is important to realize the relevance of everyday spaces of the housing cluster or neighborhood in peoples' daily lives. Rather than positioning them in dual relationships of periphery/centre, commerce/recreation, public/private, indoor/outdoor, and so forth, planners need to understand the meaning of urban public spaces for users as a continuum of spheres, activities, people, social relations and representations. With the focus of socially constructed public space and small scale everyday spaces, the relational approach also can give new insights into the understanding of the processes of social exclusion and cohesion.

In the urban public space, there exist infinite territories of withdrawals and involvement and of detachments and attachments. In that sense, exclusion and cohesion cannot be seen as two polar entities; the process of exclusion may be inherent in the process of social cohesion. As this study shows, for Turkish immigrant women, there exist spaces of interaction and spaces of retreat, in relation to their relational contexts in the urban public space. As Hajer and Reijndorp (2001) state, experiences in the public domain are in fact related to entering the parochial domain of 'others'. The experiences of being in public intervene deeply in our relational constructions of 'private' and 'public', i.e., social identification and representations of 'we' and 'they.' The relational contexts are therefore decisive in how far one would like to be a part of it.



ENDNOTES

Chapter 2

- 1 Some scholars argue that the position of Turkish women in the early periods of the Ottoman Empire was different than in later periods. They emphasize that because of the specific geography of the Ottoman Empire, many cultural and social traditions, which were already present in the quite dispersed regions of the Empire, had mingled and formed the complex system of the Ottoman tradition. Also see Yerasimos, 1996; Caha, 1993.
- 2 The Ottomans were deeply influenced by the Byzantine social structure, which was based on a rigid class society and the women who belonged to the ruling class and lived in cities, were secluded in the Harem, a practice already observed in the Muslim Umayyad and Abbasid empires, as well as the non-Muslim Persian state (Caha, 1993).
- 3 These primary schools were called '*sübyan mektebi*' (school for children) and girls in these schools were given mainly a religious education and a limited amount of the science of their time. They could have education together with male students or separately in schools particular to females.
- 4 When the Westernists triumphed in the first decade of the twentieth century, women in Istanbul abandoned their veils and went into the streets. Caha (1993) quotes from Bernard Caporal: "after the proclamation of *Mesrutiyet*, women took red-white flags and pennants and marched into the streets of Istanbul shouting 'long live the country, long live freedom', and 'long live the nation' " (Caha, 1993, p. 107).
- 5 For the discussion of the tension between modern and traditional as the civilized and the uncivilized, see 'Kemalism: The civilizing mission' (Chapter 3) in Göle, N. (1996) *The forbidden modern*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- 6 More girls than boys tend to stop their education after they complete the elementary school education (41.9% and 23.9%, respectively). Among those between the ages 6-14, 15.9% of girls and 9.9% of the boys fail to attend school, and this reaches 40% for girls and 27.3% for boys at the age of fourteen. This female-to-male ratio of 0.97 in primary school (51.5% and 53.2%, respectively) drops to 0.6 in middle school, 0.68 in high school, and 0.51 in university. In universities, men tend to study engineering and law (the female-to-male ratio is 0.31 and 0.43, respectively) and women tend to study arts, humanities, educational sciences, and medicine and health (the female-to-male ratio is 1.15, 0.81, 0.76, and 0.76, respectively). (SIS, 1995)
- 7 In 1976, 70% of women in the paid-employment labor were employed in only three sectors: health, education, and communication (Erman, 2003).
- 8 Education level is an important factor in women's participation in the labor force. In 1997, in the cities 10.6% of primary school graduates participated in the labor force, whereas 72.2% of university graduates did (Erman, 2003).
- 9 Viewing the bride is part of the pre-marriage arrangements. Female family members of the groom, also called match-makers, visit the family of the bride candidate, and if they think that the girl is suitable for the family, then both families arrange the marriage. Tekeli (1995) cites from PIAR (1989) research that 48.1% of couples were married by a match-maker.

- 10 While Patriarchal Extended Family is composed of a man and his wife, their married son(s) and wife(s) with their child(ren), and/or unmarried son(s)/daughter(s) of household head, Transient Extended Family consists of a man, who is the household head, his wife and his unmarried child(ren) live together with either the man's or his wife's widowed parent(s) and/or their unmarried sibling(s).
- 11 Non-private in this context is not used to connote 'public'. Since all land was owned by the Sultan, people had only rights for appropriation for their private uses.
- 12 Traditional public resorts and picnic grounds
- 13 Germany signed a contract with Turkey to recruit guest workers in 1961, after which date, other European countries like Austria, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Belgium, agreed to employ foreign labor from Turkey. Although, there are no data available on the specific characteristics of the guest workers in different host countries, from the interviews and personal accounts, it can be stated that the occupational (educational and employment experience) characteristics of the guest workers who went to Germany were quite different from those who went to the Netherlands, Belgium, and France. In Germany, many of the Turks were recruited according to their level of education and occupation in order to work in the highly technological industrial sectors, whereas in the Netherlands, for instance, the major demand for Turkish guest workers came from sectors, such as textile, which do not necessitate skilled labor.
- 14 Turks who wanted to work in the Netherlands could register themselves in the employment offices in their area of origin or in the area where they were working in Turkey. Until 1970, companies, which had difficulties in finding labor in the Netherlands, could also self-recruit. If a company had found workers from a certain area, then it would look for the other workers in the same area. This was also related to the acquaintances of the old-recruits, or family members and relatives. After 1970, the recruitment process became harder and also due to (in relation to) the duration of the registration. While the waiting lists in the Turkish employment offices become longer – in some cases, waiting times could last several years-, many people chose to go to the Netherlands with tourist visas. Then, this 'tourist' way became an important migration channel. They had help from their friends, relatives, and acquaintances especially to find work and housing. They were often called *kwartiermakers* because they often worked in very low-paid, low-security, and mostly illegal jobs. In 1974, the Dutch government decided to stop the recruitment of foreign workers (Van der Wal and Tax, 1999, pp. 19-20).
- 15 Formal guest workers were the ones who went to abroad through official recruitment offices.
- 16 Women guest workers had been analyzed in terms of their position in the labor force (Paine, 1974, cited in Erder Köksal, 1993).
- 17 At this point, I use the term 'offspring' broadly, for those who have either migrated with the family or were born in the host country.
- 18 There are many research institutes established in order to analyze the segregation patterns of Turks in European cities. The book of Van Kempen and Ozuekren (1997) provides extensive research and bibliography on the urban segregation and housing of Turkish immigrants in Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Sweden, Switzerland, and France.
- 19 Tillaart's data are based on the registrations of the *Kamer van Koophandel* (Dutch Chamber of Commerce). During the registration process, only the place of birth is asked, not the ethnic origin; therefore, data only present the entrepreneurship of first generation immigrants. On the other hand, based on personal impression, it is still possible that Turks may form the biggest group, yet not extensive as that in other European countries, such as Germany.
- 20 For more information, see Doomernik, 1995.

Chapter 3

- 1 *Ulema* is the body of religion scholars who are the interpreters of Islamic doctrines and laws and the chief guarantors of continuity in the spiritual and intellectual history of the Islamic community.
- 2 Nevertheless, Hagerstrand has been criticized for leaving aside questions like how and why certain social projects and their characteristic constraints become hegemonic, and why certain social relations dominate others (Harvey, 1991).

Chapter 5

- 1 Most Dutch towns were founded at strategic points, near castles, at road or river crossings, or on high ground near the sea in the course of the Middle Ages. Depending on their location and original function, researchers distinguish Dutch towns, for example, dike-towns, seaports, river-towns, bastides, and high-ground towns (Peters & Brugmans 1909-1912 and Burke 1956, cited in Alkhoven, 1993). Enschede can be characterized as a fortified border town.
- 2 The Housing Act was passed in Parliament in 1901, and came into effect in 1902.
- 3 Pillarization can be described as a peculiar Dutch approach involving the mutual presence of several religious, linguistic, and social cleavages. Being largely effective before the WWII and in the 1950s, 'pillarized' society was based on religion and ideology as central social determinants, shaping every aspect of social life (Rath, et al. 1999). Pillars had operated separately from each other and established their own social institutions, such as their own places of worship, schools, hospitals, sports clubs, political parties, and newspapers.
- 4 *Wooneenheid* is an ensemble of housing units within the neighborhood and in social and city planning terms, an iterable unit, composed of different housing forms, such as low-rise, row-houses, or housing for old people, for households in different demographic characteristics, old, single, and families with children. This *wooneenheid* is the basis of the design of the neighborhood (Van der Cammen and De Klerk, 2003).
- 5 The *brink*, according to Van Dale dictionary, has two meanings. The first one is the grass-yielding yard around a farmer's house, and the second one is the name of the village square in the east Netherlands, a plain often circled with trees with a church in the middle. The design of brinks in Wesselerbrink is based on the latter.
- 6 *Woonerf*, literally meaning street for living, is primarily a design of traffic protected neighborhood.
- 7 Roombeek is a former working-class neighborhood from the early 1920s, which was completely devastated by a fireworks disaster in May, 2000.
- 8 I believe that these groups can be another study topic regarding to the public space phenomena.
- 9 The local municipal institution that is responsible for the distribution of social benefits.

Chapter 6

- 1 The year of 1980 is conceived of as the last year of official recruitment of guest workers from Turkey and the official end year of the family reunification process of the former guest workers. In addition, in September 1980, the Turkish army had taken over the government. Starting from 1980, because of the military coup, many Turks had requested political asylum from the Dutch government and later, Turks of Kurdish and other ethnic origins also asked for such asylum.

- 2 This term has recently been adopted with the necessity to categorize the growing number of Turks who came to the Netherlands as a result of marriages between Turks; one partner is coming from Turkey (further information, see Hooghiemstra, 2003).
- 3 This group consists of mainly children of the first generation Turkish immigrants, who came to the Netherlands between their sixth and eighteenth years of age.
- 4 This group consists of Turkish immigrants the ones who came to the Netherlands before their sixth years of age or were born in the Netherlands.
- 5 In the Dutch context, the term 'marriage-immigrants' is used particularly to refer new immigrants from Turkey and Morocco, unless otherwise stated.
- 6 Not all of the third generation was born in the Netherlands. Three out of the six were born in Turkey, because of their parents' wish for them to be born in their homeland.
- 7 *Döner* is a specific Turkish meal.
- 8 In the population censuses in Turkey, religious affiliation is never asked, therefore, there are no statistical data available. The Alevi population is estimated to range between 10% to as much as 40% of the total population.
- 9 In the following chapters, I employ the term 'religious' only for Sunnis, and specify Alevis by their name.
- 10 Alter ego is used in psychology to refer to someone so perfectly sharing the views, intentions, and tastes of another that he/she can be regarded as that other's second self, an inseparable friend (Websters Dictionary).
- 11 *Hemşehrilik* is a concept that implies a tie presumed to exist between people from the same village, town, province, and in some cases, the same region. The direct English translation is same-townsmanship.
- 12 In Turkey, these regular periodical meetings are very common. Woman chooses a day (for example, every first Wednesday of the month, every 10th of the month) and receives guests at home.
- 13 Unless otherwise stated, I refer to neighborhoods that are built before 1980 in the suburban/peripheral areas in Enschede with a high degree of Turkish population, such as Wesselerbrink and Stroinkslanden.
- 14 Suryoyo's are generally considered as Syrian-Orthodox Turks, who were living in the South-eastern Anatolia and North Syria. Because of the political problems and instability in these regions, they immigrated to Europe during the first Gulf War, the first half of the 1990s. Later, problems have arisen between them and Turkish guest-worker immigrants mainly related to the separatist ethnicity concerns in Turkey.

Chapter 7

- 1 Although *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* are German words and translated to English as community and society respectively, I prefer to use the original terms.
- 2 At the time this research was conducted, Enschede had three active Turkish women's organizations: Çağrı and İlkadım under SIVE and OTIVO. SIVE (*Stichting Internationaal Vrouwen centrum Enschede*) is an umbrella organization of several immigrant women organizations, founded in 1999 to increase foreign women's participation in Dutch society. Another organization, OTIVO (*Overijsselse Turks-Islamitische Vrouwen Organisatie*, was initiated by the *Diyanet* mosque administration, who was asked by a Dutch alderman of the Enschede municipality about the absence of women in the mosques and formal religious activities. In 1997, the organization was established mainly to help the first generation women manage their daily lives when they are old. OTIVO distinguishes itself from SIVE by saying that they are more liberated, though both of them belong to Sunni religious sect. The members of OTIVO have known each other for a long time, and are either relatives or

neighbors. There was also an Alevi women organization in the very early phases of my research in Enschede. However, later the Alevi organization told that they had stopped the activities of the women's organization, since there were few participants and gender segregation is not practiced formally among Alevis, they are not in favor of a separate women organization. On the other hand, they underline the need for a broader community (although not specifying Alevi or Sunni) organization.

- 3 Anonymous name
- 4 *Stichting Educatieve Ondersteuning Medulla*, for example helps Turkish children with their homework on the weekends, Saturday for girls and Sunday for boys.
- 5 Pseudonym used for the city centre in Turkish, refers mainly to commercial activities for daily chorus.

Chapter 8

- 1 I use this classification for illustrative purposes. Depending on the subject or research area, these classifications can be diverse, for example, a social psychologist may prefer to start from the body and mind as the ultimate private space. On the other hand, in another study, the most public space may extend to the nation, and even the world.
- 2 Squatter settlements are called *gecekondu* in Turkey. The name connotes 'built in one night'. The structures are built illegally, on private or public land, and often by inhabitants who have migrated from the same villages or regions. They have an organic spatial pattern in an environment of scattered free-standing houses that are poorly constructed. Today, it is estimated that more than 40% of the housing stock in the biggest cities in Turkey are gecekondu. For more information, see Erman, 1998, 2001a, 2001b; Şenyapılı 1981; Karpas, 1976.
- 3 The neighborhood Velve-Lindenhof came into a nation-wide attention in the late 90s with the 'Miro-rellen', a civic unrest. Despite the social programs came into effect, the neighborhood has still a bad reputation mainly caused by high rates of unemployment and crime than other working-class neighborhoods.
- 4 Although there are no data available to trace Turkish enclaves in the neighborhoods of Enschede, as well as those of other Dutch cities, from the interviews, it seems that there are clusters of Turkish groups that are quite differentiated in terms of place of origin, religious affairs, and orientations. For example, the respondents point out specific locations in neighborhoods as distinctive social worlds and images; the community of a religious trait with their own secret mosque, the street where women suffer excessive social control, the cluster of inhabitants from a same province in Turkey.
- 5 Anonymous name
- 6 Tuesdays are exceptional, because of the market, even though the market resides in another part of the center. Since Enschede is located in the German border, the city attracts many Germans especially during the market days.
- 7 The café Penny in late 2001 became a place of dispute, when the security guard refused a Turkish man service in the café, saying that he violated the dress code. After the incident, the café was protested by foreigners and the management was accused of discrimination.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abadan-Unat, N.
2002 *Bitmeyen göç*, University of Bilgi Publications, Istanbul.
- Abu-Lughod, J.
1968 'The city is dead, long live the city; Some thoughts on urbanity', in S.F. Fava (ed) *Urbanism in a world perspective: A reader*, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, pp. 154-165.
- Abu-Lughod, J.
1993 'The Islamic city: Historic myth, Islamic essence, and contemporary relevance', in H. Amirahmadi & S. El-Shakhs (eds) *Urban development in the Muslim world*, Centre for Urban Policy Research, New Jersey, pp. 11-36.
- Acar, F.
1995 'Women and Islam in Turkey', in S. Tekeli (ed) *Women in modern Turkish society: A reader*, Zed Books, London, pp. 46-65.
- Akkent, M.
1995 'Foreword: A necessary correction', In S. Tekeli (ed) *Women in modern Turkish society: A reader*, Zed Books, London, pp. vii-xi.
- Akpınar, A.
2003 'The honour/shame complex revisited: Violence against women in the migration context', *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 26, n. 5, pp. 425 - 442.
- Alkhoven, P.
1993 *The Changing Image of the City: A Study of the Transformation of the Townscape Using Computer-Aided Architectural Design and Visualization Techniques: A Case Study: Heusden*, PhD dissertation online, University of Utrecht Library, Digital Publications.
- Ambert, A.M., P.A. Adler, P. Adler, & D.F. Detzner
1995 'Understanding and evaluating qualitative research', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 57, n. 4, pp. 879-893.
- Amirahmadi, H. & M.R. Razavi
1993 'Urban development in the Muslim world, encounter with modernity and implications for planning' in H. Amirahmadi & S. El-Shakhs (eds) *Urban development in the Muslim world*, Center for Urban Policy Research, New Jersey, pp. 1-10.
- Anderson, E.
1990 *Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Appadurai, A.
1996 *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Arat, Z.F.
1998 'Introduction: Politics of representation and identity', in Z.F. Arat (ed) *Deconstructing images of the Turkish woman*, St. Martin's Press, New York, pp. 1-34.

- Arendt, H.
1958 'The public realm: The common', (reprinted) In N. Glazer & M. Lilla (eds) (1987) *The public face of architecture: Civic culture and public spaces*, Free Press, New York, pp. 5-12.
- Aslanoğlu-Evyapan, G.
1993 'The effects of the 'Park Movement' in Istanbul towards the end of the nineteenth century', in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Conservation of Urban Squares and Parks*, May 12-15, 1993. Montreal. pp. 38-40.
- Atkinson, R. & J. Flint
2001 'Accessing hidden and hard-to-reach populations: Snowball research strategies', *Social Research Update*, vol. 33, retrieved from:
<http://www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/sru/SRU33.html> (06.05.2005)
- Augé, M.
1995 *Non-places: Introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity*, Verso, New York.
- Barth F.
1969 *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference*, Universitetsforlaget, Bergen.
- Bahrtdt, H.P.
1961 'Public activity and private activity as basic forms of city association' in R.L. Warren (ed) *New perspectives on the American community*, third edition (1977), Rand Mc Nally College Publishing, Chicago, pp. 25-32.
- Bassey, M.
1981 'Pedagogic research: On the relative merits of search for generalisation and study of single events', *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 7, n. 1, pp. 73-94.
- Baum, H.S.
2000 'Culture matters – but it shouldn't matter too much' in M.A. Burayidi (ed) *Urban planning in a multicultural society*, Greenwood, Westport, pp. 115-136.
- Beauregard, R. A.
1993 *Voices of decline: The postwar fate of US cities*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Benn, S.I. & G.F. Gaus
1983 *Public and private in social life*, Croom Helm, London.
- Bentley, I., A. Alcock, P. Murrain, S. McGlynn & G. Smith
1987 *Responsive environments*, The Architectural Press, London.
- Blokland, T.
2000 'Unravelling three of a kind: Cohesion, community and solidarity', *The Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences* vol. 36, n. 1, pp. 56-70.
2003 *Urban Bonds*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Blokland, T. & M. Savage
2001 'Networks, class, and place', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 25, n. 2, pp. 221-226.
- Bodaar, A. & Rath, J.
2005 'Cities, Diversity, and Public Space', *Metropolis World Bulletin*, n.5, pp. 3-5. Retrieved from:
http://www.international.metropolis.net/research-policy/World/World%20Bulletin_vol5_e.pdf (19.11.2005)
- Bollerey, F.
1993 'Preface' in H. de Mare & A. Vos (eds), *Urban rituals in Italy and the Netherlands*, Van Gorcum, Assen, pp. 1-4.
- Bolt, G.
2001 'Turken en Marokkanen over concentratiebuurten: eindbestemming of tussenstation?', *Migrantenstudies* n. 4, pp. 226-245.

- Bonacker, M.
1982 'The social community of immigrants' in J. Friedrichs (ed) *Spatial disparities and social behaviour, a reader in urban research*, Christians Verlag, Hamburg, pp. 102-113.
- Bondi, L.
1998 'Gender, class, and urban space: Public and private space in contemporary urban landscapes', *Urban Geography*, vol. 19, n. 2, pp.160-185.
2005 'Gender and the reality of cities: Embodied identities, social relations and perform-activities', online paper, retrieved from:
<http://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/1842/822/1/lbondio02.pdf> (02.11.2005)
- Boomkens, R.
1999 "Van de grote stad ging een onbestemde dreiging uit" Hoe grootstedelijk is Nederland? in R. van der Wouden (ed) *De stad op straat*, Sociale en Culturele Studies-27, the Hague, pp. 63-80.
- Bourdieu, P.
1986 *Distinction; a social critique of the judgement of taste*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
1989 'Social Space and Symbolic Power', *Sociological Theory*, vol. 7, n. 1, pp. 14-25.
1990 *The logic of practice*, Stanford University Press, California.
1998 *Practical reason*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
2000 *Pascalian meditations*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
2005 'Habitus' in J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (eds) *Habitus: A sense of place*, second edition, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 43-49.
- Bourdieu, P. & J.D. Wacquant
1992 *An invitation to reflexive sociology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Bridge, G. & S. Watson (eds)
2000 *A companion to the city*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Burayidi, M.A. (ed)
2000 *Urban planning in a multicultural society*, Greenwood, Westport.
- Burgers, J.
2000 'Urban landscapes: On public space in the post-industrial city', *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* vol. 15, pp. 145-164.
- Burke, P.
1993 'Cities, spaces, and rituals in the early modern world', in H. de Mare & A. Vos (eds) *Urban rituals in Italy and The Netherlands*, Van Gorcum, Assen, pp. 29-38.
- Calhoun, C., E. Li Puma, & M. Postone, (eds)
1993 *Bourdieu: Critical perspectives*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Calhoun, C.
2000 "Pierre Bourdieu" in G. Ritzer (ed) *Social theorists of the twentieth century*, Blackwell, Cambridge, retrieved from:
www.ssrc.org/programs/calhoun/publications/pbritzer.doc (08.09.2003)
- Cammen, H. van der & L. de Klerk
2003 *Ruimtelijke ordening; van grachtengordel tot vinex-wijk*, Het Spectrum, Utrecht.
- Campbell, H.W.
2000 *Vrijetijdbesteding in Rotterdam; Vergelijkend onderzoek onder zes bevolkingsgroepen*, Studia Interethica Research, Rotterdam.
- Castells, M.
1993 'European cities, the informational society, and the global economy', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie /Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, vol. 84, pp. 247-257.
- Castles, S. & G. Kosack
1973 *Immigrant workers and class structure in Europe*. Oxford University Press, London.

- Carr, S., M. Francis, L.G. Rivlin, & A.M. Stone
1992 *Public space*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Centraal Bureau voor Statistiek (CBS)
2003 *Allochtonen in Nederland 2003*, CBS publications, Voorburg.
- Cerasi, M.M.
1999 *Osmanli Kenti*, Yapi Kredi Yayinlari, Istanbul.
- Coleman, J.
1988 'Social capital in the creation of human capital', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 94 pp. 95-120.
- Coleman, J.S.
1990 *Foundations of social theory*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Cooper Marcus, C. & C. Francis
1990 *People places: Design guidelines for urban open space*, van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.
- Coser, R.L.
1986 'Cognitive structure and the use of social space', *Sociological Forum*, v. 1, n. 1, pp. 1-26.
- Crawford, M.
1995 'Contesting the public realm, struggles over public space in Los Angeles', *Journal of Architectural Education*, vol. 49, n. 1, pp. 4-9.
1999 'Blurring the boundaries; Public space and private life' in J. Chase, M. Crawford & J. Kaliski (eds) *Everyday urbanism*, the Monacelli Press, New York, pp. 22-35.
- Cunningham, M.C. & D.F. Savoie
1975 'Is the piazza un-American? Its uses in Italian urban history', *Ekistics*, vol. 232, March, pp.172-176.
- Çağlar, A.S.
2001 'Constraining metaphors and the transnationalisation of spaces in Berlin', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 27, n. 4 (October 1), pp. 601 - 613.
- Çaha, O.
1993 *The role of women in the formation of civil society in post-1980 Turkey*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Dagevos, J., M. Gijsberts & C. van Praag (eds)
2003 *Rapportage minderheden: Onderwijs, arbeid, en sociaal-cultureel integratie*, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, the Hague.
- Davis, M.
1990 *City of Quartz*, Verso, New York.
- Day, K.
1999 'Introducing gender to the critique of privatized public space', *Journal of Urban Design*, vol. 4, n. 2, pp. 155-178.
2000 'The ethic of care and women's experiences of public space', *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, vol. 20, pp. 103-124.
- Deben, L. & P. Rings
1999 'Reglementering en disciplineren van het gebruik van de openbare ruimte', *Sociologische Gids*, v.3, pp. 245-256.
- De Certeau, M.
1984 *The practice of everyday life*, the University of California Press, Los Angeles.
- De Clercq, D.
2001 'Everyday public space in Matonge', *OASE*, vol. 54, pp. 63-84.

- De Mare, H.
 1993 'The domestic boundary as ritual area in seventeenth-century Holland' in H. de Mare & A. Vos (eds) *Urban rituals in Italy and The Netherlands*, Van Gorcum, Assen, pp. 108-131.
- Denzin, N.K.
 1970 *The research act: a theoretical introduction to sociological methods*, Aldine, Chicago.
- Denzin, N.K. & Y.S. Lincoln
 2000 *Handbook of qualitative research*, Sage Thousand Oaks, California.
 2003 'Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research' in N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds) *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*, second edition, Sage, California, pp. 1-45.
- Doevendans, K., J. Bestelieu & A. Schram
 2002 'Urbanism in the Netherlands, a track in metropolis', in *USO-Built Report Series*, n. 1, pp. 39-44, retrieved from:
www.uso.tue.nl/USO-Report-series/01-Lausanne_dec_2002.pdf (25.04.2005)
- Doomernik, J.
 1995 'State, politics, and Islamic institutions; Turks in the Netherlands and Germany' in S. Taji-Farouki (ed) *The Muslim communities project*, University of Durham Centre for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies, Durham, pp. 7-32.
- Dovey, K.
 2005 'The silent complicity of architecture' in J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (eds) *Habitus: A sense of place*, second edition. Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 283-296.
- Dummond, L.B.W.
 2000 'Street scenes: Practices of public and private space in urban Vietnam', *Urban Studies*, vol. 37, n. 12, pp. 2377-2391.
- Durakbaşı, A.
 1998 'Kemalism as identity politics in Turkey' in Z.F. Arat (ed) *Deconstructing images of 'the Turkish woman'*, St. Martin's Press, New York, pp. 139-155.
- Elias, N. & J.L. Scotson
 1994 *The established and the outsiders; a sociological enquiry into community problems*, Sage, London.
- Emirbayer, M.
 1997 'Manifesto for a relational sociology', *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 103, n. 2. (Sep., 1997), pp. 281-317
- Emmenegger, M.
 1997 'Everyday life of newly immigrated girls. Situations-places-actions. Extracts from a social-geographical study in Basel (Switzerland), in R. Camstra (ed) *Growing up in a changing urban landscape*, Van Gorcum, Assen, pp. 168-179.
- Erder Köksal, S.
 1993 'Uluslararası göç sürecinde kadının gündeme gelişi ve 'Getto'daki kadın', *Women's Studies Review*, n.1, pp.110-125.
- Erman, T.
 1997a 'Squatter (gecekondu) housing versus apartment housing: Turkish rural-to-urban migrant residents' perspectives', *Habitat International*, vol. 28, n.1, pp. 91-106.
 1997b 'The meaning of city living for rural migrant women and their role in migration: The case of Turkey', *Women Studies International Forum*, vol. 20, n. 2, pp. 263-273.
 1998 'Semi-public/semi-private spaces in the experience of Turkish women in a squatter settlement', *Stadtplanung*, special number "Symposium Migration und Öffentlicher Raum in Bewegung", n. 22, pp. 40-51.

- 2001a 'The politics of squatter (Gecekondu) studies in Turkey: The changing representations of rural migrants in the academic discourse', *Urban Studies*, vol. 38, n. 7, pp. 983-1002.
- 2001b 'Rural migrants and patriarchy in the city', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 25, n. 1, pp. 118-133.
- 2003 'Turkey' in L. Walter (ed) *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Women's issues worldwide, Europa*, Greenwood, Westport, pp. 671-706.
- Esveldt, I. & J. Traudes
 2001 *Kijk op en contacten met buitenlanders. Immigratie, integratie en interactie*, Werkdocumenten Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (WRR) -W 119, Den Haag.
- Fenster, T.
 1997 'Gender as cultural construction of space: The forbidden and the permitted', Gender Institute Discussion Paper Series, issue 5, retrieved from: www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/GENDER/fenster.htm (05.08.2003)
- 1999 'Space for gender: Cultural roles of the forbidden and the permitted', *Environment and Planning D*, vol. 7, pp. 227- 246.
- 2004 'Gender and the city: The different formations of belonging', in L. Nelson & J. Seager (eds) *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, pp.242-256, retrieved from: www.tau.ac.il/~tobiws/gender_companion.pdf (19.11.2005)
- Flyvbjerg, B.
 2004 'Five misunderstandings about case-study research' in C. Seale, G. Gaobo, J.F. Gubrium & D. Silverman (eds) *Qualitative research practice*, Sage, London and Thousand Oaks, pp. 420-434, retrieved from: <http://flyvbjerg.plan.aau.dk/MSFiveMis9.oSageASPUBL.pdf> (29.10.2005)
- Fowler, B.
 1999 'Bourdieu's turn to La Domination Masculine', *Contemporary Sociology*, vol. 28, n. 4, pp. 478-482.
- Friedmann, J.
 1999 'The city of everyday life: Knowledge/power and the problem of representation', *DISP* n.136/137, (ETH, Zurich), April 1999, pp: 4-11, retrieved from: <http://www.nsl.ethz.ch/index.php/de/content/view/full/96/> (23.04.2005)
- 2005 'Place-making as project? Habitus and migration in transnational cities', in J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (eds) *Habitus: A sense of place*, second edition, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 315-333.
- Fyfe, N. R. (ed)
 1998 *Images of the street: Planning, identity, and control in public space*, Routledge, London.
- Gadet, J.
 1999 *Publieke ruimte, parochiale plekken en passanten-openbaarheid: Jonge alleenwonende Amsterdammers over stedelijkheid*, Mart. Spruijt, Amsterdam.
- Galster, G. & S. P Killen
 1995 'The geography of metropolitan opportunity – a reconnaissance and conceptual framework', *Housing Policy Debate*, vol. 6, n. 1, pp. 7-43.
- Gans, H. J.
 1982 *The urban villagers*, The Free Press, New York.
 1968 *People and plans; Essays on urban problems and solutions*, Basic Books, New York.
- Garcia-Ramon, M. D., A. Ortiz, & M. Prats
 2004 'Urban planning, gender, and the use of public space in a peripheral neighborhood of Barcelona', *Cities*, vol. 21, n. 3, pp. 215-223.

- Gates, P.
 2002 'Excavating and mapping the social landscape of beliefs' in P. Valero & O. Skovsmose (eds) *Proceedings of the third international MES conference*. Centre for Research in Learning Mathematics, Copenhagen, pp. 1-10, retrieved from: www.mes3.learning.aau.dk/Papers/Gates.pdf (04.07.2004).
- Gay, L.R. and P. Airasian
 1996 *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*, Merrill, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Geertz, C.
 1973 *The interpretation of cultures*, Basic Books, New York.
 1983 *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*, Basic Books, New York.
- Gehl, J.
 1987 *Life between buildings: Using public space*, van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.
- Gemeente Enschede
 1991 *Sociografie Enschede: Een overzicht van historisch en actueel material vanuit verschillende aspecten*, Afdeling Informatie en Onderzoek, Enschede.
- Gemeente Enschede
 2004 *Zicht op Enschede, monitor stedelijke ontwikkeling 2004*, retrieved from: <http://cms.enschede.nl/ariadne/loader.php/root/extern/subwebs/archiefbi/beleidsdocumenten/stedelijk/00001/view.pdf> (10.11.2005)
 2005 *Gespreksnotitie, geïntegreerd in Enschede*, retrieved from: http://cms.enschede.nl/ariadne/loader.php/nl/root/extern/themas/integratiegesprekken/documenten/integratie_gespreksnotitie.pdf/ (19.10.2005)
- Germain, A.
 2000 'Immigrants and cities: Does neighbourhood matter?', paper presented in Transatlantic Learning Committee Special Meeting, Montreal, May 23, 2000, retrieved from: im.metropolis.net/research-policy/research_content/doc/IMMIGRANTS.pdf (11.12.2003)
- Giddens, A.
 1995 *A contemporary critique of Historical Materialism*, Macmillan, Houndmills.
- Gijsberts, M. & A. Merens (eds)
 2004 *Emancipatie in estafette: De positie van vrouwen uit ethische minderheden*, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, The Hague.
- Gijsberts, M. & J. Dagevos (eds)
 2005 *Uit elkaars buurt: De invloed van ethnische concentratie op integratie en beeldvorming*, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, The Hague.
- Glaser, B.G. & A.L. Strauss
 1967 *The discovery of grounded theory; Strategies for qualitative research*, Aldine, Chicago.
- Glazer, N. & M. Lilla, (eds)
 1987 *The public face of architecture: Civic culture and public spaces*, Free Press, New York.
- Goffman, E.
 1963 *Behavior in public places*, Free Press, New York.
 1972 *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*, Allen Lane The Penguin Press, London.
 1983 'The interaction order: The American sociological association 1982 presidential address', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 48, n. 1, pp. 1-17.
- Golafshani, N.
 2003 'Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research', *The Qualitative Report*, vol. 8, n. 4, pp. 597-607, retrieved from: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-4/golafshani.pdf> (05.04.2004)

- Gottdiener, M.
1985 *The social production of urban space*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Göle, N.
1996 *The forbidden modern*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
2002 'Islam in public: New visibilities and new imaginaries', *Public Culture*, vol. 14, n. 1, pp. 173-190.
- Granovetter, M.S.
1973 'The strength of weak ties', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 78, n. 6, pp. 1360-1380.
1983 'The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited', *Sociological Theory*, vol. 1, pp. 201-233.
1985 'Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 91, n. 3, pp. 481-510.
- Gregory, D.
1985 *Space and time in social life*, Wallace W. Atwood lecture series, n.1, The Graduate School of Geography, Clark University, Massachusetts.
- Gregory, D. & J. Urry (eds)
1985 *Social relations and spatial structures*, Macmillan, Basingstroke, Hampshire.
- Grönlund, B.
1993 'Life and complexity in urban space', Nordisk Arkitekturforskning, retrieved from: hjem.get2net.dk/gronlund/Life_and_complexity.html (11.04.2002)
- Grünfeld, F.
1970 *Habitat and habitation: A pilot study*, Samsom, Alphen aan den Rijn.
- Habermas, J.
1991 *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Hagerstrand, T.
1975 'Survival and arena: On the life history of individuals in relation to their geographical environment', in T. Carlstein, D. Parkes, & M. Thrift (eds) *Human activity and time geography*, vol. 2, Arnold, London, pp. 47-63.
- Hajer, M. & A. Reijndorp
2001 *In search of new public domain*, NAI, Rotterdam.
- Hannerz, U.
1980 *Exploring the city: Inquiries toward an urban anthropology*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Harcourt, B.E.
2002 'Measured interpretation: Introducing the method of correspondence analysis to legal studies', *University of Illinois Law Review*, pp. 979-1018, retrieved from: home.law.uiuc.edu/lrev/publications/2000s/2002/2002_4/Harcourt.pdf (14.11.2004)
- Harvey, D.
1969 *Explanation in geography*, Edward Arnold, London.
1991 *The condition of postmodernity, an enquiry into the origins of cultural change*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Hayden, D.
1996 *The power of place: Urban landscapes as public history*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Healey, P.
1997 *Collaborative planning*, MacMillan, London.
1998 'Institutionalist theory, social exclusion and governance' in A. Madanipour, G. Cars & J. Allen (eds) *Social exclusion in European cities*, Routledge, London, pp. 53-73.
2000 'Planning in relational space and time: Responding to new urban realities' in G. Bridge & S. Watson (eds) *A companion to the city*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 517-530.

- 2005 'Place, identity, and governance: Transforming discourses and practices' in J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (eds) *Habitus: A sense of place*, second edition. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 189-234.
- Heiss, J.
1981 *The social psychology of interaction*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Herbert, S.
2000 'For ethnography', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 24, n. 4 pp.550-68
- Hillier, J. & E. Rooksby (eds)
2005 *Habitus: A sense of place*, second edition, Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Hooghiemstra, B.T.J.
1997 'Cultural limits? The connection between culture and space in the world of young Turkish and Moroccan girls in the Netherlands' in R. Camstra (ed) *Growing up in a changing urban landscape*, Van Gorcum, Assen, pp. 153-167.
- Hooghiemstra, B. T.J. & J.G.F. Merens
1999 *Variatie in participatie: Achtergronden van arbeidsdeelname van allochtone en autochtone vrouwen*, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, The Hague.
- Hooghiemstra, E.
2003 *Trouwen over de grens*, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, The Hague.
- Horst, H. van der & J. Messing
2003 'Bij Marokkanen zijn de gordijnen dicht', *Agora*, vol. 19, n. 4, pp. 14-16.
- Hunter, A.
1985 'Private, parochial and public social orders; The problem of crime and civility in urban communities' in P. Kasinitz, (1995) *Metropolis: Center and symbol of our times*, McMillan, London, pp. 204-225.
- I&O Research
1999 *Enschede in cijfers 1998/99: Statistisch jaarboek van de Gemeente Enschede*, I&O Research, Enschede.
2000 *Buitenlanders in cijfers 1999*, I&O Research, Enschede.
2001a *Buuratlas Enschede 2000/01*, I&O Research, Enschede.
2001b *Buitenlanders in cijfers 2001*, I&O Research, Enschede.
2001c *Enschede in cijfers 2001: Statistisch jaarboek van de Gemeente Enschede*, I&O Research, Enschede.
2002 *Inkomensituatie Gemeente Enschede 1998*, Factsheet, 1 February 2002, I&O Research, Enschede.
- Ilyasoğlu, A.
1998 'Islamist women in Turkey: Their identity and self-image', in Z.F. Arat (ed) *Deconstructing images of 'the Turkish woman'*, St. Martin's Press, New York, pp. 241-261.
- Incirlioğlu, E. O.
1998 'Images of village women in Turkey: Models and anomalies', in Z.F. Arat (ed) *Deconstructing images of 'the Turkish woman'*, St. Martin's Press, New York, pp. 199-223.
- Işın, E.
2001 *Everyday life in Istanbul: Social historical essays on people, culture and spatial relations*, Yapı Kredi Publications, Istanbul.
- Jackson P.
1985 'Urban ethnography', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 9, n. 2 pp. 157-176.
- Jacobs, J.
1961 'The uses of sidewalks' (reprinted), in P. Kasinitz (ed) (1995) *Metropolis: Centre and symbol of our times*, McMillan, London, pp. 111-129.

- Jacobs, J.M.
1993 'The city unbound: Qualitative approaches to the city', *Urban Studies*, vol. 30, n. 3/4, pp. 827-848.
- Jókövi, E.M.
2000a *Vrijetijdsbesteding van allochtonen en autochtonen in de openbare ruimte; Een onderzoek naar de relatie met sociaal-economische en etnisch-culturele kenmerken*, Alterra, Wageningen.
2000b *Recreatie van Turken, Marokkanen en Surinamers in Rotterdam and Amsterdam; een verkenning van vrijetijdsgedrag en van de effecten van de ethnische cultuur op de vrijetijdsbesteding*, Alterra, Wageningen.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç.
1975 'Modernity and the role of women in Turkey', *Bogazici Universitesi Dergisi: Sosyal Bilimler- Idari Bilimler*, vol. 3, pp. 83-90.
- Kalaycıoğlu, E.
1997 'The logic of contemporary Turkish politics', *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, vol. 1, n. 3, September, retrieved from: <http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/1997/issue3/jv1n3a6.html> (25.03.2003)
- Kandiyoti, D.
1991 'Islam and patriarchy', in N.R. Keddie & B. Baron (eds) *Women in Middle Eastern history*, Yale University Press, New Haven, pp. 23-42.
1995 'Patterns of patriarchy: Notes for an analysis of male dominance in Turkish society', in S. Tekeli (ed) *Women in modern Turkish society: A reader*, Zed Books, London, pp. 306-318.
- Karsten, L.
2002 'Mapping childhood in Amsterdam: The spatial and social construction of children's domains in the city', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie / Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, vol. 93, n. 3 pp. 231-241.
- Karpat, H.K.
1976 *The gecekondü: Rural migration and urbanization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kasinitz, P.
1995 *Metropolis; Center and symbol of our times*, McMillan, London.
- Kaya, A. & F. Kentel
2005 *Euro-Turks: A bridge, or a breach, between Turkey and the European Union, a comparative study on the Turks in Germany and France*, Istanbul Bilgi University Publications, Istanbul.
- Kempen, R. van & S. Ozuekren (eds)
1997 *Turks in European cities: Housing and urban segregation*, European Research Center on Migration and Ethnic Relations, Publications n. 4, Utrecht.
- Kempen, R. van & G. Bolt
1997 'Turks in the Netherlands', *American Behavioural Scientists*, vol. 41, n. 3 (November/December), pp. 367-388.
- Kempen, R. van & J. van Weesep
1997 'Segregation, housing and ethnicity in Dutch cities', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie / Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, vol. 88, n. 2, pp. 188-195.
1998 'Ethnic residential patterns in Dutch cities: Backgrounds, shifts, and consequences', *Urban Studies*, vol. 35, n. 10, pp. 1813-1833.
- Keune, C., N. Boonstra, & A. Overgaag
2002 *Mijn vrienden ken ik van de straat; Vrijetijdsbesteding van jonge Turken en Marokkanen in de openbare stedelijke ruimte*, Verwey Jonker Instituut Publicaties, Utrecht.

- Keuzenkamp, S. & K. Oudhof
 2000 *Emancipatiemonitor 2000*, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, the Hague.
- Khoury, D.R.
 1997 'Slippers at the entrance or behind closed doors: Domestic and public space for Mosul women', in M.C. Zilfi (ed) *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the early modern era*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 105-127.
- King, R.
 2003 'Migrations, globalization, and place', in D. Massey & P. Jess (eds) *A place in the world?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp.5-33.
- Köksal, S.
 1986 *Refah toplumunda "Ghetto" ve Türkler*, Teknoğrafik Matbaacılık, Istanbul.
 1988 'Women in chain migrant families and urban networks', paper presented at the International Symposium 'Women in international migration: Social, cultural, and occupational issues', 18-21 October 1988, Technical University Berlin.
- Kreukels, A.M.J.
 1999 'Institutes en de stedelijke openbare ruimte', in R. van der Wouden (ed) *De stad op straat*, Sociale en Culturele Studies-27, the Hague, pp. 149-158.
- Kuban, D.
 1996 *Istanbul an urban history: Byzantium, Constantinople, Istanbul*, The Economic and Social History Publications, Istanbul.
- Lamont, M. & V. Molnar
 2002 'The study of boundaries in the social sciences', *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 28 pp. 167-195.
- Lapidus, I.M.
 1969 'Muslim cities and Islamic societies', in I.M. Lapidus (ed) *Middle Eastern cities: A symposium on Ancient, Islamic, and contemporary Middle Eastern urbanism*, University of California Press, Berkeley, pp.47-79.
- Lawrence, D.L. & S. Low
 1990 'The built environment and spatial form', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 19, pp. 453-505.
- Leach, N.
 2005 'Belonging: Towards a theory of identification with space', in J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (eds) *Habitus: A sense of place*, second edition, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 297-311.
- Lefebvre, H.
 1991 *The production of space*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Lieberg, M.
 1995 'Teenagers and public space', *Communication Research*, vol. 22, n. 6, pp. 720-745.
- Liempt, I. van
 2001 *Ontmoetingen in de openbare ruimte. Een onderzoek naar het recreatiegedrag van Turkse en Marokkaanse vrouwen in een park in Amsterdam-Noord*, Scriptie UvA, retrieved from: <http://www2.fmg.uva.nl/imes/books/vanliempt-scriptie.pdf> (19.11.2004)
- Liempt, I. van & R. Verhoeff
 2001 'Ruimte voor ontmoetingen', *Rooilijn*, n. 8, pp. 389-393.
- Lofland J. & L.H. Lofland
 1984 *Analyzing social settings: a guide to qualitative observation and analysis*, Wadsworth, Belmont.
- Lofland, L.H.
 1973 *A world of strangers: Order and action in urban public space*, Waveland Press, Illinois.

- 1983 'Questioning the primacy of the primary: An analysis of human bonding', in D.G. Gutknecht, E.W. Butler, L. Criswell, & J. Meints (eds) *Family, self, and society: Emerging issues, alternatives, and interventions*, University Press of America, Lanham, pp.447-461.
- 1989a 'Private lifestyles, changing neighbourhoods, and public life: A problem in organized complexity', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie / Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, vol. 80, n. 2, pp. 89-96.
- 1989b 'Social life in the public realm', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* vol. 17, n. 4, pp. 453-482.
- 1998 *The public realm, exploring the city's quintessential social territory*, Aldine De Gruyter, New York.
- Low, S.
- 1996 'Spatializing culture: The social production and social construction of public space in Costa Rica', *American Ethnologist*, vol. 23, n. 4, pp. 861-879.
- 2000 *On the plaza, the politics of public space and culture*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Madanipour, A.
- 1999 'Why are the design and development of public spaces significant for cities?' *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* vol. 26, p: 879-891
- 2001 'How relevant is 'planning by neighborhoods' today?' *Town Planning Review*, vol. 72, n. 2, pp. 171-191.
- 2003 *Public and private spaces of the city*, Routledge, London.
- Madanipour, A., G. Cars & J. Allen (eds)
- 1998 *Social exclusion in European cities*, Routledge, London.
- Maffesoli, M.
- 1996 *The time of the tribes: the decline of individualism in mass society*, Sage, London.
- Martens, E.P. & Y.M.R. Weijers
- 2000 *Integratiemonitor 2000*, ISEO, Rotterdam.
- Martindale, D.
- 1958 'Prefatory remarks; the theory of the city', in M. Weber, *The city* (translated and edited by D. Martindale & G. Neuwirth), the Free Press, New York, pp. 9-62.
- Martinez, S.D., S. Groeneveld & E. Kruisbergen
- 2002 *Integratiemonitor 2002*, Instituut voor Sociologisch-Economisch Onderzoek, Erasmus University, Rotterdam.
- Maslow, A.H.
- 1970 *Motivation and personality*, Harper and Row, New York.
- Mason, J.
- 1996 *Qualitative researching*, Sage, London.
- Massey, D.
- 1994 *Space, place and gender*, Polity Press, Oxford.
- Mernissi, F.
- 1985 *Beyond the veil: Male-female dynamics in Muslim society*, Al Saqi Books, London.
- Merriam, S.B.
- 2002 'Introduction to qualitative research', in S.B. Merriam (ed) *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 3-16.
- Milgram, S.
- 1977 *The individual in a social world: Essays and experiments*, Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Mitchell, D.
- 1995 'The end of public space? People's park, definitions of the public, and democracy', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 85, n. 1, pp. 108-133.

- Mommaas, H.
 1996 'Modernity, postmodernity and the crisis of social modernization: A case study in urban fragmentation', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 20, n. 2, pp. 196-216.
- Mortada, H.
 2003 *Traditional Islamic principles of built environment*, Routledge Curzon, London.
- Müller, T.
 2002 *De warme stad: Betrokkenheid bij het publieke domein*, Jan van Arkel, Utrecht.
 2005 'Neighbors are like my family, the intercultural realm of neighborly relations' paper presented in IMISCOE Cluster B6 Workshop on Ethnic, Cultural, and Religious Diversity, Amsterdam, May 26-28, 2005.
- Mumford, E.
 2002 'From CIAM to Collage city: Postwar European urban design and American urban design education', paper at conference, Urban Design: Practices, Pedagogies, Premises, Columbia University, April 5-6, 2002, retrieved from: www.arch.columbia.edu/gsap-online/files/00/00/00/13099/Briefing%20Materials.pdf (18.09.2005)
- Murvar, V.
 1966 'Some tentative modifications in Weber's typology: Occidental versus Oriental city', (reprinted) in P. Meadows & E.H. Mizruchi (eds) *Urbanism, urbanization, and change: Comparative perspectives*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, pp. 51-63.
- Musterd, S., W. Ostendorf & M. Breebaart
 1998 *Multi-ethnic metropolis: patterns and policies*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Nagel, T.
 1998 'Concealment and exposure', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, vol. 27, n. 1 (Winter 1998), pp. 3-30.
- Noble, G. & M. Watkins
 2003 'So, how did Bourdieu learn to play tennis? Habitus, consciousness and habituation', *Cultural Studies*, vol. 14, n. 3/4, pp. 520-538.
- Ogan, C.
 2001 *Communication and identity in the diaspora: Turkish immigrants in Amsterdam and their use of media*, Lexington Books, Lanham.
- Oosterman, J.
 1992 'Welcome to the pleasure dome; Play and entertainment in urban public space: The example of the sidewalk café', *Built Environment*, vol. 18, n. 2, pp. 155-164.
 1993 *Parade der passanten: de stad, het vertier en de terrassen*, Jan van Arkel, Utrecht.
- Ortaylı, I.
 2006 *Osmanlıyı Yeniden Keşfetmek*, Timaş Yayınları, Istanbul.
- Ortiz, A., M.D. Garcia-Ramon & M. Prats
 2004 'Women's use of public space and sense of place in the Raval (Barcelona)', *Geojournal*, vol. 61, pp. 219-227.
- Patton, M.Q.
 2002 *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*, Sage, California.
- Peleman, K.
 2001a 'Moeizame onderhandelingen; Marokkaanse vrouwen in Burgerhout op zoek naar ontmoetingsplaatsen', *Migrantenstudies*, n.1, pp. 20-38.
 2001b 'The impact of residential segregation on participation in associations; The case of Moroccan women in Belgium', *Urban Studies*, vol. 39, n. 4, pp. 727-747.

- 2003 'Power and territoriality: A study of Moroccan women in Antwerp', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie / Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, vol. 94, n. 2, pp. 151-163.
- Penninx, R.
 1989 'Ethnic groups in the Netherlands: Emancipation or minority group formation?', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 12, n. 1, pp. 84-99.
- Phalet, K., C. van Lotringen & H. Entzinger
 2000 *Islam in the multicultural society: The views of young people in Rotterdam*, ERCOMER Research Report, Utrecht.
- Pile, S. & N. Thrift (eds)
 1995 *Mapping the subject, geographies of cultural transformation*, Routledge, London.
- Pope, J.
 2003 *Social capital and social capital indicators: A reading list*, Working Paper Series N. 1, The University of Adelaide, retrieved from: http://www.publichealth.gov.au/pdf/WPI_Social_capital.pdf
- Portes, A.
 1995 'Economic sociology and the sociology of immigration: A conceptual overview', in A. Portes (ed) *The economic sociology of immigration*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, pp. 1-41.
 1998 'Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology', *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 24, pp. 1-24.
- Pred, A.
 1981 *Space and time in geography*, Gleerup, Lund.
 1982 'Social reproduction and the time-geography of everyday life', in P. Gould & G. Olsson (eds) *A search for common ground*, Pion, London, pp. 157-186.
- Proshansky, H.M.
 1978 'The city and self-identity', *Environment and Behaviour*, vol. 10, n. 2, pp. 147-169.
- Proshansky, H. M., A. K. Fabian, & R. Kaminoff
 1995 'Place-identity: Physical world socialization of the self', in L. Groat (ed) *Giving places meaning*, Harcourt Brace & Company, London.
- Putnam, R.D.
 2000 *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*, Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Rapoport, A.
 1977 *Human aspects of urban form: Towards a man-environment approach to urban form and design*, Pergamon Press, New York.
- Rath J., R. Penninx, K. Groenendijk & A. Meyer
 1999 'The politics of recognizing religious diversity in Europe. Social reactions to the institutionalization of Islam in the Netherlands, Belgium, and Great Britain', *The Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 35, n. 1, pp. 53-68.
- Reijndorp, A.
 1993 'No slaughterhouse without a fair: The anti-structure of a Dutch city', in H. de Mare & A. Vos (eds) *Urban rituals in Italy and the Netherlands*, Van Gorcum, Assen, pp. 144-160.
- Richardson, M.
 1982 'Being-in-the-Market versus Being-in-the-Plaza: Material culture and the construction of social reality in Spanish America', *American Ethnologist*, vol. 9, n. 2, pp. 421-436.

- Ruckert, N.S.Y.
 1992 "We zitten de hele dag alleen maar thuis": Een onderzoek naar de vergroting van de participatie van Turkse vrouwen in Haaksbergen aan recreatieve en educatieve activiteiten, Wetenschapswinkel Universiteit Twente, Enschede.
- Sack, R.D.
 1983 'Human territoriality: A theory', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 73, n. 1, pp. 55-74.
 1987 *Human territoriality and space*, Clark University Press, Worcester.
- Said, E.W.
 1979 *Orientalism*, Vintage Books, New York.
- Sandercock L.
 1998 *Towards cosmopolis: Planning for multicultural cities*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
 2005 'Difference, fear and habitus: A political economy of urban fears', in J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (eds) *Habitus: A sense of place*, second edition, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 219-234.
- Sapsford, R.
 2000 'Endnote: the public and the private', in J. Muncie, M. Wtherell Langan, M. Dallos, & A. Cochrane (eds) *Understanding the family* second edition, Sage, London, pp. 317-322.
- Schendelen, M. van
 1997 'The identity of the built environment', in R. Camstra (ed) *Growing up in a changing urban landscape*, Van Gorcum, Assen, pp. 111-118.
- Schick, I.C.
 1998 'The women of Turkey as sexual personae: Images from western literature', in Z.F. Arat (ed) *Deconstructing images of 'the Turkish woman'*, St. Martin's Press, New York, pp. 83-100.
- Sennett, R.
 1970 *The uses of disorder, personal identity and city life*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
 1977 *The fall of public man*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
 1990 *The conscience of the eye: The design and social life of cities*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
 2000 'Reflections on the public realm' in G. Bridge & S. Watson (eds) *A companion to the city*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 380-387.
- Siebel, W. & J. Wehrheim
 2003 'Security and the urban public sphere', *German Journal of Urban Studies*, vol. 42, n. 1, retrieved from:
www.difu.de/index.shtml?publikationen/dfk/en/03_1/03_1_siebel.html (21.02.2004)
- Simmel, G.
 1902 'The metropolis and mental life' in K.H. Wolff (ed/translated) (1964) *The sociology of Georg Simmel*, Free Press, New York, pp. 409-424.
- Simonsen, K. & J.O. Bærenholdt (eds)
 2004 'Introduction' in K. Simonsen & J.O. Bærenholdt (eds) *Space Odysseys, Spatiality and Social Relations in the 21st Century*, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 1-11, retrieved from:
www.ashgate.com/subject_area/downloads/sample_chapters/Space_Odysseys_Intro.pdf (29.10.2005)
- Slomp, J., G
 1988 'Muslim minorities in the Netherlands', in J. Slomp, G. Speelman, & W. de Wit (eds) *In Research Papers; Muslims in Europe*, n. 37, Publications of the centre for the study of Islam and Christian-Muslim relations, Birmingham, pp. 2-12.

- SmartAgent
 2001 *Woonbeleving Allochtonen*, retrieved from:
www.smo-ov.nl/pdf/onderzoek%20woonbeleving%20allochtonen.pdf (23.04.2003)
- Snellen, D., H. Hilbers, & A. Hendriks
 2005 *Nieuwbouw in Beweging, Een Analyse van het Ruimtelijk Mobiliteitsbeleid van Vinex*, Ruimtelijk Planbureau, NAI, Rotterdam.
- Sorkin, M. (ed)
 1992 *Variations on a theme park, the new American city and the end of public space*, Hill and Wang, New York.
- Soja, E.W.
 1971 *The political organization of space*, Resource paper, Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, n. 8, Washington.
- Speelman, G.
 1988 'Muslim women in the Netherlands', in J. Slomp, G. Speelman, & W. de Wit (eds) *In Research Papers; Muslims in Europe*, n. 37, Publications of the Centre for the Study of Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations, Birmingham, pp. 13-23.
- Stake, R.
 1995 *The art of case research*, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- State Institute of Statistics (SIS)
 1995 *Women in Statistics*, SIS Printing Division, Ankara.
 1998 *Household laborforce survey*, SIS Printing Division, Ankara.
- Sunier, T.
 1999 'Muslim migrants, Muslim citizens, Islam and Dutch society', *Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences* vol. 35, n. 1, pp. 69-82.
- Suttles, G.D.
 1968 *The social order of the slum: ethnicity and territory in the inner city*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
 1976 'Urban ethnography: Situational and normative accounts', *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 2, pp. 1-18.
- Şenyapılı, T.
 1981 *Gecekondu: Çevre işçilerin mekanı*, METU Publications, Ankara.
- Talen, E.
 1999 'Sense of community and neighborhood form: An assessment of the social doctrine of new urbanism', *Urban Studies*, vol. 36, n. 8, pp. 1361-1379.
- Taylor, C.
 1993 'To follow a rule', in C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma, & M. Postone, (eds) *Bourdieu: Critical perspectives*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 45-60.
- Tekeli, S.
 1995 *Women in modern Turkish society: A reader*, Zed Books, London.
- Tesser, P.T.M., F.A. van Dugteren, & A. Merens
 1996 *Rapportage Minderheden 1996*, Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, Rijswijk.
- Tillaart, H. van den
 2000 *Monitor etnisch ondernemerschap 2000*, ITS, Nijmegen.
- Tilly, C.
 1974 *An urban world*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston.
 1997 *Roads from past to future*, Rowman & Littlefield, Oxford.
 1998 *Durable inequality*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Timur, S.
 1972 *Türkiye'de aile yapısı*, Hacettepe University Publications, Ankara.

- Turowski, J.
2003 'The dichotomy of private and public as a theoretical framework for the analysis of social reality', online article, retrieved from:
www.crvp.org/book/Series04/IVA-2/chapter_i.htm (06.05.2003)
- Tönnies, F.
1957 'Gemeinschaft and gesellschaft' (reprinted), in R.L. Warren (ed)
1977 *New perspectives on the American community*, third edition, Rand McNally College Publishing, Chicago, pp. 7-15.
- Uludağ, Z.
1998 *The social construction of meaning in landscape architecture: A case study of Genclik Parki in Ankara*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Upton, D.
2002 'Architecture in everyday life', *New Literary History*, vol. 33, n. 4 (Autumn), pp. 691-707.
- Vernez Moudon, A. (ed)
1991 *Public streets for public use*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Vertovec, S.
2001 'Transnational social formations: Towards conceptual cross-fertilization' paper presented at Workshop on "Transnational Migration: Comparative perspectives", Princeton University, June 30-July 1, 2001, retrieved from:
www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/working%20papers/Vertovec2.pdf (19.11.2004)
- Wal, G. van der & M. Tax (eds)
1999 *De vele gezichten van Turks in Nederland: Een wie is wie*, Uitgeverij Jan Mets, Amsterdam.
- Waterson, R.
2005 'Enduring landscape, changing habitus: The Sa'dan Toraja of Sulawesi, Indonesia' in J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (eds) *Habitus: A sense of place*, second edition, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 334-355.
- Weber, M.
1966 *The city* (translated from the German original and edited by Don Martindale & Gertrud Neuwirth), The Free Press, New York.
- Wegener, M. & F. Furst
1999 *Land-use transport interaction: State of the art*, Berichte aus dem Institute für Raumplanung 46, Dortmund, retrieved from:
<http://129.3.20.41/eps/urb/papers/0409/0409005.pdf>
- Weintraubb, J.
1997 'The theory and politics of the public/private distinction' in J. Weintraubb & K. Kumar (eds) *Public and private in thought and practice*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp.1-42.
- Whyte, W.F.
1981 *Street corner society*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Whyte, W.H.
1980 *The social life of small urban spaces*, Conservation Foundation, Washington.
1990 *City*, Doubleday, New York.
- Wilpert, C.
1989 'Ethnic and cultural identity: Ethnicity and the second generation in the context of European migration', in K. Liebkind (ed) *New identities in Europe: immigrant ancestry and the ethnic identity of youth*, Gower Publishers, Aldershot, pp. 6-12.
- Wirth, L.
1938 'Urbanism as a way of life', in P. Kasinitz (1995) *Metropolis: Center and symbol of our times*, McMillan, London, pp. 58-81.

- Worpole, K.
1992 *Towns for people: Transforming urban life*, Open University Press, Philadelphia.
- Worpole, K. & L. Greenhalgh
1996 *Freedom of the city*, Demos, London.
- Wouden, R. van der (ed)
1999 *De stad op straat*, Sociale en Culturele Studies-27, The Hague.
- Yanow, D.
2004 'Translating local knowledge at organizational peripheries', *British Journal of Management*, vol. 15, pp. 9-25.
- Yerasimos, S.
1996 'Tanzimat'ın kent reformları üzerine', in P. Dumont and F. Georgeon (eds) *Modernleşme sürecinde Osmanlı kentleri*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul, pp.1-18.
- Yin, R.K.
1984 *Case study research*, Applied Social Research Methods Series, vol. 5, Sage, California.
- Zukin, S.
1995 *The cultures of cities*, Blackwell, Massachusetts.

ALLEDAAGSE STEDELIJKE OPENBARE RUIJITE, HET PERSPECTIEF VAN DE TURKSE IMMIGRANTE VROUW

Het laatste decennium is de stadsgeografie en planologie overspoelt met literatuur betreffende de *narrative of loss of public space*. De nadruk ligt op een obsessie met beveiliging, surveillance en controle en de toenemende neiging tot *simulacra*, die leidt tot gelijksoortigheid, privatisatie en een nadruk op de esthetische representatie van de publieke ruimte (Davis, 1990 Sorkin, 1992 Zukin, 1995). Omschreven als gefragmenteerd, capsulair en conflicterend in plaats van gedeeld, sociaal en democratisch, wordt de openbare ruimte als gedevalueerd gezien. Dit proces wordt vaak geassocieerd met het scheiden van de voorheen elkaar aanvullende publieke en privé sferen (Sennett, 1977, 2000). Met andere woorden, de relatie tussen publieke en privé wordt steeds zwakker, terwijl de wisselwerking tussen deze twee sferen het belangrijkste kenmerk is van het stedelijke leven (Bahrtdt, 1961). Een toenemende privatisering van deze maatschappij, gesloten gemeenschappen en moderne volkstammen (gebaseerd op gedeelde gebruiken van bepaalde levensstijlen en smaken, Maffesoli, 1996) hebben gesegregeerde sociale werelden gecreëerd, die ook een bedreiging zijn voor de wederzijdse relatie tussen de publieke en de privé sfeer. Dit leidt tot de misvorming van het openbare leven.

De groeiende diversiteit van de bevolkingssamenstelling in steden, wordt in grote mate beschouwd bij te dragen aan dit cynische beeld. Groeiende concentraties van immigranten in bepaalde delen van de stad creëren aan de ene kant een groeiende angst voor isolatie, marginalisatie en veiligheid in de stedelijke publieke ruimte, nauw gerelateerd tot het bezorgd zijn om sociale uitsluiting en segregatie (Madani-pour et al., 1998, Burgers, 2000). Aan de andere kant zorgen de verspreiding van etnische zakenwijken, de commodificatie van etnisch-culturele producten (zoals muziek en eten), samen met nieuwe architecturale stijlen, verschillende designs van huizen en plekken om te bidden in het Westerse straatbeeld, voor een stedelijke diversiteit, wat in toenemende mate wordt erkend door stadvernieuwers als een essentieel hulpmiddel voor de vergroting van de welvaart in steden en een potentiële katalysator voor sociaal-economische ontwikkelingen (Bodaar and Rath, 2005). Stedelijke openbare ruimtes worden binnen dit raamwerk belangrijker dan ooit als een plek waar verschillen en diversiteit, verbondenheid en strijd, worden weergegeven.

Gesitueerd binnen dit levendige debat, richt deze studie zich op het herstellen van het potentieel dat stedelijke openbare ruimtes hebben als unieke ruimtelijke setting. Het creëert een kader gebaseerd op een visie op het sociale leven in de stad. Een visie voor degene die leven in de stad en voor degene die op elkaar inwerken in de alledaagse stedelijke openbare ruimte: een ontmoetingsplek en *social staging ground*. Door de stedelijke openbare ruimte als een sociale constructie te conceptualiseren, wordt de wisselwerking tussen de fysische, sociale en symbolische ruimte benadrukt. Gebruikers worden gezien als sociale actoren die continue betrokken zijn bij het proces van *place-making*, ontdekken, overleggen, botsen en het toe-eigenen (naar Lefebvre's *appropriation*) van de stedelijke publieke ruimte. Naast het feit dat gebruikers als sociale actoren worden beschouwd, die verantwoordelijk zijn voor het construeren van de stedelijke openbare ruimte in hun dagelijkse leven, betwist deze studie het hedendaagse beeld van de simplistische openbare ruimte door een poly-vocale omschrijving te geven hoe mensen de stedelijke openbare ruimte gebruiken en op elkaar inwerken. Gebaseerd op deze twee veronderstellingen is het hoofddoel van deze studie om de ruimtelijke praktijken en de variëteit aan concepties en interpretaties betreffende de alledaagse stedelijke openbare ruimte, die de verschillende manieren waarop gebruikers zich verbinden met, oriënteren op en betrokken zijn bij het stedelijk leven presenteert, te onderzoeken en analyseren, zoals deze gerepresenteerd wordt door Turkse immigrante vrouwen woonachtig in Enschede.

Binnen dit kader kijkt deze studie gedetailleerd naar het gebruik en de ervaring van dagelijkse stedelijke openbare ruimtes door de Turkse immigrante vrouw. Deze worden geïdentificeerd als sociale actoren wiens sociale relaties met de ruimte, zowel lokaal als transnationaal, worden beïnvloed door relationele constructies in stedelijke openbare ruimtes en tegelijkertijd als mechanisme voor sociale identificatie, insluiting en uitsluiting dienen. Deze relaties dienen ook als grens tussen wie mee doet en wie niet, niet alleen tussen verschillende etnische, culturele en religieuze groepen in een bredere sociale context, maar ook binnen de gevestigde Turkse immigrante gemeenschap zelf. Omdat deze relaties en gerelateerde constructies erg veranderlijk zijn, is er een continu proces van sociale ordening en ruimtelijke ordening die de Turkse vrouwen positioneert in een variatie aan reeksen van sociale relaties in de stedelijke openbare ruimte.

Theoretisch en Analytisch Kader

Om het complexe patroon betreffende het identificeren, het construeren en het ervaren van stedelijke openbare ruimtes door Turkse vrouwen te kunnen begrijpen, wordt de relationele benadering gebruikt als theoretisch kader. De theoretische basis van de relationele benadering voor stedelijke openbare ruimtes is primair gebaseerd op het werk van Charles Tilly en Pierre Bourdieu, voor wie het belang van de context en de relaties van voornamelijk sociale verbondenheid, netwerken en processen, als significant wordt gezien voor de omschrijving van en variëteit binnen sociale groepen en hun gedrag. Door het gebruik van de relationele benadering, worden Turkse

immigrante vrouwen gezien als actieve sociale actoren, die de stedelijke openbare ruimte construeren en reconstrueren volgens hun eigen werkelijkheid en betekenis, ontleent aan de conflicten en coalities die zijn ontstaan tijdens het gebruik van deze stedelijke openbare ruimte.

Tilly ziet categorieën als relationeel. Dit gegeven is zeer belangrijk voor een ruimtelijke analyse in die zin dat op deze manier de gelegenheid wordt gegeven om verschillende manieren te zien waarop categoriale netwerken, – sociale relaties die grenzen construeren, grenzen van insluiting en uitsluiting, zoals besproken in Hoofdstuk Drie – zijn ingebed in de ruimte door gebruik en toe-eigenen en hoe deze ruimtes tot sociale ruimtes worden gemaakt als articulaties van sociale relaties. Wanneer de stedelijke openbare ruimte wordt geconceptualiseerd als een sociale constructie en als een arena van geschillen, tegenstrijdige identiteiten en representaties, worden grenzen en de vorming van grenzen belangrijk als het gaat om het lokaliseren van de dynamiek van uitsluitende en insluitende sociale en ruimtelijke praktijken. Grenzen moeten niet worden gezien als onoverkoombare hindernissen, maar toch definiëren deze wat bij een gebied hoort en wat niet, wie wordt toegelaten en wie buitengesloten wordt en wat publiek en privé is.

Verschillende patronen van gebruik en het ervaren van de stedelijke openbare ruimte worden uitgedrukt in sociale relaties die diep zijn geworteld in ruimtelijke structuren. De theorie van Bourdieu over *practices* en twee van zijn belangrijkste concepten *habitus* en sociaal kapitaal, worden gebruikt om het ruimtelijke gedrag van Turkse vrouwen uit te leggen, welke diepgeworteld is in de *dialectical* relaties tussen cultuur, structuur en macht en de specifieke manier van de Turkse vrouw om de stedelijke openbare ruimte die is gerelateerd aan de structurele kenmerken van hun alledaagse leven te conceptualiseren.

De in het eerste deel van Hoofdstuk Twee omschreven sociale positie van de vrouw in de Turkse maatschappij, portretteert de structurele conceptualisering van betekenissen en concepties van de stedelijke openbare ruimte vanuit een historisch perspectief, beginnend bij de Ottomaanse periode en reikend tot vandaag de dag. Omdat migratie niet alleen gezien kan worden als een stroom mensen die zich van één land naar een ander verplaatsen, maar een complex geheel is van *place-making* en heridentificatie, helpt deze beschrijving in het begrijpen van karakteristieke aspecten van de Turkse immigrante vrouw in de Nederlandse maatschappij.

Beschreven vanuit het bredere kader van een veranderende sociale dynamiek binnen de Turkse maatschappij van imperiale regulaties tot de modernisering van culturele waarden en normen, van een familie structuur naar een sociaal culturele orientatie, helpen ervaringen, betekenissen en concepties van het publieke en het private uit het verleden, die zich manifesteren in gebruiken, sociale gewoontes en sociale normen en gebruikscodes, om de *habitus* van de Turkse vrouw te begrijpen. De interviews die aangehaald zijn in de tekst laten dan ook bijzondere sporen van betekenissen en concepten van ruimtelijke relaties zien zoals deze in het verleden werden ervaren.

Sinds deze studie zich richt op het benadrukken van sociaal ruimtelijke eigenschappen en betekenissen verbonden met de stedelijke openbare ruimte, is een contextueel en onderzoekend analytisch perspectief nodig. Daarom gaat de voorkeur uit naar een

etnografische case studie over de Turkse immigrante vrouw die een discursieve constructie van het alledaagse leven en de gebruikspatronen, ervaringen en het toe-eigenen van de stedelijke openbare ruimtes in Enschede analyseert.

Om het ruimtelijke gedrag van Turkse immigrante vrouwen in stedelijke openbare ruimtes te begrijpen, volgt een tweeledige analyse, die focust op hun sociale netwerken, de habitus van sociale interacties en de duurzaamheid van de relaties waarin ruimtelijk gedrag is geworteld. De eerste analyse behandelt de categorische beschrijving van Turkse vrouwen en het toe-eigenen van stedelijke openbare ruimtes in relatie tot verschillende activiteiten en leefsfereën en kenmerken die zij belangrijk vinden. Het tweede gedeelte van de analyse focust op de relationele context waarin Turkse vrouwen geworteld zijn en die hun ruimtelijke praktijken en de reflectie van deze context binnen verschillende ruimtelijke schalen beïnvloed. Hun sociale netwerken worden verwoord als ruimtelijke associaties die Turkse vrouwen maken in hun alledaagse leven in stedelijke openbare ruimtes. De relationele benadering stelt ons in staat om te begrijpen binnen welke referentiekaders de Turkse vrouw zichzelf en andere plaatst en herplaatst binnen verschillende openbare ruimtes in de stad. Doordat de sociale relaties constant aan verandering onderhevig zijn, identificeert de Turkse vrouw stedelijke openbare ruimtes steeds verschillend en eigent zij deze dienovereenkomstig toe. In dat geval kan de stedelijke openbare ruimte worden geportretteerd als een netwerk van plekken van representaties van verbondenheid/scheiding, participatie/onthouding en terugtrekking/interactie.

Categorieën en Gebruik van Stedelijke Openbare Ruimtes

Categorieën van Turkse immigrante vrouwen worden gereflecteerd door middel van door sociaal overleg vastgestelde grenzen van hun contextuele en relationele betrokkenheid zoals deze geworteld zijn in de stedelijke openbare ruimte. Terwijl de grenzen van insluiting en uitsluiting worden gevormd, beginnen deze tegelijkertijd als sociale identificatie te fungeren, niet alleen voor Turkse vrouwen, maar ook voor onze perceptie op hen. Deze identificaties faciliteren sociale verbondenheid en goedkeuring, participatie en betrokkenheid. Ook faciliteren deze identificaties scheiding en weigering, ontwijking en separatie. Tegelijkertijd wijzen deze identificaties op 'een gevoel voor plaats' en 'een gevoel voor plaats van anderen'; de *habitus*.

Terwijl categorieën gebaseerd op levensstijl (generaties) en sociaal economische positie (inkomen en educatie), religieuze verwantschap en oriëntatie en culturele oriëntatie gerelateerd tot het gebruik van taal, media en de frequentie van reizen naar Turkije, tot op zekere hoogte individueel sociale karakteristieken uitbeelden, beschrijven categorieën als sociale netwerken van Turkse immigrante vrouwen – in antropologische zin – de relationele kenmerken van Turkse immigrante vrouwen in Enschede. Om te beginnen zijn categorieën gebaseerd op generaties in hoge mate gerelateerd tot hun takenpakket en gerelateerde sociale domeinen. Het minst gedifferentieerde takenpakket is te vinden in de eerste-generatie en huwelijks immigrantengroep, vergeleken met de tweede- en derdegeneratie. Ondanks het feit dat migratiegeschie-

denis en persoonlijke kwalificaties, zoals educatie en occupatie, op papier voor verschillen in hun takenpakket zorgen, zijn de sociale levens van eerste-generatie en huwelijks immigranten beperkt tot het huishouden en familiebetrekkingen. Het onvoldoende beheersen van de Nederlandse taal en gebrekkige sociale en ruimtelijke kennis, limiteren hen tot het huishouddomein. Aan de andere kant is het meer waarschijnlijk dat huwelijksmigranten uit dit domein weten te verrijzen en hun takenpakket weten te differentiëren. Hun initiatieven op te participeren in vrijwilligersorganisaties en de wil om hun ruimtelijke mobiliteitspatroon te vergroten verwekken nieuwe mogelijkheden. Het sociale domein gerelateerd aan het takenpakket van de tweede-generatie vertoont een meer gedifferentieerd karakter dan het takenpakket van de eerste twee, nochtans leert de tijd dat de tweede-generatie immigranten meer en meer in het domein van de familiebetrekkingen terecht komen. Dit gaat zeker op voor de Turkse gemeenschap in Enschede als gevolg van uithuwelijken. Zij worden samen met de partner geleidelijk dusdanig opgenomen in de Turkse gemeenschap dat relaties opgebouwd in de bredere maatschappij teniet worden gedaan. Voor de derdegeneratie is het proces min of meer gelijk aan het proces van de tweede-generatie. Hoe ouder men wordt, hoe meer men wordt blootgesteld aan de traditionele sociale waarden en normen van de gemeenschap. Toch verzet deze generatie zich tot zeker hoogte tegen de traditionele structuren. Inkomen en educatie – sociaal-economische categorieën – beïnvloeden het conceptuele kader van participatie in de stedelijke openbare ruimte. Mede door een beperkte kapitaalkrachtigheid, is het moeilijk om bepaalde activiteiten te betalen. Educatie maakt een verschil in die zin dat als bezit van cultureel kapitaal, het scholingsniveau en de beheersing van de taal toeneemt, de betrokkenheid bij culturele activiteiten, zoals naar het theater of de bioscoop gaan, ook toeneemt.

Religieuze categorieën beïnvloeden het ervaren en het toe-eigenen van stedelijke openbare ruimtes op verschillende manieren. Religieuze sektes, *Alevi* en *Sunni*, verschijnen als scheidslijn binnen de Turkse gemeenschap. Interessant genoeg zijn de politieke reflecties van deze divisies meer invloedrijk dan de sektes zelf. Verder is die religieuze segregatie tussen de sektes in hogere mate geaccentueerd door de tweede- en derdegeneratie en getrouwde immigranten. De *Alevi* en *Sunni* divisies worden vooral gebruikt door etnisch religieuze organisaties en hun activiteiten. Een andere categorisch verschil wordt gemaakt in relatie met taal, media en reizen naar Turkije, als teken van een oriëntatie naar de Turkse of Nederlandse samenleving. Dit impliceert ook een transnationale contextuele blootstelling. Samen met godsdienst vormt dit een sociale context, een referentiekader dat effectief is in die zin dat het ruimtelijke gedrag van de Turkse vrouw wordt gevormd.

Persoonlijke netwerk categorieën, zijn belangrijk als een reeks van relationele verbanden – zowel sterk als zwak – waardoor het voor Turkse vrouwen mogelijk wordt om toegang te krijgen tot materiele hulpmiddelen, zoals hulp bij de alledaagse taken en het vinden van een baan. Maar nog belangrijker is dat deze persoonlijke netwerken sociale werelden waardoor lokale kennis stroomt belichamen en uitdrukken, de mening en waardering van mensen kadert en waarde toevoegt. Het relationele netwerk van Turkse vrouwen is belangrijk, omdat binnen dit netwerk sociale grenzen en

denkbeelden over het publieke en private sociaal worden geconstrueerd. De subcategorieën, de netwerkcomposities van Inkapseling, Segregatie, Integratie, en Isolement (naar Hannerz, 1980), vormen de relationele contexten waar Turkse vrouwen van doordrongen zijn. Terwijl *ingekapseld* meer plaatsbepaald is en daardoor territoriaal gevoelig, is *gesegregeerd* contextbepaald en dus informeel gevoelig. Anonimiteit kan alleen maar worden verklaard door *geïntegreerd*. Deze relationele contexten – welke in Hoofdstuk Zeven in detail worden beschreven – beïnvloeden de relationele constructie van grenzen en de *habitus*, hoe Turkse vrouwen zichzelf en andere positioneren in de Turkse gemeenschap en de bredere Nederlandse maatschappij.

Huisvestingcultuur categorieën worden onderzocht om zo uit te vinden hoe stedelijke openbare ruimtes worden voorgesteld en toegeëigend als belangrijk onderdeel van de leefomgeving van de Turkse vrouw. Door het vergelijken van ruimtelijke praktijken van inwoners wonend in het centrum, voor- en na-oorlogse wijken en perifere/suburbane wijken, worden kenmerken van gebruik, het ervaren en het toe-eigenen behandeld in relatie tot enkele van de bovenstaande categorieën. Het verkiezen van een bepaalde leefomgeving boven een andere blijkt gerelateerd te zijn aan de levensfase en het persoonlijke type netwerk. De levensfase is belangrijk omdat nabijheid van familie en vrienden, bekend zijn met de wijk en gelimiteerde mogelijkheden tot ruimtelijke mobiliteit als het gaat om de dagelijkse boodschappen, factoren zijn waarom een eerste-generatie vrouw een bepaalde leefomgeving kiest. Tweede-generatie vrouwen echter, vinden alleen comfortabele accommodatie voor de familie belangrijk als het gaat om het kiezen van een leefomgeving. Ondanks dat verder onderzoek nodig is, kan het feit dat tweede-generatie en aangetrouwde Turkse vrouwen relatief verspreid zijn over de woningvoorraad die beschikbaar is (nieuwe, sociale woningbouw), worden toegeschreven aan dit gegeven. Dit in tegenstelling tot eerste-generatie vrouwen die al lange tijd geconcentreerd wonen in bepaalde wijken. Daarbij zijn persoonlijke netwerken invloedrijk als het om de preferentie van een leefomgeving gaat. Vooral *ingekapseld* trekt voor *place-bound* relaties.

Deze categoriale verschillen die worden verwoord in de relationele constructies van stedelijke openbare ruimtes, geven de grenzen aan van ‘wie samen horen’, ‘wij’ en de privé sfeer, en ‘die niet bij ons horen’, ‘zij’ en de publieke sfeer. De grenzen die zijn vastgesteld in deze categorieën zijn of buigzaam of permanent; dit hangt af van de gerelateerde contextuele referenties. Toch zijn specifieke ruimtelijke gewoontes van Turkse vrouwen tot op een zekere mate ontstaan in de contextuele en relationele betrokkenheid zoals deze ingebed is in deze categorieën.

Relationele Contexten en Ruimtelijke Praktijken

In relatie met bovenstaande discussie, voorzien categorieën van Turkse vrouwen ons met een basis om relationele contexten te identificeren waarbinnen zij zijn verankerd. Deze relationele contexten geven vorm aan hun sociale wereld, hun sociale identificaties en ruimtelijke associaties en drukken deze uit. De aard van de sociale netwerken van Turkse vrouwen, vooral de primaire en secundaire contacten die elke

dag voorkomen, is significant voor het zich toe-eigenen van stedelijke openbare ruimtes. In dit kader, worden hun sociale relaties beschreven als Gemeinschaft-achtige en Gesellschaft-achtige associaties. Bijzondere aandacht wordt besteed aan de relaties die leiden tot Gemeinschaft-achtige associaties.

De valorisatie van primaire relaties in het alledaagse domein van de familie, gelijke en vrouwelijke organisaties, demonstreert de mate waarop Turkse immigrante vrouwen zijn betrokken bij en verbonden met de Gemeinschaft-achtige associaties. Op basis van dit gegeven kunnen vier aanvullende en verbindende reflecties op de ruimtelijke praktijken en in het bijzonder op het gebruik en het toe-eigenen van stedelijke openbare ruimtes worden geïdentificeerd. Ten eerste suggereert de overmacht van primaire relaties dat er beperkingen zijn als het om ruimtelijke conceptualisatie gaat. Ten tweede leiden de beperkingen van ruimtelijke conceptualisatie tot individuen die vervreemden van het stadsleven en het openbare leven mijden. Ten derde krijgt anonimiteit geen kans in een sociale setting waar iedereen verbonden is met elkaar. Als iedereen in het openbaar wordt beschouwd als een potentieel of vermoedelijk lid van een groep, *significant other*, wordt de sociale controle overal gevoeld. Daarom, ten vierde, worden intimiteit en gemeenzaamheid zeer gewaardeerde ruimtelijke eigenschappen. Dus, de overmacht van de primaire relaties van de Turkse vrouw blijken restrictief te zijn als het om het conceptualiseren en het toe-eigenen, te vervreemden en anonimiteit af te leggen als het gaat om het ervaren van de stedelijke openbare ruimte. Het faciliteert de duurzame restrictieve tradities betreffende het toe-eigenen van de stedelijke openbare ruimte; de machtsrelatie omtrent *gender, roles* en gemeenschap prevaleren in Enschede.

Desondanks kan de overmacht van primaire relaties ook kansen bieden, zoals in detail beschreven in Hoofdstuk Zeven in het geval van het participeren in vrouwenorganisaties. Eerste-generatie en getrouwde Turkse immigrante vrouwen kunnen alleen uit de privé sfeer treden als zij meedoen aan publieke activiteiten via deze organisaties. Dus, deze organisaties zijn het enige medium voorhanden die Turkse immigrante vrouwen kunnen laten participeren in het sociale en culturele leven in Nederland. Op deze manier kan gesteld worden dat ondanks het feit dat de relaties voornamelijk primair zijn en met *significant others*, dit de enige mogelijkheid is voor Turkse vrouwen om in aanraking te komen met relaties buiten de primaire sfeer en een plek te krijgen in de bredere maatschappij. Omdat zij elke activiteit organiseren als groep, een sterk samenhangende groep, ontdekken zij de stad samen. Het ervaren van openbare ruimtes is sterk sociaal georiënteerd, zoals dit het geval is met picknicks in het park en bezoeken aan het wijkcentrum.

Op deze manier leiden Gemeinschaft-achtige relaties tot twee soorten van ruimtelijke associaties. Ten eerste, door het toelaten van 'wij' identificaties, raakt 'onze' openbare ruimte gedifferentieerd van 'hun' openbare ruimte, wat leidt tot positieve territorialiteit (voor hen die de controle hebben), zoals je thuis voelen, een positieve voorstelling hebben en je verbinden. Maar het leidt ook tot negatieve territorialiteit (voor hen die zich gecontroleerd voelen), zoals ontwijking, terugtrekking en gebrek aan sociale acceptatie. Ten tweede hoe meer Turkse vrouwen betrokken zijn bij Gemeinschaft-achtige relaties, hoe meer zij zoeken naar privé en semi-privé/semi-

publieke karakteristieken. Gemeenzaamheid wordt op deze manier de meest gewilde eigenschap van de stedelijke openbare ruimte. Deze twee ruimtelijke associaties werken tot op zekere hoogte samen, zoals wanneer gemeenzaamheid plaatsgebonden is of de basis is van extensieve primaire relaties en helpt de Turkse vrouw bij het vormen van positieve gevoelens over het territorium in de vorm van constructieve representatie en positieve plaatsbinding. Tegelijkertijd creëert gemeenzaamheid een basis om met behulp van tactiek te onderhandelen over de stedelijke openbare ruimte.

Aan de andere kant promoot de grote hoeveelheid secundaire contacten interactie met andere en zorgt het ervoor dat de Turkse immigrante vrouwen tradities en sociale en culturele codes die hun gemeenschap heeft geïntroduceerd toen zij migreerde, betwisten en in twijfel trekken. Zij zien de stedelijke openbare ruimtes als settings waar zij meer interacties kunnen hebben en naar nieuwe identiteiten kunnen zoeken. Zo kunnen zij Turkse en Nederlandse waarden en normen bespreken met de gemeenschap. Zodra het inkomens- en scholingsniveau toeneemt, kunnen zij makkelijk handelen als mondige consumenten. Het gebruik van de openbare ruimte wordt hulpvaardig. Regelmatig contact met onbekende in het publieke domein stelt hen in staat om gemeenzaamheid te ontwikkelen en de mate van erbij horen te vergroten.

Gemeinschaft-achtige of Gesellschaft-achtige associaties hebben ook implicaties voor Turkse vrouwen als het gaat om hun huisvestingspreferenties, wijk keuze en huisvestingscultuur. Zoals eerder opgemerkt, degene met een ingekapseld persoonlijk netwerk hebben een zekere voorkeur voor een leefomgeving waar zij kunnen leven met dezelfde soort Turken (zelfde leeftijd, inkomen, politieke voorkeur etc) en prefereren het bestaan van Turkse elementen (een moskee voor Turken, of nog beter, voor de inwoners van dat woningcluster). Aan de ander kant kan een sterke oriëntatie op een bepaalde wijk als gevolg van sociale karakteristieken, zoals eerste-generatie Turken met lage inkomens in de noordelijke wijk en tweede-generatie Turken die klimmen op de economische ladder in de zuidelijke wijk, refereren naar een min of meer identieke habitus. Op deze manier zijn de leefomgeving en de *habitus* doorvlochten in de relationele context.

Alledaagse Ervaringen in de Stedelijke Openbare Ruimte

De ervaringen van Turkse vrouwen op alledaagse stedelijke openbare plekken brengen verschillende constructies van de stedelijke openbare ruimte aan het licht die uitsluitende of insluitende ruimtelijke praktijken reflecteren. Deze dagelijkse ervaringen, gevormd in verschillende ruimtelijke schalen, openbaren het ruimtelijke karakter van sociale identificatie: er wel of niet bijhoren.

Gebaseerd op een evidente classificatie van ruimtelijke schalen, namelijk thuis, de wijk en het stadcentrum, wordt de variëteit aan ruimtelijke associaties en verbindingen die Turkse vrouwen maken met de stedelijke openbare ruimte in de Nederlandse maatschappij onderzocht. Voor de Turkse vrouw corresponderen deze ruimtelijke schalen met verschillende percepties, voorstellingen en het toe-eigenen van de open-

bare ruimtes. Tegelijkertijd corresponderen deze schalen ook met verschillende ruimtelijke identificaties met als logisch gevolg verschillende houdingen ten opzichte van claimen van, onderhandelen over en het verkennen van deze ruimtes. Bovendien geven de ruimtelijke schalen de mate van thuishoren, betrokken zijn bij en verbinden aan, omdat hun sociale praktijken vervlochten zijn met de fysische ruimte.

Thuis refereert naar huiselijke praktijken en plekken van conformiteit en manipulatie. De huiselijke omgeving en het huiselijke territorium representeren de sterkste vorm wat betreft het claimen van de stedelijke publieke ruimte door Turkse vrouwen, van dagelijkse ontmoetingen tot het oordelen over een schone omgeving, en van privé gebruik tot specifieke *gender*-bepaalde praktijken. Sinds dit claimen een open karakter heeft, is het de plek voor interactie. In die zin bieden de huiselijke omgeving en het huiselijke territorium kansen en mogelijkheden tot sociale interacties, vooral omdat de immigrante vrouw de controle heeft. Deze ruimte is enorm belangrijk voor eerste-generatie immigranten en nieuwkomers, zoals huwelijksmigranten.

Een stap voor het werkelijke claimen van de openbare ruimte, beginnen Turkse vrouwen met het onderhandelen over de publieke ruimte met hulp van tactieken, met andere woorden toe-eigening in specifieke tijden. *Spatial literacy* is een belangrijke kwaliteit omdat hoe hoger de spatial literacy, hoe meer variëteit in tactieken en strategieën. De vertrouwde gedeeltes van de wijk representeren in dat geval familiale praktijken en plekken van improvisatie en strijd.

Aan de andere kant, voor degenen die verbonden zijn aan een wijk waar de banden met de Turkse gemeenschap sterk zijn, bestaan er bijna geen grenzen tussen het publieke domein en het privé domein. Wanneer iedereen een *significant other* is, is er geen ruimte om je in het publieke domein te bevinden als een sociaal experiment. In die zin, fungeren *Hemşehri* gemeenschappen als katalysator voor de formatie van stedelijke dorpen, omdat zij graag relaties houden die gebaseerd zijn op dezelfde streek van herkomst, en ook op hun bijzondere sociale en culturele karakteristieken, tradities en gewoontes.

Om te onderhandelen over de stedelijke openbare ruimte, kijken Turkse vrouwen naar openbare ruimtes waar het proces van *othering* is ondergeschikt. De publieke ruimtes wordt dan een plek van improvisatie en strijd. Op deze manier worden zij meer geletterd in ruimtelijke codes en sociaal gedrag. Zodra de gemeenzaamheid groeit, beginnen ze de grenzen van dominant-ondergeschikt, insider-buitenstaander en zij-wij te betwisten en uit te dagen. Het moet gezegd worden dat in bijzonder de tweede-generatie en gezinsvorming immigranten met gesegregeerde netwerken in staat zijn (en welwillend zijn) om deze onderhandelingen in de stedelijke openbare ruimte te leiden. Ondanks het feit dat Turkse vrouwen ingekapselde relaties hebben, een eenzijdig takenpakket veel voorkomt achter de coulissen (Goffman, 1969) en publieke interactie en observatie wordt gemeden, moet gezegd worden dat nabijheid (fysische nabijheid met een groeiende gemeenzaamheid) hen in staat stelt om te onderhandelen.

Binnen de ruimtelijke schalen van thuis en de wijk, ervaren Turkse vrouwen de stedelijke openbare ruimtes in hoge mate op grond van één op één interacties. Aan

de andere kant, als de perceptie op openbare ruimtes veranderd in verband met de dimensies en karakteristiek, worden ruimtelijke interactie patronen en gerelateerde toe-eigening strategieën en tactieken dus verschillend in deze verschillende stedelijke openbare ruimtes. In die zin, is ervaring in hogere mate verwant aan de *performance* en de vermogenheid om de ingeprente sociale betekenissen in de stedelijke openbare ruimte te decoderen.

De omschrijving die Turkse vrouwen geven aan het stadscentrum, helpen ons te begrijpen hoe sociale betekenissen diep zijn geworteld in de openbare ruimte. Negatieve eigenschappen, zoals drukte, kunstmatigheid, tieners, alcohol etc., roepen associaties op van terugtrekking, terwijl positieve eigenschappen zoals rust, gezelligheid, natuurlijk etc., meer aandacht krijgt en impliceert dat een openbare ruimte een fijne plek voor interactie kan zijn. Hoe meer een plek negatieve gevoelens oproept hoe meer het wordt ontweken en hoe meer het gebruik van de plek een taboe wordt. De habitus bepaald de kaders en patronen van ruimtelijke interactie in de stad

De scheidslijnen tussen participatie en terugtrekking, verbinding en scheiding, er bij horen of er niet bij horen, zijn niet zo scherp als vaak wordt gesuggereerd. Er zijn variëteiten in de mate en soorten van uitsluiting-insluiting, goedkeuring-afkeuring en betrokkenheid-afscheiding. Tegelijkertijd, belicht de betrokkenheid van de Turkse vrouw hun specifieke *senses of place*, hun *habitus*, relationele kaders van hun vormgegeven aard *of embodied dispositions*. De manier waarop Turkse vrouwen verbonden zijn met openbare ruimtes in Enschede onthult de betekenissen van die plekken voor hen en belicht mechanismen van uitsluiting en insluiting en wijst naar plekken van terugtrekking en plekken van interactie.

Slotopmerkingen

Ondanks dat het belang van stedelijke openbare ruimtes wordt onderkend door planologen, stedenbouwers en bestuurders, krijgt de perceptie van de gebruiker weinig aandacht. Immigranten – als zij al niet worden gezien als marginaal en gebrekkig – worden vaak beschouwd als een sympathiserende en passieve categorie onder de gebruikers. Hun ontwijking van, participatie in, terugtrekking van en plaatsing binnen stedelijke publieke ruimte is te verklaren door individuele karakteristieken. Dit is vooral gerelateerd aan de opvatting dat stedelijke openbare ruimtes niet meer dan containers voor activiteiten en mensen zijn.

Door het analyseren van de perceptie op en ervaringen met stedelijke openbare ruimtes van Turkse immigranten vrouwen in Enschede, creëert deze studie nieuwe perspectieven om te kijken naar stedelijke openbare ruimtes. Onderkent wordt dat dit in het alledaagse leven een plek is van wederzijdse dynamische relaties, vol van symboliek en macht, waar verschillen zoals geslacht, afkomst en etniciteit diep zijn vervlochten in representaties en sociale constructies. Aan de andere kant geeft deze studie een extensieve analyse van de diversiteit van de sociale relaties, banden, netwerken en cumulatieve processen van de Turkse immigranten vrouw, welke op hun

beurt ruimtelijk gedrag, gebruikspatronen en het ervaren van openbare ruimtes vormt, kadert of beperkt. Ook wordt belicht hoe verschillende karakteristieken en verschillende stedelijke openbare ruimtes, het gebruik en de ruimtelijke interacties van de gebruiker bepalen.

Bovendien ontwikkeld deze studie een nieuw kader over Turkse immigrante vrouwen. Het dynamische, relationele proces van het construeren van de ruimte, gebaseerd op hun betekenissen over, articulaties en representaties van sociale identificatie en ruimtelijke verbondenheid, wordt besproken. De nadruk wordt gelegd op het actief ontwikkelingen en interpreteren van sociale relaties waardoor Turkse vrouwen de stedelijke openbare ruimte kunnen creëren en transformeren. Het perspectief op het alledaagse leven geeft een beter beeld van wat leven op een bepaalde plek betekent (Healey, 1998). Op deze manier voorziet de studie naar de voorstellingen van alledaagse stedelijke openbare ruimtes door Turkse vrouwen, planologen en bestuurders van een diepere kennis: niet alleen hoe deze vrouwen denken over stedelijke openbare ruimtes, gebruik maken van deze ruimtes en deze waarderen, maar, nog belangrijker, ook hoe zij 'floreren', dat wil zeggen, hoe zij hun rechten en behoeftes definiëren, uitdrukken en aanwenden terwijl men deze alledaagse ruimtes creëert en transformeert. Daarom kunnen 'potentiële' openbare ruimtes, gecreëerd door planologen transformeren naar 'effectieve' openbare ruimtes (Gans, 1968).

Voor planologen en bestuurders levert de perceptie op alledaagse stedelijke openbare ruimte en de relationele invalshoek, nieuwe manieren op om te denken over stedelijk leven en hoe inwoners leven. Vanuit een planologisch perspectief is het belangrijk om de relevantie van alledaagse ruimtes van de woningcluster en de wijk of de centrale gebieden in het dagelijkse leven van mensen te onderkennen. In plaats van het positioneren van hen in een duale relatie zoals perifeer/centraal, commercieel/recreatie, publiek/privaat, binnen/buiten enzovoorts, moeten planologen begrijpen dat de stedelijke openbare ruimte door de gebruikers wordt gedefinieerd als een continuüm van sferen, activiteiten, mensen, sociale relaties en representaties. Met de focus op sociaal geconstrueerde openbare ruimte, kan de relationele benadering ook nieuwe inzichten geven als het gaat om het begrijpen van de processen van sociale uitsluiting en cohesie.

In de publieke ruimte bestaan er een oneindig aantal territoria gebaseerd op terugtrekking en betrokkenheid en scheiding en verbondenheid. In die zin kunnen uitsluiting en samenhang niet worden gezien als twee tegenovergestelde entiteiten; het proces van uitsluiting kan inherent zijn aan het proces van sociale cohesie. Hajer en Reijndorp (2001) stellen dat hoe wij ons publiek domein ervaren, feitelijk gerelateerd is aan het binnentreden in het *parochial* domein van 'anderen'. De belevenis van in het openbaar zijn, intervenueert sterk met relationele constructies van 'privé' en 'publiek', met andere woorden sociale identificatie en representatie van 'wij' en 'zij'. De relationele context van de stedelijke openbare ruimte is daarom beslissend wat betreft hoe graag men deel wil uitmaken hiervan.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Eda Ünlü Yücesoy was born on September 17, 1970 in Kırıkkale, Turkey. In 1988 she took up City and Regional Planning at the Faculty of Architecture of Middle East Technical University where she graduated in 1993 as a City Planner. In 1996, she earned the Master's degree in City Planning with her thesis in Urban Design and soon after she started the Ph.D. program in the same department. Starting in 1994, she worked as a teaching and research assistant in the department of City and Regional Planning for five years. In 1998, she worked as a research fellow at the Institute of Urban Studies in Budapest University of Technology and Economics, on a one semester fellowship awarded by the Hungarian government. After completing her Ph.D. Qualification Exam in City Planning, at the end of 1999, she moved to the Netherlands. In 2001, she started her Ph.D. studies in Human Geography and City & Regional Planning at Utrecht University. She currently lives and works in Istanbul, Turkey.