Meaning and Functions of Norwegian-Turkish Vernacular Space in Drammen, Norway

Karolina Nikielska-Sekula[±]

Abstract

This paper discusses the functions and meaning of Norwegian-Turkish vernacular space in Norway. Employing the Foucauldian concept of heterotopia, it analyzes Turkish ethnic clubs in Drammen - a midsized city situated in the western part of Norway. In 2013, 25% of the city's inhabitants were of an immigrant background with the majority (13.5%) being of Turkish origin (Høydahl, 2014). Most of them arrived in the city as "guest workers" in the late 1960s and 1970s, and were followed afterwards by other members of their families. Due to their prolonged residence, they have managed to make an imprint on the city's landscape. This study shows that Norwegian-Turkish ethnic clubs are heterotopias of Norwegian society, in a Foucauldian understanding of the term. They embody practices, discourses and signs of identity originating from Turkey, being at the same time ordered by the rules of Norwegian society. I argue that those transnational spaces, labeled as "foreign," and linked to Turkey, bear strong influences from the host society and should be regarded as Norwegian-Turkish, rather than Turkish.

Keywords: *heterotopia; immigrant neighborhoods; Norway; Turkey; vernacular space.*

Introduction

Migratory processes from Turkey to Europe has gained a wide attention from the academia after 1960s wave of guest workers migration. Among the studies focusing on Turks in Europe, an important branch of research was dedicated to various aspects of Turkish run businesses and so-called immigrant neighborhoods populated by people of Turkish origin. Researchers focused, among other things, on belonging expressed via placing identities in the urban space of German cities (Çaglar, 2001; Ehrkamp, 2005; Güney et. al., 2016); entrepreneurship strategies of Turkish-run businesses in Germany and Belgium (Kesteloot & Mistiaen, 1997; Pécoud, 2004); relationships and tensions between

± Karolina Nikielska-Sekula, Research Fellow. University College of Southeast Norway, Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies. Hallvard Eikas Plass, 3800, Bø i Telemark, Norway; Marie Curie Early Stage Researcher, Migration Research Center, Koc University, Istanbul, Turkey. E-mail: karolina.nikielska-sekula@hit.no.

immigrant (Turkish) and native inhabitants of neighbourhoods in Germany and the Netherlands (Hanhörster, 2000; Smets & Kreuk, 2008); housing conditions of Turks in Sweden (Özüekren, 2003) and the Netherlands (Bolt & van Kempen, 2002). In the Norwegian context, urban settlement of Turks was problematized in Søholt and Lynnebakke's (2015) work on the motives that affect residence selection.

Even though the literature on urban settlement of Turks in Europe is widely developed, it still has several gaps to be addressed. Firstly, Turkish migration has been analysed in the context of the top destinations for labour workers in 1960s and 1970s. Consequently, Turkish migration studies are overrepresented by works conducted in German, Dutch and Belgian context. Little has been said about the urban activity of Turks in places with lower population of people of Turkish origin, such as Norway. What is more, existing studies were mainly conducted in big urban centres, while the knowledge of European Turks` livelihoods in smaller cities is still limited. Secondly, a number of research, including those recognizing multiple and complex identities of Turks in Europe, still uses traditional categories of ethnicity and approaches people of minority background born in Europe as *migrants,* instead of underlying their actual belonging to the new homelands. As a result, there is still a tendency in academia to situate European Turks and their habits outside the new homeland societies. Moreover, with a few exceptions (Çaglar, 2001, 2004; Soysal, 2001; Ehrkamp, 2005; Adriaens, 2014; Savaş, 2014) existing research focus strongly on Turkishness of the investigated sites and practices, while other (global and new homeland society`s) influences in creation of the new spaces and habits are overlooked.

Having in mind these research gaps: limited number of analysis of urban activity of Turks in Norway[1] and a need to develop an approach that overcomes imposing foreignness of European Turks in their countries of residence, I propose to focus more closely on Turkish vernacular facilities in Norway, analysing them through the lens of Foucauldian concept of heterotopia. I discuss case studies of three ethnic clubs in Drammen, Norway, being more or less literal reflections of tea houses popular in Turkey. My aim is firstly, to provide insight into the functioning of Turkish facilities in Norway, which has not yet been done, and secondly, to test the utility of the concept of heterotopia in spatial analysis of ethnic facilities. I seek to open the discussion on belonging of Turkish vernacular spaces to Drammen. Consequently, the research question that I pose here is whether ethnic clubs in Drammen constitute a part of Norwegian society, or they should rather be regarded as imported entities, representing foreignness and separated from the Norwegian reality.

To the best of my knowledge none of the existing research proposed an analysis of Turkish-run facilities through the prism of the Foucauldian concept

---

[1] For some recent research on Turks in Norway from outside urban studies, see: Rogstad (2009), Sandrup (2012), Zirh (2012).

of heterotopia. I suggest that this concept is useful because it helps to overcome othering of people of Turkish background in Norway but at the same time, it acknowledges the existence of habits, which differ from the dominant norm. The entity of analysis is a heterotopic site and practices and relationships taking place there, rather than people frequenting those places. Consequently, *deviant* habits are linked to space, rather than being regarded as features of particular people. This, in turn, helps to overcome an essentialist pre-assumption of "Turks" sharing particular "ethnic" practices in any circumstances. Foucault (1984) underlines that heterotopias always refer to the dominant society. Consequently, the concept of heterotopia allows analysing unlike spaces and habits in relation to the Norwegian society, rather than presupposing their links to Turkey. This permit an interesting and not very common starting point of analysis which do not assume Turkishness of the units of analysis *apriori*. In other words, presenting Turkish ethnic clubs through the prism of heterotopia does not imply foreignness on their frequenters, endorsing rather their belonging to the Norwegian society, despite sharing different practices in a particular context. Consequently, it enables analysis of particular *deviant* habits with a limitation to spatial sites they take place within, recognizing the fact that they may not necessarily be shared by the same people in another context.

I regard so-called ethnic or immigrant facilities as vernacular spaces. The notion is borrowed from Jerome Krase and Timothy Shortell who define it as follows: "Vernacular landscapes are the interpretive context of the signs of collective identity (…). Signs have meanings that relate to the patterns and places of urban life." (2011: 372). Krase and Shortell imply a link between vernacular and ethnic or immigrant. The notion, however, refers literally to the local and indigenous, recalling the autochthonic understanding of origin. I propose to benefit from the ambiguity of this term and I suggest that vernacular landscapes, being attached to the local of immigrant origin, also involve features of the local host society.

Methodology and Context

The data presented in this paper was collected for the author's PhD thesis on everyday practices of Norwegian Turks. The methods of data collection comprise ethnographic observation conducted between 2013 and 2016 in Drammen, accompanied by photo documentation of the observed space, in-depth and semi-structured interviews with facility owners and employees, second- and third-generation Norwegian-Turks, and experts, as well as informal conversations with visitors at Turkish facilities and inhabitants of Drammen. In total, I collected around 3000 pictures of Drammen, around 50 detailed field notes from the observations, 36 structured and semi-structured interviews and more than 100 informal conversations with people in the city, with special regard to Norwegian-Turks. Along with data collection in Drammen, I conducted a short fieldwork comprising ethnographic observation and semi-structured interviews in the villages of Drammenian Turks origin in Konya

province in Turkey. This paper focuses on a small part of the collected data, presenting activities of Norwegian-Turkish ethnic clubs. The rest of the data is used as context, as is data obtained from field studies in the Konya province of Turkey, where many ethnic club visitors originated.

Drammen is a mid-sized city situated in the Eastern part of Norway. In 2013, its population was about 65,000 with 25% of inhabitants of immigrant background[3]. The majority (13.5%) of those inhabitants with an immigrant background were Turks, which gives a total of approximately 2200 people of Turkish origin. They are quite well-settled in Drammen: 62% of immigrants of Turkish origin in the city have been living in Norway for more than 21 years (Høydahl, 2014).

Ethnic Clubs through the Lens of Heterotopia

Researchers generally agree that the Foucauldian concept of heterotopia was not sufficiently explained by the author. Edward Soja (1996: 162) even describes "Foucault's heterotypologies" as "frustratingly incomplete, inconsistent, incoherent". Such vagueness stems from the fact that Foucault's concept of heterotopia is mostly known from a draft of one lecture. "Foucault never returned to this spatial framework in any explicit or sustained manner. This open-ended and ambiguous analysis has in turn provoked many conflicting interpretations and applications across a range of disciplines" (Johnson, 2006: 81). Despite its inconsistences, the concept was apparently fruitful enough to gain attention from scholars, and it found a place in recent research on urban space (see e.g. Dehaene & De Cauter, 2008). In this paper, I employ the concept of heterotopia to the analysis of Turkish vernacular space of ethnic clubs in Drammen, Norway.

Defining Heterotopia

Heterotopia may be defined as a spatial alternative to the dominant reality. Heterotopias are spaces characterised by the otherness inscribed in them, and constitute a parallel to the dominant society. They are real and existing, but at the same time, they are not ordinary in a given socio-cultural environment. Heterotopias last as long as the social relations that created them are present (Cenzatti, 2008: 82).

Foucault (1984) distinguished six core characteristics of heterotopias. Firstly, he states that each culture produces its own heterotopias. In the past, they were primarily heterotopias of crises, providing the space for people in a liminal period such as menstruating or pregnant women. Today, heterotopias of crises have been replaced by heterotopias of deviation (1984: 6); spaces for people whose behaviour is in some way deviant to the dominant, such as psychiatric hospitals or prisons. Secondly, a heterotopia may have different functions over time, depending on changing circumstances in the dominant society. Thirdly, a "heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible" (Foucault,

1984: 7). Foucault gives here examples of cinema and theatre, which recreate various spaces in a regular room. Additionally, a "heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time" (1984: 8). Moreover, access to heterotopias is limited. There is "a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable" (1984: 9). Finally, heterotopias exist in reference to other spaces and their functions relate to them. Foucault distinguishes here between two types of heterotopias: heterotopias of illusion, that attempt to create "perfect other spaces" (1984: 10), and heterotopias of compensation that aim to create a real space which overcomes defects of the existing space. These described features of heterotopias constitute the ideal type. As Johnson (2006: 84) argues: "There is no pure form of heterotopia, but different combinations, each reverberating with all the others." With this in mind, we can continue with the analysis of Norwegian-Turkish ethnic clubs in Drammen through the prism of the Foucauldian concept of heterotopia.

Norwegian-Turkish Ethnic Clubs in Drammen

Ethnic clubs are known as teahouses in the literature on Turkish vernacular space (see Blommaert, Collins, & Slembrouck, 2005; Ehrkamp, 2005; Kesteloot & Mistiaen, 1997). I, however, propose to call them ethnic clubs[2] to underline their private and non-profit character, as well as to indicate certain features that some possess, which go beyond the definition of a teahouse. In Drammen, these places were co-founded by their members: "We get this to go around. Everyone must pay 560 kr each month [to] pay the rent [for the building]." (Adem[3]). I suggest that financing of the club by the members supports designation of ethnic clubs as private spaces, where access is limited to invited guests and insiders: "If one becomes a member, one can come here [to the club]." (Yusuf). Interestingly, women are excluded from the participation in Sunni gatherings: "This is only for men" (Burak). Limited access to the clubs reflects Foucault's (1984: 9) claim that "the heterotopic site is not freely accessible like a public place."

I visited three Turkish ethnic clubs functioning in Drammen. One of them was frequented by people of an Alevi background, originating from a village in Konya province, and hosted a *cemevi* – a house of religious ritual. Members called it a "cultural association" or "family association" and it was situated in a former Church City Mission's cafeteria. In the interior of the club, there was a meeting hall with a big table on one side of the room and small square tables on the other. The square tables functioned as places for playing board games and cards, while the big table was used for general meetings of the members.

---

[2] I use "ethnic" as a descriptive, not analytical concept and I decided to employ it because the members of the club from the very first contact informed me about their identification with Turkishness. The focus of analysis, however, is still oriented on practices and relationships taking place there, rather than on *ethnicity* at large.
[3] All the names were changed.

Next to the meeting hall was a worship place – the *cemevi* – where certain religious celebrations and social activities took place. *Cemevi* was defined by Alevi respondents in opposition to the Sunni mosques: "Sunni Muslims have mosques and we [Alevis] have *cemevi*. More or less *cemevi* is [a place] Alevis have instead of a mosque" (Mustafa). The space was adjusted to the needs of the community in terms of utility and aesthetics, with visible influences from Turkey. The *cemevi* was filled with colourful, soft carpets and low-seated Ottoman sofas, similar to those in a village *cemevi*, which sat along the walls. Portraits of Imams and traditional Turkish guitars were displayed on the walls. A central place on the meeting hall's wall had a big portrait of Atatürk, founder of the Turkish Republic. This place was frequented by people of different ages, and the atmosphere was vibrant and welcoming. Women and men were equally represented and there was no division between them inscribed in space. Generally, expressions of belonging, including symbols and practices, were oriented on Turkish Alevism, but they referred also to the Turkish Republic via the presence of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's portrait.

The second ethnic club was frequented by people with a Sunni background originating from another village in Turkey. The association was located in a rented yellow wooden house, similar to other buildings in the neighbourhood. The old name of the place remained on the windows. The interior consisted of square tables and sofas. Tea in traditional Turkish tulip glasses was served by a man with limited Norwegian skills, probably a newcomer, and a traditional tea machine was spotted. On the walls, T-shirts of Turkish football clubs were displayed along with pictures of Ottoman Istanbul and the village, along with a map of Turkey. Some months later, the football T-shirts were removed and a shelf with books in Turkish was introduced. What is more, a play station room was prepared to attract attention of young males from the community. The purpose of this was explained by Ahmet:

"There are a lot of bad things on the streets, so we prefer to have our youths coming here and spending time with us instead of doing stupid things on the streets." (Ahmet).

Ali described the other functions of the club as follows:

"This is [name of a village in Turkey] association. This is where we come from Turkey. (…) We sit here, relax, talk with each other (…), play cards. [We launched this place because] we thought that we could have a place where we come and talk, where we can meet each other and talk." (Ali)

The club was only for men and was frequented by first- and second-generation Norwegian-Turks. I was allowed in the facility several times, but I was never treated as a participant. I entered the building but I did not enter the heterotopic site. The interior design of the place and its functions was very similar to corresponding spaces in a Turkish village. I spotted an announcement about a Drammen football team's match, which revealed members' interest in the local life of Drammen as well. The club thus, though transnational, was at

the same time rooted in Norwegian reality, physically and via the interests of its members.

The third place that I visited was referred to by my interlocutors as a "cultural centre". It was only for members and frequented by Sunni Norwegian-Turks. "This is a Cultural Centre. This is for members. (…) We sit here, play cards, drink tea. This is a type of a meeting place for us." (Murat).

The association was located in a wooden building that, like the other two clubs, blended into the Norwegian urban landscape. The windows were decorated with the name of the club and Norwegian and Turkish flags. The main hall was decorated with sofas, a TV next to the front door, square tables and a kitchenette. Pictures of Istanbul and other global cities, New York included, were present. A portrait of Atatürk was complemented by a portrait of the current Norwegian King. These signs referred to two important elements upon which the Norwegian-Turkish identity was built – the belonging to Norway and Turkey. Just as in the other ethnic club frequented by Sunnis, one of the men who served tea had limited skills in Norwegian and was most likely a newcomer. Men were sitting around the tables, drinking tea from Turkish tulip glasses and playing board games. This behaviour was very similar to that seen among visitors to teahouses in Turkey, but might be considered culturally foreign in relation to Norwegian society.

Heterotopias of Norwegian Society

All three ethnic clubs had belonging to Turkey embedded in their spaces. They provided an arena to exercise particular practices common in Turkey, but unfamiliar in Norway, and may be regarded as heterotopias of Norwegian society. This unfamiliarity includes two aspects: foreign design and signs of belonging to Turkey, inscribed in the space as well as leisure practices: drinking *Turkish* tea in a masculine group while watching TV and playing cards outside one's house.

The design of the space referred to patterns from Turkey. Many practices and discourses inscribed in the spaces were the same, such as the popularity of board games or gender division in Sunni clubs. Each place, however, revealed different aspects of Turkishness. While the Alevi centre focused on belonging to the Turkish Alevi diaspora, the first Sunni ethnic club was oriented on belonging to a particular village, and had a strong interest in sports inscribed in space. The third cultural centre represented Turkishness via institutionalized symbols of Turkish heritage, such as Atatürk's portrait and Turkish flags. These Turkish elements, however, were complemented by similar references to Norwegian society –Norwegian flag, a portrait of King Harald, notices of local football matches – revealing double belonging to Norway and Turkey. Ethnic clubs thus constitute heterotopias of *Norwegian* society, being an answer to *its* conditions and being *its* "other spaces". Consequently, otherness of these places is situated within Norwegian reality and the clubs constitute a part of it, even if they are unlike.

Foucault (1984) argues that heterotopias change their functions according to the changing circumstances of society. Even though my research covered less than three years of these ethnic clubs' activities, I observed a dynamic in space decoration in response to the changing needs of visitors. I also spotted differentiation between the ethnic clubs' functions for newly arriving immigrants and well-settled Norwegian-Turks. The latter group visited clubs mainly for entertainment and mentioned this in conversation. For the newcomers, ethnic clubs might play adaptation functions during the first stages of migration, facilitating integration into Norwegian society, and only later becoming an arena of entertainment aimed at alleviating homesickness.

Ethnic clubs juxtapose, in a single place, spaces that are inconsistent, reflecting another feature of heterotopias. They incorporate patterns of rural Turkey, combining them with a modern, urban life. Meetings in the facilities take place according to the working hours typical of Norway and are frequented by modern, urban people, while the activities are those typical of unemployed males in rural areas of Turkey. Additionally, ethnic clubs incorporate symbols referencing the vibrant space of urban Istanbul, including its passion for football. They effectively bring both Turkish rural areas and a Turkish city into the single place of an ethnic club. Moreover, the Alevi ethnic club combined the space of religious ritual – the *cemevi* – with the space of secular entertainments.

Foucault argues that heterotopias break with the traditional understanding of time. Ethnic clubs function according to a modern sense of time and satisfy the present needs of modern people, but they also involve strong references to the past in their daily activities. References to the past are twofold. Firstly, they refer to the personal past of ethnic club members or their ancestors, reflecting patterns familiar from their lives in Turkey. Secondly, they embrace the collective past of Turks, including the sentiments toward the Ottoman Empire and Atatürk that constitute Turkish heritage. What is more, ethnic clubs introduce alternative interpretations of time, by marking celebrations that are not present in the Norwegian calendar, such as Turkish National Days and Islamic religious celebrations. In that sense they break with traditional understandings of time, as their festival activity is ruled not only by Norwegian but also by Turkish holidays.

Access to ethnic clubs is limited to members. Their semi-private character and necessity of insider knowledge about the activities taking place inside unmarked buildings contributes to maintaining this exclusiveness and reflects another feature of heterotopias. When entering Sunni ethnic clubs, I was allowed into the building, but not the *heterotopic space,* additionally being spatially placed on the side of the room. My interlocutors also used to leave the heterotopic space for the duration of our conversations. In contrast, in the Alevi centre, after several visits, I could participate in activities and move freely between the members, asking questions and having private conversations. I became a part of the heterotopic practice.

Following Foucault's statement that heterotopias "have a function in relation to all the space that remains", I argue that Norwegian-Turkish ethnic clubs in Drammen constitute heterotopias of compensation – being a "perfect" space that is missing in Norway. This is confirmed by statements of second- and third-generation Norwegian-Turks, according to whom interpersonal relationships in Norway were cold, inhuman and deprived of selflessness. Can and Elif recall some negative experiences with ethnic Norwegian fellows:

When I was hanging out with Norwegians, every time I was going to eat something, for example, this is what I was taught by my parents: ask if the one next to you is hungry and do not eat in front of him [if he is hungry]. So I would ask: "Do you want to eat something?" (…) they would always say "yes" and I would buy them food. But the day I didn't have money, he sat in front of me and ate in front of me". (Can)

If they [Norwegians] are in a group and you are alone, this is like: «ok, we have a group, we can ignore you». (…) But with those who have foreign background, it is much easier to enter the [existing] group." (Elif)

Ethnic clubs constituted an alternative to these and other alleged defects of Norwegian society. The idea of perfection was informed by the idealised concept of home – Turkey – and idealised relationships between people in Turkey as oriented on brotherhood. Similar to the Jesuit colonies in South Africa, given by Foucault as an example of heterotopias of compensation, the space of the ethnic clubs was supersaturated with symbols referring to the idea of perfection; pictures of Atatürk, the Turkish flag, pictures of Ottoman Istanbul and other symbols reflecting Turkishness. Simultaneously, the Norwegian-Turkish ethnic clubs constitute heterotopias of illusion – reflecting spatially the space organization of teahouses, cultural centres and *cemevies* from Turkey. Since the sources of illusion go beyond national borders, the dimension of transnationalism is imposed on them. This transnational relation, however, does not make these heterotopias "Turkish". The ethnic clubs are heterotopias of Norwegian society, even if reflecting an illusory vision of Turkey.

Discussion

In Europe, there has been observed a fear against recognizing people of immigrant descent, especially Muslims, as equal members of society, which has become even more visible after the recent refugee crisis. It affects a difficult situation of well settled Muslim minorities such as European Turks. Children and grandchildren of Turkish immigrants are still considered as outsiders despite being born and raised in the new homelands of their parents[4]. Their attachment to the new country of settlement`s *culture* is ignored and their links to what is considered as Turkish are often exaggerated, while differences between them and youths in Turkey are omitted. Sadly, the othering trends are also repeated in the academia: a number of research overlook the rootedness

---

[4] See more on Turks as long-term outsiders in Germany: Inowlocki, Lutz 2000; L. Soysal 2001.

of young minority members in the countries of their settlement, persistently linking them to Turkey and regarding through the prism of migration that many of them have never experienced. Similar attitudes are expressed in a common discourse to Turkish-run vernacular spaces in Drammen. They are considered as foreign, and the fact that they are influenced by Norwegian reality and their meanings and functions are different from the corresponding spaces in Turkey is often ignored. I argue that this is partly because of the spatial otherness of these places, which in turn highlights different ethnic identification of people running and frequenting them. As I however exemplified, the functions of teahouses in Turkey and ethnic clubs in Drammen are different, despite their superficial similarities. Clubs aim into compensation of the losses of Norwegian society seeking, among other things, to provide the ground for alternative identification of their young members and trying to protect them from the gang culture that is seen as a fear coming from Norwegian society. Teahouses in Turkey in turn, are the entities of entrepreneurship and their primary role is to provide entertainment, rather than create a base for identity.

This study aimed at answering the question whether the *unlike* spaces of Turkish ethnic clubs in Drammen should be considered as immanent part of Norwegian society or rather as imported entities, foreign to Norway. With the help of the notion of heterotopia, I argued that ethnic clubs constitute spaces parallel to the dominant society, with limited access and embedding different rules, practices and discourses. They have ambiguous attitudes towards time, answering the present needs of their users, while being linked to the Turkish calendar of celebration and having multiple references to the past. They juxtapose different spaces, combining rural and urban influences from Turkey with modern Norwegian lives. They are heterotopias of compensation, presenting an alternative to Norwegian reality. In these terms, ethnic clubs break or alter the regular rhythm of society and represent Foucauldian heterotopias. The language used in the clubs, the discourses of gender division in Sunni clubs, the way of serving tea are all foreign to what has traditionally been assumed as Norwegian, revealing the core feature of Foucauldian heterotopias – deviation. On the other hand, ethnic clubs are embedded in Norwegian reality and the "deviations" taking place inside them are regulated and dependent on rules common in Norway. In other words, the behaviour and the signs of otherness inscribed in the space of the ethnic clubs are expressed in a way specific to Norway and therefore they constitute a part of Norwegian society, even if they have transnational dimensions. As the example of Sunni ethnic club showed, these heterotopic sites comprise of symbols that refer to Norwegian collective identity, such as Norwegian flags and a portrait of King Harald. They are situated in a Norwegian city and created with references to Norwegian reality. They are seriously marked with Norwegian influences, and their meaning and functions cannot be analysed in isolation from the conditions of Norwegian society. Consequently, Turkish ethnic clubs in Drammen should be regarded as part of Norwegian society, despite their

strong references to Turkishness. They are not foreign entities *carried* by people from local places in Turkey to Drammen. They were created and modified in Drammen, according to the changing circumstances of the local reality, and they reflect the current, multi-ethnic composition of Norwegian society.

The Foucauldian concept of heterotopia allows an analysis of ethnic clubs without overlooking their complex relations to both the sending and receiving society. Being alternative and "other spaces", ethnic clubs in Norway are heterotopias of Norwegian society and exist in relation to it. The utility of the Foucauldian concept of heterotopia in research on vernacular landscapes, such as those represented by ethnic clubs, comprises the presumption that these extraordinary spaces, regarded as foreign in a common discourse, are actually immanent elements of the dominant society, even if representing their atavism. Consequently, I suggest that unlike practices, habits and spaces of Turkish minority in Norway deserve recognition as elements constituting Norwegian society. The fact that they are different does not mean that they are isolated from the circumstances of the dominant norm. On the contrary, their functions and meanings responds to the ways of life popular in the new homelands. What is more, attitudes and laws in the country of residence regulate development and transformation of the elements of minority *cultures*. Unfortunately, these influences are too often overlooked in analysis of practices of minorities.

References

Adriaens, F. (2014). 'Diaspora girls doing identities': Creating ideal television programmes and narratives of the self. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 17(2):101-117.

Blommaert, J., Collins, J., & Slembrouck, S. (2005). Polycentricity and interactional regimes in "global neighborhoods." *Ethnography*, *6*(2), 205–235.

Bolt, G., & van Kempen, R. (2002). Moving up or moving down? Housing careers of Turks and Moroccans in Utrecht, the Netherlands. *Housing Studies*, *17*(3), 401–422.

Çaglar, A. S. (2001). Constraining metaphors and the transnationalisation of spaces in Berlin. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *27*(4), 601–613.

Çaglar, A. S. (2004). Mediascapes, Advertisement Industries and Cosmopolitan Transformations: German Turks in Germany. *New German Critique* (92):39-61.

Cenzatti, M. (2008). Heterotopias of difference. In M. Dehaene & L. De Cauter (Eds.), *Heterotopia and the City: Public space in a Postcivil Society* (pp. 75–86). London: Routledge Taylor & Francis.

Dehaene, M., & De Cauter, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Heterotopia and the city: Public space in a postcivil society*. Routledge Taylor & Francis.

Ehrkamp, P. (2005). Placing identities: Transnational practices and local attachments of Turkish immigrants in Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *31*(2), 345–364.

Foucault, M. (1984). Of other spaces, heterotopias. *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité*, *5*. Translation available from http://foucault.info/doc/documents/heterotopia/foucault-heterotopia-en-html

Güney, S.; Kabaş, B. & Pekman, C. (2016). The Existential Struggle of Second-Generation Turkish Immigrants in Kreuzberg: Answering Spatiotemporal Change. *Space and Culture*. (1206331216643781):1-16.

Hanhörster, H. (2000). Whose neighbourhood is it? Ethnic diversity in urban spaces in Germany. *GeoJournal*, *51*(4), 329–338.

Høydahl, E. (2014). *Innvandrere og norskfødte med innvandrerforeldre i Drammen. SSB (Statistics Norway)*. Retrieved from www.ssb.no

Johnson, P. (2006). Unravelling Foucault's "different spaces." *History of the Human Sciences*, *19*(4), 75–90.

Kesteloot, C., & Mistiaen, P. (1997). From ethnic minority niche to assimilation: Turkish restaurants in Brussels. *Area*, *29*(4), 325–334.

Krase, J., & Shortell, T. (2011). On the spatial semiotics of vernacular landscapes in global cities. *Visual Communication*, *10*(3), 367–400.

Inowlocki, L. & Lutz H. (2000) Hard Labour: The 'Biographical Work' of a Turkish Migrant Woman in Germany. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 7(3):301-319.

Özüekren, A. S. (2003). Ethnic concentration at the neighbourhood block level: Turks in a Greater Stockholm suburb (1989 and 1999). *Housing, Theory and Society*, *20*(4), 172–182.

Pécoud, A. (2004). Entrepreneurship and identity: Cosmopolitanism and cultural competencies among German-Turkish businesspeople in Berlin. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *30*(1), 3–20.

Rogstad, J. (2009) Towards a Success Story? Turkish Immigrant Organizations in Norway. *Turkish Studies* 10(2):277-294.

Sandrup, T. (2013) Farfars hus: norsktyrkiske familier : innvandrede utvandrere. PhD Thesis, University of Oslo: Unipub.

Savaş, Ö. (2014). Taste diaspora: The aesthetic and material practice of belonging. Journal of Material Culture 19(2):185-208.

Smets, P., & Kreuk, N. (2008). Together or separate in the neighbourhood?: Contacts between natives and Turks in Amsterdam. *The Open Urban Studies Journal*, *1*, 35–47.

Søholt, S., & Lynnebakke, B. (2015). Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *41*(14), 2314–2335.

Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Soysal, L. (2001). Diversity of Experience, Experience of Diversity: Turkish Migrant Youth Culture in Berlin. Cultural Dynamics 13(1):5-28.

Zirh, B. C. (2012) Following the dead beyond the 'nation': a map for transnational Alevi funerary routes from Europe to Turkey. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35(10):1758-1774.