DE-MODERNIZATION OF THE RURAL-TO-URBAN MIGRANTS
AND MODERN MULTISTORY DWELLINGS IN TURKISH CITIES

Utku Balaban, State University of New York at Binghamton

This article aims to present the relationship between the urban transformation of the last two decades in Turkish cities and emergence of apartment buildings as the primary form of dwelling by giving emphasis on the changes brought by the new regime of accumulation.

Until late 1970s, the defining element of the representation of space in Turkish cities had been the ‘squatter settlement-apartment building’ binary: the class antagonism was reproduced and expressed at the form of dwelling. Social sciences dealing with different aspects of the urban transformation took this characteristic for granted in their analyses. Accordingly, for most analyses of the time, squatter settlements were regarded as the representative of different layers of social meaning: their inhabitants were recent migrants, so their presence in the city, for some (Turkdogan, 1977; Erman, 2001; Turkdogan, 2002), means the confrontation between rural and urban in the urban life. They were also new workers of the formal economy and part of the inchoate informal economy. The spatial segregation of the squatter settlements from middle-class neighborhoods made the class antagonism visible not only in terms of the clear borders between class-based neighborhoods but also in terms of the architecture of the dwellings.

To the extent that this binary was able to describe these lines successfully, urban studies concentrated on the squatter settlement as a tool helping to form indices of urbanity, stratification, and modernization. In fact, by focusing on the architectural aspects of the squatter settlements, social thinkers expected to reach certain conclusions about the
relationship of the users of these spaces with the urban culture and their living conditions. These studies strengthened the modernist stance in the Turkish academy tending to collapse the stratification issue into the process of urbanization of the rural-to-urban migrants. Thus, the architectural differences between apartment buildings (the dwelling of the middle class at the time) and squatter settlements emerged as the spatial representation of the social stratification, which would become less serious as the migrants would be integrated to the urban life. In other words, the architectural differentiation becomes the spatial representation of a temporal problem.

The overlapping between spatial segregation and class differences concealed the problems of this attitude for a long time. However, the former rural-to-urban migrants started to build their apartment buildings and this was a development simultaneous with the advent of neo-liberal policies after 1980 coup d’etat, which signifies the export-led growth as the new regime of accumulation. Through this process, the segregation between migrants and urbanites and between working class and middle class became more blurred in terms of dwelling forms, which they had been associated with.

**Simultaneously, the emergence** of the apartment buildings in the formerly working class neighborhoods eradicated the class homogeneity, since the firstcomers, who could occupy free or cheap land, became the landlords of the latecomers, who were urged to move in the apartments and had no chance of building their own squatter settlements or apartment buildings. In fact, as the income polarization and class heterogeneity within ‘peripheral’ neighborhoods increased, spatial homogeneity increased both between and within different city quarters of different social classes.
This new situation created methodological problems for those, who presented the urban transformation in Turkish cities as a process of assimilation of migrants into the urban culture and lifestyle, since this stance has used the spatial polarity of the forms of dwellings between migrants/working class neighborhoods and urbanites/middle class neighborhoods as the major reference point (for examples of studies dealing with this difficulty: Turgut, 1996; Inceoglu, 1999). The current major challenge is to come up with a more effective methodology that delineates these recent developments in urban transformation in the absence of a visible squatter-apartment dichotomy. In order to take the initial steps for the formulation of such a methodology, contemporary conditions should be clarified.

Concordantly, the first section will summarize the relevant aspects of the squatter settlements literature and the conversion of the squatter settlements into apartment buildings. The second section will suggest some generalizations about the studies on the architectural aspects of the squatter settlements. The third section will give some examples revealing the inability of the mainstream academy to explain the recent transformation of the squatter settlements into apartment buildings. The last section will propose some suggestions regarding a functioning methodology.

1-ON THE LITERATURE OF SQUATTERS: GREAT ANACHRONISM FOR THE MODERNIZATION THEORY

The literature on urban transformation in Turkey since the 1960s (i.e. roughly the import substituting industrialization period) had been emphasizing the rural-to-urban migration as the primary explanatory aspect of the urban transformation (Tekeli, 1996). To the
extent that rural-to-urban migration determined the rate of urbanization, this approach seemed to have solid grounds. Along with the same perspective, the urban transformation became almost identical with the migration process and the changing living conditions of the rural-to-urban migrants. In fact, urban transformation started to be regarded as the outcome of the relations between urbanites and migrants, rather than as a dynamic emerging out of the cities themselves.

This approach fostered the ‘modern-traditional’ binary: the urban transformation was perceived as a step in the modernization of the society. Migration was explaining the urban transformation. Thus, integration of the migrants to the urban society was associated with the modernization of the society. At this moment, the analysis of architectural forms and the users of those forms became central to the studies of urban transformation, because there was not a clear set of parameters distinguishing migrants from urbanites on the basis of modern-traditional distinction (Kapil and Gencaga, 1972). Thus, the literature on the relationship between rural-to-urban migration and urban transformation evolved in a way that changing living conditions and lifestyles of the migrants became the dependent variable of the architectural form: this attitude on squatter settlements emerged preponderant in the architecture literature with the claim to describe the urban transformation of the time. In order to understand the methodological problem, with which we deal in Turkish context, it will be heuristic to present the concerns of the literature of architecture dealing with urban transformation. The architecture theses and studies on the squatter settlements of the period came across with two major problematiques. The first group of studies and theses deals with the origin of the squatter
settlements, while the second group focuses on how the dwellers of the squatter settlements use and perceive these spaces.

Most of the theses and studies focusing on the origin of the architectural patterns of the squatter settlements claim that spatial organizations of the squatter settlements are rooted in non-urban architectural genres: the vernacular architecture of the rural, it is claimed, has a significant impact on the spatial organization of the squatters. The meaning of ‘the vernacular’ changes from one study to another. ‘Vernacular’ means in different studies the rural architecture (Ozsoy, 1983), Turkish-Central Asian architecture (Ozen-Yalcin, 1998), or even Hittite architecture (Erdogan, 1992). That is, architectural characteristics of the squatter settlements are a matter of inquiry, as long as they are described as ‘non-urban’.

The second group focuses on the way the inhabitants of the squatter settlements use these spaces: the level and content of the specialization of the rooms in the squatter settlements attract some attention of the architects, who expect and see certain changes in the use of the space in the direction toward a ‘conventional’ use of the apartments as development in favor of urbanization. For instance, the declining importance of the living room having a central position in the plan is regarded as the sign for increasing individualization of the members of the families (Turgut, 1996). Similarly, changes in the daily life practices taking place in squatter settlements appear as an important parameter of ‘urbanization’ (Inceoglu, 1999).

The common position that I want to emphasize in these studies is the attitude towards the rural-to-urban migrants and the spaces that they created: the expectation on the part of these studies were that migrants are to adapt to the modern urban life. The transformation
of their dwellings is thought to both reflect and realize this adaptation. At this point, the binary between squatter settlements and apartment buildings in this literature signifies not only the class lines, but also the teleological path for the rural-to-urban migrants. As the spatial characteristics of the dwellings of the migrants resemble the apartment buildings, which is the architectural epitome of the urbanization, the integration of the migrants is to be completed.

However, migrants did not follow this particular path: most of the squatter settlements were built either on state land or properties of various Ottoman endowments that had been founded in pre-Republic period (Keyder, 1999). In order to legitimize their right to their parcels, most migrants gradually converted their one-story houses to multistory buildings. That is, without experiencing the expected integration to urban values and lifestyle, migrants became inhabitants of apartments. The elimination of the relationship between the social status of the migrants and their dwellings emerged as an inconsistency for this literature: in this sense, the permeation of the multistory buildings in the city quarters mostly inhabited by the rural-to-urban migrants represents an inconsistency between what was ‘supposed to’ happen and what actually happened in Turkish cities. ‘Peasants’ moved to ‘modern’ apartment buildings too early, without being urbanized/modernized/civilized: their spatial experience went faster than and also retarded the temporal experience that they had been expected to experience.

However, this inconsistency signifies not just a ‘theoretical’ problem for the mainstream literature of architecture and social sciences: at the daily life level, there is another tension; the one for those, who moved to the apartments, which are designed for nuclear families. The new regime of accumulation would make life unendurable for new
migrants, tenants of the firstcomers, who need to adapt to the flexible labor regime in their isolated apartments.

2- ON THE MODERN APARTMENT BUILDINGS: THE END OF MODERNITY

The simultaneity between the emergence of apartments and the advent of neo-liberal policies that affected both forms of migration and the employment patterns accounts for certain contemporary problems for the recent rural-to-urban migrants. While the import substituting industrialization period (ISI) was replaced with the export-led growth (ELG) policies after the coup d’etat in 1980, migration patterns and the employment structure in Turkish cities were exposed to significant changes: the urban-to-urban migration became more prominent. The rural-to-urban migrants of this period unlike their predecessors were mostly agricultural wage-laborers or sharecroppers. That is, the rural-to-urban migrants in the ELG period were both numerically less significant, which was the main reason why they could not develop a coherent political camp in the urban political scene, and much poorer than the migrants of the ISI period. Thus, in the contemporary Turkish cities, it is difficult to suggest the ‘migrant-urbanite’ distinction as a useful analytical tool in the analyses of urban transformation. There are several factors causing this judgment. In the first place, the waves of rural-to-urban migration since the 1980s have been belonging to different segments of the rural society: rather than petty landowners, mostly sharecroppers and agricultural wage laborers started to come to the cities. Thus, firstcomers and late comers have nothing in common except for their point of geographical departure (Icduygu and Sirkeci, 1999).
Secondly, with the increasing importance of urban-to-urban migration since the 1970s, migration has ceased to be the spatial representation of the changes in the use of the national labor force, but became the signifier of the shifts in the spatial distribution of investment and, hence, movement of capital. In other words, migration becomes more and more a signifier of the changes in the industrial activities, rather than a transfer of the use of the national labor force from agriculture to industry (Bugra and Keyder, 2003).

Thirdly, the relationship between the early and late migrants has become a more significant determinant in the processes of urban transformation than the one between ‘urbanites’ and migrants: as the percentage of the urban population, who have been living in the cities before the ISI period, becomes almost ignorable compared to the waves of migration within the ISI and ELG periods, the major conflicts describing the urban transformation turn out to be the ones between these two sets of migrants (Ozbay, 1999).

Certainly, the nature and role of migration are closely associated with the urban employment structure: rate of unemployment has increased in cities, since the number of jobs in the construction sectors (thanks to the completed highrise development) and marginal sectors dropped. The percentage of the urban population in one of the social security systems also decreased (Senses, 2001). State started to take swift action against new squatter settlements. Furthermore, there are no more empty parcels close to workplaces to be occupied for new squatter settlements. Thus, migrants of the ELG period have become tenants of the migrants of the ISI period. On the other hand, the links between the migrants of the ELG period and their hometowns/villages are much weaker than the links of the migrants of the ISI period: thanks to their landownership back in their hometowns, the migrants of the ISI period can still utilize some of the agricultural
produce as a direct subsidy for their subsistence. Most of the migrants of the ELG period are deprived of this chance (Bugra and Keyder, 2003).

In fact, the rural-to-urban migrants of the ELG period experience a much harsher struggle of survival than the migrants of the ISI period. Thus, housing becomes a more urgent problem, as the employment structure changes to their detriment. In this sense, the prevalence of the apartment buildings emits two major dilemmas for the actors of the urban environment.

The first dilemma is the rent-trap: they need to live close to their workplaces, while it is no longer possible to build squatters thanks to the successful rural-to-urban migrants of the ISI period, who claimed all of the empty parcels. Thus, survival in the urban context for recent rural-to-urban migrants means paying a significant portion of their wage for rent, which eliminates any chance for them to save. In fact, apartment buildings signify a major transformation of the relations of urban stratification: because most of the early rural-to-urban migrants dwell in the same apartment buildings with their tenants, the ‘peripheral’ neighborhoods are practically quite heterogeneous in terms of income level. Different class segments share the same neighborhoods.

The second dilemma is related to the architectural characteristics of the apartment buildings in Turkish cities: ‘apartment building’ has been identified as the epitome of the modernist architecture at least since LeCorbusier. In this sense, highrise development is expected to fulfill a set of functions related to the modernist lifestyle. One of the most important of these tasks is the preservation of the privacy of the nuclear families (Kumar, 1997). In fact, the apartment building as a form of architecture is designed to satisfy two contradictory demands: to build as many apartments on a given parcel as possible and to
keep the apartments as separated from each other as possible. These contradictory demands contributed to this particular architectural form, in which the semi-private spaces are designed to ease and hasten the passages of the inhabitants in order to minimize the contact among each other (Herlyn, 1970; Jephicott, 1971; Towers, 2000).

Similarly, private spaces are designed to have virtually no contact with other private spaces.

The problem for the Turkish rural-to-urban migrants, who were eager to legalize their claim to the urban land they occupied and to turn that claim into opportunities for rent, started at the point, where they built their apartment buildings. In early studies about the development of apartment buildings in Turkish cities, the observers were astonished by the fact that architects had almost no contribution to the plans of most of these structures, which could have as many stories as eight. Durmus Topcu, who studied a working class neighborhood at the beginning of the 1980s, shares his observations in his master thesis:

…And owners of the parcels, who got a project done hastily, started to construct their buildings. The applications for the construction and the street plan for most the buildings were made after the construction started. Since most of the parcel owners thought that the legal procedures might change, they hastened to get the permission soon and did not pay any attention to the initial project. Accordingly, technicians, architecture-civil engineering students, and architects working as civil servants, none of whom had the legal right to authorize a project, completed projects cheaply, with the motivation of the parcel owners to have a project at the least possible cost. Because the pay was too low, they never controlled the site of construction. Thus, practically the users [owners of the parcels] and the construction workers constructed these buildings, as they wished (Topcu, 1985).

Topcu has a sample of 35 apartment buildings and 66 percent of the buildings in his sample did not have even a project. In fact, his observation of the careless attitude of the architects, technicians, and architecture/civil engineering students is irrelevant for the
majority of the cases in this sample, since no professional ever intervened in the construction of these buildings!

In a more comprehensive and recent study comprising 68 neighborhoods in four largest cities of Turkey (Ankara, Gaziantep, Istanbul, and Izmir), Tansi Senyapili concludes that 59 percent of the apartment buildings replacing the squatter settlements on the same parcel were constructed by the parcel owners themselves through the use of family labor or occasionally hiring some construction workers. Within this 59 percent, only 54 percent of the parcel owners had an actual project and only half of these projects were completed by an architect or civil engineer (i.e. 27 percent of the cases). In 28 percent of cases, owners of the parcels resorted to the help of a professional contractor (but not civil engineers or architects) and 71 percent within this 28 percent stated that they gave the job to the contractors, who complied with their expectations. That is, even in the cases, where the contractor had the responsibility of the construction, the parcel owners intervened in the design. 14 percent of the projects of the buildings within the sample are totally the result of the imagination of the parcel owners (Senyapili, 1996).

This means that we have a case here, where the architectural characteristics of the apartment buildings were determined as a compromise between the expectations of the parcel owners and the predetermined patterns common for the construction workers, who did the actual job. In this sense, the expectations of the migrants of the ISI period from their dwellings must have had a significant impact on the internal design of these multistory structures, which might differ significantly from the more conventional (or modernist) forms of multistory buildings in other countries. So the first question is then what kind of concerns by the ISI period migrants is observed on the structure of these
apartment buildings and to what extent these concerns led to significant divergences from the more conventional/modernist forms of apartment buildings.

The second question is related to the late rural-to-urban migrants: the recent rural-to-urban migrants are relatively out of the social networks established in the ISI period (Erder, 1997). Thus, they have even much stronger motivations than the rural-to-urban migrants of the ISI period to flex the limitations of the architecture of the apartment buildings in order to establish tighter social relations with their neighbors. In fact, the contradiction inherent in the very form of the apartment buildings between efficient space-creation and privacy emerges as a problem for the migrants of the ELG period. Though the contribution of the migrants of the ISI period to the design of these buildings might reduce the tension of privacy emerging from the form, the need for the recent migrants to eliminate that isolation is much more urgent than the firstcomers. In sum, we can mention a two-layered influence on the production of apartment buildings as a space: the first one is the contribution of the firstcomers to the very projects of these buildings with motivations quite different than it would be of ‘the modernist nuclear families’. The second layer of influence belongs to the latecomers, who are in a desperate need to get involved in the urban social networks and to use the neighborhood relations as the starting point. Thus, their relations with their immediate neighbors, who share the same apartment buildings, become vital. In that sense, the reproduction of the space in the apartment building by these new migrants through the use of space becomes the second question that should be posed in order to delineate the relationship between the urban transformation and the architectural forms.
3- ON THE PRODUCTION OF SPACE IN AND OF THE APARTMENT BUILDINGS

Unfortunately, the studies on the architectural characteristics of the apartment buildings replacing the squatter settlements are scarce and do not let us make useful generalizations. This absence in the literature is closely associated with the conviction of the social thinkers writing in this vein that the rapid transformation of the squatter settlements into modern apartment buildings is a ‘great anachronism’. The general silence on the issue becomes more note-worthy, when the fact is taken into account that the apartment buildings rising on the parcels of previous squatters constituted 22 percent of the total building stock of Istanbul according to the Metropolitan Master Plan of 1995, whereas squatter settlements accounted for 49 percent of the total building stock. In fact, number of the apartment buildings built by the former squatter settlement dwellers exceeded the number of the ‘regular’ apartment buildings even in 1995: certainly, the current ratio should be expected to change in favor of ‘irregular’ apartment buildings\(^1\).

The existing few studies usually with small-sized samples, though, might help us at least find a good starting point: for instance, Hulya Ari’s study on fifteen buildings in three Istambulite neighborhoods concludes that the spaces in the apartments are too specialized and does not let different needs of its inhabitants (Ari, 1994). As the buildings get taller, the space surrounding the building on the parcel loses its functions that it fulfills in the case of squatter settlements and apartment stories of fewer stories (Onal, 1985). Almost all buildings have balconies, while they are mostly used for the storage of food and usually converted to a room (Kalkan, 1990). The primary reason for the abstinence from

\(^1\) The last Metropolitan Master Plan of Istanbul was completed in 1995. Thus, we have no clear data about the current situation. In fact, the most dynamic element of the building stock in Turkish cities has been the one that attracted least attention: though the squatter dwellings were losing their importance, they continued to be the focus of many studies throughout the 1990s.
using the balcony is suggested as the proximity among apartment buildings endangering the privacy (Onal, 1985).

In fact, it seems that, though the previous squatter settlement dwellers contributed to the plans of their apartment buildings, they could or did not change conventional characteristics of the apartments: the interior spaces are too specialized for the working class families, who need to create some space for home-based work. The semi-public spaces do not let neighbors establish close relationships easily. The spaces designed to produce some interaction such as the balconies facing each other do not satisfy the original intention thanks to the unexpected results of the physical proximity of the apartment buildings. However, these generalizations are far from being conclusive due to the scarcity of the studies. That is, the contribution of the former squatter settlements to the design of their apartment buildings is still a riddle waiting for an answer.

On the other hand, we have slightly more studies on the use of the spaces in these apartment buildings. Daily acts are not organized according to the architectural design. Kemal Yildirim observes that daily acts are enmeshed with each other in different rooms and there is no strict division of functions assigned to individual rooms (Yildirim, 1986). Though it is claimed that working class families imitate middle class aspiration of having a separate guest room (Ayata and Gunes-Ayata, 1996), it is not common to use a separate room specifically for the guests (Tamer, 1990). The use of rooms for separate functions simultaneously is expected, when the prevalence of home-based work for the working class families is taken into consideration (Bugra and Keyder, 2003).
On the other hand, the use of semi-private spaces suggests that these apartment buildings can be perceived as a single house occupied by a single big family (Turgut and Saglamer, 1995):

The main entrances of the multistory buildings are qualified as the door of a large single dwelling... The examples of semi-squatter dwellings [UB: apartment buildings that replaced the squatter settlements] are one of the last products of urbanization. With the transformation to the multistory squatter dwellings, the multistory dwelling as a form of urbanization was mutated [and] the differentiation between the private and the public gained a new dimension. In this form, the [public] stair, which has the characteristic of being an interlocutory space, becomes the front yard (Dursun, 1995).

In fact, one of the two conclusions that the studies reviewed in this article allow us to reach is that the apartment buildings probably accounting for the majority of the building stock of Turkish cities are in terms of both physical labor and mental creativity the product of the rural-to-urban migrants of the ISI period. Though this fact bears some expectations about the presence of some authentic characteristics of the internal design of the apartments and the semi-private spaces within the apartment buildings that are not observable in corporate or state-led highrise development projects, our current knowledge denies such expectations\(^2\): despite some minor modifications, the internal design mostly followed the conventional forms. Similarly, the design of the semi-private spaces does not ease their communal use by the inhabitants of these multistory buildings.

These inferences make sense, only if the fact that rural-to-urban migrants of the ISI period planned to rent the ‘surplus’ apartments to the latecomers is taken into account. Then, their intended position in these buildings would not be one of equality, but hierarchy. Separation of the apartments was not particularly the outcome of preserving the privacy, but a derivation of keeping the prospective tenants spatially distant and

\(^2\) However, as mentioned above, this inference is far from conclusive due to the scarcity of the studies.
isolated from the ‘owners’ of the property. That is, if there is a similarity between apartment buildings built by the former squatter settlement dwellers and the apartment buildings built by contractors, corporations, and the government, that is not because the formal and informal highrise developers pursued the same motivations in their decision about the design (i.e. supposedly keeping the privacy at the maximum level for the sake of the middle-class nuclear family values), but because the former squatter settlement dwellers used the middle-class designs as a tool for their economic strategies.

Tahire Erman’s study that delineates the attitudes of the previous squatter settlement dwellers about their new apartments in Ankara is in this sense heuristic: despite myriad complaints in conjunction with the isolating effect of the apartments, very astonishingly, the residents expressed their general satisfaction\(^3\). However, once the fact that her sample was composed of mostly house owners is taken into account, the riddle is resolved: though the article gives no clue, whether they were enjoying some rent, we can conclude that the ownership of a semi-legalized dwelling as a source of relative income seems to determine the attitude of the people toward their apartments (Erman, 1997).

**The second conclusion** is about the reaction of the migrants of the ELG period: this group especially with the 1990s was urged to migrate to cities mostly because of the neo-liberal policies and severe civil strife. Thus, they could not control the conditions of migration. They found themselves under the double pressure of the flexible employment structure and the housing problem. These two problems were intertwined to the extent

---

\(^3\) Erman suggests four reasons for this ambivalent attitude: the fact that moving to an apartment is a serious commitment; mostly relatively better-off families live in apartment buildings, so moving to an apartment means upward social mobility; because moving to an apartment takes time for the migrants, it means social success; and apartment housing does not have the stigma of the squatter settlements and it has better infrastructure.
that chances in the job market are enhanced with the inclusion of social networks, most of which work through the neighborhood relations. Apartment buildings retard the inclusion of the latecomers thanks to their very design and also enhance the stratification between migrants of the ISI period and the ELG period.

This difficulty urged the latecomers to ‘invent’ new social links in their very struggle for survival: the tension resulted in what the architects and sociologists observe as the houses of single big families in these apartment buildings to the extent that these links provide them with advantages in the informal job market and especially competition for home-based work (Lordoğlu, 1993; White, 1994; Çınar, 1994; Ansal, 1996). The current methodological problem is the lack of a theoretical framework governing the prospective studies, which are to account for this complexity reflected on the class heterogeneity in the ‘peripheral’ neighborhoods. Focus on the dynamics in the dwellings of the migrants will provide precious information in this sense. However, in order to work on such a framework, an important theoretical conclusion in regard to the meaning of the emergence of apartment buildings in the peripheral neighborhoods of Turkish cities should be advanced.

4- ON THE MODERNITY OF SQUATTER SETTLEMENTS AND DE-MODERNITY OF APARTMENT BUILDINGS

Certainly, the meaning of any spatial form is established within the temporal development of the production relations. Some of the early studies about the squatter settlements already point out that dwellers of the squatter settlements had the aspirations for integration to the urban culture and for upward social mobility (Karpat, 1976; Kapil
and Gencaga, 1972). This particular attitude of the rural-to-urban migrants can be understood, only when the relatively positive employment structure of the ISI period and the relative ease of these migrants to turn their squatter settlements into semi-legal property in the Turkish context are taken into consideration. In this sense, squatter settlements provided this wave of rural-to-urban migrants with many advantages that are summarized in this article. In sum, squatter settlements helped these migrants experience a social transformation associated with ‘modernization’: the second generation of this wave reached better chances for education. Extended families began to become ‘nuclear families’. Occupational variety increased and foremen of the ISI factories chose to be ‘entrepreneurs’ running sweatshops of the ELG period. In all of these chunks constituting the more macro transformation that we now retrospectively call ‘modernization’ of these migrant families, their opportunity to dwell in a squatter settlement as an important indirect subsidy to their income player a significant role in the first places. Likewise, the apartment buildings that these migrants built later turned them into rentiers, who now get their own share from the income of the latecomers. In this sense, it is not difficult to claim that squatter settlements played a major role in the modernization of this wave of rural-to-urban migrants and integrated them to the urban society.

On the other hand, the rural-to-urban migrants of the ELG period have had an experience almost totally opposite to the firstcomers: the employment structure no longer provides significant chances for making savings and their life conditions are more of a struggle for survival rather than a journey of upward social mobility. Like for the firstcomers, the currently dominant form of dwelling, i.e. apartment buildings, has a pivotal role in this struggle, but it is far from being an advantage. The rural-to-urban migrants of the ISI
period contributed to the internal design of the apartment buildings significantly. However, we are not at a position to make precise conclusions about the ultimate impact of these contributions thanks to the scarcity of the studies. The initial deductions reveal an equation: on the one hand, migrants of the ISI period must have wanted to preserve certain spatial advantages of the squatter settlements that had given them their access of the social networks of the period. That is, they might have had some motivations similar to the ones of the migrants of the ELG period. Thus, it is expected that these motivations produced non-conventional forms of interior design in these apartment buildings that decrease the isolation among apartments and socialize the semi-public spaces within the buildings. On the other hand, the same migrants must have had the intention to rent some of the apartments in their buildings, which possibly functioned as a counteracting tendency. If this effect is stronger, then the interior designs between the apartment buildings constructed by corporations or the government and the ones constructed by the migrants of the ISI period are similar, though this similarity would be the outcome of different motivations by these two sets of actors.

Existing studies lead us to believe that the expectation for the future rent played a more significant role in the final determination of the interior design of these apartment buildings. Thus, the rural-to-urban migrants of the ELG period are urged to live in isolation and relatively cut off of the social networks as a result of this isolation. In fact, they are deprived of the means that eased the processes associated with modernization for the firstcomers.

And besides this *indirect* effect of the apartment buildings on the modernization process of the latecomers, there is also a *direct* effect: rural-to-urban migrants of the ELG period
have few options to emancipate from the isolation of their apartments and the most important one seems to be to form ‘big families’ in the same building, which retards one of the essential processes associated with modernization; i.e. transformation from extended families to nuclear families. To the extent that these new relations for individual families in total enhance the informal nature of the employment structure, the societal outcome becomes decreasing chances for the latecomers to integrate to the formal segment of the job market. In this sense, apartment buildings as the predominant form of urban dwelling for the rural-to-urban migrants of the ELG period slow down or even retard the processes associated with the modernization. Thus, in a nutshell, in Turkish cities squatter settlements of the ISI period as a non-modern form of dwelling modernized their inhabitants, whereas apartment buildings of the ELG period as a modern form of dwelling de-modernize their inhabitants.
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