



MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE
FOR THE STUDY OF RELIGIOUS
AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY

Journal article

Immigrant settlement structures in Germany: general patterns and urban levels of concentration of major groups

Karen Schönwälder  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7458-6927>, Janina Söhn

Persistent identifier of original publication

[10.1177/0042098009104575](https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009104575)

Original publication date

2009

Published in

Urban Studies

Suggested citation

Schönwälder, K., & Söhn, J. (2009). Immigrant settlement structures in Germany: general patterns and urban levels of concentration of major groups. *Urban Studies*, 46(7), 1439-1460.

Document version

Accepted version

Creative Commons licence

[Attribution-Noncommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 \(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Immigrant Settlement Structures in Germany: General Patterns and Urban Levels of Concentration of Major Groups

Karen Schönwälder and Janina Söhn

Abstract: This article investigates the settlement structures of foreigners and, specifically, of Turks, ex-Yugoslavs, Italians, Greeks and ex-Soviets in Germany. The main data source is the as yet unexploited dataset of the Inner-city Spatial Observatory, complemented by data from the 2005 sample census and city statistics. Immigrant settlement is shown to be widely dispersed across west German cities. Within cities, ethnic neighbourhoods are rare. Immigrants typically live in multi-ethnic environments. Although differences exist between national groups, the level of ethnic residential concentration is relatively low in Germany. Hypotheses on the reasons for these findings are developed, focusing on the historical circumstances of migration, the structure of the German housing market, immigrant-specific state intervention as well as ethnic group differences regarding financial resources, discrimination and ethnic preferences.

Karen Schönwälder is in the Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, Max-Planck- Institute, I Hermann-Föge-Weg 11, D-37073, Göttingen, Germany.

E-mail: schoenwaelder@mmg.mpg.de.

Janina Söhn is in the Social Science Research Centre Berlin, Reichpietschufer 50, 10785, Berlin, Germany. E-mail: soehn@wzb.eu.

Introduction

The residential concentration of immigrant groups and the formation of 'ethnic' neighbourhoods have been recurring topics in German public debate. Recently, the phenomenon has attracted renewed attention. In the context of an alleged development of 'parallel societies', ethnic concentrations are seen as one indicator of a dangerous withdrawal of immigrant groups from mainstream society.¹ As has been argued in German newspapers and by German politicians, too many immigrants refuse to interact with Germans and to learn the German language and, instead, barricade themselves off in secluded communities of their own kind. In a typical statement, former Chancellor Gerhard Schröder (2004) on the one hand emphasised that "the plurality of cultures within our societies is a fact", but he went on to stress that the toleration of plurality had limits and that "no culture can be allowed to separate itself from the overall structures of society". Similarly, the Conservatives stated in their 2005 election manifesto that

the formation of ghettos and a development of parallel societies, as well as an often deliberate separation of foreign youths from German society, represent alarming signals for social peace in the country (CDU and CSU, 2005, p. 34).

Both major political parties seem to assume that cultures or groups exist in Germany that show a trend towards separation from mainstream society and that ghetto formation is progressing. Debates about segregation and immigrant integration seem to follow a cyclical scheme. Recently, the tone of the debate has become more moderate. In the context of a new emphasis on integration efforts, the government appears eager to avoid confrontational statements and stresses the need to co-operate and talk with each other. The official "National Integration Plan" of July 2007 avoids

making aggressive attacks on immigrant communities (Bundesregierung, 2007). It describes segregation as a result of market forces as well as ethnic preferences and concedes that, in early phases of immigration, ethnic infrastructures can be helpful to the individual. However, ethnic residential concentration is still seen as undesirable. And the government-appointed working party that wrote the chapter thought it necessary to warn against the development of “parallel structures”

In so far as tendencies towards separation from the host society exist that result in the development of parallel structures accompanied by a consolidation of patterns of behaviour from the countries of origin—for instance with regard to the roles of women and girls—and thus hamper integration, they are to be rejected (Bundesregierung, 2007, pp. 112–113).

This statement leaves open the extent to which such tendencies towards separation exist and how they can be identified. They take for granted, however, that ethnic community structures help to consolidate traditional patterns of behaviour and that the perpetuation of any habit linked to the countries of origin is unwelcome. Socially and ethnically mixed neighbourhoods are regarded as the best context for integration as it is widely assumed that a social mix in the residential environment will alter the attitudes, behaviour and social networks of its inhabitants.

Several key assumptions of the ‘parallel societies’ discourse, although widespread in public debates, are by no means common sense among experts. Disagreement not only concerns the normative ideal of a cohesive, more or less homogeneous society—at least one without consolidated ethnic communities. More fundamentally, the contours of the social problems to be addressed are

far from clear. Is there indeed a tendency among immigrants to withdraw increasingly from the rest of society? Are such trends, or trends towards assimilation, related to settlement structures—i.e. the existence and character of ethnic concentrations? And to what extent are immigrants in Germany dispersed over the country or spatially concentrated? In focusing on residential concentration, this article addresses one feature of an often-vague image of the unsatisfactory adjustment of immigrants to German society. It seeks to clarify whether and to what extent the settlement structures of—in novel official parlance— ‘individuals with a migration background’ give reason to assume that separation of immigrant and native population groups is a relevant phenomenon.

The article proceeds in the following manner. The first section describes the main data sources available in Germany and the so-far underexploited data of the IRB (Innerstädtische Raumbewachung) used in our own analyses. The two subsequent sections outline the residential patterns of major immigrant groups in Germany—namely, Turks, ‘ex-Yugoslavs’, Greeks and Italians as well as immigrants from the former Soviet Union. In a first step, we shall analyze patterns at the national level (section 3). Based on the results of our IRB analyses, we shall then investigate ethnic concentration within German cities (section 4). While the focus is on the German situation and on intergroup variance, brief comparisons with other European countries, primarily the UK and the Netherlands, will be drawn, and hypotheses on differences between countries will be presented (section 5). In section 6, possible reasons for the observed differences between the residential patterns of different immigrant groups in Germany will be discussed, before a conclusion returns to the social relevance of the observed residential patterns.

Data Sources

Although repeatedly a topic of political debates, spatial segregation in Germany has not yet become the subject of continuous academic observation. While in the 1980s a considerable number of studies were published (see, with further references, Glebe and O'Loughlin, 1987), these only in rare cases led to a continuous observation of trends in individual cities (see, works on Cologne by Friedrichs) and systematic, comprehensive analyses for the country as a whole do not exist (see, however, Böltken *et al.*, 2002; Musterd *et al.*, 1998). To some extent, this is due to the lack of relevant data. Unlike analyses for the US and Britain, investigations of the German situation cannot rely on census data. The last German census was held in 1987 and only in the old Western Federal Republic. Unlike in Sweden and the Netherlands, there are no nationwide registers that would allow researchers to link individual data on migration background, income, etc. with place of residence. Many data are only available locally—or not at all—and are often not accessible to researchers. The new sample census (*Mikrozensus*, as conducted since 2005) improves the available knowledge-base enormously, but it is not very helpful with regard to geographically differentiated information. Data cannot be broken down by residential area: only findings for selected cities and the regional states are available (see, however, Janßen and Schroedter, 2007; and note 19).

Older (as well as many current) official statistics are characterised by the well-known deficit of only offering citizenship information, which means that the naturalised and ethnic German immigrants (*Aussiedler*) can usually not be identified. The old distinction according to citizenship is currently being complemented by a new concept of 'migration background'. In the 2005 *Mikrozensus*, all those who were born abroad, those who possess (solely) non-German citizenship, were

naturalised, or have at least one parent who was or still is a foreign national or who immigrated to Germany are regarded as having a migration background. The concept thus includes different immigrant generations and all those with mixed German/non-German parentage. As distinct from the British concept, for example, it relies on objective criteria and not on (self-assessed) ethnicity.

In what follows, the new data are used to describe some general patterns of the distribution of the immigrant population across Germany. However, for more detailed analyses of residence patterns, it is still necessary to draw on other sources that rely on the traditional category of citizenship.² In place of satisfactory national data, we used a to-date underexploited data source that provides a unique set of data for a large number of German cities. The Inner-city Spatial Observatory (Innerstädtische Raumbewachung, IRB) brings together data for 42 large German cities.³ It has the specific advantage that uniformly defined items are collected in one dataset for relatively small spatial units within the 42 cities (see Böltken *et al.*, 2004; Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, 2007). Furthermore, while statistics often only list the overall number of foreign nationals, the IRB data contain separate figures for selected nationalities (Turks, Italians, Greeks, ex-Yugoslavs/Albanians). Other foreign nationals are assigned to summary categories (like 'new EU-members 2005'). Unfortunately, some quantitatively significant groups like the Poles, the Portuguese and the Spanish can thus not be analysed separately. However, the four largest foreign nationality groups are included.⁴ We use the category 'ex-Yugoslavs/ Albanians' as a proxy for ex-Yugoslavs; very few Albanians live in Germany and their inclusion is, in a way, counterbalanced by the exclusion of the Slovenes, who are also not very numerous. Apart from four typical 'guestworker' populations, we also looked at those immigrants who possess the citizenship of a

state formerly belonging to the Soviet Union (including those who also possess German citizenship). We did this to get an idea of the settlement patterns of the largest recent immigrant cohort which includes many ethnic Germans.⁵

Contrary to summary analyses of the settlement structures of foreigners in Germany, we can thus investigate specific patterns of selected groups. If residential concentration serves as an indicator of community formation, such an analysis of the residential patterns of individual national groups is indispensable. Of course, citizenship data are not an entirely satisfactory source as citizens of one country may consider themselves part of different ethnic communities (think of Turkish Kurds). Still, these data are the best we can currently get for Germany as a whole.

From the IRB dataset, we use a sample for the 33 West German cities,⁶ including Berlin, that consists of 1810 spatial units (*innerstädtische Gebietseinheiten*).⁷ (Inclusion of East German cities would have distorted the picture as very few immigrants live there.) The IRB relies on the spatial units (*Ortsteile, Stadtteile*) as defined by the individual cities. The units are, on average, inhabited by 8880 individuals. The standard deviation is, at 9199, fairly large. Data refer to the year 2004. The sample includes all German cities with more than 500 000 inhabitants. Some 20 per cent of the German population and 36 per cent of Germany's foreign population are represented in this selection (own calculations based on Statistisches Bundesamt, 2006). As regards 'ex-Soviets', the sample differs slightly from that used for other groups: 10 cities in the former Federal Republic do not provide information about dual citizens, while six in the former East do so. The latter were included in our analysis as both ethnic German immigrants and Russian Jews are distributed across all regional states upon arrival in Germany and are therefore well represented

in eastern regions.

Unfortunately, the cities participating in the IRB have restricted the use of 'their' data. It is not allowed to publish information on a particular city or part of a named city unless permission has been obtained from the city authorities. As it seemed unrealistic to enter into communication with more than 30 city authorities and to get permission from all of them, we refrain from identifying particular neighbourhoods. Where information on particular cities is given, the sources are publicly available.⁸

The following analysis is thus based on the official data compiled in the IRB, complemented by data from the Micro Census 2005 and some official data for individual cities.

Settlement Patterns of Germany's Immigrant Population

According to the new data of the 2005 sample census, 15.3 million of Germany's 82.5 million inhabitants have a migration background. A total of 10.4 million are immigrants in the strict sense—i.e. have themselves immigrated since 1950. About half of those with a migration background (7.3 million or 8.9 per cent of the population) have foreign citizenship,⁹ while slightly over 50 per cent are German citizens (8.0 million or 9.7 per cent of the population) (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007a). To a significant extent, the immigrant population has its roots in the guest worker recruitment of the 1960s and early 1970s. About half of the foreign nationals in Germany still hold the citizenship of one of the six main recruitment countries—i.e. of Turkey, Italy, Greece, Spain, Portugal and Yugoslavia and its successors. However, even among those, many arrived later as refugees (from Turkey and Yugoslavia), students, employees, etc. Labour migration mainly within the European Union, refugee movements and the immigration of ethnic Germans from eastern

Europe were major sources of a significant growth in Germany's immigrant population in the 1980s and 1990s, when the number of foreigners increased from 4.5 (1980) to 7.3 million (2000).

As far as ethnic heterogeneity is concerned, Germany is still deeply divided along the old border between East and West. Of those with a migration background, 96 per cent live in the former West and in Berlin. Even those who arrived after unification (1990) have obviously tended to move to Germany's western parts. Of 15.33 million residents with a migration background, only 632 000 live in the former East German states (excluding Berlin) (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007a, p. 30). As usual, migrants tend to prefer the cities to the countryside. About half of the foreign nationals live in one of the 82 cities with at least 100 000 inhabitants, while for the population as a whole this is true for only 31 per cent. Among those with a migration background, the share living in cities with at least 100 000 inhabitants (44 per cent) is a bit lower than among the foreign nationals. This is probably due to the fact that ethnic German immigrants from eastern Europe, who form a major part of this group, are more inclined to live in small towns. Indeed, if we look at the German nationals with a migration background, we find that 30 per cent live in villages and smaller towns with less than 20 000 inhabitants (compared with 22 per cent of the foreign nationals and 42 per cent of the overall population). About half live in villages and towns with not more than 50 000 inhabitants (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007a, p. 30 and Table 1; authors' calculations, data for 2005).

Of the cities with more than 500 000 inhabitants, Frankfurt, Stuttgart and Munich have the highest share of foreign nationals among their populations (see Table 2). Additionally, the regions around Stuttgart and Frankfurt in particular represent centres of

immigrant settlement. Foreigners show a slight trend to congregate increasingly in the large cities. Yet overall, the balance between the share of the population with foreign citizenship living in the large cities and those living elsewhere has not changed dramatically in the past three decades. While in 1980, 48.4 per cent lived in the West German cities having more than 100 000 inhabitants (Deutscher Städtetag, 1981), the respective share was 53.9 per cent in 2004 (Deutscher Städtetag, 2005). One might have expected an even stronger trend towards the big cities given that major immigration movements occurred after 1980.¹⁰

Migrants are overwhelmingly an urban population, but—as distinct from other European countries—Germany is characterised by a distribution of the migrant population over a large number of cities, many of them medium-sized and even small-sized. Settlement structures still reflect the labour demands of the 1960s and 1970s, when an expanding industry recruited labour migrants from southern Europe and Turkey to work in factories located all over West Germany. Italians and former Yugoslavs are more numerous in the southern part of Germany—probably a result of labour demand as well as the wish to be ‘close to home’.¹¹ Germany’s Turkish population has major settlement centres in the Ruhr region, the former centre of mining and heavy industry, in Cologne, Hamburg and Berlin.¹² As it seems, a significant part of the migrant population remain attached to the cities or at least regions to which they originally moved.

Table 1. Distribution of population groups across communities by size, 2005

<i>Community size</i>	<i>Total population</i>	<i>Population with migration background (narrow definition)^a</i>		
		<i>Total</i>	<i>German citizenship</i>	<i>Foreign citizenship</i>
All communities (thousands)	82 465.3	14 784.8	7 464.2	7 320.6
<i>Percentage of group in community category</i>				
< 2 000	6.5	2.0	2.5	1.4
Between 2 000 and < 5 000	9.4	4.2	5.0	3.4
Between 5 000 and < 10 000	11.1	7.6	8.8	6.3
Between 10 000 and < 20 000	14.7	12.6	13.9	11.2
Between 20 000 and < 50 000	18.5	19.1	20.5	17.7
Between 50 000 and < 100 000	8.9	11.1	11.7	10.5
Between 100 000 and < 200 000	7.3	10.0	9.6	10.4
Between 200 000 and < 500 000	9.2	11.3	10.5	12.2
500 000 and more	14.4	22.2	17.5	27.0

^aFigures refer to those with a narrowly defined migration background. The Federal Statistical Office gives an overall figure of 15.33 million for those with a migration background (wide definition). This larger figure includes about 550 000 cases for which the exact migration background cannot be determined. Source: Statistisches Bundesamt (2007a, p. 30), authors' calculations.

Apparently, immigrant settlement structures in Germany are marked by lesser concentration than in other European countries—although this is a preliminary finding (see Table 3). Whereas Greater London is the home of about 45 per cent of the British ethnic minority population (Peach, 2007, pp. 9, 13, authors' calculation), in (West) Germany all 12 cities with more than 500 000 inhabitants account for only about one-quarter (27 per cent) of the population with foreign citizenship. In the Netherlands, about 40 per cent of those with a non-Western background live in one of the four biggest cities (SCP, 2004, pp. 16, 48) the combined population of which accounts for a similar share of the overall population as the 12 biggest German cities. Although such a comparison based on differently defined categories (citizenship versus non-Western background and ethnic minority membership) is unsatisfactory, it seems legitimate to assume that Germany's immigrant population is less concentrated in a small number of urban centres than those of Great Britain and the Netherlands.

Further data illustrate a parallel observation for individual ethnic communities.¹³ The largest Turkish community (in Berlin) represents only 7 per cent of Germany's Turkish population. Altogether there are about 40 German cities with a Turkish minority of over 5000. Munich, which has the largest Italian community, is home to 3.6 per cent of the Italian citizens in Germany. Based on citizenship, there is no single German city where one foreign nationality accounts for more than 10 per cent of the population (the highest level is in Duisburg where 8.4 per cent of the population are Turks).

Table 2. Foreign citizens and Turkish citizens in cities with more than 500 000 inhabitants and in large West German cities (100 000+) with at least 15 per cent foreign citizens, 2004

<i>City</i>	<i>Population (total)</i>	<i>Foreigners (total)</i>	<i>Foreigners (share of population)</i>	<i>Turkish nationals (share of population)</i>
Berlin	3 387 828	454 545	13.4	3.6
Hamburg	1 715 225	244 401	14.2	3.5
München	1 273 168	282 208	22.2	3.3
Köln	1 022 627	192 156	18.8	6.7
Frankfurt/M.	655 079	165 600	25.3	4.8
Stuttgart	590 657	127 560	21.6	3.8
Dortmund	588 860	79 842	13.6	4.8
Essen	588 084	62 511	10.6	2.9
Düsseldorf	574 541	100 990	17.6	2.6
Bremen	545 983 ^a	70 208	12.9	4.4
Hannover	515 841	75 152	14.6	3.8
Duisburg	503 664	75 194	14.9	8.3
Nürnberg	495 302	94 495	19.1	4.3
Mannheim	307 499	60 735	19.8	6.4
Wiesbaden	272 591	47 837	17.5	4.2
Augsburg	275 433 ^b	44 735	16.2	5.3
Mainz	184 502	32 019	17.4	3.7
Ludwigshafen	167 410	34 155	20.4	6.2
Heilbronn	121 320	24 734	20.4	7.5
Pforzheim	118 847	20 335	17.1	5.0
Ulm	120 107	19 688	16.4	4.8
Offenbach	118 233	37 084	31.4	6.1
Fürth	112 492	17 401	15.5	4.9
Germany	82 500 849	6 717 115	8.1	2.1

^a Figures for 30 June 2005; ^b Figures for 31 Dec. 2005.

Sources: Statistical offices of the cities and the regional states; for detailed references, see Schönwälder and Sohn (2007, pp. 50–54).

Table 3. Concentration of migrants in large cities in Germany, the UK and the Netherlands

	<i>Share of sub-population living in the respective cities</i>	<i>Share of overall population living in the respective cities</i>
<i>Germany (2004)</i>		
12 cities with more than 500 000 inhabitants ^a	27 (non-German citizens)	15
<i>Great Britain (2001)</i>		
Greater London	45 (non-White population)	13
<i>The Netherlands (2004)</i>		
Four largest Dutch cities ^b	40 (inhabitants of non-Western background)	13

^a See top 12 cities in Table 2.

^b Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Den Haag and Utrecht.

Source: Germany: Deutscher Städtetag (2005); UK: Peach (2007); Netherlands: SCP (2004).

This picture changes slightly if we include both naturalised Turks and Germans with Turkish parents. The 2005 sample census provides figures for those with current as well as *former* Turkish nationality for a small number (13) of cities. For Duisburg, the respective figure is 58 500, representing 11.6 per cent of the city's population (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007a, p. 106).¹⁴ If Duisburg was representative, the estimated Turkish-origin population of a city would be about 140 per cent of the (single) Turkish nationals.¹⁵

Ethnic Concentrations within German Cities

Different concepts are used to describe settlement structures within cities. Apart from segregation indices, other measures, such as population share or location quotient, are used to identify ethnic neighbourhoods, ethnic enclaves or ghettos (on different measures see Peach, 2007; Massey and Denton, 1988). In the following, we mainly look at concentration which, by definition, also involves segregation. While segregation indices can be found elsewhere (see note 30), data on concentration in our view provide additional information helpful to identify potential ethnic community structures.¹⁶ There are, however, no "established criteria on how to identify ethnic neighbourhoods"

(Logan *et al.*, 2002, p. 305). Apart from the existence of ethnic institutional structures, such criteria could be numbers and population shares. However, there is no consensus in international research on the individuals necessary for the formation of ethnic community structures. Alba *et al.* (1997, p. 893) have used a threshold of 40 per cent to identify ethnic neighbourhoods in US cities. Canadian researchers have described a “visible minority neighbourhood” as a census tract where at least 30 per cent of the population belong to one particular minority (Balakrishnan *et al.*, 2005, p. 129). In order to identify ethnic enclaves or ghettos—i.e. areas supposedly more densely populated by one single group than ethnic neighbourhoods—thresholds of 66 and 80 per cent for single minorities have been used (see Peach, 2007, p. 23). While there is no consensus on exact measures, these examples illustrate the common assumption that, in an ethnic neighbourhood, a significant part of the population—at least 30 per cent—belong to one particular ethnic group.

In Germany, it is hardly possible to find such ‘ethnic neighbourhoods’. In our sample of 1810 spatial units in 33 West German cities, the highest population share of one national group in only one unit was 38 per cent. This was extremely exceptional and there were only 15 spatial units (less than 1 per cent of our sample) where the share of one national group—usually the Turks—reached 20 per cent or more.

Rather than ethnic neighbourhoods, German cities contain ethnically mixed immigrant neighbourhoods. Typically, areas with a large share of foreign nationals among their population are inhabited by immigrants from different countries of origin. Even then, the German nationals are usually in the majority. Larger districts with more than 50 per cent foreign nationals exist, but they are rare. Of 45 urban districts in Frankfurt (*Stadtteile*), only one had a majority of non-

German nationals in 2004 (Stadt Frankfurt am Main, 2004, pp. 161–166).¹⁷ A study of the situation in Hamburg in 1997 listed eight such urban districts out of 180 (Grabowski *et al.*, 2002; for analyses of the situation in individual cities see, for example, Bartelheimer and von Freyberg, 1996; Buitkamp, 2001; Kapphan, 2000; Friedrichs, 1998).

As our own analysis of the IRB data shows, members of the immigrant groups under analysis typically live in areas where the share of foreigners among the population is higher than in the respective city as a whole. At the same time, only a minority lives in spatial units where foreigners account for more than 30 per cent of the population. Of the foreign citizens in our sample, 21 per cent lived in such units. It seems safe to conclude that, in German cities, longer-term German citizens and immigrants live side-by-side in multiethnic neighbourhoods. The preconditions for interethnic contact, in so far as they are related to the residential environment, seem to be not too bad.

The Turks are generally the largest national group in German cities, although in Munich, Stuttgart and Frankfurt those from the states of the former Yugoslavia are more numerous. Rarely does one national group represent the absolute majority of a neighbourhood's *foreign* population (in our sample, we could identify 121 such units, or 6.7 per cent).

In order to determine characteristics of the residential patterns of the main nationalities within cities, we compare relative concentrations in the spatial units of the 33 cities in our sample. We apply two relative measures to identify high concentrations of a specific nationality. First, as a 'constant' threshold, we use a 10 per cent share of a nationality in one spatial unit. We ask in how many spatial units Turks, ex-Yugoslavs, Italians or Greeks, make up more than 10 per cent of the local population and how many individuals of that

group live in such areas. Secondly, as a 'variable' threshold, we use a location quotient of 2.0 (i.e. a spatial unit is marked by a concentration of one nationality group when the share of this group is at least twice as high as the average share in the respective town).

As shown in Table 4, in the 1810 spatial units of our sample, the Turkish nationals make up on average 3.4 per cent of the population. There are 11 units where their share exceeds 20 per cent. About one-third of the Turkish nationals live in the 121 units where at least 10 per cent of the population are fellow nationals. Slightly over one-third live in 'concentration areas', defined as areas where the share of the group is at least twice as high as in the respective city. There are marked differences between German cities: while in one city only 5 per cent of the Turkish population live in such areas, this is true for 55 per cent in another.¹⁸ Many of the cities containing areas with high shares of Turkish inhabitants are located in North Rhine Westphalia. Cologne, for example, has several districts with shares of 15 to above 20 per cent Turkish nationals (Stadt Köln, 2006; authors' calculation).

For ex-Yugoslavs, the average population share is 2.2 per cent. Their maximum share is 26 per cent, but there are only three spatial units where ex-Yugoslavs account for more than 20 per cent of the population. There are 36 units in our sample where 10 per cent or more of the inhabitants are from the same region and only 5 per cent of all ex-Yugoslavs live in one of these. One in five ex-Yugoslavs lives in an area where the share of the group is at least twice as high as in the respective city. This is the case in 9 per cent of all units. Examples of concentrated ex-Yugoslav settlement can be found in Munich where their population share is about 7 per cent in some districts and, in one case, over 13 per cent (Statistisches Amt München, 2005; authors' calculation).

The average share of Italians in the spatial units of our sample is 1.1 per cent of the population. Their highest share in one unit is 9.4 per cent; thus there is no unit where our threshold of 10 per cent is exceeded. In 7 per cent of all units, the share of Italian inhabitants is at least twice as high as typical for the respective city, and 14 per cent of Italians live in these areas. A look at Stuttgart, one centre of Italian settlement, illustrates their relatively low residential concentration: the highest share of Italian nationals in any one district is 3.4 per cent (Statistisches Amt der Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart, 2005; authors' calculation).

For Greeks, the average population share per spatial unit, at 0.8 per cent, is the lowest of the groups investigated here. However, their relative concentration is almost as high as among the Turks. One-third of this sample's Greek population live in units (11 per cent of all units) where the share of this nationality is at least twice as high as the average in the respective city. However, only a tiny fraction (0.3 per cent) live in units where Greeks form more than one-tenth of the local population. In Stuttgart, which has the second-largest Greek population of German cities and, in relative terms, the largest Greek population, their highest share in one district (*Stadtbezirk*) is 6.2 per cent (Statistisches Amt der Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart, 2005; authors' calculation).

Table 4. Spatial concentration of selected nationalities in German cities (IRB)

	Citizenship					Foreign citizenship
	Turkish	Ex-Yugoslav	Italian	Greek	Ex-Soviet ^a	
Number of individuals	657 707	376 868	168 127	132 062	289 694	2 600 947
Overall average of population share in the spatial units (percentage)	3.4	2.0	1.1	0.8	2.3	14.6
Standard deviation (in percentage points)	3.9	2.6	1.2	1.4	2.7	10.5
Maximum population share in one unit (percentage)	38.4	26.1	9.4	20.1	26	70.3
<i>Spatial units with LQ ≥ 2.0^b</i>						
Number	190	166	122	191	162	104
Percentage of all spatial units	11	9	7	11	10	6
Individuals in these spatial units	238 580	82 190	22 677	43 376	91 443	343 350
Share of group living in these units (percentage)	36	22	14	33	32	13
<i>Spatial units with ≥ 10 per cent of nationality among population</i>						
Number	121	36	—	6	38	
Percentage of all spatial units	7	2	—	0.3	2	
Individuals in these spatial units	211 575	19 271	—	3493	29 565	
Share of group living in these units (percentage)	32	5	—	3	10	
<i>Spatial units with ≥ 30 per cent of nationality among population</i>						
Number						152
Percentage of all spatial units						8
Individuals in these spatial units						540 648
Share of group living in these units (percentage)						21

^aIncludes Germans with dual citizenship; 29 West and East German cities; 1624 spatial units.

^bLQ = location quotient.

Source: IRB, authors' calculations; 33 West German cities, 1810 spatial units.

As regards those possessing the citizenship of a successor state of the Soviet Union, we can note that their residential concentration is more pronounced than for ex-Yugoslavs and Italians but less developed than among Turks. Almost one-third of those originating from the Soviet Union and its successors live in units where the share of the group is at least twice as high as in the respective city

in general. One-tenth live in units where the share of the group is 10 per cent or more.

Overall, only few spatial units are marked by very high shares of immigrants. It is rare for a national group to account for more than one-tenth of the population. Comparing the five groups analysed here, it is hardly surprising that by far the most numerous group in Germany, the Turks, also has the highest shares of residents in urban areas. At the same time, it is not self-evident that the largest group also displays the highest concentrations. All five groups show a tendency to live in areas that contain a higher share of fellow nationals than the respective city as a whole; however, there are marked differences between groups. Thus, among the Turkish and Greek nationals as well as those possessing an ex-Soviet Union citizenship, about one-third live in areas where the share of the group is at least twice as high as is typical for the city as a whole. By contrast, only about 20 per cent of ex-Yugoslavs and 14 per cent of Italians do so. Only a minority of all five groups live in areas inhabited by an atypically high share of fellow nationals. It should be remembered that our definition of high shares applied unusually low thresholds of 10 per cent of the population and a location quotient of 2.

An analysis of the immediate residential environment of foreign nationals in Germany shows a similar tendency. Looking at the, on average, nine households next to an immigrant's household, Janßen and Schroedter (2007, p. 263) found that Turks are on average surrounded by a greater number of co-nationals than Greeks, ex-Yugoslavs and Italians (the least concentrated minority).¹⁹

Comparative Perspectives: Potential Causes of Differences between European States

As countries tend to use different concepts for their immigrant populations, international comparisons are difficult to undertake. The following examples thus only serve as rough indicators for the relatively low level of ethnic residential concentration and segregation in German cities. In London, for instance, significant shares of ethnic minority groups live in wards where the particular group accounts for 30 per cent or more of the population. In 2001, this was the case for 22 per cent of those of Indian descent and for almost 30 per cent of those of Bangladeshi descent. In Bradford, a centre of Asian immigration, almost half of the Pakistani population live in areas where the group accounts for more than half of the population (Peach, 2007, pp. 20–21). Looking at another European state, data for Amsterdam show that in 2004, 39 per cent of Turks²⁰ lived in areas where the group's share of the population was four standard deviations above the Amsterdam average of 5.1 per cent²¹ (Musterd and Ostendorf, 2007, p. 45). As shown earlier, of the Turkish nationals in German cities (in our sample), about one-third live in areas where the group accounts for 10 per cent of the population (the average share for all 1810 units is 3.4 per cent); shares of more than 30 per cent rarely exist.

These data seem to confirm that levels of segregation and spatial concentration of immigrants in Germany are relatively low—both at the national and the city levels. How can we account for such differences between immigrant settlement patterns in major European countries of immigration? First, the extent to which such differences exist should be subject to more detailed investigation. The uneven data situation allows only preliminary assumptions. Hypotheses on the reasons of assumed differences between the situation in

Germany, England and the Netherlands should thus be formulated with great caution. So far, different levels of segregation and concentration have occasionally been noted (see, for example, Musterd, 2005; Friedrichs, 1995, p. 90), but as regards explanations we seem at the beginning. Thus Musterd (2005, p. 338) suggests that "The differences between cities in Europe seem to be associated with the type of state, city and group". Häußermann and Siebel (2001, p. 43) believe that political intervention aimed at limiting social segregation kept German levels of ethnic segregation relatively low. In the following, we offer a number of further hypotheses. They relate to four main factors: general settlement patterns and economic geography, the historical circumstances and characteristics of the specific immigration movements, state intervention and, last, mechanisms of the housing market including discrimination.

One obvious line of inquiry would be a comparison of the general patterns of settlement in the different countries. General settlement patterns may favour a more even distribution of migrants over the country. Thus, Germany does not have the one dominant centre London represents in England.

Probably even more importantly, the distribution of industry shaped the residential patterns of immigrant populations. At least the guest worker immigration of the 1960s and 1970s, and thus a major share of immigration to Germany, was driven by the labour needs of German industry and directed towards regions and towns where factories were located (on the history of migration to Germany, see Schönwälder, 2001). As West Germany's industrial structure was characterised by a significant proportion of medium-sized businesses, spread over a number of regions and often located in smaller or middle-sized cities, the labour migrants were also distributed over at least the more industrialised parts of the

country. Furthermore, the enormous hunger for labour that occurred in a short period of time seems to have created more multinational workforces than for example in England, where it seemed more typical that particular immigrants worked in particular sub-sectors.²² This may be one reason for the fairly multinational composition of the immigrant populations of German cities.

Further, it may be that immigration processes that are to a lesser extent state-controlled, including those involving colonial subjects who are free to move, are more likely to follow social networks and thus to reinforce existing residential concentrations than other movements. Organised recruitment to Germany limited the space for chain migration and to some extent—as the Turkish government, for example, tried to distribute the benefits of foreign employment—ensured that migrants came from different regions (Hunn, 2005, pp. 82–86). Possibly, they were thus less inclined to gather in particular cities in the country of immigration than were migrants to other countries.²³

Among more recent immigrant cohorts in Germany, large groups—i.e. refugees and ethnic German immigrants—have been the target of state intervention which temporarily restricts their freedom of movement and distributes them evenly across the regional states (*Bundesländer*) and often across communities of all sizes, thus preventing the newcomers from joining their fellow nationals in larger cities.²⁴ Although ethnic German immigrants are allowed to leave these communities after the first three years of residence, state intervention seems to have lasting effects. According to a recent survey, 65 per cent of ethnic German resettlers voluntarily continue to live in the communities to which they were assigned (Haug and Sauer, 2007, p. 88).

Within cities, the relevance of rented accommodation and its dis-

tribution over the different districts may impact on differing residential patterns of migrant populations. In Germany, rented housing is quantitatively relatively important as the rate of home-ownership is low.²⁵ Thus a greater share of the overall housing stock is potentially available to those looking for rented accommodation, including migrants. Given its greater quantitative importance, rented housing may also be more distributed over different districts of the cities than in other countries. Further, the availability and location of social rented housing are often mentioned as major factors explaining differences between European welfare states and the US, and potentially also between European states (Domburg-De Rooij and Musterd, 2002, p. 126). State intervention via controlled rents can ensure that the social structure of city districts remains mixed or can direct lower-income families towards particular areas. Indeed, in a comparison of Vienna and Munich, Fassmann and Reeger (2001, p. 286) point to “the basic liberal concept of the Munich housing market and the spatially dispersed stock of flats for the socially disadvantaged” as reasons for a “more even distribution of the foreign population” in Munich. However, for a considerable period of time, foreigners in Germany were excluded from renting publicly subsidised flats. This changed in the late 1970s, but patterns formed by the guest worker immigration of the 1960s and 1970s were not shaped by the availability and allocation of social housing. The fact that immigrant families today typically live in inner-city areas—and not mainly in the housing blocks of the *banlieus*—is partly an unintended result of discrimination. In West Berlin, for instance, the authorities in the 1960s intended to demolish large parts of the pre-1914 housing stock. German residents were moved to modern blocks of flats often situated in different parts of the city. It seemed convenient and profitable to let the vacated, sub-standard flats to guest workers, who were

meant to stay only temporarily and who were denied access to the modern social rented housing. When the demolition plans were withdrawn, Berlin-Kreuzberg and other parts of German cities had become districts where immigrants (and students) accounted for a significant share of the population (Kleff, 1998; see also Glebe, 1997, p. 148).²⁶

Taken together, these factors may go some way towards explaining differences across states in immigrant settlement patterns and the relatively low levels of ethnic concentration in Germany. To date, they are hypotheses and further comparative empirical substantiation is clearly needed.

Explaining Differences between Immigrant Groups in Germany

While the observation of differences between European states remains tentative, the empirical evidence clearly shows differences in the residential patterns of different immigrant groups within Germany. How can we explain those differences?

Differences between nationalities with regard to their residential concentration may be related to a number of factors (see van Kempen and Özükren, 1998, pp. 1636–1647; Strohmeier and Alic, 2006; Häußermann and Siebel, 2001, pp. 30–35; Friedrichs, 2002). As is well known, the most important factor impacting on residential patterns— i.e. on segregation in general—is the housing market, or the availability of affordable accommodation in particular parts of a city. Secondly, discrimination against migrants in general, or against particular groups, often leaves such groups with limited choice of housing and directs them towards less-preferred areas that may already be inhabited by a large share of immigrants. And, thirdly, some individuals and groups may choose to live close to

people from a similar background and in areas where shops, religious sites and meeting-places are within easy reach. Additionally, state intervention can play a part if social rented housing is spatially concentrated and allocation practices favour ethnic concentrations. Some migrant groups, such as newly arrived refugees, may not be free to choose where they want to live. Further, cognitive and social resources have been mentioned as factors influencing residential patterns, as limited information and particular social networks may restrict and shape the ways in which people look for new accommodation (see, for example, van Kempen and Özüekren, 1998, pp. 1636–1647; Häußermann and Siebel, 2001, p. 24; Glebe, 1997; for a German case study, see Gestring *et al.*, 2006, pp. 81–129). In the following, we will set out some empirical evidence relating to possible causes of intergroup differences.

Foreign citizens in Germany largely depend on the rental housing market. Although the share of homeowners has increased over the past few years, at 13 per cent (in 1998) it is still much lower than among Germans of whom 38 per cent owned their home (Drever and Clark, 2001, p. 470, based on the GSOEP). Yet differences between non-German nationalities are too small to account for differing residential patterns. According to a survey conducted in 2001, 90 per cent of Turks live in rented accommodation, but among Italians at 84 per cent the share was not much lower (BMAS, 2002, Table 6.7, p. 91).

Income levels, combined with household size, in all probability do explain some differences in access to segments of the housing market. According to the data of the 2005 sample census, only 14 per cent of 'Turkish' households²⁷ belong to an upper quarter of households with a net household income of at least 2600 €, while among households without a migration background the share is 25.5 per

cent (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007a, pp. 166–167 and following). 'Italian' households are on average less wealthy than non-migrant households, but with 21 per cent in this higher-income group the distance is smaller. Looking at the lower-income bracket, we find 41.2 per cent of 'Turkish' households among those with not more than 1500 € compared with 37.9 per cent of the Italian households (and 37.2 per cent of the non-migrant households). If we take into account that 63 per cent of Turkish households consist of three or more persons—while the respective share of Italian households is only 45.5 per cent—these income differentials do support the hypothesis that differing degrees of residential concentration are, to some extent, the result of a market which directs families looking for spacious and affordable accommodation towards particular areas of a city.

Apart from income, the situation of the housing market at the time of arrival of particular immigrant groups may have shaped residential patterns. Thus, the former guest workers and their descendants often live concentrated in inner-city areas, while those arriving as refugees in the 1980s and 1990s encountered a very tight housing market and were often housed in apartment blocks on the outskirts of the big cities. If today former Yugoslavs and ethnic German immigrants more often live in social rented housing and apartment blocks than other immigrants²⁸ this is probably due to their time of arrival as well as the fact that, as ethnic Germans and war refugees, they were allocated particular flats by the authorities. It has been observed in some cities that more recently arrived migrants more often live in large housing estates on the periphery (Buitkamp, 2001, p. 59, for Hanover) and that the share of migrants among the inhabitants of such areas is growing (see Grabowski *et al.*, 2002, p. 144, on Hamburg; Stadt Frankfurt am Main, 2002, p. 24, on

Frankfurt).

Further, there are indicators that migrants are discriminated against by landlords. Housing standards are on average worse. Although immigrants' households are on average larger, they occupy less space per household and per person than German citizens (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung, 2005, pp. 101–103; Drever and Clark, 2001). According to calculations by Drever and Clark (2001, p. 471), lower income alone does not explain why foreigners have to put up with smaller flats. It is plausible to assume that different migrant groups are affected to a different extent. Italians and Greeks are altogether more popular with Germans than Turks and Africans.²⁹ Indeed, in 2001, 12 per cent of Turks and former Yugoslavs reported that, when looking for accommodation, a German had been preferred to them, while among Greeks and Italians 6 and 7 per cent respectively reported the same (BMAS, 2002, Table 13.1, p. 186; on discrimination in Cologne, see Keßler and Ross, 1991).

Preference may also play a part. Thus Philipps (1998, pp. 1699, 1684) reports that in some English cities cultural factors clearly play a role in sustaining segregation as, for instance, Asian Muslims in Leicester favour residential segregation. There are no detailed studies on housing preferences and ethnic concentration in Germany. A survey for the German government gives some hints, although participants were, unfortunately, not asked about their ethnic preferences but whether they preferred to live among foreigners or among Germans. While among Turks, former Yugoslavs, Italians and Greeks, more than 60 per cent said they did not care, a quarter of Turks said they preferred to live in an area mainly inhabited by foreigners. Only 9.5 per cent of Italians and about 12 per cent of former Yugoslavs and of Greeks shared this preference (BMAS, 2002, Table 6.3, p. 87, data for 2001). In another survey, even fewer (6

per cent) ethnic German immigrants from the former Soviet Union said they would prefer to live in areas where households from these countries of origin predominated— although almost three times as many (15 per cent) in fact lived in areas described accordingly (Haug and Sauer, 2007, pp. 109, 111). However, asked about motives for having moved to a particular town, ethnic Germans most frequently mentioned the wish to live close to relatives (Haug and Sauer, 2007, p. 85). Similarly, in a study in Duisburg districts with high shares of Turkish residents, those of Turkish origin generally reported discontent with the extent of ethnic concentration—but about half of the Turks interviewed said they lived in the area because of friends and relatives (Teczan, 2000, pp. 419–425). Obviously, when many immigrant families choose to live close to their relatives from the same countries of origin, the result will be ethnic concentration at the aggregate level. Thus, answers to survey questions about *ethnic* preferences may be misleading. Still, the exact role of preference among different groups remains unexplored. There are hints that migrants of Turkish origin, to a greater extent than, for example, Italians or ethnic German immigrants, in their choice of accommodation take the ‘ethnic milieu’ of a residential area into account, but we do not have any conclusive evidence.

Additionally, ethnic concentrations can of course be the product of out-migration on the part of native Germans who move away from areas inhabited by particular immigrant groups. Again, we lack detailed studies on this problem. In a survey with former residents of Duisburg who had moved to the surrounding countryside, only 9 per cent mentioned the wish to ‘improve the social environment’ as one reason for their move and very few explicitly mentioned the high number of foreigners, although Duisburg is a main centre of Turkish settlement (Blotevogel and Jeschke, 2001, pp. 61–62; see, with

similar observations, Glebe and O'Loughlin, 1987, pp. 66, 161). Further, given the mixed composition of immigrant areas in German cities, it is not apparent that 'White flight' would result in higher degrees of residential concentration of only some immigrant groups.

Altogether it is probably an interaction of mechanisms of the housing market (income and historical circumstances), discrimination and ethnic preferences that explains differences in the settlement patterns of different immigrant groups.

Conclusions

In sum, the evidence displayed in this article clearly demonstrates that, while residential patterns of immigrants differ from those of native Germans, ethnic concentration is limited. This confirms findings by Friedrichs, Glebe and others for earlier periods and for selected cities which recorded stable or declining levels of segregation.³⁰ However, even if levels of segregation are low and immigrants thus do not live secluded from native Germans, they often live in areas where unemployment and dependence on welfare are widespread.³¹ Life chances may thus be more severely affected by contexts of deprivation, rather than ethnic concentration.

And yet, ethnic residential concentration should not too readily be discarded as a potential contextual influence on immigrant integration and thus as a relevant political and academic issue. Negative (and positive) effects of ethnic residential concentration might exist in specific areas of particularly high ethnic concentration or in areas where a number of factors combine to produce specific results. Unfortunately, to date there is very limited evidence in Germany (and in Europe) on potential links between, for example, labour market opportunities, education, language competencies and attitudes, on the one hand, and ethnic residential concentration, on the other.

While for the US neighbourhood effects have been shown to exist in various fields, it is far from clear that the same applies in Europe (see, with further references, Oberwittler, 2007; Schönwälder, 2007; for empirical evidence on Germany, see Drever, 2004). The available research indicates that the main field where ethnic residential concentrations might indeed, under certain conditions, have unwelcome consequences is education. Spatial segregation between the poor and the better-off, as well as between natives and immigrants, creates homogeneous learning environments of disadvantaged students and such environments have been shown to impact negatively on initially low-performing students (see Stanat, 2006; Schofield, 2006). In fact, segregation in schools and kindergarten is higher than residential segregation (Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung, 2008). Altogether, however, analyses using major quantitative surveys have failed to produce clear evidence for the existence of negative effects of ethnic residential concentration in Germany (see Esser, 2006, p. 33). Presumably, the low levels of ethnic residential concentration and segregation and the little developed institutionalisation of ethnic communities prevent the sometimes anticipated (positive as well as negative) effects from occurring. Further factors differentiate the European from the American context and may decrease the impact of living in a certain residential environment. Levels of inequality in the living conditions between various districts are generally less pronounced in Europe. There is also greater mobility within cities through public transport, and particular neighbourhoods are less likely to be cut off from the city centre. In addition, welfare-state policies may help reduce the impact of inequalities (see Friedrichs *et al.*, 2003). In conclusion, the evidence indicates that in Germany, among factors determining immigrant integration and the equality of life chances, the ethnic mix

of urban neighbourhoods plays a minor role, at most. Currently, levels of residential concentration of immigrants are relatively low and mixed neighbourhoods predominate. This should of course not be taken for granted. Apart from monitoring trends, further analyses should aim to improve our understanding of the mechanisms underlying differing patterns between European states and between immigrant groups.

Notes

1. There are obvious parallels between the German, the British and the Dutch debates. Their common background is the growing concern with social cohesion and, in particular, the fear of terrorist acts and urban unrest after 09/11, the van Gogh murder in the Netherlands and urban riots in Britain and France.
2. Individual cities have started to compile data on migration background. However, very few such attempts exist so far and they do not necessarily use the same concepts (see, for example, Lindemann, 2005).
3. All but one of the cities have more than 100 000 inhabitants. Cities participate voluntarily; thus the sample is not random.
4. On 31 December 2006, 1.74 million Turks, 723 000 ex-Yugoslavs, 535 000 Italians and 304 000 Greeks were registered with the German authorities. Poles (362 000) and Russians (188 000) are now more numerous than the Portuguese (115 000) and the Spaniards (107 000): Statistisches Bundesamt, rounded figures.
5. We added the dual German and ex-Soviet citizens and the foreigners with ex-Soviet citizenship. In this case, this is helpful as the dual citizens are numerous because ethnic German immigrants often retained their original citizenship. In general, ethnic German immigrants are difficult to identify in official statistics.

6. The cities are Berlin, Bielefeld, Bochum, Bonn, Bremen, Dortmund, Duisburg, Düsseldorf, Essen, Frankfurt a.M., Freiburg, Gelsenkirchen, Hannover, Hamburg, Heidelberg, Ingolstadt, Karlsruhe, Koblenz, Köln, Krefeld, Lübeck, Ludwigshafen, Mainz, München, Münster, Nürnberg, Oberhausen, Offenbach, Regensburg, Saarbrücken, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden and Wuppertal.
7. We excluded 88 spatial units with less than 200 inhabitants each and 4365 inhabitants altogether. Their inclusion would have distorted the picture as the population share of immigrant groups was exceptionally high in parts of these largely uninhabited areas.
8. Some cities publish population data in print or on the Internet; other data were obtained directly from the respective statistical offices. For detailed references, see Schönwälder and Söhn, 2007.
9. Figures for foreign nationals are either based on the Central Register on Foreigners (Ausländerzentralregister, AZR) or on a population estimate (Bevölkerungsfortschreibung). The AZR is based on the obligatory registration with the local authorities. In 2004, a revision of the Central Register revealed that, rather than 7.3 million, only 6.7 million foreigners lived in Germany. For the end of 2006, the Central Register on Foreigners showed a total of about 6.75 million persons in Germany who only held a foreign citizenship (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007b). Nevertheless, the Federal Statistical Office still assumes a figure of 7.3 million foreign nationals, which is also the figure given in the 2005 sample census. Both sources use slightly differing definitions of 'foreign citizens'. Thus, the Central Register is meant to include only those foreigners who reside in Germany for more than three months, while in principle the population estimate includes all foreigners registered with the German authorities (see Opfermann *et al.*, 2006). Given these inconsistencies, figures on foreign citizens should not be treated as entirely reliable.

10. Figures provided by the Statistisches Bundesamt (2007a, p. 30) differ slightly. For reasons of data consistency, we use the figures of the Deutscher Städtetag in this case. See Gans (2000) for a slightly differing assessment of developments from 1980 to 1994. He believed that a “job-oriented in-migration of the guestworkers into the main centres of the metropolitan zones” was taking place (p. 1510). At least for the 1980s, however, Bucher *et al.* (1991, p. 510) had noted a process of deconcentration as foreigners were moving from city centres to suburban areas and the countryside.
11. Almost half of those with current or former Italian nationality live in Bavaria and Baden– Württemberg.
12. Of those with current or former Turkish nationality (2.745 million), 964 000 live in North Rhine Westphalia and 185 000 live in Berlin (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007a, pp. 88–89).
13. The following is based on data provided by the city statistical offices and by the regional states, data are for 31 December 2004 and, where possible, based on the revised Central Register on Foreigners. For detailed references, see Schönwälder and Söhn, 2007.
14. The Micro Census gives a figure of 35 900 Duisburg residents holding Turkish citizenship; according to city statistics for 31 December 2004 the figure was 42 400. Our calculations for individual cities (i.e. the figure of 8.4 per cent Turks) are based on city statistics.
15. For Germany as a whole, the sample census gives a figure of 1.887 million foreigners with Turkish citizenship and a figure of 2.745 million with current or former Turkish citizenship (145 per cent) (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007a, pp. 38–43).
16. As the variance in size of IRB spatial units is rather large, calculating segregation indices for the individual cities and, in particular, comparing them would be methodologically problematic.

17. In two additional districts, the share of foreign nationals was 44 and 48 per cent respectively. The overall population of the districts ranged between 2449 and 29 269. Duisburg has a number of *Ortsteile* (with about 3000 to 22 000 inhabitants) where the share of foreigners exceeds 25 per cent: Bruckhausen (51 per cent), Hochfeld (37 per cent), Marxloh (34 per cent), and Obermarxloh (27 per cent) (city statistics for 31 December 2004). According to the new *Sozialbericht* (Stadt Duisburg, 2007, pp. 49–50), the share of those with a migration background is 83 per cent in Bruckhausen, 58 per cent in Marxloh and 64 per cent in Hochfeld.
18. For the reasons explained earlier, we cannot identify the cities.
19. The analysis is based on the sample census where data are provided for sampling areas (*Auswahlbezirke*) consisting of, on average, 9 households or, on average, 12 individuals. The location, and thus the environment, of these areas remains unspecified. It is debatable how meaningful segregation in this extremely narrow context might be.
20. Figures refer to first- and second-generation immigrants regardless of citizenship.
21. The respective threshold for our IRB data would be 19 per cent. Five per cent of the Turks in our IRB sample live in such units.
22. We should, however, consider whether an 'Asian' workforce in English textile factories was indeed more homogeneous than a 'Mediterranean' or 'South European' workforce in German engineering companies.
23. Bangladeshi and Pakistani immigrants to Great Britain often came from particular regions.
24. This applies to ethnic German immigrants if they are dependent on social welfare which is common after arrival. Asylum-seekers and refugees are not allowed to leave the community they were assigned to without the authorities' permission.

25. In 2002, 58 per cent of households were renting their flats—see table *Wohnsituation* on the webpages of the Statistisches Bundesamt Deutschland (www.destatis.de). As the statistical office points out, the rate of ownership is still low in comparison with Europe (www.destatis.de; pages Bauen und Wohnen).
26. In some cities in the old mining and steel region of the Ruhr, settlement patterns go back to the strategies of companies and housing corporations who allocated particular, often old and decrepit, accommodation to migrants (see Hanhörster and Mölder, 2000, pp. 356–357; Glebe, 1997, p. 152).
27. Households are grouped according to the ‘Bezugsperson’, i.e. head of household, and their current or former citizenship.
28. Data for 2001 show that the proportion living in publicly subsidised flats is highest among those from former Yugoslavia (25 per cent), while 18 per cent of Turks and 10 per cent of Italians live in such flats (BMAS, 2002, Table 6.8, p. 92). Half of the ethnic German immigrants interviewed in a recent survey for the *Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge*, during their first three years in Germany, lived in publicly subsidised accommodation (Haug and Sauer, 2007, p. 50).
29. The general population survey ALLBUS in 1996 included social distance items referring to Turks, Italians, asylum-seekers and ethnic Germans (Statistisches Bundesamt *et al.*, 1997, pp. 463–466); see also Steinbach, 2004, 145–147.
30. Böltken *et al.* (2002, p. 399) have shown that from 1980 to 2000 the segregation index for foreigners in 15 West German cities declined from 24 to 22. ILS (2003) contains figures for selected nationalities in some North Rhine Westphalian cities; figures for Cologne can also be found in Friedrichs (1998); for figures on Düsseldorf, see Glebe (1997, p. 150). See also Götdecke-Stellmann (1994, p. 384)

and contributions in Glebe and O'Loughlin (1987, p. 160) disputing that a development of ghetto-like structures was likely.

31. Our own analyses with the IRB data show a strong positive correlation between shares of immigrant nationalities and of welfare recipients and unemployed respectively. Strohmeier *et al.* (ILS, 2003) for North Rhine Westphalia also emphasise the coincidence of deprivation and high shares of foreigners. However, areas inhabited by many immigrants are not generally poverty areas and often it is not the foreigners who show high rates of welfare dependence but the native Germans in the neighbourhood (see Schönwälder and Söhn, 2007, pp. 24–25).

References

- Alba, R. D., Logan, J. R. and Crowder, K. (1997) White ethnic neighborhoods and assimilation: the Greater New York Region, 1980–1990, *Social Forces*, 75(3), pp. 883–909.
- Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung (Ed.) (2008) *Bildung in Deutschland 2008. Ein indikatorengestützter Bericht mit einer Analyse zu Übergängen im Anschluss an den Sekundarbereich I*. Commissioned by the Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland and the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung. Bielefeld: Bertelsmann.
- Balakrishnan, T. R., Maxim, P. and Jurdi, R. (2005) Residential segregation and socio-economic integration of visible minorities in Canada, *Migration Letters*, 2(2), pp. 126–144.
- Bartelheimer, P. and Freyberg, T. von (1996) Ansätze zu einer Frankfurter Segregationsanalyse: Thesen und Trends, *Widersprüche*, 60, pp. 27–47.
- Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration (2005) *Bericht der Beauftragten der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration über die Lage der Ausländerinnen und Ausländer in Deutschland*.

- land. Berlin.
- Blotevogel, H. H. and Jeschke, M. (2001) *Determinanten der Stadt-Umland-Wanderungen im Raum Duisburg*. Diskussionspapier 4/2001, Institut für Geographie, Universität Duisburg. Duisburg (www.raumplanung.uni-dortmund.de/rlp/Personal/Jeschke/original/Diskussionsp-4-2001.pdf; accessed 3 January 2008).
- BMAS (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung) (2002) *Situation der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer Familienangehörigen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Repräsentativuntersuchung 2001, Forschungsbericht von M. Venema and C. Grimm, Offenbach und München.
- Böltken, F., Gatzweiler, H.-P. and Meyer, K. (2002) Räumliche Integration von Ausländern und Zuwanderern, in: Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (Ed.) *Internationale Wanderungen und räumliche Integration*, 8, pp. 397–415. Bonn.
- Böltken, F., Gatzweiler, H.-P. and Meyer, K. (2004) Innerstädtische Raumbewertung: Ein-, Rück- und Ausblicke: Informationsgrundlagen für Stadtforschung und Stadtentwicklungspolitik/ Städtekooperation, *Stadtforschung und Statistik*, 2(Festschrift), pp. 193–211.
- Bucher, H., Kocks, M. and Siedhoff, M. (1991) Wanderungen von Ausländern in der Bundesrepublik der 80er Jahre, *Informationen zur Raumentwicklung*, 7/8, pp. 501–512.
- Buitkamp, M. (2001) *Sozialräumliche Segregation in Hannover: Armutslagen und soziodemographische Strukturen in den Quartieren der Stadt*. Agis texte No. 23, Universität Hannover.
- Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (2007) *Innerstädtische Raumbewertung: Methoden und Analysen*, Bericht vol. 25. Bonn. Bundesregierung (2007) *Der Nationale Integrationsplan: Neue Wege–Neue Chancen*. Berlin.
- CDU and CSU (2005) *Deutschlands Chancen nutzen. Wachstum. Arbeit.*

- Sicherheit. Regierungsprogramm 2005–2009*. Berlin.
- Deutscher Städtetag (Ed.) (1981) *Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Gemeinden*, Vol. 68. Köln. Deutscher Städtetag (Ed.) (2005) *Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Gemeinden*, Vol. 92. Berlin.
- Domburg-de Rooij, T. and Musterd, S. (2002) Ethnic segregation and the welfare state, in: I. Schnell and W. Ostendorf (Eds) *Studies in Segregation and Desegregation*, pp. 107–131. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Drever, A. I. (2004) Separate spaces, separate outcomes? Neighbourhood impacts on minorities in Germany, *Urban Studies*, 41(8), pp. 1423–1439.
- Drever, A. I. and Clark, A. V. (2001) Wohnsituation von Ausländern: Trotz Verbesserung immer noch großer Abstand zu deutschen Haushalten, *Wochenbericht des DIW*, 30/01, pp. 469–471.
- Esser, H. (2006) *Migration, language and integration*. AKI Research Review No. 4, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.
- Fassmann, H. and Reeger, U. (2001) Immigration to Vienna and Munich: similarities and differences, in: H. T. Andersen and R. van Kempen (Eds) *Governing European Cities: Social Fragmentation, Social Exclusion and Urban Governance*, pp. 273–295. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Friedrichs, J. (1995) *Stadtsoziologie*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- Friedrichs, J. (1998) Ethnic segregation in Cologne, Germany, 1984–1994, *Urban Studies*, 35, pp. 1745–1764.
- Friedrichs, J. (2002) Zuwanderung, ethnische Segregation und städtische Vergemeinschaftung, in: A. Treichler (Ed.) *Wohlfahrtsstaat, Einwanderung und ethnische Minderheiten: Probleme, Entwicklungen, Perspektiven*, pp. 345–353. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Friedrichs, J., Galster, G. and Musterd, S. (2003) Editorial: neighbourhood effects on social opportunities: the European and American research and policy context, *Housing Studies*, 18(6), pp. 797–806.

- Gans, P. (2000) Urban population change in large cities in Germany, 1980–94, *Urban Studies*, 37(9), pp. 1497–1512.
- Gestring, N., Janßen, A. and Polat, A. (2006) *Prozesse der Integration und Ausgrenzung: Türkische Migranten der zweiten Generation*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Glebe, G. (1997) Housing and segregation of Turks in Germany, in: S. Özüekren and R. van Kempen (Eds) *Turks in European Cities: Housing and Urban Segregation*, pp. 122–157. Utrecht: European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations.
- Glebe, G. and O'Loughlin, J. (Eds) (1987) *Foreign Minorities in European Cities*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Göddecke-Stellmann, J. (1994) Räumliche Implikationen der Zuwanderung von Aussiedlern und Ausländern: Rückkehr zu alten Mustern oder Zeitenwende? *Informationen zur Raumentwicklung*, 5/6, pp. 373–386.
- Grabowski, W., Michel, U., Podszuweit, U. and Tietjens, H. (2002) Das Tor zur Welt: Zuwanderung und Segregation in Hamburg, in: H. Fassmann, J. Kohlbacher and U. Reeger (Eds) *Zuwanderung und Segregation: Europäische Metropolen im Vergleich*, pp. 143–159. Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.
- Hanhörster, H. and Mölder, M. (2000) Konflikt- und Integrationsräume im Wohnbereich, in: W. Heitmeyer and R. Anhut (Eds) *Bedrohte Stadtgesellschaft: Soziale Desintegrationsprozesse und ethnisch-kulturelle Konfliktkonstellationen*, pp. 347–400. Weinheim: Juventa Verlag.
- Haug, S. and Sauer, S. (2007) *Zuwanderung und Integration von (Spät-)Aussiedlern - Ermittlung und Bewertung der Auswirkungen des Wohnortzuweisungsgesetzes*. Forschungsstudie im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums des Innern, Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, Nürnberg.
- Häußermann, H. (2005) Integration und Urbanität: eine problematisch gewordene Beziehung, in: Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik (Ed.) *Zukunft von Stadt und Region, Vol. 1*, pp. 19–51. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

- Häußermann, H. and Siebel, W. (2001) *Soziale Integration und ethnische Schichtung: Zusammenhänge zwischen räumlicher und sozialer Integration*. Gutachten im Auftrag der Unabhängigen Kommission Zuwanderung, Berlin/Oldenburg.
- Hunn, K. (2005) *Nächstes Jahr kehren wir zurück ... Die Geschichte der türkischen 'Gastarbeiter' in der Bundesrepublik*. Göttingen: Wallstein.
- ILS (Institut für Landes- und Stadtentwicklungsforschung des Landes Nordrhein–Westfalen) (2003) *Sozialraumanalyse: Soziale, ethnische und demographische Segregation in den nordrhein- westfälischen Städten*. Gutachten für die Enquetekommission 'Zukunft der Städte in NRW' des Landtags Nordrhein–Westfalen, Dortmund/Bochum.
- Janßen, A. and Schroedter, J. H. (2007) Kleinräumliche Segregation der ausländischen Bevölkerung in Deutschland: eine Analyse auf der Basis des Mikrozensus, *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 36(6), pp. 453–472.
- Kapphan, A. (2000) Die Konzentrationen von Zuwanderern in Berlin: Entstehung und Auswirkungen, in: K. M. Schmals (Ed.) *Migration und Stadt: Entwicklungen, Defizite, Potenziale*, pp. 137–153. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- Kempen, R. van and Özüekren, A. S. (1998) Ethnic segregation in cities: new forms and explanations in a dynamic world, *Urban Studies*, 35, pp. 1631–1656.
- Keßler, U. and Ross, A. (1991) Ausländer auf dem Wohnungsmarkt einer Großstadt: Das Beispiel Köln, *Informationen zur Raumentwicklung*, 7/8, pp. 429–438.
- Kleff, H.-G. (1998) Die Bevölkerung türkischer Herkunft in Berlin-Kreuzberg: eine Bestandsaufnahme, in: Forschungsinstitut der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Ed.) *Ghettos oder ethnische Kolonien? Entwicklungschancen von Stadtteilen mit hohem Zuwandereranteil*, pp. 83–93. Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Lindemann, U. (2005) Stuttgarter Einwohner mit Zuwanderungshinter-

- grund, *Statistik und Informationsmanagement* (Stadt Stuttgart), 64(2), pp. 30–40.
- Logan, J. R., Alba, R. D. and Zhang, W. (2002) Immigrant enclaves and ethnic communities in New York and Los Angeles, *American Sociological Review*, 67, pp. 299–322.
- Massey, D. and Denton, N. A. (1988) The dimensions of residential segregation, *Social Forces*, 67, pp. 281–315.
- Musterd, S. (2003) Segregation and integration: a contested relationship, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(4), pp. 623–641.
- Musterd, S. (2005) Social and ethnic segregation in Europe: levels, causes, and effects, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 27(3), pp. 331–348.
- Musterd, S. and Ostendorf, W. (2007) Spatial segregation and integration in the Netherlands, in: K. Schönwälder (Ed.) *Residential segregation and the integration of immigrants: Britain, the Netherlands and Sweden*, pp. 41–60. WZB Discussion Paper SP IV 2007–602, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Berlin.
- Musterd, S., Ostendorf, W. and Breebaart, M. (1998) *Multi-ethnic Metropolis: Patterns and Policies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Oberwittler, D. (2007) *The effects of ethnic and social segregation on children and adolescents: recent research and results from a German multilevel study*. WZB Discussion Paper SP IV 2007-603, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Berlin.
- Opfermann, H., Grobecker, C. and Krack-Roberg, E. (2006) Auswirkung der Bereinigung des Ausländerzentralregisters auf die amtliche Ausländerstatistik, *Wirtschaft und Statistik*, 5, pp. 480–494.
- Peach, C. (2007) Sleepwalking into ghettoisation? The British debate over segregation, in: K. Schönwälder (Ed.) *Residential segregation and the integration of immigrants: Britain, the Netherlands and Sweden*, pp. 7–40. WZB Discussion Paper SP IV 2007-602, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Berlin.

- Philipps, D. (1998) Black minority ethnic concentration, segregation and dispersal in Britain, *Urban Studies*, 35, pp. 1681–1702.
- Schofield, J. W., with Alexander, K., Bangs, R. and Schauenburg, B. (2006) *Migration background, minority-group membership and academic achievement: research evidence from social, educational, and developmental psychology*. AKI Research Review No.5. Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Berlin.
- Schönwälder, K. (2001) *Einwanderung und ethnische Pluralität. Politische Entscheidungen und öffentliche Debatten in Großbritannien und der Bundesrepublik von den 1950er bis zu den 1970er Jahren*. Essen: Klartext.
- Schönwälder, K. (Ed.) (2007) *Residential segregation and the integration of immigrants: Britain, the Netherlands and Sweden*. WZB Discussion Paper SP IV 2007-602. Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Berlin.
- Schönwälder, K. and Söhn, J. (2007) *Siedlungsstrukturen von Migranten- gruppen in Deutschland: Schwerpunkte der Ansiedlung und innerstädtische Konzentrationen*. WZB Discussion Paper SP IV 2007-601. Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Berlin.
- Schröder, G. (2004) *Rede von Bundeskanzler Schröder zur Preisverleihung für Verständigung und Toleranz an Johannes Rau, 20 November*, (<http://archiv.bundesregierung.de>).
- SCP (Social and Cultural Planning Office, the Netherlands) (2004) *Ethnic minorities and integration: outlook for the future*. SCP, The Hague.
- Stadt Duisburg (2007) *Sozialbericht 2007*. Duisburg.
- Stadt Duisburg, Amt für Statistik, Stadtforschung und Europaangelegenheiten (2006) *Einwohner nach Deutschen und Ausländern, nach Ortsteilen und Stadtbezirken am 31.12.2005* (http://www.duisburg.de/micro/statistik_und_stadtforschung/medien-3/ew_ot_31.12.2005.pdf; accessed 7 March 2006).
- Stadt Frankfurt am Main, Bürgeramt, Statistik und Wahlen (2004) *Frankfurter Statistische Berichte, Statistische Kurzinformationen*, 4.

- Stadt Frankfurt am Main, Der Dezernent für Soziales und Jugend (2002) *Frankfurter Sozialbericht, Teil V, Segregation und Wohngebiete mit verdichteten sozialen Problemlagen*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Stadt Köln, Amt für Stadtentwicklung und Statistik (2006) *Einwohner nach Nationalität in Köln auf Stadtteilebene am 31.12.2004*.
- Stanat, P. (2006) Schulleistungen von Jugendlichen mit Migrationshintergrund: Die Rolle der Zusammensetzung der Schülerschaft, in: J. Baumert, P. Stanat and R. Watermann (Eds) *Herkunftsbedingte Disparitäten im Bildungswesen: Differenzielle Bildungsprozesse und Probleme der Verteilungsgerechtigkeit*, pp. 189–219. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Statistisches Amt der Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart (2005) *Einwohner in Stuttgart am 31. Dezember 2004 nach Staatsangehörigkeit und Stadtbezirken*. Tabelle No. 897, KomunIS.
- Statistisches Amt München (2005) *Die ausländische Bevölkerung in den Stadtbezirken nach ausgewählten Nationalitäten am 31.12.2004* (http://www.muenchen.info/sta/m-stat/themen/bevoelkerung/jahreszahlen/jahreszahlen_2004/pjt050112.pdf).
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2006) *Gebiet und Bevölkerung, Fachserie 1, Reihe 1*. Stuttgart.
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2007a) *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund-Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2005, Fachserie 1, Reihe 2.2*. Wiesbaden.
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2007b) *Press Release No. 094/2007-03-07*.
- Statistisches Bundesamt, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung & Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen (Eds) (1997) *Datenreport. Zahlen und Fakten über die Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
- Steinbach, A. (2004) *Soziale Distanz: Ethnische Grenzziehung und die Eingliederung von Zuwanderern in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für

Sozialwissenschaft.

- Strohmeier, K. P. and Alic, S. (2006) *Segregation in den Städten*. Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Teczan, L. (2000) Kulturelle Identität und Konflikt: Zur Rolle politischer und religiöser Gruppen der türkischen Minderheitsbevölkerung, in: W. Heitmeyer and R. Anhut (Eds) *Bedrohte Stadtgesellschaft: Soziale Desintegrationsprozesse und ethnisch-kulturelle Konfliktkonstellationen*, pp. 401–448. Weinheim and München: Juventa Verlag.
- Wimmer, A. (2002) Multikulturalität oder Ethnisierung? Kategorienbildung und Netzwerkstrukturen in drei schweizerischen Immigrantenvierteln, *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 31(1), pp. 4–26.