

CITY FUTURES 2009
AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GLOBALISM AND URBAN
CHANGE“PEOPLE’S PROPENSITIES ON THE INTERNAL
MIGRATION: THE CASE OF TURKEY”

Ayşe Nilay Evcil, Ph.D.

Beykent University, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture Hadımkoru Yolu Cad. Ayazaga
Kampusu Sisli Istanbul, anevcil@gmail.com

Abstract: Internal migration since 1970s is one of the important problems of Turkey with regard to regional imbalances, unplanned urbanization and growth of shanty towns and decrease in quality of life. In spite of the existence of literature on migration in Turkey, the studies related to the personal reasons are scarce.

Therefore, this paper focuses on people’s propensities on the internal migration in Turkey. To reach the aim, personal reasons to move are examined according to both in and out migration between the provinces. The results confirm the importance of the relationship between internal migration and employment and show also the impact of male population on provincial in-migration. Furthermore, some demographic (age, education, marital status and labor force etc) and spatial factors influencing migration propensities are investigated. It can be concluded that educated, single men, between 20-24 aged are likely to migrate from town to town destination.

Key words: internal migration, people’s propensities, demographic analysis, spatial analysis, Turkey

Introduction

Migration is the movement of persons, households or group of people’s from one country or locality to another. In this sense, internal migration is the movement to a new home within a country. On the basis of this movement, mainly economic issues take place in all around the world. From Ravenstein (1885), who is the pioneer of the scientific studies on migration, this movement has been studied by the researchers from different field mainly for demographic and economic aspects. General economic theories consider migration as an equilibrating mechanism at national and international levels (Nivalainen, 2004). It is also important to know who migrate and what the characteristics of both destinations and origin areas are. Anjomani (2002) states that the growth of countries or regions relates closely to migration. Thus, it seems plausible that studies of migration will help to better understand the provincial and/or regional

growth. Additionally, studying the factors causing the migration will also be vital to prepare the future growth of different provinces (population of 20000 and over) and/or regions in different countries.

There is a relationship between migration and development within a country. Migration can be a product of region's underdevelopment or a product of a process of development (RuizSandoval, 2007). For the Turkish case, internal migration is an important topic and has different impacts on the country's development and population dynamics. The migration flow from country to towns which began in 1950s is now changed its direction. According to latest population census in 2000, people who migrate from town to town (57, 8 %) are higher than the population migrated from country to town (17, 46 %). In other words, rural-urban migration is not the predominant migration pattern within the country (Filiztekin and Gökhan, 2008; Gedik, 1997; Evcil et al., 2006). On the other hand, considering Turkey as a member of EU in the near future, it is worth to evaluate determinants of internal migration for further potential migration within the EU (Filiztekin and Gökhan, 2008).

Table 1: Directions of Internal Migration in Turkey (%)

Internal Migration	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1995-2000
Town to Totwn	48,90	56,18	62,18	57,80
Country to town	17,02	22,53	17,95	17,46
Town to country	19,33	12,84	12,60	20,06
Country to country	14,75	8,45	7,27	4,68

Source: TURKSTAT, 2000

This paper tries to evaluate determinants of internal migration in Turkey by considering in (pull people) and out (push people) migration by provinces separately. 22 of 81 provinces can classify as receiving migration, in other words 27 % of these provinces pull the population but as it can be followed from the Figure 1 the majority of them (73 %) lose population. This paper also tries to evaluate internal migration from a demographic point of view as age, gender being employed or unemployed and marital status. These factors are discussed according to migration direction.

Literature Review on Internal Migration

According to literature, different aspects can be distinguished on migration studies. Some researchers try to identify the spatial context of migration both international and internal levels with the influence o neoclassical or classical economic approaches. These studies examine migration between different

countries or within a specific country. The neoclassical approach considers that labor moves to where wages are the highest (Vanderkamp, 1989; Todaro, 1969) while classical theory considers income differences between the regions (Ravenstein, 1885; Lee, 1966). Ravenstein's migration theory is the first attempt to explain migration assuming push and pull factors and it is one of the milestones of classical approach.

Figure 1: Map of Turkey Showing In and Out-migration by Provinces



There are also researchers who investigate migration according to micro or macro approaches. The micro approach focuses on individual migration unit such as person or household and their migration decision process. Their object is to identify individual's behavior and the factors influencing his/her migration decision. Search on migration at micro level is also known as the discrete choice approach and it tries to maximize utility because people want to improve their life in different locations which consist the base of decision-making process (Stillwell, 2005). Added to this, the human capital theory also tries to explain migration by underlining that people try to maximize their utilities (Cadwallader, 1993). On the other hand, in macro approach migration flows are examined by using economic system of the working areas e.g. regions, provinces, municipalities etc (Etzo, 2008). These researches try to find the relationship between migration and macro variables of the destinations and origins such as unemployment, income per capita, population sizes, environmental conditions etc. Etzo (2008) points out those macro level studies are the most favored type of studies because especially for developing countries macro aggregate data are the only available data set. In this approach, a spatial difference in supply and demand for labor is considered as the cause of migration.

It is also common that studies focus on the determinants and the consequences of migration. These studies try to identify the determinants of migration (demographic, spatial, economic or environmental) and the different impacts of migration involving people and places.

Finally, a theoretical pluralism can be distinguished in migration studies. “Each perspective can only provide a partial explanation of migration phenomena, but by focusing on the interstices between the various approaches and emphasizing their complementarity, we can begin the necessary integration that might lead to a higher order of synthesis” (Cadwallader, 1993, p.6).

Internal Migration In Turkey

Turkey has to deal with an ongoing migration from 1950s. Urban planners, geographers, researchers related to demography and economy try to identify migration in the country. As a consequence, a huge literature can be found about internal migration in Turkey (Gedik, 1997; Tekeli and Erder 1978; Tümertekin, 1968; Tunalı, 1996; İçduygu and Ünalın, 1998, Dökmeci ,1981). There is a consensus that, urbanization, migration and regional inequalities are effected each other (Tunalı, 1996; Gezici and Keskin, 1998, Anjomani, 2002). Tekeli (1982) shows that modernization and mechanization in agriculture and increase in population are important factors on Turkish internal migration especially in 1960s and 70s. His claims have been verified by the State Planning Organization (SPO) and Turkish Institute of Statistics’ (TURKSTAT) publications according to countrywide data (Table 2). Table 2 shows that there is a small level of increase of internal migration but still it has some effects on the distribution of population. In other words, although internal migration in recent years has an increase at low rate, it still protects its social and economic importance.

Table 2: Rates of Population Increase and Urbanization in Turkey (%)

	Increases in population (%)	Rates of urbanization (%)*	Internal migration/total population (%)
1965-1970	2,52	6,03	
1970-1975	2,50	5,62	
1975-1980	2,06	4,40	9,34
1980-1985	2,49	4,91	8,67
1985-1990	2,17	4,99	10,81
1990-1995**	1,85	4,40	
1995-2000**	1,62	4,67	11,02

Source : SPO, <http://www.dpt.gov.tr>; TURKSTAT, <http://www.tuik.gov.tr>

* Population of 20 000 and over.; ** Estimations by SPO and TURSTAT

Until 1990, internal migration occurred mainly from country to town. This movement arises from push factors of countryside as unemployment, inadequate infrastructure losing land due to the mechanization in agriculture and inequality of agricultural land ownership and pull factors of town as economic reasons,

prosperity and opportunities of towns (Gezici and Keskin, 1998; Yenigül, 2005). As it is known economic factors are highly important on internal migration, is also valid for the Turkish case (Yamak and Yamak, 1999; Evcil and Dökmeci, 2007; Filiztekin and Gökhan, 2008). But in Turkey as Gedik (1997) shown that there is no relationship between migration and distance, which is a common principle of Ravenstein's law of migration (1885) where he showed that the amount of migrated people is inversely proportional to distance. In other words, Ravenstein demonstrated that people tend to move to a short distance. But in Turkish case, people tend to move to big metropolitan areas such as Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir from long distances if some relatives, friends or people from the same village were migrated there before. Therefore, "she (Gedik) claims that psychological distances seem to be more meaningful than the physical distance" (Filiztekin and Gökhan, 2008, p.6). On the other hand, there are some studies which do not support this claim (Öztürk, 2007).

The big cities and especially metropolis were caught unprepared for the many issues and challenges resulting from the huge and ongoing internal migration. Unemployment rate and unhealthy living conditions increased rapidly in these metropolises. According to Keleş (2002), people who live in shanty towns consist of 35 % of the whole urban population in 1995 and 40 % of them are lack of electricity. Unfortunately, the politician approach is mostly far to solve housing shortage for the newcomers; on the contrary with their promises for investment and legality for squatter settlement, nearly one third of the whole population (27 %) in Turkey live in shanty towns at the beginning of 21st century (Keleş, 2002)(Table 3)

Table 3: People Living in Shanty Town (ST) in Turkey

Years	Number of squatter settlements	Its percentage in urban population (%)
1955	50.000	4,7
1960	240.000	16,4
1965	430.000	22,9
1970	600.000	23,6
1980	1.150.000	26,1
1995	2.000.000	35,0
2002	2.200.000	27,0

Source: Keleş, 2002

Additionally, unqualified people have always difficulties to find job. This resulted as social disintegration (N'Dow, 1996) and continuation to live rural conditions in urban environment. "...is defined by urban sociologists as incomplete urban structure and/or urban areas becoming villages, in urban areas different cultural structures with very weak communication and interaction emerge" (Yenigül, 2005, p.281).

At the beginning of 1990s, the migration pattern has changed. Migration from country to town decreased, while migration from town to town increased (see Table 1). As a result of this, urbanization arrives to a more advanced stage (Gedik, 1997) which is also approved by the urban population (almost 65 % of population live in urban areas) (see Table 5).

Another development in the internal migration can be seen at the beginning of 1980s. Since that time, due to the terrorist attacks of PKK a considerable amount of people should change their living place. This calls forced or involuntary migration which is different from voluntary migration explained first by Ravenstein. Generally, forced migration is the product of arms conflicts, development projects involving big civil engineering schemes (e.g. dam), environmental disaster or trafficking. In Turkey, on the south-eastern Anatolia, forced migration has been experienced because of the PKK terrorism. In other word, as a result of the growing risk of life and property, people are exposed to move. According to Öztürk (2007) they first migrate to Diyarbakır or Van, two of the big cities of south-eastern Anatolia, then move to the east, such as Istanbul, İzmir, Adana, Mersin and Bursa.

Another outcome of the change of migration direction is that, the metropolitan cities are not the only attraction center any longer, because internal migration likely occurs through some new potential regional growth centers. Istanbul and Ankara are the best examples to explain this difference, since more than 40 years these two metropolises were the most preferred places to move. But after 1990, in-migration to these metropolises increased very little while out-migration augments. In other words, there is a considerable amount of people who leave Istanbul and Ankara. (Table 4).

Table 4: In and Out-migration---Istanbul and Ankara (person)

	In-migration	Out-migration	Net migration
I S T A N B U L			
1985-1990	995717	339040	656677
1995-2000	920955	513507	407448
A N K A R A			
1985-1990	326301	256790	69511
1995-2000	377108	286224	90884

Source: TURKSTAT, 2000

This result is related to the emergence of other regional growth centers in the country and for Istanbul it also shows the escape from the earthquake (Öztürk, 2007).

In and Out-migration According to Provinces (town)

The changed direction of internal migration from town to town is mentioned above, now some attributes of this development will be explained. At first, currently Turkey has reached to a more urbanized level (Gedik, 1997). Population distribution supports this movement too. Urban-rural population growth rate until 1950 balanced with an increase in parallel to population growth. Since 1990s this balance has changed in favor of urban population and according to 2000's population census nearly 65 % of total population lives in urban areas (Table 5).

Table 5: Rural-urban Population Distribution in Turkey (%)

	1950	1960	1970	1980	1985	1990	1995	1997	2000**
Urban population*	14,5	22,4	32,4	42,1	47,2	54,0	60,9	64,6	64,9
Rural population	85,5	77,6	67,6	57,9	52,8	46,0	39,1	35,4	35,1

Source: S.P.O., 1990 (www.dpt.gov.tr) (total population: estimate for year-end population from 1991 onward)

*: Urban refers to areas with population of 20.000 or more; **:S.I.S., 2000

Öztürk (2007) explains the reasons of internal migration from town to town as the following statements:

- Proliferation of educational institutions in cities. Household prefers better conditions for their children's education.
- Emergence of gradual migration due to the public economic policy and investment encouraging measures.
- Emergence of rural site characteristics on towns having higher out-migration.
- Because of the inadequate rotational speed of money in less populated town, capital ownership prefers more populated urban settlements.

When, we look for which age group moves the most, it becomes clear that the 20-24 age groups comes first in all directions (Table 6). The 25-29 age groups follow it except from country to country and country to town directions. For the migration direction country to country and country to town, the second moving group is 15-19 years group (16,3 % and 15,7 % respectively). The young people's propensities on migration are similar with previous studies (Panditt, 1997; Evcil and Dökmeci, 2007; Filiztekin and Gökhan, 2008). The tendency of elderly people's migration is negligible level in all directions (Table 6). The migration after retirement is not a common movement in Turkey as it occurred

in different countries (Anjomani, 2002, Nivalainen, 2004, Plane, 1992). Peker (2004) explained this situation as educational achievement and age are not push factors on migration from country to town except for the young people. Therefore, the teenagers' (15-19 age group) migration propensities are likely associated with training.

Table 6: Migrated People According To Age Groups (2000)

	From town to town		From country to town		From town to country		From country to country	
	Men+women	%	Men+women	%	Men+women	%	Men+women	%
5-9	320108	8,3	111536	9,5	120657	9,0	30746	9,8
10-14	297127	7,7	133788	11,5	114579	8,5	32810	10,5
15-19	530843	13,7	183511	15,7	157713	11,7	50969	16,3
20-24	849660	22,0	234051	20,0	221899	16,5	61129	19,5
25-29	604301	15,6	167281	14,3	182331	13,6	46233	14,7
30-34	371951	9,6	96154	8,2	126763	9,4	28763	9,2
35-39	276100	7,1	70215	6,0	103774	7,7	19989	6,4
40-44	194337	5,0	47683	4,1	80129	6,0	12857	4,1
45-49	143646	3,7	32967	2,8	67177	5,0	9251	3,0
50-54	97018	2,5	22836	2,0	54433	4,1	6304	2,0
55-59	57732	1,5	16608	1,4	38282	2,9	4443	1,4
60-64	41542	1,1	14554	1,2	28548	2,1	3373	1,1
65-69	33323	0,9	13994	1,2	21690	1,6	2805	0,9
70-74	24038	0,6	10871	0,9	13184	1,0	1865	0,6
75-79	13040	0,3	6160	0,5	6017	0,4	964	0,3
80-84	6161	0,2	2842	0,2	2581	0,2	458	0,1
85+	5910	0,2	2887	0,2	2332	0,2	419	0,1
Unknown	1134	0,0	347	0,0	429	0,0	103	0,0
Total	3867971	100,0	1168285	100,0	1342518	100,0	313481	100,0

Source: TURKSTAT, 2000

Gender as one of the demographic factors, influences migration propensities (Etzo, 2008). Generally men migrate more than women for all directions. This result is supported for the two periods 1985-90 and 1990-2000. Additionally, there is no difference in the experiences that men and women have when they choose to migrate to different directions within the country (Table 7).

Table 7: Migrated People According to Gender

	From town to town		From country to town		From town to country		From country to country	
	male	female	Male	female	male	single	male	female
1985-1990	54,4	45,6	53,7	46,3	58,5	41,5	55,5	44,5
1995-2000	54,6	45,4	54,7	45,3	54,4	45,6	52,1	47,9
	Total 100,0		Total 100,0		Total 100,0		Total 100,0	

Source: TURKSTAT, 2000

Another analysis is made to search migrated people's education level. According to the

Table 8 the majority of migrated people have completed school for all directions (from town to town, town to country, country to town and country to country). People completed primary education and high school tend to migrate mostly from town to town (37,6 % and 28,4 % respectively). But nearly 1/5 of the total migrated people from town to town is illiterate or not completed a school. This group migration trends (illiterate and not completed school) are still high for each of the other directions (30,2 % from country to town, 25,1 % from town and country and 31,8 % from country to country). As a general interpretation education and mobility are likely to be associated (Filiztekin and Gökhan, 2008; Peker, 2004).

Table 8: Migrated People's Education Levels According to Migration Directions (2000)

		From town to town	From country to town	From town to country	From country to country
No school completed+ illiterate	Number	75233	346370	330540	97683
	%	19,8	30,2	25,1	31,8
Completed primary education	Number	1429094	620360	626240	168121
	%	37,6	54,0	47,5	54,7
Completed high school	Number	1080592	136870	235372	27240
	%	28,4	11,9	17,8	8,9
Completed higher education (university, master or doctorate)	Number	542878	44084	126656	14321
	%	14,3	3,8	9,6	4,7
Unknown	Number	751	238	82	11
	%	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Total	Number	3805748	1147923	1318893	307376
	%	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Source: TURKSTAT,2000 (migrated population 6 years of age and over)

The marital status of migrated people is also searched and it is found that generally married people tend to move. 57 % of married couples in the country migrate (Table 9). This might be related to household which is a key unit in migration decisions (Nivalainen, 2004). The proportion of married couples' movement decrease for town to town migration (54,5 %) but increase for the other directions (58,2 % from country to town, 62,1 % from town to country and country to country). Indeed, to evaluate correctly the marital status of the migrants there is a need to interpret also the age composition of them. For instance, the most migrated group from town to town is 20-24 aged and single people. For the migration from country to town the most migrated group is still single but the age group is now 15-19. For the migration town to country the 25-29 aged married people's percentage and 15-19 aged group single people's percentage is equal (11,4 %). The situation is nearly the same for migration country to country. The most migrated people are single people aged 15-19 (14,1%) and married people aged 25-29 (14,3 %). As a conclusion, the young and single people tend to migrate more than young and married couples but, especially from 30s single people's migration drop suddenly while married people's migration continuous with a decreasing rate.

Table 9: Migrated People's Marital Status According to Migration Directions (%)

Age group	From town to town		From country to town		From town to country		From country to country	
	married	single	married	single	Married	single	married	single
12-14	0,0	5,2	0,0	8,5	0,0	5,8	0,1	7,6
15-19	1,7	13,8	3,3	14,9	2,0	11,4	4,7	14,1
20-24	8,1	16,7	11,8	11,4	7,6	11,2	12,7	9,9
25-29	12,7	4,9	14,0	2,5	11,4	4,1	14,3	2,8
30-34	9,6	1,3	8,8	0,7	9,6	1,2	9,8	0,8
35-39	7,4	0,6	6,6	0,4	8,1	0,7	7,0	0,4
40-44	5,2	0,4	4,4	0,3	6,3	0,5	4,5	0,3
45-49	3,8	0,4	3,0	0,3	5,3	0,4	3,2	0,2
50-54	2,5	0,3	2,0	0,3	4,2	0,4	2,1	0,2
55-59	1,4	0,3	1,3	0,3	2,9	0,4	1,4	0,2
60-64	0,9	0,3	1,0	0,4	2,0	0,4	1,0	0,3
65+	1,2	1,2	1,9	1,8	2,5	1,4	1,3	1,01
Total	54,5	45,5	58,2	41,8	62,1	37,9	62,1	37,9
	100		100		100		100	

Source: TURKSTAT, 2000 (single person includes never married+divorced+spouse died+unknown)

When the migrated people on labor force (it includes the population consisting of employed and unemployed) are considered, it is found that the majority of employed people migrate for all directions. They move probably for a better job opportunities e.g. a better status or salary. Actually, “labor force participation rate of migrated population is almost the same level of the country’s average (55,2%)....While the labor force participation rate of migrated male is decreasing, the labor force participation rate of migrated females is increasing with respect to the previous period” (TURKSTAT, 2000, p. 16). On the other hand, to interpret correctly this figure, there is a need to look at country’s situation as well. 16,2 % of total employed people as for 21,3 of total unemployed people migrate in Turkey in 2000. This means that, the migration propensities of unemployed people are more elevated than the propensities of employed people (Nivalainen, 2008) (Table 10). Furthermore, more regular casual employees and less unpaid family workers migrants out of the employed people can be distinguished when it is compared to the whole population. Briefly, the situation is supported the claim that income differentials and migration are associated in Turkey (Filiztekin and Gökhan, 2008).

Table 10: Migrated People on Labor Force According to Migration Directions (%)

Age group	From town to town		From country to town		From town to country		From country to country	
	employed	unemployed	employed	unemployed	employed	unemployed	employed	unemployed
12-14	0,3	0,1	1,6	0,3	1,5	0,0	3,1	0,0
15-19	10,2	1,0	13,6	2,7	9,9	0,04	17,5	0,3
20-24	23,6	2,0	24,8	3,1	19,1	0,8	24,2	0,4
25-29	20,1	1,4	18,2	2,5	16,8	0,5	18,2	0,3
30-34	12,8	0,7	10,9	1,5	11,8	0,3	11,5	0,1
35-39	9,3	0,6	7,4	1,2	9,8	0,2	8,1	0,1
40-44	6,3	0,4	4,8	0,7	7,6	0,1	5,2	0,1
45-49	4,2	0,3	2,6	0,5	6,4	0,1	3,7	0,0
50-54	2,7	0,1	1,3	0,3	5,2	0,0	2,6	0,0
55-59	1,6	0,1	0,7	0,2	3,6	0,0	1,8	0,0
60-64	1,1	0,0	0,4	0,1	2,7	0,0	1,3	0,0
65+	1,1	0,0	0,4	0,1	3,0	0,0	1,6	0,0
Total	93,3	6,7	86,8	13,2	97,4	2,6	98,7	1,3
	100		100		100		100	

Source: TURKSTAT, 2000 (this table considers only migrated people who are in labor force)

Multiple Regression Analysis

The aim of the multiple regression analysis is to find the effect of personal reasons on internal migration. With this objective, the multiple regression analysis is used which is one of the common method to show the correlation of multiple variables. To perform the analysis 81 provinces (towns) are grouped as receiving population (provincial in-migration) and giving population (provincial out-migration). It is assumed that towns which people move to are affected from different reasons than the towns pushing people. The data set is composed of the migration statistics of TURKSTAT in 2000. The analysis is completed by using SPSS 10 computer program. First, the relationship of the provincial in-migration with the personal reasons (search for job/employment, being appointed, factors related to household members, education, marriage, earthquake, security, others, unknown, percentage of in-migrated male population and percentage of in-migrated female population) is tested using the multiple regression model (n=22 towns). Thus, the dependant variable is provincial in-migration (in the form of logarithm) and the independent variables are personal reasons (aforementioned 11 items). The stepwise model is used.

The model presented 0,858 for the value of R^2 . The results of statistically significant model are shown on the Table 11 and 12. According to the results, reasons (personal factors) that are the most effective on in-migration are listed as being appointed and percentage of migrated male population.

Table 11: Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis-I. (Dependent variable = In provincial in-migration of year 2000.) Method: stepwise

Model	R	R ²	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	F (significance)	Durbin-Watson
	0,926b	0,858	0,3631	57,303	0,000b	1,789

b: Predictors : (constant), being appointed, percentage of migrated male population

Table 12 : Significant Variables in Multiple Regression Analysis-I

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficient	t	Significance
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	6,164	0,867		7,106	,000
Being appointed	5,00E-5	0,000	0,799	8,692	,000
percentage of migrated male population	-4,29E-02	0,015	-0,271	-2,948	,008

Secondly, the relationship of the provincial out-migration with the personal reasons is tested using again the multiple regression models. This time the number of case is 59. The same independent variables are used but as dependent variable provincial out-migration is considered. The model shown on the Table 13, expresses 0,716 for the coefficient of determination (R^2). The effect of personal reasons (independent variables) on dependant variable (provincial out-

migration) is statistically significant and according to the model, it is found that search for job/employment and being appointed have positive impacts on provincial out-migration (Table 13 and 14).

Table 13: Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis-II (Dependent variable = In provincial out-migration of year 2000.) Method: stepwise

Model	R	R ²	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	F (significance)	Durbin-Watson
	0,846d	0,716	0,37	70,661	0,000d	1,958

d: Predictors : (constant), being appointed , search for job/employment,

Table 14: Significant Variables in Multiple Regression Analysis-II

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficient	t	Significance
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	9,512	0,098		97,133	,000
Being appointed	1,034E-04	0,000	0,538	5,557	,001
Search for job/employment	3,77E-05	0,000	0,384	3,971	,000

Conclusion

Internal migration in Turkey which began in 1950s acts as the triggering force for the rapid urbanization and development but, on the other hand, it also contributes to regional inequalities and affects negatively the quality of life especially the target areas. Therefore, it is worth to evaluate internal migration according to its different aspects.

The research question of this paper is ‘what is the effect of the personal reasons on internal migration (provincial in and out-migration) in Turkey?’ To answer the question we perform a multiple regression analysis separately. The conclusion to be drawn is that, job (employment) related factors increase internal migration. Finding better job opportunities or to be appointed to another town are the most important factors on provincial in or out-migration. Furthermore, the male population is a significant factor too especially for provincial in-migration.

Early studies showed that “demographic characteristics act as determinants of mobility” (Anjomani, 2002, p.247). Thus, the paper also evaluates internal migration demographically and spatially. The important results are as follows:

- Generally the 20-24 age groups are more likely to move. This result is valid for migration from town to town as it occurs in developed countries (Etzo, 2008; Nivalainen, 2004; Plane, 1992). But this observation is not valid for other directions (migration from country to town, from country to country and from town to country).

- Men's migration propensities are higher than women.
- The majority of migrated people have completed school with regard to all of the migration directions. This result is parallel to some previous results of developed countries (Ritsila and Ovaskainen, 2001; Nivalainen, 2004).
- The young and single people tend to migrate more than young and married couples, but, especially from 30s single people's movement drop suddenly. Elderly people's (aged 65+) is a negligible level in all directions.
- The migration propensities of unemployed people are higher than the propensities of employed people.

Actually, in our previous study, we searched the relationship between personal factors and internal migration by using the same variables in the same period. At that time, we did not separate migration as provincial in and out-migration, on the contrary we considered migration in total. We also performed multiple regression analysis and found that the most effective factors are search for job/employment, household related factors and conjugal factors (Evcil and Dökmeci, 2007). By considering all these three regression analysis, it can be said that employment is a key factor. This result shows that migrants seek a better life (Nivalainen, 2004) in which economic factors still effective.

Discussion

This paper differs from the earlier migration studies in Turkey, because it examines personal reasons' effects on internal migration both for provinces pulling and pushing people. It is assumed that the results will help to develop new policies. As it is known internal migration is an important phenomenon for a country. It may contribute to urbanization and development of a country but on the other hand, it causes regional inequalities, decrease of quality of life in urban lands, social disintegration and growth of illegal housing.

Currently, town to town migration is the leader of the country. Therefore, it is needed to search this direction deeply because new and developed stage of urbanization has already begun. By this formation, bad effects of migration will likely be decreased while arising new opportunities in cities.

Generally, migration is explained as an economic based movement but a lot of people move for different reasons in the world and in Turkey. Although this paper reveals economic factors as the most effective personal reasons on internal migration, it may be found different reasons by performing the analysis in a different scale like town to town migration. As a result, for further studies it is suggested to use new methods, data and different scales and comparison of people's propensities on migration between two periods of time.

The limitation of this paper is related to the data set. Unfortunately, the 2000's migration statistics is the first publication of TURKSTAT concerning people's factors, therefore there is no possibility to compare current situation to previous ones.

References:

- Anjomani, A. (2002) Regional Growth and Interstate Migration, Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, 36, pp.239-265
- Cadwallader, M. (1993) Migration and Residential Mobility-Macro and Micro Approaches, University of Wisconsin Press
- Dökmeci, V. (1981) Urbanization pattern in Turkey and its future development, in Urbanization Processes in Developing Countries , P. Nijkamp and M. Chatterjee (Eds.) Amsterdam: Nijhoff Publishers.
- Etzo, I. (2008) Internal Migration: A Review of the Literature, Munich Personal RePEc Archive (<http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/8783> visited at 30,03,2009)
- Evcil, A.N., and Dökmeci, V. (2007) Türkiye'de Göç Eğilimlerinin Mekansal, Demografik ve Zaman Açısından Analizi, Bölge Biliminde Yeni Yaklaşımlar, 12. Ulusal Bölge Bilimi Bölge Planlama Kongresi, İTÜ, pp.193-201
- Evcil, A. N., Dökmeci, V. and Kıroğlu G. (2006) Regional Migration in Turkey: Its Directions, Paper presented at the 46th ERSA Congress, CD-Rom, Volos, Greece
- Filiztekin, A., and Gökhan, A. (2008) The Determinants of Internal Migration in Turkey, Paper presented at International Conference on Policy Modelling, EcoMod 2008, Brussel, Belgium
- Gedik, A. (1997) Internal Migration in Turkey 1965-1985: Test of Conflicting Findings in the Literature; Review of Urban and Regional Studies, 9, 170-79
- Gezici, F., and Keskin, B. (1998) Interaction between Regional Inequalities and Internal Migration in Turkey, Paper Presented for ERSA Congress, Vienna, Australia (<http://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:wiwrsa:ersa05p132>, visited at 30,03,2009)
- İçduygu, A. and Ünalın, T. (1998) Türkiye'de İç Göç: Sorunsal Alanları ve Araştırma Yöntemleri, İstanbul Tarih Vakfı Yayınları
- Keleş, R. (2002) Kentleşme Politikası, 7. baskı, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara
- Lee, E.S. (1966) A Theory of Migration, Demography, 13, p.47-57

- N'Dow, W. (1996) Cities in Crisis, Harvard International Review, 18, 2, pp. 48-51
- Nivalainen, S. (2004) Where Do Migrants Go? An Analysis of Rural and Urban Destined/Originated Migration in Finland in 1996-1999, Paper presented at ERSA Conference, Cd-Rom
- Öztürk, M. (2007) Türkiye'deki İç Göçlerin Sosyal Politika Açısından İncelenmesi: İstanbul Semt Pazarıcıları Örneği, Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Panditt, K. (1997) Cohort and Period Effects in US Migration: How Demographic and Economic Cycles Influence the Migration Schedule, Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 87, 3, pp.439-450
- Plane, D.A. (1992) Age-Composition Change and the Geographical Dynamics of Interregional Migration in the U.S., Annals of Association of American Geographers, 82 (1), pp.64-85
- Peker, K. (2004) The Causes and Results of Internal Migration From Rural Areas:Case of Eastern Anatolia, Agric. Econ.-Czech, 50, 10, pp.471-476
- Ravenstein, E.G. (1885) The Laws of Migration, Journal of the Statistical Society of London, 48, 2, pp.167-235
- Ritsila, J.,and Ovaskainen (2001) Migration and Regional Centralization of Human Capital, Applied Economics, 33, pp.317-325
- Ruiz Sandoval, E. (2007) Migration and Development: Getting It Right in Both the Ivory Tower and The Policy World, Paper to be tabled on March 2, at 48th Annual ISA Convention, Politics, Policy and Responsible Scholarship Chicago, IL, USA
- Stillwell, J. (2005) Inter-regional Migration Modelling: A Review and Assessment, Paper presented for the 45th Congress of ERSA, Amsterdam, Netherland
- S.I.S. (2000) Statistical Yearbook of Turkey, Prime Ministry of Turkey, Ankara
- Tekeli, İ. and Erder, L. (1978) Yerleşme Yapısının Uyum Süreci Olarak İç Göçler, Hacettepe University Press, Ankara (cited in Tunalı, İ., 1996, Migration and Remigration of Male Household Heads in Turkey, 1963-1973, Economic Development and Cultural Change, 45, 1, pp.31-67)
- Tekeli, İ. (1982) Türkiye'de Kentleşme Yazıları, Turhan Kitapevi, Ankara, Erk Matbaası
- Todaro, M.P. (1969) A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries, The American Economic Review, 59, 1, pp.138-148

- Tunalı, İ. (1996) Migration and Remigration of Male Household Heads in Turkey, 1963-1973, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 45, 1, pp,31-67
- TURKSTAT. (2000) *Migrational Statistics of Statistics of Turkey*, Prime Ministry
- Vanderkamp, J. (1989) Regional Adjustment and Migration Flows in Canada, 1971 to 1981, *Papers in Regional Science*, 67, 1, pp.103-119
- Tmertekin, E. (1968) *Trkiye’de İ Gler*, Istanbul University Institute of Geography Press, no:54
- Yamak, N., and, Yamak, R. (1999) Trkiye’de Gelir Daėılımı ve İ G, *D.E.. Sosyal Bilimler Enstits Dergisi*, 1, 1 (<http://www.sbe.deu.edu.tr/Yayinlar/dergi/dergi01/yamak.htm> visited at.25,03,2009)
- Yenigl, S.B. (2005) The Effects of Migration on Urban, *Gazi University Journal of Science*, 18, 2, pp.273-288