

A STUDY OF INTERNAL MOBILITY OF THE FOREIGN BORN IN TURKEY

SİRKECİ, İbrahim^{*} -COHEN, Jeffrey H.^{**} -CAN, Neriman^{***}
İNGİLTERE/UK/АНГЛИЯ

ABSTRACT

In an ever changing global context, international migration is becoming less predictable. There are hardly any fully tested theories of this particular type of human mobility. However, current models developed by migration studies give us proxy indicators of international migration propensity. Referring to cumulative causation model, earlier migration experiences are often considered as indicators for international migration. A modified use of the culture of migration concept, in this regard, is adopted to examine the role of prior internal migration experiences. Once someone has migrated the propensity for additional movements is relatively high. Although this culture of migration model had initially referred to international migration experiences, it is worth to explore the potential relationship between international and internal migration experiences. In this study, we analyse the most recent Turkish Census (2000) data to revisit this particular relationship. At three levels, individual, household and macro, we have included key variables available to depict a near complete picture. This study also provides an authoritative summary of recent immigration to Turkey and the first ever comprehensive analysis of the internal migration of the foreign-born in Turkey.

Key Words: international migration, internal migration, Turkey, Census, culture of migration.

INTRODUCTION

Previous migration experiences are known to have an effect on future migration propensity. When we examine the route maps of international migrants, often we see there are internal migrations prior to the international border crossings. Interpreting the cumulative causation model (Massey et al.

^{*} Dr. **İbrahim Sirkeci** is a Reader in Demography, Department of Marketing, European Business School, Regent's College, London, United Kingdom. **e-mail:** sirkeci@regents.ac.uk

^{**} Dr. **Jeffrey H Cohen** is Associate Professor of Social Anthropology in Department of Anthropology at the Ohio State University, OH, United States. **e-mail:** cohenjh@osu.edu

^{***} **Neriman Can** MSc is a Senior Analyst in population and migration division of Turkish Statistics Institute, Ankara, Turkey. **e-mail:** neriman.can@tuik.gov.tr

1993), one can expect higher international migration propensity for those who had internally migrated in the past. Expanding that one can also suspect if international migrants have higher internal migration propensity after the international border crossing. Thus, previous migration experience may facilitate further migration within the destination country. We can expect people, immigrant or native, to move around a little until they settle down. As Newbold put it, this could be “fine tuning” of the destination choice after arrival (1996). For example, foreign-born in Canada was found to have relatively higher interprovincial migration rate compared to the natives (Liaw and Ledent 1988 cited in Newbold 1996:728). In a US study, Hempstead compared the internal migration of foreign-born from gateway states and non-gateway states to argue that gateway states were holding their foreign-born population (Hempstead 2007). Level of “nativity concentration” is also an important factor determining internal migration propensity of the foreign-born as suggested by research on social networks (Kritz and Nogle 1994; Massey and Denton 1987). Immigrants who arrived in areas where co-ethnics are concentrated are less likely to migrate whereas those arrived in other areas are likely to move into those concentrated areas. Hence, spatial concentration of foreign-born appears to be a factor which may influence the internal migration of the foreign-born.

A culture of migration approach offers one way to frame a population’s propensity to migrate and where that population may settle following migration. Our approach builds upon the concept of cumulative causation (Massey et al 1993) and brings an appreciation of cultural practice and traditional beliefs to the recognition of the importance of social networks and social action. Within the context of a culture of migration also needs to be linked to the decision making which is often made by an individual as a member of a household. In effect, the decision made by the individual is framed by the household, its members, resources, history and place in the community (Cohen 2001; Conway and Cohen 2002; Conway 2005). In other words, history and culture of migration in the household have a bearing on individual’s migration moves. Thus, the household anchors the migrant’s decisions in a cultural milieu that organizes outcomes and establishes pathways for movement and settlement. These pathways take migrants to internal as well as international destinations and may trump economic motivations on the part of the migrant him or herself. For the foreign-born, these structure or culture frames outcomes as well and creates linkages and expectations for movement that colour the pathways migrants will follow in their search for a home. Thus, movements that look like poor decisions based on the beliefs and practices of the receiving country are shown to build upon assumptions made in the sending household and community.

There are various other factors that would impact on internal migration of foreign born (and others) such as age and gender, marital status, home ownership, education, occupation and/or economic activity. Migration

propensity decreases as people get older. Marriage is one important reason for migration but also once married people are expected to settle. Perhaps, migration of women is more linked to their partners' moves. Similarly some occupations require higher mobility while some others are more settled, however, until people get hold of permanent posts they may wander around which involves internal and/or international migration. Our analyses in this study take into account these factors as long as the census data allows in explaining the internal migration of foreign born in Turkey. In this paper, we also document the general immigration patterns in Turkey.

Data and Methods

The 2000 Turkish Census data is used in this study. We have drawn a sub-sample composed of foreign-born population in Turkey. In further analysis we have reduced the sample to focus on those foreign-born who were resident in the country five years ago. We have also excluded those younger than 5 as their moves were not identifiable in the census data. This generated a subset of 935,088 out of 1,260,491 foreign born people reported in the 2000 Turkish Census. This allowed us to see migration moves of the foreign-born between 81 administrative provinces. Finally, we have developed a logistic regression model with background variables for the purpose of finding explanatory factors for internal migration of foreign-born in Turkey.

The variables we have used are as follows:

Dependent variable: Internal migration status determined by comparing the place of residence at the day of census and five years ago. Apparently any movements between the day of census and prior five years are not detectable in the Census data. Therefore, readers still need to be cautious in interpreting these findings. Internal migration here is operationalised as changing place of residence from one district to another, one village to another, or one province to another. Movements within the same area of residence (e.g. neighbourhoods) are not counted.

Independent variables included individual level, household level and province level factors. Thus, we aim to have a comprehensive picture which also takes into account broader environmental effects on internal migration of the foreign-born.

Age: Measured in single years.

Sex: Men and women where the latter was taken as reference category.

Education: Measured in terms of the last school completed ranging from no school completed to masters/doctorate.

Marital status: married, divorcees and widows are compared to never married singles.

Economic activity is measured in three variables:

- Economic activity status in the week prior to the census taking salaried employees as comparator.
- Occupational classes taking the largest group, production and related workers, transport equipment operators and labourers, as comparator for 7 other categories according to ISCO 68 (ILO, 1969).
- Industry of employment where various categories are compared to non-agricultural manufacturing industry.

Citizenship: non-Turkish versus Turkish.

Crowdedness of the household: measured by dividing the number of members of the household by the number of rooms available to the household.

Home ownership: including home owners (comparison group), tenants, subsidised tenants.

Type of place of residence: Rural populations compared with urban populations.

Socio-economic development level: of the province lived five years ago. This is a composite measure of development level differences in Turkey compiled by State Planning Organisation in 2003 (Dincer et. al., 2003), added to the census data by the authors.

Foreign-born population in the country was identified by birth place information. Obviously among the foreign-born, there are children of Turkish return migrants as well as others who immigrated to Turkey and obtained Turkish citizenship as well as those keeping their foreign nationality.

The binary logistic regression model compares those foreign-born who had changed their place of residence within Turkey at least once in the five years prior to the Census with other foreign-born who were in the same address at the beginning and end of that period prior to the Census.

Population and migration in Turkey

Turkey with its 70,586,256 population (TurkStat, 2008) is one of the 20 most populous countries in the world and third largest in Europe, with a declining population growth rate (18 per thousand in 2000). Until the 1950s, more than 70 percent of Turkey's population was rural. As a result of urbanisation over five decades, by the end of 2007, 70 per cent were living in urban centres (TurkStat, 2008). The industrial urban centres, Istanbul, Izmir, Ankara, Antalya and Bursa have seen the largest net migration figures. In the last census, net migration to Istanbul was over 400,000. However, one should also notice that these cities have also seen largest number of people leaving. Again in the 2000 Census, over 500,000 out-migrants were recorded for Istanbul. Indicating the fact that internal migration streams are not one-way (Lee, 1966; Gedik, 1996). Two significant patterns here are; first, high level of inter-provincial migration: Over

8 percent of people relocated to another province in the 5 years prior to the census. 56 out of a total 81 provinces have net migration rate of bigger than 20. Secondly, majority of these moves are expected to be intra-urban and to a lesser extent intra-rural migrations following the historic trends (see Gedik, 1996). Some of these migrations can be attributed to the insecurity concerns in the South eastern parts of the country but the rest is yet to be studied. Our concern here is the participation of the foreign-born in these population flows.

Despite the common belief that Turkey is a new comer in international migration with a brief history often started in the early 1960s, the migration history of the country could be stretched far back for a few centuries to cover immigration of Jews from Spain in 1492-3 (Diaz-Mas 1992; Masters 2004). During the century-long decline of Ottoman Empire, the country saw large numbers immigration (of Muslims, mainly) from former territories into then what left of the Empire (McCarthy 1996). Thus modern Turkey has also been a country of emigration and immigration since the establishment in the 1920s. The legacy of the late Ottoman Empire for modern Turkey has been mass influxes of Turkish and Muslim populations from former Ottoman territories lost to newly founded states in the Balkans, Caucasus and elsewhere. There have been controlled and uncontrolled population exchanges but yet sizeable Turkish minorities were also left behind (Sirkeci and Icduygu 2001; Pentzopoulos 1962). These minorities have been the major source of immigration to Turkey since the 1920s. The very same period had also seen a mass outflow of emigration (particularly, of non-Muslims) from Turkey to new countries created on former Ottoman territories, such as Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria as well as far away destinations of Americas, however, emigration from Turkey is not in the scope of this particular paper (see Akgunduz 1998; Karpat 1985).

Relatively recently, Turkey became a country of immigration for various other national groups too (Kirisici 2007). Large numbers of Africans, Middle Easterners, and Asians arrived in either as transit migrants, clandestine/undocumented migrants and for settlement. This could be linked to increasing globalization and Turkey's prospering economy and integration with Europe as well as violent conflicts seen in the surrounding region (e.g. Iraq and Afghan wars, Iranian revolution, Chechen war, Nagorno-Karabagh, ethnic cleansing in Iraq, Palestine issue). Nonetheless, recent immigration to Turkey is not exclusively of those from less developed or developing countries, a significant number of Europeans also settled in Turkey. Among those, also were Europeans of Turkish origin (those naturalized in destination countries), their off springs as well as Turkish return migrants.

An important feature of immigration to Turkey is the country's emigration history from the 1960s onwards. Starting with bilateral labour exchange agreements with European countries and Australia, a sizeable Turkish diaspora emerged. Total number of Turkish citizens and Turkish-origin populations

today perhaps sits in the region of five to six million including those who obtained citizenship in their ‘new’ countries. Among the recent immigrants in Turkey, one would find return migrants, children and grandchildren of first generation Turkish migrants abroad, foreign partners and relatives of those as well as other foreigners. Along with family ties, these large Turkish diaspora populations in Germany, France, Netherlands, UK and some other countries have also built ties (including transportation links) between Turkey and destination countries. Existence of these links should have also influenced natives of these destinations to visit and subsequently migrate to Turkey.

We have examined the trends of immigration to Turkey to contextualize our analysis of internal migration of the foreign-born which largely relates to the late period. With disconnected and unsynchronised data collection practices, as well as known problems with immigration data collection, it is difficult to have accurate estimates of immigration in Turkey. Therefore, we present here an array of summary statistics gathered from the censuses as well as from other official sources including undocumented migrant apprehension statistics, asylum statistics and work permits statistics. Particularly for the recent years, there appear to be a wealth of statistics being accumulated but not yet consistently coordinated.

Table 1: Stock of Foreign-Born in Turkey, Reported by Censuses, 1935-2000.

Year of Census	Number	% within total population
1935	962,159	5,95
1945	832,616	4,43
1950	755,526	3,61
1955	845,962	3,52
1960	952,515	3,43
1965	903,074	2,88
1970	889,170	2,50
1975*	134,746	0,33
1980	868,195	1,94
1985	934,990	1,85
1990	1,133,152	2,01
2000	1,260,530	1,86
<i>* We could not find a clear explanation for this strikingly low figure. It is thought to be an error unique to this particular year's census data.</i>		
Source: Turkish Statistic Institute Censuses		

Table 1 summarises the stock of foreign-born in Turkey. Turkish and Muslim populations immigrated during the First World War, War of Independence, and through population exchanges would count for most of the early years. Perhaps, the last three censuses (1985, 1990 and 2000) would be also largely reporting second and third generation Turks immigrating from Western Europe and relatively small but increasing number of other foreigners

immigrated to Turkey. These figures, thus, comprise a large number of Turkish citizens including dual citizens, second and third generation Turks abroad, too.

As presented in **Table 2**, immigration to Turkey in the last three decades is identified through the place of residence questions asked in the Censuses. It indicates those whose permanent residence were abroad 5 years ago and settled in Turkey at the time of the census. These figures do not show any particular linear pattern; however, some key events would shed some light on the reasons for the fluctuation. For example, larger volumes recorded in 1985 and 1990 censuses were largely due to the fact that violation of human rights of Turkish minority by totalitarian regime of Bulgaria at the time and Turkey's response to this tragedy by opening its border resulting in large influx of Bulgarian Turks in a relatively short time period although some of them had returned to Bulgaria in following years (Karpat 1995; Vasileva 1992).

Table 2: Foreign-Born Immigration to Turkey, 1975-2000.

Year Of Census	Turkish Citizens*	Foreign Citizens	Total Foreign-Born	% Of Total Population	Total Population
1975-1980			254,171	0,66	44,736,957
1980-1985	398,801	11,419	410,232	0,92	50,664,458
1985-1990	287,986	99,855	388,994	0,77	56,473,035
1995-2000	182,000	50,244	234,111	0,38	67,803,927
* Also includes those with dual citizenship. Source: Turkish Statistic Institute Censuses					

Our analysis in this paper focuses on the last Turkish Census held in 2000. **Table 3** shows a breakdown of foreign-born population in Turkey by country of citizenship. Perhaps, the variety and large in-flows of certain citizenship groups can be explained by the historic links, migration histories, cultural and geographical proximities. As a European country and long-awaited associate member of the European Union, Turkey has historically strong relationships with those countries. The old member states of the EU are also major destinations (e.g. Germany and Netherlands) for Turkish international migrants creating large immigration stocks. Some eastern members of the EU (e.g. Greece, Bulgaria, and Romania) were part of the Ottoman Empire and host large Turkish and Muslim populations. These ties are important determinants and facilitators for migration flows. Larger numbers arriving from neighbouring countries (e.g. Iran, Iraq, Syria) can also be explained, to some extent, by geographical proximity, as well as easy accessibility, could be reason for large groups of immigrants from former Soviet countries (e.g. Ukraine and Russia). Cultural proximity is important for immigration from the Turkic countries in Central Asia (e.g. Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) and Caucasus (Azerbaijan). Countries with Islam as dominant religion or with significant Muslim populations are also among major origin countries. The largest group, thus, is composed of the EU countries and advanced economies with which Turkey has

Iran	7,859	4,830	3,029	Ukraine	2,097	857	1,240
Azerbaijan	7,498	4,718	2,780	North Cyprus	1,363	719	644
Iraq	5,101	3,024	2,077	Syria	766	511	255
Georgia	2,941	1,392	1,549	Armenia	229	76	153
Total					27,854	16,127	11,727
Other countries							
Uzbekistan	3,180	1,595	1,585	Morocco	219	157	62
Afghanistan	2,886	1,924	962	Nigeria	203	179	24
Kazakhstan	2,638	1,310	1,328	Lebanon	187	126	61
Yugoslavia	2,363	1,184	1,179	Tanzania	169	152	17
Albania	1,599	880	719	Sudan	149	110	39
Macedonia	1,349	746	603	Saudi Arabia	130	89	41
Kyrgyzstan	791	441	350	Ghana	107	93	14
Chechnya	549	328	221	Indonesia	105	43	62
China	499	297	202	Kenya	104	69	35
Palestine	473	414	59	Tajikistan	93	74	19
Moldova	470	117	353	Thailand	87	56	31
Bosnia-H.	417	232	185	Dagestan	75	25	50
Turkmenistan	446	359	87	Tataristan	70	39	31
Algeria	402	320	82	Swaziland	67	21	46
Pakistan	379	274	105	Mongolia	64	33	31
Libya	331	261	70	Senegal	50	27	23
India	301	199	102	Uruguay	39	20	19
Jordan	267	199	68	Kuwait	34	27	7
Philippines	255	144	111	Burma	30	23	7
Egypt	250	181	69	Yemen	30	20	10
Tunisia	249	146	103	Sri Lanka	26	26	0
Bangladesh	248	233	15	Ethiopia	22	11	11
Total					17,593	10,546	7,047
Subtotal					262,815	135,271	127,544
Turkish					997,676	470,122	527,554
TOTAL					1,260,491	737,599	779,911
Source: Turkish Statistic Institute 2000 Census							

Table 4: Major Origin Countries and Destination Provinces in Turkey, 2000.

Country of Origin	Total	Women	Men
Germany	73,736	40,670	33,066

Bulgaria	27,470	12,994	14,476
Northern Cyprus	13,844	8,805	5,039
Azerbaijan	9,127	4,554	4,573
Russia	8,626	5,606	3,020
Netherlands	8,013	4,462	3,551
France	7,746	4,142	3,604
US	7,561	4,451	3,110
Saudi Arabia	6,334	5,137	1,197
United Kingdom	5,708	2,920	2,788
Major destination provinces			
Istanbul	54,644	29,409	25,235
Izmir	18,025	9,440	8,585
Bursa	17,948	9,134	8,814
Ankara	17,660	10,055	7,605
Antalya	10,002	5,269	4,733
Tekirdag	5,573	2,855	2,718
Konya	5,300	3,104	2,196
Hatay	4,596	3,288	1,308
Kocaeli	4,279	2,457	1,822
Adana	4,136	2,442	1,694
<i>Total non-Turkish citizen foreign-born</i>	<i>234,111</i>	<i>130,762</i>	<i>103,349</i>
<i>Source: Turkish Statistic Institute 2000 Census</i>			

Major countries of origin among immigrants as measured by the differences in permanent residence at the time of the Census and five years before are presented in Table 4. Some of these countries are, unsurprisingly, also major receiving countries for Turkish immigrants while others are countries with substantial Turkish populations. Germany, the Netherlands, France, and the US have been top destination countries along with Austria. Northern Cyprus and Azerbaijan are Turkish republics and Bulgaria hosts a sizeable Turkish minority. Half of these countries are neighbouring Turkey, so their geographic proximity could also be a factor generating such a pattern. For traditional destinations for Turkish labour migration such as Germany, Netherlands and France, these flows are likely to be dominated by return migrants. Reflection of

Turkish international migration and the effect of return migrations can also be seen from the target provinces where immigrants have settled in. The bottom half of the **Table 4**, lists the top ten provinces with largest immigrant populations in Turkey. First four provinces in the list are the largest and most industrialised provinces and traditionally larger sources of emigration from Turkey. Bursa, Tekirdag, and to an extent Kocaeli, are provinces which have historically attracted immigrants from Balkan countries to which they are geographically close too. Antalya, among others, is a major tourist destination located in the South of the country with very attractive holiday resorts. Konya has an established history of international migration marked by large numbers of people participated in labour emigration from the 1960s onwards. International migration experiences appear to be the key in determining Turkish destinations for immigrants. In other words, those areas with emigration and immigration experiences in the past attracting more immigrants while the countries that received migrants from these provinces in the past are contributing to the immigration to these provinces today. Obviously, one should not ignore the fact international migration often targets most advanced areas, cities, and towns which largely explains the upper end of the top ten list of receiving provinces in Turkey.

Along with relatively stable foreign-born population in Turkey and immigration flows, one should also note steady level of asylum applications filed in Turkey in the last decade. Given the difficulties in measuring and reporting immigration, another proxy indicator could be the border statistics collected by Turkish Security Department recording incoming and outgoing people by nationality.

Table 5: In-Coming and Out-Going Foreign Nationals by Border Statistics, 2002-2007.

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Incoming Foreign-Nationals						
Germany	3,481,691	3,305,044	3,985,141	4,240,122	3,762,469	4,149,805
UK	1,037,480	1,090,629	1 398,412	1,757,843	1,678,845	1,916,130
Russia	946,494	1,257,559	1 603,372	1,864,682	1,853,442	2,465,336
Netherlands	873,249	938,483	1,199,474	1,253,885	997,466	1,053,403
Bulgaria	834,070	1,006,268	1,310,643	1,621,704	1,177,903	1,239,667
France	522,349	470,071	544,917	701,190	657,859	768,167
Iran	432,281	494,977	631,522	957,245	865,942	1,058,206
Total	13,248,176	13,956,405	17,548,384	21,124,886	19,819,833	23,340,911

Out-going foreign-nationals						
Germany	3,552,185	3,288,904	3,970,364	4,117,952	3,729,334	4,192,512
UK	1,015,671	1,089,679	1,424,321	1,763,174	1,704,041	1,940,412
Russia	909,015	1,300,299	1,579,451	1,878,179	1,782,568	2,353,333
Netherlands	846,112	973,935	1,200,547	1,251,463	1,003,954	1,081,436
Bulgaria	853,003	1,040,985	1,324,106	1,622,600	1,196,979	1,347,616
France	496,482	453,658	540,606	679,140	619,366	739,442
Iran	427,462	411,558	469,450	678,622	636,282	854,488
Total	12,921,982	13,701,419	17,202,996	20,522,621	19,275,948	23,017,081

Table 5 summarises these travel statistics by country of citizenship and year from 2002 till 2007. The difference between incoming and outgoing foreign nationals would give an indication of the numbers who stays each year. However, one should bear in mind that these are not immigration registers or numbers of settlement visas. Thus it may only show that the popularity of a country as a destination (for business, tourism, immigration etc.). There could also be a significant number of people who enter the country in a year and leave next year. This could be the case for some countries which shows a negative difference between incoming and outgoing numbers. For example, it indicates, more Bulgarians, from 2002 to 2007, left Turkey than those entering annually. Another reason for that can be the leaving Bulgarian Turks who had immigrated to Turkey massively in the 1980s and reverse flows was witnessed from the 1990s onwards.

As Turkey became a significant transit country, the number of undocumented migrants apprehended by authorities also increased sharply from 11, 000 in 1995 to over 90,000 in 2000 and to about 60,000 most recently (Table 6). This is also related to tightening of immigration rules as well as Turkey-EU integration process which aims to harmonise Turkish migration codes and practices with the EU.

Table 6: Number of Asylum Applications and Apprehended Illegal Migrants in Turkey, 1995-2006.

	Asylum applications	Apprehended undocumented migrants
1995	2,017	11,362
1996	2,617	18,804
1997	3,898	28,439
1998	4,498	29,426
1999	5,390	47,529
2000	4,985	94,514

2001	5,693	92,365
2002	3,525	82,825
2003	2,563	56,219
2004	3,041	61,228
2005	2,911	57,428
2006	3,516	51,983
Source: Foreigners Borders and Asylum of the General Directorate of Security under the Ministry of Interior		

Internal Migration of the Foreign-Born

The logistic regression model summarised in Table 7, using individual, household and province level indicators explains almost 19 per cent of the foreign-born people's internal migration in Turkey. Understandably, some life-stage related variables appear to be significantly increasing or decreasing the propensity of internal migration for the foreign-born. For example, married people are less likely to migrate compared to others while the highest log odds are recorded for widows. As individuals age, their likelihood of changing residence decreases. Men are more likely to move compared to women.

Educational attainment is found to be very significant determinant: higher the level of education higher the propensity of internal migration. University graduates and those with higher degrees are respectively 2.9 and 2.1 times more likely to migrate compared to their primary school graduate neighbours. Secondary school graduates and those with vocational degrees are less likely to move. One reason behind this pattern could be the higher education system in Turkey where a centralised examination system selects students almost randomly and thus most students move to another district and province, sometimes very long distances to attain university programmes. This often leads further relocation into university towns and cities or to an industrialised or more advanced area.

Employment and occupational classes are also significantly changing odds for internal migration. Salaried or waged employees and industrial workers are more likely to migrate compared to others. On the other hand, those working in manufacturing sector are less likely to do so, compared to others employed in other sectors.

Home ownership, an indicator of wealth, significantly decreases migration odds. Migration is four times more likely for tenants while it is 8 times more likely for tenants on subsidised accommodation compared to home owners. Those on subsidised accommodation are often public workers (teachers, military, doctors, etc.) who have to serve in different locations by rotational appointments; or those working on projects in other cities, or living in company owned accommodation.

At household level, crowdedness of the household is also a significant factor; every fraction smaller household size or that much extra room seems to be considered worthy of a move.

Among the foreign-born, those who are not Turkish citizens (i.e. about 19 percent) are less likely to change their place of residence; about 70 percent less than the Turkish citizen foreign-born.

At a more macro level, the socio-economic development level of the province where the individual was resident in 1995, five years prior to the Census, is making a great impact. Every little improvement on the score decreases the likelihood of internal migration for the foreign-born about one in ten. Hence, those who reside in more developed provinces are not as likely as to move compared to the others who live in less developed or deprived areas of the country. This is perhaps consistent with the international migration trends in relation to socio-economic development (Icduygu, Sirkeci, Muradoglu: 2001).

Table 7: Logistic Regression Model: Factors Affecting The Internal Migration of Foreign-Born in Turkey.

	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp (B)
Constant	-1,090	2672,5	,000	0,336
Male (<i>Comparator: Female</i>)	-,023	7,8	,005	0,977
Age	-,023	4407,0	,000	0,977
<i>Comparator: Never married</i>		524,7	,000	
Unknown/NA	-,244	100,7	,000	0,783
Married	-,026	5,9	,015	0,974
Divorced	,029	1,0	,318	1,030
Widowed	,353	238,8	,000	1,424
<i>Comparator: Primary school</i>		7126,4	,000	
NA/illiterate	-,238	135,4	,000	0,788
No school completed	-,253	200,1	,000	0,776
Combined primary and lower secondary school	-,254	80,3	,000	0,775
Secondary school	,267	391,0	,000	1,307

Secondary vocational school	-,024	0,2	,692	0,976
Upper secondary school	,575	2133,4	,000	1,778
Upper secondary vocational school	,540	1116,2	,000	1,716
High School	,629	978,5	,000	1,875
University	1,086	3993,6	,000	2,964
Masters/Doctorate	,757	352,8	,000	2,133
Unknown	-1,318	11,8	,001	0,268
<i>Comparator: Salaried employee</i>		304,0	,000	
NA/Unknown	1,305	35,5	,000	3,688
Employer	-,199	30,8	,000	0,819
Self-employed	-,209	74,1	,000	0,811
Unpaid-family business	-,458	247,9	,000	0,632
<i>Comparator: Production workers, transport equipment operators and labourers (a)</i>		228,6	,000	
Professional, technical and related	-,010	0,2	,629	0,990
Administrative and managerial	-,085	3,2	,074	0,919
Clerical and related	-,257	132,3	,000	0,774
Sales people	-,109	14,6	,000	0,896
Service workers	,082	15,2	,000	1,085
Agriculture, husbandry, forestry workers, fishermen and hunters	,083	0,9	,334	1,087
Unknown	-,420	4,0	,047	0,657
<i>Comparator: Manufacturing</i>		1015,2	,000	
Agriculture etc.	,369	17,6	,000	1,446
Mining etc.	,072	0,4	,551	1,075
Utilities	,037	0,1	,714	1,038

Construction	,081	7,2	,007	1,085
Sales and commerce	,123	26,2	,000	1,131
Transport, Communication	,025	0,7	,408	1,025
Finance, Insurance, Estate	,104	12,7	,000	1,110
Social Services	,499	803,6	,000	1,647
Unknown	-,671	25,3	,000	0,511
<i>Comparator: Home owner</i>				
Hotel, dormitory etc.	1,330	2602,7	,000	3,780
Tenant	1,388	22938,6	,000	4,007
Subsidised accommodation	2,115	7682,3	,000	8,291
Tenant – unpaid	,348	366,6	,000	1,416
Others	,787	288,2	,000	2,196
Unknown	,833	23,7	,000	2,299
Crowdedness of the household	-,001	28,7	,000	0,999
Type of place of residence (<i>Comparator: urban</i>)	- 1,320	14641,4	,000	0,267
Citizenship (<i>Comparator: Turkish</i>)	- 1,129	3804,4	,000	0,323
Socio Economic Development level of the province lived 5 years ago	-,074	1111,6	,000	0,929
<i>R Square: 18,7</i>				
<i>2 log likelihood: 500827.106</i>				
<i>(a) ISCO68 classification (ILO, 1969)</i>				
<i>Source: Turkish Statistic Institute 2000 Census</i>				

A brief comparison with the overall internal migration trends in Turkey may shed further light on the moves of the foreign-born. Table 8 recaps differences in migration motivates among foreign-born with the reasons of moves for the overall population. Women are obviously move more often as dependents or as a result of a marriage overall. However, it is relatively less the case for the foreign-born women. Single most important reason for Turkish men to move is a new job, a job relocation, or job search whereas again for the foreign-born

other reasons tops the list by more than 14 points margin. Here the line of investigation should pursue to understand the other reasons reported by 25 percent of the foreign-born women and 34.4 percent of the foreign-born men. The census data are not able to detail this category but surveys and qualitative studies can expound upon. Security constitutes only a small fraction for overall internal migration, although the rates for the Turks are double those for the foreign-born. I think this is due to a simple fact that insecurity often explicit in the southeast of the country where only a little portion of foreign-born immigrates: even the largest province (Diyarbakir) and the largest sending provinces (Bingol and Elazig) in the area takes less than one in thousands of the foreign-born immigrants in Turkey compared to the 65 percent arriving in the five largest industrial provinces (Istanbul, Izmir, Ankara, Bursa, Antalya). Another interesting difference is the effect of the earthquake. I would think of the earthquake as the census was conducted just over a year after the big Marmara earthquake in 1999 but of course it could also well be the fear of an earthquake which is a reality for the majority of Turkish geography. A larger portion of the foreign born reacted to it by changing their place of residence compared to their Turkish neighbours which can be explained by the fact that the foreign born could be relatively less tied to and less rooted in the place of residence compared to the natives. Nevertheless this is clearly a strong supportive evidence for the studies pointing the effects of environmental changes and hazards on human mobility.

Table 8: Internal migration motivations of the foreign-born compared to overall population in Turkey, aged 5 and over by gender, 2000.

	<i>Gender</i>	Born in Turkey		Foreign-born	
New job / search	<i>Men</i>	955,323	26.7%	7,165	17.0%
	<i>Women</i>	263,519	8.8%	3,608	7.8%
Job re-location	<i>Men</i>	494,992	13.8%	3,991	9.5%
	<i>Women</i>	226,368	7.6%	3,615	7.8%
As dependent	<i>Men</i>	620,484	17.3%	5,966	14.2%
	<i>Women</i>	1,037,957	34.8%	12,272	26.4%
Education	<i>Men</i>	434,821	12.1%	6,834	16.2%
	<i>Women</i>	263,532	8.8%	5,748	12.4%
Marriage	<i>Men</i>	44,121	1.2%	790	1.9%
	<i>Women</i>	511,239	17.1%	6,044	13.0%
Earthquake	<i>Men</i>	102,850	2.9%	1,816	4.3%
	<i>Women</i>	102,148	3.4%	2,115	4.5%
Security	<i>Men</i>	33,369	0.9%	230	0.5%
	<i>Women</i>	22,991	0.8%	191	0.4%
Other	<i>Men</i>	801,257	22.4%	14,499	34.4%
	<i>Women</i>	484,376	16.2%	12,056	25.9%

Unknown	<i>Men</i>	92,957	2.6%	836	2.0%
	<i>Women</i>	71,713	2.4%	869	1.9%
Total	<i>Men</i>	6,564,017		88,645	
	<i>Women</i>	3,580,174		42,127	
		2,983,843		46,518	
Source: Turkish Statistic Institute 2000 Census					

CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have provided a comprehensive account of immigration to Turkey as well as the first ever authoritative analysis of the internal mobility of the foreign born population in Turkey, which constitutes nearly two percent of the total population with a strong size over 1.26 million as reported by 2000. One could easily predict a significantly higher figure should be reported if there were another census as the increasing numbers of apprehended illegal migrants, number of asylum seekers, and travel records in the eight years following the Census indicate.

Working with census data does also have some shortcomings regarding the incompleteness of the migration data for individuals. The census only reports the difference between the place of residence on the day of the census and five years ago; therefore it is neither able to reflect the number of moves nor to identify any movements in the interval. Therefore, we do deal with here, perhaps only a fraction of total moves. Further studies, also qualitative studies would shed further light into this gap which we cannot explore through the census data.

We can confidently say that profiles of foreign-born internal migrants are similar to the native-born fellows in Turkey but yet there are significant differences in terms of migration motives. Our regression model proved to be strong enough to explain nearly 19 percent of the internal migration of foreign-born in Turkey, where education, home ownership, citizenship, gender, marital status, occupations, and socio-economic development level are all found to be significant factors in explaining internal migration behaviour.

It is important to further investigate the number of moves within the destination country following the first arrival; for which surveys and qualitative interviews can be useful. Censuses are, unfortunately, not suitable for the purpose as they only report current place of residence and five years ago.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful that Turkish Statistical Institute granted access to the 2000 Turkish Census data as well as some other data tables which were freely available to download from TurkStat (Turkish Statistical Institute) website at <http://www.tuik.gov.tr> [accessed May 2008].

REFERENCES

Akgunduz, A. (1998) "Migration to and from Turkey, 1783-1960: Types, Numbers and Ethno-Religious Dimensions", **Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies**. Vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 97-120. 1998.

Belanger, Alain and Rogers, Andrei (1992) "The Internal Migration and Spatial Redistribution of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 1965-70 and 1975-80", **International Migration Review**, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 1342-1369.

Diaz-Más, Paloma (1992) **Sephardim: The Jews from Spain**, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Diñçer, B., Özaslan, M. ve Kavasoglu, T., (2003) **İllerin ve Bölgelerin Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik. Sıralaması**, Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, Ankara.

Hempstead, Katherine (2007) "Mobility of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States, 1995-2000: The Role of Gateway States", **International Migration Review**, 41 (2), pp.466-479.

Icduygu, A., Ibrahim Sirkeci & G. Muradoglu (2001) "Socio-economic development and international migration: a Turkish study," **International Migration**, 39(4), pp. 39-61.

ILO (1969) **International Standard Classification of Occupations, Revised Edition 1968**, Geneva: International Labour Office.

Karpat, Kemal H. (1995) "The Turks of Bulgaria: The struggle for national-religious survival of a Muslim minority", **Nationalities Papers**, 23(4), pages 725 – 749.

Karpat, Kemal H. (1985) "The Ottoman Emigration to America, 1860-1914", **International Journal of Middle East Studies**, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 175-209.

Kirisci, Kemal (2007) "Turkey: A Country of Transition from Emigration to Immigration", **Mediterranean Politics**, 12(1), pp.91 – 97.

Kritz, Mary M. and Nogle, June Marie (1994) "Nativity Concentration and Internal Migration among the Foreign-Born." **Demography**, Vol. 31, No. 3, 509-524.

Massey, Douglas S., and Denton, Nancy A. (1987). "Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians". **American Sociological Review**, Vol. 52, No. 6 (Dec., 1987), pp. 802-825.

Masters, Bruce Alan (2004) *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Arab World: The Roots of Sectarianism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

McCarthy, Justin (1996) **Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922**, Darwin Press, Princeton, NJ.

Newbold, K. Bruce (1996) Internal Migration of the Foreign-Born in Canada, **International Migration Review**, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 728-747.

Pentzopoulos, Dimitri (1962) **The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and its Impact upon Greece**. Paris, The Hague: Mouton.

Sirkeci, Ibrahim and Icduygu, A. (2001) "75 years of Turkish Diaspora: a republican family on the move", **Siirtolaisuus-Migration**, Vol. 28, No.2, p.1-14.

Vasileva, Darina (1992) "Bulgarian Turkish Emigration and Return", **International Migration Review**, 26(2), pp. 342-352.