

**Revisiting the Internal and International Migration Nexus: Internal mobility of the foreign born in Turkey**

**Ibrahim Sirkeci\***, **Jeffrey H. Cohen\*\***, & **Neriman Can\*\*\***

**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

---

\* **Ibrahim Sirkeci** PhD is Senior Lecturer in Business and Management (Marketing) in European Business School London at Regent's College, UK.

Email: [sirkeci@migrationletters.com](mailto:sirkeci@migrationletters.com)

\*\* **Jeffrey H Cohen** PhD is Associate Professor of Social Anthropology in Department of Anthropology at the Ohio State University, OH, United States.

Email: [cohenjh@osu.edu](mailto:cohenjh@osu.edu)

\*\*\* **Neriman Can** MSc is a senior analyst in population and migration division of Turkish Statistics Institute, Ankara, Turkey.

Email: [neriman.can@tuik.gov.tr](mailto:neriman.can@tuik.gov.tr)

## 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. 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 jobs 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.

**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 to sample to focus on those foreign-born who were resident in the country five years ago. 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.

....

**Population and migration in Turkey**

...

Table 1: Foreign-born in Turkey, reported by Censuses, 1935-2000.

...

Table 2: Foreign-born in Turkey, 1975-2000.

...

Table 3: Stock of foreign-born by country of citizenship, 2000.

...

Table 4: Major origin countries and destination provinces in Turkey, 2000.

...

Table 5: In-coming and out-going foreign nationals by border statistics, 2002-2007.

...

Table 6: Number of asylum applications and apprehended illegal migrants in Turkey, 1995-2006.

...

**Internal migration of the foreign-born**

...

Table 7: Logistic regression model: factors affecting the internal migration of foreign-born in Turkey.

...

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

!!!!!!!

**FOR FULL PAPER PLEASE CONTACT THE AUTHORS**