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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to bring new insights to some of the conflicting findings in the migration literature about the developing countries, by the analysis of the Turkish migration data between 1965-85. The possible reasons behind these inconsistencies in the findings are explained firstly in terms of spatial and temporal characteristics of the data (mainly whether it includes intra-regional migration and whether it measures migration during a specified period or life-time migration, and whether it aggregates various different types of migration); and secondly by national macro factors (mainly the level of urbanization and the characteristics of Turkey’s urban systems).

The analysis of the Turkish data indicated (1) the significance of factors other than push factors in the rural-to-urban out-migration; (2) the increasing volume of urban-to-urban migration, and decreasing significance of rural-to-rural and rural-to-urban migration; (3) a substantial volume of return migration and its relation to the macro national factors; (4) significance of socio-physiological versus physical distance; (5) the predominant role of migration between different categories of urban areas in urban growth; and (6) the role of absorption-retention versus attracting/directing the migrants in the unbalanced population concentration.
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INTERNAL MIGRATION IN TURKEY, 1965-85:
TEST OF SOME CONFLICTING FINDINGS IN THE LITERATURE

Ayse Gedik

1. Preface and Introduction

In the migration literature about the less developed countries many of the findings are inconsistent with each other. This may result from differences in the spatial and temporal dimensions of their data, and from the specific macro characteristics of different countries (Gedik, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1991, 1992). The purpose of this paper is to bring new insights to some of the conflicting findings in the existing literature rather than to present a comprehensive review of the conflicting findings.

The empirical findings are based on various studies by the author with the Turkish data which covered the period of 1965-85. Plausible reasons for the conflicting findings between the studies by the author and those of other studies, and the way they affect the results of some of the analyses are also discussed. Rigorous empirical analysis of the Turkish migration data which was in more disaggregated-detailed form than the available data in most of the developing countries facilitated exploration of potential new theoretical insights.

Except in two sections (Sections 3.1 and 3.4), the analyses include the three five-year periods of 1965-70, 1975-80, and 1980-85. In Sections 3.1 and 3.4, only the 1965-70 period is studied.

In Turkey, “urban” is defined according to three different criteria: (1) settlements with more than 10,000 population; (2) settlements with more than 20,000 population; or (3) “cities”, which is an administrative measure and comprises the areas within the municipal boundaries of the province and district centers, regardless of their population size. According to the above stated three definitions of urban, in Turkey urbanization increased from 30 %, 25 % and 34 % in 1965 to 51 %, 46 %, and 53 % in 1985, respectively (Table 1; OECD, 1988, p.8).
3. Test of the some of the conflicting findings in the existing studies

Those findings which were found to be conflicting in the migration literature are summarized in six parts: (1) the significance of push factors and other factors in mobility of the rural population; (2) proportion of rural-to-urban migrants among the total number of migrants in the country; (3) volume of urban-to-rural return migration; (4) effect of distance; (5) share of rural migration in the total migration towards urban areas; (6) mobility of the urban-to-rural migration for the unbalanced population concentration in the metropolitan areas. Each of these will be explained in the following sections.

3.1 Mobility of the Rural Population: Push Factors versus Other Factors

In the rural-to-urban migration studies, generally speaking, push factors are emphasized in the case of out-migration rates. Push factors are usually considered in terms of low rural incomes, inadequate infrastructure, facilities and services, etc.

However, in the analyses with the Turkish data, it was found that other factors were at least as significant as the push factors. These other factors were as follows: (a) education-skill and information level of the potential rural migrant, (b) transportation and communication facilities (i.e., accessibility to urban centers), and (c) the existence of previous migrants who are relatives, friends, and people from the same village. In other words, information, ability to take risk, and social networks are at least as influential as the push factors (Gedik, 1977; Gedik, 1979). These will be elaborated with the help of two examples as explained below.

First, if there are push factors in rural areas, and pull factors in urban areas, it is reasonable to think that the out-migration rates from rural areas would be more than the respective rates from the urban areas, ceteris paribus. However, empirical findings with the Turkish data are opposite to this assumption. For example, in the 1965-70 period, while the out-migration rate between settlements in general was 13.3%, it was 10.0% for

---

1 In Turkey minimum population size for the definition of “urban” is accepted as 10,000 or as 20,000. According to these two alternative definitions, in 1965-66, about 98.9%–100% of all province centers are urban; whereas, 98.4%–99.8% of all sub-districts and villages are “rural”. In this paper, for the purpose of brevity, “sub-district and villages” will be described only as “villages”.

District centers exhibit much wider variation. For example the proportion of district centers with larger than 20,000 population was 30% in 1965, and 57% in 1985. Another point is that the migration data for the district centers is in aggregate for each province. Therefore, when urban is defined in terms of population size, we are unable to distinguish the migration to/from district centers as urban or rural.

2 Province centers are the administrative capitals as well as the largest urban centers in each of the 67 provinces (except only 1 or 2 provinces). The average enumerated population size of the province centers 100,336 in 1965, and 270,649 in 1985. The three largest are the metropolises of Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir (Table 1). The rest of the 64 province centers are considered as secondary urban centers with average size of 56,747 in 1965 and 139,575 in 1985.

3 Mobility rates are estimated by dividing the number of out-migrants by permanent resident population in the origin in the initial year of the five-year period (M/7 x 100).

4 This may be due in part to the existence of superior transportation links between cities, which result in an increased flow of information, commodities, and persons between urban areas. Moreover, it is likely that urban dwellers are more accustomed to the ‘money economy’ and thus more likely to be aware of desirable alternatives, and hence more likely to migrate.” (Greenwood, 1969, p. 289).
rural, and 20.0% for the urban areas. In other words, the out-migration rate of the rural population is half the out-migration rate of the urban population (Gedik, 1977, p. 43; Gedik, 1978, pp. 23, 40, 43, 71). The same finding is also relevant for the 1975-80 and 1980-85 periods (Table 2).

Secondly, if there are wide differences between push factors in rural areas, then it would be expected that there are wide differences in the respective rural-to-urban out-migration rates. Consequently, it would be reasonable to predict that the maximum values for out-migration rates would be in the least developed regions in Turkey, i.e., in East and Southeast Turkey. For example, in these relatively less developed regions of Turkey, there is the problem of landlessness concomitant with very high birth rates twice or three times as high as the national average, agricultural land is of poor quality and topography is very rugged, climate is harsh with deep snow falls in the winter and very little rainfall in the plains, settlements are of very minor size and scattered on inaccessible high ground which makes the provision of infrastructure, facilities and services very difficult and expensive. Regional urban industrial centers are underdeveloped partly because they are far from the national and international markets and because of lack of skilled labor, etc. If the productivity of land in Turkey is assumed to be 100 in 1980-86, the respective index is between 43 and 59 in these less developed regions of East and Southeast Turkey; whereas it is between 147 and 115 in West Turkey (Ergin, 1990, p. 40). Likewise, if the province with the highest GDP per capita in Turkey in 1980 is given the index value of 100, the index is between 9.4-16.8 in East and Southeast Turkey (Öztop, 1988, p. 347).

However, empirical findings in 1965-70 show that the highest rural-to-urban out-migration rates are in (a) West and Central Turkey, especially in the provinces which are in close proximity to the three largest urban centers, i.e., the metropolises of Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir; and (b) in the provinces in North and Northeast Turkey with a long tradition of out-migration and consequently with existing previous migrants in the metropolitan areas. (Gedik, 1979, pp. 19-22, 34). For example, the provinces in Central and West Turkey, such as Ankara (10.2%), Eskişehir (7.4%), Kayseri (6.1%), Kırşehir (5.7%), Çankiri (5.1%), Kocaeli (4.9%), Çorum (3.9%), and Bursa (3.7%) have the highest out-migration rates which are in the 75-100% quartile, and ranged between 3.7% and 10.2%. On the other hand, during 1965-70, village-to-province center out-migration rates from the least developed regions in East and Southeast Turkey such as the provinces of Hakkari, Mardin, Bitlis, Mus, Urfa, Van, are in the lowest 0-25% quartile and ranged only between 1.2% and 2.2%\footnote{\textbf{Various authors found similar results. For example, Greenwood also indicates in his study about India that migrants to urban areas tend to come from relatively high-income rural areas, and he explains this unexpected finding in terms of Todec's theory. Furthermore, he states that low rural incomes means low education, low skills, little information, and strong family ties which would make the individual reluctant to leave home" (Greenwood, 1971, p. 259-61). Likewise, other studies such as by Skeldon in Peru, by Alberoni in Italy, by Sundquist in Italy, by Cornelia in Mexico, by Sewell in Turkey, emphasize that out-migration diffuses from more advanced and accessible communities to more remote and backward ones" (Skeldon, 1977, p. 401 in Nelson, 1980, pp. 291-294, 299-301, 303-305). According to the above stated authors, the relevant factors are the transportation and communication links, education, agricultural technology, as well as attitudes, aspirations, and perception of opportunities of the rural population. Simply stated, "the impact of development...on out-migration from...rural area is a race between the effects of rural income improvement and the impact on rural antinatal change" (Nelson, 1980, p. 303).}}.

In future, as the differences between provinces decrease in terms of the education level, transportation and communication network, and especially in terms of the existence of previous migrants (in other words, migration history), then the effects of the rural push factors (such as rural incomes) on the out-migration rates will be more clearly observed. Therefore, it is reasonable to predict that in the analysis of the 1980, 1985, and 1990 Turkish data, the rural-to-urban out-migration rates and the rural push factors will be spatially more congruent.

3.2. Size of the Rural-to-Urban Migration Flow

There is general consensus that in the less developed countries, the rural-to-urban migration flow is the largest of all migration flows in the country. However, in the analysis of the Turkish data, migration between rural areas and between urban areas are found to be at least as large as or even larger than the rural-to-urban migration (Table 3)\footnote{\textbf{Many studies asserted that the migration between rural, and between urban areas are negligible in size. "This rural to rural pattern of migration is the least common in Turkey... Migratory activity between such large cities as Izmir, Istanbul, and Ankara can also be observed, but has little importance... As economic conditions improve, or worry becomes easier to find, in as developed countries, people migrate between cities" (Tunerači, 1970, p. 162, 166).}}.

Rural-to-urban migration was second in size even in 1965-70 which was a period of fast urbanization, with the urbanization level at approximately 30% (Table 1). The share of two kinds of rural-to-urban migration in the total number of migrants was 17% for the "village-to-province center"; and 27% for the "village-to-city" migration.\footnote{\textbf{On the other hand, some other authors such as Greenwood who, given an example from India, indicated the possible large size of the urban-to-urban migration as he gives an example from India (Greenwood, 1971, p. 253).}}
Furthermore, in the later periods, rural-to-urban migration decreased both in relative terms and in absolute numbers. In 1980-85, the share of village-to-province-center migration decreased from 17.0% to 14.2%, and the share of village-to-city migration decreased from 27.4% to 22.5%. The minimum values were observed in the 1975-80 period.

When the migration between villages is studied, it is found that in the 1965-70 period, 4% of the rural population migrated between villages, and it had the largest share of any of the migration flows, with 17.9% (Table 3). However, in later periods, its share decreased to 14.8% in 1975-80, and to 8.5% in 1980-85, and it became only the second and the sixth largest flow, respectively, among the total number of migrants in Turkey. It should be indicated here that, because of the data problems, these percentages do not include intra-provincial migration between villages. It is clear that if this was included, all these percentages for the migration between villages would be higher than the above stated values. The possible reasons for such high levels of migration between villages are as follows:

1. Migration from mountain villages with labor surplus to villages in the plains which have labor shortages as a result of migration to urban centers or international migration;

2. Migration between rural areas in different provinces due to family reasons such as marriage;

3. Migration of immigrants from East Europe and Central Asia from the village where they were initially settled to villages where their relatives live;

4. From villages to squatter housing areas in the vicinity of the metropolitan areas which are coded as villages in the Population Census;

5. Boundary changes between provinces, in between two Census years, which result in coding of the same village in a different province, thus giving a false impression that migration has occurred.

The above listed percentages regarding migration between villages are average values for Turkey. In the future, the variation among provinces and the reasons behind these variations should be studied. Furthermore, if the migration between villages includes those villages which are within the peripheral zones of the metropolitan area, but which are coded as village rather than urban for administrative reasons, then this type of migration between villages is an administrative artefact. If this is the case, then in reality a certain proportion of the migration between villages would actually be migration between urban and rural areas and among urban areas themselves. Therefore, if this percentage is significant in size, the values for the migration between villages will decrease; and accordingly, rural-to-urban, urban-to-rural, and urban-to-urban migration will increase to some extent (Table 3).

When the migration between urban areas is studied in terms of the migration between province centers, then in 1965-70, it is the 3rd largest (15.1%), and only slightly less than the village-to-province center migration (17.0%). In the subsequent periods, it became the largest flow with shares of 21.3% in 1975-80, and 20.3% in 1980-85. In 1980-85, migration between province centers, and migration from district to province centers comprised the two largest flows (20.3% and 16.9%, respectively). Therefore, when the migration between urban areas, including both the district and the province centers is studied, migration between urban areas increased from 39.2% in 1965-70 to 56.2% in 1980-85, and it was always the largest flow (Table 3).

The reasons why rural-to-rural and urban-to-urban migration are as large as or even larger than rural-to-urban migration, might be as follows. Firstly, these two migration flows occur parallel to the rural-to-urban migration. For example, rural-to-rural migration is due to the fact that some of the rural population who could not migrate to the urban areas (or before they could migrate to the urban areas), might have migrated to other rural areas, such as from mountain villages with labor surplus to villages in the plains with labor shortage (Karpat, 1976). This indicates the significant differences in the rural sector, and the fallacy of treating it as a homogeneous entity.

As for the urban-to-urban migration, those who migrated from rural to urban centers, as their knowledge about the employment opportunities in other urban centers, and their skill levels, increase, may leave the urban center to which they have initially migrated and

---

3 This observation corresponds to the third and fourth phase in Zelinsky's five-stage model (Zelinsky, 1971).
may try to find an optimum urban center for themselves in the course of their stepwise migration.\footnote{Tümeretkin emphasized this point clearly.}

The second reason for the relative sizes of the above stated three types of migration flows might be the mathematical artifact due to the level of urbanization, and the different mobility rates of urban and rural population. For example, the increase in the share of urban-to-urban migration can be at least partly explained by the increased level of urbanization. As stated previously, the level of urbanization in Turkey increased from approximately 30% in 1965 to approximately 50% in 1985 (Table 1). It is interesting to note that the period of 1975-80 when urban-to-urban migration first became the largest flow was the time when the level of urbanization in Turkey reached the level of approximately 50%. Secondly, as stated previously, the mobility rates of the urban population are double those of the rural population (Table 2) (Gedik, 1977, p.48; Gedik, 1978, pp. 23,40,43,71).

The third factor may be a dependence on the national socio-economic situation. For example, in 1975-80, a period with relatively adverse socio-economic conditions in Turkey,\footnote{Uzun indicated the difference between the effect of rural-to-urban versus urban-to-urban migration on the population concentration in the large urban centers in different countries with differing urbanization levels such as Sub-Saharan versus Latin American countries (Uzun, 1979, p. 6).} rural-to-urban migration decreased to a very low level\footnote{Various macroeconomic indicators show an unusual dip in 1975-80. During the three quinquennial periods between 1965-85, the average annual growth rate of GNP (at 1968 prices) was 6.8%, 7.7%, 2.6%, and 4.6%. The decrease in 1975-80 was very large for the industrial and service sectors down to 1/3 to 1/3 of its size in the previous period. For example, during 1965-85, average annual growth rate of the industrial sector was 9.6%, 9.5%, 3.0%, 7.3%, and the respective rates for the services were 8.2%, 8.0%, 3.9%, 4.1% (OECD, 1988; TSDSTO, 1987, pp.122-124, 179-80; DPT, 1990, pp. 3-7). The fact that the above stated economic conditions affected the mobility patterns is also supported by various interviews concerning the movement from squatter housing construction in urban areas and increase in the return movement back to the villages, as published in various newspapers during that period.}, instead, migration in the same sectors such as between rural and between urban areas, increased.

Generally speaking, more than one factor is operative. For example, in the 1980-85 period, the reasons for the decrease in migration between villages might be the decrease in the size of the rural population; as well as the increase in the rural-to-urban migration consonant with the relative improvement in the national socio-economic situation.

3.3. Urban-to-Rural Return Migration

It is generally thought that in the less developed countries, urban-to-rural return migration does not exist, or that it is of a very negligible magnitude. This is also supported by various interviews with rural migrants in the urban centers (Karpat, 1976; Saran, 1974).

In internal migration, there is always a counter stream for every migration stream (Lee, 1966). During 1965-85 (when the ratio of GDP per capita in urban to rural areas was approximately between 4.0 and 3.1)\footnote{The ratio of the urban to rural GDP per capita was: 4.1 in 1960, 4.0 in 1967, 3.8 in 1972, 3.7 in 1977, 3.1 in 1982 (OECD, 1988, p.14).}, the ratio of the urban-to-rural counter stream was approximately 50% of the rural-to-urban stream (Table 4). For example, the weighted mean for the ratio of the number of province-center-to-village migrants to the number of village-to-province-center migrants was 55% in 1965-70, and 47% in 1980-85.

It is interesting to note that in 1975-80 period, return migration increased significantly (Table 4). The increased return migration in the 1975-80 period also coincided with increased international return migration of Turkish workers from Europe (Gümrez, 1988, pp. 7-8). Adverse national economic conditions\footnote{See endnote no 10.} and political-social chaos and violence in 1975-80 are probably the reasons for this increased return migration.\footnote{Lee also emphasized this point. "The efficiency of a migration stream varies with the economic conditions, being high in prosperous times and low in times of depression" (Lee, 1966 in Lewis, 1982, p. 21). Likewise, Preston stresses the universal character of return migration and states that "during the Great Depression in the United States, reverse net urban-rural migration actually took place" (Schulze, 1945, p. 90 in Preston, 1988, p. 13).}
These ratios of return migration, as stated above, are the weighted mean values for Turkey. It is necessary to study how these ratios vary among the provinces in Turkey, and the reasons for this variation. If these return migrations are towards the villages around the metropolitan areas, then these would in reality represent urban-to-urban migration rather than return migration.

3.4. Effect of Distance

In the migration literature, the relationship between distance and migration is tested in terms of distance decay function, such as a Pareto curve. The relationship is tested for the 1965-70 period for each province in terms of migration from the villages to the 67 province centers.

In the relationship between the number of migrants (nij) and the distances (dij), there are two types of very large migration flows. The first is from the villages to the province center in the same or in the neighboring provinces regardless of the population size. The second is directed to one of the three metropolises regardless of the distances involved (Gedik, 1977, p. 338). All other migration flows comprise a very small number of migrants; and they are affected neither by the distances nor the population size of the destination. The examples of the provinces of Adana and Adiyaman indicate this very clearly (Figures 1-2).

There is a very high degree of channelization of the migration flows which can also be observed from their entropy values which are calculated for the total number of village-to-province center out-migrants from each of the 67 provinces (Gedik, 1977, pp. 141, 147, 180). The average observed (aposteriori) entropy value for 67 provinces in 1965-70 was 1.513 which was much below the maximum (apriori) value of 4.2047. Likewise, the average redundancy value of 0.6432 was rather high.

In summary, in the 1965-70 period, a smooth functional relation with distance could not be obtained. Elasticity of migration with respect to distance disappears almost totally after a very short distance, that is the distance from the villages to their own province center. In other words, after an average of 40 km., migrants move in a leap-frog fashion towards one of the three metropolitan areas regardless of the distances involved. Socio-psychological distances seem to be more meaningful than physical distances.

If there are previous migrants such as relatives, friends, and people from the same village, that destination is preferred over another destination which might be physically closer. Previous migrants seem to attract other migrants in a snow-ball fashion in subsequent years (chain migration).

According to the findings of this study, if certain regional centers are encouraged as growth centers, they will at least in the short and medium-term attract in-migrants from their immediate vicinity. If this is the case, then from the perspective of policy making, they should be located in regions from where rural out-migration is desired.

In the future, it is most likely that this migration flow will be less channeled and will have larger entropy levels, and that a Pareto function with a better fit will be observed.
obtained. This is based on the assumption that in the future, as the level of urbanization increases, there will be more alternative urban destinations; and as educational level and the diffusion of information in the country improves, the potential migrant will be more aware of these alternative destinations, other than his/her own province center or the largest metropolitan areas. Consequently, the potential migrant will rely less on the previous migrants (friends and relatives) in the destination\textsuperscript{24}.

### 3.5. Share of Rural Migration in the Total Migration Towards Urban Areas

In a previous section (Section 3.2), the volume of rural-to-urban migration in relation to other migration flows in the country was discussed (Table 3). This section will stress the share of rural-to-urban migration in total migration to/from the urban areas (Table 5).

It is the general consensus that rural-to-urban migration is the largest component in total migration to/from the urban centers. However, the findings of this study do not support this assumption. Furthermore, this inconsistency increases with time.

The migration flows to and from provincial centers with larger than 20,000 population\textsuperscript{25} are analyzed in two groups: the largest three metropolises, and the other provincial centers which we broadly defined as intermediate-size cities. For the case of the intermediate size provincial centers the share of the migrants from villages decreased from 2nd rank (21.2\%) in 1965-70, to 3rd (12\%) in 1975-80, and to 4th rank (11.9\%) in 1980-85 (Table 5). On the other hand, immigration from other provincial centers in the three five-year periods increased consistently through time from 3rd rank (18.5\%) to 2nd rank (26.4\%). Out-migration to other provincial centers always held first rank throughout the three quinquennal periods, with shares of 28.5\%, 33.7\%, and 31.2\%, respectively. In other words, migration between provincial centers comprised approximately 47\% of total migration to/from intermediate-size provincial centers in 1965-70, and this increased to 57.6\% in 1980-85.

---

\textsuperscript{24} The relationship between education and the effect of previous migrants are also discussed by Nelson (1980, pp. 294-95).

\textsuperscript{25} Similar findings are also obtained for the provincial centers with larger than 10,000 population.

Likewise, when the three metropolitan areas are studied, even in the 1965-70 period, the in-migrants from villages (26.1\%) were almost equal to the in-migrants from the province centers (25.5\%). Subsequently, through time the migrants from villages decreased from 1st (26.1\%) to 2nd (21.3\%) and later to 4th (15.5\%) rank. In contrast to this development, in-migrants from provincial centers and district centers increased, and in 1980-85 these two migration flows constituted the two largest flows (25.5\%, 27.2\%, 23.5\%; and 18.0\%, 17.9\%, 25.0\%, respectively). Consequently, in the 1980-85 period, about 48.5\% of the in-migrants to the three metropolises were from the "city" areas. The increased role of urban-to-urban migration indicates "the need for specific national settlement policies focusing on inter-urban mobility" (Renaud, 1979, p. 24).

One of the reasons for this increased share of migration between urban centers is undoubtedly, as indicated previously (Sections 3.1 and 3.2) the increase in the urbanization level, and the fact that mobility rates of the population in the urban areas are double those of the rural areas.

Another reason might be the existence of many intermediate size cities in Turkey as alternative centers of attraction for the rural migrants, and thus the existence of a rather balanced\textsuperscript{26} urban system (Gedik, 1991, p. 115). In Turkey, prior to 1950-55, i.e., prior to the time when major rural-to-urban migration and urbanization started, investments were directed to urban areas and to industrial development (mainly in terms of state industries, especially in 1930's), and the railroads were constructed to link the province centers (Rivkin, 1965, pp. 78, 79, 94, 96). The city of Ankara in Central Turkey, which became the capital city with the establishment of the Republic in 1923, was to become the second largest city after Istanbul. Ankara was an alternative and intervening urban center in the middle of the Anatolian plateau. On the other hand, before 1950, agriculture received minimum investment, and remained generally subsistence agriculture. Primitive agricultural techniques, availability of sufficient land, poor accessibility to urban areas, and low levels of education did not encourage rural-to-urban migration.

All of this was a planned conscious effort on behalf of the government to create a viable national urban structure before making major efforts to deal with the rural

\textsuperscript{26} This fact can be observed in various measures of "primacy index" and "rank-size" rule (Richardson, 1979, p. 9; and Clark, 1971, p. 155).
problems. At the time when rapid rural-to-urban migration and urbanization started, Turkey already had alternative urban centers and a rather balanced urban system. By contrast, in other developing countries, with very unbalanced urban hierarchial systems and a lack of intermediate-sized cities, rural migrants tend to out-weigh urban migrants in the metropolitan areas (Findlay, 1980, p.5).

3.6. Significance of Rural-to-Urban Migration for the Unbalanced Population Concentration in the Metropolitan Areas

The unbalanced population concentration in only a few largest cities is one of the significant problems faced by the developing countries. It is generally thought that this problem can be solved by attracting rural in-migrants to the intermediate sized cities. The hypothesis that the majority of the rural-to-urban migrants prefer the largest metropolises will be tested below.

The combined population of the three largest metropolises in Turkey is 52-54% of the total province center population, and about 52-60% of all village-to-province center migrants prefer these three metropolises.

When the village-to-province center migration is studied not in numbers but as rates related to the populations concerned, the following findings are obtained (Table 6). In all three five-year periods the average in-migration rates for these three metropolises (9.0%, 4.2%, 2.6%) are very similar to the average rate for the intermediate-size province centers (9.4%, 3.8%, 3.1%) (Table 6). Furthermore, correlation between the population size of the province centers (log) and the village-to-province-center in-migration rates is very low in all the three five-year periods (r=0.07, -0.04, -0.22). Consequently, we can say that regardless of their population size (i.e., whether they are large metropolises or not), province centers in each of the three five-year periods, attracted village migrants in almost constant proportion (approximately 9%, 4%, 3%) to their population size.

On the other hand, the out-migration rates from the three metropolises to the province centers are very low (4.6%, 4.0%, 3.5%), and they are very close to the minimum values estimated for the intermediate-size province centers (5.0%, 3.8%, 3.5%). About 47-54% of the out-migration from the intermediate-size province centers to other province centers is towards the three metropolises (Gedik, 1991, p. 108). The correlation coefficients indicate that the net migration rates of the province centers are more related to the out-migration rates to other province centers (r=0.76, -0.89, -0.78) than to the immigration rates from the villages (r=0.51, 0.49, 0.36).

In conclusion, the empirical analysis indicates that the three metropolises do not have high in-migration rates from the villages. In fact these rates are close to the "average" rates for the intermediate size province centers. However, the out-migration rates from these three metropolises to other province centers of intermediate size are very low and are near "minimum" values because of their relatively higher capacity to absorb and retain the in-migrants.

In another words, the reason for the high net immigration of the metropolises is not their high in-migration rates from the villages, but rather their very low out-migration rates to other province centers. Therefore, contrary to the general consensus, the problem of unbalanced population concentration in the metropolitan areas is not to attract the village migrants to the intermediate-size province centers. The crucial problems lies in the implementation of policies which will facilitate the absorption-retention of the village migrants in the intermediate-size province centers, which will minimize their subsequent out-migration to the metropolitan areas.

One of the reasons for the inconsistency between the findings of this study and the general consensus concerning the above stated causes of the problem of primacy, might be the characteristics of the data. The Turkish data includes "intra-provincial" as well as "inter-provincial" migration. Furthermore, in the Turkish data, "migration" is defined not in terms of life-time migration, but in terms of change in "permanent residency" during two quinquennial Population Censuses. If the Turkish data only included inter-provincial migration, there would be wide differences between the metropolises and the intermediate-size province centers in terms of the village in-migration rates. This would be because of the significance of intra-provincial and stepwise migration in the developing countries. Only in the case where intra-provincial migration is not included, would the...
empirical findings of this study indicate to us that the village migrants preferred large
metropolises.

For example, the percentage of the intra-provincial village-to-province center migration is 70-74% for the intermediate sized cities. The respective percentage for the metropolises is almost half of this value. Therefore, if only the inter-provincial migration were considered, then the village-to-province center in-migration rates for the intermediate size province centers would decrease noticeably in the three periods from 9.4%, 3.8%, 3.1% to 2.0%, 1.0%, 1.0%; whereas the respective rates for the metropolises would decrease only slightly from 9%, 4.2%, 2.6% to 6.9%, 4.0%, and 2.4%. Furthermore, if life-time migration (instead of migration based on a change in permanent residence) is studied, these differences would further increase.

The reasons behind the fact that the village-to-province-center in-migration rates are a rather constant proportion of the population size of the province centers (regardless of whether they are intermediate-size cities or metropolises), are as follows. Firstly, the village-to-province center migrants, at least in the initial years, are employed in the informal sector and are attracted by the existence of previous migrants who are relatives and friends from the same village (chain migration). Secondly, these two factors are closely related with the population size of the province center (Gedik, 1977, pp.275-91; Gedik, 1991, pp. 110,115; Gedik, 1992, p. 414).

4. Conclusions and Theoretical Insights

The relevant findings based on the analyses of the Turkish migration data in the three five-year periods between 1965-85, are summarized as follows:

1. For the rural-to-urban out-migration, a number of factors - education, skill, access of the migrants to information, availability of transportation and communication facilities, and especially the existence of previous migrants and the past migration history of the rural population - all have significant effects, at least as much as the push factors.

2. In the early periods of urbanization (when level of urbanization is approximately 30%, such as it was in Turkey in 1965), the intra-sectoral and inter-sectoral migration is comparable in size. In other words, the volume of migration between rural, and between urban areas is at least as great as the rural-to-urban migration. This indicates that we should consider the stepwise migration between the rural areas, as well as the migration from rural areas to metropolitan centers (Raveanest, 1885 in Isard, 1972, p. 67).

In adverse macro national conditions, rural-to-urban migration decreases, whereas intra-sectorial migration increases. Another factor is that as the level of urbanization increases, the volume of rural-to-rural as well as rural-to-urban migration declines relative to the urban-to-urban migration. The attainment of the last stage (when urban-to-urban migration is predominant) is increasingly more rapid because the mobility of the urban population is double that of the rural population.

3. During the entire 1965-85 period, urban-to-rural return migration was substantial in size, approximately 50% of the rural-to-urban migration. During periods with adverse national socio-economic conditions and when the ratio of GDP per capita in urban to rural areas decreases, as happened during 1975-80, urban-to-rural return migration increases whereas rural-to-urban migration decreases.

4. Rural-to-urban migration becomes inelastic after a very short average distance of 40 km. (i.e., the distance from the villages to the province center in the same province); after which socio-psychological distance (e.g., existence of previous migrants who are relatives, or friends, and previous knowledge of the destination) becomes significant.

5. In the urban growth in developing countries, the share of urban-to-urban migrants is increasingly larger than the share of the rural-to-urban migrants regardless of whether the destination is a metropolis or an intermediate size city. This is observed as the level of urbanization increases, together with the higher mobility rates of the urban population, and depends also on the existence of the intermediate-size cities as alternative urban destinations in the national urban system.

6. The main factor behind urban primacy, i.e., the unbalanced urban population concentration, is not the relatively larger in-migration rates from rural to
metropolitan areas. In fact the metropolitan areas attracted rural in-migrants in constant proportion to their population size. The major factor in the unbalanced population concentration is the low capacity of absorption-retention of the migrants in the intermediate size cities and the consequent high out-migration rates from these urban centers towards the other urban centers, especially towards the metropolitan areas.

Therefore, policy should emphasize the retention-absorption of the rural migrants in the intermediate-size cities as well as directing/attracting them towards these cities. Otherwise, one-sided policies, that is emphasizing only attracting migrants to the intermediate-size cities, would be counter-productive, and would aggravate rather than alleviate the problem such that the primacy would increase in subsequent years.  

It is important to remember that the above stated findings concerning migration are highly affected by (1) the characteristics of our data, and (2) the national macro factors. Therefore, before the findings of this study are generalized to other developing countries, the data characteristics and the national macro factors should be examined.  

Firstly, as for the characteristics of the data, the following points have very significant impacts on the outcome of the empirical analyses: whether the data includes intra-regional as well as the inter-regional migration; or whether it measures life-time migration or the migration during a specific time period such as five-years; and whether it is disaggregated in terms of individual urban and rural settlements, or instead represents aggregations of such settlements at a regional sub-national scale.

Unfortunately, in most of the less developed countries, the migration data is available only as inter-regional, and as life-time migration. Such differences in data are important since migration in the developing countries is largely intra-regional and step-wise. Furthermore, in the developing countries, urban versus rural disaggregation is best made at regional/sub-national scale. The last point is important for the less developed countries where significant socio-economic differences exist between the urban and the rural populations. If the population is considered in aggregate, various empirical analyses will be inconsistent because of the differences in the proportion of the different migrating population groups, ceteris paribus.

Secondly, just as we cannot directly apply assumptions and findings about the developed countries to the developing countries, findings about a specific developing country may not be directly applicable and valid for another developing country. This is because of the fact that besides the differences in data characteristics, there are wide disparities among the developing countries in terms of their per capita incomes, level of urbanization, urban systems (mainly, spatial location of metropolitan areas, and the existence of intermediate-size cities), as well as the size of the total national population and the land area of the country. The way these national macro factors affect our findings is explained under each section.

In terms of policy implications, the following findings are discussed: (1) the effect of rural development and the location of growth centers on the trend of the rural out-migration rates; (2) the role of the attraction versus absorption-retention capacities of the migrants in the growth centers, intermediate size cities and in the metropolises, in the population agglomeration in the primate cities; (3) the role of rural-to-urban in-migration rates versus urban-to-urban out-migration rates in the urban growth; (4) the significance of the established migration routes, the role of chain migration and the snowball effect of the previous migrants in the population distribution; (5) the increasing significance of urban-to-urban migration rather than rural-to-urban migration, as the level of urbanization increases (especially near and after the 50% level); (6) national economic growth and its positive relationship with the rural-to-urban out-migration, and its negative relationship with the return migration from urban-to-rural areas.

---

28 This fact is also emphasized by Sundquist in his study about Italy, and by Todaro (Sundquist, 1974; and Todaro, 1969; in Nelson, 1980, pp. 291-292, 303-305).
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Table 1. Level of Urbanization, and the Largest Three Metropolises, 1965-1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Level of urban (%)</th>
<th>Total national population (1,000)</th>
<th>Population of three largest metropolises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Istanbul (1,000)</td>
<td>Ankara (1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>31,51</td>
<td>2,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.1)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>35,321</td>
<td>2,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>40,025</td>
<td>3,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>44,438</td>
<td>4,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>50,345</td>
<td>5,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: (a) Urban is defined as “city”; (b) Figures in parentheses are percentages of the total national population.

Table 2. Mobility Rates(%), in 1965-70, 75-80, and 80-85.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total popul.</th>
<th>Village popul.</th>
<th>City popul.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965-70</td>
<td>1975-80</td>
<td>1980-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(province center)</td>
<td>(19.3)</td>
<td>(12.9)</td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(district center)</td>
<td>(20.5)</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>(14.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from: DIE (State Institute of Statistics), Daimiler Halk İstatistikleri (Domestic Migration by Permanent Residence). Ankara: DIE (1985 and 1989); Nos. 1124 and 1381.

Note: (a) For the definition of mobility rates, see endnote no. 2.

Table 3. Share of Different Migration Flows in Total Number of Migrants (%), in 1965-70, 75-80, and 80-85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1965-70</th>
<th>1975-80</th>
<th>1980-85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From province center to province centers</td>
<td>15.1 (3)%</td>
<td>21.3 (1)</td>
<td>20.3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From district center to province center</td>
<td>11.2 (4)</td>
<td>11.9 (3)</td>
<td>16.9 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From villages to province center</td>
<td>17.0 (2)</td>
<td>9.9 (4)</td>
<td>14.2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From province center to district center</td>
<td>7.0 (7)</td>
<td>6.5 (9)</td>
<td>9.9 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From district center to district center</td>
<td>5.8 (9)</td>
<td>9.2 (7)</td>
<td>9.1 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From villages to district center</td>
<td>10.4 (5)</td>
<td>7.1 (8)</td>
<td>8.3 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From province center to villages</td>
<td>9.3 (6)</td>
<td>9.8 (5)</td>
<td>6.7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From district center to villages</td>
<td>6.2 (8)</td>
<td>9.6 (6)</td>
<td>6.2 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From villages to villages</td>
<td>17.9 (1)</td>
<td>14.8 (2)</td>
<td>8.5 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from: DIE (State Institute of Statistics), Daimiler Halk İstatistikleri (Domestic Migration by Permanent Residence). Ankara: DIE (1985 and 1989); Nos. 1124 and 1381.

Note: (a) Turkey on the average (weighted mean); (b) Values in the parentheses indicate the ranking order of the shares (descending order); (c) Includes both the province centers and the district centers.
Table 4. Ratio\(^{a}\) of Return Migration (%), in 1965-70, 1975-80, and 1980-85.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1965-70</th>
<th>1975-80</th>
<th>1980-85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From province center to villages(^{b})</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From district center to villages(^{c})</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From cities to villages(^{d})</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: (a) Ratios are in terms of Turkey on the average (weighted mean)
(b) Ratio of province center-to-village migration to village-to-province center migration.
(c) Ratio of district center-to-village migration to village-to-district center migration.
(d) Ratio of city-to-village migration to village-to-city migration.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intermediate size province centers(^{a})</th>
<th>Three metropolises(^{a})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>75-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From villages to prov. center(^{e})</td>
<td>21.2(2)(^{e})</td>
<td>12.0(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From distr. center to prov. center</td>
<td>14.5(4)</td>
<td>11.0(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From prov. center to province center</td>
<td>18.5(3)</td>
<td>24.9(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From prov. center to villages(^{**})</td>
<td>11.0(5)</td>
<td>10.7(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From prov. center to distr. center(^{**})</td>
<td>9.3(6)</td>
<td>7.6(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From prov. center to prov. center(^{**})</td>
<td>28.5(1)</td>
<td>33.7(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |


Note: (a) Weighted mean.
(b) It only includes the province centers with larger than 20,000 population, and does not include the three metropolises.
(c) For Istanbul and İzmir, the whole province is included.
(d) Values in the parentheses indicate the ranking order of the shares (descending order).
\(^{e}\) In-migration to the province center
\(^{**}\) Out-migration from the province center.
Table 6. The Rates for In-migration to Province Centers from Villages, and Out-migration from Province Centers to Other Province Centers (%): Average, Minimum and Maximum Values, in 1965-70, 1975-80, 1980-85.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intermediate-size province centers(^b)</th>
<th>Three metropol.(^6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From villages to prov.center</td>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>75-80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-85</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From prov.center to prov.center</td>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>75-80</td>
<td>13.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-85</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from: DIE (State Institute of Statistics), Daimi ilanetoğaba Göre İç Gıçler (Domestic Migration by Permanent Residence). Ankara: DIE (1983 and 1989); Nos. 1124 and 1383.

Notes: (a) Rates are estimated by dividing the number of migrants in five-year period by permanent resident population of the province centers in the beginning of the five-year period.
(b) It only includes the province centers with larger than 20,000 population, and does not include the three metropolises.
(c) For Istanbul and Izmir, the whole province is included.
* In-migration to the province center.
** Out-migration from the province center.
Figure 2. Number of Migrants and the Distances From the Villages in Adiyaman Province to the Province Centers