



Socio-Economic Effects of Internal Migration: The Case of Gaziantep Province

Salih OZTURK^{1,*}, Enez KAN^{2,**} and Melahat ŞENGÜLER^{3,***}

* Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics, Administrative Sciences Namik Kemal University, TR-59410 Tekirdağ, Turkey

ABSTRACT

In this study, it is aimed to reveal the causes and consequences of internal migration -as one of Turkey's most important social and economic problems- through the case in Gaziantep province, and the measures needed to be taken for the future will be tried to be determined. For this purpose, it was tried to set forth the differences in the causes of migration by obtaining findings concerning the causes of migration, migration tendency and the measures that need to be taken through the implementation of 1000 questionnaires on migrants living in the metropolitan county of Gaziantep, Sahinbey and Sehitkamil. SPSS 22 software package was used in this study. Statistical methods, Correlation and ANOVA tests have been utilized and solutions were tried to be presented according to the obtained data.

Keywords: Immigration, Migration, Regional Development, Economics, Turkey.

Authors emails

salibozturk@nku.edu.tr;

enezkan@hotmail.com

sengulermelos_01@hotmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of migration is a highly influential event that is directly related with the socio-cultural, economic and political structure of societies. As a dynamic process, migration describes a section of the population living in a settlement leaving that place due to various reasons and settling in another place. Migration often occurs due to economic, social or political reasons. The differences between different regions in terms of economic development usually lie on the basis of the economic reasons. In that respect, it is the migration of labor from regions that are sub-developed in economic terms, to developed regions. Accordingly, economically developed regions form centers of attraction in terms of migration.

The internal migration movement that started in the 1950s in Turkey has left very deep and varied effects on the migrants, migration-receiving and migration-sending regions. Internal migration occurs in connection with industrialization and particularly with the combination of the pushing factors of rural areas and the pulling factors of urban areas. In addition, the

development of mass media and means of transportation has further accelerated internal migration. Although the intensity of internal migration may change from time to time, the consequences it causes do not. Internal migration significantly affects both the physical and the socio-economic structures of migration-receiving and migration-sending regions.

Migration causes significant problems in relation with housing, education, health, infrastructure and particularly unemployment in cities. Furthermore, insufficient local services, economic difficulties and cases of identity crisis, maladaptation and alienation in connection with the resulting psychological problems occur in proportion with the size of the migration received.

Gaziantep is one of the most important and primary industrial, commercial, service, culture, tourism and education centers of Turkey. Particularly onwards from the 1990s, the province has received intense internal migration, which continued incrementally after the 2000s. As it is the case in the other provinces receiving heavy internal migration, it caused the problems of

housing, education, health and particularly unemployment to worsen.

In the present study, the effects of the migration Gaziantep received from 1990 to 2010 on its socio-economic structure will be examined. In this context, analyses were conducted through correlation and chi square tests were conducted in order to determine the effects of the internal migration Gaziantep receives from other provinces, migration tendencies, demographic characteristics and the relations among different variables, while ANOVA test was used to observe the differences among provinces.

Our purpose in the present study is firstly to manifest the effects of internal migration on Gaziantep's socio-economic structure, and then to develop concrete ideas on how the negative aspects of these effects can be negated or at least minimized. This purpose was determined with the consideration of the fact that the internal migration Gaziantep receives has lowered the socio-economic development level of the province.

II. MIGRATION TENDENCY

The most general and important hypothesis of theoretical migration analyses states that the primary driving force of migration movements is the socio-economic development level differences between regions or countries (Friedlander; 1992:293). Following the industrial revolution, a process of migration from rural areas towards the more developed urban centers started. This is referred to as "the push of the rural and the pull of the urban" (Karabulut and Polat, 2007).

The push of the rural is caused by inadequacies in economic, education, health, social and cultural terms. There are also forced (unnatural) migrations made from rural to urban due to causes such as war and terror. The pull of the urban, on the other hand, indicates developed urban centers where employment opportunities, health and education possibilities and socio-cultural services are provided at a higher level (Karabulut and Polat, 2007).

III. MIGRATION ANALYSES AND THE LITERATURE

In theory, the phenomenon of migration is explained through three principal analyses.

3.1. Cost-Benefit Analysis

If migration is considered as a sort of human capital, in theory this is called "the cost-benefit analysis of migration". The main point of this analysis is the fact that individuals' decision to migrate depends on the costs and benefits of migration. Therefore, individuals would migrate only if the benefits of migration are higher than its costs (Celik, 2005:168).

The classics report that individuals make cost-benefit analysis and migrate to the place where their income would be the maximum. The migration of those following this is rational.

On the other hand, neoclassical analysis states that the decision to migrate depends on the difference between the expected incomes. According to this point of view, "income difference" is the difference between the rural income and the urban income the migrant may achieve in case he or she can find a job. M.P. Tadora is accepted as the pioneer of the neo-classics. According to Tadora (1976), the socio-economic inequalities between regions and countries are the main determinant of migration. He emphasizes on the effect of individuals' expectations from the future on the migration decision. It is presumed that individuals would migrate from places where they earn low income to place where they can earn higher income, or from places with fewer employment opportunities to places that offer more opportunities (Tadaro, 1976: 215 - 225).

3.2. Analysis of the Pushing and Pulling Forces

The movement of migration is examined within the frame of the "push and pull" model. On the basis of individuals' migration decision lie the pushing and pulling factors that cover the reason for migration. The factors that make individuals decide to migrate and leave the places they were born in and they are used to, are referred to as the pushing factors. On the other hand, the attractions of the place decided to be migrated to are called pulling factors. In case that the comparison individuals make between the pushing and the pulling factors end up in favor of the pulling factors, they leave the place they live. These factors vary according to internal and external migration. However, every decision of migration involves a mixture of the pushing and pulling factors. Also the difficulties that may be experienced are added on top of these. Since a migrant has more information on the place he lives in comparison to the place he will migrate to, he would perceive the pushing factors better than the pulling factors. On the basis of the pushing factors and the information obtained from those who migrated before him, he would try to negate the effect of the difficulties he will experience (Ucdogruk, 2002:159).

"Push" is the factors of settlements that causes and raises migration. For instance, deficiency of land, low income, inadequacy of education and health facilities, population growth, mores pressure, religious pressure and socio-cultural factors are among the factors that force migration from settlements. On the other hand factors such as labor requirement, relatively high means of income, relatively better education, health and social

security facilities, a colorful, autonomous and free life are the pulling elements of migration-receiving areas. The studies on the recent migration movements in Turkey can be summarized as follows.

3.3. Selectivity Analysis

According to this analysis, migrants consist of individuals with distinguished qualities. Migrants have distinguished qualities in terms of education, age, gender and marital status. Selectivity analysis is based on the idea that those that migrate from a place to another are distinguished individuals (Celik, 2002:276).

Dorothy Thomas (1938) presented migration-related suggestions on the basis of eight groups of migrants. These are: Age, gender, marital status, physical and mental health, intelligence, occupation and motivation. D. Thomas asserts migrants to be youngsters. Age distinction of migrants indicates the relation between individuals' tendency to migrate and risk-taking age (Schlottmann, Herzog, 1984:72). Risk-taking age is the individuals' capacity to meet the costs that occur in consequence of migration. In this respect, young individuals are more advantageous than the elders. A general finding obtained from migration-related studies indicates that there is a negative relation between individuals' tendency to migrate and risk-taking age (Schlottmann, Herzog, 82). Later on O.D. Duncan (1940) and D. Bogoue and M. Hagood (1953) also provided significant contribution to the literature. R. A. Nakosteen and M. Zimmer (1980) report women's migration tendency to be lower than that of men (Greenwood: 534). Migrants are mostly men. In consideration of this, it can be asserted that men's migration tendency is higher than that of women (Celik, 2002:283).

The pioneer of the selectivity approach is Simon Kuznets. Kuznets states that migrants are distinguished people in terms of education, age, gender, race, marital status, health and other social and demographic qualities.

From his observations on the Third World Countries, P. Harrison reports that it is the most healthy, most well educated, most energetic, intelligent individuals that are most open to developments that migrate from the rural to the urban (Harrison, 1990: 69). J. R. Tulloch and J. A. Millan (1970) report the factors of education, age, gender, marital status, occupation and the term of being unemployed among the factors that affect "migration capacity" (Karabulut and Polat, 2007).

H. Long (1973), on the other hand, found a positive relation between individuals' qualities and geographic mobility. According to this relation, migration tendency

increases in line with the higher number of distinguished qualities migrants have. Long also states that the education level of individuals is a significant variable in forecasting migration (Long, 1973:249). There is a linear relation between education and the likelihood of migration (Long, 1973:273).

IV. SIGNIFICANCE, PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Gaziantep is a self-ordained province with a history full of success. It is built on a strategic area that is important both in military and economic terms between the south of Turkey and north of Syria. In other words, Gaziantep is a locally distinguished and central province. Currently, it is the 6th largest province of Turkey (Pierce, 2004). Gaziantep developed by means of its own sources and built its industry through its own efforts, without receiving support from the state. The province proved to be very successful in this and significantly distinguished itself from its neighbor provinces (Alkin et al., 2007). With its number of facilities, employment opportunities it offers and the added value it creates, Gaziantep gradually assumed the image of a polar province (Esiyok, 2002).

In the clustering analysis conducted by Uyan (2009) on the basis of provinces' socio-economic characteristics, Gaziantep is included in the same cluster with the provinces of Bursa and Kocaeli. According to this, Gaziantep is the 6th most developed province of Turkey in economic terms (Uyan, 2009:152).

According to the most recent data published by the Turkish Exporters Assembly, Gaziantep's annual export, which had not been even 500 million dollars in the early 2000s, reached 6,473 billion dollars by the end of 2013, thus Gaziantep became the 6th province of Turkey that exports the most (TEA, <http://www.tim.org.tr/>, 2013). In addition, with the foundation universities established in Gaziantep, which grows also in social and cultural terms, its number of universities has reached four. With the universities planned to be founded in the coming period, this number is expected to increase rapidly.

Such a level of economic development causes Gaziantep to receive substantial migration from developing regions and provinces. It is guessed that this migration takes place both as a natural movement and a forced or unnatural migration. Accordingly, it is important to determine the matter by means of scientific data. The present study was planned in order to propose the implementation of effective policies focused on the reasons and consequences of the positive or negative effects migration has on Gaziantep province.

V. DATASET AND METHOD

In order to create the dataset of the study the population according in the Sahinbey and Sehitkamil districts in Gaziantep metropolis was taken as basis according to the 2012 General Population Census (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2012). According to the results of the 2012 census made through address based registry system, the population of Gaziantep province is 1.799.558. As for the total population of the districts, it is approximately 1,5 million (TSI, 2012).

According to the data of Turkish Statistical Institute, the rate of the population that came through migration within the total population is approximately 30%. Accordingly, the population that came through migration to the districts of the metropolis is considered to be approximately 500.000. The dataset used in the study consists of the horizontal section data obtained through a questionnaire implemented on the households in metropolis districts. In order to conduct a valid statistical study in the light of these data, the following formula was employed;

$$n = \frac{NPQZ^2}{(N-1)H^2 + PQZ^2} \text{ (Ozdamar, 2001:257)}$$

where

n: is the sample size,

N: is the size of the universe,

P: is the probability of the household to migrate (0,5),

Q: is the probability of the household not to migrate (0,5),

Z: is the Z test value at (1-a) % level, á: is the level of significance and

H: is the error acceptance rate (0.05).

According to this, the sample size of the population living in the districts and that came via migration was calculated to be 665 as shown below:

$$n = \frac{500000(0,5)(0,5)(1,96)^2}{(500000-1)(0,05)^2 + (0,5)(0,5)(1,96)^2} = 665.$$

Also considering the worst case scenario, where the actual immigrating population may be different than the population declared by the Turkish Statistical Institute, it was considered how the findings would be affected if the sample size is increased. In this respect, the maximum margin of error that would be obtained by using 1.000 samples at 99 % reliability rate and with the worst probability of 50 % error for a population of 900.000 was calculated as follows:

$$n = \frac{900000(0,5)(0,5)(1,96)^2}{(900000-1)(0,05)^2 + (0,5)(0,5)(1,96)^2} = 1000$$

Before the questionnaire was implemented on the districts of Sahinbey and Sehitkamil, the questionnaire was brought to its final form by taking into consideration its inadequacies and the criticism and suggestions it received in consequence of a trial application. In consequence of the reliability test, Cronbach Alpha was determined to be 75,2% for the reasons of the migrants, and it was understood that the questionnaire can be implemented reliably.

Accordingly, interviews with a total of 1.000 migrant families were conducted. The questionnaire of 44 close ended questions was implemented by conducting face to face interviews with randomly selected households within a period of 2 months from October to November 2012. The questionnaire was designed in three main sections. The first section is related with the demographic characteristics (gender, age, education, occupation, etc.) and income, social security, employment and life satisfaction of the respondents. The second section includes questions inquiring the reasons of the migrants to stay in the city. Finally, the third section presents questions intended to determine the migrants' opinions on Gaziantep. The reasons for migrating to Gaziantep were classified as economic, social, environmental and urban and psychological factors.

For data analysis SPSS 21 package software was used along with frequency percentile distributions, arithmetic means, correlation, chi square and ANOVA test.

VI. HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Gaziantep is the 6th largest province of Turkey. With its geographical position, it constitutes a passage between the east and the west. It is also a significant center of industry and commerce.

The general demographic characteristics of the participants are presented in the table below.

Accordingly, Gaziantep receives heavy migration from developing eastern provinces and particularly from Sanliurfa, Adiyaman, Kahramanmaras and Kilis that constitute its near geography. It also receives heavy migration from its own rural villages and districts. In the literature, this is examined within the frame of the "push - pull" model. We will be examining the internal migration Gaziantep receives also within the frame of this model. In light of these information, the hypotheses of our project are as follows:

H1: Demographic variables are effective on the internal migration tendency to Gaziantep.

H1₁: There is a relation between gender and migration tendency.

- H₁₂: Migration tendency decreases with the increasing age.
- H₁₃: Migration tendency increases with the increasing level of education.
- H₁₄: There is a relation between migration tendency and occupational groups.
- H₁₅: Migration tendency of single individuals are increasing.
- H2: Tendency to migrate to Gaziantep increases as the level of income decreases.
- H3: Tendency to migrate to Gaziantep is higher in those who do not have any social security.
- H4: Economic factors are the main reason that triggers migration to Gaziantep.
- H5: Tendency to migrate to Gaziantep increases as working conditions worsen.

VII. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The general characteristics of the participants are presented in the table below.

Table 1: Numerical and proportional distribution of the participants in terms of their number, gender, age group and level of education

		Female	Male	Total	Rate (%)
Gender	Female	233		233	23,3
	Male		767	767	76,7
Age Group	18-25	11	24	35	3,5
	26-35	109	128	237	23,7
	36-45	65	328	393	39,3
	46-55	35	223	258	25,8
	56 and older	13	64	77	7,7
Education Level	Illiterate	13	20	2,0	
	Not graduated from any school	20	62	82	8,2
	Primary school graduate	48	221	269	26,9
	Secondary school graduate	41	221	262	26,2
	General or occupational technical secondary school graduate	2	58	60	6,0
	High school graduate	24	104	128	12,8
	Occupational or technical high school graduate	4	13	17	1,7
	2 or 3 year college graduate	23	18	41	4,1
	4 year faculty graduate	56	62	118	11,8
	Post graduate	2	1	3	0,3
	Doctorate degree	-	-	-	
TOTAL	233	767	1000	100,0	

While 76,7% of the participants are males, 23,3% are females. As for the participants' ages, while 39,3% of them are aged between 36 and 45 years of age, 25,48% are aged between 46 and 55. Contrary to the common belief, these rates indicate that migration tendency increases with the increasing age. While 42,2% of the participating households have 2 or 3 children, 36% have between 4 and 7 children. This also indicates that the tendency to migrate increases with the increasing number of children. 26,9% of the participants are primary school graduates, while 26,2% of them are secondary school graduates. 31,1% of the participants reported that they are workers and in parallel 44,7% were determined to be included in the salaried group. In terms of level of income 25,7% of the participants earn between 501 and 1000 TL.

The fact that most of the participants were male is related with the local culture. Women's reluctance to speak with strangers without the consent and approval of their husbands, lack of self-confidence and the fact that most of the interviewers were males had been determining factors in the participants' distribution of genders. Still, it comes to the attention that in general the questionnaire items are respondent not individually but on behalf of the respondents' families. On the other hand, more homogenous distributions are found in other categories.

7.1. Relations between the provinces giving migration to Gaziantep and several variables

As it can be seen from Table 2, chi square test was conducted in order to determine the relations between the provinces giving migration to Gaziantep and several

Table 2: Relations between the provinces giving migration to Gaziantep and several variables

Gender	2	73.55**	Correlation C.	-0.068
	Sig. (P)	0.005	Sig. (P)	0.007
	n	1000	N	1000
Age	2	262.287*	Correlation C.	-0,034
	Sig. (P)	0.000	Sig. (P)	0.005
	n	1000	N	1000
Marital Status	2	202.950***	Correlation C.	0.142
	Sig. (P)	0.161	Sig. (P)	0.240
	n	1000	n	1000
Number of Household Members	2	90.941**	Correlation C.	-0248
	Sig. (P)	0.006	Sig. (P)	0.003
	n	1000	n	1000
Education Level	2	520.494 *	Correlation C.	-0.345
	Sig. (P)	0.000	Sig. (P)	0.042
	n	1000	n	1000
Occupational Groups	2	675.528*	Correlation C.	-0.563
	Sig. (P)	0.000	Sig. (P)	0.002
	n	1000	n	1000
Level of Income	2	342.530*	Correlation C.	0.756
	Sig. (P)	0.000	Sig. (P)	0.04
	n	1000	n	1000
Social Security	2	89.229*	Correlation C.	0.042
	Sig. (P)	0.000	Sig. (P)	0.05
	n	1000	n	1000

* P < 0.01

**P < 0.0

variables. According to the conducted analyses significant relations at the significance levels of 5% ($P < 0,05$) and 1% ($P < 0,01$) were determined.

According to Table 2, significant and insignificant relations of 5% level of significance were determined in Chi-square (χ^2) analyses. According to these, it is possible to state that:

- Men's tendency to migrate is higher than that of women,
- The tendency to migrate increases in the middle age (36 - 45) category, while it is lower in the younger and older categories of age,
- There is no relation between the tendency to migrate and marital status,
- The tendency to migrate decreases as the number of household members increases,
- Migration tendency decreases as the level of education increases and
- The fact that mostly the participants included in the worker group tends to migrate is connected with Gaziantep's quality of being an industrial city. Also the relatively high rate of tradesmen and self-employed can be associated with the developed commerce in Gaziantep.

- As for the relation between the level of income and migration tendency, the tendency increases in categories of low and medium income, while it decreases in the category of high income.
- Individuals who do not have any means of social security tend more to migrate.

In consideration of the above findings, it was determined that the hypotheses H1(H_{1,1}, H_{1,2}, H_{1,3}, H_{1,4}), H2 and H3 are confirmed, while H1(H_{1,5}) hypothesis is declined.

7.2.Relations between the reasons to migrate to Gaziantep and the thought of migration

The relations between the thought and reasons of migration are presented in Table 3 with the conducted 2 and correlations.

As it can be seen from Table 3, with the correlations made between the thought of migration and the reasons of migration significant relations at the significance level of 5% ($P < 0.05$) were determined. According to this, it was determined that the worsening of working conditions, low level of education, weakening of family bonds and increase of appointments and the safety concerns increase the tendency to migrate. On the other hand, no statistically significant relations could be found between the tendency to migrate and economic

Table 3: Relations between the thought and reasons of migration

Reasons of Migration				
Economic Reasons	2	31.290**	Correlation C.	-0.20
	Sig. (P)	0.003	Sig. (P)	0,561
	n	827	n	827
Job and Employment	2	28.157**	Correlation C.	-0.76*
	Sig. (P)	0.012	Sig. (P)	0.044
	n	827	n	827
Appointment	2	59.242**	Correlation C.	0.897**
	Sig. (P)	0.000	Sig. (P)	0.005
	n	827	n	827
Retirement	2	112.372**	Correlation C.	-0.37
	Sig. (P)	0.000	Sig. (P)	0.290
	n	827	n	827
Social Life	2	20.634*	Correlation C.	0.037
	Sig. (P)	0.056	Sig. (P)	0.282
	n	827	n	827
Security Concerns	2	121.055**	Correlation C.	0.231**
	Sig. (P)	0.000	Sig. (P)	0.000
	n	827	n	827
Education	2	13.157**	Correlation C.	-0.072*
	Sig. (P)	0.358	Sig. (P)	0.039
	n	827	n	827
Intrafamilial Reasons	2	36.964*	Correlation C.	-0.066*
	Sig. (P)	0.044	Sig. (P)	0.057
	n	827	n	827
Health	2	12.648	Correlation C.	0.051
	Sig. (P)	0.395	Sig. (P)	0.145
	n	827	n	827

** P < 0.01

* P < 0.05

reasons, retirement, social life and health. According to this, the hypothesis H2 is confirmed.

7.3. Differences of the tendencies and reasons to migrate to Gaziantep on the basis of provinces (ANOVA Test)

Whether the reasons of those who consider migrating to Gaziantep vary by the provinces they live in was examined through Anova analysis.

It was determined that the responses indicating reasons other than retirement and appointment vary significantly on the basis of provinces. According to this, most of the participants who migrated due to economic difficulties ($\bar{X} = 4.073$) and working conditions ($\bar{X} = 4.845$) migrated from Sanliurfa province. These are followed by those migrated from Diyarbakir due to economic difficulties ($\bar{X} = 3.771$), and those who migrated from Kahramanmaras due to the difficulties in the working conditions ($\bar{X} = 3.180$).

In terms of migration due to the inadequacy of education services, Sanliurfa has given the highest migrants ($\bar{X} = 5.572$). In this category, Sanliurfa is followed by Diyarbakir ($\bar{X} = 4.855$) and Adiyaman ($\bar{X} = 3.850$).

Most of those who migrated due to the lack of health services, once again, migrated from Sanliurfa ($\bar{X} = 6.542$). In this category Sanliurfa is followed by Kahramanmaras ($\bar{X} = 5.493$) and Adiyaman ($\bar{X} = 4.188$).

It was observed that Diyarbakir displays a significant difference in terms of those who considered migrating due to security reasons. It is possible to associate this with Diyarbakir being located the terror zone ($\bar{X} = 5.153$). In this respect, Diyarbakir is followed by Sanliurfa ($\bar{X} = 4.195$). It was also understood that Kahramanmaras has given the least migrants due to security concerns ($\bar{X} = 1.324$).

Examining the migrations on basis of interparental conflicts shows that the number of those migrating from Sanliurfa due to this reason is higher than those

Table 4: Differences in Migration Thought and Reasons by the Provinces

		Provinces	X	Std. Deviation	F	P
Economic Factors	Financial impossibilities	Diyarbakir	3.771	1,816	103.465	.000
		Adiyaman	2.245	1.456		
		K.Maras	2.752	1.364		
		Sanliurfa	4.845	1.494		
	Job and working related reasons	Diyarbakir	2.567	2,564	29.450	.000
		Adiyaman	1.961	0.267		
		K.Maras	3.180	1.403		
		Sanliurfa	4.073	1.490		
	Retirement	Diyarbakir	2.561	1.753	26.453	.250
		Adiyaman	2.475	1.548		
		K. Maras	2.454	1.245		
		Sanliurfa	2.484	1.489		
Social Factors	Asking for appointment	Diyarbakir	3.040	1.058	49.419	.420
		Adiyaman	3.055	1.184		
		K. Maras	3.026	1.203		
		Sanliurfa	3.080	1.357		
	Inadequacies in social life	Diyarbakir	5.208	1.049	206.163	.000
		Adiyaman	4.080	1.175		
		K. Maras	4.870	1.795		
		Sanliurfa	3.966	1.331		
	Inadequacy of education-related services	Diyarbakir	4.855	2.179	103.465	.000
		Adiyaman	3.850	2.325		
		K. Maras	3.808	2.225		
		Sanliurfa	5.772	1.345		
	Inadequacy of health services	Diyarbakir	3.508	1.112	51.806	.000
		Adiyaman	4.188	1.233		
		K. Maras	5.493	1.248		
		Sanliurfa	6.542	1.494		
Psychological Factors	Intrafamilial conflicts	Diyarbakir	4.024	1.861	10.881	.000
		Adiyaman	3.825	1.887		
		K. Maras	2.829	1.864		
		Sanliurfa	5.798	1.028		
	Security risk	Diyarbakir	5.153	2.445	62.009	.000
		Adiyaman	2.550	1.352		
		K. Maras	1.346	1.257		
		Sanliurfa	4.195	1.324		

migrating from other provinces ($\bar{X} = 5.798$). It is possible to associate this with the strong feudal structure in Sanliurfa. Those who migrated from Diyarbakir due to the same reason rank the second ($\bar{X} = 4.024$).

VIII. CONCLUSION, EVALUATION AND SUGGESTIONS

Internal migration occurs due to the pushing-pulling factors difference among provinces being distinct. Individuals or societies leave their settlements in order to give a new direction to their lives. While hoping their lives would improve in their new settlements, they also bring along both material and moral inconveniences to the individuals already living in the places the migrants immigrate to. Thus, several problems are brought along with internal migration.

Some of these problems caused by migration are related with housing, education, health, infrastructure

and particularly unemployment in migrating receiving cities. Furthermore, insufficient local services, economic difficulties and cases of identity crisis, maladaptation and alienation in connection with the resulting psychological problems occur in proportion with the size of the migration received. Being unable to find a job in the cities they migrate to affect individuals negatively and lead them -particularly those of low education- to commit crime.

In order to minimize these problems it is essential to commit to urbanization, to establish an urban culture, to redirect migrations and ensure that urbanization proceeds on its own natural process. Because migrations aimed at economically developed provinces increases population density at those provinces. Since monetary accumulations were also brought along via migration, it further improved the development level of the

migration receiving areas. This, as a spiral, ensures that migration to the developed areas continues. In order to reduce the speed of internal migration, regional plans peculiarly designed for the migration-giving developing areas should be prepared and implemented.

Migration due to socio-economic results causes various problems both in migration-giving and migration-receiving cities. In order to prevent these problems to be experienced also in the future, it is important to determine the exact reasons of migration and the measures to be taken in order to stop this process.

Gaziantep, is one of the most important and primary industrial, commercial, service, culture, tourism and education centers of Turkey. Particularly onwards from the 1990s, the province has received intense internal migration, which continued incrementally after the 2000s.

According to the findings of our study, the provinces that give the most migration to Gaziantep are Sanliurfa, Adiyaman, Kahramanmaras and Diyarbakir in the given order. In consideration of the migrants' places of birth, it was determined that 93,3% of the migrants came from east of Gaziantep and from some of its neighboring provinces.

The fact that most of the participants were male can be associated with the local culture. Women's reluctance to speak with strangers without the consent and approval of their husbands, lack of self-confidence and the fact that most of the interviewers were males had been determining factors in the participants' distribution of genders. Expectations on the improvement of working conditions and economic means are the primaries of the reasons for migration.

It was determined that approximately 63% of the respondents were secondary or primary school graduates and that there is a linear relation between migration and the level of education.

According to the data obtained from the study, the most significant reasons to migrate to Gaziantep are determined to be the possibility to find a better job than the migrants had in their previous settlements, economic difficulties, inadequacy of health services, inadequacy of education-related services, lack of social activities, security concerns and interfamilial reasons in the given order.

It is accepted that approximately one third of Gaziantep's population is formed of immigrants (TSI, Address-Based Population Registration System:2013). Since the 2013 population of Gaziantep was 1.800.000, there are approximately 600.000 immigrants in the province.

Even if Gaziantep has succeeded in absorbing this level of migration through its own means, due to the fact that it does not receive any support from the capital Ankara, or in other words the central government, substantial problems have emerged in Gaziantep along with such a level of incoming migration. Some of these problems are significant rates of squatting (approximately three fourths of Gaziantep consist of squat housing), inadequate sewage system, lacking road, water and electricity services, insufficient numbers of schools, classes and teachers, excessively expensive houses and high rents, security problems and the increase of drug trade, thinner-addicts, seizures and thefts. In addition, Syrian refugees who are not registered in censuses, are not reflected on any official figure and settled in Gaziantep due to the civil war in Syria also cause further serious problems.

Ever since the establishment of the Republic, the economic system implemented in Turkey is statism. There is a system that the state owns or monitors all sources and also distributes the income obtained from the usage of these sources. Despite the fact that it is a quite large city, Gaziantep could not receive enough share from this system ever since the early years of the Republic and managed everything solely through its own means.

No public economic enterprise was established in Gaziantep within the scope of the industrialization plans in the early years of the Republic and the planned period until the year 1980. Furthermore, Gaziantep was also denied to benefit from the industry stimulation policies implemented after the 1980s.

For the solution of the above mentioned problems the measures required to be taken at central administration and local levels can be summarized as follows:

It is essential to prevent migration by improving security and economic buoyancy in migration-giving provinces. For this, the security of meadows and plateaus in migration-giving provinces has to be ensured and stockbreeding needs to be encouraged through incentives.

In order to achieve the integration of the migrants coming to Gaziantep, special education programs designed for the migrants' children should be implemented in the regions where they are concentrated and further language support should be provided.

The state should provide the required support to the urban transformation projects and national registration system, for internal migration integration Gaziantep should be accepted as the pilot area, its internal migration inventory should be prepared,

households' social and economic life standards and problems should be monitored and the required solutions should be created.

It is necessary to contribute to the social, economic and cultural development at first in immigration areas and then at a broader perspective by forming teams from the institutions concerned with poverty, unfair distribution of income, health, education, access to information, child development, social gender equality, women rights, human rights and environment.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alkin, E., Dundar, D., Alpay, Y., Ezgin G., 2007. Gaziantep Report from Past to Present. Turkish Exporters Assembly, Istanbul.
- [2] CelikFatih (2005), "Internal Migrations: A Theoretical Analysis" Cukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences Journal. Volume 14. Issue 2
- [3] CelikFatih (2002), "Analysis of Internal Migration by means of the Selectivity Approach". Institute of Social Sciences Journal, Issue 13, p. 276
- [4] Dorothy T. (1938), Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials, New York: Social Science Research Council.)
- [5] Esiyok, B.A., 2002. Development Differences, Growth Poles and the Southeastern Anatolia Project. www.tkb.com.tr/icerik.aspx (Accessed in: 2014).
- [6] Friedlander D. (1992), "Occupational Structure. Wages. and Migration in Late Nineteenth-Century England and Wages". Economic Development and Cultural Change V. 40. N. 2 pp. 295-319.
- [7] Greenwood, Michael. (1975), "Research on Internal Migration in the United States: A Survey" *Journal of Economic Literature*, 13, 397-433.
Harrison P. (1990), Westernization of the Third World. Pinar Publications. Istanbul.
- [8] Harrýs, John R. VeTodaro, Mýchael P. (1970), "Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two Sectoral Analysis", *The American Ecomomic Rewiev*, Vol. 60, Is. 1: 126-142.
- [9] Herzog, H., W., A., M., and Schlottmann, 1984: Labour Force Mobility in the United States: Migration, Unemployment and Remigration. *International Regional Science Review*, Vol. 9, No., pp. 43-48).
- [10] Henderson J.V. (1986), "Urbanisation in a Developing Country: City Size and Population Composition", *Journal of Development Economics*, 22, 269-293.
- [11] Long H. (1973), "Migration Differentials by Education and Occupation: Trends and Varations" *Demography*. 10. pp. 243-258.
- [12] Karabulut, K. Polat, D. A Subregion Application on the Migration Phenomenon in Turkey, *Cukurova University, 5th National Econometrics and Statistics Symposium*, 24 - 25 May 2007, 1 - 15, <http://idari.cu.edu.tr/sempozyum/bi18.htm>, (Accessed in: 2014).
- [13] Ozdamar, K. *Statistical Data Analysis via Package Software - 2nd Renewed 5th Edition*, Kaan Bookstore, Istanbul, 2004, p. 479, pp. 482 - 485.
- [14] Duncan, O. D. (1950), Fertility of the Village Population in Pennsylvania 1940, *Social Forces*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp.304-309.
- [15] Bogoue, D. J. veHagood, M. J. (1953) Subregional Migration in The United States, 1935-40. Vol. II: Differential Migration in the Corn and Cotton Belts, Oxford. Ohio: Scripps Foundation, Miami University, 1953, pp. 248, (Scripps Foundation Studies in Population Distrubation, No. 6.
- [16] Pierce, L., (2004), *Morality Tales: Law and Gender in The Ottoman Court of Aintab*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [17] Nakosteen, R. A., Zimmer, M. (1980), Nakosteen, "Migration and Income: The Question of Self-Selection." *Southern Economic Journal*, 46, 840-51.
- [18] Kuznets, S., Rubin, E. (1954), "Appendices to "Immigration and the Foreign Born", NBER Chapters, in: *Immigration and the Foreign Born*, pp. 85-107.
- [19] Schlottmann A. and Herzog H.W. (1984) " Career and Geographical Moblity Interactions: Implications For The Age Selectivity of Migration". *Journal of Human Resources*. 19 (1) pp. 72-86.
- [20] Todaro M. P. (1976), "Urban Job Expansion. Induced Migration and Rising Unemployment", *Journal of Development Economics*, V.3. N.3 ss.211-225.
- [21] Tulloch, J.R. and Mac Mýllan, J.A. A Micro-Analytic Model of Migration Behaviour. *Regional Science Perspective*, v.3,1973, s.105-127.
- [22] Uyan, B. (2009), Dynamics of Regional Development: Factors Affecting Local Economic Development in Gaziantep Province, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Cukurova University Institute of Science, Adana.
- [23] Ucdogruk, S. (2002), "Examination of the Internal Migration Movement in Izmir via Multinomial Logit Technique". *DokuzEylul University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences Journal*. Volume: 17, Issue: 1.
- [24] Turkish Exporters Assembly, <http://www.tim.org.tr/>, 2014
- [25] Turkish Statistical Institute, <http://www.tuik.gov.tr>, 2014.