

**INTERNAL MIGRATION IN TURKEY:
SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS
BY DESTINATION AND TYPE
OF MOVE, 1965-70**

*KORAY TANFER
Temple University*

The spatial distribution of population in the developing countries has recently become an issue of increasing concern for scholars and policy makers. In an inquiry conducted by the United Nations, 68 of the 116 developing countries that responded declared the spatial distribution of their population to be "highly unacceptable" and 42 countries to be "unacceptable to some extent" (United Nations, 1978:28). Central to any discussion of the spatial distribution of population are the urban and rural proportions and the growth (or decline) in these. Before going any further there is a need to stress the conceptual distinction between "urban growth" and "urbanization," since the principle sources of urban growth and of urbanization are quite different. Conventionally, urbanization is defined as the process of growth in the urban proportion of the population rather than the growth of the urban population per se (United Nations, 1980:33-34). If the rate of natural increase is equally high in both the rural and urban areas, the urban population would grow, but urbanization would not occur in the absence of population transfers. Hence, urban proportion can grow either through urban excess in rates of natural increase or as a result of positive net in-migration from rural areas.¹

Urbanization has not only been occurring more rapidly in the less developed countries, but also seems to be centered primarily in large cities, as reflected by the emergence of new large metropolitan areas, which dominate the urban pattern (United Nations, 1968). Preston (1979) shows that urbanization in developing countries is not exceptionally rapid by historical standards, but rather it is the rates of urban growth which represent an unprecedented phenomenon, and that in most of the developing world urban growth results primarily from the natural increase of urban populations and to a lesser extent from rural to urban movements. The trend in Turkey, however, seems to constitute an exception on two accounts—rate of urbanization and sources of urban growth (Preston, 1979:196,198). The urban proportion² of the population in Turkey increased from 19 percent in 1950 to 36 percent

in 1970, and the average annual rate of urban growth was slightly over six percent compared to less than three percent for the total population. While less than one-half of the population increase in urban areas, particularly in large cities, was due to natural increase, the bulk of the growth was a result of rural to urban migration (and area reclassification from rural to urban). The number of cities with 100 thousand or more population also increased from 4 to 19 during the same period (State Institute of Statistics, 1973).

The growing concern about the spatial redistribution of the population stems not only from the increase in the sheer volume of people living in urban areas, but also from the changing composition of the urban populations. The redistribution of the population through internal migration is a complex process. In a given setting, during a specified period of time, the volume and nature of population distribution through migration (*i.e.*, “who” goes “where” and in “what” numbers) are determined by a multiplicity of factors. Earlier works have demonstrated that the decision to migrate is influenced by different considerations for individuals, as reflected by the aggregate properties of migrants compared to those of nonmigrants both at origin and destination. This concept of selectivity and differential migration dates back as far as Revenstein’s seminal work “The Laws of Migration” (1889). Since then its importance has been repeatedly stressed (Lee, 1966; Thomas, 1938) and demonstrated for various populations at different times and within different social and economic contexts (Browning, 1971; Caldwell, 1969; Elizaga, 1966; Miller, 1965; United Nations, 1961).

Not only migrants tend to have different personal, social, and economic characteristics from those of nonmigrants, but the characteristics of migrants tend to vary, through time and space, among other things with distance spanned, choice of destination, type of move, and so on. Migrant selectivity is a variant property which changes in response to changed conditions and varies among groups. It needs to be examined within a dynamic framework. For instance, it has been suggested that the socioeconomic composition of migrants may exhibit a shift from the relatively less educated, unskilled, rural to urban migrants to skilled and educated inter-urban migrants, as societies become more industrialized during the course of economic development. This phenomenon has been observed in advanced countries (Bouvier et al., 1976; Long, 1973; Miller, 1977; Stone, 1969). Since fewer and fewer parts of the world remain in a state of purely agrarian economy, we

should be able to find more signs of this shift in the migration process occurring in the developing world.

Finally, investigation of migration in less developed countries has been restricted—albeit due to the scarcity of data—in several ways one of which is that attention has not been directed to all forms of internal migration. The primary focus of many studies has been on migration to major cities or the capital only, whereas evidence suggests a significant volume of migration occurring outside the primate cities.

This paper examines internal migration in Turkey during the 1965-1970 period, with a view to describing the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of migrants and the variation in these properties by type of move undertaken (first, repeat, and return migration) and by choice of destination. The volume, rates, and differentials of migration are discussed in this context.

THE SETTING

The population of Turkey nearly doubled in the postwar period, from 18.8 million in 1945 to 35.6 million in 1970, as a result of the very high rate of natural growth. The crude birth rate has steadily but slowly declined from about 50 births per 1000 population during the same period. Due to a faster decline in the crude death rates from about 40 to 13 deaths per 1000 population in the 25 years following World War II the natural rate of population increase has, however, doubled (Shorter and Tekce, 1973). Thus Turkey exhibits the typical demographic features of developing countries: a high birth rate, a dramatically reduced but still relatively high death rate, and a high infant mortality rate. The expectation of life (at birth) has risen from 48 years in 1960 to 56 in 1970. Typically again, population under age 15 was 42 percent of the total population in 1970, whereas the working age population (15-65) was 54 percent, signifying a high dependency ratio³ (The World Bank, 1975).

Since the establishment of the Republic in 1923, Turkey has pursued a consistent development strategy aimed at modernizing the country in a system of mixed economy. Consequently, from 1923 until the first multiparty elections in 1950 the economy underwent considerable change. Modern industries, both public and private, were established, although little resulted from efforts to develop agriculture. In the agricultural sector production increased slowly. The increase in cultivated land and lack of easy communications between rural areas and cities limited rural-urban migration. Meanwhile, the pattern of eco-

conomic growth increased the marked imbalance in the country, some parts of the country remaining underdeveloped with most of the growth being concentrated in the regions surrounding the largest cities such as Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir (Barker, *et al.*, 1951).

A very rapid rural-urban migration occurred in the 1950-1970 period; urban population increased from 18.8 to 35.8 percent of the total. The emphasis on industrialization; the mechanization and relatively slower growth of agricultural production; the scarcity of new lands to cultivate; and the construction of a large road network connecting cities with their hinterland and rural communities contributed to this increased movement. Of the demographic components determining urban growth, rural-to-urban population transfers and reclassification of areas from rural to urban are the most significant factors. While the urban fertility rate is lower than rural, the gap in the urban-rural mortality rates is smaller than the gap in fertility (Shorter and Tekce, 1973; Turkish Demographic Survey, 1970). Cities with population of 100 thousand or more have grown the fastest, followed by medium sized cities with 25 to 100 thousand populations (Table 1). In fact this has been the trend for the past one-half century (Keles, 1970). With no apparent decline in the rate of population growth in sight,⁴ it is projected that Turkey's population will be nearly 66 million in 1995, accompanied by a speedy urbanization rate of 6-7 percent per annum. So far deliberate measures are not planned to slow the latter down (The World Bank, 1975). It is thus taken for granted that among other things the demand for labor in rural, agricultural areas will fall and that the rural population will move to the cities, despite increasingly unfavorable employment conditions there. It is further expected that by 1995 the urban population will have increased to 75 percent of the total population, transforming Turkey from a predominantly rural country to a mainly urban one in less than half a century. Again the largest cities are expected to grow much faster than the medium-sized and smaller urban centers. It is in this context that it is important to differentiate the migrant characteristics by destination and examine the types of migration accordingly.

DATA, DEFINITIONS, AND RESTRICTIONS

For the first time in 1970 the Turkish census questionnaire included a question on "place of usual residence five years ago" (i.e., in 1965). Along with information on place of birth and usual residence in 1970,

Table 1. Population Size and Rates of Growth by Size of Place, Turkey, 1950-70

Size of Place	Population (000)		Population distribution (percent)		Index of growth (1950=100)		Average annual rate of growth (percent)	
	1950	1970	1950	1970	1960	1970	1950-1960	1960-1970
Turkey, total	20,947	35,605	100.0	100.0	133	170	2.8	2.5
Urban, total (10,000 or more)	3,924	12,731	18.7	35.8	185	324	6.2	6.1
Over 500,000	983	3,889	4.7	10.9	215	396	8.9	6.7
100,000-500,000	738	2,998	3.5	8.4	169	406	4.4	8.5
25,000-100,000	1,091	3,622	5.2	10.2	214	332	7.4	4.7
10,000-25,000	1,112	2,222	5.3	6.2	142	200	3.6	3.5
Rural, total (less than 10,000)	17,023	22,874	81.3	64.2	120	134	1.9	1.1

Source: Census of Population, 25.10.1970, State Institute of Statistics, Ankara, Publication No. 672, 1973.

the census provides information on place of residence at three points in time, which consequently allows identification of migratory movements during a fixed time period and the type of move made for the entire population. The study is based on a 1/1,000 sample selected from the household records of the 1970 Population Census of Turkey.

The scope of discussion is restricted to the migration of the adult population, thus excluding the migration of children (up to age 15) which is viewed as involuntary. Hence, the study group is comprised of men and women 15 years of age and over. It should be added that the discussion is by no means solely in terms of voluntary migration. There are two groups of population whose migration is hard to classify. The first group is the non-civilian population, namely the armed forces. Data do not permit the exclusion of this group without introducing a bias of a different kind. A very large proportion of this population consists of young men (ages 20-24) who are drafted as a result of the universal conscription in the country. The inclusion of these may yield gross overestimations at times. On the other hand, excluding them would have undermined the effects of this forced movement upon the sending and the receiving areas as well as on the subsequent migration behavior of these men.

The migration of the second group, that of currently married women, is more difficult to classify. It is tempting to argue that they migrate only because their husbands do. But we have no evidence as to what role married women play in the making of the decision to move. We tend to think that it probably is not a very passive role and thus they are included in the scope of this study, although much of the following discussion concerns mainly male migrants.

The working file contains 20,602 cases. Variables used in the analysis include age, sex, education, labor force status, occupation, and place of residence in 1970. The migration defining variables are province of birth and usual residence in 1965 and 1970 (at the census date). When the origin of migration is discussed, place of residence in 1965 is used. We now turn to the definition of these variables and their limitations vis-à-vis the scope of this paper.

We define migration at the provincial level. A migrant is a person whose province of residence in 1970 is a different one than that in 1965. The province of birth information is used to distinguish three types of "recent" migrants: first migrants, repeat migrants, and return migrants. First migrants are those whose province of birth and residence in 1965 are the same, but who moved to a different province

Table 2. Volume of Interprovincial In-migration, Out-migration, and Net Migration of Both Sexes at Ages 15 and Over, Turkey, 1965-70

Place of residence category	Taking up residence by 1970 (in-migrants)		Leaving 1965 residence (out-migrants)		Difference (net migration)	
	N	% of mid-period population ¹	N	% of mid-period population ¹	N	% of mid-period population ¹
Metropolitan	650	27.3	258	10.8	+392	16.5
Large cities	236	15.2	218	14.0	+18	1.2
Medium and small cities	252	20.9	331	27.4	-79	6.5
Towns	446	14.5	486	15.8	-40	1.3
Villages	320	2.6	611	4.9	-291	2.4

¹Population at ages 15 and over.

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

before the census in 1970. Repeat migrants are those whose province of birth is not the same as the province of residence in 1965 and who moved to a third province by 1970. Return migrants are those who were not in their province of birth in 1965 but who returned to province of birth during the 1965-1970 interval. These three are referred to as "recent" migrants because they have changed province of residence between 1965 and 1970. Two important groups, which have been left out of the scope of this study, need to be mentioned. Both of these groups have not changed their province of residence during the study period, so they are "non-migrants" for our purposes. However, in 1965 some of these were residing in a province other than their province of birth. These are often called permanently "settled" migrants.⁵ The remainder who have not experienced any change (we assume) in province of residence since birth are "never" migrants.

The shortcoming of these definitions is that we do not know all the moves made by these people between birth and 1965 or all the moves between 1965 and 1970. In the absence of information on intervening moves we have made a simplifying assumption (sweeping as it may be) that the group of migrants defined above represent whom they purport to do. Consequently, the findings will have to rely upon distinctive characteristics and patterns for each group. We can then assume that these are an approximation of the true differences or similarities among the three migrant types.

By confining migration to change of residence across provincial boundaries we have also left out the moves made within province, e.g., from villages to towns or the provincial capital which in fact may cover a longer distance than some interprovincial moves. Therefore, migrants, as defined in this paper, may include persons moving a short distance across a border and exclude some intraprovince migrants who do not necessarily change their province of residence.

In the context of our analytical objectives, destinations (and origins) of migrants are classified into an urban size hierarchy according to place of usual residence. The metropolitan category includes three cities with more than 500 thousand population in 1970 and with an average population size of 1.25 million. Large cities are provincial capitals with 100 to 500 thousand population (mean size is slightly over 150 thousand); medium and small cities are provincial capitals with less than 100 thousand people (mean size is about 42 thousand). Towns are all other administrative units and their average size of population is little over ten thousand. Finally, villages are rural places with an aver-

age size of less than two thousand. Since we have used a combination of administrative classification and population size to delineate these categories, admittedly there are many holes in the hierarchy and there might be some overlapping between the medium-small cities and towns when only the population size is considered.⁶

The education variable used is the level of schooling completed as of 1970 (combined with literacy status) and not the number of years of education. Along with labor force status and occupation, education data are used as indicators of socioeconomic status.

Finally, the data possibly have the common misreporting problems with respect to province of birth, residence five years prior to the 1970 census, age, and education. Most empirical research is inflicted with measurement and definition problems. Identification of such increases the hope that it will lead to improvements. Moreover, awareness of these cautions the researcher to their potential effects on results.

FINDINGS

Volume of Internal Migration

Census data indicate that 9.2 percent of the population 15 years of age and over changed their place of residence during the 1965-1970 period, moving to another province (interprovincial migrants). An additional four percent moved to another place within the same province (data not shown). Table 2 provides summary information on in- and out-migration at the interprovincial level.

The volume of interprovincial migration is more than twice as large as that of intraprovince movement. There appears to be a considerable amount of gross migration (in and out) at every level of the size-hierarchy. However, only the metropolitan areas show a significant amount of increase in population at these ages due to net interprovincial in-migration. Medium and small cities, towns, and villages have all lost adult population through net out-migration. The gain in the large cities is rather modest. The heaviest losses relative to their population are in medium and small size cities. The data imply a definite trend of ultimately metropolitan bound interprovincial migration.⁷

The rural areas have lost about 5.5 percent of their population 15 years of age and over as a result of both interprovincial (2.4 percent) and intraprovincial (3.1 percent) migration during the 1965-1970 period. When all migration is considered (within and between pro-

vinces), a direct relationship is observed between the size of place and the amount of growth in the adult population through migration, as the table below shows.

Percent population growth due to migration during 1965-1970	
Metropolitan	19.8
Large cities	9.0
Medium and small cities	-0.5
Towns.....	2.7
Villages	-5.5
	} 1.6

The trend is more clear when medium and small cities are grouped with towns, since the largest overlap can occur between these two in terms of urban-size hierarchy.

A large majority of the migrants are first migrants (59 percent), while 24 percent have moved to a third province (repeat migrants) and 17 percent returned to their province of birth (return migrants). Of all moves, 32 percent originated from rural areas (villages) and about 25 percent from small towns. More than one-third of all migrants have moved to metropolitan areas, about one-fourth each to cities and towns. The distribution of migrants by origin (residence in 1965) and destination (residence in 1970) is shown in Table 3, separately for each type of move made.

There are distinct differences between the migration patterns (origin and destination) of the three types of migrants. First migrants are predominantly from villages and small towns regardless of destination, although a significant proportion of first migrants from all origins has moved into a metropolitan area. The volume of out-migration is inversely related to the urban-size hierarchy, but a distinct pattern does not emerge in relation to volume of in-migration (of first migrants) and size-hierarchy. For instance, small towns receive as many first migrants as do the non-metropolitan cities combined, nearly one-half of them from rural areas. In view of the fact that towns receive a sizable and steady share of migrants of all types (Table 3), but have lost population through interprovincial migration (Table 2), it seems that towns are playing the traditional role in stage migration, first attributed to them nearly a century ago.⁸

Metropolitan cities attract the largest proportion of first migrants from all other places of origin, and the smaller the size of the sending area, the greater is its proportion of all first migrants to metropolitan

Table 3. Percentage Distribution of Interprovincial Migrants by Place of Origin¹ and Place of Destination² According to Type of Move, 1965-70

Place of origin	Place of destination					All places
	Metropolitan	Large cities	Medium and small cities	Towns	Villages	
<u>First migrants</u>						
Metropolitan	1.1	0.6	0.7	2.4	0.0	4.8
Large cities	4.2	1.7	0.9	1.2	0.3	8.1
Medium and small cities	7.2	2.0	2.6	2.5	0.3	14.5
Towns	13.2	4.3	3.5	6.1	1.5	28.7
Villages	15.1	2.6	4.5	11.2	10.5	43.8
All places	40.7	11.2	12.2	23.3	12.6	100.0
(N=1129)						
<u>Repeat migrants</u>						
Metropolitan	6.3	6.0	5.8	7.4	1.6	27.0
Large cities	7.1	2.5	4.0	3.3	0.2	17.2
Medium and small cities	10.5	4.2	2.9	4.5	0.4	22.5
Towns	6.7	3.1	3.1	6.3	2.7	21.9
Villages	2.9	1.1	1.1	2.0	4.2	11.4
All places	33.5	17.0	17.0	23.4	9.2	100.0
(N=448)						
<u>Return migrants</u>						
Metropolitan	1.2	2.5	4.6	5.3	12.1	25.7
Large cities	2.8	1.5	1.2	4.3	5.3	15.2
Medium and small cities	3.7	2.2	3.1	4.0	7.4	20.4
Towns	2.2	2.8	1.9	7.1	5.9	19.8
Villages	2.2	1.2	0.6	3.1	11.8	18.9
All places	12.1	10.2	11.5	23.8	42.4	100.0
(N=323)						

¹Place of residence in 1965.²Place of residence in 1970.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: Census population, 1970, Turkey.

areas. Hence the volume of migrants, in the case of first migrants, varies directly with the degree of diversity of the sending and the receiving communities (Lee, 1966). While urban-rural migration is negligible among first migrants, more than one-half of this group has moved from one urban area to another. It is very striking that in a

country that was still 64 percent rural in 1970, the majority of interprovincial first migrants (54 percent) were making an urban-to-urban move, while only 33 percent were rural to urban migrants. Since the "urban" category includes all but one of the size-hierarchy groups we have constructed, this lumping conceals the direction of the streams. Of the urban-to-urban first migrants 64 percent have moved to an area larger than the place of origin, while one-fifth have gone to an area within the same urban-size category and the remainder to a smaller urban area. Table 4 summarizes the five point size-hierarchy streams within the framework of the conventional rural-urban typology.

A different picture emerges when we examine the migration patterns of those who have made a second or a higher order move. Villages are no longer the predominant sending areas, and if any, there seems to be a direct relation between the volume of out-migration and size of place of origin, in contrast to the relation found in the case of first migrants. The metropolitan cities are the major receiving areas for the repeat migrants, an overwhelming majority of whom have moved from one urban area to another. Return migration is heavier to villages than to any other one residence category, but similar to that observed for the first and repeat migrants, a significant amount of urban-to-urban return

Table 4. Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Type of Place of Origin, Type of Place of Destination, and Type of Move 1965-70

Place of origin and destination	Type of migrant			Total	N
	First	Repeat	Return		
Rural to rural	6.3	1.0	2.0	9.3	176
Urban to rural	1.2	1.2	5.2	7.6	144
Rural to urban	19.8	1.7	1.2	22.7	431
Urban to urban	32.2	19.7	8.6	60.5	1149
to larger urban	(20.5)	(8.2)	(2.6)	(31.3)	(595)
to same size urban	(6.8)	(4.2)	(2.2)	(13.2)	(251)
to smaller urban	(5.9)	(7.3)	(3.7)	(15.9)	(303)
Total	59.4	23.6	17.0	100.0	1900

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: Census of population, 1970, Turkey.

Table 5. Sex Ratios¹ for Interprovincial Migrants, Nonmigrants, and Total Population, 15 Years of Age and Over, by Place of Residence in 1970 and According to Type of Move Made by Migrants During 1965-70

Place of residence in 1970	Total population	Non- migrants	Recent migrants	Type of migrant		
				First	Repeat	Return
Turkey	100	92	232	228	229	253
Metropolitan	118	103	183	183	212	110
Large cities	109	96	236	240	300	136
Medium and small cities	133	116	227	207	300	192
Towns	122	106	312	439	174	267
Villages	88	86	264	178	242	448

¹Number of males per 100 females.

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

migration has also occurred during this period. For both repeat and return migrants, towns continue to be the second major receiving area (Table 3).

So far the discussion has covered both men and women. Earlier studies have shown that there is no uniformity in terms of sex differentials which holds through space and time. With some exception the developing world presents two main patterns: the female dominant Latin American one and the Afro-Asian pattern in which there has been, in the past, a clear predominance of men. As shown in Table 5, the latter pattern prevails among migrants in Turkey, with slight variations in the intensity of male dominance depending on the type of move and destination. There are extreme sex imbalances among first migrants to towns, repeat migrants to nonmetropolitan cities, and among migrants returning to villages. Excepting return migration to metropolitan areas and large cities, men far outnumber women at each destination, even controlling for the type of move. The sex imbalance is obviously related to the marital status of migrants. The further the sex ratio is from 100, the greater the proportion of migrants who are single. Moreover, the sex imbalance is compounded by the proportion of men who are willing to leave their families back home, at least temporarily. This seems to be more common in Asia and Africa than in Latin America.

Table 6. Proportions of Men and Women Who Were Married at Census Date in 1970, by Migration Status and Residence in 1970 (percent)

Place of residence in 1970	Males		Females	
	Migrant	Nonmigrant	Migrant	Nonmigrant
Turkey	55	71	74	72
Metropolitan	51	66	78	66
Large cities	58	68	83	68
Medium and small cities	50	66	51	64
Towns	52	68	76	70
Villages	66	74	76	74

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

We find, in the case of Turkey, that a smaller proportion of migrant men are married compared to nonmigrants. The opposite seems to be true for females, where a larger proportion of migrant women are married. There are minor variations by destination for both men and women. Medium, and small cities appear to be attracting a larger proportion of single men and women, possibly a large amount of young high school students. Larger proportions of male migrants are single at all destinations. Female migration in general is characterized by the migration of the married (Table 6). As seen below, single males are three times as likely to have recently moved than single females and almost twice as likely as married men. Meanwhile, there is only a slight difference between single and married women. The reader is cautioned that the differentials reflect the post-migration status and not the pre-migration status, which by the way would have yielded more accurate migration propensities.

	Migrants per 1,000 population in specified marital status (1970)	
	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>
Married	103	57
Single	199	62
Divorced/widowed	74	36

Table 7. Interprovincial Migration Rates per 1000 Population at Selected Age Categories and per 1000 Population at Risk, at the End of the Interval by Type of Move, 1965-70

Age at census date and type of move	Males		Females	
	Migrants per 1000 population	Migrants per 1000 population at risk	Migrants per 1000 population	Migrants per 1000 population at risk
Ages 15 and over				
N	10,293	8,472 ^a 1,871 ^b	10,271	8,878 ^a 1,393 ^b
Total migrants	129	129	56	56
First migrants	76	93	34	39
Repeat migrants	30	171	13	98
Return migrants	23	128	9	66
Ages 20 and over				
N	8,387	6,760 ^a 1,627 ^b	8,515	7,255 ^a 1,260 ^b
Total migrants	135	135	54	54
First migrants	77	95	31	37
Repeat migrants	33	169	14	94
Return migrants	26	132	9	59
Ages 25 and over				
N	6,973	5,549 ^a 1,427 ^b	7,175	6,074 ^a 1,101 ^b
Total migrants	94	94	48	48
First migrants	37	46	26	31
Repeat migrants	29	142	14	91
Return migrants	27	134	8	53

^aPopulation at risk for first migration.

^bPopulation at risk for repeat or return migration.

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

Among male migrants the proportion married greatly varies by type of move. While more than three-fourths of the return migrants are married, more than one-half of the first migrants are single. This is not observed for females, among whom the proportion married is stable across all types of move. Marital status differentials may partially be accounted for by the age differentials in the type of move made; the median age for first migrants, both men and women, is five years lower than that for repeat or return migrants.⁹ On the other hand, since the marital status of individuals may have changed during the period

between departure from place of origin and census enumeration at destination, the differentials may slightly favor the currently married or post-married status. So, if anything, the proportions who were single at the onset of migration are underestimated.

Age-Specific Rates by Type of Move and Destination

Table 7 presents the basic age-sex data on interprovincial migrants during the 1965-70 period. Most migrants were moving for the first time (we assume) during the interval, although the relative importance of each type of move changes by age. Beyond age 25, more male migrants were moving for at least the second time. The relative share of first migration steadily declines by age, while that of higher order moves increases, especially for males. When migration rates are obtained by using population "at risk" for each type of move, data clearly show that the probability of moving is very much higher among those who have previously made at least one move than among those who have not.¹⁰ This phenomenon which has been documented for advanced countries (Morrison, 1970; Taeuber, 1968; Miller, 1977) is more pronounced beyond age 25 when compared with the probability of making a "first move." The probability of moving to a third province (other than province of birth and province of residence in 1965) is higher than the probability of returning to the province of birth. After age 25, for males, the propensity to return to the province of birth is almost as high as that of moving to a third place. This is not observed for females.

	Proportions married among migrants by type of move made (%)	
	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>
All migrants	55	74
First	46	74
Repeat	61	74
Return	79	73

Migration rates for persons at risk of making a specific type of move are shown by age in Table 8. At every age, persons who were not living in their province of birth in 1965 are more likely to migrate in the succeeding five years than those who were in their province of birth in

Table 8. Interprovincial Migration Rates for Populations at Risk by Age and Type of Move, 1965-70

Age at census date in 1970	Stet		In province of birth in 1965		Outside province of birth in 1965		
	N	Migrants (per 1000 N)	N	First migrants (per 1000 N)	N	Repeat migrants (per 1000 N)	Return migrants (per 1000 N)
Males, ages 15+	10,293	129	8,472	93	1,821	171	128
15-19	1,906	102	1,712	82	194	186	93
20-24	1,414	341	1,211	319	203	355	118
25-29	1,101	204	839	98	262	252	294
30-34	982	113	774	57	208	188	135
35-39	1,130	88	901	49	229	131	114
40-44	935	96	737	52	198	136	126
45 & over	2,825	45	2,298	22	527	78	66
Females, ages 15+	10,271	56	8,878	39	1,393	98	66
15-19	1,756	64	1,623	48	133	128	135
20-24	1,340	85	1,181	67	159	119	101
25-29	1,172	84	1,011	59	161	168	68
30-34	1,147	58	985	35	162	136	68
35-39	1,095	56	936	33	159	88	101
40-44	905	38	770	27	135	52	44
45 & over	2,856	30	2,372	17	484	62	29

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

1965 and thus are presumed to have not moved before. For males, the likelihood of moving to a third province is higher than returning to province of birth, at every age except at ages 25-29, after which the probability of returning to the province of birth is as high as that of moving to a third province. Age-specific migration rates for males exhibit the often observed migrant age curves, increasing to a peak rate in early ages, followed by initially sharp then gradual declines at later ages. Return migrants, as expected, are older than non-return migrants (Eldridge, 1965). The peak rates are confounded by the effects of the military draft and discharge and reflect the pull exerted by the higher education and employment opportunities, which are concentrated in large cities.

The peak age of female first migration is also 20-24, but the age of repeat migration is older than that for males, possibly because women are not drafted and their higher education enrollment is lower. The age pattern of return migration has two peaks, one in very early ages and one at middle ages separated by a trough in between. In search of a plausible explanation for this deviation from the bell-curve pattern, we suggest that the high rates of return among the younger women are what is changing the shape of the return migration curve. These rates in the young ages reflect the return of those who had initially moved only temporarily and thus were predisposed to return. It has also been suggested that young women have greater attachment to family and parental household than men, which further increases the likelihood of return (Herold, 1979).

Metropolitan areas appear to be the preferred destination of male migrants at almost every age, and by far the most dominant choice of women at ages 20-29. The peak age of males moving to urban areas is 20-25 and five years older for those migrating to villages (Table 9). The disproportionately high male in-migration to towns and medium and small cities at these peak ages might be further evidence of the effects of the draft and discharge on the patterns of internal migration. The relative shares of towns and small cities decline during the years beyond age 24, while the share of metropolitan cities increases, along with the share of villages, as the table below shows.

Male migrants (age)	Residence in 1970					
	Turkey	Metro	Large cities	Medium and small cities	Towns	Vil- lages
20 and over	100	29	13	14	27	18
25 and over	100	33	13	11	19	23

Should we have been able to confine the sample to civilian population only, metropolitan areas could have been shown to have the greatest attraction for migrants of all ages, with the largest share of interprovincial migrants. Although the "forced" movement of young men might somewhat distort the migration patterns and trends, it also might increase their propensity to make subsequent moves at a later time. In this respect the influence of the first "involuntary" move on the subsequent migration behavior should not be disregarded. These men who change their residence for the first time because of the draft are now better informed about the destinations, economic opportunities

Table 9. Interprovincial Migration Rates During 1965-70 by Age and Distribution by Place of Residence in 1970

Age at census date in 1970	Stet N	Migrants (per 1000 N)	Migrants by place of residence in 1970 (per 1000 N)				
			Metro- politan	Large cities	Medium and small cities	Towns	Villages
Males, ages 15+	10,293	129	41	16	17	33	23
15-19	1,906	102	50	10	10	14	18
20-24	1,414	341	76	41	63	130	31
25-29	1,101	204	67	30	18	45	45
30-34	982	113	30	11	11	20	32
35-39	1,130	88	28	13	7	17	23
40-44	935	96	36	13	7	17	22
45 & over	2,825	45	15	6	7	8	9
Females, ages 15+	10,271	56	22	7	7	11	9
15-19	1,756	64	17	6	18	11	13
20-24	1,340	85	40	13	9	12	10
25-29	1,172	84	41	4	9	19	11
30-34	1,147	58	17	8	8	17	9
35-39	1,095	56	23	13	4	9	7
40-44	905	38	19	6	2	4	7
45 & over	2,856	30	13	3	3	6	5

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

at alternate destinations, and about the intervening obstacles, than those who have never moved. They also have a better perspective of their place of origin vis-à-vis other alternatives. Therefore, they are more likely to make a second (or a higher order) move than the non-migrants.

The age at which the female migration rate reaches a maximum and its level at the peak age vary by destination. The total rates (for all destinations) reach a peak in ages 20-29, a longer peak period than that observed for males. The migration rate declines thereafter, first sharply, with little change between ages 30-34 and 35-39. This sharp decline is followed by another dip. The life cycle of women's migration

appears to be more closely related to the life cycle of education, marriage, and the family. Differences in the phases of these cycles contribute to the variations in the age patterns of female migration to alternate destinations. Migration to metropolitan areas reaches an early peak, followed by a sharp initial decline, with little change in later ages. The levels of migration to other destinations are too low to exhibit distinct patterns. If the patterns held, at higher levels of migration, the age pattern of female migrants to large cities could be identified as a "double peak" curve; that of migrants to medium and small cities and villages as an "early peak" and the age curve of migrants to towns as a "late peak." However, caution must be taken in attaching labels and attributing meanings to these variations in view of the generally low levels of destination specific female migration rates.

Education-Specific Rates by Type of Move and Destinations

Aside from age, the selective factor of education probably is the next most generalizable explanatory variable. Previous works on migrant selectivity have documented that migrants, in general, have higher educational attainment than the populations from which they originate (Caldwell, 1969; Ejiogu, 1968; Shryock and Nam, 1965; Zachariah, 1966). In later works, education differentials have been observed also by type of move and the destination of migrants (Herold, 1979; Miller, 1977). In the developing countries the relationship of education to urban-to-rural migration can be viewed as self-perpetuating. While persons with higher levels of educational attainment have higher propensity to migrate, the educational system itself stimulates migration out of communities without the proper facilities beyond primary school and into towns and cities which do offer higher educational opportunities.

Table 10 shows the migration rates for "at risk" populations, specific for education, by type of move made. The often observed migration differential by educational attainment emerges clearly, especially among first and repeat migrants. The rapid increase in first migration beyond secondary education is an evidence of migration for schooling purposes. The consistent increase in migration rates with increasing level of education among repeat migrants indicates a higher propensity for the better educated to make subsequent moves. The conventional differential disappears among the return migrants. Men at lower levels of schooling are more likely to return to their province of

Table 10. Interprovincial Migration Rates for Populations at Risk by Completed Level of Education and Type of Move, 1965-70

Completed level of education at Census date in 1970	State		In province of birth in 1965		Outside province of birth in 1965		
	N	Migrants (per 1000 N)	N	First migrants (per 1000 N)	N	Repeat migrants	Return migrants
						(per 1000 N)	(per 1000 N)
Males, ages 15+	10,293	129	8,461	93	1,819	171	128
None, illiterate	3,236	52	2,939	39	297	40	138
None, literate	1,256	92	1,071	70	185	70	146
Elementary	4,376	148	3,591	120	785	135	143
Secondary	674	188	460	133	214	229	79
High school	528	345	318	264	210	333	133
College	210	419	82	256	128	469	55
Females, ages 15+	10,251	56	8,862	39	1,389	98	66
None, illiterate	6,953	32	6,260	24	693	38	59
None, literate	533	75	445	54	88	102	80
Elementary	2,177	79	1,785	54	392	128	61
Secondary	328	216	233	176	95	211	105
High school ¹							
College	260	262	139	202	121	248	83

¹There are few women college graduates in the sample (N=34); therefore the two levels have been combined.

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

birth than those at higher levels. Since at any given time the less educated are probably over represented among the draftees, the high rates of return at lower educational levels might be partially a result of their discharge from the military service. Furthermore, with inadequate schooling and training, the uneducated migrants are less likely to succeed at destination and thus are prone to return. Finally, it is notable that relatively high return rates are also observed for men with high school and women with secondary education. This might be largely due to the return of young temporary migrants, who have initially left

their communities to acquire a certain skill or training in a field locally in demand, such as nursing and teaching.

The positive association between education and migration is observed for each urban bound stream (Table 11). The better educated are not only more likely to migrate but also are more likely to move to a large urban area. Beyond secondary school, metropolitan areas tend to be the predominant choice of migrants. Towns are equally attractive to migrants with intermediary levels of schooling. No consistent pattern emerges among migrants to villages.

Table 11. Interprovincial Migration Rates During 1965-70 by Completed Level of Education and Distribution by Place of Residence in 1970

Completed level of education at Census date in 1970	Total Migrants		Migrants by place of residence (per 1000 N)				
	N	(per 1000 N)	Metro-politan	Large cities	Medium and small cities	Towns	Villages
Males, ages 15+	10,293	129	41	16	17	33	23
None, illiterate	3,236	52	15	4	4	8	21
None, literate	1,256	92	22	11	14	25	19
Elementary	4,376	148	44	19	21	43	21
Secondary	674	188	55	30	28	56	19
High school	528	345	155	30	36	59	64
College	210	419	157	95	67	95	5
Females, ages 15+	10,251	56	22	7	7	11	9
None, illiterate	6,953	32	12	4	2	5	9
None, literate	533	75	45	9	4	9	8
Elementary	2,177	79	32	11	6	22	7
Secondary	328	216	58	21	104	24	9
High school ¹							
College	260	262	127	27	46	42	19

¹See note for Table 10.

Table 12. Educational Distribution by Migration Status, Type of Move Made and by Place of Residence of Migrants, 1970 (percent)

Completed level of education at Census date in 1970	Non-migrants		Recent migrants		Type of migrant			Place of residence of migrants in 1970					
	100	100	100	100	First Repeat	Return	Metro- politan cities	Large small cities	Medium and	Towns	Villages	100	100
Males, ages 15+	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None, illiterate	34	13	14	4	18	12	9	7	8	29			
None, literate	13	9	10	4	12	7	9	10	10	10			
Elementary	42	49	55	34	48	46	49	53	56	40			
Secondary	6	10	8	16	7	9	12	11	11	6			
High school	4	14	11	23	12	20	10	11	9	15			
College	1	7	3	19	3	8	12	8	6	a			
N	8953	1327	785	310	232	419	165	174	337	232			
Females, ages 15+	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100			
None, illiterate	70	39	45	19	45	36	37	18	34	68			
None, literate	5	7	7	7	8	11	7	3	5	5			
Elementary	21	30	28	37	26	30	36	18	44	18			
Secondary	3	12	12	15	11	8	10	45	7	3			
High school													
College	2	12	9	22	11	15	10	16	10	6			
N	9681	570	343	135	92	228	70	76	108	88			

¹See note for Table 10.

²Less than one-half of one percent.

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

Migration Differentials at Destination

Education. Table 12 illustrates the education differentials by migration status of the population and by type of move made, and destination for migrants. Migrants are better educated than nonmigrants; repeat migrants are by far the better educated group; and migrants to larger-size places have had more schooling than their counterparts. By comparison, first and return migrants tend to be similar with respect to educational attainment. As shown on the right panel of Table 12, the larger the size of the place of destination, the higher is the proportion of male migrants with higher education, e.g., percent with high school or college education gradually increases from 15 percent in villages to 28 percent in the metropolitan areas. This pattern does not hold as well for the female migrants. The disproportionate amount of married women migrating to metropolitan areas (with their husbands) is one possible reason for the distortion in the pattern. There are two other plausible explanations. First, the concentration of young women, with secondary schooling, in towns where most of the high school equivalent trade schools for women only are located. This possibly is the major attraction of the towns for this group. Second, the expansion of the educational facilities in the medium and small cities might be attracting young women, with high school education, either to continue their schooling or to teach in elementary or secondary schools.

Finally, it is important to note that since age is strongly associated with both migration and education, the educational differentials in migration are probably overstated in the absence of statistical controls for the age differentials. In other words, the younger cohorts have more education and are more migration prone.

Occupation. The employment status and the occupation of the migrants, discussed in this section, are those at the census date in 1970, and therefore reflect the post-migration differentials at the place of destination. Unemployed males are more likely to have moved recently than the employed, and the return migrants are more likely to be employed than other migrants. Table 13 shows the number of migrants per 1000 males at the risk of making a specific type of move by employment status and broad occupation categories. A slightly higher proportion of the men unemployed in 1970 are migrants compared to those who were employed. Regardless of the employment status the probability of having moved is much higher among those who were living outside their province of birth in 1965, and are assumed to have

Table 13. Interprovincial Migration Rates for Males at Ages 15 and Over and at Risk of Making a Specified Type of Move by Employment Status and Occupation of the Employed, 1970

Employment status and occupation at Census date in 1970	Total		In province of birth in 1965		Outside province of birth in 1965		Return migrants (per 1000 N)
	N	Migrants (per 1000 N)	N	migrants (per 1000 N)	N	Repeat migrants (per 1000 N)	
Unemployed	1,317	140	1,016	106	301	183	73
Employed	8,976	127	7,456	91	1,520	168	139
White-collar workers	1,191	208	738	136	453	199	128
Prof., tech., adm., mng.	476	277	270	170	206	286	131
Clerical, sales wrks.	715	162	468	115	247	126	126
Blue-collar workers	2,462	266	1,779	250	683	196	111
Service workers	496	243	342	243	151	166	79
Agricultural workers	4,830	25	4,597	11	233	30	279

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

made at least one previous move. Unemployed males are more likely to have either moved for the first time or moved to a third province other than their province of birth. Due to the predominance of agricultural workers among the return migrants, the probability of having returned to the province of birth is higher than that of making a first move, among the employed. The rates seem to further indicate that blue-collar and service workers are more likely to have moved for the first time, while repeat migration is more prevalent among professional, technical and administrative workers. This is not surprising, since repeat migration rates are highest for the high school and college educated men, and occupation and education are very strongly associated. The fact that agricultural workers are much more likely to be return migrants is in line with the finding reported earlier (*e.g.*, Table 3) that a high proportion (42.4 percent) of return migrants are found in villages. In fact it was shown that from each place of origin, return migrants are more likely to have gone to villages than any other destination in 1970.

In Table 14, proportions employed among males and the occupational distribution of the employed are shown according to the type of move made by migration status and area. Although a slightly larger proportion of nonmigrants are employed at the aggregate level (87 percent of nonmigrants versus 86 percent of migrants), nonmigrants in fact have lower employment rates in each area except in villages. In the latter, the high employment rates are primarily due to the dominance of the agricultural sector, employment in which is often seasonal and disguised, and seasonal unemployment is high. The data used here however do not allow us to detect these.¹¹

While lower rates for nonmigrants elsewhere may be associated with their age composition vis-à-vis migrants¹², it is not surprising to find that in-migrants are generally employed at higher rates (except in metropolitan areas) since "economic opportunities" are presumably what attract migrants in the first place. Besides, migrants are more likely to take the jobs, possibly at lower wages, which the "natives" may refuse or hesitate to take.

Out-migrants from metropolitan areas are largely repeat migrants who may have left only after securing a job at the destination. In addition, nearly one in every six metropolitan out-migrants is a returnee to villages (Table 3), most of whom are employed in agriculture (Tables 13 and 14). The relatively smaller proportion employed among in-migrants may indicate migration to metropolitan areas for reasons other

Table 14. Proportions Employed and Occupational Distribution of the Employed Males, 15 Years of Age and Over, According to Migration Status, Type of Move Made and Place of Origin and Place of Destination, 1970 (percent)

Migration status and size of place	Employed in 1970	Prof., tech., adm., mng. workers	Clerical sales workers	Blue-collar workers	Service workers	Agri-cultural workers
Males, 15 and over	87.2	5.3	8.0	27.4	5.5	53.8
Nonmigrants	87.4	4.4	7.6	23.1	4.8	60.1
Migrants	86.1	11.6	10.2	57.2	10.5	10.6
First	86.2	6.8	8.0	65.7	12.3	7.2
Repeat	82.3	23.0	12.1	52.3	9.8	2.7
Return	90.6	12.8	14.7	36.0	5.7	30.8
Metropolitan						
Outmigrants	89.0	16.7	9.9	51.9	9.3	12.3
Inmigrants	80.0	12.2	17.0	58.0	10.1	2.7
Nonmigrants	79.6	14.0	24.0	49.1	10.4	2.5
Large cities						
Outmigrants	78.7	14.7	17.1	56.6	6.2	5.4
Inmigrants	84.2	14.4	8.6	68.3	5.0	3.6
Nonmigrants	77.6	6.8	16.4	55.0	11.2	10.6
Medium & small cities						
Outmigrants	83.8	16.5	15.9	53.4	6.3	8.0
Inmigrants	85.7	10.7	8.7	75.3	4.0	1.3
Nonmigrants	72.8	8.3	18.3	45.4	11.3	16.7
Towns						
Outmigrants	85.7	10.4	9.7	58.3	12.5	9.0
Inmigrants	91.7	6.5	7.8	60.8	19.4	5.5
Nonmigrants	78.2	5.2	15.3	35.3	9.3	34.8
Villages						
Outmigrants	89.0	6.9	5.7	60.7	12.9	13.9
Inmigrants	90.5	16.7	4.8	30.5	6.2	41.9
Nonmigrants	93.8	2.2	1.8	11.4	1.8	82.9

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

than employment, *e.g.*, education, as indicated by the large proportion of high school graduates in these places (Table 12).

On the aggregate, two-thirds of the first migrants and one-half of the repeat migrants are employed in blue-collar occupations, compared with only little over one-third of returnees, 31 percent of whom are agricultural workers. White-collar workers constitute one-third of the repeat migrants, the highest proportion among the three migrant groups, who are mostly in professional, technical and administrative occupations. Although nearly one-third of all out-migrants originate from villages, a very small proportion is found in agriculture (14 percent).

Conversely, while only 11 percent of the nonmigrants in villages are blue-collar workers, 61 percent of the village out-migrants have found blue-collar jobs at their destinations. This indicates a flow of work-force from the rural-agricultural sector to the urban-industrial sector. A final interesting point to note is that in-migrants to villages have a very high proportion of blue-collar workers, nearly three times higher than nonmigrants. Although the sample is too small and does not have data on occupational histories to test this, it seems that return migrants to villages are less likely to be in agriculture than nonmigrants, possibly because the experience of migration has a permanent effect on the occupational status, even if the villager returns.

The preceding discussion focused on men only. The generally low levels of female migration and labor force participation of women in the nonagricultural sector preclude an analogous description of the migration differentials for the women in our sample. Nevertheless a few observations are presented in Table 15. Since in the rural areas nine out of ten women are employed as unpaid family workers in agriculture (Tanfer, 1975), employment data are shown separately, both including and excluding the agricultural workers. Employed nonmigrants are almost exclusively agricultural workers. When the latter are excluded, migrant women are found predominantly in white-collar occupations, while nonmigrants tend to be more in blue-collar jobs. It is evident that the migration of the better educated women is associated with employment opportunities. In fact they seem to be largely concentrated in health and education related fields which is commonly observed in other Middle Eastern countries (Youssef, 1971; 1974). Migrant women from rural areas are not sufficiently trained for the urban nonagricultural jobs. On the other hand, over one-half of the employed migrant women are urban-to-urban movers, two-thirds of whom are in white-collar occupations. When the agricultural workers are excluded, the employment rates for the first and return migrants are reduced by about one-half, which indicates the dominance of this sector. The employment level of the repeat migrants, however, is not changed, since they seem to be mostly white-collar workers moving from one urban place to another.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The urban population in Turkey has increased at three times the rate for the rural population during the 1950-1970 period. More than one-half

Table 15. Proportions Employed by Migration Status, Type of Move and Destination, and the Occupational Distribution of the Employed, Females, 1970

	Migrants		Nonmigrants	
	Including agriculture	Excluding agriculture	Including agriculture	Excluding agriculture
A. Percent employed and occupational distribution of the employed				
Females, age 15 and over	22.9	13.6	57.3	4.6
All occupations	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White-collar workers	40.4	67.9	2.7	33.3
Blue-collar workers	16.8	28.2	4.8	58.9
Service workers	2.3	3.8	0.6	7.8
Agricultural workers	40.5	a	91.9	a
B. Percent employed in each area of destination				
Area				
Metropolitan	17.5	16.2	13.3	13.2
Large cities	15.7	15.7	10.6	8.0
Medium and small cities	18.2	16.9	10.9	7.5
Towns	14.8	10.2	25.4	6.0
Villages	56.8	6.8	79.1	3.1
C. Percent employed among migrants by type of move made				
Type of move				
First migrants	20.4	10.8	a	a
Repeat migrants	19.9	19.9	a	a
Return migrants	37.0	15.2	a	a

^aNot applicable

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

of this urban growth is a result of the population transfers from rural areas. Data reviewed here offer evidence which basically substantiates the findings of earlier works as well as our hypotheses.

First, there are strong indications of stage migration, if we consider movements both within and between provinces. All urban places show population growth through intraprovincial migration; the larger the size of the place, the higher the increase in population through intraprovincial migration. However, only large metropolitan cities have grown

through interprovincial migration. Hence it is evident that migrants from rural areas first move to the towns and cities within the same province, then make a second move to other, mostly larger, urban areas and metropolitan cities. Out-migrants from villages are much less likely to make interprovincial moves than those with other origins: for instance, 54 percent of all out-migrants from villages compared with 74 percent from towns and 88 percent of those from cities.

Second, the majority of the interprovincial migrants (60 percent) are inter-urban movers and only one-fifth are rural-to-urban migrants. In a country that was still 64 percent rural in 1970, it is very striking to find a high volume of urban-to-urban migration. This is partially because most of the rural-urban migration is occurring within the provinces, followed by a second stage urban-urban move across the provincial boundaries. That is also why the largest migration stream appears to be that of the first urban-to-urban migrants, since their earlier intraprovincial move is excluded by the definition of migrant in this paper. Nevertheless, it is apparent that there is a substantial amount of population movement between urban areas.

Third, there exists a large group of repeat migrants moving mainly between urban places. These migrants are relatively older, better educated and skilled, and more likely to be employed in white-collar occupations than their counterparts. Although interprovincial migration in Turkey is dominated by young and single males, there is considerable variation in migrant properties according to the type of move made and the place of destination. Opportunities for education and employment seem to be the two important factors underlying the migration decision.

Finally, the often noted migration differentials are also observed in Turkey. However, the migrant-nonmigrant differences widely vary among the various migration streams and by type of move. Based on these differences two basic migration types can be distinguished: (a) that of the relatively younger less educated and less skilled first migrants from rural to urban areas, and (b) migration of the skilled and educated inter-urban movers. The latter type seems to be dominant among both the males and the females, supporting the earlier hypothesis that, with economic development and industrialization the socioeconomic composition of the migrants may exhibit a shift (Bouvier, et al., 1976; Miller, 1977). The socioeconomic characteristics of the different streams are shown in Appendix Table A. The summary table below shows the distinct differences between the two dominant streams.

Appendix Table A. Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Origin and Destination According to Employment Status, Education, and Occupation in 1970 for Each Sex

Socioeconomic characteristics	Category total	Place of origin and destination of migrants						Number in category	
		Rural to rural		Urban to urban		Urban to rural			
		to rural	to urban	to larger place	to same size place	To larger place	To smaller place		
A. Males									
Total	100	9	8	24	59	(29)	(13)	(17)	1,326
Unemployed	100	10	2	15	73	(45)	(11)	(17)	180
Employed	100	9	10	25	56	(27)	(13)	(17)	1,146
White-collar	100	8	10	12	70	(34)	(13)	(22)	248
Blue-collar	100	5	5	31	60	(28)	(14)	(18)	656
Service	100	3	8	38	51	(24)	(15)	(12)	120
Agriculture	100	36	37	9	18	(7)	(7)	(4)	122
Education									
Illiterate	100	25	16	23	37	(24)	(5)	(8)	166
Literate	100	8	13	32	47	(16)	(20)	(11)	115
Elementary	100	7	7	32	53	(28)	(11)	(15)	648
Secondary	100	6	5	13	77	(34)	(17)	(26)	127
High school	100	9	10	7	75	(41)	(14)	(20)	182
College	100	0	1	5	94	(39)	(23)	(35)	88
N	1,326	119	113	316	778	(388)	(171)	(219)	

Appendix Table A. (continued)

Socioeconomic characteristics	Category total	Place of origin and destination of migrants						Number in category	
		Rural to rural		Urban to urban		Total			
		Urban rural	Rural urban	Urban to larger place	Rural to smaller place	To same size place	To smaller place		
A. Females									
Total	100	10	5	20	64	(36)	(14)	(14)	571
Unemployed	100	8	3	23	68	(39)	(14)	(15)	440
Employed	100	24	14	10	52	(27)	(12)	(13)	131
White-collar	100	0	9	4	87	(40)	(23)	(24)	53
Blue-collar and service	100	4	0	24	72	(48)	(8)	(16)	25
Agriculture	100	58	25	9	8	(4)	(4)	(0)	53
Education									
Illiterate	100	21	7	30	42	(26)	(9)	(8)	220
Literate	100	5	5	30	60	(45)	(13)	(2)	40
Elementary	100	5	4	18	73	(37)	(16)	(19)	172
Secondary	100	1	3	7	89	(49)	(20)	(20)	71
High school and college	100	0	7	2	91	(49)	(19)	(23)	68
N	571	57	31	115	778	(206)	(80)	(82)	

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: Census of Population, 1970, Turkey.

	Males		Females	
	Rural to urban	Urban to urban	Rural to urban	Urban to urban
Percent of all migrants	24	59	20	64
Percent with no schooling	24	15	68	32
Percent with secondary or higher education	10	41	5	34
Percent of employed in white-collar occupations	10	27	15	68

The demographic and socioeconomic differentials between these streams are sharper when they are examined by the specific type of move made, and within flows to specific destinations, such as between first and repeat migrants, and for streams into metropolitan areas versus other urban places. The emerging picture is unlike that which is typical for the less developed countries.

Migration is a response to pressures caused by demographic, social, economic, and political change. The nature of the spatial redistribution of the population through migration is of concern because of its ultimate social, economic, demographic, even environmental, and political consequences. A discussion of these consequences is beyond the scope of this paper. Yet the significance of the total effects of the migration process vis-à-vis the social-economic-political conditions prevailing in a country can not be disregarded. Policy makers and academicians alike need to raise further questions in an attempt to delineate and explain the complex interrelationships. Could we, for instance, speculate that the socioeconomic and political situation in many developing countries is a direct product of the rapid proliferation of communications in recent years, including migration, mass education, and the impact of the vastly improved high-technology media, all of which might have generated a premature confluence of conflicting values and of rising expectations?

NOTES

This is a revised version of a paper prepared for the Population Association of America meetings in Denver, April 1980. I wish to gratefully acknowledge Ann R. Miller for valuable comments and suggestions on an earlier draft. Thanks are also due to Jay Weinstein and the anonymous reviewers for their comments.

1. We have deliberately excluded the role of international migration and the reclassification of places from rural to urban areas for simplicity and clarity.

2. Urban places are defined as having 10,000 or more population.
3. The ratio of the population at ages 0-14 and 65 and over to working age population, 15-64.
4. The State Planning Organization expects the rate of growth of population to rise to 2.72 percent per annum by 1980-1985, and to decline gradually thereafter to 2.01 percent in 1990-1995. These figures are based on the "intermediate" projections, compared with the "high" projections of 76 million, and "low" projections of 63 million in 1995 (World Bank, 1975).
5. These life-time migrants cannot be appropriately studied within the conceptual framework of this paper as there is no information on the timing of migration, or characteristics at the time of migration (*e.g.*, age, education, etc.) or destination and order of move.
6. Administrative classification is used because it is (a) the only way of differentiating between places on the data tape, and (b) in most instances administrative units approximate the degree of urbanization better than the size of population alone can do because of concentration of services and economic opportunities.
7. In all urban areas there is a net increase in population at ages 15 and over through net intraprovincial migration. The amount of gross migration (turnover) is inversely proportionate to the size of place. Consequently, the larger the mean size of place, the higher is the rate of growth through intraprovince migration indicating a definite trend of urban bound population movement.
8. The metropolitan share in each stream of first migrants increases, as the size of the sending area gets larger, which is another indirect evidence of stage migration.
9. The median ages for first, repeat, and return migrants are, 23.7, 29.3 and 29.9 years, respectively. The mean age at first marriage around the same time was about 18 years for females and approximately two years older for males.
10. The concept of "at risk" population is a refinement introduced in the population base in order to obtain more meaningful rates in most demographic analysis. The risk, in this case, is the risk of experiencing a specific event during a specific period, *e.g.*, birth, death, making a migratory move, etc. Here, probability rates for each type of migration are obtained by relating the migrants to the population at the risk of making that type of move: first migrants are related to the population that was living in its province of birth in 1965, repeat and return migrants to the population living outside its province of birth at that date. Hence, in each group population for which the risk is zero has been excluded from the base (Shryock and Siegel, 1973).
11. The census was taken in the last week of October, during which a large proportion of agricultural workers would still be employed in harvest related activities. I suspect, if the census was taken in the winter months of December or January, the proportion employed in the agricultural sector would be relatively smaller.
12. For instance, 53 percent of the migrants were at ages 20-29 compared to 24 percent of the nonmigrants; and more than one-third of the nonmigrants are 40 years of age or older, while only one in six migrants is in that age group.

REFERENCES

- BARKER, J.M.
1951 The Economy of Turkey: An Analysis and Recommendations for a Development Program. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- BOUVIER, L.F., J.J. MACISCO, and A. ZARATE
1976 "Toward a Framework for the Analysis of Differential Migration: The Case of Education." In Anthony H. Richmond and D. Kubat (eds.), *Internal Migration: The New World and the Third World*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

- BROWNING, HARLEY L.
1971 "Migrant Selectivity and the Growth of Large Cities in Developing Societies." In The National Academy of Sciences, *Rapid Population Growth: Consequences and Policy Implications*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- CALDWELL, JOHN D.
1969 *African Rural-Urban Migration*. Canberra: The Australian National University Press.
- EJIUGU, C.N.
1968 "African Rural-Urban Migrants in the Main Migrant Areas of the Lagos Federal Territory." In J.C. Caldwell and C. Okonjo (eds.), *The Population of Tropical Africa*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ELDRIDGE, HOPE T.
1965 "Primary, Secondary, and Return Migration in the United States, 1955-60." *Demography* 2:444-455.
- ELIZAGA, JUAN C.
1966 "A Study of Migration to Greater Santiago (Chile)." *Demography* 3:352-377.
- HEROLD, JOAN M.
1979 "Female Migration in Chile: Types of Moves and Socioeconomic Characteristics." *Demography* 16:257-277.
- KELEŞ, RUSEN
1970 "Türkiyede Şehirleşme Eğilimleri." (Trends of Urbanization in Turkey) *Journal of Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Ankara*, 25:48.
- LEE, E.S.
1966 "A Theory of Migration." *Demography* 3:47-58.
- LONG, L.H.
1973 "Migration Differentials by Education and Occupation: Trends and Variations." *Demography* 10:243-258.
- MILLER, ANN R.
1965 "Migration Differentials Among Occupation Groups: United States, 1960." Paper presented at the United Nations World Population Conference, Belgrade, A.3/V/E/179.
1977 "Interstate Migrants in the United States: Some Social-Economic Differences by Type of Move." *Demography* 14:1-17.
- MORRISON, PETER A.
1970 *Chronic Movers and the Future Redistribution of Population: A Longitudinal Analysis*. Unpublished paper. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.
- PRESTON, SAMUEL H.
1979 "Urban Growth in Developing Countries: A Demographic Reappraisal." *Population and Development Review* 5:195-215.
- RAVENSTEIN, E.G.
1889 "The Laws of Migration." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 52:241-301.
- SHORTER, FREDERIC C. and BELGIN TEKÇE
1973 "Demographic Determinants of Urbanization in Turkey, 1935-1970." In P. Benedict, E. Tümertekin and F. Mansur (eds.), *Turkey: Geographical and Social Perspectives*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- SHRYOCK, HENRY S. and C.P. NAM
1965 "Educational Selectivity of Interregional Migration." *Social Forces* 43:299-310.
- SHRYOCK, HENRY S. and JACOB SIEGEL
1973 *The Methods and Materials of Demography*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
State Institute of Statistics, Turkey
1973 *Census of Population, 25.10.1970*. Ankara: Publication No. 672.
- STONE, LEROY O.
1969 *Migration in Canada*. Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.
- TAEUBER, KARL E., LEONARD CHIAZZE, and WILLIAM HAENZEL
1968 *Migration in the United States: An Analysis of Residence Histories*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Health Monograph No. 77.

TANFER, KORAY

- 1975 Working Women: A Study of Female Labor Force and Determinants of Participation in Six Large Cities of Turkey, 1970. Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

THOMAS, DOROTHY S.

- 1938 Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials. New York: Social Science Research Council Bulletin 43.

Turkish Demographic Survey

- 1970 Turkish Demographic Survey: Vital Statistics 1966-1967. Ankara: School of Public Health.

United Nations

- 1961 Mysore Population Study. New York: United Nations Population Studies No. 34.
1968 Urbanization: Development Policies and Planning. New York: 22-33, 81-84.
1978 Concise Report on Monitoring of Population Policies. New York: E/CN.9/388. Population Commission.
1980 Patterns of Urban and Rural Population Growth. New York: Population Studies No. 68.

World Bank

- 1975 Turkey: Prospects and Problems of an Expanding Economy. Washington, D.C.

YOUSSEF, NADIA H.

- 1971 "Social Structure and the Female Labor Force: the Case of Women Workers in Muslim Middle Eastern Countries." *Demography* 8:427-439.
1974 Women and Work in Developing Societies. Berkeley: University of California, Population Monograph Series, No. 15.

ZACHARIAH, K.C.

- 1966 "Bombay Migration Study: A Pilot Analysis of Migration to an Asian Metropolis." *Demography* 3:378-392.