

## **Internal Migration and its Effects in one of the Underdeveloped Regions of Turkey (The Sample of Adiyaman)**

**Dr. Gazanfer Kaya**  
Department of Sociology  
Dokuz Eylül University  
Tinaztepe Yerleskesi, Buca  
35260 Izmir, Turkey

### **Abstract**

*Migration is an international phenomenon having social and historical dimensions. The near and far social history of Turkey witnesses lots of migrations. Adiyaman, located in the underdeveloped region of Southeastern Anatolia, has undergone a dynamic internal migration in the last 30 years. This article is a field research focusing on the causes and effects of the internal migration in Adiyaman. As a part of the research, 300 migrants out of 6 neighborhoods of the city centre of Adiyaman were interviewed. Thus, the process of the internal migration in Adiyaman is analysed in the light of the findings obtained from the interviewees.*

**Keywords:** Migration, Internal Migration, Turkey, Underdevelopment, Adiyaman

### **1. Introduction**

The phenomenon of migration, having an important place throughout human history, differs both as regards causes of emergence and its effects, and also its types. As a type of migration, the internal migration is possible to take place in almost every society. The internal migration can take place as a result of changes in the structure of society as well as being the cause of some changes by itself. Turkey has undergone an internal migration period which began to take shape especially in 1950s and obtained a dynamic character in the following decades. The main cause of this migration is the changes occurred in the rural areas. Especially the replacement of closed and for-the-livelihood type of production available by primitive technology by the type of production based on market economy and carried out by modern technological means forced the landless peasants or the ones having little land to migrate. This period of internal migration mostly caused by push factors created a time period of rapid and irregular urbanization. Located at an underdeveloped region in Turkey, the city centre of Adiyaman received an intensive migration from the rural areas after 1980. This study in which the causes and effects of the migration dynamics are explored is composed of several parts. In the study the phenomenon of migration and conceptual approaches to internal migration are firstly handled. Afterwards the internal migrations in Turkey and the historical/social dimensions of the internal migration movement in Adiyaman are examined in the light of related literature. The findings and analysis of them, too, take an important place in this research. Lastly the results obtained out of this study are presented.

### **2. The Phenomenon of Migration**

Migration, in the most general sense, can be described as the relocation and mobility of people across an area. This phenomenon is as old as human history. Similarly, Joseph Fichter points out that history is full of people's migrations (2004: 181). Occurred in almost every society, the phenomenon of migration has always drawn attention of scholars. In the centre of this attention lie the factors causing relocation across the area and outcomes of the migration.

According to the Turkish Language Association: Migration is individuals' or communities' moving from one country to another or from one settlement to another due to economic, social and political reasons; emigration (TDK, 1998: 863). In *Meydan Larousse Encyclopaedia* migration is defined as relocation of individuals under the influence of economic, political and social reasons (1971: 251).

Regarding the the phenomenon of migration, playing an important part in people's and societies' life with many dimensions such as sociological, anthropological, economic, historical and socio-psychological ones, a lot of definitions and conceptualisations have been done. As a matter of fact, Gordan Marshall states that migration includes the permanent movement of individuals or groups beyond symbolic and political boundaries towards new settlement areas and societies (1999: 685). According to Ozankaya, migration is heading of individuals or social groups from one place to another in order to settle (1995: 52). With a similar approach, Keleş defines migration as the movement activity from a settlement to another, from a country to another usually in order to settle (1998: 58). According to Yalçın, migration is a geographical, social and cultural relocation movement from one place to another, caused by economic, political, ecological and individual motives, which includes the aim of returning in short-, mid- and long-term or permanent settlement (2004: 13). Migration designates changing an administrative border and real place of residence forever or for long. This change can take place intercontinentally, interregionally, from rural areas to the city or vice versa (Tümertekin ve Özgüç, 2012: 289). From sociological perspective, migration can be defined as a sum of processes in which people or groups' relocation in place and time turns it into action and which has its own affects later on (Çakır, 2011: 131). Having an integrality with its previous and following dimensions, the migration process is closely related with social change. Migration can be evaluated both as a dependent variable affected by social change and an independent variable affecting social change.

Each migration and wave of migration is distinct and unique both in terms of its nature and the way it occurs and is felt. Each migration needs to be understood in its own circumstances and integrality. While defining the phenomenon of migration, the points to be first looked into are population (migrants or potential migrants), geography (source or target place, region, country) and movement (migration movement) (Çağlayan, 2011: 87). According to Jackson, migration manages to change place of residence and many other factors based on a physical movement. Jackson also puts an emphasis on social dimension of migration adding that besides physical movement, the migration takes place from one society to another (1986: 2). Similarly, Faist, too, considers migration as a transfer from a location to another and from a social or political unit to another (2003: 41). Migration is a collective activity caused by social change and it affects both society receiving migration and the one causing emigration (Castles ve Miller, 2008: 29). The phenomenon of migration is one of the most significant indications of social change, especially in modern times (Jansen, 1970: 3). The changes occurred in traditional social structure and relations of production created the phenomenon of migration from rural areas to the city. Industrial Revolution and the accompanying process of urbanization have especially been decisive in terms of direction and dynamics of the phenomenon of migration.

The economic dimension of the phenomenon of migration needs to be particularly emphasized. In parallel with social change, the decrease in need for workforce leads some population of rural areas to cities so as to find new areas of employment (İçduygu ve Diğerleri, 1998a: 216). The feature qualifying population movements in modern world dominated by capitalist economy is relocation of workforce. Therefore, considering migration only as a matter of population movement can cause ignorance of the various economic roles the migrants play (Doğan, 2002: 22).

While exploring the phenomenon of migration, sociologists especially choose relation between migration and society as a focal point of their analysis. Which social phenomena or factors have been affective on the phenomenon of migration appearing in a society? On the other hand, the phenomenon of migration, too, affects other phenomena and processes. As a result of migration, many social problems emerge, particularly in cities and interaction processes such as adaptation, cooperation and conflict take place. The problems created or greatly affected by migration give shape to cities in particular and all social structure in general (Erjem, 2009: 10). As Akan and Arslan emphasize as well, the phenomenon of migration is a basic means of change influencing life at all points from economic perspective to culture being a social movement in its essence, though (2008: 3). In other words, migration is not only the relocation of people on a site but it is also a phenomenon closely associated with many elements of social structure.

### **3. Internal Migrations**

Many classifications are made for migration, which is dynamic and has a significant place in communities' life.

In these classifications, criteria such as whether individual's/group's own intention or an external enforcement is effective in occurrence of the migration, whether the direction of migration is in the border of the country or across the border and the duration of residence are foregrounded. In this study, one of the migration types, internal migration and a kind of internal migration, the one from rural areas to the city will be focused in particular.

Migration is a human movement taking place towards or outwards a region. The movement or migration towards a region can be defined as internal migration. All the nations experience internal migration, that is, the movement from borders of a region to another (Macionis, 2012: 569-570). According to Marshall, internal migration is the population movement qualifying for the labour moving to regions composing the economically developing poles in the border of a nation state. As a progressive phenomenon proceeding together with urbanization and industrialization period, the phenomenon of internal migration encompasses massive population movements from rural areas to the city (1999: 314). According to Ozankaya, internal migration is population's moving from villages to cities and also from underdeveloped regions to developed regions in a country (1996: 269).

Internal migration is the motion inside a country from one of the places such as a region, city, town and village to another for settlement. Internal mobility, namely the motion inside the borders of a country has great importance for Sociology. There are still a few nomadic peoples like hunting and herding people in modern world. On the other hand, there still can be found unsettled groups such as migrant workers, travellers, peddlers, Gipsies, circus members and migrant agriculture workers (Fichter, 2004: 181).

The directions of migration can be listed as follows: a) from rural areas to rural areas, b) from rural areas to a city, c) from city to city, d) from city to rural areas. The migrations from rural areas to cities have a significant place in internal migrations. Due to these migrations, the areas surrounding cities are densely populated, the production and division structure changes. The Industrial Revolution has a great influence on internal migrations from rural areas to cities. The Industrial Revolution created fundamental transformations in social structure. The motive behind these transformations lies at the root of the fact that the intensified population at rural areas left the land and migrated towards city centres and as a result an overpopulation emerged at the migrated cities. In Sencer's words, the population growth in urban areas, to a great extent, occurs with migrations as well as with birth rates. Since the fertility rate generally decreases in the cities of developing countries, the city population is nurtured mostly by migrations from rural areas (1979: 2).

The push factors are foregrounded in migrations from rural areas to a city. The push factors caused by economic reasons need to be particularly focused. Some of economic reasons are caused by the circumstances of agricultural areas leading to migration of peasants from their villages. Capitalisticized agricultural enterprises have an encouraging influence on the decrease in agricultural workforce. The productivity of agriculture and per capita agricultural income are too low to keep peasants in their villages, especially in underdeveloped countries (Keleş, 2008: 31-32). The factors driving rural population from their settlements are as follows: Population pressure, insufficiency of land and bad sharing, concealed unemployment, inadequate employment, low productivity, agricultural mechanization, lack of economic activities out of season, natural disasters, mobility enhanced by education, agricultural policies, features of agricultural lands, conditions of climate and erosion (Ertürk ve Sam, 2009: 18-19).

Some causes leading surplus rural population to a city are pull factors. The pull factors of urbanization can be listed as follows: income differences between villages and cities, a better and further education, attraction of the city, hope for finding a job, higher standards of living and transportation facilities (Sezal, 1992: 36). As Kiray remarks, modern cities grow thanks to the development of commercial and industrial institutions, not thanks to randomly added population. In this regard, the migrants from rural areas to the city will be employed insofar as the already existing sectors other than agricultural one need (2007: 15). Although the causes of migration are classified in various ways, in fact, the aforementioned causes present a chain of integrity. Along with mechanization and technological developments, a break in economic system as a result of the changes in agricultural structure combined with insufficiencies in rural areas and attraction of the city compose the phenomenon of migration (Akgür, 1997: 56).

The economic and social problems resulting from intensive internal migrations from rural areas to the city are as follows: unemployment and employment focusing on marginal sectors, instability between sectors, the instability of urbanization between regions, the obstruction in infrastructure services, shanty town formation, environmental destruction, physical unplannedness and irregular settlement, inequality in distribution of income, increase in social classes, cultural change and gap, and social disintegration (Sezal, 1992: 74).

In short, along with the internal migration from rural areas to the city, the problems experienced before the migration are transferred to the city or new problems come into being in urban life.

#### ***4. Internal Migrations in Turkey: Its Causes and Effects***

Turkey has undergone many economic, socio-cultural, political and demographic changes in the time period of more than 90 years since its foundation up until today. The transformation of the structure mostly composed of rural area residents into the structure mostly composed of urban residents is one of the above mentioned changes in the population of a society. The population movement and especially internal migrations from rural areas to the city are decisive in this change. The period of structural change Turkey has experienced is a contributing factor for understanding the internal migrations.

In the period of 1923-1950 in Turkey, the relations of the production based on traditional and closed economy were dominant factors. The internal migrations were limited in this period due to the fact that the structural transformations hadn't started yet and also means of transportation and communication were restricted. Besides, there occurred some limited migrations to Istanbul, the capital city Ankara and partly to Izmir.

The basic change in the rural areas of Turkey realized in 1950s. In other words, relations of production which were principally closed, for living and based on organic power until 1950s, started to change under the influence of the transference of external capital and technology. The rapid agricultural mechanization in this period is noteworthy. As a matter of fact, the number of tractors, 1800 in 1948, rose to 44 000 in 1956 (Tekeli, 2008: 50-51). The increase in the number of tractors decreased the need for workforce to a great extent. The factors such as unproductivity of land and land fragmentation by inheritance along with this new situation led to acceleration in masses' leaving their lands and migrating to the cities. The most significant dynamics in this increase is the phenomenon of "internal migration". According to Icduygu and Unalan the factors underlying the internal migration in 1950s and 1960s are: population growth, low agricultural productivity, the increasing unemployment in rural areas and movement towards cities for education. This is the period when people rapidly get away from villages and being villagers (1998b: 43).

The employment facilities in the cities were developing much more slowly than the growth rate of workforce. Nevertheless, the high payments in industry were preserving their attraction. The cultural values, too, reinforced the internal migration to the cities. In fact, living conditions were rather insufficient in urban areas. However, the migration from rural areas went on at full tilt since the living conditions in villages and towns were not better than in cities. In 1950 and following years, industrialization was accelerated to some extent through external support and efforts initiated for development only caused swift progress in certain sections (e.g in some building sections such as construction) (Özer, 2004: 58-59).

Another factor influencing the increase in internal migration in Turkey is the developments in transportation and communication networks. First of all, the importance given to road construction and spread of means of transportation facilitated relocations. Furthermore, these developments affected the transportation of the goods to the markets and commercial dynamism. Moreover, the communicative factors such as the increase in the number of TV channels in the period of 1950-1960 has also caused more rise in internal migration. In addition, according to results of population census in 1950, while urban population makes up 25% of the total population, this rate becomes 35% in 1965 (TÜİK, 2008: 9).

The internal migration from rural areas to the cities increased intensively in 1960s and 1970s. Furthermore, while the rate of agricultural workers was 77.4% in 1955, it decreased to 56% in 1980 (Keleş, 2008: 75). The migrants from rural areas to the cities encountered two basic problems. The first problem was about provision of a house for accommodation and second one was about finding a job for earning their livelihood. The migrants found a solution for the housing problem through shanty town houses they built illegally on state land without having a title. The migrants overcame the second problem by working in organized and guaranteed jobs in industrial and service sectors of economy. But the migrants unable to find a job in these sectors with limited capacity had to work in informal sectors (Güneş, 2009: 256).

The phenomenon of urbanization and internal migration which didn't emerge in Turkey depending on industrialization appeared as overpopulation in urban areas and this situation caused rise in the number of the existing urban problems. Therefore, the urbanization in Turkey resembles the urbanization process of underdeveloped countries in many ways (Öztürk, 2007: 257).

Another problem the internal migration in Turkey creates is the issue of becoming urbanized. The cities get increasingly crowded by these intensive waves of internal migration. These desperate crowds from rural areas, without education and knowing nothing other than agriculture, in particular, either feel as foreigners in the cities they migrate or cannot integrate with the society or else a long time is needed for this to take place (Öztürk, 2007: 258).

The wave of migration from rural areas to the cities has continued at different rates from 1980s up until today and it is observed that particularly the population migrating from underdeveloped regions of Turkey, the Eastern Anatolia Region, Southeastern Anatolia Region and Eastern Black Sea Region, has a migration movement towards developed western regions. In addition, the atmosphere of conflicts and violence experienced in eastern and southeastern Turkey as of 1980 added a new dimension to the migration from rural areas to the cities. One of the main causes of the population mobility in 1980s is forced migrations. Based on the figures Kaygalak presents; according to data given in 1997 by Governorship of Region in State of Emergency (OHAL Bölge Valiliği), 450.000 people were forced to migrate from the region as a result of evacuating totally 905 vilages and 2523 hamlets, that is, 3428 settlements. According to the same report, the people whose villages were evacuated, mostly migrated from the region in masses or settled in big cities such as Urfa, Van and Diyarbakir or in the cities such as Mersin, Adana and Antalya where there were facilities of employment such as agricultural work requiring no education and skills (2001: 141). In both 1980-1985 and 1985-1990 periods, the Marmara Region and the Aegean Region predominantly received immigrants. Moreover, in the same periods, the Eastern Anatolia Region, Southeastern Anatolia Region were among the regions from where the migration mostly took place (DİE Tebliği, 1997: 43).

Another factor increasing the migration from rural areas to the cities in Turkey from 1980 on is the neoliberal policies implemented for agriculture. The social state practices were replaced by market state and privatization policies. In the mentioned period, rising of the prices of inputs such as fuel oil, fertilizer and animal food along with the decrease in agricultural subsidies caused rural producers to experience hardships. Furthermore, the masses that were unable to earn their living and left unemployed were forced to migrate. According to Gunaydin, in the time period of 2001-2007, 2.2 million farmers stopped working in agricultural sector (2010: 191). Additionally, while the employment rate of agriculture was 28% in 2006, it fell to 18.9% in 2013 (Ulukan, 2009: 121).

One of the significant causes of internal migration, the unemployment issue keeps being a problem even after the migration. According to Kalca, a mass of people, who do not appear in unemployment figures of employment statistics even though they are disguised unemployed in agricultural sector, migrate to the cities. However, they aren't absorbed in industrial and service sectors in the cities and thus turn into "open unemployed" in urban locations (Kalça, 1999: 129). One of the most noteworthy results of the internal migration in Turkey is irregular urbanization. The urban plannings prepared lag behind internal migration and a nonstandard structuring is formed (Pazarlıoğlu, 2007: 66). So, while, on one hand, exceedingly luxurious gentrified locations increase in number, on the other hand, an unequal view of locations next to these ones, where old shanty towns are situated and mostly the "others" of the city (the poor) live, appears.

### **5. The Internal Migration Mobility in Adiyaman**

Adiyaman is a city situated in the Southeastern Anatolia Region, one of the underdeveloped regions of Turkey. Adiyaman became a city in 1954 getting separated from Malatya. In other words, it has been for 60 years since it became an administrative province.

Adiyaman is a city where agricultural production is primarily made as compared with the country in general or with the Southeastern Anatolia Region. Besides, according to 2011 TUIK (Turkish Statistical Institute), employees' range in sectors is as follows: The range in agricultural sector is 50.8%; in industry it is 18% and in service sector it is 30.8% (2013: 49). A great deal of industry in Adiyaman is based on small and medium-sized enterprises and most of them consist of enterprises active in industrial sectors dependent on agriculture. It isn't possible to say that trade has developed enough in the city. Textile factories standing in the first rank in the city, there are also enterprises of food, coal, cement, marble, raw material of brick and tile, manganese, iron, copper ore, phosphate and mineral water. Data by GAP Administration-Provincial Directorates of Industry and Commerce (Sanayi ve Ticaret İl Müdürlükleri) indicate that 48 enterprises out of 110 industrial enterprises are based on textile while 34 enterprises out of them are based on food (Erkan, 2005: 79).

Looking at the population movement of Adiyaman to other cities, it is noteworthy to see that the migration from the city is as intensive as the the internal migration into the city. As the industrial infrastructure to employ workers in Adiyaman is insufficient, an intensive population mobility to out of the city is observed. In 2011-2012, Adiyaman receives 14323 migrants and the number of migrants leaving Adiyaman is 22591. So, the number of migrants leaving the city is 8268 people more than the one it receives (TÜİK, 2012: 78).

Adiyaman receives migrants to the city centre while it also sends migrants. The urbanization in Adiyaman accelerated after 1980. The main factor decisive in the population rise of urban-dwellers is internal migrations. While the economy of Adiyaman was based on agriculture and livestock for many years, the negative results of agricultural policies and economic hardships forced people to stop cultivating the land. Furthermore, upon construction of Ataturk Dam, many settlement areas and agricultural lands were submerged and according to the official figures, around 50.000 people were negatively affected by this situation. In this regard, Adiyaman's city centre was subject to an intensive migration after construction of the dam and the city centre population, 53.219 in 1980, reached 101.576 in 1990 (www.adiyaman.gov.tr).

The renowned urbanologist Rusen Keles draws attention to the city centre of Adiyaman concerning the placement of settlements in regard of having the fastest population growth in Turkey of 1985-1990 (2008: 67). Besides, imposing a quota on tobacco in the late 1990s and Turkish State Monopoly (TEKEL)'s ceasing to collect tobacco caused the people whose source of income was cultivation of tobacco to migrate to the city centre. Moreover, according to recordings of Tobacco and Alcohol Market Regulatory Authority, while the number of tobacco producers in Adiyaman in 1998 was 54.428, it declined to 28.162 (Uznay, 2014: 107). As of 2012 census, the population of the city centre of Adiyaman is 217.789. The total population of Adiyaman is 595 261 according to the results of Address-based Population Registration System. 365 381 people out of this population live in the city while 229 880 people live in towns and villages. The rate of the city residents is 61.38% while the rate of town and village residents is 38.62% (TÜİK, 2012: XI).

The signs of rapid urbanization which occurred as a result of the process of migration experienced by Adiyaman, located in one of the underdeveloped region of Turkey, can be listed as follows: the widespread presence of houses of 1/2-storey and their adjacency, remaining of agricultural lands in the city, grazing of animals within the neighbourhood, pollution caused by the usage of poor quality coal, insufficiency of education and health services, high fertility rates and abundance of seasonal labourers and peddlers. As a result of these factors, Adiyaman turns into a centre where masses of unemployed and poor people without any qualification gather. In short, Adiyaman has appeared to be dynamic regarding both migration and urbanization since 1980 up until today.

## **6. Field Research**

### **6.1. Method**

This part of my study exploring the cause and effects of migrations from rural areas of Adiyaman to the city is based on the data obtained from the field and analysis of these data. In this regard, 300 migrants out of 6 neighborhoods of the city centre of Adiyaman were interviewed. The questionnaire forms, administered to 40 migrants from Bahcelievler Neighbourhood, 38 migrants from Imamaga Neighbourhood, 60 migrants from Karapinar Neighbourhood, 43 migrants from Sumerevler Neighbourhood, 75 migrants from Yeni Neighbourhood and 44 migrants from Yesilyurt Neighbourhood, were processed in the database of the SPSS 16.00 software program and similarly they were evaluated by being analysed through this program.

### **6.2. Findings and Their Analysis**

#### **6.2.1. Demographic Features of Migrants**

151 people out of the interviewed migrants who migrated from rural areas and settled in the city are females (% 50.3) whereas 149 of them are males (% 49.7). The number of the gender of the interviewed migrants are almost equal. As for birthplace, the rate of village-born migrants is 96.3% and the rate of town-born migrants is 3.7%. The ages of 37% of the interviewees range between 35 to 44 years while 26.3 % of them range between 45 to 54 years. 20.3% of them range between 25 to 34 years while 13% of them range between 55 years and over. The frequency of the range of young adults and middle aged migrants draws attention among the participants. Regarding the settlements; the migrants born in villages inside the borders of the city centre compose the majority with 62.7 %. The rate of migrants born in the district of Samsat is 13.7% and migrants born in the district of Kahta is 11.7% while the rate of migrants born in Besni is 7%.

The migrants of the city centre of Adiyaman are mostly born in the neighbouring rural areas. 91.7 of the interviewees are married, which is a considerable rate. The divorce rate among migrants is very low with 1.3%. This rate reveals to what extent the traditional relations are effective on the married couples. As for the number of households of a dwelling, the density is between 4 (22.3%) or 5 (25.3%) households. The rate of dwellings accommodating 6 households is 17.3%. These rates reveal that the widespread rate of extended family in rural areas is replaced by nuclear family in the city. Among the interviewees, the elementary school graduates have the highest rate with 42%. Furthermore, the illiterate rate is 19 %, which stands for a considerable figure. The almost equal number of male and female interviewees has also an effect on the high rate of illiteracy. As a matter of fact, as this issue is evaluated concerning the gender; among 57 illiterate migrants, the number of women is 48 while the number of men is only 9. The rate of high school graduates among all the migrants is 11% and the rate of secondary school graduates is 10.3% while it is 8% for faculty graduates. Concerning migrants' jobs, the rate of housewives ranks first (43.7%). The rate of migrants working in private sector is 8.7% and the rate of shopkeepers and artisans is 8% whereas construction workers constitute 7.3%. The officers make up 6.3% while the retired make up 5.3%. In addition, peddlers, daily workers, porters, seasonal workers compose 4.7% of them. The percentage of the migrants remarking themselves as unemployed is 8.3%. The fact that the majority of interviewees is composed of housewives, namely unpaid family workers, disguises the number of the unemployed and at the same time demonstrates it lower.

### **6.2.2. The State of Income and Social Security**

In the dwellings migrants live, the percentage of dwellings with one employee is 69% and dwellings with two-employee is 17.3% while the percentage of the dwellings without any regular jobs is 11%. According to these data the dwellings with one employee consist the most of the percentage. The rate of interviewed households without a regular income is 23%. The interviewees having an income under 750 TL, namely under the minimum wage in Turkey, have a rate of 16.3%. In other words, migrants of an income under the minimum wage or with no regular income totally compose 36.6% of all, which is a striking rate. The periphery of the city centre of Adiyaman has become residing places for rural workers as the population in the centre has considerably grown due to migrations from rural areas in the last 30 years. Among migrants, the dwellings with no social security have a rate of 9.3%. Among the migrants living in the city centre of Adiyaman, the rate of migrants having Green Card, one of the most significant indications of poverty, is 31.7 %, which is very high. 20% of the interviewees state that they get support from an institution (mostly from the governorship or municipality).

### **6.2.3. Causes of Migration**

One of the leading causes of migration is unemployment with 29.7%. This is followed by economic insufficiency with a percentage of 23%. The changes in the economic state of people living in rural areas where agricultural relations are dominant, are the primary causes of migration. Imposing a quota on tobacco, which was the basic source of income for the residents of the region for a long time, in 1999 and totally stopping to collect tobacco as of 2008 increased the unemployment and economic insufficiencies. Therefore, while interviewing, most of the migrants more than often added to the causes "state's ceasing to collect tobacco" after choosing economic insufficiencies and unemployment as the causes of the migration. Another urging cause of the internal migration in Adiyaman is, with the rate of 10.4%, construction of Ataturk Dam. As of the construction of the dam, many people had to leave their settlements and lands. There are also socio-cultural causes which affected the migration. The people who migrated due to marriage has a rate of 9.1% and the ones giving their children's education as a reason for migration has a rate of 5% while the ones who migrated for health reasons compose 2.7%. Regarding the years of migration, the rate of people who migrated in the period which coincided with the construction period of Ataturk Dam (21-25 years) is 18.7%. As of 1999, when a quota was imposed on collecting the tobacco (11-15 years), the rate of migrants is 15.7%. In the last 5 years during which Tekel hasn't collected tobacco, the migration rate is 16.7%. The rates are close to each other in the migration range of the years but the total of migrants in the range of 25 years and less is more than four fifths of all migrants. These data on internal migration coincide with a period when a rapid urbanization takes place in Adiyaman.

### **6.2.4. Economic Situation during Pre-and Post-Migration**

The economy of Adiyaman has been established on agriculture for many years. 55.7 % of the interviewed migrants point out that their main source of the income is tobacco production. The second source of income after tobacco is cultivation of cereals such as wheat and barley with 9.7%.

Agriculture based on fruit and vegetable growing (8.3%), livestock (6.3%) seasonal labouring (5.5%) are other sources of income. The seasonal labouring becomes more apparent especially after the imposed quota on tobacco and state's ceasing to collect it. One of the primary economic activity the migrant families resort to is construction working with a percentage of 19.3%. Concerning the question on how the households earn their living after migration, working in the private sector comes second in the answers given (17.7%). The industry of Adiyaman is primarily based on textile. Therefore, among the workers of private sector, the workforce of textile workers is important. The works having an irregular income such as seasonal labouring (12.7%) and peddling and selling in an outdoor market (11.3 %) are considerably carried out. The people working in such jobs with no social security are mostly overpopulated in the poor areas of the city. The number of agricultural workers going out of the city in the seasons of summer and autumn is getting increased in this areas in particular. As for answers given to the question on what kind of problems they are exposed to, the unemployment comes first with 35%. The rate of people who remark that they experience hardships for earning their livelihood is 32%. These rates, too, indicate that the negative factors that forced migrants to go to the cities keep increasing in the cities even after the migration. Among the migrants, the rate of the people having housing problems after the migration is 15.3%.The migrants who state that they have no housing problem compose only 12.1% of them. The rate of interviewees happy or very happy with their current economic situation is 23% while more than half of them (55.3%) are unhappy or very unhappy with their current economic situation. The rate of migrants stating their economic situation as modest (manageable) is 22.7%.

### **6.2.5. The Impacts of Migration on the Settlements of the City**

For the migrants, the first motive behind preferring a place (neighbourhood) for living is the impact of relatives with 30%. It is observed that relative relations have a substantial influence on choosing the neighbourhood in Adiyaman where traditional relationships are still alive. Obviously, the traditional relations play a part of protection (patronage) both during the time of getting used to the city and alleviating the hardships encountered. Regarding settling in the neighbourhood, the second reason comes up as settling into their own house (15.2%) while the rate of some of migrants who stated that they rented a house with a reasonable price in that neighbourhood, is 11.5 %. The 64.3% of the households interviewed remark that the house they live in belongs to them. Besides, the rate of renters is 28.7%. Adiyaman is a city that is predominantly composed of one or two-storey houses mostly constructed without a zoning plan as a result of migration and rapid urbanization. The research shows that one-storey buildings are the most common types of houses with 42.3%. The rate of migrants living in two-storey houses is 20%. The migrants consider the insufficiency of infrastructure services as the most essential problem of the neighbourhood they live in with 35.3% percentage. The rapid, unhealthy and irregular kind of developments have increased the problems encountered in local government services. Furthermore, as for other rates of problems, the problem of shortage of parks and green areas is 19.6%, pollution problem is 15.7%, lack of educational institutions is 10.7% and lack of health institutions is 9.8%. A city is not only a settlement, the migrants' state of belonging regarding a city, reveals some clues about relations with a city. A significant rate of migrants, 60.6%, don't regard themselves as urban dwellers. In reply to the question of "who is an urban dweller?"; the statements such as having good economic conditions (37%), being born in a city (30.4%) and educated people (12.5%) are leading answers.

### **6.2.6. The Impacts of Migration on Social and Cultural Life**

To what extent the migrants show socio-cultural behaviours peculiar to the city they live in, in other words, how they integrate with urban life is a subject that needs to be focused. 26,3% of the interviewees go to the city centre once a month while 22.7% of them go every day. 15.7% of interviewees go to the city centre once a week while 15% go to the city centre twice or three times a week. Regarding their relation with the city, the migrants that chose "others" with a percentage of 19% remark that they go to the centre for attending a wedding, going shopping for the festival and health reasons. The rate of women among migrants going to the centre once a week is 78% and among the migrants who chose the "others" stating that they had rarely been to the centre, the rate of women is 93.8%. These data indicate that there is a great deal of difference between genders. The existence of traditional and patriarchal relationships in the city life has been substantially effective on the difference between genders. Among what the interviewees trust most in Adiyaman, family ranks first with a rate of 40.8% whereas it is followed by relatives with 23%. One of the situations that draws attention in the research is that 19% of the respondents state that they trust nobody. Although migrants come from a traditional type of social structure, some sort of relationships which emerged from this structure tend to weaken.



One of the criteria of being a modern urban dweller is to follow mass media. Regarding interviewees' habit of reading papers, results are as follows: The rate of migrants never reading papers is 56% and the rate of irregular readers is 27.7% while it is 16.3% for regular readers. These data reveal that the habit of reading papers, an indication of social consciousness and sensibility in the urban life, is very low. Moreover, 88% of them state that they haven't gone to any socio-cultural activities such as going to the cinema, theatre and concert. Concerning what they wish most from the future, a good job (27%), income/social security (21.4%) and health (21.2) are among the leading answers of the interviewees. These wishes show that the factors which brought the migrants to the city are not met satisfactorily and they still keep being alive.

## **7. Conclusion**

Migration is one of the dynamic elements in societies' life. Internal migration, one of the social movements of population, takes place from one settlement to another in a country. The internal mass migrations of modern times have occurred depending on industrialization. Different from industrialization in the West, the internal migrations in Turkey result from push factors that were formed by changes in rural areas. Especially the period between 1950 and 1980 is the time when the workforce in the rural areas flocked to the cities. Adiyaman, located in the Southeastern, one of the underdeveloped regions of Turkey, had a structure whose main source of income was agricultural production (especially tobacco) for many years. However, the neoliberal policies that were put in practice in 1980s and speeded up in 1990s changed this structure and triggered the migration into and out of the city. New neighbourhoods began to emerge in the periphery of the city centre as the migrants left their settlements mostly because they found it difficult to earn their living. The problems encountered before migration were transferred to the city and also new ones were added to the existing problems in the city life in the period during which rapid and irregular urbanization took place. The poor masses that migrated to the cities were subject to unemployment or unguaranteed jobs with low wages. Furthermore, migrants also represent a population of people who struggle to lead their life in suburban neighbourhoods with substantially insufficient infrastructure services and integrate with the city life along with problems of unemployment and poverty. Looking into this population, it is revealed that women mostly stay as family workers without payment, their education level is low and their relation with the city is rather limited; in other words, they compose a disadvantaged group. To conclude, the main cause of this much rapid internal migration is macro-level policies and we need multi-dimensional macro- and micro-level policies in order to solve the problems caused by migration. The policies concerning solution of the problems of migrants and aiming a good integration should be made taking into account the economic, social, cultural and spatial dimensions. If not, it seems impossible to find permanent and realistic solutions to the existing problems.

## **References**

- Akan, Y. & Arslan, İ. (2008). Göç ekonomisi. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Akgür, Z. G. (1997). Türkiye'de kırsal kesimden kente göç ve bölgeler arası dengesizlik (1970-1993). Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Castles, S. & Miller, M. J. (2008). Göçler çağı modern dünyada uluslararası göç hareketleri. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayını.
- Çağlayan, S. (2011). Kent sosyolojisi. F. Güneş (Ed.), Göç kavramı ve kuramları (pp. 84-115). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayını.
- Çakır, S. (2011). Geleneksel türk kültüründe göç ve toplumsal değişme. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 24, 129-142.
- DİE Tebliği (1997). 1985-1990 sayımları arası dönemlerde Türkiye'de iç göçler (pp. 39-61.). Toplum ve göç, II. ulusal sosyoloji kongresi. Ankara: DİE Matbaası.
- Doğan, A.E. (2002). Yeni bir uluslararası göç dalgasının eşliğinde: dünya kentlerine göç. A. A. Dikmen (Ed.), Kentleşme, göç ve yoksulluk (pp. 19-53). Ankara: İmaj Yayıncılık.
- Erjem, Y. (2009). Mersin'de göç kentleşme ve sosyal problemler. Mersin: Mersin Valiliği Yayınları.
- Erkan, R. (2005). Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi'nin sosyal yapısı ve değişme eğilimleri. Ankara: Kalan Yayınevi.
- Ertürk, H. & Sam, N. (2009). Kent ekonomisi. Bursa: Ekin Yayıncılık.
- Faist, T. (2003). Uluslararası göç ve ulusaşırı toplumsal alanlar. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- Fichter, J. (2004). Sosyoloji nedir?. Ankara: Anı Kitabevi.

- Güneş, F. (2009). Kentleşme, N. Suğur (Ed.), Sosyolojiye giriş (pp. 244-267). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayını.
- İçduygu, A. & Ünal, T. (1998a). Türkiye’de İçgöç ve İçgöçün İşçi Hareketine Etkisi, A. İçduygu, İ. Sirkeci & İ. Aydınğün (Eds.), Türkiye’de İçgöçler (pp. 207-244). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- İçduygu, A. & Ünal, T. (1998b). Türkiye’de içgöç: sorunsal alanları ve araştırma yöntemleri, A. İçduygu, İ. Sirkeci & İ. Aydınğün (Eds.), Türkiye’de İçgöçler (pp. 38-55). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- Jackson, J. A. (1986). Migration, London: Longman.
- Jansen, C.J. (1970). Migration: A Sociological Problem. C.j. Jansen (Eds.), In Readings in the sociology of migration (pp. 3-35). Oxford: Permagon.
- Kalça, A. (1999). Sanayileşme temeline dayanmayan şehirleşme ve kayıtdışıİstihdam,İ. Öztürk (Ed.), Kent Yönetimi ve Çevre Politikaları (Sempozyum) (pp. 124-134).İstanbul: İstaç Yayınları.
- Kaygalak, S. (2001). Yeni kentsel yoksulluk, göç ve yoksulluğun mekânsal yoğunlaşması: Mersin / demirtaş mahallesi örneği, Praksis Dergisi, 2, 124-172.
- Keleş, R. (1998). Kentbilim terimleri sözlüğü. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Keleş, R. (2008). Kentleşme politikası. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Kıray, M. (2007). Kentleşme Yazıları. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- Macionis, J. (2012). Sosyoloji. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Marshall, G. (1999). Sosyoloji sözlüğü. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Meydan Larousse Ansiklopedisi (1971). Cilt: 5. İstanbul: Meydan Yayınevi.
- Ozankaya, Ö. (1995). Temel toplumbilim terimleri sözlüğü. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Ozankaya, Ö. (1996). Toplumbilim. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Özer, İ. (2004). Kentleşme kentleşme ve kentsel değişme. Bursa: Ekin Yayınevi.
- Öztürk, M. (2007). Türkiye’de iç göçe katılanların kent yaşamına ve kentsel emek piyasalarına etkileri, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları Dergisi, 52, 246-264.
- Pazarlıoğlu, V. (2007). İzmir örneğinde iç göçün ekonometrik analizi. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Yayını.
- Sencer, Y. (1979). Türkiye’de kentleşme. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Sezal, İ. (1992), Şehirleşme. İstanbul: Ağaç Yayıncılık.
- TDK (1998). Türkçe Sözlük. 1. Cilt. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Tekeli, İ. (2008). Göç ve ötesi. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- TÜİK (2008). İstatistik göstergeler 1923-2007, Ankara: Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu Matbaası.
- TÜİK (2012). Seçilmiş göstergelerle Adıyaman. Ankara: Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu Matbaası.
- Tümer E. & Özgüç, N. (2012). Beşeri Coğrafya İnsan. Kültür. Mekan. İstanbul: Çantay Kitabevi.
- Ulukan, U. (2009). Türkiye tarımında yapısal dönüşüm ve özleşmeli çiftçilik: Bursa örneği. İstanbul: Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı.
- Unat, N. A. (2006). Bitmeyen göç konuk işçilikten-uluslararası yurttaşlığa. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayını.
- Uznay, F. (2014). Türkiye’de Sarmalılık Kıyılmış Tütün Üretimi ve Ticareti, Sorunları ve Çözüm Yolları Adıyaman İli Örneği. İzmir: Meta Basım.
- Tezcan, Tolga. (2011). Gebze "küçük türkiye’nin göç serüveni". İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayını.
- Toksöz, G. (2006). Uluslararası emek göçü. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayını.
- Yalçın, Cemal (2004). Göç sosyolojisi. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- <http://www.adiyaman.gov.tr/AdiyamanIlimiz.aspx?GrupId=9>