



Selcuk Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences

Selçuk Tarım ve Gıda Bilimleri Dergisi

A Research on The Tendency of Re-Migration to Rural Area: A Case Study of Karatay District in Konya Province (Turkey)

Zukal KARAKAYACI^{1,*}, Cennet OĞUZ¹, Ayşe ÖZ¹

¹Selçuk University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Economics, Konya, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received date: 15.10.2018

Accepted date: 12.12.2018

Keywords:

Rural Migration
Sustainability
Development
Agriculture.

ABSTRACT

Migration from villages to cities is an extremely important factor in terms of social, cultural and economic development of the countries, which significantly affects the agricultural sector. On the other hand, the migration and population growth have begun to restrict the living areas in the cities, and it is seen that people tend to re-migrate to the villages. Within this scope, it was aimed to determine the factors affecting people to migrate, the tendency to re-migrate to village. In the study, people who had spent their previous life in the villages and had a tie (house, land etc.) with their village were taken into consideration. The population interval was enlarged in order to reach the example according to the desired interval, assuming that all the people living in the city did not have villages, and Karatay district of Konya province was determined as the research area. In the study, the criterion of "having been migrated from village to city" was taken into consideration. Sample number was calculated as 60 surveys. According to the results of the research, these households earned income from farming before migrating to the city. The most important factors of coming to the city were financial difficulties, childrens' education and unemployment. The most important feature of the examined households is that they have been continued on agricultural activities by going to their villages. Raising the welfare and providing the livability of the rural areas which are the source of agricultural sector indispensable for county's economy, return to rural areas from urban areas will make possible.

1. Introduction

The concept of migration has become a topic that has been very popular in Turkey and in the World in recent years. Migration can be defined as a universal event which people move from one place to another place due to economic, social, political and cultural reasons (Koçak and Terzi, 2012; Gümüş et al., 2013). Urbanization has accelerated in Turkey in the last 50 years. Definitely, this situation has become an important indicator for urbanization. This process is seen not only in Turkey but also all developing countries. The most explicit feature of social change in all countries in Asia, Africa and South America is the urbanization movement (Tezcan, 1988). The general characteristics of settlements in all over the world have changed by the result of rural migration. The rural migration leads to the acceleration of the urbanization process, the increase of the urban population, the formed of modern cities, and the great socio-economic change of the world when considered as a whole (Güreşçi, 2009).

The rapid development of cities and the increase of new job opportunities have led to the dense population movement from villages to cities. There are many reasons such as the lack of education, the inaccessibility of health services, the lack of infrastructure services in villages and low turnover rate of the land. One of the basic reasons for migration is to have job opportunities providing to receive the cash in cities instead of the labor of people in villages. The existing possibilities of the cities about meeting job opportunities are an attractive feature of cities. On the other hand, it has caused to acquire qualification as "megacity- metropolitan city" by means of increasing population and growing cities by providing opportunity for opening up new settlement areas in order to supply housing need to people migrated. Also, the force that cities have more amenities than rural area such as education, health and infrastructure services has people pushed to urbanization. The fact that the job opportunities in cities are high is a major reason that attracts to the cities the people. Migration emerging

* Sorumlu yazar email: zkarakayaci@gmail.com

with these reasons has caused many negative effects on the urban in Turkey. Firstly, compliance problem has occurred for people migrated from villages to the cities and, this situation has caused that the structures of cities have deteriorated. Problems such as squatting, infrastructural inadequacy, air and noise pollution have arisen (Özdemir, 2012).

The population increase due to migration has caused many problems, because the cities have more people than they can provide services. After a while, cities have begun to put pressure on people by losing their attractive features. People who have reached a particular position and savings entered the process of normalization, because the living in cities is not luxury for them anymore. This situation is especially related to people connected with village. Therefore, in recent years, people begin to prefer places away from the pressure and noise of the cities. This situation is especially seen people over 50 years of age.

Migration from villages to cities is an important factor in terms of social, cultural and economic development of the countries, this situation affect considerably the agricultural sector. On the other hand, the increase of population and migration has begun to restrict the living spaces in the cities. It is seen that people have tend to remigration to villages due to the life challenges such as noise pollution, environmental pollution and lack of livelihood.

The study aims to analyze the internal migration from urban to rural, determine the attitudes and behaviors of the households on the tendency of remigration, determine the desire of remigration to village of people who migrated from village to city before.

2. Material And Method

In this study, people who spent their previous life in villages and have relation with village (House, land etc.) were considered. Assuming that all people living in the city do not have villages, the population range was enlarged in order to reach the sample according to the desired criteria and Karatay district of Konya was determined as the research area. A five-point Likert scale was used to evaluate the results of the study.

In the determination of people to be surveyed, Konya Governorship records were taken account by considering the population criteria. According to these records, the population of Karatay District was 308 983.

In the study, the criterion of “households migrated from villages to city” was taken into consideration. The Unclustered Sample Random Sampling Method was used for determining the sample size.

$$n = \frac{N * (p * q)}{(N - 1) * D^2 + p * q}$$

n= Sample Size

N= Population Size

p= Likelihood ratio of unit examined in population (0,5)

q= 1-p (0,5)

$$D^2 = \frac{d}{t}$$

d= Acceptable error margin

t= table value for the confidence interval

The population of Karatay District was the population of the study. The sample size was determined as 60 with a confidence limit of 99% and error of 10% by taking into account the fact that the households were related to village.

3. Phenomenon of Migration and Migration in the World

International Organization for Migration (IOM) defines migration as change place by moving across an international border or within a state. It is the population movements that people change place regardless of what time, structure, and reason. This includes refugees, displaced people and economic migrants (Şahin et al., 2013).

People make evaluation such as the cost-benefit analysis when they decide on migration. It is compared with the negative characteristics of the place where people located which defines as the driving factor and the positive factors of the place where people gone which defines as the attracting factors. The individual decides to immigrate, if the expected benefit of migration is above the cost of staying place of person (Pazarlıoğlu, 2007).

The Types of Migration

There are many types and subheadings in terms of the area examined, the location, the way of development, while technically, there is divided into as internal migration and external migration according to the aspect of the movement of migration (Özdemir, 2008). Other classifications are international migration, obligatory migration and voluntary migration (Özyakışır, 2012).

4. Internal Migration In Turkey

Internal migration is defined as the movement of change place executed between the provinces, the regions and sub-settlements within the borders of the country. Starting in the 1950s, dating back to the 1908s industrialization and urbanization process have introduced the concept of internal migration in Turkey. In the 1950s, the changes living because of reasons such as the population growth in the rural area, the mechanization in agriculture, sharing of lands through inheritance led to the unemployment and not earn a living with insufficient land for a large population in rural

area, and thus it has triggered the migration from rural to urban areas (Yenigül, 2005).

4.1. The Main Causes and Consequences of Internal Migration in Turkey

The main cause of internal migration in Turkey; the existence of inter-zonal and intra-regional development difference and the fact that this existence has been going on for many years. Considering the historical development of internal migration in Turkey, the changes are clearly observed according to the years. In Turkey, the number of the province has risen 81 and the rate of urban population has risen 75% in 2010, when the number of it was 63 and the rate was 18% in 1950. The rate of urban population continues to increase (Anonymous, 2014a).

In Turkey, internal migration, which is concentrated from the rural to the cities, caused unplanned growth of the cities, to occur many social and economic problems and has developed in the form of urban agglomeration. Population movements are followed more clearly on the regions continuously received migration and the regions continuously given migration. Eastern Anatolia, Southeastern Anatolia and Black Sea Regions are continuously the sending migration regions, while Mediterranean, Marmara and Western Anatolia Regions are continuously the receiving migration regions. Since the main reason for internal migration is economic factors, it has been seen the internal migration movement from the regions where employment opportunities are scarce to the regions where employment opportunities are more (Anonymous, 2014b).

4.1.1. Economic Causes

The main economic indicative of migration movements are income and employment. Therefore, the migration movements arise from the underdeveloped places towards the developed places in terms of economic (Çelik, 2007). In the context, the underlying causes of migration are especially the income inequalities and the problems about employment. Because, better jobs and higher wage opportunities play an important role in the migration decisions of individuals. In a report published in 2010, it was indicated that the most important factors migrating 61% of people from Mexico to the USA were economic opportunities, high wages and more job opportunities (Özyakışır, 2012).

4.1.2. Demographic, Social and Cultural Causes

The dimensions of migration that emerged based on the social and cultural structure can be handled especially the population structure, education and social fabric in the context of social policy (Taşcı, 2009). These social fabrics are the expectation of extended families from migration, the improvements of education and health conditions of children, the wishes of women about comfortable urban life by utilizing the large opportunities, and the expectation that they will

grow their children on better conditions (Özyakışır, 2013).

4.1.3. Politic and Other Causes

The one of the main causes of migration is originated from political/military. Generally, there are political causes arisen from wars, closely related to the phenomenon of "terror" and sometimes manifest itself with political developments (Taşcı, 2009).

The main determinant of population movements in the country is the migration from city to city because of inequality distribution of economic and social developments among cities, and accordingly the concentration of population in cities has increasingly continued. As a matter of fact, the rate of the population in cities increased to 65% in 2000, it reached to 76% in 2010 (Başar, 2015).

4.2. Migration Status in Konya

By year of 2017, the population of Konya is 2.180.149 and the population density is 53 person per square kilometer. In the period of 2016-2017, in-migration of Konya was 53 007, and out-migration of Konya was 56 594. In this case, Konya net migration was -3587, and rate of net migration was ‰ -1.6. The provinces where Konya has in-migration and out-migration respectively are Ankara, İstanbul, Antalya, İzmir and Karaman. Having studied the migration status by age group, it is seen that the highest age group of the total migrating to Konya is in the 15-19 age group with 23.6%. The most age group of the total migrating from Konya is in the 20-24 age group with 30.9% (TSI, 2017).

5. Finding Research And Discussion

According to the findings obtained as a result of the study; there are 327 people living in 60 households examined in Karatay District. Survey study was conducted with 60 people.

5.1. Opinions of Households about Migration from Urban to Rural (Remigration)

According to the information obtained from the surveyed 60 households, all of the families lived in the villages before coming to the city, and the more than half of them lived in the villages where connected to Altınekin District of Konya. They earned a livelihood from farming before coming to the city. The main causes of migration to the city are lack of livelihood, education of children and unemployment. The most important feature of the surveyed households is that they still go to the villages and continue farming. This means that people do not break off the relation with their villages. In the study, this was taken into account as a criterion and the tendency of remigration to the villages was investigated.

Table 1
Migration Time of Households Surveyed

Years	Number	%
2000 and before	45	75
2001-2006	5	8,33
2006-2010	8	13,33
2011-2016	2	3,33
TOTAL	60	100

It can be clearly seen at table that the migration wave from villages to Karatay District started seriously before 2000. 75% of the households surveyed migrated from villages in 2000 and the previous years and settled in Konya. It was determined that the earliest migration from village to city was in 1965. 13% of the households settled in the city center between 2006 and 2010.

Table 2
Location where the Households Surveyed came from

	Number	%
Village	50	83,33
District	5	8,33
Another City	5	8,33
TOTAL	60	100

83% of the households surveyed migrated from the villages in Altnekin District of Konya Province and settled in Karatay District which is the center of Konya. 8% of them migrated from the villages of other cities.

Table 3
The Causes of Migration from the Villages of the Households Surveyed

	Number	%
Job	24	34,29
Education	17	24,29
Health	1	1,43
Marriage	1	1,43
Attractiveness of the city	7	10
Lack of Livelihood	20	29
TOTAL	70*	100

* As more than one option is checked, it may be more than the number of participants.

It was determined that the households surveyed had to leave from their villages and settled to the city center due to many causes. In this study, it was found that 34% of the families settled to the city because of getting a job, 29% of them because of having lack of livelihood and 24% of them because of education of their children. The remaining 10% migrated due to have attractive of the city and live a comfortable life in the city.

Table 4
Income Sources of The Households before Migration

	Number	%
Farmer	53	88,33
Public Servant	1	1,67
Employee	2	3,33
Other	4	6,67
TOTAL	60	100

The families involved in the survey had provided their livelihoods in different ways in the villages before they settled to the city. According to the survey results, 88% of the families earned a livelihood from farming, 6% of them provided for other ways (worker etc.) and 3% of them worked in the lands of other farmers.

Table 5
Ownership Situation of Housing Lived of the Households Surveyed

	Number	%
Householder	47	78,33
Tenant	13	21,67
Public Housing	0	0
Other	0	0
TOTAL	60	100

It is understood from the distribution on the table 5 that the most of the families live in their own houses. Being a house is very important for city life. The fact that people have their own houses in the city puts away them from their villages and more connects to the cities. According to the finding of the study, 78% of the families own to the house, and 22% of them live their houses as tenants.

Table 6
The Situation of the Households Going to Their Hometown

	Number	%
Yes	57	96,61
No	2	3,39
TOTAL	59	100

97% of the families are still in contact with their hometown. This situation shows that they have not completely broken connection with their villages.

Table 7
Reasons for Going to Their Villages of the Households

	Number	%
For Holiday	1	1,75
For Visiting	20	35,09
Other	36	63,16
TOTAL	57	100

The reasons for going to the villages of the families are on the purpose of holiday, visiting and other (agricultural activities etc.). It was determined that the highest rate about the reasons for going to their villages was agricultural activities with 63.13%. These people spend some months of the year, especially in summer by engaging in agricultural activities in their villages, and

they are in the city because of lack of livelihood in residual time of the year. The main reason for lack of livelihood is that they cannot provide their livelihood with their agricultural income.

Table 8
Land Assets in the Villages of the Households Surveyed

	Number	%
Yes	50	83,33
No	10	16,67
TOTAL	60	100

83% of the households have land in their villages. This situation is considered as an effective factor about the desire to return to their villages.

Table 9
Land Size of the Households Surveyed

	Number	%
Less than 30 decares	4	8,0
31-50 decares	2	4,0
51-100 decares	10	20,0
101 decares and more	34	68,0
TOTAL	50	100

There are land size of the households surveyed in table 9. 68% of the households have land more than 100 decares in their villages. 20% of them have land between 50-100 decares. According to these results, the lands of the people in their villages are big enough to be not underestimated. This means that people do not give up their land and do not want to leave empty. However, they have settled and found additional work in the city, because their income is not sufficient for

Table 12
Causes of Loving in the Villages of the Households

	1	2	3	4	5	Total	General Average
Clean and healthy air	-	-	-	1	57	58	4,98
Natural and healthy food	-	1	-	-	57	58	4,95
Reliable neighborhood relationships	-	-	1	4	53	58	4,90
To be more lively local custom	-	2	1	7	48	58	4,74
Rural life is cheap	2	5	-	-	51	58	4,60
Families are crowded and more fun	5	2	1	8	42	58	4,38
Pressure and noise of the cities are not in villages	-	1	-	-	57	58	4,95
In touch with nature	-	-	-	-	58	58	5
To be engaged in farming	1	1	1	2	53	58	4,81
To become stronger family relationships	-	-	-	3	55	58	4,95

Note: Scale 1:Absolutely disagree, 2:Disagree, 3:No idea, 4:Agree, 5:Absolutely agree .

The households stated that they loved the rural life more than the city because of some reasons such as the clean air, natural and healthy food, reliable neighborhood relations, being not the pressure and noise of the city, engaging in farming.

their subsistence in the villages. Therefore, there was began to be ignored the agricultural production in time, because of inadequate of the agricultural income. This leads to decrease productivity, since there are not sufficiently dealt with the lands. People tend to abandon agricultural activities because of decreasing productivity.

Table 10
Land Operation Situation of the Households Surveyed

	Number	%
Themself Operates	36	72,0
Relationship Operates	4	8,0
Rented	7	14,0
Land is Empty	3	6,0
TOTAL	50	100

72% of the households have land in their villages have operated their lands themselves. 14% of them are renting their lands.

Table 11
Loving Situation Rural Life of the Households Surveyed

	Number	%
Yes	57	95
No	3	5
TOTAL	60	100

It was determined that 95% of the households have loved in rural life. They think that there was not place for living elsewhere in villages if there was not the lack of livelihood in there. Because rural life is very important in terms of healthy life. They stayed in the city because of necessity.

Table 13
Request to Return to Their Villages of the Households Surveyed

	Number	%
Yes	38	63,33
No	22	36,67
TOTAL	60	100

37% of the households indicated that the most important reasons of reluctant about remigration to the villages were education, health and income. 63% of them said that they would like to return immediately if they get enough income from agricultural production.

In a study carried out in Istanbul, 67.7% of the respondents did not want to return to their villages, 21.8% of them wanted to return and 10.5% of them were not sure about returning (Özyakışır, 2012).

Table 14
Causes for Returning to the Villages of the Households Surveyed

	1	2	3	4	5	Total	General Average
To escape from the noise of the city	-	-	-	-	38	38	3,17
Their children are growing	3	-	2	7	24	36	2,62
He or his wife is retired	4	-	4	-	18	26	1,77
Not adapting to urban life	2	2	3	1	27	35	2,57
For healthy life	-	-	-	-	35	35	2,92
For engaging agricultural activities	-	1	-	-	36	37	3,03
For getting away from environmental pollution	-	-	-	1	36	37	3,07
To keep family home	-	-	-	3	36	39	3,2

Note: Scale 1: Absolutely disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: No idea, 4: Agree, 5: Absolutely agree .

It was determined that the households wanted to return to their villages owing to escape from the noise of the city, to not adapt to the urban life, to get away from environmental pollution, to keep family home and to engage in agricultural activities, but they obligated to go to the city for addition job, because the agricultural income was not enough for their livelihood.

Table 15
Return Period to Their Villages of the Households Surveyed

	Number	%
Soon	22	55
After 3 years	6	15
After 5 years	1	2,5
After 10 years	11	27,5
TOTAL	40	100

55% of the households who request to return to their villages want to remigration immediately if sufficient conditions are provided in the villages. 28% of them declared that they want to go to their villages 10 years later and want to live in there.

6. Results and Suggestions

According to the data obtained from 60 households surveyed, all of the families lived in the villages before coming to the city and more than half of them resided in the villages in Altınekin District of Konya. These households provided from agricultural production before coming to the city. At the beginning of the causes of coming to the city are lack of livelihood, children's education and unemployment. The most important feature of these households is that they still go to their villages and continue farming. This means that people do not break off the relation with their villages. In the study, this was taken into account as a criterion and the tendency of remigration to the villages was investigated. It was determined that there was a serious migra-

tion wave from the villages to the center of Karatay District especially from before 2000.

Rural migration leads to occur the modern cities, increase the urban population, accelerate the industrialization process, and when considering as a whole, a great socio-economic change of the world (Güreşçi, 2009).

It is seem that Turkey population which steady increase from 1950 until today have migrated to specific regions and provinces because of especially economic reasons and social, cultural, politic reasons. It is a known fact that the main reason of the migration movements from underdevelopment regions to developed regions is the regional development disparities. This difference can sometimes be regarded as one of the important consequences of migration and sometimes as a cause of migration.

The general characteristics of settlements have changed as a result of rural migration all over the world.

Although it is not possible to completely eliminate the fact of regional development disparity, it can be solved this problem with the policies to be made based on provincial and regional. One of the most effective ways remove the regional or province development disparity is to prioritize the characteristic features of region or province and to make investments in terms of these features.

It should be provided input support to the land owners such as feed, seed and diesel in the regions where agriculture and livestock are the main sources of income. Nowadays, these inputs which are necessary for agricultural production is nearly the same the income obtained at the end of production. Therefore, there do not stay profit in the hands of the farmers. For this reason, the support policies for farmers should be better analyzed and carried out in order that the farmers

make profit and do not leave their villages. It will be inevitable to leave the self-sufficient position and dependent on outside for every product, if the farmers leave their villages and settle to the city, not engage in farming. Remigration will provide an important contribution to the evaluation of one of Turkey's most important problems that unused lands. For this purpose, it is necessary to develop policies to encourage people for migrating to rural areas. The conditions should be provided for people to live within welfare in rural areas.

7. References

- Aksoy, Z., (2012). Uluslararası Göç ve Kültürlerarası İletişim. Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 5(20) s.292-303.
- Anonim, (2014a). Ankara Göç Analizi. Ankara Kalkınma Ajansı. Ankara.
- Anonim, (2014b). Onuncu Kalkınma Planı (2014-2018). Göç Özel İhtisas Komisyon Raporu. Kalkınma Bakanlığı . Ankara.
- Başar, Y., (2015). Türkiye'de İller Bazında İç Göçü Belirleyen Faktörlerin Ekonometrik Analizi: 2008-2013. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ekonometri Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Trabzon. s.39-85.
- Çelik, F. (2007). Türkiye'de İç Göçler;1980-2000. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 22 (1) s.87-109.
- Gümüş, N., İlhan, A., Gülersoy, A.E. (2013). Bir Tersine Göç Örneği: Köprucük Köyü (Vato-Muş), Turkish Studies, 8/6 Spring s.233-261.
- Güreşçi, E., (2009). Kırsal Göç ve Tarım Politikası Arasındaki İlişki. Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (İLKE) Sayı:22, s.51-67.
- Koçak, Y., Terzi, E. (2012). Türkiye'de Göç Olgusu, Göç Edenlerin Kentlere Olan Etkileri ve Çözüm Etkileri. Kafkas Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi (Kafkas University, Journal Of Economics And Administrative Sciences Faculty) Kars, Cilt:3 Sayı:3. S.1-22
- Özdemir, M., (2008). Türkiye'de İç Göç Olgusu ve Çorlu Örneği. Trakya Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Edirne.
- Özdemir, H., (2012). Türkiye'de İç Göçler Üzerine Genel Bir Değerlendirme. Akademik Bakış Dergisi (Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi) İktisat ve Girişimcilik Üniversitesi, Türk Dünyası, Kırgız – Türk Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kırgızistan, Sayı:30.
- Özyakışır, D., (2012). İç Göç Hareketleri ve Geriye (Tersine) Göçün Belirleyicileri: TRA2 Bölgesinden (Ağrı, Kars, Iğdır, Ardahan) İstanbul'a Gerçekleşen Göç Üzerine Bir Saha Araştırması. Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İktisat Anabilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi. Erzurum.
- Özyakışır, D. (2013). Göç, Kuram ve Bölgesel Bir Uygulama . Nobel Akademi Yayıncılık. Yayın No:663, 1.Basım.
- Pazarlıoğlu, M. V., (2007). İzmir Örneğinde İç Göçün Ekonometrik Analizi. Yönetim ve Ekonomi Dergisi. (14) s.1
- Şahin, F., Şahin, H., (2013). 2000-2012 Yılları Arasında TRA2 Bölgesindeki Göçlerin Yönlendirilmesinde Kamu Yatırımları ve Yatırım Teşvik Belgelerinin Önemi. Akademik Yaklaşımlar Dergisi (Journal Of Academic Approaches). Cilt: 4 Sayı:2
- Yenigül, S. B., (2005). Göçün Kent Mekanı Üzerine Etkileri. Gazi Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara. 18(2) s.273-288.
- Taşçı, F., (2009). Bir Sosyal Politika Sorunu Olarak Göç. Kamu-İş: İş Hukuku ve İktisat Dergisi, 10(4) s:177-204.
- Tezcan, M., (1988). Kentten Köye Göç. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 1(22) s.37-42.