İktisat Politikası Araştırmaları Dergisi
Journal of Economic Policy Researches

Research Article   Open Access

Global Migration Dynamics: The Driving Force of Poverty and Connections and the Impact of Demographic Factors

Murat İstekli [1] ✉

[1] Non-affiliated, İstanbul, Türkiye

Abstract

The aim of this research was to investigate the close relationship between worldwide migration patterns and the extent of poverty. In addition to previous research that demonstrated a cause-and-effect relationship between poverty and global migratory movements, this study suggests that poverty is the primary catalyst for global migration. Moreover, it is hypothesized that the intricate web of interactions and connections significantly impacts worldwide migratory patterns. To fulfil the study's goals, a survey was created for completion by foreign migrants living in the chosen nations. The deliberate selection of organizations, institutions, religious buildings, and areas with high concentrations of foreign migrants, together with the choice to conduct the surveys in person, proved to be a notable advantage in this study. The acquired data underwent statistical analysis, revealing the influence of poverty on worldwide migration patterns and other variables that determine migration. The findings revealed that poverty exerts a significant influence on worldwide migratory patterns. Besides poverty, other notable variables that impact worldwide migration patterns include political instability, security concerns, and a dearth of social possibilities. Moreover, factors such as employment opportunities and job-related obligations, marriage and the desire to be with family, and the pursuit of education in more advanced nations also play a significant role in driving global migration patterns.

Global Migration Dynamics: The Driving Force of Poverty and Connections and the Impact of Demographic Factors

The correlation between worldwide migration patterns and poverty is a significant matter that impacts the livelihoods of numerous individuals across the globe. Poverty, defined as the state in which persons lack the income or resources to fulfil their fundamental requirements, is a significant global issue currently being addressed. Migration movements refer to the voluntary or forced movement and resettlement of individuals from one location to another, driven by various factors. Undoubtedly, migration movements stem from several factors, and the choice to migrate is subject to individual variation. Motivations such as pursuing improved employment opportunities, more income, and enhanced quality of life play a significant role in influencing migration choices. Furthermore, an array of additional variables, including environmental circumstances, family reunification, educational and career prospects, instability, armed conflicts, and security concerns, collectively influence migratory patterns.

The correlation between worldwide migratory patterns and poverty is intricate and complicated. There are instances in which poverty serves as a catalyst for migration, as well as instances in which migration intensifies poverty. Studies that examine this subject from this particular angle are commonly found in the literature. The majority of these studies indicate that migration movements do not directly result in poverty. Migration is a deliberate tactic employed by individuals and families to evade poverty and pursue improved economic prospects. Individuals frequently migrate in pursuit of improved employment opportunities, enhanced living standards, and greater access to education and healthcare. However, a series of impediments that they are unable to surmount upon reaching their destination further exacerbate their already critical circumstances. Hence, it is imperative to accurately identify and promptly execute suitable strategies for managing migratory patterns and assimilating migrants, both in the countries they come from and the countries they move to.

The objective of this study is to analyze the correlation between worldwide migration patterns and poverty. For this purpose, a survey covering only international migrants was conducted in selected countries. most surveys were completed through direct personal interaction. If there were difficulties in contacting the participants, the online survey approach was employed. Before the event, we identified the associations, foundations, places of worship, and localities that had a high concentration of international migrants. The use of this identification facilitated the research, which occurred during the COVID-19 era, to be carried out in a more cost-effective and expedited manner. The acquired data underwent analysis. The investigation found that poverty is the predominant factor driving worldwide migration movements. A multitude of factors influence migratory patterns, including but not limited to economic disadvantage, political instability, inadequate security, and a paucity of social opportunities. The significant findings also include migration for employment, family reunion through marriage, and educational pursuits.

Literature Review

This section seeks to investigate multiple research that analyze the intricate correlation between worldwide migration patterns and poverty. Global migratory movements are significant events in human history and are influenced by several variables including economic prospects, political unrest, environmental shifts, and access to social advantages. Migration movements, whether they be within a country or between different countries, including those that are compelled by war or natural disasters, have an impact on the changes in poverty levels in both the places where people leave and the places where they go. To gain a comprehensive

understanding of this complex relationship, it is essential to integrate research findings from several fields such as economics, sociology, geography, and other studies on migration.

Oucho (2002) highlights migration and poverty as among the most pressing global issues. He reproaches his predecessors for insufficiently addressing the matter. Furthermore, he asserts that there is an inadequate comparison of the evidence and discoveries regarding the correlation between the two concepts. Consequently, he asserts that it is impossible to provide policymakers with recommendations that are truly beneficial. This study examines migrant movements and poverty from two viewpoints, considering both their causes and effects. Based on the findings, migrants play a crucial role in driving growth in their home countries by sending and bringing remittances. Oucho emphasizes the need to aggressively resist racism, particularly in this specific direction. The benefits obtained through beneficial advances that alleviate poverty are hindered by xenophobia in the nations of migration, therefore impeding progress.

Adams and Page (2005) generated a novel dataset encompassing 71 developing nations, focusing on international migration, remittances, inequality, and poverty. They subsequently conducted an in-depth examination of the dataset. This work significantly contributes to the existing literature in this regard. The findings indicate that both international migration and remittances have a substantial impact on reducing the extent, intensity, and seriousness of poverty in emerging nations. Based on the research, a 10% rise in international remittances per person from the nations where people migrate to their countries of origin results in a 3.5% decrease in the poverty rate.

According to Skeldon (2008), migrant flows have consistently been a component of development. He is extremely convinced in his notion, to the point where he asserts that international migration is a stage of growth. He supports this assertion with reference to his prior observations. The foundation of Skeldon's observations is mostly based on Ravenstein's pioneering work in migration studies, which asserts that industry, trade, and transportation flourish alongside increasing migratory patterns. Skeldon asserts that there exists a direct correlation between migrant flows and development. This study investigates the significance of migrant movements and their impact on development, assessing its validity. Therefore, there is uncertainty on whether migration movements can extend beyond being a transient phase in the developmental process. Ultimately, the study acknowledges that migration movements are a direct result of global development events. Individuals migrate to developing cultures with the intention of escaping poverty and, if feasible, eradicating it. The report encourages governments to be prepared for these migrations and predicts that development-induced migrations will persist.

Cattaneo (2009) sought to empirically examine the influence of migrant movements on the poverty level of the countries of origin. This study examines the impact of international migration on various income groups within the population, thus indirectly establishing the connection between the decision to migrate and levels of welfare. Furthermore, the study also investigated the correlation between migratory patterns and poverty by analyzing the influence of family and friends on the choice to migrate, with the aim of elucidating the significance of connections. Nevertheless, this investigation produced inconclusive findings as a result of inadequate measures.

Siddiqui (2012) stated that migration models are intricate. Migration, albeit intricate, is a fundamental component of the present-day global economy. Both domestic and global migration have significant effects on individuals and families as well as on the regions and economies of both the place of origin and the destination. Certain consequences contribute to progress, while others result in deprivation. This study conducts a comprehensive analysis of the current body of research to determine the empirical connections between migration and poverty, as well as between migration and development. There is a lack of research on these connections at both the national and international levels. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct

further investigations in order to obtain evidence that can be compared. This study seeks to gather evidence regarding the correlation between migration and development on both national and global scales.

Vargas-Silva et al. (2016) investigated the impact of international migration on poverty in the United Kingdom. The study underscores the pivotal role of migration in understanding poverty. It is asserted that the prevalence of poverty among migrants is typically higher than that observed among the local population. The underlying causes of this phenomenon can be attributed to the prevalence of low-wage employment, the existence of barriers to accessing the labour market, and the inadequacy of social security provisions. The study indicates that migrants' position in the labour market, level of education, and language skills directly influence their economic status and capacity to avoid poverty. Restrictions on access to social assistance for some migrant groups also perpetuate poverty. In particular, newly arrived migrants encounter legal or administrative barriers to accessing social assistance and public services. Housing problems are also a significant contributing factor to the onset and perpetuation of poverty. Migrants often reside in substandard or overcrowded housing, which further intensifies their economic disadvantage. The economic situation of migrants is also contingent upon their level of education and the skills they possess in the labour market. Individuals who have attained higher levels of education are less susceptible to poverty. The development of language skills is also a significant factor in increasing employment opportunities. Considering these findings, the study underscores the necessity for an expansion of programmes designed to equip migrants with language proficiency and vocational abilities. The study posits that strategic interventions for migrants in areas such as access to education, skills development programmes, and provision of appropriate housing can reduce poverty. However, studies on migration and poverty are insufficient. To elaborate further, it is noted that there is a dearth of long-term data to understand the economic mobility of migrants and studies examining the effects of migration policies on different groups at the local and national levels. In conclusion, this study emphasizes that the effects of migration on poverty are complex and that there is a need for further research in this area. The importance of shaping migration policies to promote economic integration and support disadvantaged migrants is also highlighted.

Lee et al. (2021) investigated the potential of mobile banking services to modernize money transfer practices among poor rural households in Bangladesh and their family members who have migrated to urban areas for work. The researchers also examined the extent to which this approach could contribute to poverty reduction. This study evaluated the potential of mobile technologies to reduce rural poverty by transforming traditional money transfer methods. This study is distinguished from other studies in the literature by its simultaneous tracking of households in rural and urban areas and comprehensive measurement of the impact on both the migrant's sending money and the recipients (rural households). One of the study's primary findings is that daily consumption per capita in rural areas increased by 7.5%, accompanied by a decline in the extreme poverty rate. The findings indicate that rural households borrowed less, saved more, and consumed a more nutritious diet. However, migrants exhibited higher saving rates but reported deteriorating health conditions. The study demonstrates that when used effectively, mobile technologies can reinforce rural-urban connections and diminish economic disparities. In comparison to other mobile money transfer studies in Kenya and other locations, this study is one of few to encompass the experiences of both urban and rural remitters within an extremely impoverished sample.

The effects of migration movements on poverty have been the subject of extensive analysis in the general literature. This study, however, focuses on the impact of poverty on migration movements, thereby offering a novel contribution to the field. The purpose of this literature review is to provide insights into the intricate relationship between migratory flows and poverty, aiming to inspire policies that empower communities and foster fair socio-economic advancement.

Material and Methodology

During the design phase of the study, the research question *"What is the correlation between poverty and global migration movements?"* had developed and evolved based on previous research and experiences over the years. Furthermore, this study also provides an opportunity to address the research question "What is the correlation between connections and global migration movements?" which is another area of interest. We were prompted to explore the subject from a fresh perspective due to the numerous studies in the literature that presented opposing findings. The study aimed to find out the impact of poverty on migration fluctuations towards European countries, which were previously identified based on specific criteria. This study is the first investigation that concentrates on the chosen European countries, making it a one-of-a-kind study.

The study's theoretical framework incorporates Ravenstein's Migration Theory, Push-Pull Theory, and Network Theory. Ravenstein's empirical research, titled "Laws of Migration" published in 1885 and 1889, was the first complete theoretical investigation on migration. The aforementioned research, which highlighted economic considerations and distance as the primary determinants of migrant movements, played a pioneering role in shaping subsequent migration studies and ideas. Ravenstein (1889) posited that while migration might be influenced by factors such as high taxes, unfavourable climate, and harsh living conditions, the primary driver of migration is poverty and the aspiration for improved economic circumstances. Ravenstein's initial groundbreaking research, published in 1885, posited that women have a higher propensity for migration than men. In his subsequent study published in 1889, he further proposed that women tend to travel more frequently than men, particularly over shorter distances (Dedeoğlu & Gökmen, 2020).

The study also incorporates the "Push-Pull Theory", a commonly employed framework for elucidating international migration patterns (Dedeoğlu, 2016). This theory, grounded in the concept of push and pull variables influencing migration, seeks to elucidate the choice to move within the framework of human and rational decision-making, while disregarding structural factors. Migration movements are influenced by push factors in the countries or regions where people come from and pull factors in the countries or regions where they go to, as stated in the theory (King, 2012).

The final theory to be examined in relation to understanding the theoretical framework is the "Network Theory" which focuses on the interconnections and relationships among migrants. The thesis posits that knowledge sharing and direct experience serve as a guide for migrants and those who aspire to migrate. Aspiring migrants gain advantages from those who have already migrated. The networks formed by the initial wave of migrants who travelled to Germany in the 1960s and those who aspired to migrate later serve as a compelling example that bolsters the claims of this theory (Abadan-Unat, 2006).

This work is classified as basic research and falls under the category of explanatory research. A data-driven quantitative research methodology was employed. Quantitative research can employ various research designs. This study used a survey research design. Furthermore, there exist numerous categories of survey research. The methodology employed in this study is a relational survey. The primary instrument employed for data collection in such studies is the questionnaire. During this study, the participants were not asked to provide any personal information when they were interviewed in person or when they completed the surveys online. The questionnaire consisted of identical questions for all the research sites. There exist two types of questions: open-ended and closed-ended. The respondents' level of seriousness in answering the questions was assessed using specific questions. Consequently, the questionnaires of participants who provided inconsistent responses were eliminated from the assessment. Furthermore, questionnaire forms were meticulously crafted in both physical and digital formats for all research locations.

The study was subject to some constraints based on specific criteria. The constraints relate to the geographical scope of Europe and the demographic category of overseas migrants. Hence, the target population for this study comprises all global migrants. Defining the public is a relatively simple task, but effectively reaching and engaging with them can be challenging and often unattainable (Karasar, 2010). Hence, the study focuses on Europe as the research population due to its status as the global leader in terms of hosting the highest number of foreign migrants, as reported by the United Nations (2019). Germany and the United Kingdom, which are the primary and secondary countries of significance within Europe, with Turkey, were chosen. To establish the assertion that there exists a correlation between poverty and migratory patterns, which is the primary objective of this research, the individual must initially be an international migrant. In the context of this study, migrants refer to those who move from one country to another, either by choice or by force, with or without legal authorization. Furthermore, it is crucial for this study that the individual has firsthand experience of both the migration journey and the decision-making process involved in migrating. Hence, potential participants were queried regarding their migrant status, their adherence to the study's definition of migrant, and their accountability for the decision to migrate. This is a prerequisite of the Network Theory, one of the foundational theories upon which the study is grounded. The primary aim of this study is to determine whether the decision-making process of the responsible individual is influenced by the prior migration and relationships with others who have migrated to the same country. Furthermore, the study only included the individual who held the responsibility for making migration decisions within a family of migrants.

The United Nations (UN) reports that the global population of international migrants has risen from 153 million in 1990 to almost 272 million in 2019. Furthermore, Europe is the geographical area that accommodates the most quantity of individuals who have migrated internationally, totaling around 82 million individuals (United Nations, 2019). These statistics were used to identify that the focus of this study is the European continent. According to the UN, when migration patterns are examined from a gender perspective, women constitute just under half of all international migrants, accounting for around 48% worldwide. Nevertheless, the percentage of female migrants surpasses that of male migrants in continental Europe, accounting for 51.4% (United Nations, 2019). The poll assessed the number of male and female international migrant participants by considering the proportion of male and female international migrants in Europe. The United Nations (2019) reported that in 2019, Europe had a total of 82,304,539 international migrants. Among these, 28,561,085 were represented in Europe, with Germany hosting 13,132,146 migrants, the United Kingdom hosting 9,552,110 migrants, and Turkey hosting 5,876,829 migrants. Of the entire amount, Germany accounts for 46%, the United Kingdom for 33%, and Turkey for 21%. The study encompassed 948 surveys. The survey count per country is as follows: Germany performed 423 surveys, the United Kingdom conducted 297 surveys, and Turkey conducted 228 surveys. Nevertheless, a grand total of 192 of these surveys were excluded due to a variety of factors. The survey elimination counts were as follows: 78 in Germany, 47 in the United Kingdom, and 67 in Turkey. The study was conducted using 756 valid questionnaires, with 345 from Germany, 250 from the United Kingdom, and 161 from Turkey. This sample size is considered sufficient for representing the research population. Typically, quantitative social science research can be adequately conducted with a sample size ranging from 30 to 500 participants (Altunışık et al., 2012; Gürbüz & Şahin, 2018). However, these numbers are consistent with the percentiles of the countries' hosting numbers of international migrants in Europe. In Germany, the number 345 represents 46% of the total valid surveys. In the United Kingdom, the number 250 represents 33% of the total valid questionnaires. In Turkey, the number 161 represents 21% of the total valid questionnaires. As previously mentioned, the proportions of the survey population determine the number of male and female international migrants in valid surveys. Europe is home to 40 million male foreign migrants, specifically 7,661, and 42 million female international migrants,

specifically 42,296,878. Male foreign migrants constitute roughly 49% of the total, and female international migrants make up approximately 51% of the total. Out of the 756 surveys done for this study, 386 were given to female international migrants and 370 were given to male international migrants. Out of the 756 questionnaires, which were deemed valid, individuals from 67 distinct nations were included.

The questions were prepared using sources from the literature. The questionnaire draws upon sources such as Todaro (1980), Smith (1988), Milojicic et al. (2000), Hatton (2010), Zachariah and Rajan (2012), Millock (2015), and Rajan, D'sami, and Raj (2017). An attempt was made to pose inquiries that could provide responses to the assertions put forth by the theories upon which the study is founded. As stated by Ravenstein in his Migration theory, an attempt was made to determine whether the factors that compelled the participants of this study to migrate were primarily economic and material in nature. Consequently, the participants were inquired about the primary sources of distress in their life before their migration. The available choices encompassed economic challenges and livelihood difficulties, political factors, education, and health. Furthermore, an additional option labelled "other" was included among the choices to accommodate participants who did not find any of the existing options suitable. In the subsequent question, the participants were queried about whether the option they selected was their motive for relocating. The participants were queried about the Network Theory, a foundational theory of the study. They were asked if they knew anyone who had moved before them and, if so, if their decision to move was influenced by these connections.

Following the previously provided information and research, a survey form consisting of 34 questions was created. A preliminary study was conducted in Turkey, involving 30 participants. The pilot application facilitated the identification of flaws and weaknesses in the questionnaire form, leading to its subsequent revision. After the pilot study was finished, the survey was initially carried out in the United Kingdom in January 2020. Interviews were conducted with international migrants primarily in places including Birmingham, Manchester, Brighton, Eastbourne and Edinburgh, with a focus on London. Following the initial implementation, which spanned roughly 13 days, the survey was relocated to Germany, where it persisted for approximately 10 days. The survey in Germany extended to many cities including Stuttgart, Munich, Ulm, Aalen, and Heidenheim in the southern region. It also covered Frankfurt, Hanover, and Lengerich in the interior, as well as Essen, Düsseldorf, Cologne, Dortmund, Bottrop, Gelsenkirchen, and Oberhausen in the northwest. The survey encompassed the areas inside these cities and their surrounding territories. During the months of February, March, and April 2020, attempts were made to initiate the implementation phase in Turkey. However, the global impact of the COVID-19 pandemic interrupted the progress of the work. In August and September 2020, a second journey to the United Kingdom and Germany was arranged for a duration of 15 days, capitalizing on the reduced impact of the pandemic and the relaxation of travel limitations. The intended number of surveys in the UK and Germany was successfully accomplished due to these subsequent excursions. The Turkey phase was completed during the subsequent time, but with a delay until June 2021.

Notwithstanding the extensive planning, certain issues were discovered throughout the data collection phase. One crucial aspect is that certain participants who fulfilled all the requirements and willingly participated in the study did not approach the survey with the necessary level of seriousness. It was noted that these participants frequently inquired about the duration of the questionnaire shortly after the beginning, expressed curiosity about the purpose of the questions, and requested permission to skip some sections. Upon receiving the questionnaires, all of the respondents' forms were promptly evaluated and thoroughly examined. Most of these questionnaires were not assessed. As previously stated, 192 out of the total 948 questionnaires were excluded due to these specific reasons. Given the aforementioned ideas and observations, the hypotheses developed in this study are as follows:

• H_0: *Poverty is not the most important factor causing migration movements.*

- *H_1: Poverty is the most important factor causing migration movements.*
- *H_0: Connections do not have a positive effect on migration decision-making.*
- *H_1: Connections have a positive effect on migration decision-making.*

Another pertinent idea to address in this section is the notion of relative poverty. Relative poverty, as a concept, encompasses more than just the absence of resources when defining poverty. Relative poverty refers to the extent to which an individual or household meets the society's minimum standard of life. Relative poverty is concerned with the disparities in the allocation of income and welfare, rather than the specific income level of individuals or households. The inability of individuals to attain their desired standard of living within their society or perceiving themselves as lacking it, indicates their relative poverty. The questionnaire used in this study includes several items that assess individuals' perceptions of their own poverty status.

Findings

The study included 756 valid questionnaires, with 370 participants being male and 386 participants being female. Of the total responders, 48.9% were male, while 51.1% were female. Another statistical measure examined in the study was the level of education achieved. There are five categories: illiteracy, elementary, secondary, undergraduate, and graduate. Participants were instructed to indicate the most recent educational level they completed. The survey found that the participants in the migrant movement originated from most 67 nations, most of which are classified as underdeveloped or developing. Another statistical measure examined in the study was the individual's marital status. The number of valid surveys for all categories of descriptive statistics is presented in the relevant sections of this study.

It is essential to assess whether the developed questions accurately gauge the same opinions and if there is a consistent pattern within the scale (Bryman & Cramer, 2005). Reliability tests are used to assess the consistency of the survey data, which is the primary research tool in this context. Reliability coefficients are determined by dividing the variation of the real scores by the variance of the observed scores (Clark-Carter, 1997). When the ratio resulting from the examination is 1, it indicates that there is no measurement error in the analysis process. Conversely, if the ratio approaches 0, it signifies that there are several measurement problems (Ural & Kılıç, 2013). The Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test is used to identify and assess measurement errors.

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient: $\alpha = \frac{k}{k-1}\left[1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} s_i^2}{s_p^2}\right]$

Here, k represents the number of questions in the scale, s_i^2 represents the variance of each question, and s_p^2 represents the overall variance. Cronbach's alpha value is the weighted standardized average of variance obtained by proportioning the sum of the variance of each question to the overall variance. Cronbach's alpha value takes values in the range of 0-1 (Özdamar, 2013).

Table 1

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test Results

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,705	7

The Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test was conducted on the remaining 7 questions in the questionnaire after excluding any questions unrelated to the research problem. The test results indicate an internal consistency value of 0.705. Given that the value exceeds 0.70, it may be concluded that the scale possesses a high degree of reliability. Therefore, the applicable coefficient can be confidently used in social surveys and

the formulation of scientific opinions (Özdamar, 2013). The survey study successfully fulfilled the essential requirements for reliability and internal consistency.

Following the Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test, it was imperative to assess the normal distribution of the data in the study. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test is a statistical test used to assess the conformance of frequency distributions to a certain distribution or any distribution. This test is specifically employed to determine the compatibility between a sample distribution and a theoretical probability distribution or to evaluate the similarity between two sample distributions. Additionally, it is appropriate for use in research with sample sizes exceeding 30 individuals (Özdamar, 2004; Canyürek, 2005).

The null hypothesis H_0 for the 7th question, which assesses the distribution of the gender variable, states that the gender variable is not normally distributed. The probability value associated with this hypothesis is 0.001. The null hypothesis is rejected based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normal distribution test statistic, as it falls below the critical value of 0.05 at a 5% margin of error. The null hypothesis H_0 for the 8th question, which measures the education level variable, states that the education level variable does not follow a normal distribution. The probability value associated with this hypothesis is 0.001. The null hypothesis is rejected based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normal distribution test statistic, as it falls below the critical value of 0.05 at a 5% margin of error. The null hypothesis H_0 for the 11th question, which measures the variable of marital status, states that "The marital status variable does not follow a normal distribution." The probability value associated with this hypothesis is 0.000. The null hypothesis is rejected based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normal distribution test statistic, which is below the critical value of 0.05 at a 5% margin of error. The null hypothesis H_0 of the 18th inquiry, which examines the economic scenario without migration, has a probability value of 0.000 due to the non-normal distribution of the variable. The null hypothesis is rejected based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normal distribution test statistic, which is lower than the critical value of 0.05 at a 5% margin of error. The null hypothesis H_0 for question 24 states that there is no normal distribution of the variable measuring inequality in social rights between immigrants and other citizens in the country of immigration. The probability value associated with this hypothesis is 0.000. Based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normal distribution test statistic, the null hypothesis is rejected with statistical significance, as it falls below the critical value of 0.05 at a 5% margin of error. The null hypothesis H_0 for question 26, which examines the variable representing the most serious problem experienced before migration, states that the distribution of this variable is not normal. The probability value associated with this hypothesis is 0.000. Based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic for normal distribution, the null hypothesis is rejected with statistical significance, as the test statistic is lower than the critical value of 0.05 at a 5% margin of error. The H_0 hypothesis of the 34th question, which examines whether any relatives or relatives have migrated to the country of immigration before the immigrants, states that the variable is not normally distributed. The probability value associated with this hypothesis is 0.000. The null hypothesis is rejected based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normal distribution test statistic, which is lower than the critical value of 0.05 at a 5% margin of error. Based on the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normal distribution test, the null hypothesis that the data follows a normal distribution is rejected with a statistical significance of 5% for all variables. The data exhibit a non-normal distribution. This indicates that nonparametric tests will be used in the subsequent stages of the analysis. The findings of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normal distribution test are succinctly shown in Table 2:

Table 2

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normal Distribution Test Results

Questions	Test Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Probability Value
7. Your gender?	0.347	756	0.001
8. Educational attainment?	0.203	756	0.001
11. Marital status?	0.414	756	0.000
18. How could your financial status have been if you hadn't migrated?	0.490	756	0.000
24. Do you think there is an inequality in social rights between immigrants and other citizens in your country of immigration?	0.478	756	0.000
26. What was the most significant problem you faced in your life before migrating?	0.478	756	0.000
34. Did any of your relatives or acquaintances emigrate to the country you emigrated to before you?	0.435	756	0.000

Based on the statistical definitions used in the study, it was found that the response "It would be worse than it is now" was particularly prominent among the answers given to the 18th question, which asked about the hypothetical economic scenario if the individuals had not relocated. The total number of individuals who reported migrating because of economic challenges and difficulty in sustaining their livelihoods is 618. However, there are 622 individuals who believe that their circumstances would have been more unfavourable if they had not chosen to relocate. Put simply, some individuals travelled for reasons unrelated to poverty yet believed that their economic circumstances would deteriorate if they did not migrate.

The response "No" is particularly notable in the 24th question, which asks whether the respondent believes there is a disparity in social rights between immigrants and other citizens in the country to which they migrated. The total count of those who responded negatively to the inquiry is 653. Hence, the overwhelming majority of migrants reported no discernible inequality that caused them distress in the country of their migration.

The most common response to the question *"What was the primary issue that troubled you prior to migrating?"* in the 26th position of the questionnaire, which aims to address the major hypothesis of the study, is economic and livelihood difficulties, resulting in poverty. A total of 618 respondents provided this response to the given question. Furthermore, all of these individuals explicitly stated that this was their motive for relocating in the subsequent inquiry.

The majority of respondents answered "No" to the 34th question, which inquired whether any of their relatives had previously migrated to the country to which they relocated. Refer to Table 3 for specific information.

Table 3

Statistical Definitions

Questions	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
18. How would your economic situation have been if you had not migrated?	1,1984	1	1	0,45781
24. Do you think that there is an inequality in social rights between immigrants and other citizens in your country of immigration?	1,496	1	1	1,20099
26. What was the biggest problem that bothered you in your life before you migrated?	1,496	1	1	1,20099

Questions	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
34. Have any of your relatives migrated to the country you migrated to before you?	1,6825	2	2	0,4658

Out of the 618 individuals surveyed, the majority identified economic difficulties and a lack of means to support themselves as the primary issues that troubled them before they travelled. Hence, individuals who relocated because of destitution accounted for 81.7% of the overall respondents. The proportion of respondents who migrated for work-related obligations is 5.8%, which corresponds to 44 individuals. There were 9 individuals, who accounted for 1.2% of the total respondents, who migrated because of political instability. The number of respondents who relocated due to marriage was 38, which accounted for 5% of the total respondents. Similarly, the number of respondents who migrated due to education was 37, representing 4.9% of the total respondents. The individuals who travelled because of security concerns were comparable to those who relocated due to political instability. This group is composed of nine individuals, accounting for 1.2% of the overall respondents. Ultimately, only one individual emigrated because of insufficient healthcare services, accounting for a mere 0.1% of the overall participants. The following question 26, the participants were queried about their ability to provide the answer they gave in that question as their rationale for relocating. Each participant unequivocally affirmed that their response to question 26 served as their primary motivation for relocating.

Upon analyzing the responses to question 26 based on gender, it is evident that out of the 370 male participants, 316 of them answered the question as economic concerns and livelihood problems, thus indicating poverty. Furthermore, out of the male participants, 27 individuals identified work-duty as their answer, 6 mentioned political instability, 3 cited marriage, 13 indicated education, and 5 stated securities. The perspective among the female participants is as follows: A total of 302 female participants reported that they migrated because of economic problems and challenges in sustaining their livelihood. Additionally, 17 participants cited work-related obligations as the reason for their migration, while 3 mentioned political instability. Furthermore, 35 participants migrated because of marriage, 24 because of educational opportunities, 4 because of security concerns, and finally, 1 participant migrated because of inadequate health services. The sub-hypotheses on the gender variable are listed below, and the data are presented in Table 4:

- H_0: *There is no correlation between gender and migration due to poverty.*
- H_1: *There is correlation between gender and migration due to poverty.*

Table 4

Table of Frequency for the Question "What was the biggest problem in your life before you migrated?" by Gender

Gender	Economic Hardships	Work	Political Instability	Marriage	Education	Security	Inadequacy of Health Services
Male	316	27	6	3	13	5	0
Female	302	17	3	35	24	4	1
Total	618	44	9	38	37	9	1

The responses to question 26, categorized by educational status among demographic characteristics, are as follows: Out of the respondents who were unable to read, 25 chose the option of economic problems and livelihood problems as their answer to the question, while 2 of them selected political instability. Out of the individuals who completed only primary education, 169 individuals reported facing economic and livelihood difficulties. The remaining responses from primary school graduates included work obligations, chosen by 2 participants, political instability, chosen by 5 participants, marriage, chosen by 3 participants, and security, chosen by 2 participants. Out of the individuals who finished their secondary school, 255

individuals reported that they migrated because of economic and livelihood difficulties. Furthermore, one individual indicated that they relocated as a result of occupational obligations, another person due to the presence of political instability, twelve individuals due to matrimonial commitments, three individuals due to educational pursuits, and four individuals owing to concerns regarding personal safety. Among the undergraduate participants, 161 individuals reported migrating because of economic and livelihood challenges, while 35 individuals migrated for work-related reasons. One person migrated due to political instability, 20 individuals migrated due to marriage, 27 individuals migrated for educational purposes, 3 individuals migrated for security reasons, and 1 person migrated due to inadequate health services. The responses provided by the postgraduate graduates, who constitute the smallest group of participants in the study, are as follows: Out of the 24 participants who have completed postgraduate studies, 8 relocated as a result of poverty stemming from economic and livelihood issues, 6 migrated due to employment obligations, 3 migrated owing to marriage, and 7 migrated for educational reasons. The sub-hypotheses on the education status variable are listed below, and the corresponding data are presented in Table 5:

- H_0: There is no correlation between education level and migration due to poverty.
- H_1: There is correlation between education level and migration due to poverty.

Table 5

Table of Frequency for the Question by Education Level "What are the biggest problem in your life before you migrated?"

Education Level	Economic Hardships	Work	Political Instability	Marriage	Education	Security	Inadequacy of Health Services
Illiterate	25	0	2	0	0	0	0
Elementary	169	2	5	3	0	2	0
Secondary	255	1	1	12	3	4	0
Bachelor	161	35	1	20	27	3	1
Graduate Level	8	6	0	3	7	0	0
Total	618	44	9	38	37	9	1

Among the respondents to the 26th question about marital status, the final demographic variable, 420 married individuals reported that they migrated because of economic and livelihood difficulties. Furthermore, 14 married individuals relocated as a result of employment obligations, 7 due to political unrest, 35 due to marriage, 4 due to educational and security concerns, and 1 due to inadequate healthcare services. Out of the single respondents, only 198 of them migrated because of economic challenges and difficulty in making a living, which is significantly less than that of the married respondents. Out of the individuals who responded, 30 indicated that they migrated because of work obligations, 2 due to political unrest, 3 due to marriage, 33 due to pursuing education, and 5 due to concerns about safety. The sub-hypotheses on the variable of married status are presented below, and the corresponding data are summarized in Table 6:

- H_0: There is no correlation between marital status and migration due to poverty.
- H_1: There is no correlation between marital status and migration due to poverty.

Table 6

Table of Frequency for the Question "What was the biggest problem in your life before you migrated?" by Marital Status

Marital Status	Economic Hardships	Work	Political Instability	Marriage	Education	Security	Inadequacy of Health Services
Married	420	14	7	35	4	4	1
Single	198	30	2	3	33	5	0
Total	618	44	9	38	37	9	1

The Kruskal-Wallis H test was conducted to assess if there is a significant difference in the mean rankings of the poverty scale affecting global migration movements based on gender, education, and marital status variables. The results indicate a significant difference between the poverty-based migration tendency and the mean rankings of gender, education, and marital status variables. Consequently, men are more inclined to move than women due to economic and livelihood challenges. Individuals who had economic hardships and challenges in their livelihoods before migrating are more likely to migrate if they have a secondary education or lower, particularly if they have only completed secondary education. These individuals included almost 73% of the respondents who provided an answer regarding economic challenges and hardships in their lives. Upon analyzing the scenario based on marital status, it is evident that out of the 618 individuals who responded to the question regarding economic and livelihood issues, 420 of them were married, whereas 198 were single. Thus, those who are married are more inclined to migrate if they have economic challenges and difficulty in sustaining their livelihoods, according to the responses of the participants. It is important to highlight that 414 of 420 married respondents who were in poverty responded affirmatively to the question regarding the presence of dependents in the questionnaire. The hypotheses "H_0 : *There is no relationship between the gender variable and poverty-induced migration*", "H_0 : *There is no relationship between education level and poverty-induced migration*", and "H_0 : *There is no relationship between marital status and poverty-induced migration*" have been rejected. The statistical values obtained from the analysis are presented in Table 7:

Table 7

Kruskal-Wallis H Test: Question No. 26 and Correlation Between Demographic Variables

	Value	Degree of Freedom	Probability
Gender			
Kruskal-Wallis H	7,836	1	0,005
Education Level			
Kruskal-Wallis H	120	4	0,001
Marital Status			
Kruskal-Wallis H	22,067	1	0,001

To examine the influence of ties on migration patterns, 240 out of 756 participants responded affirmatively while 516 responded negatively to the question "*Have any of your relatives previously migrated to the country you are planning to migrate to?*" in the questionnaire. The affirmative responses were given by 31.7% of the participants; however, the negative responses were given by 68.3% of the participants. All participants who responded affirmatively indicated that their connections had a beneficial influence on their choice to migrate.

Upon analyzing the responses to the 34th question based on the gender variable, it was discovered that 124 male participants reported having a relative who travelled before them, whereas 116 female participants answered affirmatively to the question. 246 men responded negatively to the question, while 270 women responded negatively. The sub-hypotheses on the gender variable are shown below, and the corresponding data are summarized in Table 8:

- *H_0: There is no correlation between gender and migration due to connections.*
- *H_1: There is correlation between gender and migration due to connections.*

Table 8

Table of Frequency for the Question "Have any of your relatives migrated to the country you are migrating to before you?" by Gender

Gender	Yes	No
Male	124	246
Female	116	270
Total	**240**	**516**

Upon analyzing the 34th item in the questionnaire form, which asks if any of the participants' relatives have migrated to the country they relocated to before them, it was observed that 8 illiterate persons answered affirmatively, while 19 answered negatively. Out of the individuals who completed primary education, 67 responded affirmatively, whereas 114 responded negatively. Out of the individuals who had completed secondary education, 88 individuals responded affirmatively, and 188 individuals responded negatively. Similarly, among the participants who hold a bachelor's degree, 68 individuals opted to answer in the affirmative while 180 individuals chose to answer in the negative. Ultimately, out of the total 24 participants, 9 individuals possessing postgraduate degrees responded affirmatively, while 15 responded negatively. Table 9 presents a concise overview of the data, specifically focusing on the variable of education level.

- H_0: *There is no correlation between educational status and migration due to connections.*
- H_1: *There is correlation between educational status and migration due to connections.*

Table 9
Table of Frequency for the Question "Have any of your relatives migrated to the country you are migrating to before you?" by Educational Status

Educational Status	Yes	No
Illiterate	8	19
Elementary	67	114
Secondary	88	188
Undergraduate	68	180
Graduate	9	15
Total	**240**	**516**

Regarding the marital status variable, which is another and the last demographic factor, 147 of the married respondents answered yes and 338 answered no, while 93 of the single respondents answered yes and 178 answered no. The sub-hypotheses related to the marital status variable are below and the data are summarized in Table 10:

- H_0: *There is no relationship between marital status and migration due to connections.*
- H_1: *There is a relationship between marital status and migration due to connections.*

Table 10
Table of Frequency for the Question "Have any of your relatives migrated to the country you are migrating to before you?" by Marital Status

Marital Status	Yes	No
Married	147	338
Single	93	178
Total	**240**	**516**

The Kruskal-Wallis H test was conducted to assess if there is a significant difference in the mean rankings of the relationship network scale affecting global migration based on gender, education, and marital status variables. The results indicate that there is no significant difference between the relationship between the network-based migration tendency and the mean rankings of gender, education, and marital status

variables. Factors like marital status, educational attainment, or gender have no bearing on the phenomena of migration, which is impacted by the interconnection of relationships. Specifically, there is no correlation between an individual's level of education and the impact of their relatives in the destination country on their desire to migrate. The hypotheses "H_0 : *There is no correlation between gender and migration due to connections*", "H_0 : *There is no correlation between education level and migration due to connections*", and "H_0 : *There is no correlation between marital status and migration due to connections*" have been confirmed. The statistical values obtained from the analysis are succinctly shown in Table 11:

Table 11

Kruskal-Wallis H Test: Question No. 34 and Correlation between Demographic Variables

Gender			
	Value	Degree of Freedom	Probability
Kruskal-Wallis H	1,043	1	0,307
Education Level			
Kruskal-Wallis H	4,882	1	0,300
Marital Status			
Kruskal-Wallis H	1,287	1	0,257

Overall, the study's primary hypothesis, "H_0 : *Poverty is not the primary catalyst for migration movements*" has been disproven. Hence, poverty exerts a significant influence on migration patterns. When examining the issue from a demographic perspective, it becomes evident that male respondents who saw themselves as impoverished before leaving are more susceptible to engaging in migrant movements. Furthermore, it has been discovered that individuals who self-identified as impoverished and indicated this as a motive for migration primarily consist of individuals who have completed secondary education and possess lower levels of education. Ultimately, it was disclosed that the prevailing number of individuals who professed their poverty and relocated due to their financial circumstances was in fact married. Thus, the sub-hypothesis "H_0 : *There is no significant difference between the categories*" is refuted, indicating a considerable distinction between the categories.

In summary, the findings indicate that connections cannot be considered a significant factor driving migration movements. This conclusion is based on the responses obtained from individuals regarding their knowledge of or relationships with people in the countries to which they choose to migrate. Out of the 756 participants, a total of 240, which is equivalent to 31.7%, responded affirmatively to the question. All respondents who answered affirmatively reported that their ties in the country to which they plan to migrate had a beneficial impact on them. Connections play a role in the migration decision-making process and can have a positive influence on the decision to migrate; however, they are not the primary reason for migrant movements.

Conclusions

Due to the significant extent of globalization, the movement of people across borders has become a prominent characteristic of the current day, and there are still numerous aspects that require further investigation. This study has demonstrated that poverty and livelihoods play a pivotal role in stimulating cross-border migratory movements. Furthermore, it highlights that the availability of employment possibilities in host countries serves as a compelling incentive for impoverished individuals seeking to migrate from various parts of the globe. Furthermore, affluent nations are actively recruiting both qualified and unskilled workers to address the challenges posed by demographic changes and labour shortages, in order to sustain their economy. The allure of stable employment, higher pay, and benefits is a key factor in migrants' decisions to

work in this region. Although there are many advantages, migrants often encounter cultural and language obstacles in their new surroundings, which can result in social isolation and estrangement. This can make it challenging for them to maintain good mental health and successfully integrate into society as a whole.

Indeed, it is imperative for host countries to adopt equitable and compassionate migration policies. Establishing legal channels for economic migration, streamlining visa processes, and ensuring safeguards for migrant labourers can mitigate instances of exploitation and violations of human rights. Furthermore, the implementation of measures aimed at establishing cost-effective housing alternatives will facilitate the ability of low-income individuals and families to obtain secure and enduring housing.

Efficient strategies to combat poverty frequently necessitate a thorough and multifaceted approach that considers the distinct difficulties encountered by various communities and locations. Regular assessment and adjustment of these programmes is essential to ensure their efficacy in diminishing poverty eventually. Enacting policies that foster economic growth and job creation directly decrease unemployment rates and an expansion of income prospects for the people. Allocating resources towards education and training initiatives empowers individuals to secure higher-paying employment opportunities and equips them with the necessary knowledge and skills to escape the cycle of poverty. It is crucial to ensure that all sectors of society have access to these programmes. Indeed, this study revealed that a significant proportion of the participants who reported migrating because of poverty exhibited limited educational attainment. According to this study, poverty, economic concerns, and loss of livelihood are identified as the primary drivers of migration movements. Given the circumstances, it is imperative for the authorities to prioritize the adoption and implementation of anti-poverty measures followed by comprehensive and protective migration policies.

Author Details	**Murat İstekli (Dr.)**
	¹ Non-affiliated, İstanbul, Türkiye
	ⓘ 0000-0002-0092-783X ✉ muratistekli55@gmail.com

References

Abadan-Unat, N. (2006). *Bitmeyen Göç: Konuk İşçilikten Ulus Ötesi Yurttaşlığa (2. Basım)*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Adams, R. H. and Page, J. (2005). Do International Migration and Remittances Reduce Poverty in Developing Countries? *World Development*, 33(10), 1645-1669.

Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S., & Yıldırım, E. (2012). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri (7. Basım)*. Sakarya: Sakarya Kitapevi.

Bryman, A. and Cramer, D. (2005). *Quantitative Data Analysis with SPSS 12 and 13: A Guide for Social Scientists*. Routledge.

Cattaneo, C. (2009). International Migration, Brain Drain, and Poverty: A Cross-Country Analysis. *World Economy*, 32(8), 1180-1202.

Clark-Carter, D. (1997). *Doing Quantitative Psychological Research: From Design to Report*. Psychology Press.

Canyürek, E. (2005). *Parametrik Olmayan İstatistiksel Teknikler*. Eskişehir: T.C. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Dedeoğlu, S. (2016). *Türkiye'de Mevsimlik Tarımsal Üretimde Yabancı Göçmen İşçiler Mevcut Durum Raporu: Yoksulluk Nöbetinden Yoksulların Rekabetine*. Ankara: Kalkınma Atölyesi, Altan Matbaası.

Dedeoğlu, S., & Gökmen, Ç. E. (2020). Göç Teorileri, Göçmen Emeği ve Entegrasyon: Kadınların Yeri. *Türkiye'de Göç Araştırmaları*, 18.

Gürbüz, S., & Şahin, F. (2018). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri: Felsefe, Yöntem, Analiz (Gözden Geçirilmiş ve Güncellenmiş 5. Baskı)*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Hatton, T. J. (2010). The Cliometrics of International Migration: A Survey. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 24(5), 941-969.

Karasar, N. (2010). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi (21. Basım)*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

King, R. (2012). Theories and Typologies of Migration: An Overview and A Primer. *Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnics Relations*, 3(12).

Lee, J. N., Morduch, J., Ravindran, S., Shonchoy, A., & Zaman, H. (2021). Poverty and Migration in the Digital Age: Experimental Evidence on Mobile Banking in Bangladesh. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 13(1), 38-71.

Millock, K. (2015). Migration and the Environment. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 7(1), 35-60.

Milojičić, D. S., Douglis, F., Paindavine, Y., Wheeler, R. and Zhou, S. (2000). Process Migration. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 32(3), 241-299.

Oucho, J. O. (2002). The Relationship Between Migration and Poverty in Southern Africa. *In Seminar on Regional Integration, Migration and Poverty, Pretoria* (Vol. 25).

Özdamar, K. (2004). *Paket Programlar ile İstatistiksel Veri Analizi (1. Baskı)*. Eskişehir: Kaan Kitabevi.

Özdamar, K. (2013). *Paket Programlar ile İstatistiksel Veri Analizi: Minitab 16-IBM SPSS 21*. Eskişehir: Nisan Kitabevi.

Rajan, S. I., D'Sami, B. and Raj, S. S. A. (2017). Tamil Nadu Migration Survey 2015. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 85-94.

Ravenstein, E. G. (1889). The Laws of Migration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52(2), 241-305.

Siddiqui, T. (2012). Impact of Migration on Poverty and Development. *Migrating out of Poverty Research Programme Consortium Working Paper*, 2.

Skeldon, R. (2008). International Migration as a Tool in Development Policy: A Passing Phase? *Population and Development Review*, 34(1), 1-18.

Smith, J. M. (1988). A Survey of Process Migration Mechanisms. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review*, 22(3), 28-40.

Todaro, M. P. (1980). Internal Migration in Developing Countries: A Survey. In R. A. Easterlin (Ed.), *Population Furthermore, Economic Change in Developing Countries (pp. 361-402)*. University of Chicago Press.

United Nations. (2019). Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *International Migration 2019: Report*.

Ural, A., & Kılıç, İ. (2013). *Bilimsel Araştırma Süreci ve SPSS ile Veri Analizi*. Detay Yayıncılık.

Vargas-Silva, C., Markaki, Y. and Sumption, M. (2016). Impacts of International Migration on Poverty in the UK. *Joseph Rowntree Foundation*.

Zachariah, K. C. and Rajan, S. I. (2012). Inflexion in Kerala's Gulf Connection: Report on the Kerala Migration Survey 2011. *Working Paper*, 463.