

Immigration Phenomenon in Turkey-EU Relations and Problem of Free Movement of Labor Force

Assistant Prof. Dr. M.Ozan Şahin

Gaziosmapasa University
Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences
Department of Political Science and International Relations
Tasliciftlik Campus
Tokat/Turkey

Associate Prof. Dr. İlhan Eroğlu

Gaziosmapasa University
Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences
Department of Economics
Tasliciftlik Campus
Tokat/Turkey

Assistant Prof. Dr. Serkan Kekevi

Gaziosmapasa University
Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences
Department of Political Science and International Relations
Tasliciftlik Campus
Tokat/Turkey

Abstract

This study aims to examine the migration phenomenon in the European Union (EU) and Turkey relations. The results of the study show the potentiality that Turkish citizens will immigrate to the EU in case of the acceptance of Turkey's membership is unlikely to be high enough to disturb the EU member states.

Keywords: European Union, Turkey, Immigration, Labor Force

JEL: F50

Introduction

Immigration is a constant element in the history of humanity. People with poor living conditions tend to move to the places where they may have better conditions. In parallel with population increase all over the world, the imbalance among regions and countries has also increased. The migration phenomenon has become more complicated with the effects of natural disasters, wars and domestic conflicts. Economic, social and political imbalances in the globalization process and challenging living conditions have led to a sharp increase in emigration (Gökbayrak, 2006, 10). Thus, legal and/or illegal migration phenomenon has today become an international problem (Isigicok, 2005, 436). Furthermore, immigrants sometimes fail to accommodate themselves to new social values and this may lead to xenophobia and racism among the natives.

Intrastate migration is a national matter whereas immigration is considered as an international issue. International migration affects economic, social, political and cultural structures of both immigrant-receiving and emigrant countries. Thus, states attach special importance to the concept of international migration and to their international migration policies. An international organization, the EU follows supranationalist migration policies. People generally tend to immigrate to the places with better living conditions. Thus, the articulation of societies and national economies with globalization leads to international migration that concentrates on the EU member states.

In making migration policies, the EU today gives priority to ‘check’ policies on security. In this sense, the EU member states make and follow various policies for international migration. At the national level, they tighten border security and they seek for multinational collaboration for coast guard at the international level. Furthermore, they seek to make agreements that focus on repatriation for illegal immigrants.

The implementation of the Schengen Agreement removed internal borders and transformed the issue of illegal migration, once a problem for ‘first migration’ countries only, into a common problem. This process necessitated the development of joint policies in the Union.

The aim of this study is to examine the migration phenomenon in international dimension and evaluate this phenomenon in the Turkey-EU relations. First, we deal with the concept of migration, reasons of emigration and types of emigration in addition to the results of emigration. Second, we mention the immigration phenomenon in the EU and immigration problems in the Turkey-EU relations. Last, we present an overall assessment and conclusions.

1. Concept of Migration

Throughout history, humans have moved from one place to another for better standards of living (Gökbayrak, 2006, 22). Turkish dictionary by Turkish Language Association (TDK) explains ‘migration’ as “the act of moving from one place to another or from one country to another with economic, social or political reasons (Yalçın, 2004, 12).” It is a national migration if migration is performed within the same country, and, it is an international migration if people cross international borders. Most of the definitions regard the migration phenomenon as “changing location”. To a broader definition that features the social effects of migration, “migration is a population movement that reshapes the structure of society economically, culturally, socially and politically”. Migration is a multidimensional phenomenon that is directly associated with sociocultural, economic and political structures of societies. Thus, many scientists including anthropologists, sociologists, geographers and economists have long been interested in the concept of migration (Mutluer, 2003, 9).

The focus of international migration is on moving from one country to another. Migrating to relatively distant places is considered as old as the history of humanity. However, international migration emerged in today’s context in the 19th century when ethnicity- and culture-based nation-states established homelands within their political power. More than one country is included in the emigration process. In other words, immigrants, emigrant country and migration-receiving country are all included in this process. Thus, the effects of emigration on all variables appear in both emigrant and migration-receiving countries. Emigration has three fundamental elements: Source country (emigrant country), target country (migration-receiving country) and immigrants (İçduygu, 2006). The relationships between the three elements indicate the reasons and results of emigration (İçduygu, 2007). Emigration is shaped by the sources between source and target countries, employment, population growth, security, human rights and sociopolitical differences (İçduygu, 2007). International immigrants may move from one country to another with the aim of returning to their homelands after a while or they may live out their lives in the target country. Whether international migration will be permanent or temporary is dependent on immigrants’ will, conditions in emigrant and migration-receiving countries and policies of the two states. International migration may be voluntary or forced with the effects of external factors. In optional emigration, people usually decide to emigrate due to various external factors whereas political conditions and natural disasters oblige them to emigrate in forced emigration.

2. Reasons of Emigration

Emigration is usually perceived negatively as leaving undesired conditions or being obliged to leave homeland. The reasons of emigration are generally economic and political. People with financial difficulties and poor living conditions, those unhappy with the present governments or uneasy about security tend to emigrate. People usually emigrate when their native countries fail to provide the opportunities that are already available in other countries (Report of the Global Commission on International Migration, 2005, 789). Furthermore, they may sometimes emigrate for educational, social and cultural reasons.

The main reason of emigration may be attributed to the worldwide domination of capitalism in the 20th century. The economies of the states that participated in the Second World War failed to compete with world markets and this worsened living conditions in rural and urban areas, leading capitalist states to the demand for labor force. Emigration has increased drastically with the rise of globalization (Toksöz, 2006, 24).

3. Types of Emigration

The complex and multidimensional structure of the concept of migration leads to various definitions. The variety is also available in the categorization of emigration movements. The United Nations (UN) considers any location change lasting for more than one year as migration.

Some authors and international organizations regard location changes that happen out of individuals' will as migration. These approaches divide the concept of emigration into two as voluntary and forced. Migration that happens usually with individuals' will and economic and personal reasons is considered as 'voluntary emigration' whereas it is 'forced emigration' due to wars, population exchanges and asylum (Gökdere, 1978, 10-11). Forced emigration is generally due to social conflicts, poor economies and natural disasters. In fact, it is very difficult to distinguish the case when people emigrate voluntarily from that when they are forced to emigrate. For instance, people regard living in their native countries as a natural phenomenon whereas they see emigration as a solution when forced to live under poor economic conditions. Thus, whether migration is voluntary or forced is a matter of debate (Nakanishi, 2008, 10).

The difference between voluntary and forced emigration refers to the presence or absence of compulsion, pointing to deportation, exile, relocation, slavery and torture. Faist suggests the concept of semi-voluntary emigration is included in the category that comprises the nation-state-supported forms of violence against ethnical, religious or cultural minorities (Faist, 2003, 48).

In addition to economic and social reasons, natural events may lead to temporary or permanent emigration. Earthquake, flood, volcanism, desertification and drought are the primary reasons for emigration.

4. Results of Emigration

People emigrating from their homelands to other countries due to various reasons produce economic, political and social results. Immigrants tend to give different reactions to the culture and social environment of the host country. Social status of immigrants and confronted different cultures equip them with a different mutual identity (Kümbetoğlu, 2003, 271).

Immigration eventually changes immigrants' legal positions, turning them from guests to citizens of the host country. Most refugees become the citizens of the country they have immigrated to and gain various social positions. Thus, social dimension of international migration is highly important (Kümbetoğlu, 2003, 271). The concept of international migration gained importance as a result of the excessive and irregular migrations in the post-Second World War era. In return for international migrations to developed countries, migration-receiving states have made several efforts to "bring international migration under control".

Emigration movements are today steered generally from Asian and African countries to the Northern American and European countries. Governments have developed several strategies for the regularization of migration movements. The idea of extending nationwide migration policies to the international level has become popular especially in industrialized countries (Castles; Miller, 2010, 131-132).

5. Immigration Phenomenon in EU

Throughout the history, Europe has always been familiar with migration and affected by migration as both an emigrant and a migration-receiving continent. The EU is a popular center of attraction for international migration. The EU member states are the centers of wealth and stability in the eyes of immigrants although they sometimes suffer from domestic economic and social issues. Thus, the regulation, administration and systematization of migration pose a series of problems in the EU.

The integration process that has started with the establishment of the EU has become extensive enough to comprise migration policies and making a joint migration policy is now one of the primary objectives of the Union. The Single European Act (SEA) is the basic document that regularizes migration in the EU. The article 48 of the Treaty of Rome, establishing the European Economic Community (EEC), on "freedom of movement for workers" proposes eliminating employment discrimination among the member states (Treaty of Rome, 1957, 21). The Treaty of Rome proposes opening all borders and increasing solidarity to assure free movement for people, goods and services for single market and a joint European economy. The SEA has put the proposal into practice. The SEA's plans for providing the free movement of labor and creating a borderless Europe via the Schengen Agreement have brought the migration phenomenon at the top of the Union's agenda (Dearden, 1997, 2).

Amended by the SEA, Article 8 Subsection 2 of the EEC Treaty (Article 7a of the Maastricht Treaty and Article 14 of the Amsterdam Treaty) defines the EU's internal market as a zone without internal borders where free movement of people, goods, services and capital is assured.

Article 8 Subsection 3 implied that the EEC take necessary steps to establish the internal market until 31 December 1992 (EEC Treaty, Article 8/1-2) (The Single European Act, 1986). However, third-country nationals drew no advantage from the right of free movement granted by the SEA and they were still subjected to border checks.

The Schengen Agreement is an important step to maximize the collaboration among the states in making international migration policies. The Schengen Area is a zone that provides the EU citizens with the right of free movement. The Schengen Area has established a joint external border where migration control procedures will be implemented. The common visa implementation includes additional precautions against terrorism and organized crimes as well as the development of collaboration in police, customs and justice (İktisadi Kalkınma Vakfı, 2014).

Dragged into a deepening process pursuant to the SEA and Schengen Agreement, the Union has attempted to make bilateral migration policies. The acceptance of the Dublin Convention in June 1990 was another important development in the integration of migration and asylum policies. The Dublin Convention came into force in 1997 and is still the only contract to be accepted by the EU member states in the field of refugee law. This convention introduced several regulations including the determination of member state responsible for examining asylum applications (Dublin Convention, 1997).

Council Regulation accepted "establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the member state responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the member states by a third-country national" on 18 February 2003. This regulation incorporated the Dublin Convention into the EU. The objective of Dublin II Regulation can be summarized as taking individuals with request for asylum under strong protection in the member states and preventing them from requesting more than one country for asylum so that only one state can examine each asylum application (Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003).

The Maastricht Treaty has finalized the coordination in justice and home affairs in the Union's migration policy (Dinan, 2005, 479). The Treaty aims to bring an inter- and supra-governmental order, concentrating on asylum policy, border crossing, immigration, preventing drug trafficking, international fraud prevention, and judicial, custom and police coordination.* The Maastricht Treaty put the EU under severe security pressure in the face of economic and political instability that emerged in the Balkans due to the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The Amsterdam Treaty was prepared under such circumstances. The incorporation of the Schengen Agreement into the Community in 1999 by the Amsterdam Treaty established a single external border where people coming from a country outside the EU would be subjected to the same procedure for crossing. This agreement has given permission to any human action in favor of law and order in signatory countries and proposed several regulations including common visa rules, asylum, external border checks, policing and custom officers (Özer, 2010, 199).

The EU *acquis* including Schengen regulation and the decisions of the Tampere Summit basically proposes executing all border checks by a civil and specialized organization dependent on only one authority (Presidency Conclusions, Tampere European Council, 15 - 16 October). In the face of the EU *acquis*, the existing border security units have been replaced with "Border Police".

The European Council assembled in Brussels in November 2004 after the EU failed to deal with the increasing immigration movements. The Council accepted the Hague Program including 10 priorities as to increasing freedom, security and justice in the EU and placed special emphasis on a comprehensive approach that could deal underlying reasons of emigration, acceptance policies, integration and re-acceptance (İltica ve Göç Mevzuatı, 2005, 119-126). The Treaty of Lisbon manifests that Title IV –Area of Freedom, Security and Justice– will be switched to title IV regarding other policies on visa, asylum, migration and free movement of people. General Provisions express the requirement to make a solidarity-based common migration policy that will provide third country citizens with just asylum and remove internal border checks to establish a just and tolerant social ground respectful of fundamental rights and traditions. Furthermore, maximum security will be provided by the coordination between police and judicial authorities against crime, racism and xenophobia.

* Treaty on European Union, Official Journal C 191, 29 .07.1992, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/11992M/htm/11992M.html>, 10.01.2014, online 152

As for the policies on border checks, asylum and migration; the EU will take a series of measures including monitoring external border checks and determining uniform asylum status in the member states for third country citizens with no right of asylum in Europe but in need of protection (Bozkurt et. all, 2008, 83-84).

According to the 2010 data of Eurostat, 32.452.500 foreigners live within the borders of the EU. 12 million of them are the citizen immigrants of the EU member states and 20 million are third country nationals (Eurostat, 2011). The EU-15 countries house more than 90% of the legal immigrants in the EU (Munz, 2008, 1). Thus, the states with the highest numbers of immigrants are expected to be more influential in making migration policies.

6. Problem of Immigration in Turkey-EU Relations

With the removal of borders in the globalized world, migration has become a phenomenon that should be dealt carefully. As a result of worries about increasing migration and “perceived risk”, securitization** has become the most proper of all other national discourses. Based on the assumption that securitization may preserve the present borders and identity effectively, securitization can be regarded as the most proper discourse for protecting the Union in a pluralistic world. At this point, it is highly important to examine the perceptions of and worries about migration.

From the perspective of the member states, there are various worries about the presence of immigrants. These worries are about security, crime and socioeconomic and cultural factors. Actually, these are *not* fresh worries because opposition to immigration has always been common in Europe. Opposition to immigration almost disappeared some years ago but it has emerged again in new forms during political instability and transition periods (UNDP, 2009, 89).

The security worries of the member state citizens are also due to the perceived link between immigration and crime. The 2002 European Social Survey shows that 70% of participants believe immigrants will increase a country’s crime rate. The percentage exceeds 85% in Germany, Czech Republic and Norway (UNDP, 2009, 89). The data on 25 member states shows imprisonment in foreign-born people are twice as common as that in natives. A study on 5 European countries (Austria, Germany, Luxembourg, Norway, and Spain) has revealed that crime rate is higher in foreigners (UNDP, 2009, 89-90).

The 2008 global economic recession has resulted in the revival of opposition to immigration. Economic worries are also associated with the unemployment rate in both member and candidate states. Unemployment has become a crucial problem and locals’ fear of job loss has increased in this period. Governments are under the pressure of these circumstances. Thus, natives’ attitudes to immigrants have reversed even in the countries where immigration has already gained widespread acceptance. For example, in England there are more and more negative opinions about Eastern European immigrants (UNDP, 2009, 90). The majority of 52 countries included in the World Values Survey (WVS) are in favor of the migration restrictions and emphasize that these restrictions should be associated clearly with the availability of employment opportunities (WVS, 2014). Economic worries of the EU citizens may sometimes trigger security worries and vice versa. Marginalized immigrants with temporary or irregular immigrant status tend to exhibit antisocial behaviors and get involved in crime. Thus, European people perceive immigration as an increasing threat and they blame immigrants for several socioeconomic and social problems.

Some of the anti-immigration views in Europe center upon high population density, unnecessariness of immigrant labor force and also upon the growing burden on the wealth systems of the member states. Furthermore, they assert immigration alone will be unable to compensate population aging and solve the EU’s problems in the labor market.

The migration phenomenon always occupies a special place in the EU and Turkey relations since Turkey is both a source and transition country because of its geographical position. Emigration movements from Turkey to Europe started after the 1950s. European countries imported a large number of workers from Mediterranean countries including Turkey as economic reconstruction created need for foreign labor force after the Second World War.

** Developed by Copenhagen School, this approach is explanatory for the solution of the problems regarding foreign policies. The securitization theory explains how and why a certain public issue becomes a security problem.

In the 1950s, Turkey signed labor force agreements with European countries to regularize irregular migration movements and foster the interest in immigration to Europe. Based on bilateral agreements on the regularization of international labor force, labor-importing was conducted systematically.

Economic conditions in emigrant and migration-receiving countries determined the reciprocal migration movements from Turkey to European countries and vice versa until 1973. Among the reasons for large-scale labor migration from Turkey to Europe in that period were rapid population growth, low income per capita, unfair income and land distribution and employment problems. Thus, Turkey's migration policies were determined by such factors as the EU's need for labor force and high unemployment in Turkey (İçduygu; Kirişçi, 2009). Labor migration began individually in the 1950s and later became a government policy. Turkey's state-organized labor migration policy led to large-scale emigration movements (Küçükkalay, 1998, 1).

The 1973-1975 oil shock led to economic recession in Europe and European countries stopped labor-importing from the non-EU states including Turkey. However, emigration from Turkey to Europe continued in the forms of family reunification and asylum (Kirişçi, 2003). The restrictions on legal immigration to Europe increased the number of illegal immigrants as from the second half of the 1970s. Furthermore, most European states initiated various policies on the integration of immigrants and enacted to reunite immigrants with their families living in their homelands. These implementations led to a large-scale family reunification emigration from Turkey to European countries (Uslu; Cassina, 1999, 16). The number of immigrants was about 1,5-2 million until 1973. The decrease in the European countries' demands for foreign labor force due to the 1973 oil shock and economic recession dropped the number of workers emigrating from Turkey. After 1975, the number of people immigrating to Europe was smaller than that to the Northern African and Arab countries (Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, 2001). Refugee movements from Turkey to European countries increased remarkably in the second half of the 1970s. For instance, the number of people requesting for asylum in Germany due to political pressure was 809 in 1976. However, this number attained 57.913 4 years later. Requests for asylum increased excessively as a result of the 1980 Military Coup (Uslu; Cassina, 1999, 56). Emigration from Turkey concentrated on Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States in the early 1990s. Thus, we can claim Turkish migrants have immigrated to various countries other than Europe in recent years (Kirişçi, 2003).

According to the data collected from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey, the number of Turkish citizens living abroad is approximately 5 million. Roughly 4 million of these people live in EU countries, 300.000 in the Northern American countries, 200.000 in the Middle East and 150.000 in Australia (TC Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2014)

The EU member states are worried that they may suffer from large-scale emigration from Turkey in case of the acceptance of Turkey's membership. The potentiality of large-scale emigration waves from Turkey to Europe is regarded as an obstacle to Turkey's membership. Turkey is a transition country and this leads to some worries in the member states that have taken some measures^{***} against the groups of people planning to come to Europe over Turkey's eastern borders.

The EU member states are worried that millions of people will flood in their countries just after states like Turkey with large and young population have joined the EU. From Turkey's perspective, several field researches have showed that Turkish citizens are less eager to immigrate to the EU than Europeans suppose. A field research^{****} with 2000 Turkish participants has asked the participants "Will you immigrate to a European country if Turkey joins the EU?"

^{***} 2000- 2003 The Accession Partnership Document.

^{****} For further information. Tns-Piar, Research document of "Türkiye'de Seçmenlerin Avrupa Birliği'ne Yönelik Tutumları", 20 March 2009, İstanbul ,p.12-23.

**Table 1- “Will you immigrate to a European Country if Turkey Joins the EU?”
(Distribution by Gender and age)**

	Average	Gender		Age				
		Female	Male	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+
Yes	11	9,1	12,9	15,5	11,9	11,8	7,4	7,9
No	78,2	75,7	80,7	75,2	77	76,5	82,8	80,3
No Idea	10,8	15,1	6,4	9,2	11,1	11,7	9,8	11,7
TOTAL	2000	1008	992	361	507	406	317	409
BASE	2000	1008	992	361	507	406	317	409

Table 1 shows that 11% of the participants choose ‘Yes’ whereas 78,2% choose ‘No’. Young people are more willing to immigrate to Europe and the percentage of those unwilling to emigrate is 15,5%. The percentage of willingness decreases as the participants grow older. On the other hand, Table 2 shows the percentage of those willing to immigrate to Europe decreases as level of education and socioeconomic status reach higher.

Table 2- “Will you immigrate to a European country if Turkey joins the EU?” (Distribution by Level of Education and Socioeconomic Status / SES)

	Average	Education				SES			
		Unedctd	Low Eductn	Average Eductn	High Eductn	AB	C1	C2	DE
Yes	11	13,2	9,7	12,2	13,5	10,5	14,1	10,8	9,8
No	78,2	65,5	78,9	81,7	82,3	80,7	80,9	76,8	78
No Idea	10,8	21,3	11,4	6,1	4,2	8,8	5	12,4	12,2
TOTAL	2000	242	1132	459	167	271	289	946	494
BASE	2000	242	1132	459	167	271	289	946	494

The results show that emigration waves from Turkey to Europe will probably be less intense contrary to European expectations if Turkey joins the EU. The expectation that millions of people will immigrate to European countries is always given as a justification for refusing Turkey’s membership. However, this and other researches***** have showed Europeans’ worries are pointless. There is a small tendency among Turkish people to immigrate to Europe in case of the acceptance of Turkey’s membership. However, Turkish people’s attitudes to immigrating to Europe vary by region. As is seen in Table 3, the average percentage of the participants with ‘Yes’ is %11 whereas it is 33,3% in the Southeastern Anatolia Region, 15,9% in Mediterranean Region and 15,5% in Eastern Anatolia Region. People living in these regions are more prone to immigrating to Europe due to high unemployment rate and some local problems in their regions since they regard migration as a solution to their problems. Thus, they support Turkey’s membership in the EU. Some other field researches have obtained similar results.*****

***** A research conducted on 12-13 January 2008 by A&G Research showed 67,6% of Turkish people were unwilling to live abroad. The percentage of those willing to live abroad was 20%. Similar to our research, A&G has found the percentage of willingness decreases as the participants grow older. People living in the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia regions are more likely to emigrate from Turkey. For further information, see A&G Araştırma Şirketi Yayınları, Yurtdışında Yaşama Arzusu, 20 April 2008.

Another research conducted in 2011 by Eurobarometre found the percentage of those unwilling to work in other countries was around 70%. Of the EU member and candidate states, Turkey had the highest percentage of unwillingness.

***** A research by Konda Research and Consultancy obtained similar results. According to the report published on 9 November 2008 in Radikal Newspaper, 13,4% of the citizens in the Southeastern Anatolia are willing to emigrate immediately whereas 33,1% may emigrate depending on the existing circumstances. For further information, see Bekir Ağırır, “Kürtler ve Kürt Sorunu”, Konda Research and Consultancy, İstanbul, 2008, p.9.

Table 3- “Will you immigrate to a European country if Turkey joins the EU?” (Distribution by Regions)

	Average	Settlement		Regions							
		Urban	Rural	Metropoltn Cities	Marmara	Aegean	Medtrrn.	Black Sea	Central Anatolia	Eastern Anatolia	South Eastern Anatolia
Yes	11	10,9	11,2	9,3	4,4	12,3	15,9	2,9	5,1	15,5	33,3
No	78,2	77,2	80,6	72,2	88,1	75,8	69,4	94,3	93,1	77,1	62,5
No Idea	10,8	11,8	8,2	18,4	7,5	11,9	14,7	2,8	1,9	7,4	4,1
Total	2000	1427	573	619	247	168	250	220	194	146	156
Base	2000	1427	573	619	247	168	250	220	194	146	156

Interestingly enough, Euro-Turkish citizens complain about unemployment, homesickness, low salaries, heavy working conditions, intolerance and moral differences. Thus, they dissuade their relatives from emigrating from Turkey (Kaya; Kentel, 2008, 127-128).

Conclusion

Historically, ‘migration center’ regions have dealt with both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the migration phenomenon. The quantitative indicators and qualifications of immigrants have been a matter of debate. Potential emigration waves are expected to spark a new debate right after free movement of labor force are established in the Turkey-EU relations. Some circles argue that the issue of free movement of labor force is a strong obstacle to Turkey’s membership in the EU. Thus, there are several nonacademic and unrealistic assumptions about the problems that may stem from emigration waves from Turkey even in Turkey’s membership process. These assumptions are attributed to the acculturation problems of Turkish immigrants in the EU and to whether young Turkish population will create large-scale immigration waves in the Union. Some EU member states are seriously worried about the presence of large unemployed young population in Turkey. Turkey’s socioeconomic characteristics and demographics differ remarkably from those of the EU member countries and these differences are considered triggering reasons for potential emigration waves. The issue of international migration creates a broader political field in the Turkey-EU relations. The issue of immigration has been an important topic in the Turkey-EU relations since Turkey entered into negotiations with the EU over full membership on 3 October 2005. Despite the nightmare scenarios about potential emigration waves from Turkey to Europe, the results of the relevant academic studies show the expected immigration movements are unlikely to be intense enough to disturb the member states. Furthermore, these studies have showed young people and those with the highest and lowest socioeconomic status are more prone to emigrating from Turkey. We have found people’s attitudes may vary by region. People living in the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia regions are more willing to emigrate probably because of poor living conditions. In short, emigration movements from Turkey to Europe are unlikely to be as intense as Europeans suppose. Furthermore, it must be born in mind that Turkish emigration movements will be steered to other countries than those in Europe. For instance, USA, Canada, Russia and Australia also appeal to Turkish immigrants. Furthermore, Turkey has become both an ‘emigrant’ and ‘migration-receiving’ country in recent years.

References

- Ağırdır, Bekir, (2008), “Kürtler ve Kürt Sorunu”, Konda Arş. Danışmanlık, İstanbul.
- Bozkurt, Enver; Özcan, Mehmet; Köktaş, Arif,(2008), Avrupa Birliği Temel Mevzuatı, Asil Yayınları, Ankara.
- Convention determining the State responsible for examining applications for asylum lodged in one of the Member States of the European Communities - Dublin Convention, OJ C 254, 19.8.1997, p. 1–12, English version, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:1997:254:0001:0012:EL:PDF>, 10.01.2014, online.
- Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003 of 18 February 2003 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national, OJ L 50, 25.2.2003, p. 1–10, English Version, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:050:0001:0010:EN:PDF>, 10.01.2014, online.
- Dearden, Stephen J.H. “Immigration Policy in the European Union”, European Development Policy Study Group, 1997, (Erişim) www.edpsg.org/Documents/Dp4.doc, 4 Ocak 2011

- Demond Dinan (ed.), (2005), Avrupa Birliği Ansiklopedisi, Cilt I, Göç Maddesi,-Göç Politikası Güncelleme, Kitap Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Eurostat, Immigration by Sex, Age Group and Citizenship: (migr_imm1ctz), 2011, http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search_database, 20.06.2011.
- Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı. (2001). Yurtdışında Yasayan Türkler Alt Komisyonu Raporu. DPT Sekizinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı, İş Gücü Piyasası Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu. No. 2642 - ÖK: 650. Ankara: DPT
- Faist,Thomas,(2003), Uluslararası Göç ve Ulus aşırı Toplumsal Alanlar, Çev. Azat Zana Gündoğan, Can Nacar, Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- Gençler,Ayhan,(2006), “Avrupa Birliği’nin Göç Politikası”, Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları (Prof. Dr. Turan Yazgan’a Armağan) 49. Kitap. İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Yayını, İstanbul.
- Gökbayrak, Şenay,(2006) “Göçmen Grupların Sosyal Hakları”, Çalışma Ortamı Dergisi. Sayı: 89, Kasım-Aralık
- Gökbayrak, Şenay, (2006), “Uluslararası Göçler ve Kadın Emeği”, Çalışma Ortamı Dergisi. Sa: 86, Mayıs-Haziran 2006
- Gökdere, Y.Ahmet,(1978), Yabancı Ülkelere İşgücü Akımı ve Türk Ekonomisi Üzerine Etkileri, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayını, No:23, Ankara.
- Işığçok, Özlem, (2005) “Küresel Gerçeklerle Türkiye’de Yabancı Kaçak İşçi Sorunu: Boyutları ve Sonuçları”, Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları (Prof. Dr. Nevzat Yalçıntaş’a Armağan) 50. Kitap. İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Yayını, İstanbul.
- İçduygu, Ahmet,(2006), Türkiye–Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri Bağlamında Uluslararası Göç Tartışmaları. Türk Sanayicileri ve İşadamları Derneği Yayınları, İstanbul.
- İçduygu, Ahmet,(2007) “Avrupa ile “İnsan Bağı”: Yirmi birinci Yüzyıl Başında Türkiye, Avrupa ve Uluslararası Göç”, Voyvoda Caddesi Toplantıları. Osmanlı Bankası Arşiv ve Araştırma Merkezi, http://www.obarsiv.com/pdf/ahmet_ıcduygu.pdf, (24.12.2012)
- İçduygu, Ahmet and Kirişçi,Kemal,(2009), “Challenges Facing Turkey as a ‘Migration Transition’ Country and a Future Research Agenda”, Land of Diverse Migrations- Challenges of Emigration and Immigration in Turkey, Ed. Ahmet İçduygu and Kemal Kirişçi, İstanbul Bilgi University Press, İstanbul.
- İktisadi kalkınma Vakfı, AB Kavramları Sözlüğü, Schengen Maddesi, http://www.ikv.org.tr/sozluk.asp?bas_harf=S&anahtar=&sayfa=&id=1257, 10.01.2014, online.
- Kaya, Ayhan, Kentel, Ferhat,(2008), Belçika Türkleri Türkiye ile Avrupa Birliği Arasında Köprü mü, Engel mi?, Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul
- Kirişçi, Kemal,(2003), “Turkey: A Transformation from Emigration to Immigration” <http://migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?ID=176> (15.02.2014).
- Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs,(2003), “Uluslararası Göç, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Güvenlik” , Uluslararası İlişkilerde Sınır Tanımayan Sorunlar”, Ed. Ayhan Kaya ve Günay Gökso, “, Bağlam Yayınları,İstanbul.
- Lahey Programı Brüksel Başkanlık Sonuç Bildirisi Kararlarına Ek , 4-5 Kasım 2004, İltica ve Göç Mevzuatı , Ankara, Şubat 2005.
- Küçükkalay, A.M. (1998) Planlı Dönemde Yurtdışı İş Gücü İstihdamı ve Türkiye Ekonomisine Etkileri. Dış Ticaret Dergisi, No:11. Ankara: Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı.
- Munz, Rainer, “Migration, Labor Markets, and Integration of Migrants: An Overview for Europe”, World Bank, No: 0807, 2008, (Erişim) <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Labor-Market-DP/0807.pdf>, 5 Temmuz 2011.
- Mutluer,Mustafa, (2003), Uluslararası Göçler ve Türkiye, Çantay Kitabevi, İstanbul.
- Nakanishi, Hisae; Sirkeci, İbrahim; Cabbarlı,Hatem,(2008), Sorunlu Bölgelerde Göç, Global Strateji Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Özer, Y.Yeşim, “Yasadışı Göçün Kontrolünde Destekleyici Düzenlemelerin Rolü: Avrupa Birliği Ve Türkiye Örnekleri”, Örgütlü Suçlar ve Yeni Trendler Seçilmiş Bildiriler, Polis Akademisi Yayınları http://www.utsam.org/images/upload/attachment/utsas_2010_secilmis/Yasad%C4%B1%C5%9F%C4%B1%20G%C3%B6%C3%A7%C3%BCn%20Kontrol%C3%BCnde%20Destekleyici%20D%C3%BCzenlemelerin%20Rol%C3%BC-Avrupa%20Birli%C4%9Fi%20ve%20T%C3%BCrkiye%20C3%96rneklere.pdf, 10.01.2014, online.
- Presidency Conclusions, Tampere European Council ,15 - 16 October 1999 http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/00200-r1.en9.htm, 10.01.2014, online.

- Redhouse Sözlüğü (English-Turkish), (1983),10. Baskı, Redhouse Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Report of the Global Commission on International Migration”, Population And Development Review, Cilt 31, sayı 4, Aralık 2005
- Stephen, Castles ve Miler,(2010), Göçler Çağı ve Modern Dünya da Uluslararası Göç Hareketleri, Çev. Bülent Uğur Bal, İbrahim Akbulut, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- The Single European Act, Section II Provisions relating to the foundations and the policy of the Community , Subsection I – Internal Market, Article 13, 17 February 1986,
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/emu_history/documents/treaties/singleeuropeanact.pdf, 10.01.2014, online.
- Tns-Piar, (2009),Türkiye’de Seçmenlerin Avrupa Birliği’ne Yönelik Tutumları Araştırması.20 Mart 2009, İstanbul.
- T.C. Dışişleri Bakanlığı, “Yurtdışında Yaşayan Türk Vatandaşları”, http://www.mfa.gov.tr/yurtdisinda-yasayan-turkler_.tr.mfa (09.01.2014).
- Treaty of Rome, Title III, Chapter I, 25 March 1957, s.21,
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/emu_history/documents/treaties/rometreaty2.pdf, 10.01.2014, online.
- Treaty on European Union, Official Journal C 191, 29 Temmuz 1992,
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/11992M/htm/11992M.html>, 10.01.2014, online
- Toksöz, Gülay,(2006), Uluslararası Emek Göçü, Bağlam Yayınları,İstanbul.
- Türk Dil Kurumu (TDK) Sözlüğü,(2005), 10. Baskı, TDK Yayınevi, Ankara.
- United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2009- Overcoming Barriers: Human Mobility and Development, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009
- Uslu, S.; Cassina G.,(1999), Türkiye’den Avrupa’ya Göç (Turkish Migration to Europe.1.b. Ankara: Hak-s Eğitim Yayınları.
- Yalçın, Cemal,(2004), Göç Sosyolojisi, Anı Yayıncılık, Ankara.