

Mehmet Çınar

Corresponding Author

Bursa Uludağ University,
Department of Econometrics,
Bursa,
Turkey

✉ mcinar@uludag.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0001-8441-243X

Özge Özbek

Bursa Uludağ University,
Department of Econometrics,
Bursa,
Turkey

✉ ozgeozbek@uludag.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0002-2951-7631

The Impact of Economic and Institutional Factors on International Migration Flows: Evidence from Turkey

Summary: International migration affects the economy, culture, and social life of the destination country. Internal conflicts and wars within countries especially compel people to migrate. Turkey is exposed to a heavy influx of migration as one of the countries most affected by this situation. In this context, the study addresses six different migrant groups: those migrating from Turkey and those migrating to Turkey, those migrating from Turkey to Europe and Asia, and finally, those migrating from Europe and Asia to Turkey. The study investigates economic factors influencing migration together with institutional effects. The results showed that while economic factors are more influential on migration from Turkey to European countries, institutional factors are determinative in migration from Europe to Turkey, and income is the primary determinant in migration from Asia. It was concluded that to strengthen its migration policies, Turkey should pay attention to institutional structures in addition to economic factors.

Keywords: International migration, Migration flows, Europe-Turkey-Asia migration network, Income, Institutions.

JEL: F22, O15.

Migration has led to unforeseen challenges for some communities while providing opportunities for prosperity for others. This process has continued from ancient times to the present and has gained even more importance, especially due to the Syrian civil war, which has been ongoing since 2011. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2023 report, approximately 6.4 million people have been forced to migrate from Syria (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2023). The concept of migration refers to the movement of individuals or societies across borders, resulting in population mobility, regardless of place of birth or citizenship status (Qing Guan, James O'Donnell, and James Raymer 2024). Research categorizes migration into involuntary migrants, economic migrants, desperate migrants, forced migrants, and refugees (A. K. M. Ahsan Ullah and Ahmed Shafiquel Huque 2020; Jorgen Carling 2024). Forced migration may be driven by persecution or natural disasters (William B. Wood 1994) and can also be state-imposed (David Owen 2024). People migrate due to oppressive laws, economic hardships, institutional failure, and

poor social conditions, seeking a better life and escape from these challenges. The push-pull theory explains migration as factors that either push people away from or pull them toward specific regions (Everett S. Lee 1966). Understanding these migration drivers is crucial for both developed and developing countries. By analyzing the factors influencing migration, countries can adjust policies to retain skilled labor and prevent brain drain, thereby enhancing their human capital and overall development.

In recent years, increasing international migration flows have made migration a key factor in shaping a country's economic and institutional dynamics. As migration trends continue to evolve, understanding Turkey's role in these movements has become increasingly important. While existing literature has extensively examined migration patterns across various regions, research on the dual role of Turkey as both a source and destination country remains relatively limited. To address this gap, the aim of this study was to analyze how Turkey is impacted by migration and how it, in turn, shapes migration dynamics. Specifically, institutional and economic factors influencing migration were examined to identify the key determinants of migration flows to and from Turkey, between the Asian and European continents. Finally, Turkey's current migration-related challenges were examined and policy recommendations to address these issues were proposed. By highlighting these challenges and offering potential solutions, it was aimed for the study to contribute to both academic discourse and policy discussions on migration management in Turkey.

The structure of the paper is organized as follows: The first section of this study briefly reviews the impact of migration on Turkey. The second section provides an overview of the relevant literature. The dataset, variables, and models are presented in section three. The empirical findings are reported in section four, and section five concludes the paper.

1. The Impacts of Migration on Turkey

Migration flows affect the economic and sociological structure of countries. One of the countries most affected by this situation is Turkey. Due to its position as a bridge between the continents of Asia and Europe, Turkey holds geopolitical significance (Talip Küçükcan 2022). The first major migration from Turkey took place in the 1960s, when Turkey exported labor to Western Europe to fill labour shortages, thereby transitioning from a country that received migration to one that provided migration (Fahrettin Tepealtı 2019). The migration to Europe resulted in both a flow of foreign currency into Turkey and a partial solution to the unemployment issue in the country (Mehmet Soytürk 2012).

The Arab Spring, which started in North Africa in 2010, spread to Syria, leading to political instability in the country and causing internal turmoil, resulting in the migration of millions of people (Süleyman Ekici and Gökhan Tuncel 2015). The political turmoil in Syria, located in the continent of Asia, has also affected Turkey in many ways. Due to the conflicts in Afghanistan from 2001 to 2021, in Iraq from 2003-2011, and the Syrian civil war that began in 2011, many migrants have sought refuge in Turkey (Dilaver Arıkan Açar and Haldun Yalçınkaya 2023). Turkey, which has been subjected to a large influx of migrants escaping the internal conflicts in Afghanistan and Syria, has come under the influence of the European Union's (EU) migration policy

during its EU membership process. The readmission agreement, which came into effect on October 1, 2014, covers the readmission of migrants who entered EU countries illegally and their repatriation to their home countries, leading to Turkey transitioning from a transit country to a destination country (Abdullah Gül 2014). With this agreement, Turkey gains financial assistance and visa liberalization rights, constituting an important step in the migration policies between Turkey and the EU. However, while this agreement has had a positive impact on the EU side, the situation has not unfolded similarly for Turkey, because Turkey has not been able to benefit from the visa liberalization promised by the EU and has not received the full financial support it was promised. Only approximately 25.6 percent of the 72,000 Syrians planned to be resettled in EU member states have been accepted (Didem Ş. Çelik and Sühal Şemşit 2020).

Despite the Silk Road trade contributing to the prosperity of Asian countries, trade shifted to Europe with the discovery of new routes. A natural consequence of this was the economic decline of some Asian communities, who have then used Turkey both as a destination country and as a transit route to achieve prosperity (Enver Günay and Onur Çelik 2021). Turkey is not only affected by the quest of these communities for prosperity but also by situations such as wars, natural disasters, economic crises, political instability, and conflicts. When these negative factors are present in their own country, migrants seek refuge in Turkey. According to the Turkish Directorate General of Migration Management (TDGMM) report, there are more than 4.6 million foreign nationals in Turkey, of which 3.2 million have temporary protection status as Syrians (Turkish Directorate General of Migration Management Report 2023). After Syria, the countries with the highest number of protected status applications in Turkey are Afghanistan, Iran, and Iraq.

The intersection of Asian and European dynamics shapes Turkey's economic, social, and cultural structure. The lower wages paid to refugees compared to local workers reduces the employment opportunities for locals, disrupts public services due to the increasing population, and leads to social conflict resulting from the interaction of different cultures. However, it has also been seen that immigrants with temporary protection status facilitate the development of the economy by establishing businesses, filling the labor force gap in certain sectors, and contributing to economic growth (Hasan Canpolat and Hakkı Onur Arıner 2012; Özge Bozkaya and Ali Kıncal 2018; Hakan Ömer Tunca and Ahmet Karadağ 2018; Faik Tanrıku 2021).

2. The Relevant Literature

Migration has a significant impact on economic and regional development. Migration regulates the labour market and structures the consumption of goods, services, and human resources (Michał Bernard Pietrzak, Natalia Drzewoszevska, and Justyna Wilk 2012). In addition to positive effects, there can also be negative implications for countries receiving migrants. In countries experiencing high levels of migration, increases in population density lead to disruptions in public services, which then negatively affects economic growth. Countries experiencing immigration may face inflation problems due to the increased consumption demand.

The effects of migration can be addressed in economic and institutional contexts. Thus, studies in literature that reveal the effects of migration can be classified

as: (i) economic effects, (ii) institutional effects, and (iii) studies that take both economic and institutional effects into account. In this study, these effects were analyzed separately. First, the economic factors influencing migration were examined in detail, and their impact on migration thoroughly explained.

Focusing on the effects of variables such as the Gini coefficient, relative poverty, and total relative poverty as factors that encourage migration, Oded Stark (2006) and Stark, Maja Micevska, and Jerzy Mycielski (2009) argued that an increase in income inequality drives individuals to migrate, stating that individuals focus on their income and decide to migrate by considering the income of the people around them. It was concluded that migration is directly proportional to increasing income inequality. Stark (2006) also stated that the unemployment rate has a negative effect on migration as the unemployed do not have sufficient resources to migrate. Frederic Docquier, Giovanni Peri, and Ilse Ruyssen (2014) examined the difference between the migration potential and actual migration of individuals with economic, social, and demographic factors. The findings showed that an increase in the target country's GDP and labour force potential increases migration to the target country. However, growth rates do not have a significant effect on migration. Elvira Nica (2015) examined the economic, social, and demographic effects on the labour market of migration flows in Europe. The findings of that study showed that the most important factors in migration were wage differences, unemployment rates, and living costs. Countries offering high wages are more attractive to immigrants. If the source country's unemployment rate is high, there is a greater tendency for individuals to migrate, and countries with high GDPs are attractive to immigrants.

Mathias Czaika (2015) examined the factors affecting migration decisions and explained short-term fluctuations based on economic expectations. According to that study, there is more migration to countries with high employment rates and higher per capita income. The higher the economic growth rate of a country, the greater the tendency to migrate to that country. A study by Thu Hien Dao (2018) examined the effect of economic, social, demographic, and geographic factors on migration in an inverted U-shaped relationship. The study findings showed that migration decreases in countries with high-income levels, and migration is low in countries with low-income levels due to financial constraints, whereas migration rates peak in countries with medium income levels. Individuals in poor countries cannot migrate due to financial constraints. A common language, geographical proximity, and commercial connections significantly affect the tendency to migrate. Martin Guzi and Stephan Mikula (2022) examined the effect of market-oriented reforms on migration flows in post-communist countries, and concluded that the unemployment rate in the source country does not significantly affect migration and that the destination country attracts more migration if the unemployment rate is low. In a study by Smaranda Cimpoeu (2020), the reasons for migration flows in Europe were examined through a comparative analysis establishing two separate models, one covering the old member states and the other covering the new member states. It was stated that the unemployment rate is an important supply-push factor and inequality in countries is a push factor on migration, whereas economic freedom positively affects the net migration rate only for New Member States.

George Agiomirgianakis, Georgios Bertsatos, and George Sfakianakis (2024) examined the effects of purchasing power parity, GDP, and poverty on net migration flows for Greece between 1996 and 2021. According to the findings of that study, greater levels of poverty are a factor that triggers migration, and local currency depreciation is considered a factor that increases migration. At the same time, the increase in the GDP rate increased migration to Greece, whereas with increasing poverty, the effect on migration of GDP and the exchange rate decreased. In other words, when poverty reaches high levels, economic factors cease to be the primary variable that drives migration. Atthetar Gara and Besnik Fetai (2024) examined the determinants of labour migration in the Western Balkan countries; Eugen Dimant, Tim Krieger, and Daniel Meierrieks (2013) examined the migration decisions of 111 countries and Nabamita Dutta and Sanjukta Roy (2011) examined the impact of economic and institutional factors on migration, and it was concluded by all that an increase in the unemployment rate increased the migration rate.

The Western Balkan region serves as a source of migration to developed EU countries and is an important migration route for migrants from Asia and Africa. Kosta Josifidis et al. (2013) examined migration movements from Eastern Europe to Western European countries, and stated the direction of movement to be from countries with high unemployment rates to countries with low unemployment rates. The migration flows of Western Balkan countries have been addressed in studies by Visar Malaj and Stefano de Rubertis (2017), Malaj and Naiada Firza (2023) and Malaj and Soana Jauplari Teka (2023).

Using the Pooled OLS (POLS) method, Malaj and Rubertis (2017) and Malaj and Firza (2023) examined the effects on migration of inflation, corruption, population, distance, and GDP per capita difference between source and destination countries. The study findings demonstrated that people tend to migrate from countries with high levels of corruption and weak governance to countries with higher income levels and relatively lower levels of corruption. Similarly, Malaj and Teka (2023) showed that migration is positively associated with population, income in the country of origin, the existence of a common border, the Human Development Index, and the level of education in both the countries of origin and destination, whereas it was seen that income and distance in the countries of origin have a negative effect on migration. In the literature that determined that the distance between countries has significant effects on migration, Nathan J. Ashby (2010), Anna Maria Mayda (2010), Dimant, Krieger, and Meierrieks (2013), Francesc Ortega and Giovanni Peri (2013), Marie Poprawe (2015) and Günay and Çelik (2021) found that migration decreased as the distance increased.

The way a country's institutions are governed plays a crucial role in its economic growth and development. In societies with strong institutions, property rights are protected, policymakers prioritize public interest over personal gain, resources are distributed efficiently, and significant importance is placed on education and human capital (Daron Acemoğlu, Simon Johnson, and James A. Robinson 2005). In contrast, weak institutions often lead to issues such as corruption, lawlessness, and political instability. Migration patterns can be influenced by economic institutions that promote greater economic freedom, provide opportunities for individuals, create employment, encourage investment, and secure property rights (Imran Arif 2020). Countries with

well-functioning institutions tend to attract migrants, as they offer political stability, the rule of law, respect for human rights, and a secure environment (Graziella Bertocchi and Chiara Strozzi 2008). Therefore, individuals dissatisfied with governance in their home country are more likely to migrate to nations with stronger institutions. In this context, the following studies focused on the institutional effects of migration.

Gara and Fetai (2024) examined the determinants of labour migration in the Western Balkan countries by considering institutional factors. It was stated that increased political stability and the rule of law reduced the migration rate, greater government effectiveness increased migration, and poverty had no significant effect on migration. Dutta and Roy (2011) examined the impact of political instability on skilled migration and found that countries with political stability are better able to retain skilled labour. Government stability, demographic accountability, investment climate, and low levels of internal conflict reduce the migration rate. In countries with low economic instability, skilled labour is less likely to migrate. Bertocchi and Strozzi (2008) stated that when institutional factors are examined, democratic countries, countries with broad voting rights, and countries implementing citizenship laws based on place of birth tend to attract migration. Thus it was concluded that anti-immigration policies reduce migration, while immigrant-friendly policies increase migration. Ashby (2010) stated that countries with high economic and political freedom attract more migration. As the per capita income of individuals in the destination countries increases, migration rates also increase, but increased income levels in the source countries does not always reduce migration. Greater physical distance between countries was seen to reduce migration, whereas there are higher migration rates between countries that share a common language and ethnicity. Andrea Ariu and Mara Pasquamarina Squicciarini (2013) stated that countries with high levels of corruption lose more skilled labour. Despite increases in GDP per capita, the impact of corruption on migration continues; that is, skilled labour continues to be lost in wealthy but highly corrupt countries. Gara and Fetai (2024) stated that increased political stability and the rule of law reduce migration, whereas increases in government effectiveness and per capita income increase migration, and poverty has no significant effect on migration.

Dimant, Krieger, and Meierrieks (2013) found that corruption impacts international migration. Poprawe (2015) specifically showed that countries with higher levels of corruption both encourage and discourage migration because they offer worse and more unpredictable economic conditions, increased insecurity, and a lower quality of life. The results of that study showed that larger populations, a common language, and a shared border increase migration, while the distance between two countries decreases migration. Furthermore, education, GDP per capita, inflation in the destination country, and corruption and education levels in the source country can robustly explain migration. Maryam N. Nejad and Andrew T. Young (2016) investigated the relationship between migration and institutional quality in a sample of university-educated and non-university-educated migrants. The study concluded that economic freedom is an attractive factor for migrants. The results of a study by Daniel Auer, Friederike Römer, and Jasper Tjaden's (2020) showed that corruption is a push factor for migration. Arif (2022) investigated the impact of education level and corruption on migration, evaluating the push and pull factors of migration. According to the findings, countries with

low levels of corruption and countries with high economic freedom are more attractive to migrants.

Finally, some studies have revealed both the economic and institutional effects of migration as follows: Simon Winter (2020) investigated the economic, political, and social determinants of migration for 28 EU member states, and Arif (2020) for 103 countries. According to the results, income has a positive effect on migration, economic freedoms play an important role in migration decisions, poor political conditions in a country increase migration, and economic factors are more important than political factors in migration decisions. Dimitrios Karkanis et al. (2022) examined the impact of geographical, institutional, and sociopolitical factors on migration. The findings indicated that, unlike economic migration, geographical factors do not significantly influence migration flows. This suggests that moving to a neighboring country is not always the most viable option. Moreover, the presence of refugees from the same country of origin in the destination country increases the likelihood of others from that nationality seeking asylum there. Rogneda Vasilyeva, Valentin Voytenkov, and Alina Urazbaeva (2023) investigated bilateral migration flows between the EU, the Commonwealth of Independent States, and the United States between 2000 and 2015. The empirical findings revealed that economic development and legislative systems had a significantly positive impact on migration flows in the sampled countries. However, government regulation and political stability were found to have a negative impact on migration. Furthermore, Russia attracts migrants from the Commonwealth of Independent States due to cultural and institutional factors, while the EU and the United States serve as destinations primarily for economic reasons. That study highlighted the often-overlooked role of institutional development as a determinant of international migration, offering new insights into the impact on migration patterns of corruption control, legal frameworks, government regulation, political stability and democracy, and ease of doing business.

3. Dataset, Variables, and Model

This study utilizes data from 63 countries with available migration statistics related to Turkey, covering both emigration from Turkey to these destination countries and immigration from these origin countries to Turkey between 1995 and 2020 at five-year intervals. The selection of these 63 countries ensured consistency in analyzing bilateral migration flows, allowing for a comprehensive examination of migration patterns in both directions. This dataset was selected to maintain comparability across different periods and to include countries with significant migration interactions with Turkey, thereby providing a robust basis for evaluating the economic, social, and policy-related factors influencing migration trends.

Since the data is five years old, the period in the model to be applied for economic factors is six years. In models that include institutional factors, they encompass the five years between 2000 and 2020, thus T equals five. Therefore, there are 378 observations in the economic model and 315 observations in the institutional model. The variables used in the analysis, together with their abbreviations and sources, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Definition and Resource of Variables

Variable	Definition	Resource
Migration _{it}	Migration from the origin country to the destination country	CEPII
Distance _{it}	The distance between the origin and destination country	CEPII
Gdp_d _{it}	The gross domestic product of the destination country	World Bank
Gdp_o _{it}	The gross domestic product of the origin country	World Bank
Unemp_d _{it}	The unemployment rate of the destination country	World Bank
Unemp_o _{it}	The unemployment rate of the origin country	World Bank
Inf_d _{it}	The inflation rate of the destination country	World Bank
Inf_o _{it}	The inflation rate of the origin country	World Bank
Va_d _{it}	The voice accountability of the destination country	World Bank
Va_o _{it}	The voice accountability of the origin country	World Bank
Ge_d _{it}	The government effectiveness of the destination country	World Bank
Ge_o _{it}	The government effectiveness of the origin country	World Bank
Ps_d _{it}	The political stability of the destination country	World Bank
Ps_o _{it}	The political stability of the origin country	World Bank
RI_d _{it}	The rule of law of the destination country	World Bank
RI_o _{it}	The rule of law of the origin country	World Bank
Cci_d _{it}	The control of corruption in the destination country	World Bank
Cci_o _{it}	The control of corruption in the origin country	World Bank

Notes: The natural logarithm of all variables was used.

Source: Authors' compilation.

The models used in the study are presented in Equation (1) for economic variables and Equation (2) for institutional variables:

$$\text{Migration}_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Distance}_{it} + \beta_2 \text{Gdp}_{hit} + \beta_3 \text{Gdp}_{mit} + \beta_4 \text{Unemp}_{hit} + \beta_5 \text{Unemp}_{mit} + \beta_6 \text{Inf}_{hit} + \beta_7 \text{Inf}_{mit} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Migration}_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Distance}_{it} + \beta_2 \text{Va}_{hit} + \beta_3 \text{Va}_{mit} + \beta_4 \text{Ge}_{hit} + \beta_5 \text{Ge}_{mit} \\ + \beta_6 \text{Ps}_{hit} + \beta_7 \text{Ps}_{mit} + \beta_8 \text{RI}_{hit} + \beta_9 \text{RI}_{mit} + \beta_{10} \text{Cci}_{hit} \\ + \beta_{11} \text{Cci}_{mit} + \varepsilon_{it}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In the equation, the subscript t represents time, and the subscript i represents countries. ε_{it} represents the error terms of the equation, α is the intercept term, and β_k ($k=1,2,\dots,11$) are the parameters indicating the effects of the explanatory variables used in the model on the dependent variable. The distance variable, which is both influential and significant in international migration, is used in both models. However, since the distance between countries does not change over time, the fixed effects model with individual and/or time dimensions cannot be used. Therefore, to avoid specification bias in the models, the Pooled Ordinary Least Squares (POLS) model was used, which has been used in previous studies in literature such as those by Dimant, Krieger, and Meierrieks et al. (2013), Malaj and Rubertis (2017), Arif (2020) and Malaj and Firza (2023).

4. Empirical Results

The dual role of Turkey as both a destination and an origin country for migration, coupled with its recent experience with international migration flows, has made migration a significant factor shaping the country's economic and institutional dynamics. The aim of this study was to investigate the factors affecting migration from Turkey to Asian and European countries, and migration to Turkey from these countries, using economic and institutional variables. Since all models in the study were constructed based on both economic and institutional quality variables, this section focuses on a total of twelve model outcomes.

4.1 Econometric Assumptions

In Table 2, the results of testing for autocorrelation, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity assumptions are provided to determine the estimated models for all migrants, European migrants, and Asian migrants both coming to Turkey and leaving from Turkey.

Table 2 Test Results for Econometric Assumptions

			Wooldridge autocorrelation test	White heteroscedasticity test	VIF multicollinearity test (average)
All migrants	Leaving Turkey	Economic model	58.908*** (0.0000)	234.92*** (0.0000)	1.77
		Institutional model	79.480*** (0.0000)	80.69*** (0.0000)	3.31
	Coming to Turkey	Economic model	55.327*** (0.0000)	22.64* (0.0665)	1.10
		Institutional model	23.830*** (0.0000)	42.017*** (0.0026)	3.05
European migrants	Leaving Turkey	Economic model	100.434*** (0.0000)	62.78*** (0.0000)	1.34
		Institutional model	146.265*** (0.0000)	31.66*** (0.0045)	3.63
	Coming to Turkey	Economic model	299.633*** (0.0000)	3.30 (0.6537)	1.00
		Institutional model	21.688*** (0.0000)	56.15** (0.0131)	1.88
Asian migrants	Leaving Turkey	Economic model	7.9270** (0.0130)	32.03*** (0.0002)	1.05
		Institutional model	5.2910** (0.0362)	13.06 (0.1597)	1.05
	Coming to Turkey	Economic model	31.329*** (0.0001)	45.43** (0.0146)	4.07
		Institutional model	91.667*** (0.0000)	21.59** (0.0103)	1.07

Notes: ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. The values in parentheses represent marginal significance.

Source: Authors' compilation from Stata 17.

When the test results of the economic and institutional quality models for migrants leaving Turkey are analyzed together, it can be observed that both the autocorrelation and covariance assumptions are violated. In contrast, the multicollinearity

assumption is not violated. Similar results are obtained for the test results of the economic and institutional quality models for immigrants to Turkey. In addition, similar results are obtained for migrants coming from European and Asian countries to Turkey and for migrants leaving Turkey for European and Asian countries for the test results of the economic and institutional quality models. Therefore, to obtain the Best Linear Unbiased Estimators (BLUE), it is necessary to use methods that produce consistent standard errors, such as the John C. Driscoll and Aart C. Kraay (1998) estimator. In this context, Table 3 and Table 4 are composed of consistent standard errors.

Table 3 The Estimation Results for Economic Factors

Variables	All migrants		European migrants		Asian migrants	
	Leaving Turkey	Coming to Turkey	Leaving Turkey	Coming to Turkey	Leaving Turkey	Coming to Turkey
Distance _{it}	-0.889*** (0.149)	-1.325*** (0.028)	-2.024*** (0.117)	-1.856*** (0.026)	-1.539*** (0.108)	-0.993*** (0.019)
Gdp_d _{it}	0.410*** (0.139)		1.224*** (0.039)		0.256*** (0.020)	0.239*** (0.028)
Gdp_o _{it}		0.350*** (0.078)	-0.754*** (0.131)			1.029*** (0.148)
Unemp_d _{it}	-0.399*** (0.045)	0.554*** (0.051)	-0.171** (0.072)		-0.697*** (0.036)	0.783*** (0.135)
Unemp_o _{it}	0.356*** (0.092)					
Inf_d _{it}	-0.371*** (0.115)	0.0888*** (0.016)	-0.332*** (0.080)			0.575*** (0.091)
Inf_o _{it}	0.171**** (0.047)			-0.132*** (0.043)		0.501*** (0.085)
Constant	4.363* (2.330)	6.731*** (1.816)	12.988*** (3.574)	21.555*** (0.302)	14.434*** (1.337)	-23.118*** (4.406)
R ²	0.255	0.288	0.552	0.105	0.304	0.437
$\bar{R}^2$	0.243	0.280	0.542	0.074	0.282	0.399
F-stat	1923.59***	171784.7***	12059.1***	5522.55***	1850.20***	1072.99***
Rmse	2.286	1.997	1.888	2.539	1.798	1.555

Notes: ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. Values in parentheses indicate Driscoll-Kraay's (1998) consistent standard errors. The appropriate models were determined by evaluating parameter significances, econometric assumptions, and tests using the general-to-specific strategy.

Source: Authors' compilation from Stata 17.

4.2 The Results for Economic Factors

This analysis was conducted separately for all migrants, and for European and Asian migrants, considering both migration to and from Turkey. Overall, the models are statistically significant at the 1% level, and the coefficients of determination range from 0.105 to 0.552.

The results for all migrants indicate that economic conditions in destination countries play a crucial role in migration from Turkey. A 1% increase in a destination country's GDP leads to a 0.41% rise in migration from Turkey, whereas higher unemployment and inflation rates reduce it by 0.40% and 0.37%, respectively. In contrast, worsening economic conditions in Turkey drive more people to migrate. Notably, a 1% increase in Turkey's unemployment rate raises migration to destination countries

by 0.36%. When the distance between the destination country and Turkey was examined, a 1% increase in the distance reduces migration to the destination countries by 0.89%. In the examination of the independent variables in the estimated model of the economic effects of migration, the most important factor affecting migration from Turkey to the destination countries was determined to be the income level in the destination countries in addition to distance. Regarding migration to Turkey, economic conditions in both Turkey and destination countries remain influential. A 1% increase in Turkey's GDP results in a 0.35% rise in the number of incoming migrants. A 1% increase in unemployment in destination countries leads to a 0.55% rise in migration to Turkey, while a similar increase in inflation results in a 0.09% rise. In addition, the increase in the distance between the home countries of the migrants and Turkey causes a 1.32% decrease in migration to Turkey.

From the analysis of the impact of economic factors on migration in the context of European countries, it was observed that an increase in the economic growth of the destination country increases migration from Turkey to the destination country, but an increase in Turkey's economic growth decreases migration from Turkey to the destination country. An increase in the inflation and unemployment rate of the destination country decreases migration from Turkey to the destination country. In addition, an increase in the distance between the destination country and Turkey decreases migration to the destination country by 2.02%. In the model including economic factors for migrants coming from Europe to Turkey, an increase in Turkey's inflation rate and an increase in the distance between the migrants' homeland and Turkey decrease migration from Europe to Turkey by 0.13% and 1.85%, respectively.

When the effect of economic factors on migration for Asian countries was examined, a 1% increase in the gross domestic product (GDP) leads to an increase of approximately 0.26% in migration from Turkey to Asian countries. An increase in the unemployment rate of Asian countries and an increase in the distance between the destination country and Turkey reduce migration to destination countries by 0.69% and 1.54%, respectively.

In the estimation results, including economic factors for those migrating from Asia to Turkey, if the GDP of Asian countries increases by 1%, migration from Asian countries to Turkey increases by 0.24%. If the GDP of Turkey increases by 1%, migration from Asian countries to Turkey increases by 1.02%. Similarly, when the inflation rate of Asian countries and Turkey increased by 1%, migration from Asian countries to Turkey increased by 0.57% and from Turkey to Asian countries by 0.50%, respectively. At the same time, when the unemployment rate in Asian countries increased by 1%, migration from Asian countries to Turkey increased by 0.78%, and if the distance between Asian countries and Turkey increases by 1%, migration from Asian countries to Turkey decreases by 0.99%.

From the analysis of the independent variables in the models estimating the economic effects of migration, it is clear that distance between countries, income, inflation, and unemployment rates have significant impacts on migration. Among all the models, the one explaining migration from Turkey to European countries due to economic reasons has the highest explanatory power, while the model explaining migration from Europe to Turkey exhibits the lowest explanatory power.

4.3 The Results for Institutional Factors

In Table 4, the impact of institutional factors on migration is analyzed, including all migrants, and migrants in Europe and Asia, with a focus on both migration to and from Turkey. When the models were examined, it is evident that each model is generally significant, with the explanatory power of the independent variables varying between 0.095 and 0.481. A key finding across all the models was that a greater distance between countries significantly reduces migration. Specifically, a 1% increase in distance leads to a decrease in migration by between 0.65% and 1.74%.

Table 4 The Estimation Results for Institutional Factors

Variables	All migrants		European migrants		Asian migrants	
	Leaving Turkey	Coming to Turkey	Leaving Turkey	Coming to Turkey	Leaving Turkey	Coming to Turkey
Distance _{it}	-0.654*** (0.006)	-1.447*** (0.018)	-0.618*** (0.030)	-1.743*** (0.041)	-1.017*** (0.125)	-0.902*** (0.039)
Va_d _{it}			0.701*** (0.110)	-1.409*** (0.306)		
Va_o _{it}	-0.910*** (0.109)					-1.094*** (0.108)
Ge_d _{it}	1.433*** (0.213)	1.106*** (0.028)	2.493*** (0.310)	3.665*** (0.692)		
Ge_o _{it}	-2.120*** (0.434)				-2.092*** (0.515)	-0.814*** (0.109)
Ps_d _{it}		-0.649*** (0.136)		-0.649*** (0.136)		
RI_d _{it}					-0.287*** (0.131)	1.344** (0.178)
RI_o _{it}		0.141*** (0.021)		0.314*** (0.017)		
Cci_d _{it}	-0.474*** (0.114)	-0.501*** (0.103)	-1.084*** (0.071)	-0.260*** (0.091)		
Cci_o _{it}	2.842*** (0.598)			-1.164*** (0.194)		
Constant	9.401*** (0.236)	17.875*** (0.239)	3.498*** (0.967)	17.875*** (0.239)	24.895*** (3.448)	25.650*** (0.582)
R ²	0.119	0.290	0.115	0.270	0.161	0.508
$\bar{R}^2$	0.102	0.279	0.095	0.244	0.128	0.481
F-stat	259.28***	7490.11***	775.5***	5214.20***	726.93***	5841.35***
Rmse	2.456	1.989	2.598	2.317	1.953	1.457

Notes: ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. Values in parentheses indicate Driscoll-Kraay's (1998) consistent standard errors. The appropriate models were determined by evaluating parameter significances, econometric assumptions, and tests using the general-to-specific strategy.

Source: Authors' compilation from Stata 17.

When examining the findings for all migrants, a 1% increase in the level of accountability in target countries leads to a 0.91% decrease in migration from Turkey to these countries. Similarly, an increase in government effectiveness in target countries results in a 2.12% decrease in migration from Turkey, whereas an increase in government effectiveness in Turkey leads to a 1.43% rise in migration from Turkey to target countries. A 1% increase in corruption control within Turkey increases

migration from Turkey to target countries by 2.84%, while an increase in corruption control in target countries decreases migration from Turkey by 0.47%. When the independent variables in the estimated model for the institutional effects of migration were examined, the most critical factors affecting migration from Turkey to destination countries were seen to be corruption control and government effectiveness in Turkey.

When the findings for all immigrants coming to Turkey were examined, migration to Turkey increases as the rule of law in Turkey increases. When political stability and control of corruption in the immigrants' home countries increase by 1%, migration to Turkey decreases by 0.65% and 0.51%, respectively, and an increase in government effectiveness in the immigrants' home countries causes a 1.11% increase in migration to Turkey. An increase in the distance between the immigrants' home countries and Turkey leads to a 1.45% decrease in migration to Turkey. When the independent variables in the estimated model regarding the institutional effects of migration were examined, the most important factors affecting migration to Turkey were determined to be government effectiveness, and political stability in the immigrants' home countries.

When the model that considers migrants migrating from Turkey to Europe was examined, a 1% increase in accountability and government effectiveness in the destination country was seen to increase migration from Turkey to the destination country by 0.70% and 2.49%, respectively. Conversely, 1% increase in corruption control in the destination country reduces migration from Turkey to the destination country by 1.08%. When the independent variables in the estimated model for the institutional effects of migration were examined, the most effective factors on migration from Turkey to the destination country were found to be the level of government effectiveness and corruption control in the destination country.

When examining the model for migration from Europe to Turkey, it was observed that a 1% increase in accountability and political stability in European countries reduces migration from Europe to Turkey by 1.41% and 0.64%, respectively. A 1% increase in the rule of law in Turkey leads to a 0.31% increase in migration from Europe to Turkey. If government effectiveness in European countries increases by 1%, migration from Europe to Turkey rises by approximately 3.66%. An increase of 1% in corruption control in European countries decreases migration from Europe to Turkey by 0.26%, while a rise in corruption control within Turkey reduces migration from Europe to Turkey by 1.16%. When examining the independent variables in the estimated model for the institutional effects on migration, it is clear that influencing migration from Europe to Turkey includes the levels of government effectiveness and accountability in European countries.

When the model for those migrating from Turkey to Asian countries was examined, 1% increase in the rule of law in Asian countries causes a 0.28% decrease in migration from Turkey to the relevant country. An increase in government effectiveness in Turkey causes a 2.09% decrease in migration from Turkey to Asian countries. The variable of government effectiveness in Turkey was seen to be an important factor affecting migration from Turkey to Asian countries.

For migration from Asia to Turkey, 1% increase in the levels of accountability and government effectiveness in Turkey increases migration from Asian countries to Turkey by 1.09% and 0.81%, respectively. If the rule of law level of Asian countries

increases, migration from Asian countries to Turkey increases by approximately 1.34%. The most effective factors in migration from Turkey to Asian countries were seen to be accountability in Turkey and the rule of law in Asian countries.

5. Conclusions and Discussions

Turkey has been a source country, a destination country and a transit country for migration since 2011, and is among the countries most affected by migration worldwide. Consequently, migrants from Asia tend to perceive the country as both a transit and destination country, while there is also a flow of skilled migration from Turkey to European countries. This study focused on which economic and institutional factors lead individuals to leave their homes and the effects on both the origin and destination countries. The results are presented of models that encompass both immigrants coming to Turkey and emigrants leaving Turkey. In this context, analyses were made of the available five-year data from 1995 to 2020 for immigrants coming to Turkey from the same 63 countries and emigrants leaving Turkey to the same 63 countries.

According to the results obtained from the study, migration from Turkey to any destination country was found to be more influenced by institutional factors rather than economic factors. This result encapsulates the most significant finding of the study. It was observed that the higher the institutional effectiveness of the destination country, the greater the tendency for migration, demonstrating that individuals tend to move to countries with better institutional conditions. Therefore, strengthening institutional factors in Turkey may reduce the motivation of individuals to migrate from Turkey. The increase in accountability and government effectiveness in Turkey would lead to a decrease in migration to the destination country, while an increase in the government effectiveness of the destination country would lead to an increase in migration to that country. This highlights the crucial role of institutional factors in migration decisions. From an economic perspective, key factors influencing migration from Turkey include the destination country's GDP, unemployment rate, and inflation rate, together with unemployment and inflation rates in Turkey. Rising inflation and unemployment in Turkey act as strong push factors, driving individuals to seek opportunities elsewhere.

Both institutional and economic factors are important for migrants coming to Turkey from any country. The increase in Turkey's gross domestic product (GDP) serves as an attractive factor for migration, while the increases in unemployment and inflation rates in migrants' home countries play a significant role in their decision to migrate to Turkey. For migrants deciding to move to Turkey, institutional factors are crucial. Greater political stability and improvements in corruption control in migrants' home countries encourage them to stay in their countries, and the increase in the rule of law in Turkey appears as an attractive factor for migrating to Turkey.

The results of the estimated models for migration to and from European countries can be summarized as follows: for migrants from Turkey to Europe, while institutional factors are prominent, income also holds significant importance. When the potential income level in European countries increases, migration from Turkey to European countries also increases. Moreover, when the government's effectiveness and level of corruption control in the destination country increase, migration from Turkey to that destination country also increases. When looking at immigrants coming from

Europe to Turkey, institutional factors were seen to be more influential than economic factors. In other words, when accountability, political stability, and the rule of law increase in Europe, migration to Turkey decreases.

Finally, when examining migrants from Turkey to Asia and migrants from Asia to Turkey, it was observed that the most influential factor affecting migration from Asia to Turkey is primarily economic. In clear terms, immigrants from Asian countries come to Turkey mainly because of the potential increase in income, with Turkey's GDP being the primary motivating factor. When Turkey's GDP increases, migration from Asia to Turkey also increases. At the same time, an increase in inflation and unemployment rates in Asia also increases migration from Asian countries to Turkey. In this case, individuals living in Asia primarily consider economic factors rather than institutional factors. In Asian countries, the prioritization of economic factors over institutions is mainly because some Asian countries are low-income and less-developed nations. In other words, the internal turmoil experienced in some countries (such as Syria, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, etc.) in Asia may compel individuals to consider economic factors rather than institutions to migrate for a more comfortable life.

The common finding for all migrants leaving Turkey, all migrants coming to Turkey, all migrants leaving Turkey for Europe, and all migrants coming to Turkey from Europe is the significance of institutions. The primary factor in preventing individuals from migrating lies in the increased functionality of institutions rather than economic effects. It was observed that in countries where the rule of law is not ensured, government effectiveness is low, accountability is decreased, and political instability is experienced, and thus individuals tend to migrate to countries where institutions are effectively functional instead of continuing their lives in their home country.

The results obtained in this study, while showing variations for migrants migrating to and from destination and origin countries in terms of continental context, are supported by literature studies such as those by Stark (2006), Stark et al. (2009), Mayda (2010), Ortega and Peri (2013), Docquier, Peri, and Ruysen (2014), Czaika (2015), Nica (2015), Dao et al. (2018) and Guzi and Mikula (2022), which indicate that economic factors such as income, inflation, and unemployment are influential in migration. In addition, the findings of studies by Bertocchi and Strozzi (2008), Ashby (2010), Dutta and Roy (2011), Ariu and Squicciarini (2013), Dimant, Krieger, and Meierrieks (2013), Poprawe (2015), Nejad and Young (2016), Arif (2020), Auer, Römer, and Tjaden (2020), Malaj and Firza (2023) and Vasilyeva, Voytenkov, and Urazbaeva (2023), have shown that institutional factors such as accountability, government effectiveness, political stability, rule of law, and corruption control are influential in migration. Moreover, the results of all estimated models reveal that increasing the distance between source and destination countries leads to a decrease in migration to the destination country. This result is supported by both migration theory and empirical findings from studies such as those by Poprawe (2015), Malaj and Rubertis (2017), Günay and Çelik (2021), Arif (2022), Karkanis et al. (2022), Malaj and Firza (2023) and Vasilyeva, Voytenkov, and Urazbaeva (2023).

Reviewing the migration policies of countries is essential to be able to identify potential opportunities and threats. In this context, comprehensive and sustainable programs should be developed to facilitate the effective integration of immigrants into

society. Providing various services such as language courses, vocational training programs, and social and cultural integration courses can significantly accelerate the adaptation process of migrants to their host countries. At the same time, a strong legal framework should be established to prevent potential risks associated with irregular migration, ensuring the implementation of regulatory and deterrent measures. Although the number of academic studies on migration has increased, future research should focus more specifically on examining the factors that contribute to the positive value added by immigrants in destination countries. In other words, countries should assess their economic and social weaknesses and implement strategic investments and programs that leverage the contributions of immigrants to meet demands that cannot be fulfilled by their citizens alone. By adopting a well-regulated migration policy, it will be possible to effectively identify both skilled and unskilled regular migrants and allocate them to sectors where they are most needed. Such an approach would not only address labour shortages but also allow migration to be seen not just as a challenge but as an opportunity to contribute to sustainable development.

References

- Açar, Dilaver Arıkan, and Haldun Yalçınkaya.** 2023. "Conflicts, Irregular Migration and Turkey's Security in the Context of Turkey-European Union Relations." *Akdeniz İİBF Journal*, 23(2): 211-218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25294/aiuibfd.1359607>
- Acemoğlu, Daron, Simon Johnson, and James Robinson.** 2005. "Institutions as a Fundamental Cause of Long-Run Growth." In *Handbook of Economic Growth*, ed. Philippe Aghion and Steven N. Durlauf, 385-472. Amsterdam: Elsevier. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0684\(05\)01006-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0684(05)01006-3)
- Agiomirgianakis, George, Georgios Bertsatos, and George Stakianakis.** 2024. "Corruption, Exchange Rates, and Migration Flows." *Review of Economic Analysis*, 16(4): 469-498. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15353/rea.v16i4.5590>
- Arif, Imran.** 2020. "The Determinants of International Migration: Unbundling the Role of Economic, Political and Social Institutions." *The World Economy*, 43(6): 1699-1729. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/twec.12889>
- Arif, Imran.** 2022. "Educational Attainment, Corruption, and Migration: An Empirical Analysis from a Gravity Model." *Economic Modelling*, 110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2022.105802>
- Ariu, Andrea, and Mara Pasquamaria Squicciarini.** 2013. "The Balance of Brains: Corruption and Migration: Corruption Could Be an Important Factor for Emigration and Immigration Decisions." *EMBO*, 14(6): 502-504. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/embor.2013.59>
- Ashby, Nathan J.** 2010. "Freedom and International Migration." *Southern Economic Journal*, 77(1): 49-62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4284/sej.2010.77.1.49>
- Auer, Daniel, Friederike Römer, and Jasper Tjaden.** 2020. "Corruption and the Desire to Leave Quasi-Experimental Evidence on Corruption as a Driver of Emigration Intentions." *IZA Journal of Development and Migration*, 11(7): 1-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2478/izajodm-2020-0007>
- Bertocchi, Graziella, and Chiara Strozzi.** 2008. "International Migration and the Role of Institutions." *Public Choice*, 137(1/2): 81-102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11127-008-9314-x>
- Bozkaya, Özge, and Ali Kınca.** 2018. "Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri ve Suriyeli Yerinden Edilmiş Kişiler Bağlamında Türkiye'nin Göç Politikasındaki Gelişimin Değerlendirilmesi." *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(2): 90-126.
- Canpolat, Hasan, and Hakkı Onur Arıner.** 2012. "Global Migration and the Development of Migration Policies of the European Union and Turkey." Orsam Report 123.
- Carling, Jorgen.** 2024. "Why Do People Migrate? Fresh Takes on the Foundational Question of Migration Studies." *International Migration Review*, 58(4): 1757-1791. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/01979183241269445>
- Çelik, Didem Ş., and Sühal Şemşit.** 2020. "Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği Geri Kabul Anlaşmasının Uygulanmasında Suriyelilerin Etkisi ve Rolü." *Celal Bayar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(Special Issue): 66-84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18026/cbayarsos.522869>
- Cimpoeru, Smaranda.** 2020. "Macro-Economic Determinants of Migration: A Comparative Analysis Old vs. New European Member States." *Economic Computation and Economic Cybernetics Studies and Research*, 54(4): 5-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24818/18423264/54.4.20.01>

- Czaika, Mathias.** 2015. "Migration and Economic Prospects." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(1): 58-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2014.924848>
- Dao, Thu Hien, Frederic Docquier, Chris Parsons, and Giovanni Peri.** 2018. "Migration and Development: Dissecting the Anatomy of the Mobility Transition." *Journal of Development Economics*, 132(C): 88-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2017.12.003>
- Dimant, Eugen, Tim Krieger, and Daniel Meierrieks.** 2013. "The Effect of Corruption on Migration, 1985-2000." *Applied Economics Letters*, 20(13): 1270-1274. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13504851.2013.806776>
- Docquier, Frederic, Giovanni Peri, and Ilse Ruysen.** 2014. "The Cross-Country Determinants of Potential and Actual Migration." *International Migration Review*, 48(S1): 37-99. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/imre.12137>
- Driscoll, John C., and Aart C. Kraay.** 1998. "Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimation with Spatially Dependent Panel Data." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 80(4): 549-560. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/003465398557825>
- Dutta, Nabamita, and Sanjukta Roy.** 2011. "Do Potential Skilled Emigrants Care about Political Stability at Home?" *Review of Development Economics*, 15(3): 442-457. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9361.2011.00619.x>
- Ekici, Süleyman, and Gökhan Tuncel.** 2015. "Göç ve İnsan." *Birey ve Toplum*, 5(9): 9-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20493/bt.71783>
- Gara, Atdhetar, and Besnik Fetai.** 2024. "Determinants of Labour Force Migration: Evidence from the Western Balkans." *Prague Economic Papers*, 33(2): 244-260. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18267/j.pap.856>
- Guan, Qing, James O'Donnell, and James Raymer.** 2024. "Changes in International Migration to and from Australia during the COVID-19 Pandemic." *International Migration Review*, 0(0): 1-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/01979183241249967>
- Gül, Abdullah.** 2014. "Readmission Agreement." *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey*. August 02. <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2014/08/20140802-1.htm>.
- Günay, Enver, and Onur Çelik.** 2021. "Yakın Tarihte Afrika ve Asya'dan Türkiye'ye Göç Çekim Modeli ile Analizi." *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet*, 32(2): 505-524. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33417/tsh.770982>
- Guzi, Martin, and Stepan Mikula.** 2022. "Reforms That Keep You at Home: The Effects of Economic Transition on Migration." *Economics of Transition and Institutional Change*, 30(2): 289-310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ecot.12287>
- Josidifis, Kosta, John Hall, Valerie Berenger, and Novica Supic.** 2013. "Eastern Migrations vs Western Welfare States - (Un)Biased Fears." *Panoeconomicus*, 60(3): 323-345. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2298/PAN1303323J>
- Karkanis, Dimitrios, Evgenia Anastasiou, Konstantina Ragazou, and Marie-Noelle Duquenne.** 2022. "Asylum Flows in the EU Context: Lessons from Gravity." *Migration Letters*, 19(2): 123-138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33182/ml.v19i2.1605>
- Küçükcan, Talip.** 2022. "Türkiye's Migration Experience and Policy Orientations: Integrating Syrians in Higher Education." *Studies in European Affairs*, 26(3): 175-193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33067/SE.3.2022.8>
- Lee, Everett S.** 1966. "A Theory of Migration." *Demography*, 3(1): 47-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2060063>

- Malaj, Visar, and Stefano de Rubertis.** 2017. "Determinants of Migration and the Gravity Model of Migration - Application on Western Balkan Emigration Flows." *Migration Letters*, 14(2): 204-220. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33182/ml.v14i2.327>
- Malaj, Visar, and Naiada Firza.** 2023. "The Impact of Corruption on Migration: Evidence from the Western Balkans." *Migration Letters*, 20(8): 896-907. <http://dx.doi.org/10.59670/ml.v20i8.5627>
- Malaj, Visar, and Soana Jaupllari Teka.** 2023. "Emigration and Gravity Theory: Application on the Western Balkans." *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 8(1): 12-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26417/802ecr24c>
- Mayda, Anna Maria.** 2010. "International Migration: A Panel Data Analysis of the Determinants of Bilateral Flows." *Journal of Population Economics*, 23(4): 1249-1274. <http://dx.doi.org/0.1007/s00148-009-0251-x>
- Nejad, Maryam N., and Andrew T. Young.** 2016. "Want Freedom, Will Travel: Emigrant Self-Selection according to Institutional Quality." *European Journal of Political Economy*, 45(S): 71-84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2016.06.002>
- Nica, Elvira.** 2015. "Labor Market Determinants of Migration Flows in Europe." *Sustainability*, 7(1): 634-647. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su7010634>
- Ortega, Francesc, and Giovanni Peri.** 2013. "The Effect of Income and Immigration Policies on International Migration." *Migration Studies*, 1(1): 47-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/migration/mns004>
- Owen, David.** 2024. "From Forced Migration to Displacement?" *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 43(3): 272-279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/rsg/hdae016>
- Pietrzak, Michal Bernard, Natalia Drzewoszewska, and Justyna Wilk.** 2012. "The Analysis of Interregional Migrations in Poland in the Period 2004-2010 Using Panel Gravity Model." *Dynamic Econometric Models*, 12: 111-122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/DEM.2012.008>
- Poprawe, Marie.** 2015. "On the Relationship between Corruption and Migration: Empirical Evidence from a Gravity Model of Migration." *Public Choice*, 163(3-4): 337-354. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11127-015-0255-x>
- Soytürk, Mehmet.** 2012. "Türkiye'den Avusturya'ya İşgücü Göçü." *Turkish Studies*, 7(3): 2313-2328. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.3465>
- Stark, Oded.** 2006. "Inequality and Migration: A Behavioral Link." *Economic Letters*, 91(1): 146-152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2005.09.015>
- Stark, Oded, Maja Micevska, and Jerzy Mycielski.** 2009. "Relative Poverty as a Determinant of Migration: Evidence from Poland." *Economic Letters*, 103(3): 119-122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2009.02.006>
- Tanırkulu, Faik.** 2021. "The Political Economy of Migration and Integration: Effects of Immigrants on the Economy in Turkey." *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 19(4): 364-377. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2020.1810840>
- Tepealtı, Fahrettin.** 2019. "Avrupa Birliği'ne Yönelik Türkiye Geçişli (Transit) Göç Hareketleri ve Türkiye'nin Düzensiz Göçle Mücadelesi." *Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi*, 24(41): 125-140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17295/ataunidcd.548941>
- Tunca, Hakan Ömer, and Ahmet Karadağ.** 2018. "Suriye'den Türkiye'ye Göç: Tehditler ve Fırsatlar." *Science Journal of Turkish Military Academy*, 28(2): 47-68.
- Turkish Directorate General of Migration Management Report.** 2023. "Overview of Migrant Situation Migrant Presence Monitoring." Annual Report 2023.

- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.** 2023. Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2023. <https://www.unhcr.org/global-trends-report-2023> (accessed December 21, 2023).
- Ullah, A. K. M. Ahsan, and Ahmed Shafiqul Huque.** 2020. “Demoralization-Led Migration in Bangladesh: A Sense of Insecurity-Based Decision-Making Model.” *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 5(4): 351-370. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2057891119867140>
- Vasilyeva, Rogneda, Valentin Voytenkov, and Alina Urazbaeva.** 2023. “The Impact of Institutional Factors on Bilateral Migration: The Gravity Approach.” *Corvinus Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 14(1): 55-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14267/CJSSP.2023.1.3>
- Winter, Simon.** 2020. “‘It’s the Economy, Stupid!’: On the Relative Impact of Political and Economic Determinants on Migration.” *Population Research and Policy Review*, 39(2): 207-252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11113-019-09529-y>
- Wood, William B.** 1994. “Forced Migration: Local Conflicts and International Dilemmas.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 84(4): 607-634. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.1994.tb01879.x>