



Ege Coğrafya Dergisi, 23/2 (2014), 1-18, İzmir
Aegean Geographical Journal, 23/2 (2014), 1-18, İzmir—TURKEY

A MIGRATION SYSTEM FORMATION BASED ON TOURISM BETWEEN RUSSIA AND TURKEY (ANTALYA)¹

Rusya ile Türkiye Arasında Turizme Dayalı Bir Göç Sistemi Oluşumu

Ertuğrul Murat ÖZGÜR

*Ankara University Geography Department
ozgur@ankara.edu.tr*

Ayla DENİZ

*Ankara University Geography Department
adeniz@ankara.edu.tr*

Abstract

Starting from the mid-1980s, flows of goods and capital between Russia and Turkey was followed by ever-increasing flows of people; thus, Turkey - particularly Antalya, a tourism city - became a destination for a great number of Russian tourists and migrants. This study examines the emerge of an Antalya-centred migration system based on tourism between Turkey and Russia, as well as focusing on the macro and micro structures having influence over this system.

This study bases on data derived from a survey carried out on 209 Russian participants, who were reached by means of the several snowball sampling methods, and on interviews with migrants. Main findings of the study indicate that: Tourism creates strong linkages in the migration system between the two countries; the migration system feeds itself through touristic travels, circular participation in the local workforce, partner relationships, marriage, and VFR; the region where the Russian community live spreads along the coast and finally the migration system is also developed with attracting other CIS citizens.

Keywords: International Migration Systems, Tourism, Russia, Turkey, Antalya.

Öz

1980'lerin ortasından başlayarak, Rusya ve Türkiye arasındaki emtia ve sermaye akışını, giderek artan insan akışları izledi; böylece Türkiye, özellikle de bir turizm şehri olan Antalya, büyük bir miktardaki Rus turist ve göçmen için bir destinasyon haline geldi. Bu çalışma, Türkiye ve Rusya arasında turizme

¹ This article has been derived from the TÜBİTAK Project numbered 112K480 entitled "Immigration from Russia and Azerbaijan to Turkey and the Formation of a Transnational Social Space in Antalya". Extended summary of this article has been presented at the 2014 Conference of Turkish Association of Geographers.

dayanan, Antalya merkezli bir göç sisteminin ortaya çıkışını incelemekte, aynı zamanda bu sistem üzerinde tkili olan mikro ve makro yapılara odaklanmaktadır.

Bu çalışma, farklı kartopu örneklemeler yoluyla ulaşılan 209 Rus katılımcılara uygulanan bir araştırmaya ve göçmenlerle yapılan mülakatlara dayanmaktadır. Çalışmanın bulguları, turizmin iki ülke arasındaki göç sistemlerinde güçlü bağlantılar yarattığına, göç sisteminin turistik seyahatler, yerel işgücüne döngüsel katılım, partner ilişkileri, evlilik ve arkadaş-akraba ziyaretleri yoluyla kendi kendini beslediğine, Rus topluluğunun yaşadığı bölgenin kıyı boyunca yayıldığına ve son olarak göç sisteminin diğer BDT vatandaşlarını çekerek de geliştiğine işaret etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Uluslararası göç sistemleri, turizm, Rusya, Türkiye, Antalya

INTRODUCTION

The economic, political and social changes and transformations which happened worldwide in the recent years have influenced international migration, and, migration to some countries, such as Turkey, other than the traditional receiving countries started to increase (Karaçay and Düvell, 2013). Therefore, having been among sending countries in general until 1980s, Turkey's position within global migration regimes changed. Having received from time to time the migration of ethnic Turks since the foundation years of the Republic of Turkey, Turkey joined the countries that send mass labour migration to Europe in the 1960s. Afterwards, in 1970s and 1980s, Turkey's sending country identity strengthened, as a result of the family reunification and refugee movements to Europe as well as worker migration flows to the Arabic countries and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Besides, Turkey became the transit country of Asian migrants who seek to go to the West. In addition, from the 1990s, Turkey began to develop for the first time the identity of a migration-receiving country, as a result of rather irregular flows of foreigners (İçduygu, 2004; Kirişçi, 2003), and became the destination of migrants from the European Union (EU), CIS, Middle East and African countries.

Due to the collapse of the socialist system, the former Soviet Union (USSR) countries became participants of the international migration movements, beginning from the early 1990s (Molodikova, 2007). As an indication of transformations which took shape after the disintegration of the Soviet Union and its passage to a new economic system, new migration patterns

have emerged throughout the post-Soviet territories (Ivakhnyuk, 2006 and 2007; Molodikova, 2007; Yudina, 2005). Flows of people from the former Soviet Union towards foreign countries played a vital role in coping with the living difficulties that emerged during the change of the political-economic system (Rybakovsky and Ryazantsev, 2005; Zayonchkovskaya, 2000), and a part of such flows headed towards Turkey (Iontsev and Ivakhnyuk, 2002).

Albeit Russia is today a major labour force market attracting labour migrants from a great number of countries (Number of migrants (irregular migrants, to a great extent) varied presumably from 3-4 million to 13 million people) (Ivakhnyuk, 2007; Molodikova, 2007; Yudina, 2005), Russians constituted a large group among circular migrants who arrived in Turkey immediately after Soviet Union disintegrated. Initially arrived in the Black Sea coastal cities of Turkey (Aydın, 2006; Beller-Hann, 1995) and the metropolis of Istanbul for working in sectors such as tourism, entertainment and domestic works, as well as for carrying out shuttle trade (Erder and Kaşka, 2003; Gülçür and İlkaracan, 2002; Iontsev and Ivakhnyuk, 2002; Yüksek, 2003 and 2007; İrdam, 2011). However, by time, Russian migration spread to other large cities of Turkey, such as Ankara and İzmir, and to touristic regions at the Mediterranean coast, such as Antalya, Alanya and Fethiye (Dedeoğlu, 2010; Gebelek, 2008). Yet the main development took place in the Antalya region, and both tourist and migrant flows from Russia to Turkey continued increasingly toward this region in particular (Deniz and Özgür, 2010).

A migration system had emerged between Turkey and Russia, beginning from the mid- 1980s, through the project-tied migrants brought there by the Turkish construction companies which had been dealing with undertaking business in Russia (İçduygu, 2009; İçduygu and Karaçay, 2012). This system had further developed after disintegration of the Soviet Union, due to the good political-economic relations between the two countries, and migrant flows increased. In the recent years, Antalya and its surroundings became an important component of this migration system in relation to tourism. This study, by focusing on the migration flows from Russia towards Antalya and on a sub-migration system resulting from such flows related to tourism, seeks an answer to the question “Why some of the human movements between locations are of continuous and systematic characteristics, which is self-perpetuated in time?” (de Haas, 2009).

Even though studies regarding the tourism-migration relation (Gössling and Schulz, 2005; Hall and Williams 2002; Williams 2012; Williams and Hall 2000; 2002) or retirement and lifestyle migration (Balkır and Kırkulak, 2009; Benson 2010; King *et al.* 2000; O'Reilly 1995; Südaş and Mutluer, 2006; Warnes and Patterson, 1998; Williams *et al.*, 2000) have been often encountered within the last two decades, the importance of tourist flows and touristic activities for the formation of a migration system has been emphasized on a limited scale (Ryazantsev, 2013), thus, the tourism-migration relation remained unexamined to a great extent (Hall and Page, 1999). Therefore, this study is expected to contribute, in general, to the development of the notion of migration system and, in particular, to help understand a migration system newly developing between Russia and Turkey in relation to tourism.

At the centre of the study, Antalya is a rapidly growing tourism city situated at the south of Turkey at the Mediterranean coast (Turquoise Coast), which has a population of 2.158.265 people (Turkish Statistical Institute-TUIK 2014a). As a result of the implementation of the “South Antalya Tourism Development Project”, which was prepared for the purpose of improving tourism in Turkey, Antalya has become an important

destination for domestic as well as foreign tourists, particularly for those from the EU and CIS countries. The rapid development in tourism made Antalya a destination for internal and international migrations and by this means the city transformed into a concentrating area of people with different ethnic/national identities and cultural properties. According to the statistics of the TUIK, 456.506 foreigners are living in Turkey as of end-2013, and Antalya, with 42.310 people, is the second city with the largest foreign population, after Istanbul (135.018 people). The same statistics indicate that 20.650 Russian Federation citizens are registered in Turkey, and Antalya is the city with the largest Russian population, with 6.876 people (1/3 of the Russians registered in Turkey) (TUIK, 2014b).

This study bases substantially on the data obtained from a questionnaire, applied in summer 2013 to 209 Russian participants who were reached by means of the several snowball sampling methods. The questionnaire applied composes of questions directed towards determining the socio-economic properties and migration motivations of the Russian migrants, the Antalya connections and transnationalism tendencies of the migrants. Such data are supported by field observations made during the same period, interviews with the migrants and qualitative document analysis. The interviews include semi-structured questions aiming to understand migrants' lives before migration, their personal migration experiences, the impacts of tourism and visits of friends-relatives (VFR), on the migration process, and the future of the migration. In this scope, interviews with eight Russian migrant females and four Turkish spouses have taken averagely 45 minutes. Information obtained as a result of the interviews was used in this article for descriptively supporting the questionnaire findings.

The study proceeds with a theoretical background following the introduction, which provides a briefing on the migration systems approach; then, the macro and micro structures prevailing in the emergence and development of Antalya-centred migration system basing on tourism are examined, and the article ends with the concluding remarks, by which the main elements of the migration system are emphasized.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: MIGRATION SYSTEMS APPROACH

Having lost favour at a time in the past, in parallel to the regression of the general system theory (Bertalanffy, 1950) and attracted the attention of a very few number of researchers, (Mabogunje, 1970), the migration systems theory has once again found its place among academic priorities as a result of the revival of the social system theory in recent years (Pickel, 2007), owing to the social theory (Bakewell, 2012).

As known, the international migration system emerges at a spatial dimension, basing on at least two countries (or rather, locations between different countries) which have been tied through migration flows and other linkages (Bakewell *et al.*, 2011).

The migration system is shaped by certain political, economic, social and demographical context factors in the sending and receiving countries (Kritz and Zlotnik, 1992) and characterized by feedback mechanisms linked by human movements between certain locations (Fawcett, 1989; Levitt, 1998). Locations within a migration system are linked to each other not only through migrant flows, but also through other tangible, relational and regulatory linkage types (Fawcett, 1989). Such formal and informal links encourage migration by various means, strengthening the systematic structure of international flows, and forms a relatively stable human exchange between some nations, hence making up a definable geographical structure which lasts through time and space (de Haas, 2009, 9; Massey *et al.*, 1998, 61). Though it is not possible for all human flows to make up a system, it is a fact that migration leads to more migration (de Haas, 2009). As the number of migrants settling in the migration destination reaches a significant size, migration gains a self-sustaining (Massey, 1990) and self-changing characteristic on account for the emergence of dynamic social structures and migration networks, thus emergence of a system becomes possible.

Migration systems approach essentially points out that a migration movement takes place through links resulting from the interaction of macro and micro structures (Castles and Miller, 2003). Macro

structures include large-scale political and economic institutional structures; and micro structures include migrant networks, practises and migrants' own thoughts. These two structures are linked to each other through a series of mechanisms called meso-structures.

The notion of migration systems also offers us a tool for explaining the inter-meshing status of the dual causality between tourism and migration (Williams *et al.*, 2000). All kinds of population movements, including tourist entries-exits, have a direct or indirect contribution to the migration system, and idiosyncratic systems may develop by dint of interactions (Kritz and Zlotnik, 1992). Tangible linkages such as tourist flows, VFR, relational linkages that the migrants have established as a result of previous holiday/work experiences (Hall and Williams, 2002), and the States' regulations on tourism and foreigners, as part of the system, may play a critical role in the emergence and development of a migration system.

EMERGENCE OF ANTALYA-CENTRED MIGRATION SYSTEM BETWEEN RUSSIA AND TURKEY

Macro Structures: Political, Economic and Social Contexts

Political Relations

Turkish-Russian relations have always been problematic, except for historically short intervals (Çelikpala, 2007), and the relations have often been prevailed by war, diplomatic struggle, political tension and reciprocal distrust. Nevertheless, the fact that the economic means of foreign policy began from the early 1980s to be brought to the forefront in bilateral relations, with a functionalist approach, contributed to the reduction of the political issues between Turkey and Russia (Büyükkıncı, 2004). Collapse of the Soviet Union and ending of the Cold War changed the shape of Turkish-Russian bilateral relations (Çelikpala, 2007), and the relations of the two countries came by a new approach based on commercial partnership and mutual understanding (Özbay, 2011). The political-economic cooperation agreements signed between Russia and Turkey and institutional structures such as Turkish-Russian

High Level Cooperation Council (Özdam *et al.*, 2013) created regulatory links within the migration system, which positive links activated the beginning phase of a migration system between two countries (İçduygu and Karaçay, 2012, 58).

Legislation on Foreigners in Turkey

The legal legislation in Turkey and the bilateral agreements signed with Russia are among the important political elements of the migration system between the two countries.

1) Visa. Foreigners' law of Turkey allows the foreigners who are to stay for up to ninety days enter the country by visa (Republic of Turkey Official Gazette, 2013). However, citizens of some countries (e.g. Russian Federation citizens, since 2011) are exempted from visa, as a result of agreements to which the Republic of Turkey is party to or of Cabinet decision. This practice allows foreigners to enter Turkey easily as tourists and to stay in the country for up to six months (either by renewing visa or illegally). This enables the foreigners who enter the country by tourist visa to work at the informal labour market during the tourism season and encourages their circular movements.

2) Buying Property. Since it allows a migrant to obtain residence permit in case he/she buys a house in Turkey, the Turkish legislation on foreigners' possession in Turkey transforms into a significant element feeding the migration system. For, the legal regulation on foreigners' residence permits in Turkey enables one who holds property or who shall establish trade connections or a business in Turkey to be granted with a one-year residence permit (Republic of Turkey Official Gazette, 2013). The motives of possession and establishment of trade connections/business, as stated in the law, helps the tourists arriving at Turkey and circular migrants entering Turkey by tourist visa turn into permanent migrants. Observations and interviews made in Antalya indicate that some Russians who arrived as tourists have shown tendencies to become permanent by this way. Further, possession leads up for the tourists to extend their holiday durations and also for retirement migration.

3) Citizenship. Foreigners in Turkey may acquire Turkish citizenship, on condition to remain married to a Turkish citizen at least for three years and to reside in Turkey uninterruptedly for five years (Republic of Turkey Official Gazette, 2009). Hence, migrants who acquire citizenship via marriage are entitled to permanent residence, making business and other citizenship rights and turn into critical actors in the development of the migration system.

Goods, Capital and Human Flows

1) Goods flows. The volume of trade between Turkey and Russian Federation is gradually increasing. By this way, the bilateral trading volume which was 3.5 billion dollars in 1999 (Kınıklıoğlu, 2001) reached its top level with 38 billion dollars in 2008 (Aras, 2009), and the trading volume is at the level of 32 billion dollars as of end-2013 (TUIK, 2014c). In addition, it is estimated that Turkey has made revenue of 60-70 billion dollars from 1992 to 2005, through shuttle trade (Kolobov *et al.*, 2006).

2) Capital flows. While the Turkish private sector accelerated its investments in Russia beginning from the end-1990s, the Russian private sector's interest in making investment in Turkey has increased in the recent years. It is estimated that as of end-2011 the total amount of the investments of Turkish entrepreneurs in Russia has reached 8 billion dollars, and that the amount of investments of Russian investors in Turkey has exceeded 9 billion dollars (The investment amount of the nuclear power plant to be constructed by Russians in Mersin, Akkuyu (at the south coast of Turkey) is estimated to reach 20 billion dollars.). Number of Turkish banks operating in Russia is increasing (Özdam *et al.*, 2013). Number of the projects to which Turkish construction companies operating in this country had been related from 1989 to 2012 has reached 1.283, and the total project value has reached 35 billion dollars (Akın, 2013: 100).

3) Migrant worker flows. Flows of goods and capital between Turkey and Russia, as well as the developing trade relations and economic investments, contribute also to the increase of human flows. In particular, migrant-worker flows are taking place from Turkey to the Russian Federation, in connection with undertaking works

(İçduygu, 2009). Workers sent every year from Turkey to foreign countries through the Turkish Employment Organisation-ISKUR include a great number of workers going to Russia.² On the other hand, the touristic establishments and tourism agencies in Antalya import staff from Russia and CIS countries. These mutual flows of people serve to strengthen the links of the two countries.

4) Tourist flows. Turkey's economy has flourished, by means of a structural transformation, in a short span of time beginning from the 1980s, and tourism became one of the growing sectors which drive the economy (Deniz and Özgür, 2010). With the rapid development, the numbers and bed capacities of touristic facilities have been increased, the transportation infrastructure has been improved, and all inclusive holiday programs have been made up for foreign tourists. Thus, the number of tourists visiting Turkey has reached 36 million in 2012 (The World Tourism Organization-UNWTO, 2014) from 1.158.125 in 1981 (State Institute of Statistics, 1994).

Furthermore, thanks to the facts that the political and economic links between Turkey and CIS countries have enhanced and Turkey, through a liberal border policy, has eased the way for foreigners to enter the country for short-time visits, an increase has been observed in the number of tourists arriving at Turkey from the post-Soviet region (Erder, 2010). While in 1988 only 20 thousand visitors came to Turkey from the former Soviet Union, in the year 2013, the number of people coming from CIS countries has exceeded 8.6 million (Table 1).

According to the Russian Federal Statistics Institution, citizens of the Russian Federation made totally 54 million overseas travels in the year 2013, and the same year Turkey has welcomed 4.269.306 Russian citizens, thanks to visa convenience, geographical proximity and service quality (The Association of Turkish Travel Agencies, 2014 and Table 1). Antalya holds the first place among touristic destinations that foreign tourists, especially the Russians, mostly prefer in Turkey (Turkish Hoteliers Federation, 2014).

² Number of workers sent to Russia is 13.463 in the year 2013, (ISKUR, 2014)

Table.1 Numbers of tourists that arrived in Turkey from the CIS and Russian Federation

Tablo 1: BDT ve Rusya Federasyonu'ndan Türkiye'ye gelen turistlerin sayısı

Years	CIS	Russian Federation
1988	21.567	-
1994	929.807	397.701
2000	1.380.731	677.152
2005	3.431.601	1.864.682
2010	6.075.484	3.107.043
2013	8.607.486	4.269.306

Sources: TUIK, 2014d; Deniz and Özgür, 2010:15

Transportation links

In parallel to the acceleration of mutual touristic visits, transportation opportunities between Turkey and Russia improve. Airlines with Turkish and Russian capital have scheduled flights to different points between the two countries (Özdal *et al.*, 2013, 61). Having been established at the beginning between Istanbul and Moscow with a limited number of flights, the airline connection has developed and become frequent in progress of time, and the points of connection in Russia have spread geographically. Especially during the tourism season, intense air transportation occurs in Antalya. The fact that the airline connection becomes stronger makes a positive contribution to the development of mutual relations and flows.

Micro Structures: Characteristics, Experiences and Networks of Migrants

Which basic attributes do the Russian migrants have?

According to the results of the questionnaire applied in Antalya, the rate of women among Russian participants is very high (83%). Other references point out that women are active participants in migrations from Russia to Antalya (Deniz, 2012; Deniz and Özgür, 2010 and 2014). Average age of the Russian participants is 37, and 45 per cent of them are within the age interval of 30-39. Almost 73% of the Russian participants are either married or in cohabitation (more than half of them are together with a Turk), about 90% of them have a bachelor's and master's degree and approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of them have managerial or professional occupations. 97 per cent of the Russian

participants speak Turkish, at least at basic level. Besides, 65% of them speak English and about 20% speak one of the Western languages.

Employment participation rate of the Russian participants in Antalya is 53% and the jobs they perform include mostly professional jobs related to tourism (42%), service and sales jobs (23%). Jobs that the Russians hold examined in detail, the occupation-tourism relation is observed more clearly: Russian participants' rate of working in hotel and tourism agency, sports-entertainment-art, real estate and retail sales sectors exceeds 60 per cent. Considered together with other jobs, it is understood that Russians are successful in seeing the gaps of the Turkish labour market and in creating new business areas (Özgür *et al.*, 2014), as well as in making the best of the opportunities that tourism provides.

Russian migrants with high level of education work in qualified jobs and therefore derive good revenues in Antalya (Özgür *et al.*, 2014). 42 per cent of Russian participants earn more than 1500 \$ monthly, which offers migrants a good life quality in Turkey, where the subsistence wage is about 375 \$. Majority of the Russian migrants work in employee status, though the rate of employers and self-employed (37 per cent) is worth to note.

In brief, it may be brought forward that the Russian participants living in Antalya is a qualified group consisting mostly of young adults, predominantly married and females, with high level of education, skills, language and income.

When and why did the Russian migrants come first to Antalya? At which arrival did they decide to live here and what was it that affected this decision?

Russian participants began to come to Antalya beginning from 1990, however, it is determined that the first arrivals started to increase from 2000 to 2004 (25%) and became remarkable after 2005 (57 per cent). The first arrival purpose of participants is touristic to a large extent (61 per cent), this is why touristic travels are of a critical importance in the formation and development of the migration system. However, while touristic travels predominate the first arrival purposes of those who came to Antalya in the early periods

(e.g. 89 per cent of those who arrived in the period 1990-1994 arrived for touristic purposes), the rate of those arriving for touristic purposes is relatively decreasing after the year 2010 (47 per cent). On the other hand, first arrivals to Antalya for other purposes such as VFR knowledge, working, education and settlement increase after the year 2000. This, on one hand, means that touristic travels preserve their importance in migration to Antalya, while, on the other, indicating that VFR, work, and even direct settlement have begun to be important elements in feeding the migration system.

More than half (53 per cent) of the Russian participants decide to live in Antalya after 1 or 2 arrivals; and, the rate of those who have decided to live in Antalya after coming here 3 or 4 times reaches 30 per cent. The crosstab analysis made provides us with an interesting relation between the arrival during which it is decided to live here and the first year of arrival. It takes long for the Russian migrants who arrived in Antalya in the early period (1990-1994) to decide to live here (56 per cent of the migrants who came here at this period decided to live here after arriving here more than five times), while those who have arrived here in the near past (83% of those who came after 2010), make this decision after 1-2 arrivals. This finding shows us that Russian migrants are deciding to stay in Antalya in a shorter time in comparison with the past. This probably indicates the positive impact of the facts that the Russian community has grown and established its social networks on possible migrants.

It is important, in order to understand the migration process, to know what the migrants' basic motives are in deciding to live in Antalya. For this purpose, participants were asked five-degree Likert type questions and it was endeavoured to determine the most important variables, according to the means. The analyses made show that the basic motives prompting Russians to live in Antalya are led by some attractive properties of the destination (Turkey, especially Antalya).

"Antalya is Turkey's warmest place. We came to Antalya in January 2005. We saw that Antalya is beautiful, the blue sky, the oranges, green trees and so on..." (Female, 40 years old,

married, university graduate, not working)

The most important reasons for Russian participants in choosing Antalya as a migration destination are respectively Antalya's warm climate, good environmental conditions and touristic attractions, the fact that Turkey has an image of good and liveable country, the host society's tolerant attitude towards foreigners, the ease of establishing social and human relations with the local people, former positive Turkey and Antalya experiences (e.g. holiday, education) and the existence of a vast number of foreigners in Antalya. Surely the migration motives of Russian participants include economic-based ones, such as various job opportunities in Antalya, demand for Russian-speaking labour force and expectations of good earning. However, economic factors have been found less important than social and geographical factors in Russians' decisions to migrate to Antalya.

An interviewee replies the question "What do Turkey and Antalya mean for you?" as:

"Turkey and Antalya, to speak with short words: sun... Turkey means Antalya to me, they united, and they became one. Of course not everywhere in Turkey is like Antalya. But we live here; this is why Antalya seems to mean Turkey." (*Female, 40 years old, married, university graduate, not working*)

Another interviewer summarizes the local people's view to foreigners in the following words, in a way to reflect tourism's effect in Antalya:

"As a free person, I want to be free in all aspects. If I'm thinking to go out alone and drink that night, I go out alone and drink. I can go wherever I want in Kemer (Antalya)... For, people in Antalya are so used to foreigners that they don't see us. But in Central Anatolia, one night, on my own?" (*Female, 41 years old, divorced, university graduate, has her own company*)

The fact that the most important migration motives include migrants' previous holiday experiences, the existence of a great number of foreigners due

to its being a touristic, the local people's being used to live together with foreigners and touristic attractiveness may probably indicate the relation of the migration system between Russia and Turkey to tourism. The destination such socio-spatial characteristics related to tourism, which attracts migrants, creates at the same time a contextual feedback mechanism which sustains the migration process.

Tourism is one of the critical areas which strengthen Turkey-Russia relations and it creates very significant material and relational links in the migration system between the two countries (Fawcett 1989; Hall and Williams 2002). Links of the Antalya-centred migration system between Russia and Turkey emerge in the tourist flows and touristic activities, which increase in parallel to the political-economic relations and dependencies increasing between the two countries (Deniz and Özgür, 2013), and develop and gain continuity in the course of time.

As known, touristic travels may be a preliminary facilitator of migration for some people (Oigenblick and Kirschenbaum, 2002), and the development of tourism may lead to temporary or permanent mass flows of tourists and, at the same time, of labour migrants (Gössling and Schulz, 2005). In bilateral relations, tourism helps two different cultures get to know each other better and reduces social prejudices, not to mention its economic acquisitions (Özdal *et al.*, 2013). Hence, the mutual negative prejudices of sending and accepting societies may turn into a positive image, through increasing visits between the two countries.

Touristic travels, before all else, help migrants overcome the feeling of being outsider to the destination, obtain information on the host society and location, as well as establish friendship and business connections. Previous holiday experiences of individual migrants are important in the destination selection of migrants (Williams *et al.*, 2000). Holiday experiences help migrants define the space they look for and provide an infrastructure which facilitates their migration. This is why Cuba (1991) quotes that proximity to a certain destination through holiday visits precedes the decision of migration.

The increase in the number of tourists arriving from the origin country in the destination creates a demand for a labour force who can speak these tourists' language (e.g. Russian language). Hence, it becomes possible for some tourists to find jobs later on in the destination, and they turn into temporary migrants or permanent habitants (King *et al.*, 2000).

There are a great number of studies indicating the strong relation between VFR and migration (e.g. Jackson, 1990; Yuan *et al.*, 1995) and such visits are of importance in determining the migration target, since they provide direct information regarding residing realities (Williams *et al.*, 2000). VFR increases as the number of migrants from a certain origin country increases. While tourism stimulates permanent migration, permanent migration creates demand for tourism, particularly for VFR tourism (Dwyer *et al.*, 2010).

Touristic travels may lead to new movements such as possession of a second house, lifestyle and retirement migration. Possession of a second house often functions as a stepping-stone for seasonal visits for holiday and the subsequent permanent migration (Williams *et al.*, 2000). Warnes (1991) puts that the mental maps of retired migrants restrict their possible geographical searches and that for most of them, the outer reaches of such maps are determined by their previous holiday experiences (Williams *et al.*, 2000).

Finally, tourism activities may attract students who wish to serve their internships in touristic facilities, and investors, thanks to the business opportunities they offer, and even may cause some tourists to turn into marriage migrants as a result of emotional relationships (Deniz and Özgür, 2013).

"I came for internship, stayed for 5.5 months. When the internship finished I went back. Then I came again. And then I met Hasan (Turkish spouse of the Russian migrant), we met at the end of the season" (*Female, married, graduate of tourism school, works as a receptionist in a hotel in Kemer*)

What kind of a role did the network connections play in the migration of Russian migrants to Antalya?

Through the questionnaires applied to Russian participants, they were asked from whom they got assistance in their process of migration to Antalya, as well as their level of agreeing with some expressions regarding their connections they maintain in Antalya. From the answers, it was determined that while migrating Russian participants got the most assistance from spouses, majority of whom were Turks, (38.3 per cent), lovers (12.9 per cent) and other Turkish friends/relatives (65.6%). Russians who live today or have lived in the past in Antalya held the second place with 30.2 per cent. 20.6 per cent of participants declared that they have used the Internet and media or that they got no assistance during their migration process (Since participants have marked more than one option, the total ratio exceeds 100 per cent.). Similarly, Turkish spouses, lovers and other acquaintances became the most active actors for the migrants to find job and accommodation and in their integration with the destination. This probably indicates that the marriage and partner relationship has an important role in entire of the migration process.

Though the predecessor migrants in the origin and destinations function in facilitating the migration and in making it easier to decrease the pressure of adapting to a new society, migrant networks are generally of a secondary importance in the migration process. But what more interesting is the role that the migrant himself/herself has played as an actor in the migration process. Russian participants indicate a high level to make use of means of mass communication and not to get any assistance in turning the migration decision into movement and finding jobs and accommodation after migration, and adapting to Antalya and the Turkish society (varying from 20 to 35 per cent). Nonetheless, the analyses indicate a high tendency of participants to inform those who want to come from Russia to Antalya and top assist the newcomers in getting to know Antalya, and a medium tendency to help them find jobs and accommodation. This finding shows similarity with the participants' networks effects in their own

migration experiences. An interviewer whose spouse is Russian answers the question "Are there any of your wife's friends in Russia who wish to live in Antalya or who ask for your help in finding a job?" as:

"There are people who want to get residence permit here, or who want to have houses here, so they won't pay tons of money for holiday, and they'll stay in their own houses." (*Male, 37 years old, married, high school graduate, works in tourism*)

Russian migrants' individual qualities, their previous Antalya and Turkey experiences and the fact that they speak Turkish by a majority bring them to the forefront as an actor in the migration process, and reduce relatively the need for networks. There is evidence in the migration literature that migrants become less dependent on social capital, in parallel to the increase in their qualities.

What kind of links do the migrants establish with the origin country?

Russian migrants in Antalya inform their friends and relatives on the destination and link up to the origin region in different dimensions. 63 per cent of the participants live in Antalya at all year round, and 37 per cent of them live outside Antalya, mostly in Russia, during a part of the year (18 per cent more than 6 months). This points out that some Russian migrants are circular migrants moving between at least two countries (19 per cent of the participants also work in their own country).

Spouses of the 21 of 162 participants (13 per cent) with spouses, children of the 67 (49 per cent) of 138 participants with children, parents of 152 (95 per cent) of 160 participants with parents live in Russia or in another country.

It is another form of connection that migrants visit their relatives in the origin country or that their relatives visit them in Antalya. Therefore, the frequency and reason of migrants' travel to and back from the origin country is meaningful information. Participants' majority (75 per cent) state that they travel to and back from Russia once or twice a year, while 9 per cent declare that they go more than 3 times a year. Percentage of those

who go there once in a few years and who never go at all is 16 per cent.

Participants go to Russia mostly for VFR (67 per cent) and for vacation (8 per cent) and generally (65 per cent) stay shorter than a month. Such figures indicate that the Russian migrants pursue their physical connections to the origin country.

The fact that migrants see their relatives in their country or other countries via means of communication such as the Internet and telephone etc. provides a very strong connection between them. 85 per cent of the Russian participants use these tools very effectively for the origin country connection, while only 4 per cent do not use it at all. A Russian migrant interviewed with explains her connection with her family:

"At least once a week I talk to my mother and father on the phone. And I see my brother via Skype. I constantly talk to my family. They come here once a year and stay with us. Maybe they can buy a house here when they get retired. We are talking about it. We go to Russia every 2-3 years and stay there for one-two months with our children. Our children see the place and the life over there and they spend time with my mother and father, and cousins." (*Female, 31 years old, married, university graduate, teacher of Russian language*)

In addition, half of the migrants use social networking sites serving over the Internet.

Another tangible linkage with the origin country is ensured through money transfers. 22.5 per cent of the Russian participants express that they send money transfers to at least one of the parents, spouses, children or brothers-sisters, whether regularly or irregularly. Additionally, some (21.5 per cent) of the Russian migrants establish business connections with the origin country in the fields of tourism, real estate and commerce.

What are the future plans of migrants?

Future plans of migrants, when considered together with some of their attributes, include important hints in respect of the continuity of the migration

and the growth of the community that migrants formed.

Through the questionnaires applied to Russian migrants, they were asked the places they wish to live in the future. Answers of the participants indicate that a great majority want to live in Antalya in the future and only a small part of them wish to go back to their country (Table 2).

Table 2 Places the Russian participants in Antalya prefer to live in the future

Tablo 2: Antalya'daki Rus katılımcıların, gelecekte yaşamayı tercih ettikleri yerler

Place wished to live in the future	Number	%
Antalya	149	71.3
Somewhere else in Turkey	6	2.9
Russia	12	5.7
Another country	5	2.4
Does not know	37	17.7
Total	209	100.0

The migrants' tendency to want their relatives in Antalya presents a similar pattern with the variable of the place where they wish to live in the future. The question: "Would you like your relatives to live in Antalya?" 70.3 per cent of the Russian participants answered yes, and 9.1 per cent answered no, and 20.6 per cent said they could not decide. An interviewed Russian migrant answered the question "How are you describing Antalya to those who wish to come here from your country?" as:

"Well I describe Antalya and Turkey as I see and I really love Turkey. It's comfortable here, my children are happy here..." (Female, 40 years old, married, university graduate, not working)

Some migrants married to Turks, though few in number, are planning to live in the future in Russia or in the two countries at the same time. A Turk married to a Russian migrant says:

"...We are there at least two-three months in a year (Moscow). My season ends, so I don't work and what to do if there's no work? My wife has a house there, we stay there... I applied for a residence permit. My wife has a citizenship here... Our son has dual citizenship...So we are both here and there." (Male, 37 years old, married, high school graduate, works in tourism)

Some characteristics of Russian participants stiffen their wishes to live in Antalya, hence Turkey, in the future. When the table indicating the Russian participants' level of language is examined, the Russians' level of knowledge of the host country's language, in categories other than speaking, is surprising. So much so that, it is understood that more than half of the participants can read and understand, even write in the Turkish language (Table 3).

Table 3 Turkish linguistic level of the Russian participants in Antalya

Tablo 3: Antalya'daki Rus katılımcıların Türkçe dilbilgisi düzeyi

Level	Speaking		Reading-understanding		Writing	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
None	7	3.3	11	5.3	16	7.7
Basic	34	16.3	32	15.3	30	14.4
Intermediate	51	24.4	53	25.4	53	25.3
Good	72	34.4	67	32.1	69	33.0
Very Good	45	21.5	46	22.0	40	19.1
No answer	-	-	-	-	1	0.5
Total	209	100.0	209	100.0	209	100.0

Moreover, 70 per cent of the Russian participants have acquired this skill by making efforts over a year and 43 per cent of them by attending a language course. Russian interviewer describes her language-learning process:

"I started TÖMER (A foundation giving Turkish language courses) in September...My father-in-law would take me to the course, my old father came with me for months, he waited for me at the door... It took me 2.5-3 years to work Turkish out completely. I mean completely, enough to discuss politics." (*Female, 31 years old, married, university graduate, teacher of Russian language*)

Language proficiency is a special thing (Williams 2012) and knowing the language of the host society increases migrants' social acknowledgment and integration (Esser 2006). A migrant's learning a native language may be considered as an expression of his/her wish to live for a long time or be permanent in that country.

The migrants' tendency to make investments in the destination may be a sign of their developing a new socio-spatial belonging. 56.5 per cent of the Russian participants stated that they have made any kind of investment in Antalya. Among the investments made, house ranks first, and workplace ranks second; 48 per cent of the participants state that they bought a house in Antalya, 13 per cent of them state that they bought a workplace, and an additional 6 per cent state that they bought touristic establishments. The list of investments fills with those who bought real properties such as land and fields. Buying properties is a behaviour which, in general, increases the spatial belonging, and this behaviour probably means more for a foreigner living in another country, and refers to his/her transnational identity.

The Russian participants' level of agreeing with the expressions given in regard to their social and spatial belonging to the migrated place has been measured through a five-degree likert scale. Results show, with a high average, that migrants feel belonging to and pleased with Antalya, as if they feel at home. An interviewer with a strong belonging feeling to Antalya and Turkey answers

the question: "What do you think about foreigners going into politics in Turkey?" as:

"I am a citizen of this country, I'm living here, working here and paying my taxes, driving my car, my children were born here and they go to a Turkish school. I can't say it's none of my business. I'm definitely in, I support it." (*Female, 41 years old, divorced, university graduate, has her own company*)

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Antalya-centred migration system, framework of which has been drawn by the good political and economic relations that developed between Russia and Turkey is being fed by tourist flows. Therefore, these flows are of importance in respect of the continuity of the system, as well as its formation. On one hand, linkage elements with power to mobilize masses, such as the international media and Internet are contributing to the advertisement of Turkey, and on the other, the fact that those arriving in Antalya convey their positive holiday experiences to the origin country is ensuring the strengthening of relational linkages and constituting a social context factor, which plays a critical role for the migration system. This factor, with the regulatory behaviour of tour operators and contribution of the airlines link established between the two countries, is ensuring the increase of the number of tourists coming to Turkey / Antalya from Russia and the post-Soviet region.

The migration system takes shape through the stages of touristic travels, participation in the circular qualified local labour force, partner relationship and becoming permanent through marriage (acquiring citizenship right). Increase in the period before the year 2000 in the number of Russian-speaking tourists created a demand for Russian and Turkish speaking labour force in Antalya. Thus, relational linkages emerged from Russia and other Russian-speaking societies (mostly through female circular migrants) for meeting this demand. These pioneer migrants contributed to the formation of the networks, however, the main contribution to the development of such nets owes to the emotional relationships that some of these migrants lived with Turkish

men. For, some of these partner relationships resulted in marriage after a while and the circular migrants turned into marriage migrants.

Marriage of Russian female migrants to men from the local people paved the way for them to obtain residence permit, and after a while, then acquire citizenship, therefore become permanent. Such a tendency became evident in Antalya during the period 2000-2005 and lead to new results for the migration system.

During this stage, where tourist flows and circular labour force flows carry on increasingly, marriage migrants caused VFR to happen. Marriage migrants formed the core of a Russian community in Antalya, fulfilling very important functions for developing their networks, constituting their institutions, strengthening their local connections and providing the social acceptance of Russian migrants. Hence, marriage migrants became the fundamental actor for continuity of tourist, circular migrant and migrant flows from the origin region, therefore for growth of the community and development of the migration system.

The migration system between Russia and Turkey, with the increase in the number of migrants (50-60 thousand of Russian migrants are estimated to live in the Antalya region, though there are not precise figures to show the facts), has caused the Russians to acquire identity of a transnational community in

Antalya during the period after 2005. Growth of the transnational community, at the same time the two countries' cancelling the visa applications on basis of reciprocity, regulatory linkages between States, which allow for foreign capital investment, possession and, in linkage there with, granting of a one-year residence permit lead to the emergence of new mobility categories. In relation therewith, retired persons who bought houses from Antalya or persons who still work in Russia began to travel to Turkey, especially in during vacations. Nevertheless, it can be stated that mobility of students who want to take education in Antalya or serve their internships in the touristic facilities, and a mobility of qualified persons including artists, writers, academicians, and partially a return migrations started.

Another result of the community's growth is that the region where the Russian community, who gathered in Antalya at the first stage, lives has recently spread spatially to Alanya, and even Mersin, to the east, and coastal departments of Muğla to the west.

Finally, the transnational community of Russians in Antalya is attracting citizens of other CIS countries to this region and encouraging them to form new sub migration systems. Hence the migration system carries on to developing and changing, as an open system.

REFERENCES

- Aras, B., 2009. "Türkiye ve Rusya Federasyonu: Çok Boyutlu Ortaklık" *Seta Analiz* 10, 1-15.
- Aydın, S., 2006. 'Post- Sosyalist Ülkelerde Açığa Çıkan İşgücü ve Trabzon'da Yabancı Uyraklı Kadın Olgusu.' *MA Thesis*, Muğla University
- Bakewell, O., 2012. "Re-Launching Migration Systems." *University of Oxford International Migration Institute Working Papers* 60.
- Bakewell, O., de Haas, H., Kubal A., 2011. Migration Systems, Pioneers and The Role of Agency. *University of Oxford International Migration Institute Working Papers* 48.
- Balkır, C., Kırkulak, B., 2009. 'Turkey, the New Destination for International Retirement Migration.' In Fassmann H., Haller M., Lane D. (eds.) *Migration and Mobility in Europe: Trends, Patterns and Control*, Cheltenham, 123-143, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd., UK.
- Beller-Hann, I., 1995. 'Prostitution and its Effects in Northeastern Turkey'. *The European Journal of Women's Studies* 2, 219-235.
- Benson, M., 2010. 'The Context and Trajectory of Lifestyle Migration: The Case of British Residents in Southwest France'. *European Societies* 12(1), 45-64.
- Bertalanffy, L. von., 1950. 'An Outline of General System Theory'. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 1, 134-65.
- Büyükakıncı, E., 2004. 'Soğuk Savaş Sonrasında Türk-Rus İlişkileri'. In Sönmezoğlu, F. (ed) *Türk Dış Politikasının Anali..* Der Yayınevi, İstanbul
- Castles, S., Miller M. J., 2003. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Guilford Press, New York
- Cuba, L. 1991. 'Models of migration decision making reexamined: The destination search of older migrants to Cape Cod'. *The Gerontologist* 31(2), 204-209.
- Çelikpala, M., 2007. '1990'lerden Günümüze Türk-Rus İlişkileri'. *Avrasya Dosyası* 13(1), 267-298.
- Dedeoğlu, S., Ekiz-Gökmen, Ç., 2010. *Türkiye'de Yabancı Göçmen Kadınların Sosyal Dışlanması Üzerine Araştırma*. TUBITAK SOBAG Project Report No: 106K258. Muğla: Turkey.
- De Haas, H., 2009. 'Migration System Formation and Decline. A Theoretical Inquiry Into the Self-Perpetuating and Self-Undermining Dynamics of Migration Processes'. *University of Oxford International Migration Institute Working Papers* No: 19.
- De Haas, H., 2008. 'Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective'. *University of Oxford International Migration Institute Working Papers* No: 9.
- Deniz, A., 2012. 'Rusya'dan Antalya'ya Ulusaşırı Göç ve Bu Göçün Sosyo-Mekânsal Sonuçları'. *MA Thesis*, Ankara University
- Deniz, A., Özgür, E. M., 2013. 'Antalya'daki Rus Gelinler: Göçten Evliliğe, Evlilikten Göçe'. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi* 27(2), 151-175.
- Deniz, A., Özgür, E. M., 2010. 'Rusya'dan Türkiye'ye Ulusaşırı Göç: Antalya'daki Rus Göçmenler'. *Ege Coğrafya Dergisi* 19(1), 13-30.
- Deniz, A., Özgür, E. M., 2014. Transnationalism and Gender: Russian Migrant Women in Antalya." In Safi S., Kavak, Ş. (Eds) *Gender and Migration: Critical Issues and Policy Implications*, London Centre for Social Studies Conference Proceeding, London

- Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., King, B., Seetaram N., 2010. *Migration-Related Determinants of Australian Inbound and Outbound Tourism Flows*. CRC for Sustainable Tourism Pty Ltd., Gold Coast Queensland
- Erder, S., 2010. "Düzensiz Göç, Göçmen Korkusu ve Çelişen Tepkiler". In Pusch, B., Wilkoszewski, T. (eds) *Türkiye'ye Uluslararası Göç: Toplumsal Koşullar-Bireysel Yaşamlar*. 41-55. Kitap Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Erder, S., Kaşka, S., 2003. Irregular Migration and Trafficking in Women: The Case of Turkey. *Genova: International Organization for Migration*.
- Esser, H., 2006. 'Migration, Language and Integration'. *Programme on Intercultural Conflicts and Societal Integration*. AKI Research Review 4. Social Science Research Center, Berlin Accessed July 2014. http://www2000.wzb.eu/alt/aki/files/aki_research_review_4.pdf
- Fawcett, J. T., 1989. 'Networks, Linkages and Migration Systems'. *International Migration Review* **23**, 671-680.
- Gebelek, G., 2008. 'The New International Migration from a Gender Perspective: A Case Study of Post-Soviet 'Servants of Tourism' in Antalya'. *MA Thesis*, University of Koç.
- Gössling, S., Schulz, U., 2005. 'Tourism-Related Migration in Zanzibar, Tanzania'. *Tourism Geographies* **7**(1), 43-62.
- Gülçür, Leyla and Pınar İlkaracan. 2002. "The 'Natasha' Experience: Migrant Sex Workers From the Former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in Turkey." *Women's Studies International Forum* **25** (4): 411-421.
- Hall, C. M., Page S. J., 1999. *The Geography of Tourism and Recreation: Environment, Place and Space*. Routledge, New York
- Hall, C. M., Williams, A. L. 2002. 'Conclusions: Tourism-Migration Relationships'. In Hall, C. M., Williams, A. L. (Eds) *Tourism and Migration New Relationships Between Production and Consumption*, 277-289. Springer, Netherlands
- Iontsev, V., Ivakhniouk I., 2002. 'Russia in the World Migration Flows: Trends of the Last Decade (1992-2001)'. In Iontsev, V. (ed) *World in the Mirror of International Migration, International Migration of Population: Russia and the Contemporary World*, 34-78 Moscow. Accessed 20 July 2014. http://www/demostudy.ru/books/volume%2010_eng-1.pdf
- Irdam, D., 2011. Suitcase Trade between Turkey and the Post-Soviet States: The Resistance, the Dynamics and the Change. *MA Thesis*, University of Koç. İstanbul
- Ivakhnyuk, I., 2006. 'Migrations in the CIS Region: Common Problems and Mutual Benefits'. Paper presented at the International Symposium '*International Migration and Development*', Turin: Italy. 28-30 June.
- Ivakhniouk, I., 2007. Eurasian Migration System: Theoretical and Political Approaches. In Iontsev V. (ed) '*Migration and Development*', *International Migration of Population: Russia and the Contemporary World*. Moscow University Press, Moscow
- İçduygu, A., 2004. 'Demographic Mobility over Turkey: Migration Experiences and Government Responses'. *Mediterranean Quarterly* **15**(4), 88-99.
- İçduygu, A., 2009. *The International Migration Systems between Turkey and Russia: The Case of Project-Tied Migrant Workers in Moscow*, CARIM Research Reports 18.

- İçduygu, A., Karaçay, A. B., 2012. 'The International Migration Systems between Turkey and Russia: Project-Tied Migrant Workers in Moscow'. *International Migration* **50** (1), 55-74.
- Jackson, R. T., 1990. 'VFR Tourism: Is it Underestimated?' *Journal of Tourism Studies* **1**(2), 10-17.
- Karaçay, A. B., Düvell, F., 2013. 'Towards New Migration Systems, Patterns and Policies in Eurasia: The Case of Turkey and the Russian Federation'. Oxford: UK. 25 November 2013. Accessed 20 July 2014 http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/Events/Events_2013/TurkMiS_9_Workshop.pdf
- Kımkıloğlu, S., 2001. 'Türk-Rus İlişkileri: Kasyanov Ziyaretinin Anatomisi'. *Avrasya Dosyası Rusya Özel* **6** (4), 155-164.
- King, R., Warnes, T. Williams, A. M. 2000. *Sunset Lives: British Retirement Migration to the Mediterranean*. Berg Publishers, New York
- Kirişçi, K., 2003. *Turkey: A Transformation from Emigration to Immigration*. Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute, Migration Information Source Paper.
- Kolobov, O. A., Kornilov, A.A., Özbay, F. 2006. *Çağdaş Türk-Rus ilişkileri: Sorunlar ve İşbirliği Alanları (1992-2005)*. TASAM Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kritz, M. M. Zlotnik, H., 1992. 'Global Interactions: Migration Systems, Process and Policies'. In Kritz M. M., Lim, L. L., Zlotnik, H. (Eds) *International Migration Systems: A Global Approach*. 1-18. Clarendon Press, Oxford
- Levitt, P., 1998. 'Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-Level Forms of Cultural Diffusion'. *International Migration Review* **32**, 926-948.
- Mabogunje, A. L. 1970. 'Systems Approach to a Theory of Rural-Urban Migration'. *Geographical Analysis* **2**, 1-18.
- Massey, D. S., 1990. 'Social Structure, Household Strategies, and the Cumulative Causation of Migration'. *Population Index* **56**, 3-26.
- Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., Taylor J. E., 1998. *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Clarendon Press , Oxford
- Molodikova, I., 2007. 'Transformation of Migration Patterns in Post-Soviet Space: Russian New Migration Policy of 'Open Doors' and Its Effect on European Migration Flows'. *Review of Sociology* **13**(2), 57-76.
- Oigenblick, L., Kirschenbaum, A. 2002. 'Tourism and immigration: Comparing alternative approaches'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **29**(4), 1086–1100.
- O'Reilly, K., 1995. 'A New Trend in European Migration: Contemporary British Migration to Fuengirola, Costa del Sol'. *Geographical Viewpoint* **23**, 25-36.
- Özbay, F., 2011. 'Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Türkiye-Rusya İlişkileri: 1992-2010'. *Bilge Strateji* **2**(4), 35-77.
- Özdal, H., Özertem, H. S., Has, K., Demirtepe, M. T., 2013. *Türkiye-Rusya İlişkileri: Rekabetten Çok Yönlü İşbirliğine*. Uluslararası Stratejik Araştırmalar Kurumu-USAK Ankara: USAK Report 13-06.
- Özgür, E. M., Deniz, A., Hasta, D., Yavuz, S., Yüceşahin, M. M., 2014. 'The Immigration of Russians and Azerbaijanis to Antalya (Turkey): Who Are They? Why Are They Here?' *10th Turkish Migration Studies (TurkMiS) Workshop*. 28 March 2014. Ankara: Turkey. Accessed 25 July 2014 <https://ankara.academia.edu/ErtuğrulMuratÖzgür>
- Pickel, A., 2007. 'Rethinking Systems Theory'. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* **37**, 391-407.

- Ryazantsev, S., 2013 'The Case of Tourism'. Paper presented at Towards New Migration Systems, Patterns and Policies in Eurasia: The Case of Turkey and the Russian Federation. Panel II Migration in Eurasia: Turkish-Russian Migration System. Oxford: UK. November 25.
- Rybakovsky L., Ryazantsev, S., 2005. 'International Migration in The Russian Federation'. Paper presented at United Nations Expert Group Meeting on International Migration and Development. New York: US. July 6-8.
- State Institute of Statistics. 1994. *Tourism Statistics 1990*. Ankara: State Institute of Statistics Pub. No 1632.
- Südaş, İ. Mutluer, M., 2006. 'Immigration Européenne de Retraités Vers la 'Riviera Turque': Le Cas d'Alanya (Côte Méditerranéenne)'. *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales* **22**(3), 203-223.
- The Association of Turkish Travel Agencies. 2014. *MITT Moskova Turizm Fuarı Sonuç Raporu*. (MITT Moscow Tourism Fair Final Report-The Association of Turkish Travel Agencies). Accessed 20 August 2014 http://www.tursab.org.tr/dosya/10436/tursab-mitt-moskova-fuar-sonuc-raporu_10436_3147501.pdf
- The World Tourism Organization-UNWTO 2014. *UNWTO Tourism Highlights 2014 Edition*. http://dtxtq4w60xqpw.cloudfront.net/sites/all/files/pdf/unwto_highlights14_en.pdf
- Turkish Employment Organisation-ISKUR. 2014. *Turkish Employment Organisation 2013 Annual Report*. Accessed 20 August 2014. <http://www.iskur.gov.tr/kurumsalbilgi/raporlar.aspx#dltop>
- Turkish Hoteliers Federation. 2014. *Tourism Report*. Accessed 22 August 2014. http://www.turofed.org.tr/PDF/DergiTr/Turizm_Raporu-rapor%20turizm%20turofed.pdf
- Turkish Statistical Institute-TUIK. 2014a. Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemi Sonuçları (Address Based Population Registration System Results). Accessed 20 August 2014. <http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/adnksdagitapp/adnks.zul>
- Turkish Statistical Institute -TUIK. 2014b. Türkiye'de İllere ve Tabiiyetine Göre Yabancı Uyruklu Nüfus (Foreign Population by Provinces and Nationality). Ankara: Turkey
- Turkish Statistical Institute -TUIK. 2014c. Dış Ticaret İstatistikleri, Ülkelere Göre Yıllık İhracat ve Ülkelere Göre Yıllık İthalat- En Çok İhracat ve İthalat Yapılan 20 Ülke (Foreign Trade Statistics, Exports by Country and Year, Top 20 Country in Export and Import). Accessed 20 August 2014. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1046
- Turkish Statistical Institute -TUIK. 2014d. Turizm İstatistikleri, Ülkeye Giriş Yapan Yabancı ve Vatandaşlar 2013 (Tourism Statistics, Arriving Foreigners and Citizens 2013). Accessed 20 August 2014. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1072
- World Tourism Organization. 2014. *UNWTO Tourism Highlights Edition*. Accessed 20 August 2014. http://dtxtq4w60xqpw.cloudfront.net/sites/all/files/pdf/unwto_highlights14_en.pdf
- Warnes, A. M. 1991. 'Migration to and seasonal residence in Spain of Northern European elderly people'. *European Journal of Gerontology* **1**, 53-60.
- Warnes, A. M. Patterson, G., 1998. 'British Retirees in Malta: Components of the Cross-National Relationship'. *International Journal of Population Geography* **4**(2), 113-133.
- Williams, A. M. 2012. 'Tourism, Migration and Human Capital: Knowledge and Skills at the Intersection of Flows'. In Gartner, W.C., Hsu C. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism Research*, 251-264. Routledge, London

- Williams A. M. Hall M. C., 2002. 'Tourism, Migration, Circulation and Mobility: The Contingencies of Time and Place.'"In Halland, C. M., Williams A. M. (eds) *Tourism and Migration New Relationships Between Production and Consumption*, 1-52. Springer, Dordrecht Netherlands
- Williams A. M. Hall M. C., 2000. 'Tourism and Migration: New Relationships Between Production and Consumption'. *Tourism Geographies* 2(1), 5-27.
- Williams, A. M., King, R., Warnes, T., 1997. 'A Place in the Sun: International Retirement Migration from Northern to Southern Europe'. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 4(2), 115-134.
- Williams, A. M., King, R., Warnes, T., Patterson, G., 2000. 'Tourism and International Retirement Migration: New Forms of an Old Relationship in Southern Europe'. *Tourism Geographies* 2(1), 28-49.
- Yuan, T. F., Fridgen J. D., Hsieh, S., O'Leary J. T., 1995. 'Visiting Friends and Relatives Travel Market: The Dutch Case'. *Journal of Tourism Studies* 6 (1), 19-26.
- Yudina, T. N., 2005. 'Labour Migration into Russia: The Response of State and Society'. *Current Sociology* 53(4), 583-606.
- Yükseker, D. 2003. *Laleli-Moskova Mekiği: Kayıtdışı Ticaret ve Cinsiyet İlişkileri*. İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Yükseker, D., 2007. 'Shuttling Goods, Weaving Consumer Tastes: Informal Trade Between Turkey and Russia'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 31(1), 60-72.
- Zayonchkovskaya, Z., 2000. 'Recent Migration Trends in the Commonwealth of Independent States'. *International Social Science Journal* 52(165), 343-355.