

Migration as Movement and Multiplace Life: Some Recent Developments in Rural Living Structures in Turkey

Murat Öztürk¹, Andy Hilton² and Joost Jongerden^{3,*}

¹Vocational School, Kadir Has University, Selimpaşa, Istanbul, Turkey

²Foreign Languages Department, Istanbul Technical University, Maslak, Istanbul, Turkey

³Sociology and Anthropology of Development, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Discussing recent trends and developments in migration and mobility affecting what may be referred to as a 'reconstitution' of villages, this paper discusses the changing character of rural settlement and settlement patterns in Turkey today. The binary division of rural and urban is questioned through a dialectical/relational approach to settlement formation, while settlement is defined by relation to (human) movement, itself understood as incorporating the modalities of migration and mobility. By focusing on the socio-economics of increasing affluence, the advance of capital generally, and the introduction of neoliberalism into agriculture in particular, a number of contemporary rural-oriented (migratory/mobility) movements and 'living structures' are investigated, which, taken together, suggest a growing development of 'dual settlement' and 'multiplace hybrid' life. The paper concludes with a typology of villages and some thoughts on the theoretical implications of this study. Copyright © 2013 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Accepted 17 September 2013

Keywords: migration; village formation; rural–urban relations; multiplace settlement patterns; agriculture; living structures; Turkey

*Correspondence to: Joost Jongerden, Sociology and Anthropology of Development, Wageningen University, Hollandseweg 1, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
E-mail: joost.jongerden@wur.nl

INTRODUCTION

This paper studies the changing character of rural settlement and living patterns in Turkey from two perspectives. The first focuses on the development of new village types, distinguished on the basis of income generation and habitation. We make this characterisation cognisant of the proviso that places are always heterogeneous (Massey, 2005: 9–10) and that differences reside not only between the types we identify but also within each type. We also view the village, like any place, as a temporary permanence (Harvey, 1996: 241) or temporary constellation (Massey, 1994), to be studied from the perspective of evolving practices and interactions. Hence our second perspective, starting point and the main substance of this piece, a focus on processes shaping the development of villages in Turkey today. These processes are strongly related to changed agricultural conditions and new movements of people (migration and mobility), which requires that we look at the (re)formation of villages in the context of their relations with towns and cities.

The present work is developed from a recent research project and presentation.¹ Data was collected for this project in two phases: Phase 1, consisting of focus groups with villagers (in 25 villages, nationwide) and in-depth interviews with Ministry of Agriculture district office managers and agricultural input sellers/product traders (in 18 provincial districts), and Phase 2, interviews with village households (436) and a village-based questionnaire (74). The report (publication in preparation) is supported here by state figures, mostly from the Turkish Statistical

Institute (TSI, in Turkish *TÜİK*); unreferenced statistics, however, come from the report.

Structurally, we begin with an explication of aims and assumptions, followed by a contextualisation of our case, discussing rurality, migration and counterurbanisation. The next section looks at changes in village life and related issues, with focuses on farming, rural economics, village demographics and migration/mobility-oriented 'living structures'. The conclusion presents a new village taxonomy and develops the idea of an emergence of dual-settlement or multiplace hybrid life, with implications for movement classifications and the rural/urban distinction in the context of global development.

AIMS AND ASSUMPTIONS

There must be considerable tension in establishing the village and the rural as a focus for study in the context of migration and mobility, since this movement rather undermines any focus on specific spatial categories insofar as they introduce an empirically unjustified exclusion (here, of the city and the urban). Focusing on settlement formation in relation to socio-economic practices, therefore, we should not look at the village and the city, or the rural and the urban, as (if) comprising discrete units of analysis, but try to understand how these operate within, as aspects of, a unity. In other words, a relational approach is necessary, one that synthesises place and space as spatial practice (crucially, on the assumption of movement).

In fact, of course, a radical questioning of the various dualistic assumptions on which the relational analysis in geography was founded is at the theoretical heart of the discipline [e.g. Lefebvre, 2003 (1970)]. This questioning might be characterised as having led from (i) logical analysis, with the primary argument that we cannot very well define one side of a dyad (the minor, such as the rural) merely by negation (of the dominant, e.g. urban), a 'dichotomy specified in terms of a presence and an absence' (Massey, 1992: 71); moving through (ii) deconstruction and reconstruction, producing 'complexities of combination and intersection ... turning them into continua and mixing them up in new matrices' (King, 2002: 94); and now arriving at (iii) their heuristic usage on the *assumption* that they are 'problematised theoretically and blurred in practice' (King, 2012: 136–137). It is very much in

this context, therefore, that we employ the category of rural (rural/urban pairing), here. The urban is not equated to progress, for example, and the rural, by default, to that left behind. On the contrary, we emphasise a rural social development that runs counter to the modernist subtext of fossilisation. Equally, we make an assumption of continua – like Cloke's (1977) 'levels of rurality' or the linear specification of places according to access (Bamford *et al.*, 1999) – which gives texture to and thus undermines the homogenising spatial flatness of modernity's duality. Applied to migration/mobility, this grading suggests an imperative to think in terms of direction rather than destination – *towards*, for example, the rural, as in *rural-directed movement*, rather than just a simplistic assumption of rural migration. The case of Turkey is explored here for such spatial motions.

In picking out these motions from the village/rural perspective and the places/spaces they produce, we are concerned with *dimensions* of human geography rather than geo-social objects. Importantly, the idea of rural-directed movement does not reify the category of 'rural' in the manner of binaries but rather assumes its conceptual application to (as a part of) the whole. We take the position here that the old binaries become dialectics, couplings that are not only unthinkable without each other (as a principle of theoretical analysis) but even demand a relational conceptualisation (as a recognition of 'facts on the ground'). This emphasis on a dialectic as opposed to binary perspective is one that does not try to deny the divisions; but it will, almost inevitably, tend to blur them and, more importantly, re-vision them as 'interrelated parts of a whole ... [in which] dynamism is immanent to reality' (Merrifield, 1993: 517).² The focus on movements such as migration accords well with the dynamic implicit in this rendering of dialects.

The assumption of a rural/urban dialectic to determine a continuum of places remains a very blunt tool, of course, and cannot characterise very much within broad, unproblematised categories, such as 'village'. Although we may assume the basic idea of a village as a small settlement (and its lands) in a generalised rural setting (space), therefore, an emphasis on migration and mobility requires that we refashion some of its characterisations assumed in modernity, particularly in terms of its relation to the socio-economics of agriculture. However, rather than constructing a formalised matrix of intersecting

scales for this, we prefer to report on the types of practices we have observed through the synthetic of *living structures*, meaning the spaces that people in Turkey are creating as their geo-social realities, or the socio-spatial products of their movement.

Thus is the contemporary and ongoing reconstruction of rural space in Turkey conceived. Villages are importantly understood in terms of movement, which, in turn, is determined principally by the 'basic' concerns of residence and subsistence. Who is leaving, staying, returning, commuting, traveling to and from and between villages and other settlements, in what types of time frames, and what and where are their sources of income/subsistence motivating this? Who is working the land and where do they reside? And how do the migrations and other movements involved in these restructure the rural, especially by joining (blurring or synthesising) the rural and urban?

Notwithstanding the issues of space around the rural/urban, the crucial ontological problem here is clearly rooted in our idea of place, that of sedentary settlement and singular residence – as expressed, for example, in the binary phrasing of origin:destination, so fundamental to the notion of migration as a 'disruption' (Brown, 2012). The problematisation of this binary has resulted in, first, a conceptual blossoming in the literature – with, for example, temporal, sequential and geographical dimensions of the migration category – and, second, in a discursive redefinition of the category itself – in terms of a 'subset of spatial mobility', which, crucially, is a 'space-time phenomenon' (King, 2012: 136). Making this 'mobility turn', we take it as assumed that settlement and movement need to be viewed together. The phrase introduced here, *living structures*, refers to just this sense of space/place as defined in relation to time/movement, with 'structures' as the arrangements/patterns of spatiotemporal locations and 'living' as the human dynamics of this, the changing (re) construction and more or less flexible employment of these in people's lives.

Related to the *agency* implied in this idea of living structures, migration has long been viewed psychosocially as a 'rite of passage' [Massey *et al.*, 1993: 453, from van Gennep (1960 (1907))], with the development of a 'migration culture' (Reichert, 1982), thus incorporating anthropology, among others, in a 'more integrated approach to migration studies' (King, 2002: 90). Demographically, this is the

ritualised outflow of the rural youth. This and other life cycle movement-related considerations need to be considered for a social characterisation of people's agency in the reshaping of the rural.

Nevertheless, any agency orientation to the developments covered here needs to be placed in the dominant contemporary socio-economic context of 'a brutally neoliberalising international capitalism' (Harvey, 2012: xii). This includes the inherently unequal workings of capital (cf. Bernstein, 2008) and its differentiating impact on place/space (in different regions, for example). As the dominant socio-economic dynamic over the past three decades, and especially over the last, since the millennium, neoliberalism has effected massive changes to Turkey's villages, its agriculture and rural life, and thus to its rural/urban-directed movements.

Summarizing, therefore, in a sentence, the Turkish case presented here shows the reconstitution of the village as socially defined (significantly by the dialectical bifurcation of the rural/urban) through (new types of) movement and the ongoing construction of living structures determined by and in the context of (the recent dynamics of) capital and neoliberal policy together with the life course. For us, it is the strikingly kaleidoscopic character of *everything happening at once* that makes this case so fascinating, and not only inherently worthy of analysis but also potentially instructive.

The blurring and synthesising of the rural and urban referred to, and counterurbanisation in particular, has mostly been theorised from a perspective of societies and economies termed 'advanced' and 'developed' (Halfacree, 2008). The presentation of a view from Turkey, therefore, as an 'emerging', still 'developing' country, suggests possibilities to respond to demands to augment and reformulate, for example, familiar Western-centric (north European and Anglophone) notions of counterurbanisation – for example, with the notions introduced here (below) of *return mobility* and *multiplace life*. This may extend work begun at both the intranational and transnational levels, such as in Spain (Rivera Escribano, 2007) and in the case of reverse migration back to Ireland (Farrell *et al.*, 2012).

Finally, placing these matters in a Turkish context, the classification of villages we develop here can be understood as a response to the recent assessment that it has 'no comprehensive study typifying transformations that have taken place

in villages after 1980' (Tekeli, 2008: 53) – itself an expression of the more general acknowledgement that there is a 'very valid case for classifying the *places* where people live and that conventional ways of doing this leave a lot to be desired' (Champion & Hugo, 2004: 24). We also engage with a slowly growing body of work that takes forward the tradition of place and migration studies in Turkey's social geography (cf. Tümertekin, 1974) with considerations of lived practice from a spatial perspective emphasising various forms of movement (our 'living structures').

The present concern with an economic framing of rural mobility follows a line of enquiry opened at least as long ago as 1966 in Turkey, with the identification of a category of 'truck entrepreneurs' (Akşit, 1987: 15), people who invested capital gained from agriculture into areas outside of agriculture, and whose life was thus typically split between work in the village (farming) and on the road (transporting goods). This research and analysis also develops academic work on (rural) dual residence and cyclic migration (or, *return mobility*), such as a study by Sönmez (2001: 92–96) that identified three quarters of rural households as having another residence out of the village and 5% as having members who live abroad but return to their villages in the summer; and we engage with the literature on hybrid lifestyles, including work by Keyder and Yenal, like their (2004: 358) observation of the 'diversified and complex income generating activities' that 'place [rural populations] ... in urban areas', and further develop this orientation to the socio-economics of mobility and its implicit hybrid geography (Whatmore, 2002).

CONTEXT: THE CASE OF TURKEY

Rurality and Migration

Turkey's modern history of rural space was founded on the settling of (nearly all of) Anatolia's semi-nomadic peoples and tribal groupings, various enforced mass population migrations and the development of a fairly weak but highly centralised and hierarchical political system that directed the modernisation of agriculture. It was in this context that the village assumed paramountcy as the legal specification of rural settlement units by the state for the purposes of administration (quintessentially defined by the Village Act of 1924, one of the first pieces of legislation enacted under the new

republican regime established after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire). Historically, that is, it was through the village, some 35,000 of them, that the new Turkish state constructed its territory (cf. Güzelsu, 1983). In the predominantly agrarian socio-economy, with three quarters of the population living in the countryside (TSI, 2000) and rural settlement units as the primary representation of individual and communal identity, space was politically (re-)constructed at the village level.

Easily overlooked in this territorial discourse, it should be mentioned, was the inheritance of a complex, multi-functioning tapestry of 30,000–50,000 'sub-villages'. Tunçdelik (1974) identified three levels of these rural micro-settlements on the basis of social complexity, intersecting across a fourfold geo-economic dimension and culturally designated by 'structural function'.³ A mobility/temporal specification would delineate them as inhabited permanently (hamlets, little incorporated into the state system) or seasonally (mostly in the summer, for grazing), the latter implying movements of people between different (for us, 'rural') locations. Some of these movements were semi-nomadic, but usually they were tied to the nearby village, with both lowland and mountainside village populations retreating en masse to their *yayla* (highland/plateau settlement) for cool summer pasture and then returning together as the weather cooled. Such settlements are still dotted across large areas of the mountainous Anatolian countryside, and the seasonal (rural-to-rural), communal migration of man and beast with its localised definition of place/mobility continues, albeit much reduced.

From the 1960s, industrialisation and urbanisation developed quickly in Turkey, with a growing number of people moving to the cities, particularly Istanbul. By the mid-1970s, fully 10% of the national population was recorded as 'migrant' (Içduygu, 2009), while between 1975 and 2000, some three and a half million people migrated from rural to urban areas – a figure, however, that represented only a *fifth* of the intranational migration recorded during the period. In fact, over half of this movement occurred *between* urban areas, and there was also a major migration of almost three million people *out of* urban (to rural) areas (TSI, 2000). Thus, not only did the rural population still continue to grow quickly until the 1980s, but, standing conventional wisdom rather much on its head, (i) the massive

growth of the handful of major cities during this phase of development seems to have been significantly fuelled by migration from provincial towns and smaller cities (rather than villages), and (ii) urban-to-rural ('counter') migration was already a major phenomenon (even though, until the mid-1980s, the majority of the populace was still living in the countryside).

Regarding the first of these, the received wisdom is that people move from the countryside to cities, as the (relative) labour demand in agriculture is in decline and job opportunities in the city on the rise (where the increased surplus value produced in the urban-oriented secondary and tertiary sectors also translates into higher wages/salaries); urban-to-urban migration may be explained similarly, only with families uprooting and people moving from small, agrarian-oriented towns to cities, and (especially) from these provincial towns and cities to the metropolitan conurbations. Taken as a whole, this constitutes an *urban-based urban-directed flow*: the addition of this refinement to the basic rural-to-urban migration model of economic development probably needs to be more strongly emphasised.

Regarding the high number of people moving to villages, this demands some consideration, particularly as it continues today, like an ongoing backflow to the main contemporary wave of urban migration. The fact that it emerged on such a large scale in Turkey prior to the emergence of a mass middle class suggests that it assumed a rather different character, at least in part, to the standard conception of counterurbanisation in the West as a primarily bourgeois phenomenon related to the rural idyll. This rural migration thus constitutes our point of departure in setting the scene for recent changes in Turkey's rurality.

Counterurbanisation and other Rural-directed Movements

Our research reveals various reasons for and styles and results of people migrating to the countryside. Starting with recent forms that evidence Turkey's increasing affluence, first, there are those, professionals especially, who move out of city centres to live in nearby green spaces. This movement is similar to that of Western suburban-style counterurbanisation, comprising a single-step migration and subsequent mobility with the development of commuter-belt communities (Turkish *banliyö*, from

the French *banlieu*). A relatively novel movement in Turkey, this also has a somewhat different style in the context of rapid population increase and today's global push for fast economic growth, insofar as (i) rather than the renovation of old properties, it mostly involves very rapidly developed housing projects (and not necessarily attached to old, preexisting rural settlements); and (ii) the suburban villages this produces tend to be highly concentrated in the environs of the Istanbul metropolitan and a clutch of other large conurbations (following the extremely uneven or skewed geography of national development generally, as is usual without a high level of centralised planning to mitigate the geographical concentration of wealth).

A second type of rural migration is constituted by what might be termed the 'rites of retirement', of couples especially, aged around 40–60 years (until recently, Turks were able to retire in their forties, or even mid to late 30s, and still the minimum retirement age in the main state pension system is 50 years). Urbanites are escaping the city to retire to a place in the country, mostly in the warm and relatively prosperous southern and western Mediterranean and Aegean coastal region. Again, still a somewhat novel phenomenon outside of rich countries, this has been described by Tekeli (2008: 53) in terms of the emergence of 'retirement villages' – typically small, old villages and hamlets of disproportionately high levels of and massively expanded by the urban retirees.

Again, therefore, this movement is productive of a new settlement type and similar to the Western experience, but tending to be relatively extreme in its effect on space, with a lot of new building and relatively little renovation and a sudden, overpowering influx of city wealth and culture (places are thus transformed rather than evolve, space is much more radically redefined). Also differentiating this trend in Turkey is the prevalence of garden farming, which is practised not just because of the desire for value (organic produce and contact with the land), or even because of the cultural imprinting of a but recently urbanised city populace, but also, and importantly, for economic reasons: simply, pensions are lower and savings smaller here than in wealthier countries, and even in relatively well-to-do households, retirement income may need supplementing.

Young (2007: 29, 40) similarly noted the development in the Aegean region of 'hip' or

'urbanite' villages – small settlements with a 'country style' and situated in the mountains but in relative proximity to popular holiday destinations, separated but connected, village-like yet urban, 'produced by/for individuals who easily slip from one category to the next'. This easy categorical slippage suggests also the move from second-homers to rural retirement – specified in terms of a decades-long settlement shift that starts with weekend and holiday mobility and ends with long-term migration and that may be characterised as an extended, somewhat indeterminate, *counterurban movement*. This typically takes a life cycle-defined form that begins with new family life in early to middle adulthood, features a transitional stage of part-retired parents and their increasingly independent children, and only becomes retrospectively specifiable as a retirement process, or migration. It tends also to feature a strong geo-seasonal dimension, with people living in the northerly city in the winter and southerly village in the summer – the second home in Turkish is termed a 'summer place' (*yazlık*). For some, moreover, this counterurban movement occurs between a suburban and summer village. Thus, different dimensions emerge, informing a mobility/migratory space of *rural-urbanite dual-place residence* (living structure).

These two counterurban-defined forms – (movements to and establishment of) commuter and retirement/summer villages – are quite quickly growing yet still fairly marginal phenomena in Turkey. Another, and much larger, group of people who move from city to village as they retire comprises those returning to their village. *Village return* may be life stage/event defined, especially by retirement or dependents completing their education. Because secondary (and tertiary) education is highly concentrated in the larger urban centres in Turkey, a small but significant proportion of the adult village population move to sustain their child(ren) at school/college and (may) return when this is completed. Similar to the summer/retirement village/second home case, these (retirement/education-based) reverse migrations tend to commence and combine with the (cyclic) journeys of family groupings from the city to their village of origin, for three- to ten-day official/religious holidays (celebrated twice yearly) and lengthy periods during the summer (perhaps minus the employed, most commonly

men, and determined by the three-month long summer school holidays) – this last provision of women-oriented movements suggesting an interesting mobility variation (gender inversion) of the migratory dimension of trailing spouse. Thus, return mobilities morph into return migrations, as a form of *rural-directed movement*.⁴

Of course – and it should *not* go without saying – the mass movements of village production and return outlined here have only been made possible by the recent development of accessible, fast transportation (cf. Sheller & Urry, 2006), particularly that which brings together distant places otherwise separated by topographically challenging territory. The new mobility in Turkey operates on an (inter)national scale to connect the urban back to the rural via convenient (quick and affordable) travel along new highways and motorways (with scores of competing bus companies) and multiple air routes (with a clutch of internal as well as international airlines) that make cross-country return journeying commonplace nowadays – augmented and facilitated by its virtual dimension, the movement of culture (information and representations) through the exponentially expanded scope (range and immediacy) of contemporary communication (and the expanded consciousness and material facilities – e.g. online ticket purchase – this implies). It is the particular combination of this rather sudden mobility development of being able to traverse previously prohibitive routes combined with the contemporary situation of very rapid urbanisation (implying close social and emotional links with homelands) that is the main driver of the inordinate volume of village return presently observed.

On a wider scale, the development of affordable air travel is linked to the movement and mobility of migrants. This translates into the return of people to Turkey from migrant communities in Europe, especially Germany.⁵ From the rural perspective, it means people returning to their native villages, or perhaps to summer/retirement villages, for holidays and/or to live (return migration), typically to retire or retire after a fashion (and bringing with them that part of their hard-earned capital that is not left with those who stay on). People who move from Turkish villages to German cities and then come back to live in their native (or retirement) villages thus make a rural-to-urban-to-rural migration.

This sequence is also followed by those who move from villages to the city and then later move out again, to commuter or retirement villages. Thus, spatiodynamically defined – and to a certain extent also by shared human experience – this represents what might be dubbed a *transrural movement*, which changes rural demographics (e.g. the location, wealth, and age of village populations) without directly affecting gross (national rural) population figures (but affecting them indirectly insofar as children tend to grow up in the cities and thus be lost to the rurality).

Finally, two more categories of people making rural-directed movements should be mentioned. First, there is the village-return movement of those people who do not survive or choose not to stay in the city and go back home. They may fail to make a home or lose their job, especially during periods of economic crisis (recently, in 2001 and 2008), and go back to their village where there is at least better access to the basic needs of food and shelter. Thus defined by their village return as a non-normative life event (Reese & Smyer, 1983), these people may become marginalised, part of a rural underclass. Second, there is the seasonal migration of agricultural labourers for weeding and harvesting work, when extended families and even whole communities travel together, from the (majority Kurdish) southeast especially to the northeastern (Black Sea) coast for the tea and hazelnut harvests or to the citrus- and cotton-growing southern (Mediterranean) coast. This long-established practice has taken on a significant urban-to-rural dimension with recent processes of urbanisation – partially forced, with over 3000 villages emptied and part-destroyed by the Turkish military during 1990–2000 in response to the Kurdish insurgency in the southeast (Jongerden, 2007) – thus recalling the particular importance of armed conflict to migration-related issues outside the relatively settled conditions of rich countries (see Sirkeci, 2009). These two categories of returnee and seasonal work movement are not productive of place as such.

Before moving our focus to old, established villages and the new forms they are taking with contemporary, primarily socio-economic developments related to agriculture, it may serve to summarise the categories of (rural-directed) movement introduced thus far that are productive of new living structures and village types (Box 1).

Box 1. Rural-directed movements and associated living structures and settlements

(1) *Counterurban movements*

Understood similarly to the standard usage of 'counterurbanisation'; an emphasis on movement rather than result implying action rather than status, so not necessarily implying migrations, but can rather point to mobilities, a shift of gravity in people's lives from urban towards rural settings; productive of *rural-urbanite dual-place residence* and urbanite *retirement/summer* and *commuter villages*.

(2) *Rural return movements*

Direction-wise, the reverse of urban or transnational migration taking people out of their villages or hamlets (or small towns), thus a return to native rural settlement (including rural towns); conceived as a type of counterurban movement, but as return quite different in social impact; ranges across the temporary/permanent axis (encompassing mobility and migration); the focus on the rural excluding transnational return to cities, it intersects with return migration; productive of *village return*, linked to the changing character of (traditional, agricultural) villages and associated living structures.

(3) *Transrural movements*

Involves movement from one rural settlement to another, via urban settlement(s); migratory in character and ultimately productive of rural population change, although indirectly (through non-repopulation of rurality); a two-step process composed of (i) urban migration, thus making it highly pertinent to economically fast-growing societies, and (ii) counterurban movement, so productive of *rural-urbanite dual-place residence*, and linking it to the development of urbanite *retirement/summer* and *commuter villages*.

CHANGES IN FARMING AND VILLAGE LIFE

Neoliberalism, Urban Migration and Rural Demographics

Underlying and overarching and in all ways pervading the latest developments in farming and traditional village life in Turkey is the recent history of state macroeconomic policy. Briefly, a combination of factors came together in a perfect storm at the turn of the millennium to result in a

radical transformation of the country's agricultural sector. Some aspects of neoliberalism had already reached the rurality during the 1980s and 1990s, as (i) farming became more integrated into the market economy (particularly in southern and western coastal zones and the central-western interior corn belt), and (ii) village labour became redundant (literally) with the privatisation of state-owned heavy industries and closure of local factories around which villages had expanded (especially in the north-western coal region).

During this period, the more market-integrated villages/regions were able to develop and thrive, whereas those dependent on industrial production were decimated and only survived by other means and radical transformation (primarily through external inputs – initially severance payments, then retirement pensions, and, eventually, some out-of-village non-agricultural employment). Those villages that survived, having transformed first from their agricultural origins to an industrial base and then having lost this, constitute a quite specific category of what may be termed *ex-agro-industrial villages*.

By and large, however, agriculture had remained fairly well state-protected and traditionally supported until the millennium, with rural life only slowly evolving or else dying as outward migration began to suck the life from village communities. Then, within the space of less than five years, the macroeconomic work of the previous twenty years was rapidly completed. The old statist edifice originally established for the agricultural sector in the 1920s and 1930s and renovated according to a centralised, developmentalist model from the 1960s was (mostly) dismantled. Sweeping changes effected the privatisation and termination of structures owned, run and/or supported by the state, ranging from nationwide production facilities (e.g. sugar refineries) and local marketing cooperatives (e.g. input channels for tobacco producers) through a complex of control mechanisms (such as fixed-price grain purchase) and financial supports (subsidised fertilisers, cheap credit through the state Agriculture Bank, etc.) to protective barriers (such as high tariffs on imported meat products), while land transfer and the entry of international capital were facilitated (Ayдын, 2010; Öztürk, 2012).

The state's recognition of a wealth-producing need to reduce the proportion of the labour force

engaged in agriculture (DPT, 1995: 57) was thus acted upon as the proportion of farmers and farm labourers in the national workforce plummeted in the decade 2000–2010 from 45% to 25% (DTP, 2000: 18, TSI, 2012: 221), while the GNP increase itself accelerated by around 15%.⁶

The effects of this on the countryside have been profound. Expressed in terms of simple demographics, between 2000 and 2007, the total rural population of Turkey dropped from around 24 to 21 million, some half a million people per year. Within a seven-year period, that is one in eight of all people living in the countryside were gone, and the village population was returned to its level of 40 years previously (TÜİK, 2000, 2008–2011). This devastation of rural depopulation has continued, at a rate of around 1% annually over the four years 2008–2012,⁷ indicating the changes outlined in this paper to be very much part of an ongoing process.

Strikingly, however, even through this period of major population loss, over 5% of the country's 923 administrative districts saw an overall gain in their rural numbers. In fact, for almost 10% (3,539) of individual villages, official figures for 2000–2007 show population increases that were higher than the urban average (TSI, 2000, 2008). Clearly, people do not go from city to village in some kind of undifferentiated national spread: on the contrary, the neoliberal advance should be *expected* to have an extremely uneven effect, exaggerating pre-existing differences previously masked by socially oriented economic policies. In this case, although a large part of the recorded village growth has derived from counterurbanisation, a significant share has come also in areas where the already well market-integrated farming has further developed, and there is, therefore, no significant outward migration (enabling the traditionally higher rural birth rates to result in rising populations).

There may even be a net inward movement to these rural areas. People migrate out from urban ghettos – permanently as well as seasonally – for employment in agriculturally prosperous areas; also, as Keyder and Yenil (2011: 62) observed, populations of Kurds have been moving from the poorer and still conflict-ridden south east of the country. A growing phenomenon over the last two decades, this Kurdish movement especially has come to constitute a contemporary wave of rural migration, from the cities and towns and also villages and hamlets of the eastern interior

to the 'vibrant villages' of the Mediterranean/Aegean. Nationwide, therefore, there is an ongoing dynamic of rural population shift from the eastern to southern and western coastal zones. Furthermore, with some of the urban emigrants having previously left (under duress) the *emptied rural settlements* of the southeast, they now become rural-to-urban-to-rural migrants and thus categorically (if in few other ways) join those mentioned (above) in making what becomes a transrural movement.

In addition to the 10% of villages that have seen a fast population increase, twice as many again have had a smaller or no increase, meaning that the recent rural exodus has taken place from the remaining 70%. These 25,000-odd villages have thus now seen an average population drop since the turn of the millennium of the order of 20–25%. The sudden failure of local farming to provide employment when thrown to the market has translated very directly to sudden urban migration in the form of an army of ex-farmers and farm labourers and their dependents, especially the young and healthy, moving to the dynamic urban centres, where they have prospered or at least survived well enough – or else struggled and joined the swollen ranks of the urban poor further adding to the already overburdened city ghetto infrastructure of poor housing and excess labour supply (thus low wages and under-employment/unemployment), and later, perhaps, to return (above).

From the urban perspective, this influx contributes to structural changes in the nature of city poverty, for example by fixing what had been transit shanty-style housing (*gecekondu*) as a permanent arrangement and thereby contributing to the spatial marginalisation of the outer-city poor (Öztürk, 2012: 189ff). In the countryside, meanwhile, the disproportionate outflow of the youth and (would be) working population is augmented by the rural migration of retired people – both returnees and those going to live in the retirement/holiday villages – to massively impact on an already ageing demographic (due to better nutrition, healthcare, etc.). The number of the rural elderly is currently growing quickly in both absolute and relative terms, rapidly changing the shape (widening the upper section) of the rural age pyramid. During the 2007–2010 period alone, for example, the proportion of elderly people (age 60+ years) in rural areas rose from 12.7% to 15%, a relative increase of 15% in just three years.⁸

Clearly, the ageing population in Turkey's countryside represents a loss of vitality and generalised hardship. The villagers' old-age pensions are rather low, little more than a basic subsistence level, added to which huge numbers of the rural elderly have no personal income at all since they are not registered as retired (because they or their employers never paid into state pension schemes). Figures, for example, from a 1994 study – which will be relevant today – indicated that even in relatively prosperous agricultural areas and among heads of household fully one third of rural residents had no social insurance whatsoever (Aksoy *et al.*, 1994). This socio-economic dynamic combines with the return migration of those who do not succeed in establishing themselves in the city and the stasis of that part of the rural population that does not have the capacity to even attempt such a move, along with the squeeze on human labour resulting from increased capitalisation through industrialised production methods; the result for the rurality of all this is the development of villages as homes for the elderly, asylums for the weak and centres of unemployment (Öztürk, 2010). Although the national economy booms and Turkey is internationally touted as a success story for the neoliberal imperative – to the extent that 'remigration' from the economically stagnant European Union is now noted (Sirkeci & Esipova, 2012) – from a spatial perspective, the greater part of its territory is being impoverished. Rural levels of absolute poverty even appear even to have risen in recent years, with approaching 40% of villagers now officially classified as in (food + non-food) poverty (roughly, a real rise of 4% over the decade).⁹

Smallholders and Pensions

Historically, the rural poor were its peasantry, working family plots for sustenance farming. In this respect, therefore, it is striking that the number of smallholdings in Turkey (as a proportion of all holdings) is still very high. In 1963, 87% of holdings nationwide measured less than 10 ha; by 2001, this figure had only decreased by 4% (to 83%); by 2006, with agrarian neoliberalisation, it had fallen by another 4% (to 79%).¹⁰ This still comprises a third of all farming land, however (and parallels the 70% of farms that have no irrigation).¹¹ The loss of smallholdings has speeded up immensely, therefore, but a major part of rural

life and the places/spaces it defines would appear to be structurally unaffected to a rather large degree.

At the core of the recently sharpened decline in small-scale farming is the poor income gained from agriculture today (contrasted, of course, with the alternative of urban migration). Because smallholder farmers are weak sellers in modern market conditions (with prohibitive input prices, lack of information, etc.), they are particularly vulnerable (to fluctuating product prices, drought, etc.). In one area in the south east we even observed informal waste collection to be preferred over work in agriculture, which surely indicates the low and/or unreliable returns that farmers may face. This leads to the question of how it is that so many smallholdings – and small-to-medium-size family enterprises, for that matter – survive at all.

The first explanation is a negative one, that Turkey is topographically unsuited to the extension of capital. Steep terrain effectively prohibits the introduction of economies of scale into much of the country and thus operates as a break on change that protects small-scale, family-based agriculture. Other cultural and political factors combine with this geography to result in what may be characterised as a mass centre of gravity resistant to change. Second, following the major (although uncompleted) shift from subsistence to market farming over the past half century, families have managed to maintain their small, independent holdings in the face of the new agrofiancial realities through the (increased) adoption of 'subsistence strategies' (Aydın, 2001) – like working larger plots, taking on debt, and/or focusing on high value-added products (broadly, husbandry and fruit/vegetables rather than cereals) or niche markets (such as maraschino cherries or wildflower honey). Third, and most important, smallholders – and medium-size family enterprises too – survive through income transfers: remittances, pensions and paid employment.

Thousands of rural communities thus remain founded on relatively well-established, albeit now (generally) market-oriented, spatial practices and still dominated by family-owned and family-run smallholdings in primarily local contexts of extended family and close communal relations. There is, it is true, the outward movement of the young allured by urban attractions and a failure of farming income in the face of heightened

competition, which suggests a slow decay; and, indeed, urban migration does mean that some villages are dying or dead – or *moribund* – where local conditions have proven too hard in comparison with the possibilities offered by the city; but overall, there is also here a residual and resilient core category of fairly *traditional, agriculturally-based rural settlements*.

Migration and mobility are combining to both maintain and change these villages. Seasonal movements – particularly permanent inhabitants using various urban residential arrangements to escape the hard winter and city dwellers on return holidays in the good weather (or working holidays during the harvest period) – occurring in the context of somewhat depopulated villages after one to three decades of urban migration mean that many villages have skeleton populations in the cold months that flesh out with spring and then swell again in the summer. Non-farming income, which is predominantly movement-related, also has huge effects, especially retirement pensions and paid employment (below). The combination of this seasonal movement with non-farming income results in a somewhat ambiguous but numerically important and growing category of *semi-seasonal semi-agricultural villages*.

Like other income sources, retirement pay is used to do things such as finance routine farming activities, to forestall the need to sell produce at peak harvest time for bottom prices and to protect against the slide into debt and forced sale. Pensions, although small and far from ubiquitous, not only (part) support the aged but, in (larger and extended) family contexts, also function as an important contributor to household income and thus help to sustain small-scale farming and community life. Our research indicates that around two out of every five rural households contain retired people, many of whom winter outside the village and/or are urban/transnational returnees – although again, the general figures mask huge variations (in parts of the Black Sea coastal area, for example, we found almost every household to have an income from retirement, mainly from unionised employment in mining and shipbuilding, especially in the *ex-agro-industrial villages*). In terms of migration, therefore, the return/cyclical moves of pensioners help to maintain small-scale agricultural production – and this rural-directed return movement, quite unlike counterurbanisation, is

generally *not* to be associated with the conversion of villages into spaces of consumption.

Conversely, pensions are subsidised by agriculture. Small-scale farming – garden allotments with fruit trees, vineyards and one or two cows or a few sheep and poultry – effectively tops up low incomes. This holds for long-established villages just as for the emerging summer (retirement/holiday) villages, offering retiree villagers a degree of food (+ non-food) security/sovereignty. Thus, just as outward migration offers a line of support to village families back home through remittances, so does *return migration/mobility* allied to increased life expectancy in combination with the extended provision of retirement pay nowadays mean that rural communities become less dependent on farming. This loosening of the ties between agriculture and the village becomes a major theme in the emergence of a new rural space, even as the villages themselves remain substantially agricultural in character. A review of non-agricultural employment, which similarly functions to both support and supplant traditional practices, more clearly reveals this agrarian slippage and, moreover, the village-based bifurcation/synthesis of the rural/urban distinction.

Employment and Mobility

The effect of the neoliberalisation of the agricultural sector in the rural context is starkly apparent in the employment figures. The number of people officially working on local farms or family smallholdings nearly halved during the first decade of the millennium, dropping from around nine to five million people, yet rural employment outside of agriculture was fairly unchanged, and this despite the massive population drop. As a result, the (official) ratio of non-agricultural to agricultural work in the countryside rose by something like two thirds, going from 20–25% to 35–40%.¹² We found similar figures, with almost two in every five rural households having at least one member in off-farm employment. Clearly, this represents a major shift in the position of farming in village life, with, essentially, large numbers of villagers working in local towns and cities.

As a generalised collapse or ‘compression’ (Harvey, 1989) of space, mobility is unevenly experienced (Massey, 1994) – like the benefits and pains of ‘development’, indeed – but it is certainly

extensive. In the localised context of rural Turkey today, it is observed to be facilitated by things like a macadam mountain road that is open in the winter, cars in the village (our research shows around half of village households to possess a vehicle) and a regular minibus connection between the village and town giving mobility to the otherwise disenfranchised. At the related virtual or metaphorical level, it also means television (relatively rare just a generation ago), probably by satellite in the mountains, mobile phones (found in some 90% of village households), and now the Internet (cable-accessed by about 20%) and the recent explosion of wireless/3G (smartphone, tablet, etc.) technology.

The physically mobile rural workforce is most apparent along the western and southern coastal regions of the country, which have enjoyed by far the largest rise in rural non-agricultural income. The Aegean and Mediterranean is a major (inter)national holiday destination, and tourism there has boomed, with fishing communities transformed and inland villagers along with city migrants working at hotels, restaurants and suchlike. In terms of settlement type, the massive increase of outside employment has considerably changed the character of these communities, which may thus be dubbed *semi-agricultural villages*.¹³

In terms of movement, tourism-related jobs and their effects tend to vary with the work and according to the terms of employment (from daily/casual to long-term/contracted), which combine with distance to and from the tourist centres to determine residence and the frequency of return home (and thus the mobility/migratory specification). More broadly also, the growth of the service sector in small, agrarian-oriented towns and provincial cities throughout the land affords local employment opportunities for villagers at supermarkets, banks, garages and so on – thence *urban-directed village movements* – while the various types of income transfers to rural areas in turn bring constant construction work.

Shifting our focus on the spatial setting of this rural/urban bifurcation to towns and cities, the flip side to the increased non-agricultural income in rural areas is that of income from farming in urban locations. The context of alternative food networks has been much remarked on in recent times (e.g. Jarosz, 2008), but city farming in less-developed countries is probably the more widespread and established and arguably more important phenomenon. In Turkey, for example,

this has long meant migrants from the countryside supplementing family income by growing vegetables and fruit in household gardens. What is also observed now, however, is a large rural-farming urban population – that is, urban-based farmers/farm owners and farm workers whose land/employment is out of town, in the country. Indeed, about a quarter of the one million listed agricultural enterprises in Turkey are now registered in towns and cities, where a similar proportion of the three-and-a-half million agricultural workers reside.¹⁴

Looking at this phenomenon of *urban rural farmers*, we have found a variety of forms ranging between two main categories: those who farm their own land close to urban settlements and those who have a village enterprise in their name but pass daily responsibility over to others. The former prefer to live in the nearby towns (or cities) and travel out to work on their farms, with revenue from farming activities either the main source or just one of a plurality of different contributions to family income: these people may be categorised as *local urban rural farmers*. The latter often take the form of semi-absentee landownership, in which a relatively well-off farmer may live part of the year in a far-away city and have someone living locally whom he or she pays to keep an eye on the land or with whom there is a land use/sharecrop arrangement: hence, *semi-absentee urban rural farmers*. Although the geography (urban aspect) of these rural farmer types is quite different, with concomitant implications for spatial construction, they typically share an (earlier) *urban-directed migration* followed by *rural-directed (agricultural) mobility* – or *urban-rural-directed farming movements*; and they thus produce *living structures* that are *dual* or *multiplace* and *rural-urban* or *hybrid*, but which are based on residence in towns/cities, as opposed to the village-based form (above).

Other forms that we have observed at the migrant end of the movement scale include truck drivers who organise their journey routes to stop by their arable land as necessary but otherwise only spend significant time in the village during the planting and harvesting seasons – this being the contemporary, urbanised development of the category of truck entrepreneurs (above). The newly introduced categories of movement taking a rural orientation (centred on villages or their lands) and the living structures associated with these are listed in Box 2.

Box 2. Types of movement and new living structures (rural orientation)

(1) *Urban-directed village movements*

People living in villages but working in towns and cities, travelling daily, weekly, or less frequently (e.g. at the start and end of a temporary employment period); extended to include school children, older students and any guardians (parents or relatives) travelling daily or less frequently (e.g. weekends at the start and end of a semester, plus holidays); at the longer period of stay/less frequent journey end of the spectrum, completion and return intersect with *village return*; productive of (*village residence oriented*) *dual/multiplace (hybrid) living structures*.

(2) (*Urban-*)*rural-directed farming movements*

Movements by urban-resident rural farmers (often originally from villages), either local or at a distance (thus semi-absentee); extended to include farm workers and also entrepreneurial (farming) truckers; comprising *urban migration* followed by *rural-(agricultural) urban mobility*; productive of (*town/city residence oriented*) *dual/multiplace place (hybrid) living structures*.

Dual Settlement or Multiplace Hybrid Life

We begin to shift from a simple, albeit powerful generalisation (depopulation and impoverishment of the countryside) to a far more complex picture of rural/urban intermingling. The weakening relationship between rural settlement and agriculture means that the simple equation of these, the assumed spatial product of modernity, becomes increasingly untenable. A significant proportion of people involved in agriculture no longer live in the village, or not all the time, while many of those living in the village are not employed in farming, or not all the time. This takes novel forms. Semi-absentee urban rural farmers, for example, combine returning to the village to work their land as required with family visits for important social events (weddings or funerals), thereby maintaining the rural social fabric from a distance. Villagers, meanwhile, keep up their small farms through a multitude of family-based, age-related (life-stage) arrangements. These tend to involve income derived from agricultural produce supported by – or, increasingly,

supplementing – that from (young adult, perhaps urban migrant) employment and (old age, perhaps return migrant) pensions, while family farming labour is typically organised around all of these on a somewhat *ad hoc* basis – as determined, for example, by casual employment opportunities (taking family members away from home/village) and return movements (bringing them back, e.g. to work on the farm during return holidays).

The relationships of the latter, village return group, with agriculture (working their own land, labouring, otherwise), length of stay (short break, summer holidays, good weather), distance travelled (from local town, provincial city, metropolis), and the units of movement (individuals, couples, nuclear families, informal extended family groupings), are varied and variable, as is their spatial sense of gravity or place identification (where they 'belong', whether they *feel* that they have migrated). But these are all people who are in some sense returning to their village roots. Even those who are permanently resident in the city routinely exhibit a psychological reference to communities of origin, which means that there is an important sense in which they have not left. Classically, these people would be recorded as urban migrants, and yet their urban lives may be regarded as, and/or ultimately turn out to be, only a temporary affair – even if one that lasts years, or decades even. As a returnee, therefore, the urban migrant is not infrequently found to inhabit/construct (constitute or be constitutive of) a spatio-temporal form in which the twinned village-defined movements out and back specify a single, somewhat amorphous, abstract category of *return migrant extended space-time*. And the picture is further complicated insofar as spouses and children do not (necessarily) *return* as such (insofar as it is their husband's [typically] or parent's village, perhaps considered a native land [*memlekt*] but either way not actually where they grew up).¹⁵

Strikingly, the contemporary social phenomenon of a coterminous combination of (human) urban-directed and rural-directed movements results in a back-and-forth channelling of multifarious material and cultural goods and services. These include, for example, the village produce of families sent to support and supplement their city relatives and the care work of women returning for extended periods to look after sick

relatives, while the settlement dimension of this two-way (or more) movement features residences in both urban and rural settings that operate as family resources for mobility/migration. Lived spaces are thus created that span geographically distant places and are made into multivalent living structures through human relationship and (other) socio-economic networks. Eschewing considerations of threshold (minimal criteria for what counts as a migration), we combine these with the more localised hamlet/village-to-town/city and rural farming-oriented migrations/mobilities outlined, as well as the movement practices linked to the development of urbanite retirement/summer and commuter villages (above), to develop an overarching conception of rural-urban connectedness, a dialectic generalised as *dual settlement* or *multiplace hybrid life*.

CONCLUSION

New Villages

Identifying the emergence of new village forms, we have categorised five types that are (substantially, and in different ways) not primarily based on agriculture and that thus express – in spatial form – the overall decrease in the relative importance of farming in village life. These are only characterisations, it should be stressed (indeed, the problems we have had in specifying them are indicative of how such mapping fails to represent the complex, heterogeneous realities). They are introduced here with informal scales/criteria and by reference to the contemporary form of the traditional type, along with the 'negative' categories also referred to for a typology of villages in Turkey today (Box 3).

Box 3. Village typology

(1) *Agricultural villages*

Traditional farming settlements inhabited year-round, with generally old or mixed-age housing, basic infrastructure, and few or no amenities; consumption (food and furniture) significantly home produced, only slowly increasing market relations; strong extended family and communal relations; role of agriculture dominant; outward urban migration; slowly declining as a village category.

(2) *Semi-seasonal semi-agricultural villages*

Old agricultural villages, often semi-deserted in the winter when living conditions are difficult; many retired inhabitants (permanent and temporary/cyclic); (temporary/cyclic) inhabitants originating from the village, many using it as a summer resort (hence a major source of non-agriculture income); some (increasing) commercial farming and gardening, some out-of-village employment; housing mixed (old, renovated, or new), with variable (but improving) infrastructure and amenities; some home production; outward urban, inward reverse, cyclic (seasonal) migration/mobility; a major and fast-growing category.

(3) *Semi-agricultural villages*

Old agricultural villages (mostly Aegean and Mediterranean) that have integrated into the market; productive, commercial farming on fertile, irrigated land; significant income from external employment (mostly tourism in Aegean and Mediterranean, but also from real estate and construction and the services sector); mixed housing, reasonable infrastructure, few amenities; relatively little home production; where there are other employment opportunities, there is a permanent, year-round population; increasing in number as a result of inward migration (mostly from the east and major cities).

(4) *Retirement/summer villages*

Essentially, new settlements located near the sea (mostly Aegean and Marmara); almost empty in the winter; inhabited by retired and holidaying outsiders, relatively well-off urbanites who live/stay in the village during the summer; no commercial farming, but vegetables and fruit grown in gardens for personal consumption and as a hobby; houses mostly new but some renovated; reasonable infrastructure and good amenities (especially for leisure/entertainment); inward migration from cities (and also suburban villages) and cyclic (seasonal) migration/mobility make this a growing category.

(5) *Suburban villages*

New, commuter belt settlements; permanently inhabited, generally by urbanite professionals who work in or have strong relations with the city; new housing and excellent infrastructure and amenities (either in the villages or within easy reach); very little agriculture or gardening; fairly

standard counterurbanisation; a relatively small but fast-growing category.

(6) *Ex-agro-industrial villages*

Old villages (mostly in the western Black Sea area) that have not been agricultural for decades; inhabitants predominantly industrial retired, generally from discontinued state-owned enterprises (SOEs), living permanently in the village; mountain terrain has always prevented significant farming, but some gardening (vegetables and fruits) for household consumption; mixed (mostly old and renovated) housing and variable infrastructure and amenities; some communities dying (with little investment) some larger ones urbanised; migration relatively insignificant; numerically static; can be expected to disintegrate as a discrete category over time.

(7) *Emptied villages*

Villages in the south-east, partially or wholly destroyed and to which people may or may not be returning; numerous; may be (sub)divided according to level and style of revival, and then reclassified again as traditional, semi-seasonal, or moribund (Categories 1, 2 and 8).

(8) *Moribund villages*

Dead or diminishing communities; only small numbers of generally elderly folk; some (subsistence/enterprise) agriculture essentially traditional villages deprived of life and vitality.

There are various ways in which these can be related and compared. Most interestingly, in our opinion, although type 3 has emerged out of type 1 over recent decades, type 2 villages are in the process of doing this. That does not imply that type 2 will eventually develop into type 3; indeed, they are already beginning to constitute a more settled, distinctive form. Actually, this type probably represents the majority of Anatolian villages today and encompasses many of its hamlets/sub-villages too. The category of *yayla*, for example, now commonly combines the traditional functions of a cool retreat for summer herding (rural cyclic/seasonal migration) with those of a location target for counterurbanising movements – used mostly for holidays, as described for villages, but also as summertime-cum-commuter settlements (in the southern Mediterranean region especially), and, moreover, comprising a developing sector of ‘*yayla (yaylacılık)*’ tourism’.

Given that we have found no agricultural villages that receive *no* inputs from outside of the agricultural sector and that *all* transition types have at least *some* farming, the distinction between types 1 and 2 is manifestly one of degree. In reality, however, our experience is of a fairly clear division between those villages in which relatively traditional spatial forms and social practices continue to dominate and those in which migratory/mobility patterns, demographic changes and economic base mark them out as places that are moving away from agriculture and permanent habitation. Still, we would emphasise the pluralistic potential of the transformation of these (semi-)seasonal agricultural villages and their wide variety of hybrid living (residence and labour) forms: (sub-)division of this category may be indicated over time.

We have identified several (possibly novel) categories related to spatial movement and living structures that may be particularly pertinent to 'developing' countries – including *return rural-directed movements* (as distinct from *counterurban movements*), *return migrant extended space-time*, *urban-directed village movements* and *local/semi-absentee urban rural farming*. Thus, for example, as ever more surplus wealth is created, we may expect to see widespread expansions parallel to the sharp, counterurban ruptures of the rural space outlined. And the large-scale co-occurrence of urban-directed and rural-directed movements seems to imply a somewhat different developmental track from that laid out by the temporally distant (disconnected) phenomena of urbanisation and counterurbanisation in Western-style (post-)modernisation – which globally, therefore, serves to outline a non-unilinear schema for emerging spatial practice.

The neoliberal removal of state agrarian support/protection with minimal rural assistance or compensation characterises a major and ongoing process, in the non-rich world particularly. Sidestepping the previously slow penetration of capital into farming with sudden exposure of the agricultural sector to the global market leads to an upheaval in rural demographics, effecting major changes to the way people do agriculture and otherwise subsist and how they organise their lives around this. Where ties with the (home)land are strong, the resulting rapid urbanisation may also imply the emergence of a new tradition of rural return movements that not only contributes to the

ongoing development of village life but also specifies the rural-urban dialectic in new ways.

This appears somewhat dissimilar to the dominating impression of agribusiness destruction (McMichael, 2006; van der Ploeg, 2008) and rural urbanisation (Murdoch & Pratt, 1993), as established by the historically prior and analytically inferior position of the rural in the rural/urban binary (Halfacree, 2004; Marsden, 2006). In fact, people are increasingly spending their time split between two or three places located in both rural and urban settings; (rural-rooted) households and family complexes are more and more oriented to living structures that include multiple residences, in the village and (its) hamlet(s), in the local town and nearest city, and in the distant metropolis(es) and foreign countries. Today, in Turkey, we see not only the post-modernising movements of urbanites between the city, gated communities in the rural suburbs, and fair-weather villages near the sea or in the hills, but also those who integrate a wide variety of other hybrid residence/employment combinations, including urban settlement with rural farming and family farm residence with urban employment, as well as those migrating between poor villages and rundown urban areas for reasons of subsistence.

It seems clear that the types of human movement involved in the living patterns observed here need to be integrated into our concept(s) of settlement. The Turkish example as discussed reveals rural-oriented living patterns ranging from the level of individuals to that of extended family households (and communities), which comprise an array of space/place combinations with assorted styles of migration/mobility constructed by a range of temporal references, from the mobility forms of daily commuting through seasonal sojourn to life-stage migration. The effect of this is not so much to blur (or deny) the dualistic rural/urban distinction as to re-order it, synthesising the binary division through the multifarious combinations of small and large places in complex and many-faceted lived spaces, combining migration and mobilities for a picture of movement through time, connecting and relating and interrelating between and among different spatial settings, and thereby enabling us to go beyond the rural/urban binary with a dialectic implied by extended hybrid dual-settlement and multiplace life practices.

This unifying approach (discursive redefinition) may also be observed in the idea of movement as productive of spaces (Boxes 1 and 2). The category of *rural-urbanite dual-place residence*, for example, might be regarded as a settlement-oriented definition of what is also referenced by *counterurban movement*: in other words, these styles of residence and movement both get at the same living structure, but one by reference to place (emphasising the spatial) and the other by reference to migration/mobility (emphasising the temporal). And the suggested concept of *return migrant extended space-time* is quite self-consciously specified by the unifying discursive redefinition – thus, we conclude, following King (2012), that movement, such as migration, might be a space-time phenomenon, but so is the place/space of our geography.

While taking the ‘mobility turn’, however, we would like to argue for an adjusted nomenclature, one that maintains the commonsense understanding of a basic (English language) distinction between, on the one hand, migration (an *action*, implying distance and permanence, thus important [and often necessitated] decisions) and, on the other, mobility (an ability [modality], implying choice, access and power, thus ease and frequency). Importantly, these are politically (and morally) charged as well as geo-temporally characterised conditionalities (necessities/potentialities). Rather than collapsing the one into the other, regarding, therefore, migration as a form of mobility (Urry, 2000), we understand them to be better treated as (approximate) equals – even comprising something of a dialectic, indeed, or poles of a range. Either way, for ease of reference, we suggest they be subsumed under a generalised bundle of ‘movement’, a more neutral (or vacuous), and thus preferable, collective term than ‘mobility’.

By way of an aside here in support of this terminological suggestion – and acknowledging that the jargon is in place now and currently carries a cachet that is not really vulnerable to displacement – we note that even as Shelly and Urry introduced their 2005 paper on the ‘new mobilities paradigm’ with the opening line, ‘All the world seems to be on the *move*’, they included the example of ‘refugees ... displaced from their homes’, which is then finessed into the category of ‘diverse yet intersecting *mobilities*’ (emphasis added); yet the implication that refugees – like migrants – are theoretically defined by their

movement as (representatives of) a kind of mobility sits ill at ease with the manifest reality that refugees (and migrants) generally do *not* enjoy very much mobility at all. This terminological ambiguity appears to be an unnecessary confusion, and one, perhaps, that betrays as much as underscores the need to distance the paradigm from ‘nomadic theory’ and present a theoretical synthesis that ‘delineates the context in which both sedentary and nomadic accounts of the social world operate’ (Shelly and Urry, 2006: 209–210).

Thus, (human, spatial) ‘movement’ for us comprises or at least includes, ‘migration’ and ‘mobility’ (which, inevitably, tend to blur into each other). This is a theoretical analysis firmly grounded in our study of village formation, a proposed thesis supported by the empirical data presented. Clearly – we hope – it would have made little sense for our investigation to try to fix on migration *as opposed to* (differentiated from) mobility, at any level, practical (the empirical research) or theoretical (its pre-construction and post-analysis). Rather, the obviously migratory in this context should (had to) be viewed along with the not so obviously, probably not so obviously, and obviously not so – coupling migration and mobility, that is, within relevant human movement *as a whole*.

In respect of the discursive redefinition, this case study strongly supports the proposition that settlement and movement do need to be viewed together – classically, as a binary (of geographical fixity: change, expressed as sedentary: nomadic and residence: migration, as well as stationary: mobile) – but with these also regarded dialectically, as mutually informing pairs. Just as ‘any breakdown of migration’ (from its assumption as a ‘clearly bounded event’) quickly problematises the ‘fundamental sedentarist norm of being settled in place’ (Halfacree, 2012: 212), so also do the new types of movement demand a revision of space. The phrase introduced here, *living structures*, refers to just this sense of space/place as defined in relation to time/movement, with ‘structures’ as the arrangements/patterns of spatiotemporal locations and ‘living’ as the human dynamics of this, the changing (re)construction and more or less flexible employment of these in people’s lives.

Economically, these living structures specify spaces that are hugely organised by capital; yet they also deal with identity and lifestyle formation and might thus be regarded as

heterolocal (Halfacree, 2012). Understanding this from the perspective of rites of passage, the living structures may also be considered in terms of liminality (cf. Zukin, 1992, from Turner, 1969) – for example, in the context of return migrant extended space-time, with the idea of cities as transitory spaces between the rural, specified by (the separation stage of) urban and (integration stage of) reverse/counter-migration (and thereby inverting the usual perspective of the binary inequality by marginalising the urban).

Certainly, the living structures considered here are social constructs connecting small settlements with larger ones in hybrid contexts that continue to be importantly agricultural, but decreasingly so. Or, generalising, migrations and mobilities as residence and labour movements specify the contemporary global development of the new, dynamic, complex spaces of multiplace life, which may be characterised by the locus of human activity as rural, implying village and agriculture, but not exclusively, or necessarily, and certainly not unproblematically.

NOTES

1. Research project: 'Dynamics of changes in rural and agriculture in Turkey after the 1980s,' organised by Murat Öztürk, funded by Kadir Has University, Istanbul; subsequent presentation by Öztürk and Jongerden (2012).
2. It follows from this synthetic or holistic perspective that we need not assume a bivalent division: we might well refer, for example, to a trialectic of wild : rural : urban.
3. He also identified eight names for sub-village forms, a rather rich cultural lexis of (mostly) traditional Turkish and Kurdish terms.
4. Paralleling this and a part of the intra-urban migration referred to earlier, there is also an urban-to-urban return to hometowns from the city. This may also be considered as a *return rural movement*, insofar as the rural-urban dimension is conceived as a range and hometowns are small and rural in character [closely bound to (defined by) the surrounding villages/rurality].
5. Turkish nationals went to Germany on its 'guestworker' (*Gastarbeiter*) programme from the 1960s; the total number of Anatolian-origin residents in Germany now may be around four million (<http://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-expatriate-turkish-citizens.en.mfa>).

6. Extrapolated from http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=39
7. <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTabloArama.do>
8. <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTabloArama.do>
9. 2002: 34.5%, 2009: 38.7% (http://www.tuik.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?alt_id=23)
10. <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=3977>
11. Figure extrapolated from TZOB (2011).
12. Figures vary within these parameters, according to which years are selected and counting system was used.
13. Fishing, like forestry, is here treated as a part of agriculture. Although there are arguments for differentiating fishing and forest villages, we find that the main considerations that apply to the various crop farming and herding/livestock-based farming villages apply to these too and thus do not warrant their separate specification here. Generalising, the fishing communities tend to have diversified and metamorphosed into *semi-agricultural villages*, as indicated here, whereas forest villages, with few opportunities for growth, tend to stay fairly *traditional* and, with the population drain to cities, stagnate and become *moribund*.
14. TZOB (2011).
15. In Turkey, people asked the question literally translated as 'Where are you from?' generally give their *memleket*, which, regardless of where they were born and raised, is the native land (however specified) of their father (and thus grandfather, and perhaps beyond) – information (cultural heritage) that is officially recorded and inscribed on their ID card.

REFERENCES*

- Akşit B. 1987. Kırsal dönüşüm ve köy araştırmaları 1900–1980 [Rural return and village research]. *11. Tez Kitap Dizisi* 7: 11–30.
- Aksoy S, Eraktan G, Eraktan S, Kuhnen F, Winkler W. 1994. *Türkiye'de kırsal nüfusun sosyal güvenliği* [Social security among the rural population of Turkey]. Ankara University: Ankara.
- Aydın S. 2001. Yapısal uyum politikaları ve kırsal alanda beka stratejilerinin özelleştirilmesi; Söke'nin Tuzburgası ve Sivrihisar'ın Kınık köyleri örneği. *Toplum ve Bilim. Bahar* 88(2): 11–31.
- Aydın S. 2010. Neo-liberal transformation of Turkish agriculture. *Journal of Agrarian Change* 10(2): 149–87.
- Bamford EJ, Dunne L, Taylor DS, Symon BG, Hugo GJ, Wilkinson D. 1999. Accessibility to general practitioners in rural South Australia. A case study using geographic information system technology. *Medical*

*All Internet citations accessed October 2012.

- Journal of Australia* 171(11–12): 614–6. PubMed PMID: 10721346.
- Bernstein H. 2008. Who are the ‘people of the land’? Some provocative thoughts on globalisation and development, with reference to sub-Saharan Africa. Conference: *Environments Undone: The Political Ecology of Globalisation and Development*. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 29 Feb.–1 March 2008.
- Brown DL. 2012. A perspective for examining rural migration during the 21st century. Conference: *Agriculture in an Urbanising Society*, Wageningen 1–4 April 2012.
- Champion T, Hugo G. 2004. Moving beyond the urban–rural dichotomy. In *New Forms of Urbanisation: Beyond the Urban–Rural Dichotomy*, Champion, T, Hugo, G (eds). Ashgate Publishing Company: Aldershot, UK/Burlington, VT; 1–24.
- Cloke PJ. 1977. An index of rurality for England and Wales. *Regional Studies* 11: 31–46.
- DPT. 1995. *Yedinci beş yıllık kalkınma planı, 1996–2000* [Seventh five-year development plan 1996–2000]. Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, T.C Başkanlık: Ankara.
- DPT. 2000. *Sekizinci beş yıllık kalkınma planı, tarımsal politikalar ve yapısal düzenlemeler Özel ihtisas komisyonu raporu* [Eighth five-year development plan, special commission report on agricultural politics and structural reorganisation]. Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, T.C Başkanlık: Ankara.
- Farrell M, Mahon M, McDonagh J. 2012. The rural as a return migration destination. *European Country* 1: 31–44. DOI: 10.2478/v10091-012-0012-9
- Gennep A van. 1960 (1907). *The Rites of Passage*. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.: London.
- Güselu K. 1983. *Türkiye’de köy kalkınması ve kentleşme ve kent sorunları* [Village Development and Urbanisation and Town Issues in Turkey]. Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, T.C Başkanlık: Ankara.
- Halfacree K. 2004. Rethinking ‘rurality’. In *New Forms of Urbanisation: Beyond the Urban–Rural Dichotomy*, Champion, T, Hugo, G (eds). Ashgate Publishing Company: Aldershot, UK/Burlington, VT; 285–304.
- Halfacree K. 2008. To revitalise counterurbanisation research? Recognising an international and fuller picture. *Popul Space Place* 14: 479–495.
- Halfacree K. 2012. Heterolocal identities? Counterurbanisation, second homes, and rural consumption in the era of mobilities. *Popul. Space Place* 18: 209–224.
- Harvey D. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford/Cambridge MA.
- Harvey D. 1996. *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference*. Blackwell: Cambridge MA.
- Harvey D. 2012. *Rebel cities: from the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso: London.
- İçduygu A. 2009. International migration and human development in Turkey. Human Development Research Paper (HDRP) Series, 52(2009). UNDP. At http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2009/papers/HDRP_2009_52.pdf
- Jarosoz L. 2008. The city in the country: growing alternative food networks in Metropolitan areas. *Journal of Rural Studies* 24: 231–244.
- Jongerden J. 2007. *The Settlement Issue in Turkey and the Kurds: An Analysis of Spatial Policies, Modernity and War*. Brill: Leiden/Boston.
- Keyder Ç, Yenal S. 2004. Kalkınmacılık sonrası dönemde Türkiye’de kırsal dönüşüm eğilimleri ve sosyal politikalar. *Küresel Düzen: Birikim, Devlet ve Sınıflar* (3. Bas). İletişim Yay: İstanbul; 357–382.
- Keyder Ç, Yenal S. 2011. Agrarian change under globalisation: markets and insecurity in Turkish agriculture. *Journal of Agrarian Change* 11(1): 60–86.
- King R. 2002. Towards a new map of European migration. *International Journal of Population Geography* 8: 89–106.
- King R. 2012. Geography and migration studies: retrospect and prospect. *Popul. Space Place* 18: 134–153. DOI: 10.1002/psp.685
- Lefebvre H. 2003 (1970). *The Urban Revolution*. The University of Minnesota: Minneapolis, MN.
- Marsden T. 2006. Pathways in the sociology of rural knowledge. In *Handbook of Rural Studies*, Cloke, P, Marsden, T, Mooney, PH (eds). Sage Publications Ltd: London/Thousand Oaks, CA/New Delhi; 1–17.
- Massey D. 1992. Politics and space/time. *New Left Review* 196: 65–84.
- Massey D. 1994. A global sense of place. In *Space, Place and Gender*, Massey, D (ed.). University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis; 146–156.
- Massey D. 2005. *For Space*. Sage: London.
- Massey D, Arango J, Hugo G, Kouaouci A, Pellegrino A, Taylor J. 1993. Theories of international migration: a review and appraisal. *Population and Development Review* 19/3: 431–466.
- McMichael P. 2006. Peasant prospects in the neoliberal age. *New Political Economy* 11(3): 407–418.
- Merrifield A. 1993. Place and space: a Lefebvrian reconciliation. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 18.4: 516–531.
- Murdoch J, Pratt AC. 1993. Rural studies: modernism, postmodernism and the ‘post-rural’. *Journal of Rural Studies* 9: 411–427.
- Öztürk M. 2010. 1980 Sonrası yıllarda Türkiye tarımında değişme eğilimleri köysüzleşen kırlar, baliyöleşen köyler, zayıfların sığınağı köyler. *Monthly Review* (Turkish Edition), *Hasiran* 23: 113–183.
- Öztürk M. 2012. *Agriculture, Peasantry and Poverty in Turkey in the Neo-liberal Age*. Wageningen Academic Publishers: Wageningen, NL.
- Öztürk M, Jongerden J. 2012. The changing character of villages in Turkey. Conference: *Agriculture in an Urbanising Society*. Wageningen 1–4 April 2012.

- Ploeg JD van der. 2008. *The New Peasantries: Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in Era of Empire and Globalization*. Earthscan: London.
- Reese HW, Smyer MA. 1983. The dimensionalisation of life-events. In *Life-Span Developmental Psychology: Nonnormative Events*, Callahan, EJ, McKluskey, KA (eds). Academic Press: New York.
- Reichert JS. 1982. Social stratification in a Mexican sending community: the effect of migration to the United States. *Social Problems* 2: 422–433.
- Rivera Escribano MJ. 2007. Migration to rural Navarre: questioning the experience of counterurbanisation. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 98: 32–41.
- Sheller M, Urry J. 2006. The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning* 38: 207–226.
- Sirkeci I. 2009. Transnational mobility and conflict. *Migration Letters* 6.1: 3–14.
- Sirkeci I, Esipova N. 2012. Turkish migration in Europe and desire to migrate to and from Turkey. Border Crossing: Transnational Working Papers, No. 1301 (Regent's Centre for Transnational Studies). London: Regent's College.
- Sönmez A. 2001. Doğu karadeniz bölgesi fındık üretim kuşağında toprak ağalığı, köylülük ve kırsal dönüşüm. *Toplum ve Bilim, Bahar* 88: 69–104.
- Tekeli I. 2008. *Göç ve ötesi*. Tarih Vakfı-Yurt Yayınları: İstanbul.
- TSI. 2000. *General Population Census, 1927–2000*. Turkish Statistical Institute, Printing Division: Ankara.
- TSI. 2008. *Turkey Statistics Yearbook 2008*. Turkish Statistical Institute, Printing Division: Ankara.
- TSI. 2012. *Economic Indicators 2012*. Turkish Statistical Institute, Printing Division: Ankara.
- TÜİK. 2000. *Genel Nüfus Sayımları [TSI, General Population Census], 1927–2000*. TÜİK: Ankara.
- TÜİK. 2008–11. *Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemi Sonuçları [TSI Results of Address Based Population System]*. TÜİK: Ankara.
- Tümertekin E. 1974. The development of human geography in Turkey. In *Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives*, Benedict, P, Tümertekin, E, Mensur, F (eds). Brill: Leiden.
- Tunçdilek N. 1974. Types of rural settlement and their characteristics. In *Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives*, Benedict, P, Tümertekin, E, Mensur, F (eds). Brill: Leiden.
- Turner VW. 1969. *The Ritual Process. Structure and Anti-structure*. Aldine: Chicago.
- TZOB. 2011. *Zirai ve iktisadi rapor, 2007–2010 (Türkiye Ziraat Odaları Birliği)*. [Agricultural and economic report, 2007–2010 (Turkish Chamber of Agriculture Federation)]. Türkiye Ziraat Odaları Birliği: Ankara.
- Urry J. 2000. *Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the 21st Century*. Routledge: London.
- Whatmore S. 2002. *Hybrid Geographies: Natures, Cultures, Spaces*. Sage: London.
- Young SY. 2007. Hyper traditions, hip villages: urbanite villagers of western Anatolia. *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review* XVIII(II): 29–42.
- Zukin S. 1992. *Landscapes of Power*. University of California Press: Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA.