

CAUSES OF RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION AND EMPLOYMENT CHALLENGES IN URBAN ETHIOPIAN:

(A Case Study of South Wollo Administrative Zone)

Dr.ABEBE FENTAW NEBEBE (Ph.D)¹

Abstract

The internal migration has become a major issue of influencing government policies and program efforts. Thus, the main objective of the study is to analyze the socio-economic factors associated with the movement of rural-urban migration and employment challenges in urban Ethiopia. A total of 400 both rural-urban and urban-urban migrants were covered in the three purposively selected urban areas. Of all migrated population, 72% of them migrated from rural areas while 28 percent was within-urban migration. The Binary logistic model was chosen as an appropriate model and the dependent variable (y_i^*) is binary which takes 1 for migrants mainly who migrated from rural to urban area, 0 otherwise. The coefficient of distance from birth area is negatively related with the dependent variable (rural-urban migration) and as distance from place of origin decreases, migrants are more likely to be expected to be pulled towards urban areas compared to migrants from remote rural areas. Conversely, the coefficients of illiterate, adult and religious, primary, high school and preparatory education levels, reasons for migration; (to seek employment, advancing in education, shortage of agricultural land, job transfer) and source of information are positively associated with rural migration and the likelihood of moving out from rural areas increases by 24.57%, 26.68%, 27.24%, 27.05%, 27.54%, 24.43%, 23.91%, and 23.73%, 9.77% respectively. This implies that not only more educated, but also illiterate and less educated migrants are more likely to be pulled toward urban areas and the main causes for rural-urban migration in the study are found to be economic factors, which is in line with the Harris Todaro model of rural-urban migration.

Subsequently, the study proposes generating more employment opportunities through self-employment and wage employment opportunities to be created simultaneously both in rural and urban areas. Moreover, the rural development policies should pave the opportunities to enable youth migrants to involve in farm and nonfarm investments. The poor should participate in the new productive safety- **net program similar to urban areas**, or expanding the food-for-program apart from creating permanent job opportunities in labor-intensive public works so as to reduce the role of push factors. Education is one of the significant characteristics inducing rural-urban migration. Besides, technical and Vocational Educational Training (TEVT) should be given for rural migrants to equip them with the necessary skills and make them competitive in the non-farm labor market.

KEYWORDS: Rural-Urban Migration, South Wollo, Ethiopia, Employment Challenges

¹ Assistant professor in Economics at Wollo University, Dessie Ethiopia

1. Introduction

Migration is a basic major component of population dynamics which is characterized by the deliberate rational decision of the migrant, whereas international migration exacts some forms of checks and limit on intending migrants, internal migration on the other hand is easily more achievable. As the most developing countries of the world, internal migration has become a major issue of influencing government policies and program efforts. Crucial among these issues are problems of unplanned urbanization, growing urban crimes, rural poverty, neglect of agriculture and unbalanced population concentration. These suggest the effect of the dominant pattern of rural-urban migration and its effect on national life.

However, Ethiopia is urbanizing very fast, but it started from a low base compared to other developing countries. While it has a high rate of urbanization (estimated at 4.4% per year), the level of urbanization is still very low, even, considering Africa standards, (2014). Only 19% of the population resided in urban areas of at least 2,000 people. For the whole Africa, Sub-Saharan and East African Countries, however, the percentage was 40%, 37% and 25%, in their order.. The urban population is expected to reach 22 million people by 2020, based on the 4.4% estimated annual growth rate (PASDEP 2006 cited in Muzzi 2008).

However, until recently, researchers have not paid much attention to the rural –urban drift and employment challenges in urban centres in Africa in general and in Ethiopia in particular, except very few researches conducted on the causes of internal migration in Ethiopian and Africa. The essence of this research work is, therefore, to identify the causes of rural migration and whether the newly arrived rural-urban migrant is left out in the bitter in terms of employment opportunities. Analysis involves estimation of a binary logistic model to examine socioeconomic factors associated with rural-urban migration to identify whether or not the migrant is more likely to have adverse employment prospects in urban Ethiopia.

Objective

The objective of the study is to analyze the socio-economic factors associated with the movement of rural-urban migration and employment challenges in urban Ethiopia: A case study of South Wollo Administrative Zone, Amhara National Regional State.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the theoretical and empirical review, in the existing literature, *vis-à-vis* the situation and factors associated with the causes of rural-urban migration. Section 3 highlights the nature of data and methodological issues. Results and discussions are present in section 4 which shows the detailed analysis of factors associated with the causes of rural migration and employment challenges. Finally, Section 5 summarizes the findings of and policy recommendations of the study.

2. Literature and Empirical Review

The process of economic development has usually been seen as a transformation of the rural agricultural sector of the urban manufacturing sector. This process, in the two sectors is driven by labor migration and capital accumulation. According to W.Arthur Lewis in his work on ‘Economic development with unlimited supplies of labor’ (1954) analyzed the labor market dualism and the structural difference between the subsistence sector and capitalistic sector in developing economies. The two sectors in the Lewis model were named as subsistence and capitalistic sectors originally and then they were renamed as traditional and modern sectors. The Lewis model was also formalized and extended by John Fei and Gus Ranis in 1961 and the combination is named as the Lewis Ranis and Fei (LRF) model. The model, which takes to account the context of developing countries, explains a dual economy model of economic development with an assumption that there exists surplus labor in the traditional (agricultural) sector, which is to be re-allocated to fill the rising modern (urban) sector labor demands. This means that the loss of labor in the traditional agriculture sector does not reduce agricultural production as a result of migration of labor to the modern sector. The traditional agricultural sector is characterized by low wages and very low/ zero marginal productivity of workers.

Hence, the labor in the modern manufacturing sector has a positive marginal product and because of incentives in the modern sector individuals in traditional sector is motivated to migrate to the modern manufacturing sector. The model also points out the importance of surplus labor in generating inter-sectoral shift of employment and then triggering economic growth without increase in real wages in the formal sector. As pointed out by Ranis⁴ (2004), the dual economy model continued to be relevant and an important policy guide for labor abundant countries with heavy population pressure and scarcity of cultivable land.

However, Oded Stark and David E Bloom in 1985 realized the concept of the New Economics of Labor Migration (NELM) model which provides a new insight by shifting the way how the migration decision is made and by linking rural-urban migration with development as described below. The NELM model shifts the focus of migration model from individual to mutual affair where migration decisions are influenced by other actors, i.e. by households or families. The decision to migrate is a collective action done by the migrants themselves and their families, where the head of the family takes a lead in the decision making process. According to the model, variations in the characteristics of a household and its members can potentially affect the earnings of household members as well as the motivations of migrants to remit part of their earnings to the household.

Nevertheless, the NELM model has brought a new direction in migration research; it has also been criticized by some scholars by Cortes (2007) as well as Folbre (1986), the household model emphasized on the strong cooperative bonds among household members and considers households as a single unit but neglecting the conflicts and inequalities of power existing within a household. The other phenomenon is regarded migration networks. Distorted information about the host region, which is transmitted via networks in the destination, can mislead potential migrants. Absence of

networks and contacts in destination region can also make potential migrants not to access the right information and depend entirely on their families for transportation and adjustment costs. This in turn increases the cost of migration and then affecting the decision to migrate.

There are several reasons for population mobility from place to place. The causes of migration are usually identified as two broad categories, namely “pushing” and “pulling” factors. People of a certain area may be pushed off by poverty and other natural factor to move towards towns for employment. On the other hand, better employment opportunities or the need for better facilities in urban areas may also pull people to different urban areas. In addition, the decision to migrate from one place to another may also be influenced by non-economic factors such as the need to join relatives, the need to be free from cultural and family restriction and obligation and so on. In general, however, as to the causes of migration scholars conclude that migration is a response of humans to a series of economic and non-economic factors (Lewis, 1982; Todaro, 1997).

A research conducted by Birhan A. M (2011) in North Wollo zone identified that a large number of migrants were single (unmarried) when they came to Woldiya town. The dominant divorcees and widowers were females in at rural origin. Most of the migrants had formal education. However, more males than females had formal educations in both migrants of urban and rural origin. A greater number of migrants were either students/trainees or unemployed or sick/disabled before they migrate to Woldiya. Among the employed most of them were farmers. Most migrants moved basically for economic reasons such as seeking employment, job transfer, to open up or extend personal business, to gain education and training services. On the other hand, some of them were moved to Woldiya for non-economic reasons, such as to be free from cultural or family restriction and obligation, and to join relatives or friends in the town.

According to the research examined by **Niels, et al, 2015**, the internal migration in Ethiopia is focused on the linkages among internal migration, education and wages. Descriptive statistics indicate that migrants are better off than non-migrants on average in terms of both their education and their wages. When moving to the multivariate analysis, these preliminary results are strengthened: not only do migrants also obtain higher wages when other factors (including education) are controlled for, they also obtain higher returns to their education than non-migrant, controlling for other factors. That is, the results suggest that the more educated are the winners from increased migration, while the less educated are the losers. That is, “the winner takes it all”: the more educated reap higher returns both from benefitting more from migration and from being better educated to begin with, leaving the less educated—especially among the migrant population—as the losers.

The study conducted by Fasil E and Mohammed B (2017) had examined the central characteristics of migrants and determinants of rural-urban migration in Southern Ethiopia based on the snow ball sampling and a survey of 665 sample migrants using descriptive and econometric analysis. The study finding revealed that individuals who were young, educated and unmarried tend to be more mobile; they seek works that match their age, higher skills and experiences and which pay the return on education costs incurred. The results of Probit regression analysis model also indicated that age, years of schooling, relatives at receiving areas, monthly income at sending areas and family size significantly affect rural-urban migration.

However, until recently, researchers have not paid much attention to the causes of rural –urban flow in line with their employment challenges in urban centres in Africa in general and in Ethiopia in particular, except very few researches conducted on the causes of internal migration in Ethiopian and Africa. The essence of this research work is, therefore, to identify the causes of rural migration and whether the newly arrived rural-urban migrant is left out in the bitter in terms of employment opportunities.

3. Data, Methods and Model Specification

3.1.Data Type and Source

The data used in this study has come from a primary individual survey conducted by the researcher from three cities (Dessie, Kombolcha and Hayq) of South Wollo Administrative Zone. Data collection process undertakes through a face to face (personal) interview and group discussion with purposively selected both urban-urban and rural-urban migrants in the study areas. A total of 400 internal migrants were included in the survey. In addition to the primary data collected using the household survey, pertinent documents such as books, previous working literatures and policy evaluation reports, statistics, and checklists of facts and figures and unpublished materials were utilized.

3.2.Sampling Techniques

There are various sampling techniques; the non-probability sampling (purposive and snowball sampling) and probability sampling. In this research, therefore, the emphasis was given to non-probability sampling specifically on purposive and snowball sampling procedures. It is the most common methods of sampling, it is “walk and ask”, used when the universe/ population is not clearly defined and sampling units or it may be difficult to identify the sampling frame or a complete source list of units (the names of all items) in kebele² registry office. Only migrants were purposively selected in more crowded and slum areas, in the street, open market areas, construction sites, employment agency offices, bars and restaurants, individual houses, informal business operators, casual workers, housemaids etc were assumed to be found and were interviewed to talk based on their sex, varying age group, marital status and above all their potential to say what they would have had in their life-their ability to share factor for their migration, livelihood and their life experiences at large. Accordingly, a purposive sampling technique used to sample 400 migrants in some selected cities of South Wollo Administrative zone. The reference period for the study were 2017/18 and 2018/19

In south wollo administrative, there are two major and medium / emerging cities (Dessie and Kombolcha) and 16 small district towns/ cities. For this reason, the study was following a multistage sampling technique. In the **first stage** of sampling technique the central part, more crowded and slum areas/ cities, etc., Dessie, Kombolcha and Hayq, were directly selected according to their population size and number of migrants and the proportion of migrant households engaged in non agricultural activities to represent major, medium and small cities/district centers for the purpose of intensive rural- urban migration analysis.

² Kebele is the smallest administrative unit in Ethiopia

In the **second stage** more crowded and slum areas of Kebeles were also purposefully selected from a list of cables in each town by excluding the expansion and rural kebeles. That is 6 (1,2,3, 6, 9 and 10 out of 15) in Dessie, in kombolcha 3 (2,3 & 5 out of 5), and in Hayq 3 (1, 2, 5, out of 5) central slum and very crowded urban kebeles were selected, respectively

For simplicity, therefore, the researcher used the survey result of CSA (2013) and appropriate sample size formulae of Fowler (2001) for finite population, which is indicated by as follows. Among recent migrants (those who migrated in the last five years before the survey), rural to urban migrants account for 39%, while the rural to rural migrants account for only 27%.

In the **third stage**, the above predetermined total sample size of 420 migrants was determined as follows in the study areas.

$$n = \frac{[z_{\alpha / 2}]^2 p [1 - p]}{E^2} \quad (1)$$

Where N=size of households, n= number of surveyed population; $Z_{\alpha/2}$ = the two-tailed critical value at 95 percent confidence interval (2.1); P = assumed only the share of rural-urban migration in Ethiopia (P) =0.39), by excluding the share of urban-urban migration taking E = marginal error between the sample and population size (0.05).

Hence the estimated sample size will be determined by using the above formula

$$n = \frac{[2.1]^2 0.39[1-0.39]}{(0.05)^2} \approx 420 \quad (\text{Approximately})$$

In this research, 5% margin of error is accepted as a minimum margin to cover a large sample size in the study area and in order to be confident with a higher degree of precision.

In addition to this, since the researcher did not have any information/data/ about the exact number or lists of rural-urban and urban-urban migration, a predetermined total sample size of **n=420** was purposefully distributed on the basis of the minimum proportion of the population (CSA, 2008) in each city (Table 1.1). In the final analysis, for compatibility and comparability, however, it was desirable to distinguish only between urban and rural origin of migration in the study area

Table 1. 1: Distribution of Sampled Urban Areas and Respondents

City	Population (CSA 2008)	Actual Proportion in%	Expected Sample size (%)	Sample size	Proportion in %	Actual Data collected	Proportion in %
Dessie	151,174	60.67	50-60	231	55	224	56.00
Kombolcha	85,367	34.26	30-35	139	33	129	32.25
Haiq	12,640	5.07	5-12	50	12	47	11.75
Total	249,181	100	100%	420	100	400	100%

Source: Own Computation, 2019

3.3. Model Specification

3.3.1. Logit/ Probit Model for Binary Response

The Binary logistic model is chosen as an appropriate model when we assume the random component of the response variable follows a binomial distribution and when more explanatory variables have categorical responses. Thus the dependent variable in this analysis is households' internal/ rural-urban/ migrants. The presence of one migrant individual and above in the household represents as migrants' household who migrate from rural and urban to the study areas. Hence, the dependent variable (y_i^*) is binary which takes 1 for migrants mainly who migrated from rural to urban area, 0 otherwise. The analysis involves estimation of a logit model to examine factors associated with the decision for migration

$$rural - urban_i = y_i^* = \beta_k x_i + u_i \quad (2)$$

Where u_i stochastic error term which is normally distributed in logit model, that is, $u_i \rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2)$; β_k is vector of model parameters; and x_i is a vector of independent variables, y_i^* is the latent variable indicating the status of migration

The Marginal/ Partial Changes)

The marginal /partial changes/in $\Pr(Y_i = j)$ for the particular variable X_k is;

$$\frac{\partial \Pr(Y_i = j)}{\partial X_k} = \Pr(Y_i = j / X) \left[\beta_{jk} - \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{\beta}_{jk} x \Pr(Y_i = j / X) \right] \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

Note a few things about the above expression

- The marginal effect varies as the function of a bunch of things, including
 - The probability itself
 - The value of the coefficient estimate
 - The sum of the other coefficients for that covariate

- This means that the $\left[\beta_{jk} - \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{\beta}_{jk} x \Pr(Y_i = j / X) \right]$ term signs the marginal effect which in turn

means that the marginal effect may or may not have the same sign as the coefficient estimate itself. And note that the study has to calculate separately for each of the J possible outcomes for.

That is the Probability of rural-urban migration ($y_i=1$) = $\frac{\exp(x' \beta)}{1 + \exp(x' \beta)}$ -----(4)

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Place of Birth and the Length of Years Stay in the study Area

4.2.1. Region, Zone and Zone of Migrants

In many developing countries, the largest proportions of migrants are coming from rural areas (Caldwell, 1969). This fact coincides with the rural-agrarian dominated nature of these developing countries, where the majority of the people reside in rural localities. Ravenstein also argues that migration is common from rural agrarian economy to urban industrialized ones (Lewis, 1982).

For that reason, almost all migrants arrived in the study areas came from three regions and Capital city of Ethiopia, but a considerable share came from the areas surrounding study areas, Dessie, Kombolcha and Haiq, Amhara (96%), Oromiya (2%), Tigray (1.75%) and Addis Ababa (0.25%), respectively (Table 1.2). As a result, the results of the Chi-square ($\chi^2=10.8199$ and $p=0.094$) revealed that the closer the distance is between the sending and destination areas, the higher the rate of out migration and their difference is statistically significant at the 10 percent level.

Among the other areas, relevant out-migration zones to the study areas are those in northern Ethiopia, South Wollo, South Gonder, Oromia Special zone, North Shewa, some part of Oromia and Tigray regions, For example South Wollo 68.75%, North Wollo 22%, South Gondar 2.5% are the main regions which contributed a lion share of all migrants living in study areas, Dessie, Kombolcha and Hayq city Administrations (Table 1.2). Hence, the Chi-square ($\chi^2=65.0083$ and $p=0.000$) showed that their difference is statistically significant or there is a strong association between zone and destination areas of migrants at 1% level. In general the number of migrants decreases as distance from sending areas increases because increases the cost of rural-urban migration and may reduce the wave migration. Thus, most of the migrants to the study areas are short distance migrants and the volume of urban ward migration decreases with an increase in distance.

Table 1.2: The Distance Between Current Destination and Place of Birth of Migrants (in km)

Area of Birth	Current Destination						Total N=400	χ^2	p-value	
	Dessie N=224		Kombolcha N=129		Hayq N=47					
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%				
Area of Birth: Region (Rbirth2)										
Amhara	216	96.43	126	97.67	42	89.36	384	96.00	10.8199	0.094
Tigrie	4	1.79	0	0.00	3	6.38	7	1.75		
Orromiya	3	1.34	3	2.33	2	2	8	2.00		
Addis Ababa	1	0.45	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.25		
Zone (Zbirth2)										
South Wollo	147	65.63	88	68.22	42	89.36	277	69.25	21.7298	0.005***
North Wollo	57	25.45	31	24.03	0	0.00	88	22.00		
South Gondar	5	2.23	5	3.88	0	0.00	10	2.50		
Oromia Special Zone	3	1.34	1	0.78	0	0.00	4	1.00		
Others	12	5.36	4	3.10	5	10.64	21	5.25		
The distance between this city and place of birth (in km) (distan2)										
1-30 km	43	19.20	29	22.48	44	93.62	116	29.00	117.7284	0.000***
31-60 km	26	11.61	16	12.40	0	0.00	42	10.50		
61-90 km	23	10.27	14	10.85	0	0.00	37	9.25		
90-120 km	27	12.05	11	8.53	0	0.00	38	9.50		
121-150 km	12	5.36	11	8.53	0	0.00	21	5.25		
151-180 km	17	7.59	4	3.10	0	0.00	23	5.75		
181-210 km	26	11.61	18	13.95	0	0.00	21	5.25		
211-240 km	14	6.25	10	7.75	0	0.00	24	6.00		
241-270 km	13	5.80	5	3.88	0	0.00	18	4.50		
Above 270 km	23	10.27	11	8.53	3	6.38	37	9.25		

Source: Own Computation 2019 (***)Significant at the 1% level)

4.3. Current Address of Migrants

As indicated below in Table 4.2, out of the total migration, Dessie has the share of 56.00% (224) and followed by Kombolch, 32.25 % (129) and Haiq, 11.75%(47), respectively. However, the rural-urban migration becoming the dominant migration pattern in the study areas. The small city, Haiq, has pulled 89% of , next the medium/industrial city, Kombolcha, 71.32% and followed by the big, Dessie, to attract 68.75% of total rural-urban migrants. The result of Chi-square analysis ($\chi^2 = 8.2307$ or P-value=0.016) has also witnessed that the area of birth of migrants is the statistical difference between the current address of the migrants (cities).

Table 1. 3: Current Destination/ Address of Migrants

Area of birth of Migrants	Current Address of the respondents						Total		χ^2	p-value
	Dessie		Kombolcha		Hayq		Freq	%		
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%				
Urban areas	70	31.25	37	28.68	5	10.64	112	28.00	8.2307	0.016**
Rural areas	154	68.75	92	71.32	42	89.36	288	72.00		
Total(N)	224	56.00	129	32.25	47	11.75	400	100.00		

****Significant at the 5% level**

4.4. Demographic Characteristics of the Migrants (Before Migration)

The major background characteristics of migrant are presented in Table 1.4. Thus, a majority, 244 (61.0%) of the sampled respondents were male migrants, while about 156 (39.0%) of them were female. A similar pattern of was found when migrants first left their birth places and moved from rural areas to urban areas (to the study areas); the share of male migrants was, 184 (63.89%), while the share of female migrants was, 104 (36.11%). Likewise, out of the total migrants who moved from urban-urban areas, the proportion male migrant was also very high, 60(53.63%), while the proportion of female migrants was small, 52(46.53%), compared to its counterpart. This is consistent with the finding of Kebede (1994) that migration was not only age selective, it was also sex selective. However, the sex selectivity of migration was different in different regions. The result of Chi-square analysis has witnessed the gender differentials of area of birth of migrants (P-value of 0.015), indicating that males migrants were more prone to rural-urban migration than their counterpart females in their area of birth.

The same Table 1.4 shows that the current age of the sampled migrants and their age when they left their birth place. Accordingly, both the rural and urban originated migrants found to be in the same age interval and younger, 87.50% between 14-30 age range out of the total in-migrants.. The results of the survey also reveals that a majority of the respondents, 265(66.25%) had age of 30 and less than 30 years and the remaining respondents, 135 (33.75%) between 30 and 64 years age ranges, with the highest concentration in the range of 18-43years. Consequently, regardless of whether the origin area of migrants was rural or urban, currently young people are more likely to move to urban areas. This is because the young age group were equally likely less satisfied with the existing employment opportunities in their birth places.

The dominant religious groups of people in Ethiopia are Christians and Muslims. As the survey results in Table 1.4 below confirmed that the Christian religion groups were more likely to move from rural to urban areas than Muslim religious group. For that reason, the Christian religious groups accounted for about 65% of the migrants; while Muslim religious group contributed only 35% of the total migrants.

It is quite natural that the largest proportion of the migrants has come from the same administrative region, i.e. Amhara Region, mainly because of the proximity to the study area, the importance of networking and cultural ties in migration decision. Thus, Table 1.4 shows that the ethnic background of migrants and it was observed that Amhara migrants contributed the lion share, (97.25%), followed by Tigre (1.5%) and Oromo (1.25%), respectively.

Marital status is another important characteristic influencing the propensity to migrate. That is, the matter of being married, unmarried (single), divorced and widowed, has an effect on the decision to migrate. Single persons have less responsibility than married ones. As such, the propensity to migrate is higher among the single than married ones. According to many studies, many of the migrants were unmarried at the time they migrated, (Kebede, 1994 and Birhan, A , 2011)). Equally, the survey results and the response given by the respondents strengthen the above empirical literature. As indicated in the same Table 1.4 below, though their difference is not statistically significant, about 18% of the respondents were married, while 82% were single before they migrated to towns. It may be inferred that most of the urban-urban migrants, 84.82%, were single, while 80.90% of rural-urban migrants were single before they came to urban areas. .

Regarding Household family size in the place of origin, most of the migrants were single and lived with their parents and relatives. In particular, about 73.75% migrants were single before they left their places of origin. However, as indicated in Table 4.5, the majority of the migrants ,22.75%, were reported to come from households 1-3 members; 47.5% were from households having 4-6 members; 26.50% from 7-9 members and only 3.25% were belonged to come from households greater than 9 members.

It was also reported during the survey period that the majority of the migrants (83.00%) had 1-3 household members, (of which 52.75% of migrants were living alone, 16% were with 2 and 14% migrants were with 3 family members), while 47.5% of them have 4-6 members; only 1.25 and 0.25% had 7-9 members and greater than 9 members. The family size of rural-urban migrant households is smaller than that of urban-migrant households, suggesting that smaller families are more likely to have rural migrant members. Thus, as the survey result (Table 1.4) indicates, about 80.90% of rural migrants were single compared to 84.82% of urban migrants when they left their birth places. On the other hand, migrants were asked to mention the relation /position/to their households/ family/ when they left their birth place or past residence or place of origin, the assessment of household composition shows that 305 (76.25%) of the sampled migrants were sons/daughters, followed by spouse/partner, 50(12.50%) , head 35[(8.75%) , parent of head/spouse 6 (1.50%), while other relatives had the smallest share, 4 (1.0%).

For education, sampled migrants were asked how many years of schooling they had completed, and primary school was tallied with if someone had 1-8 years of schooling and secondary school counted for anyone who had more than 8 years of schooling. However, the distribution of the respondents by education level, prior to their move to the current destination, showed that there little improvement in all level , such as 69(17.25%) were illiterate, 18(4.50%) were in adult and religious education, 162(40.50%) were primary education (grade 1-8 level), followed by High school, 115 (28.75%) ,

and preparatory (grade 10-12 level) (26.1%), Technical and Vocational education (TVET) and Diploma 19(4.75%) and university level, 17 (4.25%). This implies that the trade off between education and migration seems relevant. The probability of migration is higher for individuals with junior high school education and tends to fall for those with secondary and tertiary education.

Table 1.4: Demographic Characteristics of Migrants (Current and Before)

Demographic Characteristics of Migrants		Area of birth of Migrants				Total		χ^2	p-value
		Urban areas		Rural areas		freq	%		
		Freq	%	Freq	%				
Gender	Male	60	53.67	184	63.89	244	61.00	3.6083	0.057*
	Female	52	46.33	104	36.11	156	39.00		
Age (birth pace)	Age <14years	10	8.93	17	5.90	27	6.75	2.3778	0.305
	Age 14-30years	98	87.50	252	87.50	350	87.50		
	Age>30 and =<64	4	3.57	19	6.60	23	5.75		
Religion	Christian	75	66.96	185	64.24	260	65.00	0.2638	0.608
	Muslim	37	33.04	103	35.76	140	35.00		
Ethnicity	Amhara	104	92.86	285	98.96	389	97.25	11.4648	0.003***
	Tigre	4	3.57	2	0.69	6	1.50		
	Oromo	4	3.57	1	0.35	5	1.25		
mrts (birth place)	Single	95	84.82	233	80.90	328	82.00	0.8390	0.360
	Married	17	12.18	55	19.10	72	18.00		
fsize2(own family in the place of origin)	1-3	108	96.43	266	92.36	374	93.50	5.0478	0.148
	4-6	2	1.79	19	9.60	21	5.25		
	7-9	2	1.79	2	0.69	4	1.00		
	Greater than 9	0	0.00	1	0.35	1	0.25		
fsize3(parent family size in birth place)	1-3	25	22.32	66	22.92	91	22.75	1.5922	0.661
	4-6	52	46.43	138	47.92	190	47.50		
	7-9	33	29.46	73	25.35	106	26.50		
	Greater than 9	2	1.79	11	3.82	13	3.25		
relative(position/to family in birth place)	Head	6	10.71	29	10.07	35	8.75	5.7339	0.220
	Spouse/ partner	12	10.71	38	13.19	50	12.50		
	Son/daughter	93	83.04	212	73.61	305	76.25		
	Parent of head/spouse	0	0.00	6	2.08	6	1.50		
	Other/ relative	1	0.89	3	1.04	4	1.00		
edul2 (birth place)	Illiterate	17	15.18	52	18.02	69	17.25	9.9673	0.076*
	Adult/Religious education	1	0.89	17	5.90	18	4.50		
	Primary education (1-8)	47	41.96	115	39.93	162	40.50		
	High school & Preparatory (10-12)	31	27.68	84	29.17	115	28.75		
	TVET & College	8	7.14	11	3.82	19	4.75		
	Diploma	8	7.14	9	3.13	17	4.25		
	University Education	8	7.14	9	3.13	17	4.25		

*Significant at the 10% level; **Significant at the 5% level; ***Significant at the 1% level

Source: Own Survey, 2019conomic Status of Migrants

4.5. Economic Status of Migration (Before Migration)

Table 1.5 depict that the majority (73.00%) of out migrants (at migration) were unemployed either due to lack of employment opportunities (65.00%), being young, student, housewife, old age or

health problems (8.00%) out of the total in-migrants., while only 27.00% of them were employed , before they moved to their current destinations. The occupational distribution of sampled migrants, among employed in-migrants, shows that the highest percentages were farmer, 16.75%, followed by self employment, 6.00%, private employees, 2.50%, and only 1.75% of them were government employees, respectively. Thus the unemployed-employed difference among rural and urban migrants is statistically significant ($p=0.045$) at 5% significant level. Nonetheless, the unemployment proportion, (63.54%) of rural migrants was less compared to the other urban migrant categories (68.75%) before they moved to the study areas (towns). This implies that unemployment at their place of departure is the main reason to migrate to a big (Dessie), medium (Kombolcha) and small (Hayq) cities, which will be discussed in detail next.

Table 1. 5: Economic Status of Migrants (Before Migration)

Economic Migration)	Status of Migrants (Before Migration)	Area of birth of Migrants				Total N=400		χ^2	p-value
		Urban N=112		Rural N=288		freq	%		
		freq	%	freq	%				
employment (pastemp)	Yes	25	22.32	84	29.17	109	27.25	1.9060	0.167
	No	87	77.68	204	70.87	291	72.75		
Main occupation	Self-Employed	11	9.82	13	4.51	24	6.00	11.3636	0.045**
	Government/ NGO Employee	2	1.79	5	1.74	7	1.75		
	Private Employee	4	3.57	7	2.43	11	2.75		
	Farmer	9	8.04	58	20.14	67	16.75		
	Other/young/ student/ housewife...	10	8.93	22	7.64	32	8.00		
	Unemployed	77	68.75	183	63.54	261	65.00		
job waiting	Yes	17	15.18	50	17.36	67	16.75	0.2755	0.600
	No	95	84.82	238	82.64	333	83.25		

*Significant at the 10% level;**Significant at the 5%level;***Significant at the 1% level

Source: Own Computation 2019

4.6.The Causes for Migration

As many literatures indicate that the causes of migration are usually identified as two broad categories, namely “pushing” and “pulling” factors. In the same way, better employment opportunities or the need for better facilities in urban areas may also pull people to different urban areas. In addition, the decision to migrate from one place to another may also be influenced by non-economic factors such as the need to join relatives, the need to be free from cultural and family restriction and obligation and so on.

Thus the result of this study confirmed the above migration theories that people move for better employment opportunities or the need for better facilities (example advancing in education...) in urban areas had pulled people to different urban areas from rural areas and small city centres. The survey result also shows that the majority of in-migrants that accounted for 61.75% of the total surveyed migrants moved to urban areas to obtain job or seek employment, followed by to seek advancing in education, 14.25% (16.07% of urban-urban and 4.26% of rural-urban) , despite the fact that very few proportion of sampled in-migrants moved to the study areas as a result of shortage of

land and oxen, burden of family ties, inadequate social amenities in their origin, to avoid burden of agriculture, to join friends and relatives/family reasons, job transfer, to open up/extend own business and old age/health problems. The same Table 1.6 below further indicates that there was only a small variation between rural and urban origin migrants. About 61.61% of surveyed urban migrants moved to urban areas to seek employment whereas 61.81% of urban migrants moved to other urban areas to seek employment.

Table 1.6: Socio-Economic Factors Influencing Migration by the Place of Birth

Cause of Migration	Area of birth of Migrants				Total		χ^2	p-value
	Urban N=112		Rural N=288		N=400			
	freq	%	freq	%	Freq	%		
To seek employment	69	61.61	176	61.81	247	61.75	12.3181	0.196
Advancing Education	14	12.50	43	14.93	57	14.25		
Shortage of land and oxen	1	0.89	13	4.51	14	3.50		
In adequate social amenities	2	1.79	10	3.47	12	3.00		
Burden of family ties	6	5.36	17	5.90	23	5.75		
To avoid burden of agriculture	5	4.46	4	1.39	9	2.25		
To join friend and relatives/ family reason/	2	1.79	2	0.69	4	1.00		
Job transfer/ job moved/	3	2.68	8	2.78	11	2.75		
To open up or extended personal business	5	4.46	9	3.13	14	3.50		
Other / old age, health problem....)	5	4.46	4	1.39	9	2,25		

Source: Own Survey 2019

4.7.Current Economic Characteristics of Migrants

As revealed in the Table 1.7 below, about 77% were employed, whereas 23% of the migrants were unemployed at the time of the survey period. This may imply that employment rate was higher among migrants because they highly competed for any types of job opportunity than non-migrants in new destination areas. However, there is only a big variation proportion of unemployment migrants among big (Dessie) medium or industrial (Kombolcha) and small (Hayq) city destinations. About 33.25% of surveyed in-migrants were unemployed in Dessie, followed by Kombolcha, 15.50% and Hayq, 4.26%, respectively. Hence, compared with small towns, the problem of unemployment with in-migrant population is very high in big and medium cities. This implies that employment opportunity in big cities is a very low compare to medium and small cities. Thus, their occupational differences among big, medium and small migrant population is statistically significant ($p=0.062$) at 10 percent significant levels.

The same Table 1.7 further points out the nature presence jobs of migrants that out of the total of employed migrants, about 36.69% of them were engaged in temporary jobs (46.675% in Dessie, 19.27% in Kombolcha and 44.44% in Hayq), pursued by 25.65% engaged in casual/housemaid/ jobs (Dessie; 19.48%, Kombolcha; 36.70%, and Hayq; 20.0%), 22.73 in permanent jobs (19.48% in Dessie, 22.94% in Kombolcha and 33.33% in Hayq) and 14.94% (Dessie14.29%; Kombolcha; 22.10 %; and Hayq; 2.22%) of them were engaged in seasonal jobs. Consequently, big and medium cities are more fitting for temporary jobs than small cities, whereas medium and small cities are more appropriate for permanent and casual jobs and their occupational difference is statistically significant ($\chi^2=27.2823$ $p=0.00$) at the 1% significance level.

Thus, most of the migrants were employed in self employment and private organization seasonally/ part of the year (41.88%), once a while (29.55%), while only a small proportion, 28.57%, of them were

employed throughout the year in all occupations. Likewise, self-employed respondents were also asked in which type of own self-employed they were engaged. As regards 37.42% self-employed migrants were engaged in street vendor, followed by petty-trade, 30.32%, shoeshine, 15.48%, construction, 4.53%, preparing food and selling of local drinks, 3.23%, hotel/cafeteria service, 2.58%, barber, 2.58%, metal and wood work, 1.29%, tailor, 1.29% and a very small proportion of them were engaged in handicraft/embroidery and pottery (0.65%) and broker (0.65%). The difference was especially great between big, medium and small cities, but the value of chi2 (p=530) reveals that their difference is not statistically significant.

Table 1.7: Current Economic Characteristics of Migrants

Current Economic Status of Migrants		Current Address of the respondents						Total (N=400)		χ^2	p-value
		Dessie (N=224)		Kombolcha (N=129)		Hayq (N=47)					
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%				
main occupation	Self-employed	89	39.73	44	34.11	22	46.81	155	38.75	49.3771	0.000***
	Government/NGO/ employee	3	1.34	1	0.78	5	10.64	9	2.25		
	Private employee	32	14.29	24	18.60	9	19.15	65	16.25		
	Casual /housemaid worker	30	13.39	40	31.01	9	19.15	79	19.75		
	Unemployed	70	31.25	20	15.50	2	4.26	92	23.00		
nature of presence work;	Permanent	30	19.48	25	22.94	15	33.33	70	23.73	32.6710	0.000***
	Temporary	72	46.75	21	19.27	20	44.44	113	36.69		
	Seasonal	22	14.29	23	21.10	1	2.22	46	14.94		
	Casual	30	19.48	40	36.70	9	20.00	79	25.65		
duration of employment (durationemp)	Throughout the year	36	23.38	35	32.11	17	37.78	88	28.57	27.2823	0.000***
	seasonally /part of the year/	70	45.45	54	49.54	5	11.11	129	41.88		
	Once a while	48	31.17	20	18.35	23	51.11	91	29.55		
type of self-employed (currselfemp)	Petty-trade/guilt	26	29.21	12	27.27	9	40.91	47	30.32	18.8772	0.530
	Street vendor	30	33.71	19	43.18	9	40.91	58	37.42		
	Metal and wood work	1	1.12	1	2.27	0	0.00	2	1.29		
	Hotel/ cafeteria service	4	4.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	2.58		
	Food and selling of local drinks	5	5.62	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	3.23		
	Handicraft/embroidery/pottery/	1	1.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.65		
	Construction	5	5.62	2	4.55	0	0.00	7	4.52		
	Tailor	2	2.25	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.29		
	Shoeshine	10	11.24	10	22.73	4	18.18	24	15.48		
	Barber	4	4.49	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	2.58		
	Broker	1	1.12	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.65		
	No	104	67.53	50	45.87	27	60.00	181	58.77		
main reason (s) for being unemployed (curreasons)	Had no formal education	14	20.00	4	20.00	1	50.00	19	20.65	2.3479	0.672
	Lack of job opportunity	52	74.29	16	80.00	1	50.00	69	75.00		
	Lack of land/oxen/	4	5.71	0	0.00	2	0.00	4	4.35		

****Significant at the 5%level;***Significant at the 1% level**

Source: Own Computation 2019

4.8.Problem faced by Migrants (After Arrival at Urban Areas)

Taking all respondents together, 48.50% of them were reported to have faced serious unemployed problem followed by shelter/housing problem, 22.50%, foods and other consumer goods, 10.25%, and inadequate social services and other social utilities, 3.25%, and others/ working places.../ problems (1.75%), while only 13.75% of them were reported to have no difficulties they faced during their first arrival at their destinations. The employment challenge is very high in medium (51.16%) and big (48.21%) cities compared with small (42.55%) district city. The P-value of the Chi-square analysis also revealed that there is a strong association between area of destinations and the main problems faced at 5 percent level of significance (P=0.039).

Currently, about 41.25% of them replied that they faced the same serious unemployed challenge pursued by ever increasing challenge of shelter/housing, 31.25%, foods and other consumer goods, 7.0%, and inadequate social services and other social utilities, 8.25% and others/ working places.../ problems, 1.50%), while only 10.75% of them were reported to have no difficulties they faced during their first arrival at their destinations. Similarly, the employment challenge is very high in a big (48.21%) city than in medium/ industrial (40.28%) and small district (41.25%) cities. Nevertheless, the P-value of the Chi-square analysis revealed that there was no strong association between area of destination and main challenges they are facing now (P=0.967) in current destinations/ cities/. One can therefore conclude that the main difficulties being faced by migrants were obtaining formal jobs, inadequate supply of housing, inadequate supply of social services, inadequate social utilities and working places.

Table 1.8: Main Challenges of Migrants by the Area of Destinations (After Arrival)

Main challenges	Current Address of the respondents								χ^2	p-value
	Dessie N=224		Kombolcha N=129		Hayq N=47		Total N=400			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
1. Main challenge (s) they faced during their first arrival in each city (challenge_03);										
Employment	108	48.21	66	51.16	20	42.55	194	48.50	19.1196	0.039**
Shelter (house)	57	25.45	26	20.16	7	14.89	90	22.50		
Food and other consumer goods	20	8.93	9	6.98	12	25.53	41	10.25		
Inadequate Social service and other social utilities	6	2.68	6	4.65	1	2.13	13	3.25		
Others/ working places.....)	3	1.34	2	1.55	2	4.26	7	1.75		
No difficulties	30	13.39	20	15.50	5	10.64	55	13.75		
2. Awareness about the above challenges before they migrated to each city (awaredif);										
Yes	77	34.53	51	39.53	28	59.57	156	39.10	10.2413	0.006***
No	146	65.47	78	60.47	19	40.43	243	60.90		
3. Main challenge (s) they are facing now in each city (currdifucal_01);										
Employment	109	48.66	40	31.01	16	34.04	165	41.25	26.7642	0.003***
Shelter (house)	68	30.68	47	36.43	10	21.28	125	31.25		
Food and other consumer goods	14	6.25	7	5.43	7	14.89	28	7.00		
Inadequate Social service and other social utilities	15	6.70	12	9.30	6	12.77	33	8.25		
Others/ working places.....)	4	1.79	1	0.78	1	2.13	6	1.50		
No difficulties	14	6.25	22	17.05	7	14.89	43	10.75		

Source: Own Computation 2019 (**Significant at the 5%level;***Significant at the 1% levels)

4.9. Econometric Analysis

Logistic regression method is a powerful technique because it is relatively free of limitations /or restrictions/ and it allows analyzing a mix of all types of predictors. For that reason, the study applies a Binary Logistic Model to identify the determinant of migration decision. Hence, the dependent variable (y_i^*) is binary which takes 1 for migrants mainly who migrated from rural to urban area, 0 otherwise. Prior to running the binary logistic econometrics analysis, all the hypothesised explanatory were checked by using various post-estimation tests like the Wald test, Cronbach's alpha test and contingency coefficient, Heteroskedasticity, Multicollinearity tests.

Heteroskedasticity: Breusch Pagan (hettest) was employed just to detect heteroskedasticity problem, the case in which the estimate variance of the residual from regression are dependent on values of the independent variables. The test result detected presence of heteroskedasticity problem. The hypothesis for the existence of homoskedasticity was rejected as $\text{Prob} > \chi^2 = 0.0013$. In this study there is a heteroskedasticity problem and hence robust standard errors were estimated to tackle heteroskedasticity problem in the data (Annex Table 1)

Multicollinearity: In most economic variables it is likely that a set of independent variables within themselves correlated each other. There are two measures are often suggested to test the existence of multi-collinearity, such as, Variation Inflation Factor (VIF) for association among the continuous explanatory variables and contingency coefficients for dummy variables. The VIF values displayed in Annex Table 2.4 have shown that all the continuous explanatory variables are the rule of thumb, 10 have no series multicollinearity problem. Then, before analyzing the effects of independent explanatory variables on the dependent variable, all variables, which were hypothesized to migration decision by origin of birth, were checked for multicollinearity using bivariate correlation matrix tables. The result of the test confirmed that there is no significant collinearity between each other and both hypothesized continuous and dummy variables could be included into the model.

Tests of Model Fit: The model validation statistics was also checked by using Pearson or Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test (2000, 147-150) **after logit model estimation (Annex Tables 11.1 and 11.2). Hence both Pearson ($p > \chi^2 > 0.01337$) and Hosmer-Lemeshow ($p > 0.6677$) goodness of fit tests indicate that we cannot reject the null hypothesis that the model is normally well fitted at 1% significant, suggesting that the error in the model is normally distributed and our model fits reasonably well running logistic model is appropriate for analysis of determinants of rural-urban migration decision.** In the same way, the study has spent much of its time in the data exploration process. To begin with, the statistics of the overall model indicate that the logistic regression is a good fit, with the Wald chi-square statistics of the , $\chi^2(23) = 46.77$ and $p\text{-value} > \chi^2 = 0.0024$, shows the overall model as a good fit with LR of 209.71253 and exemplifies at least some of the slope coefficients are significantly different from zero. Furthermore, the fit of the model is also checked using Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC). Accordingly, at 24 degrees of freedom, the fitted model improves upon the null model in explaining the variation of the response variable (Annex Table 2.6). However, as with the BIC, a smaller AIC indicates a better-fitting model.

In addition to this, Heteroskedasticity is not a serious problem. That is the variance of the error term is constant (Homoskedasticity) and our logistic regression cannot produce biased and misleading parameter estimates. The normality and specification error tests are also carried out (Annex Table 2.2)

As shown in the following Table 1.9, the results of logistic regression model, some are statistically significant at 1%, 5% and 10% level while others are not significant even at the 10% level of significance. Nevertheless almost all explanatory variables entered with expected signs and are influential to identify the reasons of rural people migration decision to urban areas, except married, family size, , inadequate social services in rural areas, burden of ties, burden of agricultural works, to join with relatives/friends, to open up or extended business and past employment status of urban residents. On the other hand, the coefficients of the variables, with positive signs, are positively associated and coefficients, with a negative sign, are negatively correlated with the probability of being rural-urban migration.

As a result, among variables, distance between birth of place and urban destination, the education dummy; adult and religious education, other education dummies; illiterate, primary (1-8 grade level) high school and preparatory (9-12 grade levels), dummies reason for migration; advancing in education (reference category as university education), dummy sources of information about living conditions of cities; ‘yes’ , dummies reasons for migration; to seek employment , shortage of agricultural land job transfer suggest that they are significant to affect the decision of rural migrant to move to urban areas, (either as being permanent or temporarily resident), at 5% (or at 99% , 95% and 90% confidence levels), respectively.

Concerning the marginal effect of these variables, however, the survey found different results. Table 1.9 also reveals that the coefficient of distance from birth area is negatively related with the dependent variable (rural-urban migration). This implies that as distance from sending area increases by 1 kilo meter, the possibility of migrants to be pulled towards urban areas will be decreased by 0.08%. Thus the finding is consistent with the research hypothesis and many empirical literatures like Ravenstein (1885) that indicated the basic laws of rural-urban migration. This implies that as distance from place of origin decreases, migrants are more likely to be expected to be pulled towards urban areas compared to migrants from remote rural areas.

As can be seen from Table 1.9, the coefficient of education dummies; illiterate, adult and religious education, primary education (1-8 grade levels), high school and preparatory education (9-12 grade levels) are positive and statistically significant in affecting rural-urban migration and the probability of to be pushed out of rural areas to urban areas 24.57%, 26.68%, 27.24% and 27.05%, respectively. Equally, though the coefficients of education dummy technical and vocational education training (TVET) and diploma education levels is positive and statistically insignificant in affecting the decision of rural-urban migration, the likelihood of rural migrants to be pushed out of their birth place increases by 14.22%.

The main sources of rural-urban migrants may be school dropouts in rural areas and one factor for low educational attainment of migrants of rural origin. In addition, in rural areas parents may not be willing to send their children to attend education rather they keep them at home to help them in farming and other related activities before they migrated to urban areas. This implies that both less educated; and younger

individuals are more likely to out migrate from the country sides in the study areas, similar to the result obtained by Fasil and Mohammed (2017) in Southern Ethiopia.

The main reasons for rural-urban migration in the study areas are better jobs opportunities at urban areas, search for further education, shortage of agricultural land, inadequate social amenities, to open up and extend business, to be free burden of family ties, burden of agriculture, to join friends and relatives, job transfer, etc. Regarding to the coefficients and marginal effects of reasons for migration dummies; to seek employment, advancing in education, shortage of agricultural land, job transfer; they are positively associated with rural migration and the likelihood of moving out from rural areas increases by ,27.54%, 24.43%, 23.91%, and 23.73%, in that order. Thus, the study confirmed that the main causes for rural-urban migration in the study are found to be economic factors (employment and job transfer) and this is in line with the Harris Todaro model of rural-urban migration.

Similarly, the coefficient of the source of information dummy, yes; is positive related and statistically significant in affecting rural-urban migration and the probability of to be pulled out of rural areas to urban areas increases by 9.77%. It implies that the migrants who have positive or encouraging access to information about living conditions and facilities, pulling factor, such as the availability of housing, health care, employment opportunities, etc of their current destinations before leaving their previous residences, are more likely to be pulled from rural toward urban areas.

Converse, among variables positively correlated with probability of rural to urban migration sex dummy male; dummy religion; Christian; dummy married; family size (fsize2) in the place of origin; dummy education level; TVET & college diploma,; dummy reasons for migration; inadequate social amenities in rural areas, burden of family ties, burden of agricultural activities, to open up/extend/ own business; and dummy in past employment, yes are statistically insignificant but the probability of an individual to migrate from rural to urban areas increase by 6.76%, 3.34%, 0.84%, 18.92%, 16.62%, 6.15%, 12.22% and 5.74%.

Even if statistically insignificant, the coefficient of dummy male is positive it implies that male migrants are more likely to be pulled either by the attraction of job opportunities, or higher expected income in urban areas, further educational advancement, to open up or extend new business or pushed out of the rural areas due to the non-availability of jobs ,shortage of agricultural land, burden of agricultural activities and family ties than women counter parts, as reference category, which is in contrary with some empirical literature that women are more likely to move to cities; men are more likely to move to rural areas in Ethiopia.

Regarding the coefficient of family size of the parents of the migrants, there is positive and statistically insignificant relationship between family size and the dependent variable, the pull versus push factors. The higher family size in rural areas induces rural out migration due to push factors or large family size induces push out of the rural area, as predicted by economic theory, holding other things constant. This is in line with the finding of Fasil and Mohammed (2014) in Southern Ethiopia.; that is, since there are many families with large family members in rural Ethiopian; it may be difficult to provide those additional family members with food and shelter and because of large number of family members (family burden), many people migrate to cities and live separately.

One of the dominant religious groups of people in Ethiopia is Christian in general; Orthodox Christians in particular, is more likely than all other denominations to move to urban areas. This implies that Muslims (as reference group) are less likely than Orthodox Christians to move to urban areas.

The marital status dummy shows that marital status influences the rural migrants' perception of the benefits of rural urban migration. Married migrants who start up their own families might have additional family responsibilities and the amount of remittances to be sent for parents in origin might be affected. The implication is that the married migrants have a more positive perception of the benefits of rural-urban migration than unmarried ones, which is compatible with the study prediction and many empirical literatures.

Table 4. 1: Determinants of Rural-urban Migration: A Binary Logistic Regression Analysis Results

Dependent variable: Rural-Urban Migration (dummy-Rural-urban mig)						
Explanatory Variables		Coefficient	Robust Std.Err.	Z	P>/z/	dy/dx
Sex	dummy Male	.3539	.2507	1.41	0.158	.0676
Age	age2	-.0507	.0820	-0.62	0.536	-.0095
	age2 ²	.0013	.0018	0.71	0.476	.0002
Religion	dummy-Christian	.1756	.2754	0.64	0.524	.0334
Marital	dummy-married2	.0615	.3469	0.18	0.859	.0116
Family	Fsize2	.0447	.1118	0.40	0.689	.0084
Distance	distan	-.0043	.0010	-4.22	0.000***	-.0008
Education level	dummy-illiterate	1.8304	.8073	2.27	0.023**	.2457
	dummy-adult &religious educ	3.3737	1.2794	2.64	0.008***	.2668
	dummy-primary(1-8)	1.5801	.7722	2.05	0.041**	.2724
	dummy-high/preparatory (9-12)	1.7685	.8133	2.17	0.030**	.2705
	dummy-TVET & college diploma	.9719	.8850	1.10	0.272	.1422
Reasons for migration	dummy-to seek employment	1.3840	.7502	1.84	0.065*	.2754
	dummy-advancing in education	1.9165	.8413	2.28	0.023**	.2443
	Dummy-shortage of land...	2.5308	.1.3959	1.81	0.070*	.2391
	dummy-inadeq.social amenities	1.5380	1.0415	1.48	0.140	.1892
	dummy-burden of family ties	1.2000	.8958	1.34	0.180	.1662
	dummy-burden of agriculture	.3592	1.0500	0.34	0.732	.0615
	dummy-to join friends/relatives	-.3743	1.2484	-0.30	0.764	-.0764
	dummy-job transfer	2.5758	1.4619	1.76	0.078*	.2373
dummy-open up/extended business	.8024	.9842	0.82	0.415	.1222	
Source inf.	Dummy-yes	.5205	.2658	1.96	0.050**	.0977
Past-emp	Dummy-yes	.3294	.3332	0.99	0.323	.0574
Cons.		-2.2768	1.4773	-1.54	0.123	
No.of obs=400		Prob>ch2=0.0024				
Log pseudo likelihood = -209.71253		Pseudo R ² =0.1158				
Wald chi2(23) = 46.77		Correctly classified=76.00%				

*Significant at the 10% level;**Significant at the 5%level;***Significant at the 1% level;
 Source: Computed from own survey, 2019/20.

5. Conclusion and Policy Implication

The main objective of the study is to analyze the socio-economic factors associated with the movement of rural-urban migration and employment challenges in urban Ethiopia, in particular reference with South Wollo Administrative zone, Amhara National Regional State, and to provide a basis for appropriate preventive policy measures so as to mitigate the extent of rural migration and

employment challenges. The study used primary data, a cross-sectional individual level analysis and covered a total of 400 both rural-urban and urban-urban migrants were covered in the study areas. Since it was difficult to obtain and identify the sampling frame or a complete source list of units (the names of rural-urban and urban-urban migrants) in each city administrative offices, in this research, the emphasis was given to non-probability sampling specifically on purposive and snowball sampling procedures. On the other hand, only migrants were purposively selected to achieve the above predetermined objectives..

As mentioned in the Binary Regression analysis above, among variables, distance between birth of place and urban destination, the education levels; adult and religious education, illiterate, primary (1-8 grade level) high school and preparatory (9-12 grade levels) (reference category as university education); reason for migration; to seek employment, advancing in education, shortage of agricultural land job transfer; and sources of information about living conditions of cities;, suggest that they are statistically significant to affect the decision of rural migrant to move to urban areas,

The study also reveals that not only more educated, but also illiterate and less educated migrants are more likely to be pulled toward urban areas due to availability of jobs or income earning opportunities/business/, job transfer, access to education, its networks or access to information. Therefore, education is not only the relevant factors in accounting for rural-urban migration in the study areas. This implies that the main sources of rural-urban migrants may be school dropouts in rural areas and one factor for low educational attainment of migrants of rural origin. In addition, in rural areas parents may not be willing to send their children to attend education rather they keep them at home to help them in farming and other related activities before they migrated to urban areas. This implies that both less educated; and younger individuals are more likely to out migrate from the country sides in the study areas, similar to the result obtained by Fasil and Mohammed (2017) in Southern Ethiopia

The other indicator of succession migration to the study area is the flow of information to the recipient. During the interview and discussion, respondents pointed out that information about the situation of the study areas has been put across through people they knew before in the study areas (their relatives and friends). In particular, the role of already settled in-migrants is vital to “pull” their follows to urban areas from their place of origin and provide migrants some

important assistants in order to adjust themselves to different urban life and to strengthen their economy

5.2. Policy Implication

The internal migration has become a major issue of influencing government policies and program efforts. Crucial among these issues are problems of unplanned urbanization, growing urban crimes, rural poverty, neglect of agriculture and unbalanced population concentration. These suggest the effect of the dominant pattern of rural-urban migration and its effect on national life. Thus the result of this study also confirmed the above migration theories that people move for better employment opportunities or the need for better facilities (example advancing in education...) had pulled people from rural areas and small city centres to different big, medium and small cities in Ethiopia.

Then after analyzing the causes of rural-urban migration to Urban Ethiopia, the determinants of current employments status and Problem faced by Migrants (After Arrival in Urban Areas) the study proposes the following recommendations that could be implemented by policy makers and interested organizations at country, regional, zonal and district levels:

1. Rural development policies should also be designed in ways of enhancing the productivity of labor and improving the living standard of the rural population and contribute for the process of rural transformations. Moreover, rural development policies should pave opportunities to enable migrants to involve in farm and nonfarm investments. Non-farm enterprises serve as a means of rural livelihood diversification and reduce the pressure on land. Furthermore, rural development policies should pay a special attention for the poorest groups of the rural population who migrate as a result of chronic poverty. The poor should participate from the planning to evaluation of rural development projects in this regard.

1.1. Designing a new productive safety- **net program similar to urban areas**, or expanding the food-for-program apart from creating permanent job opportunities in labor-intensive public works so as to provide effective grants for unemployed and casual workers and to ensure fair adults participation in rural and in small district urban centers public works projects in order to reduce the extent of rural-urban migration to urban areas.

- 1.2. The direct support program intended to provide grants to households who are labor-poor and cannot undertake public works. Beneficiaries, in this regard, will include, orphans, low earner pensioners/retired people, disabled and elderly households and other labor-poor high risk households with sick individuals (such as people living with HIV/AIDS), and the majority of female-headed households with young children; and
 - 1.3. Cash and food transfers (through direct public distribution system) for food insecure households are another policy recommendation in the form of social security. In particular, the public distribution system (PDS) is the most important and far-reaching poverty alleviation programme to provide food security to poor households by supplying essential commodities at subsidized prices.
2. Education is one of the significant characteristics inducing rural-urban migration. The decision to migrate is also more likely influenced by educational attainment. The probability of migration is higher for individuals with junior high school education and tends to fall for those with secondary and tertiary education. One plausible explanation is that young people abandon school before completing their secondary level to migrate. That is school dropouts were found to be high in the rural areas, which is partly associated with the highest internal migration of youths to urban areas.
 - 2.1. Both the regional, zonal and local level education departments should work hard as how to minimize school dropouts by improving the quality of education. Unless otherwise, more students will chose to terminate schooling intended to migrate to Urban areas
 - 2.2. Technical and Vocational Educational Training (TEVT) should be given for rural migrants to equip them with the necessary skills and make them competitive in the non-farm labor market. Similarly, favorable conditions should be created to enable migrants transfer their skill gained from commercial farms and industries to their rural origin.
3. The availability of land is an important asset for the rural population livelihood. The study found that shortage of land and its fragmentation as a result of population growth is one of the challenges of rural households forcing households to migrate, particularly in

densest populated districts of the country such as in all rural areas of the country, in general, and in the study areas, in particular. The growth of labor force in rural areas is too high as compared to the growth of available resources and employment opportunities. Thus, land distribution policies should be revised again to incorporate the new demand of youth population in rural areas.

Besides, resettlement on voluntary basis from highly degraded areas to where there are vacant and potentially productive irrigable lands can reduce the flow of people towards urban areas

4. The life in the rural area is seen to be hard and difficult and many of the empirical literature believed that this is due to the lack of schools, electricity, running water, health services, communication, paid employment and material things. Accordingly, rural migrants took the chance to change their lives to something better by moving to urban areas. Thus;

- 4.1. Urbanization and rural-urban linkages should be supported by the development of infrastructure such as road and transportation facilities both in urban and rural areas.

- 4.2. As many empirical literatures and this study indicated that migrants prefer to move to a town or city that is close to their origin areas and families, many end up migrating to regional capitals, big and medium cities, where economic opportunities and services are better. Investments in smaller cities and towns can avoid an overconcentration of people in large cities. In addition, research has shown that development of towns and secondary cities has a bigger poverty-reduction effect than concentration in mega, big and medium cities

- 4.3. During the survey, it was observed and discussed with respondents that internal migrants got information regarding the opportunities in urban regions from friends or relatives informally. In such cases, information is often biased and exaggerated leading to excess migration to urban centers, increasing the unemployment level, exploitation of labor and human trafficking. Thus, access to information should be improved for potential rural migrants. Providing **job search assistance**, such as the provision of easily accessible information on jobs available (or where and how to seek jobs) and related support services

(accommodation, training opportunities, one-stop shops, credit facilities, housing, working conditions, etc.)

Thus, well established institutional framework and localized migrant youth consultation may provide important information about the challenges, constraints and priorities of youth and may allow the youth to engage in the process of seeking solutions.

- 4.4. Designing an **internal labor mobility strategy and policy** that acknowledges labor mobility as a positive livelihood option and that aims to maximize the benefits of internal migration while mitigating the risks. This strategy would also need to include sensitization of local authorities and law enforcement to better understand the concept of mobility and migration and the reasons behind it.
5. The life in the rural area is seen to be hard and difficult and many of the empirical literature believed that this is due to the lack of schools, electricity, running water, health services, communication, paid employment and material things. Accordingly;
 - 5.1. Urbanization and rural-urban linkages should be supported by the development of infrastructure such as road and transportation facilities both in urban and rural areas.
 - 5.2. As in this study indicated that migrants prefer to move to a town or city that is close to their origin areas and families, many end up migrating to regional capitals, big and medium cities, where economic opportunities and services are better. Investments in smaller cities and towns can avoid an overconcentration of people in large cities. In addition, research has shown that development of towns and secondary cities has a bigger poverty-reduction effect than concentration in mega, big and medium cities
6. Finally, the development of Agro-allied industries and small scale farming system must be set-up in the rural areas to reduce rural-urban migration in order to provide job opportunities for the people of the rural area. The agricultural inputs and farming technologies should be introduced to the rural people to improve the production level. Good road should be constructed for the rural area and credit facilities should be provided for the rural people to improve their production level, which will lead to improvement in their standard of living.

Reference

- Adepoju A. 1977: Migration, Agricultural Activity and Socioeconomic Change in Ife Division of Southwest Nigeria. Dakar: IDEP.
- Adepoju, A. 1974: Rural-urban socio-economic links: The example of migrants in southwest Nigeria. In Modern migrations in western Africa, ed. J. Armin. London: Oxford University Press.
- Adewale J., G., 2005, : Socio-Economic Factors Associated with Urban-Rural Migration in Nigeria: A Case Study of Oyo State, Nigeria, *Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, Ladoké Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria*, J. Hum. Ecol., 17(1): 13-16 (2005)
- Akinyemi A.II. and Olaopa O3.Oloruntimehin O2 : MIGRATION DYNAMICS AND CHANGING RURAL-URBAN LINKAGES IN NIGERIA1;.
- Beladi and Naqvi (1988: 365-375) on their works on ‘Urban unemployment and non-immiserizing growth’ reviewed the Harris-Todaro assumption to show the implication of economic expansion for urban unemployment and sectoral output.
- Birhan A., M., 2011: ‘Causes And Consequences Of Rural-Urban Migration: The Case F Woldiya Town, North Ethiopia .
- Cortes, R. (2007). *Children and women left behind in labor sending countries: an appraisal of social risks*. Global Report on Migration and Children; UNICEF-UNDP initiative
- CSA (2008): “Population Size by Age and Sex”; Summary & Statistical Report of the 2007 Census, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- CSA(2014): “STATISTICAL REPORT ON THE 2013 NATIONAL LABOUR FORCE SURVEY”, STATISTICAL BULLETIN, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Ethiopian (2014/15): https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/South_Wollo
- Fasil E and Mohammed B (2017): Dynamics and determinants of rural-urban migration in Southern Ethiopia: Department of Economics, Arba Minch University, Arba Minch, Ethiopia
- Folbre (1986:5) particularly identified significant differences between the economic position of men, women and children in a household calling for a structured analysis of gender and age inequalities rather than taking a household as a single representative unit.
- Gujarati (2004), “Basic Econometrics”, the Fourth Edition, the McGraw-Hill Companies
- Harris, J., and Todaro, M. 1970 Migration, unemployment and development: A two sector analysis, *American Economic Review* 60(1): 126-42.
- Harris, JR & Todaro, MP (1970). *Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two-Sector Analysis*. The American Economic Review, American Economic Association, Vol. 60, No. 1:126-142
- Lewis, W. A., 1954, *Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour*; The
- Liao, T.F.(1994). *Interpreting probability models. Logit, probit and other generalized linear models. Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*. Sage Publications.
- Maddala (1992): “Introduction to Econometrics”, Second Edition, Macmillan Publishing

Company, New York, Manchester School, 22, 2, 139-191.

- Marchiori, L., Maystadt, J.F., and Scumacher, I. (2010) *Another Inconvenient Truth: climate change and migration in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Conference on the Transnationality of Migrants (TOM) Marie Curie Research Training Network ‘International Migration: Transnational links, Effects and Policies’ September 16-18, 2010. Hosted by Venice International University
- MoFED and UN (2012): “Assessing Progress towards the Millennium Development Goals: Ethiopia MDGs Report 2012”, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Muzzini, E. (2008), “Urban Poverty in Ethiopia: A Multi-faceted and Spatial Perspective”, the World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Niels-Hugo Blunch Caterina Ruggeri Laderchi, 2015; “Internal Migration, Education and Wages in Ethiopia”, discussion papers Series, IZA DP No. 8926
- Ranis, G. & J. C. H. Fei, 1961, A Theory of Economic Development, American
- Tesfaye, A.G (2006): “The Dynamics of Poverty in Urban Ethiopia”, University of Sydney, Australia.
- Todaro, M. P., 1969, A Model of Labour Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries, American Economic Review, 59, 1, 138-148.
- Tom Bundervoet (2018): Internal migration in Ethiopia evidence from a quantitative and qualitative study: The World Bank 1818 H Street NW, Washington DC 20433
- UN (2014): “World Urban Prospects”: The 2014 Revision, Department of Economic & Social Affairs, Network.
- World Bank (2010): The Characteristics, Motives and Outcomes of Migrants to Addis Ababa: Poverty Reduction and Economic Management, Africa Region, **Report No. 55731-ET, Newyork, USA**
- Yanyi K. Djamba , Sidney Goldstein and Alice Goldstein :Urban Migrants and Occupational Change in Three Countries Undergoing Transitions; USA

Annex Tables

Annex Table 1: Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

Compute interitem correlations (covariances) and Cronbach's alpha

Average interitem correlation: 0.0812
 Number of items in the scale: 28
 Scale reliability coefficient: 0.7121

Annex Table 2: Post Estimation Test After Binary Logistic Regression Analysis

Annex Table 2.1: Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity

Ho: Constant variance

Variables: fitted values of dummyAbirth2

chi2(1) = 7.17

Prob > chi2 = 0.0074

Annex Table 2.2: Skweness ?kurtosis for Normality test

Cameron & Trivedi's decomposition of IM-test

Source	chi2	df	p
Heteroskedasticity	218.35	192	0.0932
Skewness	188.86	23	0.0000
Kurtosis	17.09	1	0.0000
Total	424.30	216	0.0000

Annex Table 2.3: Specification error tests for omitted variable

Ramsey RESET test using powers of the fitted values of dummyAbirth2

Ho: model has no omitted variables

F(3, 373) = 1.70

Prob > F = 0.1676

Annex Table 2.4: Variation Inflation Factor (VIF) for Multicollinearit test
For Continuous Explanatory Variables

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
-----+-----		
age22	18.46	0.054179
age2	17.93	0.055769
fsize2	1.14	0.873378
distan	1.02	0.976434
-----+-----		
Mean VIF	9.64	

Appendix Table 2.5: Multicollinearity test For Discrete Variables:

Correlation Matrix of independent Variables

	dumm~221	dummyr~1	dummyS~1	dumm~211	dumm~212	dumm~213	dumm~214	dumm~215	du~s_011	du~s_012	du~s_013	du~s_014	du~s_015
dummysmrt221	1.0000												
dummyrel21	0.0246	1.0000											
dummySex1	-0.0945	0.0795	1.0000										
dummyedul211	-0.1650	-0.0534	0.0259	1.0000									
dummyedul212	0.0075	0.0834	0.1241	-0.0991	1.0000								
dummyedul213	0.0684	0.0929	0.0123	-0.3767	-0.1791	1.0000							
dummyedul214	0.0388	-0.1013	-0.0583	-0.2900	-0.1379	-0.5241	1.0000						
dummyedul215	0.0128	-0.0825	-0.0624	-0.1020	-0.0485	-0.1842	-0.1419	1.0000					
dummysmai~011	0.0463	-0.0491	-0.0387	0.0598	-0.1021	0.0939	-0.0797	0.0307	1.0000				
dummysmai~012	0.0979	0.0742	0.0034	-0.1483	0.1875	0.0133	0.0255	0.0435	-0.5180	1.0000			
dummysmai~013	-0.0170	0.0257	0.1244	-0.0149	-0.0413	-0.0463	0.1195	-0.0425	-0.2420	-0.0776	1.0000		
dummysmai~014	-0.0320	0.0676	0.0505	0.1137	0.0325	0.0042	-0.0793	-0.0393	-0.2234	-0.0717	-0.0335	1.0000	
dummysmai~015	-0.0520	-0.0439	-0.0887	0.0293	-0.0018	0.0150	-0.0145	-0.0047	-0.3138	-0.1007	-0.0470	-0.0434	1.0000
dummysmai~016	-0.0606	-0.0654	0.0522	0.0646	-0.0329	0.0122	-0.0219	-0.0339	-0.1928	-0.0618	-0.0289	-0.0267	-0.0375
dummysmai~017	-0.0183	0.0211	0.0288	-0.0459	-0.0218	0.0195	0.0472	-0.0224	-0.1277	-0.0410	-0.0191	-0.0177	-0.0248
dummysmai~018	-0.0406	0.0593	0.0404	-0.0768	-0.0365	-0.1076	-0.0730	-0.0376	-0.2137	-0.0686	-0.0320	-0.0296	-0.0415
dummysmai~019	-0.0170	-0.0314	-0.0151	-0.0509	0.0243	-0.1571	0.2397	-0.0425	-0.2420	-0.0776	-0.0363	-0.0335	-0.0470
sourcei~2_01	0.0515	-0.0205	-0.0065	-0.0075	-0.0057	0.0090	0.0819	-0.0399	-0.0826	-0.0442	0.0982	0.1327	0.0965
dummyspas~011	-0.2394	-0.0571	0.1440	0.1813	-0.0245	-0.0017	-0.1407	-0.0575	0.0658	-0.1852	-0.0249	0.0899	-0.0306

```

      | dummys~6 dumm~017 dumm~018 dumm~019 sou~2_01 du~p_011
-----+-----
dummysai~016 | 1.0000
dummysai~017 | -0.0152 1.0000
dummysai~018 | -0.0255 -0.0169 1.0000
dummysai~019 | -0.0289 -0.0191 -0.0320 1.0000
sourcei~2_01 | -0.0040 0.0590 -0.0931 -0.0111 1.0000
dummysas~011 | -0.0550 -0.0615 0.1031 0.0362 -0.0098 1.0000
  
```

Annex Table 2.6: Akaike's information criterion and Bayesian information criterion

estat ic

```

-----+-----
      Model | Obs ll(null) ll(model) df AIC BIC
-----+-----
      . | 400 -247.2815 -218.8403 24 485.6806 581.4758
-----+-----
  
```

Note: N=Obs used in calculating BIC; see [R] BIC note