



ISSN Print: 2664-8679  
ISSN Online: 2664-8687  
Impact Factor: RJIF 8  
IJSH 2024; 6(1): 40-48  
[www.sociologyjournal.net](http://www.sociologyjournal.net)  
Received: 14-12-2023  
Accepted: 21-01-2024

**Aman Adem Tese**  
Department of Sociology,  
College of Social Science,  
Werabe University, Werabe,  
Ethiopia

**Messele Kumilachew Aga**  
Department of Management,  
College of Business and  
Economics, Arsi University,  
Asella, Ethiopia

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Aman Adem Tese**  
Department of Sociology,  
College of Social Science,  
Werabe University, Werabe,  
Ethiopia

# International Journal of Sociology and Humanities

## The effects of rural: Urban migration on migrant's livelihood

**Aman Adem Tese and Messele Kumilachew Aga**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26648679.2024.v6.i1a.76>

### Abstract

In developing countries like Ethiopia rural-urban migration affects economic development and migrants livelihoods in both urban and rural areas. This study was attempted to examine the effects of rural to urban migration on Migrants livelihood. Descriptive and explanatory research design was applied by using quantitative and qualitative approaches. 145 respondents were selected from three kebeles of the town and both primary and secondary data were employed, primary data were collected through questionnaire and interviews, while the secondary data were gathered from published and unpublished sources and analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Improvement in life of migrants after migration is used as a proxy variable in this study and used as dependent variable while change in income, employment, education/skill/, housing/shelter/, access to urban transport and access to education for migrant's dependents were used as explanatory variables for regression. Empirical method employed for this research analysis is Ordered Logistic regression. The finding of the study shows that income of migrants after migration to urban is raises significantly that reveals positive effect of rural-urban migration of economic growth. Otherwise housing/shelter and urban transport service were observed as cost of migration on economy. The majority of the interviewed participant mentioned this rural-urban migration is negatively affect employment opportunity at urban area and contribute for expansion of informal sectors, facilitates illegal residence, youth bad behavior like drinking alcohols, chat and shisha that lead them to other crime and theft. These flows of migration also affect rural area agricultural activities that need large number of lobar force. Now a day youth and educated people are highly migrate to urban for the seek of modern urban service and job opportunity, this affect negatively agriculture economy at rural area and at urban area affect access to get modern urban service like education, health, pure water, electricity, and telecom service.

**Keywords:** Rural-urban migration, economic development, livelihood

### Introduction

Migration is a type of geographic mobility that involves moving from one geographical unit (the origin) to another, usually changing one's place of residence (the destination). This procedure, also known as out migration, entails moving permanently or temporarily from one local settlement (Administrative Unit). Immigration is the definition of relocating to a specific area. (Kebede, 1994) <sup>[13]</sup>. The labor input shift from agriculture to manufacturing and/or services is one of the most significant structural transformations in developing nations. In the literature, rural-urban migration is seen as the primary driver of economic development because the manufacturing and service sectors are concentrated in cities, while the agriculture sector is mostly based in a nation's rural areas. (Herrendorf, Rogerson, & Valentinyi, 2014) <sup>[10]</sup>.

Like many other developing nations, Ethiopia is not a recent addition to the global migrant population. Evidence now available indicates that one of the factors propelling Ethiopia's urbanization is migration from rural to urban areas. Although Ethiopia is among the least urbanized nations in Sub-Saharan Africa, the country's share of the people living in cities is expected to nearly double from 16 percent in 2007 to 27 percent by 2035 due to recent acceleration of urbanization. (CSA, 2008) <sup>[5]</sup>,

The population of Ethiopia climbed to 94.2 million in 2017, 20.3 million increase and was predicted by the CSA median variant projection (CSA, 2013) <sup>[6]</sup> to reach 136 million in 2037, with an estimated 42.4 million of the population likely to reside in urban areas. The primary causes of this fast urbanization include natural population growth, migration from rural to

urban areas, and the categorization of rural settlements. Before 2018, rural-urban migration (33%) and the reclassification of rural communities as urban centers (24%), together with natural growth (40%) accounted for the majority of the increase in the urban population. (World Bank Group, 2015).

Inadequate management of urbanization processes and rural-urban migration, for instance, can lead to the overcrowding of informal settlements and intensification of urban poverty. This implies that as cities grow and become more urbanized, poverty too does. (Singru, 2015) <sup>[20]</sup>. Urban poverty may also be a result of migration. Migrants experience particular disadvantages and frequently make up a disproportionate share of the urban poor. (Tacoli, 2014) <sup>[21]</sup>. The disadvantages faced by migrants in urban areas are frequently linked to their exclusion from social security programs and citizenship privileges. While the urban poor frequently work in the informal sector, migrants are more likely than non-migrants to lack access to finance, land and they also experience higher levels of food insecurity. (Crush, 2012) <sup>[4]</sup>.

Ethiopia's rural-to-urban migration rate is still very high, at 44.4%. (World Bank, 2019) and the migrants sometimes lack the finances for formal housing and hence wind up in slums as a short, transient alternative. Due to this circumstance and the severe lack of formal housing available, secondary markets for land and homes are becoming more and more attractive. The persistent exodus of rural migrants seeking rudimentary urban amenities puts strain on socioeconomic circumstances. There are not enough job opportunity available to accommodate the influx of people, which strains housing, healthcare, and educational institutions. (Ralph, 2012 and Habtamu, 2015) <sup>[19, 8]</sup>. Additionally, research has demonstrated the critical significance that migration and remittances have in sustaining rural livelihoods. (Johnson and Stol 2008) <sup>[11]</sup>, while (Grau and Aide, 2007) <sup>[7]</sup> have demonstrated the detrimental effects of rural youth exodus on family well-being and the community's economy.

One of the Sub-Saharan African nations with the highest rates of population pressure, redistribution, and rural-urban migration is Ethiopia. (Abeshu, 2008) <sup>[1]</sup>. Research on the function and potential impacts of rural-urban movement on economic development is made possible by Ethiopia's present growth in commercial farms, agro-processing companies, and workforce out-migration from rural areas.

The above-mentioned researches focus on the cause and consequence, the impact of rural to urban migration on social and economic, employment, rural development and the like. Indeed, there has been virtually no address the effect of rural-urban migration on migrants' livelihood and as far as to the knowledge of researcher there is no study conducted on the effect of rural-urban migration on migrants' livelihood at the specific study area. There is the time and knowledge gap. In order to close information gaps and take future policy interventions into consideration regarding the effects of rural-urban migration on the livelihood of migrants, the current study examines the impact of migration from rural to urban areas on the livelihood of migrants in the study area.

Therefore, this research has the following contributions. Firstly, this study aims to examine the effect of rural-urban migration on the migrants' livelihood. Its findings could enable to get reliable evidence and information for various

concerned bodies such as government office like Job opportunity and skills, social & labour affairs, urban municipality office to provide service for these people, nongovernmental originations that work on related issue. Secondly, this study has tested the improvement in life of migrants after migration is used as a proxy variable in this study and used as dependent variable while change in income, employment, education / skill / experience, housing/shelter/, access to urban transport and access to education for migrant's dependents were used as explanatory variables for regression. Empirical method employed for this research analysis is Ordered Logistic regression. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, educators, and policymakers can use these findings to better understand the effects of rural-urban migration on the livelihoods of migrants and the factors that influence it. This information can then be used to design policies, initiatives, programs, and projects that will support the development of migrants' livelihoods in urban Ethiopia. This is how the remainder of the article is organized. The next section discusses the review related literature, theoretical review and empirical review. Then, the study's methodology includes research design/approach, sample, method of data collection, data analysis techniques and model specification. After that, the results are presented and followed by discussions and conclusions.

### Literature review

The theoretical framework of the research has benefited from various migration models. New Economics of Labor Migration (NELM) model serves as the foundation for the research's primary theoretical framework, but it also incorporates ideas from other models, including the Harris-Todaro (HT) and Lewis-Ranis-Fei (LRF) models. The Lewis model's assumption of surplus labor in the traditional agricultural sector is evaluated with regard to the Ethiopian case, and the research's partial interests lie in illustrating how Ethiopia's labor-intensive industry growth has facilitated labor migration from rural areas and in identifying the inter-sectoral links between the traditional agricultural sector and the modern manufacturing sector. Similarly, the HT model clarifies how the "expected wage differential" between rural and urban areas influences migratory patterns. Furthermore, the HT model adds to the research's theoretical framework by elucidating the significance of contacts and networks in influencing both the cost and the process of making migration decisions. The primary theoretical foundation for this study is the Harris-Todaro model, which emphasizes household factors as key determinants of migration decisions and discusses their potential effects. The model shows how remittance flows and labor migration from rural to urban areas affect household income as a whole and local investments in rural areas. In the end, this facilitates the link between migration and rural development. The Harris-Todaro model then suggests that a growth in employment in cities may, under some parametric ranges, lead to higher urban unemployment rates and even lower national GDP (the Todaro Paradox). Migration was viewed in the Harris-Todaro model as an adjustment mechanism whereby workers try to maximize their projected wages by dividing themselves between various labor markets, some of which are located in rural areas and some of which are located in urban areas. The model often highlighted that the decision to migrate would

be made by the migrants based on the likelihood of unemployment in the areas of destination. It was therefore the most pertinent to the current investigation.

### **Harris-Todaro Model of Migration**

One of the specific influence theory works - that of (Todaro, 1969) and (Harris-Todaro, 1970) <sup>[9]</sup> was highlighted in this model. It was reasonable to assume that policies emphasizing industrialization would both relieve the overcrowding in the countryside and raise national incomes when economists began focusing on the issues of population growth and economic development in the LDCs in the early 1950s. However, as it became clear that poverty and inequality had continued despite decent rise in the GNP, this viewpoint was progressively called into question during the 1960s. Due to this difficulty, a new paradigm has emerged in which migration from rural to urban areas in the LDCs is seen as "a symptom of and a contributing factor to underdevelopment." Todaro (1969) and Harris-Todaro (1970) <sup>[9]</sup> are the main proponents of the new paradigm, whose model has provided many LDCs with an internationally accepted theoretical framework for understanding urban unemployment. Assuming that potential migrants do respond to the probability of urban employment and considering rural-urban migration as a purely economic phenomenon, the Harris-Todaro model then shows that an increase in urban employment may, in some parametric ranges, lead to higher levels of urban unemployment and even lower levels of national product (the Todaro Paradox). According to the Harris-Todaro model, migration is a process by which workers try to optimize their projected salaries by dividing themselves between various labor markets, some of which are located in rural areas and some of which are in urban areas. The model often highlighted that the decision to migrate would be made by the migrants based on the probability of unemployment in the areas of destination. Even when their income is currently better in their place of origin than in their place of destination, the migrants are nonetheless free to move. This is a result of the migrants' hope for a higher salary that would eventually be able to make up for lost time (Todaro and Smith, 2003) <sup>[26]</sup>. According to a 1977 theory by Brown and Neuberger, cited in (Kasahun 2000) <sup>[12]</sup>, some migrants are essentially "pushed" out of a place of residence by a confluence of adverse factors that make staying there unappealing. Some people are "pulled" out of their homes by alluring circumstances in other places. Similarly, according to (Bekure, 1984) <sup>[2]</sup>, "migration took place when conditions in the area of origin became intolerable or when the destination appeared attractive."

### **Migration and the Dual Sector Model of Economic Development**

The two primary sectors in the Lewis Dual Sector model are the urban/industrial sector, which has a strong demand for labor and pays more than the rural areas, and the agricultural/rural sector, which is defined by zero marginal productivity of labor. Lewis considered the agricultural industry to be solely for subsistence, with surplus labor, poor incomes, low productivity, and significant underemployment. It was believed that some members of the rural work force were superfluous or redundant and did not add anything to the output. It was believed that the industrial sector operated in an urban setting, utilizing high

levels of investment and cutting edge technology. (McCatty, 2004) <sup>[16]</sup>.

According to the Lewis Dual Sector model, individuals migrate from the rural agricultural sector to the industrial sector in search of work since there is an excess of labor in this area. (McCatty, 2004) <sup>[16]</sup>. Furthermore, in order to increase productivity in the urban industrial sector, labor transfer is required. In contemporary areas, there is a belief that migrants are drawn to higher wages. Todaro contends that substantial rates of rural-urban migration are possible even in the face of high and well-known urban unemployment rates among prospective migrants. Even if a migrant ends up unemployed or earns less in the city than in the country, they will nevertheless relocate (Todaro, 1976) <sup>[28]</sup>. In a similar vein, the likelihood of obtaining a job in an urban area is negatively correlated with the rate of urban unemployment (Todaro, 1976) <sup>[28]</sup>.

### **Empirical Review**

In many emerging nations, the trend of rural-urban migration persists despite differences in ideology. This subsection outlines some of the typical reasons for and effects of documented rural-urban migration in light of empirical evidence from various literature sources. Ethiopia is predicted to urbanize at a rate of 5.4%, which is faster than Sub-Saharan Africa's 4% growth rate (World Bank Group, 2016). Ethiopia has been urbanizing at a rate of 4.5%. The number of people living in urban grew by 414% between 1984 and 2021, from 4.45 to 22.88 million. In 2018, the primary factors contributing to the swift increase in urbanization were natural growth (40%), migration from rural to urban areas (33%), and the reclassification of rural settlements (24%).

Different findings from surveys on the influence of rural-urban migration on the growth of local economies in Sub-Saharan Africa indicate that the direct and indirect effects varied from nation to nation. On the one hand, certain research, like that done by (Lipton, in 1980) <sup>[15]</sup>, showed that migration is frequently seen among the population's most productive members, which causes a manpower shortage that ultimately lowers rural productivity. Furthermore, the majority of the remittances are used for daily expenses, and the amount remitted to the remaining rural families scarcely permits the deployment of labor-saving technologies. Remittances to rural areas are said to be minimal on average, and families of migrants find it difficult to invest their money in agriculture because production inputs like chemical fertilizers, livestock breeds, and hired labor are expensive.

### **Materials and Methods**

#### **Research Design/Approach**

Since research design makes numerous research procedures easier, it is regarded as the foundation of each study. According to Kothari (2006) <sup>[14]</sup>, research design helps in the researcher's ability to prepare ahead for the procedures to be followed in order to gather pertinent data and the methods to be applied during analysis. The most crucial elements to take into account when selecting the best study design are the goals and nature of the topic to be examined, as well as the methods for gathering data. When choosing a research design, descriptive and comparative methods are suitable if the study's goal is to accurately describe a scenario. Investigating causes and reasons and offering



proof to either confirm or deny an explanation or prediction are the goals of explanatory research.

In this study, the researcher used descriptive and explanatory type of research designs. Explanatory study aims to uncover causes, establish causality between variables, ascertain consequences on behavior of a social phenomenon, and forecast how one phenomenon will change or vary in connection to another variable (Pierson and Thomas, 2010) [18]. According to (Taylor, Sina, & Goshal, 2006) The descriptive research is used to describe the situations as they exist and it will be used to show the facts, directions, the percentage, tables, and bar charts, and coefficient of variation in research conducted and the researcher was use both qualitative and quantitative or mixed data. It is advisable to use both quantitative and qualitative methodologies simultaneously, according to (Teshome, 1998) [24]. Since qualitative data offered broad elaborations, explanations, interpretations, and relatively new ideas, while quantitative data offered accurate summaries and comparisons. A cross-sectional method that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data was used in light of all of these considerations. These approaches are thought to be better suitable for examining the subject of discussion-the financial impacts of migration from rural to urban areas on the lives of migrants.

### Sample

For migrant respondents, the researcher utilized random sampling; for informants from governmental and nonprofit organization, purposive sampling was employed because the informants' perspectives were pertinent to the research question. The approach of probability sampling was utilized for the respondents who were migrants. This was done since they are important informants and possible sources of information about the issue at hand as well as information in general.

The data gained from Adaba town 01, 02 and 03 kebele show that there are 227 people migrate from rural kebele of Adaba wereda to their kebele which are legally registered and these migrants are 81, 83 and 63 from each kebele respectively. (Adaba Twon 01, 02 & 03 kebele administrations). The Taro Yamane formula,  $n = N/1+N*(e)^2$ , was employed by the researcher to get the sample size. Where N= number of target population, e = margin of error at 5%., n = sample size

**By using formula:** Taro Yamane Sample size determination formulas

$$n = 227 / 1 + 227 * (5\%)^2$$

$1 + (N * e^2) = 144.8 = 145$ . Therefore, sample size of the three kebele is 145. The migrant participants in the current study's background revealed that 59.31% is male whereas the rest is female. On the other hand, large numbers of migrants are covered in the range of 18-34 age. 60% of the study sample is fall in 18-34 age intervals whereas 28.28% is fall in 35-52 age intervals.

### Instrument Development Procedure

The investigator employed a combination of primary and secondary data sources in order to accomplish the study's goals. The major sources include of key informants (i.e., migrants, kebele administrators, town municipality workers,

and woreda finance and economic development office worker), governmental officials, and workers from non-governmental organizations in rural areas.

In research projects, using multiple data gathering strategies is more beneficial than using a single one. According to (Teshome, 1998) [24], every data gathering strategy has advantages and disadvantages. By utilizing many approaches, the researcher can combine the advantages and address some of the shortcomings of each individual data source. More precisely, questionnaires, interviews, and secondary sources have been chosen as the techniques of collecting the required data.

In-depth interviews were prioritized in order to obtain the necessary data. Interviews were held with non-migrant individuals who could provide their participant experiences of the past and current economic situation, town administrators, planners, and other concerned town authorities, as well as administrators of sample kebeles. In order to supplement the data collected through other instruments, the researcher also collected primary data on individual migrants and other respondents using both open-ended and closed-ended questionnaires.

### Model Specification

The analytical model used for this research is the Ordered Logit Model (OL model hereafter). The ordered logit model is a regression model for an ordinal response variable. The model is based on the cumulative probabilities of the response variable: in particular, the logit of each cumulative probability is assumed to be a linear function of the covariates with regression coefficients constant across response categories.

In this research, improvement in life of migrants after their migration is used as a proxy variable. Respondents were asked to select the rank of their life improvement after migration. Hence, the respondent was presented with four list of possible level of improvement.

An ordinal response  $Y_i$  with  $j$  categories can be represented as an underlying continuous response  $Y_i^*$  with a set of  $j-1$  thresholds  $u_j$  such that  $Y_i = y_j$  if and only if  $u_{j-1} < Y_i^* \leq u_j$ . It follows that a cumulative model for an ordinal response, such as the ordered logit model, is equivalent to a system composed of a set of thresholds  $u_j$  and a linear regression model for an underlying continuous response:

$$y_i^* = \beta x_i' + e_i$$

$$y_i = j \text{ if } u_{j-1} < y_i^* \leq u_j \text{ where } i = 1, \dots, N$$

The probability that observation  $i$  will select alternative  $j$  is:

$$p_{ij} = p(y_i = j) = p(u_{j-1} < y_i^* \leq u_j)$$

$$= F(u_j - \beta x_i') - F(u_{j-1} - \beta x_i')$$

### Results and Discussion

The study was intended to assess the effect of rural-urban migration on migrants' livelihood by using descriptive statistics. Based on information gathered from 145 sample migrants in the study area through questionnaires and from interviews with employees of the government office working on the related issues, the effects of rural-urban migration on the economy of migrants, the trends/practices of rural-urban migration, and the perception of migrants on

rural-urban migration in the study area were discussed. The data obtained from both questionnaire and interview were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively and presented as follows.

### Questionnaires Data Analysis

Under this section, data collected from migrants using questionnaire regarding the observed variables that

associated with rural-urban migration were discussed. Firstly, in order to understand the sample migrants, it is worthwhile to describe their demographic characteristics. Migrant's demographic variables are among the most common characteristics which are mostly associated with migration behavior. From this category of variables sex, age and education were reviewed in this study.

**Table 1:** Demographic analysis of migrants

Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	86	59.31
	Female	59	40.69
Age	<18 age	17	11.72
	18-34 age	87	60
	35-52 age	41	28.28
	>52 age	0	0
Education	Secondary	18	12.41
	Certificate	27	18.62
	Diploma	28	19.31
	1 <sup>st</sup> Degree	65	44.83
	Above 1 <sup>st</sup> Degree	5	3.45
	Illiterate	2	1.38
Times of migration	Before 2000 E.C	26	17.93
	2000-2008 E.C	49	33.79
	2008 latter E.C	70	48.28

**Source:** Own survey data, 2014 E.C

Table 1 presents the migrant's sex, age and education in different categories. The table shows that, of the total sample of migrants taken for this study, 59.31% is male whereas the rest is female. On the other hand, this table shows that large numbers of migrants are covered in the range of 18-34 age. 60% of the study sample is fall in 18-34 age intervals whereas 28.28% is fall in 35-52 age intervals. This reveals that the more productive group of the society is take large share of migrants. In addition, as observed from table 1, migrants have various educational backgrounds and of total respondent large number are from first degree holders and above that is 44.83%. 19.31% and 18.62% of the

respondents are at diploma and certificate level. On the other hand, 12.41% are attends secondary schools while 1.38% are illiterate. This indicate that the more educated people prefer to live in urban and high level of education rises the number of migrants.

Table. 1 also attempted to shows the trends of migration in the study area by classifying the time of migration in three categories as before 2000, 2000-2008 and 2008 latter. As observed from the table, 33.79% and 48.28% were migrates in 2000-2008 and 2008 latter respectively. This suggests that the trends/practices of migration at the study area increasing from time to time.

**Table 2:** Observed Reasons of migration

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
To obtain job	63	43.45
To free from cultural or family restrictions and obligations	0	0
Economic related problems	27	18.62
To join immediate relatives and friends or following them	0	0
To gain education and training	23	15.86
To seek modern urban services and facilities	28	19.31
Job transfer	4	2.76
To open up or extended personal business	0	0
To seek good climate	0	0

**Source:** Own survey data, 2014 E.C

The study also attempted to identify the main reasons (determinants) of migrations. Different factors were observed as a reason of migration from rural to urban. To obtain job, various economic related problems, to gain education and training, to seek modern urban services and facilities and job transfer are the identified as a reason of migration from the expected reasons. Table. 2 show that 49.66% of respondent are migrates from rural to urban to search for a job while 19.31% and 18.62% are migrates to find modern urban services and facilities and due to economic related problems such as famine/crop failure, lack of oxen & the like inputs of production, land shortage and

others. It reveals that most respondents are migrates to urban to find for a job and it indicates lack of employment opportunity at rural area.

**Table 3:** Perception of the migrants

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Perception	Very happy	23	15.86
	Happy	46	31.72
	Neutral	34	23.45
	Unhappy	27	18.62
	Very Unhappy	15	10.34

**Source:** Own survey data, 2014 E.C

The study also attempted to identify the perception of migrant after migration. After migration respondents have different perception toward their migration. Table 3. show that 31.72% of respondents are happy to migrations, 15.86% are very happy, 23.45% of them are neutral, while 18.62%

of the respondents are unhappy for migration and 10.34% of them are very unhappy for their migration. It indicates that large numbers of the respondents are happy for their migration from rural to urban.

**Table 4:** Comparison of unemployment and income level migrant before and after migration

Variables	Category	Before Migration		After Migration	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Unemployment		87	60	44	30.34
Income	<1000	15	10.34	0	0
	1000-2000	12	8.28	7	4.83
	2000-3000	20	13.79	16	11.03
	>3000	0	0	77	53.10
	No income	98	67.59	45	31.03

Source: Own survey data, 2014 E.C

The study also attempted to compare the rate of unemployment before and after migration and compare income of respondent before and after migration. Table 5. show that 60% of respondents are unemployed before migration whereas after migration only 30.34% of the respondents are unemployed. In other word, half of the respondents were able to find a job and employed after they migrates to urban which implies better employment opportunity at urban area than rural since there is significant difference between unemployment rate of respondent before and after migration.

categories as no income, less than 1000, between 1000-2000, between 2000-3000 and above 3000 birr. Table 5. show that before migration 67.59% of respondents have no income whereas only 31.03% of the respondents have no income which indicates that more that 50% of migrants who have not income before migration were able to earn income after they migrates to urban. On the hand, table 5 reveals the improvement in income of respondents after migration. None of respondents were not get more than 3000 birr per month before migration whereas 53.10% of the respondents were earned more than 3000 birr per month and none of them earns less than 1000 birr after migration. This suggests that income levels of migrants are improved after migration.

In the other direction, comparison was made between before and after migration of migrants' income in different

**Table 5:** Mean comparisons of income before and after migration

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Income ~ n	145	2258.966	136.3164	1641.467	1989.526	2528.405
Change ~ m	145	1614.207	114.4998	1378.76	1387.89	1840.524
diff	145	644.7586	87.73649	1056.487	471.3409	818.1764

mean (diff) = mean (income after mig ~ n - change in income ~ m) t = 7.3488  
 mean diff) = 0 degrees of freedom = 144  
 mean (diff) < 0 Ha: mean(diff) != 0 t = 7.3488 Ha: mean(diff) > 0  
 Pr(T < t) = 1.0000 Pr (|T| > |t|) • 0.0000 Pr (T > t) - 0.0000

Source: Own survey data, 2014 E.C

The study also attempted to compare the average value of income of respondent before and after migration. Table 5. Show that the comparisons of income of migrant before and after migration were increased. It reveals that there is significant income increment after migration.

to Adaba Town from rural kebele of Adaba woreda. Its trend is increasing from time to time and it affect negatively urban economic development. Economic development is not measured only by income. Though these migrant can get income and employment opportunity better than rural area but it contribute for expansion of informal sectors, youth bad behavior like drinking alcohols, chat and shisha that lead them to other crime and theft.

This section presents the interview result undertaken with Adaba Town stake holder of migrant Government official's i.e. town administration officers, woreda woreda job opportunity and skills officers, woreda labour and social affairs officers and each kebele administrators.

On the other hand, according to interviewee opinion, rises in rural to urban migration from time-to-time resulted increase unemployment rate in the town, reduce access to urban services like pure water, health service, education, house and telecom service. Consequently, nowadays, in Adaba town health centers and high schools are serving more than standards, the interviewee said. This adversely affects the quality of education, health service, getting telecom service, pure water and related services i.e. in Adaba town do to increment of resident from time to time access to house rent is too difficult, and also access to get pure water is so difficult we got only 2-3 days per week this make our life worse.

Rural-urban migration and its effect on economic development is seen differently by different people. In this study, the various interview questions were raised towards the effect of rural-urban migration on the economic development, its trends or practice and effects on urban infrastructure like access to pure water, health, education, house, telecom, employment opportunity and the like. The reflection is that rural-urban migration to study area is seen negatively by most of the interviewed people on economic development of both place of the origin and destination.

There are also some interviewees differently suggest that rural-urban migration affects economic development of both place of origin and destination.

The non-migrant participants of interview told that in rural area there is no employment opportunity and lack of infrastructure because of that large number of youth migrate

That mean migrant can get job opportunity at urban area than rural but in case of rural area most prominent input of agriculture, labor force, that required largely is highly migrate to urban to the seek for modern urban service and job opportunity. This affect negatively agriculture based economy, at urban area it facilitates illegal residence, informal sector activities, affect also access to get modern urban service like education, health, pure water, electricity, and telecom service.

### Econometric Analysis

This part presents the explanatory analysis to estimate the effect of rural-urban migration. For this study, the general living status improvement of migrant is used as proxy variable for migration. The migrants were asked to identify their economic improvement after they migrate to urban from the alternative level of improvement as very improved, improved, less improved and no improvement. Then, variables that conceptually hypothesized and associated with life improvement like improvement in employment, change

in income of migrant after migration, education/skill improvement of the migrant, access to education of their dependent (migrant's children), access to housing/shelter and access to transport service after migration are included in the regression and regressed to show their association with life improvement of the migrants. In this study, since the proxy variable, migrant life improvement is ordered in scale the ordered logit model were employed to analyze association and statistical significance among variables.

In estimation procedure, the problems of multicollinearity and heteroscedasticity have been treated well. Multicollinearity has been tested using VIF after auxiliary regression. Based on the test estimation, there is not variable excluded from the model due to multicollinearity.

To avoid and reduce the possible heteroskedasticity problem, robust standard error has been generated. For estimation purpose STATA 14 software package was employed. Table below gives model information and the OL estimation of coefficients of the model.

**Table 6:** Ordered Logit Regression Result

Iteration 0:							log likelihood - -177.24206
Iteration 1:							log likelihood - -77.97967
Iteration 2:							log likelihood - -69.380185
Iteration 3:							log likelihood - -65.893964
Iteration 4:							log likelihood - -65.881872
Iteration 5:							log likelihood - -65.881867
Order logistic reression		Number of obs =					145
		LR chi2(6) =					222.72
		Prob > chi2 =					0.0000
Log likelihood = -65.881867		Pseudo R2 =					0.6283
<b>Migrants life improvement</b>	<b>Coef.</b>	<b>Std. Err.</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>p&gt; 21</b>	<b>195% Conf.</b>	<b>Interval)</b>	
Employment status	.8659371	.8225314	1.05	0.292	-.7461948	2.478069	
Education skill work experience IMPR	1.14458	.6007826	1.91	0.057	-.032932	2.322093	
Education improvement for dependent	-.9693804	.6771862	-1.43	0.152	-2.296641	.3578802	
Housing improvement	-2.212185	.6979535	-3.17	0.002	-3.580149	-.8442215	
Access to urban transport	-.0586133	2.047616	-0.03	0.977	-4.071867	3.95464	
Change in income after migration	.0027479	.0004554	6.03	0.000	.0018555	.0036404	
/cut1	.3017218	2.220553			-4.050482	4.653926	
/cut2	3.552696	2.307933			-.9707704	8.076162	
/cut3	5.382933	2.320495			.8348453	9.93102	

**Source:** Own survey data, 2014 E.C

As observed from the regression result, three variables are statistically significant while the rests are insignificant. The table also shows that some variables are negatively associated with the life improvement of migrants even though they are statistically significant. The table reveals that change in income and education/skill/work experience improvement of migrants after migration are positively associated with life improvement of migrants and they are statistically significant at 1% and 5% level of significance, respectively. This pays that rural-urban migration has positive and significant effect on the life of migrants at individual level and on economy in general. As observed from the table, on the other hand, housing/shelter improvement is negatively associated the life improvement of migrants and statistically significant at 1% level of significance. In addition to this, migrant suggest that they are restricted to live periphery that there is no access of pure water and electricity due to lack income to rent at center.

Though they are statistically insignificant access to education of dependent of migrants (migrant's children) and access to transport service are negatively associated with the

life improvement of migrants that adversely affects their life after they migrate to urban which can be the burden to an economy.

### Conclusion

Migration is a type of permanent or temporary geographic migration from one geographical unit to another. According to (Nigatu, 2004) <sup>[17]</sup>, a significant number of people in Ethiopia and other developing nations are constantly moving from rural to urban areas. The same is true about at Adaba town administration. Internal or domestic migration and foreign migration are the two main categories of migration, depending on the territories covered by space coverage. Both forms of migration have distinct effects on the population, productivity shortage, and economy. These migrants have an impact on working activities in addition to the social and economic advancement of their places of origin and destination. In essence, questionnaires and interviews were used to collect primary and secondary study data from Adaba Town. The study shows that majority of migrants are young, educated men. The majority of migrants



are individuals between the ages of 18 and 34 and those with formal education. The study indicates that the majority of the migrants are migrated to Adaba town to search for employment opportunities, or job, better urban infrastructures facilities such as education or training, electricity, telecom service, pure water and the like.

The study indicates that productive age (youth) and educated group of people are highly migrating than other and they are happy for their migration when test their perception to migration.

The study shows that economic status of migrant indicates improvement in comparison of unemployment rate of respondent before and after migration as well as income of migrant before and after migration. The income and education/skill/work experience improvements of migrants after migration are positively associated with life improvement of migrants. This pays that rural-urban migration has positive and significant effect on the life of migrants at individual level and on economy in general. On the other hand, housing/shelter improvement is negatively associated the life improvement of migrants and migrant suggest that they are restricted to live periphery that there is no access of pure water and electricity due to lack income to rent at center. migrants education of dependent of migrants (migrant`s children) and access to transport service are also negatively associated with the life improvement of migrants that adversely affects their life after they migrate to urban which can be the burden to an economy. They states that there is more access of schools for their dependent as well as transport access than that of rural area but affordability to use these access is difficult.

As the study also reveals even though income and life of migrants are improved the rural-urban migration is negatively affect employment opportunity at urban area and it contribute for expansion of informal sectors, youth bad behavior like drinking alcohols, chat and shisha that lead them to other crime and theft. This flow of migration also affect rural area agriculture production that needs large number of lobar force and now a day youth people are highly migrate to urban to the search for modern urban service and job opportunity. Though it affect negatively the bases of agriculture economy, at urban area it facilitates illegal residence, informal sector activities, affect also access to get modern urban service like education, health, pure water, electricity, and telecom.

### Corresponding Author

*Aman Adem Tese* is currently a MA. Besides, he teaches at Werabe University, College of Social Science Department of Sociology, located in Werabe Ethiopia. His research interests are social issue like migration and its effect, Joblessness and its impact, women participation on economic activities, and development management. In addition, he teaches sociology, social work and development management, at graduate levels in both public and private higher education institutions in Ethiopia.

*Messele Kumilachew Aga* is currently teaching is Arsi University, College of Business and Economics, Department of Management at a rank of Assistant Professor. His focuses of research are entrepreneurship and small business management, strategic management, organizational behavior, and marketing management. Besides, he is the co-

author of this study and has published many research articles in reputable journals.

### References

1. Abeshu GA. The effects of Inter-Regional Spontaneous Resettlement on the Livelihood of the Host Population in Ethiopia. CDS, AAU, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; c2008.
2. Bekure W. Industrial Labor Force in Addis Ababa Region before 1975. In Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, 26-29 April 1992, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala; c1984. p. 603-616.
3. Central Statistics Agency. Home Page. Retrieved 11 2, 2017, from Central Statistics Agency: <http://www.csa.gov.et/> 2017.
4. Crush J. Migration, development and urban food security. Urban Food Security Series No. 9, Queen's University and AFSUN, Kingston and Cape Town; c2012.
5. Central Statistical Agency. National Statistics Abstract. Central Statistical Agency, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; c2008.
6. Central Statistical Agency. Report of the Inter Censal Population Survey. Addis Ababa: Central Statistical Agency; c2013.
7. Grau HR, Aide TM. Are Rural-Urban Migration and Sustainable Development Compatible in Mountain Systems? Mountain Research and Development. 2007;7(2):119-123.
8. Habtamu B. Rural-Urban Migration and its Consequence on Urban living: the case in Hawassa City Southern Ethiopia. Global Journal of Human-Social Science: Economics. 2015;15(4):10.
9. Harris JR, Todaro MP. Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two Sector Analysis. Development Activities and Rural-Urban Migration. Washington, D.C: Office of Urban Development; c1970.
10. Herrendorf B, Rogerson R, Valentinyi A. Growth and structural change in the US economy: A quantitative analysis of aggregate and industry-level data. Handbook of Economic Growth; c2014.
11. Johnson PJ, Stoll K. Remittance patterns of Southern Sudanese refugee men: Enacting the global breadwinner role. Family Relations. 2008;57:431-443.
12. Kasahun A. Migration to Addis Ababa: An Explanation of Reasons for Migration and Employment status at the Destination. Addis Ababa, Addis Ababa University, unpublished; c2000.
13. Kebede M. Migration and urbanization in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: MOE-ICDN; c1994.
14. Kothari CR. Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers; c2006.
15. Lipton M. Migration from Rural Areas of Poor Countries: The Impact on Rural Productivity and Income Distribution. World Development. 1980;8:1-24.
16. McCatty M. The Process of Rural-Urban Migration in Developing Countries. Carleton University Honours Essay; c2004.
17. Nigatu R. Poverty reduction policies of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa; c2004.
18. Pierson J, Thomas M. Dictionary of social work: the definitive A to Z of social work and social care. New



- York: McGraw Hill Open University Press. Study; c2010.
19. Ralph E. Urban migrants: A Focus on Their Social Networks and Vulnerability Dynamics. Radboud University, South Africa; c2012.
  20. Singru RN. Regional Balanced Urbanization for Inclusive Cities Development: Urban-Rural Poverty Linkages in Secondary Cities Development in Southeast Asia. ADB Southeast Asia Working Paper Series No. 11; c2015.
  21. Tacoli C. Urbanization, gender and urban poverty: paid work and unpaid carework in the cities. Urbanization and Emerging Population Issues Working Paper Series, IIED and UNFPA, London and New York; c2012.
  22. Taylor EJ. The new economics of labor migration and the role of remittances in the migration process. *International Migration*. 1999;37(1):51-81.
  23. Taylor JE, Arango J, Hugo G, Kouaouci A, Massey DS, Pellegrino A. International Migration and Community Development. *Population Index*. 1996;62(3):397-418.
  24. Teshome N. Media Utilization and School Improvement. A Case Study of Primary Education Ratio Support Programs in Ethiopia. Doctoral Dissertation for the PhD Degree in International and Comparative Education, Institute of International Education, Stockholm University; c1998.
  25. The World Bank. Internal migration on Ethiopia evidence from qualitative and quantitative research study; c2018.
  26. Todaro M, Smith P. *Economic Development*. 8th edition. Addison Wesley; c2003.
  27. Todaro M. *Educational and Rural-urban Migration*. Washington DC: Office of Urban Development; c2000.
  28. Todaro MP. *Migration and Economic Development: A Review of Theory, Evidences, Methodology Priorities*. Nairobi Institute of Development Study, University of Nairobi, occasional paper, No. 18; c1976.
  29. Todaro MP. A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries. *Handbook of Economic Growth*; c1999.
  30. United Nations. *Integrating Development and Population Planning*. New York: United Nations; c1991.