

The third objective was also to look at the challenges and opportunities associated with migrants' flow in the study area. However, according to the findings, the main challenge faced by most migrants is the high cost of rent (17%). A strategic view proposed by migrants to deal with this challenge is through government intervention focused on equipping the rent control department to work effectively by ensuring that migrants pay the required rent fees. Besides, the main opportunity that exists for migrants is the availability of job opportunities in the study area.

Finally, the last objective was to look at how rural-urban migration affects the socioeconomic status of migrants. This aim created the path to the built-up of regression models to explain this phenomenon. The findings revealed that the employment status of migrants' increases the socioeconomic status by 0.04 units (not statistically significant). In practical terms, the value of 0.04 units depicts that the socioeconomic status of migrants' turns to increase along with the access to employment.

Again, age increases the socioeconomic status of migrants by 0.006 units, but a year increase in age decreases the socioeconomic status by -0.012 units. Relating this result to income and socioeconomic status, it could be argued that age has a significant relation to income maximization and a subsequent increase in the socioeconomic status. Thus, young migrants' output and income growth could be higher than migrants with old age. For this reason, it could be seen from the results that at the initial stage, age had an important increase on the socioeconomic status, but decreases with time

Further, the education level of migrants' increases the socioeconomic status by 0.073 units. This is particularly true because, in the social ladder, individuals with a high level of education turn to have high social status and a subsequent economic return through access to job opportunities. In view of this analysis, education is an important factor for increasing the socioeconomic status of migrants.

More so, income decreases the socioeconomic status of migrants by -0.22 units, however, an extra income increases the socioeconomic status of migrants by 0.044 units and this was statistically significant. These results showed that at the initial stage, income was not a sufficient measure or indicator for increasing the socioeconomic status of the migrants rather requires an extra output in income maximization to raise the level of the socioeconomic status. It showed that a meagre income is not enough to increase the socioeconomic status, hence entails extra income.

6. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are made:

- ✚ It was gathered that rural-urban migration has a socio-demographic characteristic on migrants in terms of job opportunities, incomes, and education.

- ✦ Even though there are varied reasons for migration among the migrants, it was, therefore, gathered that the main motive for the flows was mainly due to the availability of job opportunities in the destination.
- ✦ Comparing the state of employment status of migrants before and after the migration, it is concluded that the level of employment increased significantly among the migrants.
- ✦ Migrants also go through several challenges which directly or indirectly affect their socioeconomic livelihoods. Some of these challenges included the high cost of rent, poor sanitation, unemployment and underemployment, low wages, corruption, among others.
- ✦ Income plays a significant role in the socioeconomic status of migrants.
- ✦ The level of education of migrants is an important factor for increasing socioeconomic status of migrants.

Recommendations

The study has revealed several fascinating results from which suitable recommendations could be developed. However, in line with the main findings of the research, the following policy recommendations are made:

- ✦ The study has helped to reveal that rural-urban migration has a comparative high socioeconomic status on migrants living in urban areas in terms of education, income and job opportunities. It is, therefore, recommended that the government will provide and strengthen infrastructural development such as education, health facilities, among others in the rural areas. Also, to enhance the real incomes of the people living in the rural areas, there is the need for the government to intensify rural industrialization through investment package in labour-intensive employment prospects in agricultural-based and livestock farming like animal husbandry, poultry, fisheries, dairy, horticulture, piggyery, floriculture, silviculture and apiculture.
- ✦ The study has also helped to reveal that migrants are better off in urban centres than when they were living in the rural area. However, it is, therefore, recommended that efforts are kept in place by the government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to ensure local capacity development through programmes aimed at training rural people to enhance their human resource progress which will consequently improve their socioeconomic livelihoods.
- ✦ The study has revealed numerous challenges faced by migrants in the study area. These challenges require immediate government and city authority's attention to seek for prudent ways to solve these problems particularly with the issues of the high cost of rent, poor sanitation, the emergence of slums, unemployment and underemployment, crime and insecurity, and the problem of erratic power supply. In the process of tackling these problems, the

government may integrate development agencies and private firms to fast-track development interventions.

Reference

- Ackah, C., & Medvedev, D. (2010). *Internal Migration in Ghana: Determinants and Welfare Impacts*. 25.
- Adewale, J. G. (2005). Socio-Economic Factors Associated with Urban-Rural Migration in Nigeria: A Case Study of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 17(1), 13–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09709274.2005.11905752>
- Apuke, O. D. (2017). Quantitative Research Methods: A Synopsis Approach. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 6(11), 40–47.
<https://doi.org/10.12816/0040336>
- Asuah, A. Y., Sam-Awortwi, W. E., & Kwatia, J. K. B. (2016). *Ghana's Urban Management Crisis: Case of Sunyani*. 9.
- Awumbila, M., Teye, J. K., Litchfield, J., Boakye-Yiadom, L., Deshingkar, P., & Quartey, P. (2015). *Are Migrant Households better off than Non-Migrant Households? Evidence from Ghana*. 48.
- Bowling. (2005). *Quantitative social science: The survey*. *Handbook of health research methods: Investigation, measurement and analysis*.
- Deotti, L., & Estruch, E. (2016). *Addressing rural youth migration at its root causes: A conceptual framework*.
- Duplantier, A., Ksoll, C., Lehrer, K., & Seitz, W. (2017). *The internal migration choices of Ghanaian youths*. 41.
- Enu. (2015). *The Effects of Rural -Urban Migration in Ghana: Empirical Evidence from the Okaishie Community—Greater Accra Region*.
- Fujishiro, K., Xu, J., & Gong, F. (2010). What does “occupation” represent as an indicator of socioeconomic status?: Exploring occupational prestige and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 71(12), 2100–2107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.09.026>
- Gallup, J. L. (1997). *THEORIES OF MIGRATION. Development Discussion Papers Reprint Series*. 27.
- GSS. (2014a). *2010 Population and Housing Census District Analytical Report. Sunyani Municipality*.
- GSS. (2014b). *Migration in Ghana (2010 Population and Housing Census Report)*. Ghana Statistical Service.
- Gurak, T., & Caces, F. (2010). *9 Migration Networks and the Shaping of Migration Systems*. 16.
- Hair, J. F. (Ed.). (2014). *Multivariate data analysis (7. ed., Pearson new internat. ed)*. Pearson.

- International Organization for Migration. (2011). *Glossary on Migration 2nd Edition*. International Organization for Migration. <http://www.iom.int>
- Kumpikaitė, V., & Žičkutė, I. (2012). Synergy of Migration Theories: Theoretical Insights. *Engineering Economics*, 23(4), 387–394. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.23.4.1240>
- Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal. *Population and Development Review*, 19(3), 431. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2938462>
- Mckenzie, D., & Rapoport, H. (2007). Network effects and the dynamics of migration and inequality: Theory and evidence from Mexico. *Journal of Development Economics*, 84(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2006.11.003>
- Nguyen, L. D., Raabe, K., & Grote, U. (2015). Rural–Urban Migration, Household Vulnerability, and Welfare in Vietnam. *World Development*, 71, 79–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.11.002>
- Poot, J., Alimi, O., Cameron, M. P., & Maré, D. C. (2016). *The Gravity Model of Migration: The Successful Comeback of an Ageing Superstar in Regional Science*. 27.
- Porumbescu, A. (2015). *Defining the New Economics of Labor Migration Theory Boundaries: A Sociological-Level Analysis of International Migration*.
- Seid, A. K., Bloomfield, K., & Hesse, M. (2018). The relationship between socioeconomic status and risky drinking in Denmark: A cross-sectional general population study. *BMC Public Health*, 18(1), 743. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5481-y>
- Sharma, G. (2017). *Pros and cons of different sampling techniques*. 4.
- Silke J, D. (2007). *The value of children in African countries – insights from studies on infertility* (Vol. 28). *Journal of Psychosomatic Obstetrics & Gynecology*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01674820701409959>
- Sunyani Municipal Assembly. (2014). *Republic of Ghana Composite Budget of the Sunyani Municipal Assembly for the 2014 Fiscal Year*.
- Taylor, J. E. (2001).). *Migration: New dimensions and characteristics, causes, consequences and implications for rural poverty. Food, agriculture, and rural development*.
- Teye et al. (2018). *ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE AND MIGRATION IN AFRICA*.
- Tiwari, I. P. (1996). Impact of Migration on Rural Employment and Earnings in the Western Development Region of Nepal. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 5(4), 417–448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/011719689600500403>

- Twumasi-Ankrah, K. A. (1996). *Rural-Urban Migration and Socioeconomic Development in Ghana: Some Discussions*. 11. <http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/africanjournals/>
- Wouterse, F. S. (2006). *Survival or accumulation: Migration and rural households in Burkina Faso*. 166.

© GSJ