



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN-SOCIAL SCIENCE: C  
SOCIOLOGY & CULTURE  
Volume 18 Issue 2 Version 1.0 Year 2018  
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal  
Publisher: Global Journals  
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

# The Sociological and Cultural Factors for the Rural Urban Influx

By Akalework Mengesha & Ashenafi Hizekel

*Wolaitta Sodo University*

**Abstract-** This study has made an immense attempt to make out various socio-cultural factors that underlie behind the migration of people from Sodo Zuria district to Sodo town. It has presented wide-range of sociological and cultural variables that prompted the movement of people to the town.

A cross sectional design was used. The quantitative data was collected through questionnaire from 384 migrants. Besides, qualitative data was collected by using four focus group discussions (each contains six members) and nine key informant interviews. Both primary and secondary data were used to collect the data needed for this study. The descriptive statistics like percentages and frequency distributions were used to analyze quantitative data while qualitative data were presented by using narrative analysis.

**Keywords:** rural, urban, migration, migrants.

**GJHSS-C Classification:** FOR Code: 370199



*Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:*



© 2018. Akalework Mengesha & Ashenafi Hizekel. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

# The Sociological and Cultural Factors for the Rural Urban Influx

Akalework Mengesha <sup>α</sup> & Ashenafi Hizikel <sup>σ</sup>

**Abstract-** This study has made an immense attempt to make out various socio-cultural factors that underlie behind the migration of people from Sodo Zuria district to Sodo town. It has presented wide-range of sociological and cultural variables that prompted the movement of people to the town.

A cross sectional design was used. The quantitative data was collected through questionnaire from 384 migrants. Besides, qualitative data was collected by using four focus group discussions (each contains six members) and nine key informant interviews. Both primary and secondary data were used to collect the data needed for this study. The descriptive statistics like percentages and frequency distributions were used to analyze quantitative data while qualitative data were presented by using narrative analysis.

The major findings of this study revealed that rural-urban migration has been contributed by different pushing and pulling factors of socio-cultural and economic factors. The community's culture, strong social contacts, the flow of inflated information, desire for personal freedom and independence life; problem of accessing food and hunger were the mainly identified socio-cultural factors that greatly influenced the decision of people to leave the rural area.

**Keywords:** rural, urban, migration, migrants.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Migration is a wide spread phenomenon which exists as old as human beings, and it has been observed in the population throughout the world. It is believed that about half of the population in the world lives in cities and urban areas. Most of these have migrated from different places of a country particularly from the rural areas. Nowadays in most of the least developed countries of Africa, a large number of people have been migrating over a varying distances of rural to urban areas due to various driving socio-cultural and economic factors. Hence, factors behind rural-urban migration are often multiple, complex and difficult to comprehend as a chain of events and circumstances that can lead someone to make the decision to move from rural to urban areas (World Bank, 2016).

According to Czaika and de Haas (2011), the Concentration of investment in industries, commerce, and social services in towns has been the causes for inequalities and differences of socio-economic opportunities between rural and urban areas. Mostly, these differences have been revealed in many of the

least developed African countries, and which intensified the process of rural-urban migration. In addition, productivity of the rural and agricultural sector has remained low, and leading to rural out-migration to urban and industrial sectors with a growing rate.

As stated by Kiros and White (2004), Ethiopia is one of the least developed countries in Africa with a relatively high level of rural-urban migration and population redistribution. This is related with economic shift of the country from socialist to market-oriented economy, serious political changes since the 1970s through 1990s, and the country's condition of civil war and famine. Therefore, the trend and process of rural-urban migration have been continued in the country alarmingly. The movement of people from rural to urban areas includes various types and strata of the society in its trends and process that are mostly associated with certain social and economic factors. The reasons behind migration are vary from time to time based on the conditions that brought about the decision.

Furthermore, it has been observed that rural-urban migration in Wolaita Zone is high. In this Zone, the number of migrants from rural to urban areas is enormous today. Many people are regularly migrating from rural areas of the zone to Sodo town and different urban centers of Ethiopia, particularly from Sodo Zuria District; people are highly migrating and resettled in Sodo town due to different socio-cultural and economic reasons. Farm owners and residents change farms, children have been sent to live and labor with other families in the town, and young people entering into seasonal and circular migration patterns before and after starting their own households. At this time, many people prefer urban migration leaving their original residence of rural areas, and that is a most dominant practice in Wolaita Zone. Zemen (2014) mentioned that migration from rural areas of Wolaita zone to urban area is increasing in alarming rate and becoming high in the future.

Hence, rural-urban migration is one of the predominant forms of migration which has been experienced within the community of Sodo Zuria District. Despite this reality, no adequate studies have been conducted so far in the study area about socio-cultural and economic factors that enforce people to migrate from the rural areas to Sodo town. Thus, this was the motive behind the researcher to select this title for scientific study. For this matter, the current study did

*Author α:* Ass.Prof. of sociology, Wolaitta Sodo University.

*e-mail:* akemengesha@gmail.com

*Author σ:* Lecturer of Sociology, Dilla University

investigate the socio-cultural and economic factors that contribute to rural-urban migration, and which were not examined adequately in the study area.

## II. RESEARCH METHODS AND MATERIALS

### a) *Study Approach and Design*

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative research approaches were used. The descriptive research method from quantitative research approach, especially cross-sectional design was employed. The quantitative research approach was used to utilize statistically specific data that was representative of the target population as a whole, and to make the research more objective, accurate and generalizable. And, questionnaire was used to collect the quantitative data.

To use the advantages of both quantitative and qualitative data, employing the quantitative and qualitative research approach together were very preferable and powerful. Hence, the qualitative approach was used to obtain in-depth data about the research problem. The focus group discussion and key informants interview were used to collect the qualitative data.

## III. METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

### a) *Survey*

In this study, survey was used to collect quantitative data and administered for 384 migrants. The migrants were selected from eleven kebeles of Sodo town proportionally based on inclusion and exclusion criteria. Structured and semi-structured questionnaires were designed and employed to generate quantitative data from respondents. It was prepared in English, and translated into local language by professionals before the data collection.

Eleven data collectors were selected from each kebele of Sodo town with the collaboration of kebele officials. They have been working as a voluntary worker in their kebele that they know more about the residents of their respective kebele. All of them had completed secondary school and they were appropriate to access the respondents and collect the data in a most effective manner. Before the data collection, data collectors were given training on the over all data collection process. Hence, they were clarified with inclusion and exclusion criteria, questionnaire and ethical considerations of this study. Based on this, they went to house to house in their respective kebele, and managed to collect the data.

However, it became a great challenge to get the respondents in working days as most of them were daily labor and domestic workers. Despite this, by revisiting the respondents and using weekends (Sunday), data collectors were able to collect the data needed for this study.

### b) *Focus Group Discussion*

The focus group discussion was vital to obtain the views of different participants on the issue. Thus, four FGD were conducted; two from migrants, one with the heads of migrants' families from the place of origin and one with concerned officials of GOs. The discussion with officials was arranged in collaboration with Sodo Zuria district administrative office. Each group comprised of 6 participants with total of 24 members. These participants were selected and identified as they have a good knowledge and experiences about the stated problems of this study. Also, they were the participants who could express a range of views freely and actively on the factors behind rural-urban migration. They were categorized under different age, sex and educational backgrounds. The researcher identified and selected the FGD discussants through the friendship networks that have been made between the discussants themselves. Considering its appropriateness for discussion, the places were selected based on the interest of the participants, and held on different days. Therefore, the FGD discussion of concerned GOs officials was held at Sodo Zuria district administrative office (in the labor and social affair office). And, the FGD discussion of migrants was held in the compound of Sodo town administrative office. The permission was given for each place from concerned body of the offices. Also, the discussion of heads of migrants' families was held on their respective residence, and the discussions conducted for 45-50 minutes. In addition, 10 minutes was used for the tea break.

The guide questions were designed and used to direct the discussion. Hence, the researcher facilitated the discussion by explaining for the discussants that they can freely and actively express their idea, feelings and opinion about the research problem, and took notes.

### c) *Key Informant Interview*

Key informant interview was employed to obtain valuable supplement to the quantitative data collected through interview schedule. It was conducted with four kebele's chair persons, two migrants, two with the heads of migrants' families from the place of origin who were not selected for FGDs, and one official from Wolaita Zone social and labour affair office. They were identified and selected through the reference of their friendship networks since they were considered as more knowledgeable persons than others about the research problem of this study. Thus, they were taken as the right key informants to give relevant data for this study. Each informant was asked as if they were voluntary for the interview. After having their verbal consent, the researcher conducted the interview by using the guide questions. The interview was undertaken with the officer in the WZLSA office after 11:30 am, with migrants in

STLSAO at lunch time, and with kebele's chair persons and heads of migrants' families in their respective dwelling.

#### IV. SAMPLE SIZE DETERMINATION AND SAMPLING METHODS

##### a) Sample Size Determination

Due to the problem of obtaining the exact data of study population in a given place at a fixed time and the absence of sampling frame, for the quantitative data, employing Cochran's single population proportion formula of sample size determination was the most suitable formula to conduct this study. Therefore, it was persuaded to apply this formula by expecting the larger sample size that gives more reliable and accurate data for the study. The largest possible proportion (p) of study population was 50%. Absolute precision and the most confidence level value were 5% and 1.96 respectively. Hence, the sample size was determined by using the following formula:

$$n = \frac{Z^2 p(1-p)}{d^2}$$

where;

n = the sample size,

Z = a standard score corresponding to 95% confidence level value = 1.96

p = estimate of expected proportion, the researcher was employed 50% (.5) since there is no previous data or list of population.

d = the desired level of absolute precision = 5% (0.05)

Thus, the required;

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times 0.5 (1-0.5)}{0.05^2} = 384$$

Based on the above formula, the number of respondents for survey was 384 migrants in the study; which was selected by using proportional sampling method based on inclusive and exclusion criteria of the

##### c) Reasons of rural-urban migration

Table 1: Response on the Reasons to Rural-urban Migration

| Variables                            | Categories  | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|---------|
| The main reason to come to Sodo town | Parent death  | 51        | 13.3    |
| Starvation                           |   | 73        | 19.0    |
|                                      | To free from family restrictions and obligations          | 65        | 16.9    |
|                                      | To join immediate relatives and friends or following them | 32        | 8.3     |
|                                      | Positive information about the town                       | 79        | 20.6    |
|                                      | Migrants are respected within the community of origin     | 84        | 21.9    |
| Total                                |   | 384       | 100.0   |

Source: own survey, 2016

Table 3 reveals that 84 (21.9 %) of the respondents mentioned that they mainly triggered to

study. This sample size was assumed to be representative of the study population.

On the other hand, qualitative data was collected by using snowball sampling method. This was because of the problem of accessing or identifying participants and informants who would meet the requisite characteristics important to this study. The size of informants was not predetermined, and the data was collected until it becomes saturated.

#### V. DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS

Available data of this research was analyzed through different ways. After collecting data in the field, the collected data was edited to identify and correct technical errors. Then, the response of the respondents was presented and analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The quantitative data was analyzed by using the descriptive statistics like frequency and percentage. And also, SPSS version 21 was employed for processing the data which was collected through interview schedule. To supplement the quantitative data, the qualitatively collected data was analyzed, interpreted and presented by using narrative analysis.

##### a) Results and Discussion

The subsequent parts include the detailed presentation and discussion of data obtained through both qualitative and quantitative research methods.

##### b) Socio-cultural Factors that Contribute to Rural-urban Migration

There are various socio-cultural factors that push people to leave their place of origin, and pull them to move to the place of destination. Hence, the researcher identified and discussed social links between place of origin and destination, the desire for personal freedom and independence life; hunger and food shortage as the main socio-cultural factors that contribute to rural-urban migration.

leave their place of origin because of the respect which has been given to the migrants by the local community

followed by those respondents who stated positive information which they had about the town as their main reason for migration 79(20.6 %). There were also respondents who moved to the place of destination because of starvation 73(19.0 %). Also, those who had left their place of origin as the result of family restrictions and obligations, parent death, and because of joining immediate relatives and friends accounted for 65(16.9 %), 51(13.3 %) and 32(8.3 %) respectively. This indicates that various driving factors were involved for the drift of people from the study area, and which vary from one migrant to another. Besides to this, conditions in the rural area were difficult to bring improvement and change in one's own life. Thus, the future hope of staying in the area became dark for many of the residents. Due to this reason, a significant number of people from the district have been migrating to the town. In the same manner to the above data, the key informant interview identified that most of the people were depressed to live in their birth place. With this regards, one of the key informants, from Wolaita Zone, labor and social affair officers said:

*"As far as I have known, life in the rural area is monotonous. The rural people have been leading similar way of life throughout their stay. I can safely say that it is a night in the rural area even in the daytime since nothing is unique and peculiar rather the same throughout the time. But, the people eagerly looking forward to see or hold something unusual in their life. So, in my opinion, this could be the impelling factor that why the rural people become an excited to move to the town, and proud of the person who would be able to live in the town from the place of origin."*

In similar way, one of the FGD discussants demonstrates that how the people from the study area motivated to reside in the town.

*".....I don't know howl could explain. Let me tell the most driving practice of rural-urban migration. In the village, migrants have been known as a civilized and knowledgeable person. Also, I have seen that migrants and their family have given a special place within the local community. This is due to the fact that in their return trip, migrants have taken different consumable and other goods like oil, salt, cloths, tape and radio for their families and some of their relatives. In addition, during their stay in the rural area, they would be observed with a distinctive clothing and haircut style which demonstrates them as they have a quality life in the town. Obviously, these conditions create a misunderstanding among the local community about the town."*

From the above facts, it is possible to understand that stipulations were not passable to stay in the village. Furthermore, it discloses that the local communities had a positive outlook towards people's migration to the town. This indicates that the existing culture support migration and mainly it has been

accustomed as a good option by the rural community of that particular place. Hence, the meagerness provisos of rural area and prevailing culture of the community have contributed to migration from the district to the town. Moreover, migration is considered as a means to gain a social esteem within the community.

In contrast to the above idea, the finding of Belay (2011) in the case of Ankeshawereda of Awi Zone indicated that most of the people in the place of origin have negative view towards rural-urban migration. According to his finding, migrants and their family too were determined with a lower prestige and viewed as rude, thieves and losers of their culture by the majority of people of the place of origin, and that migration has been accepted as the last option. However, as his study, regardless of community's negative outlook towards rural-urban migration due to their culture, still people have a great motive to migrate if there is an opportunity.

Additionally, the participants of FGD stated that families of migrants as well as non-migrants undermine those who have left behind in the rural area. This is because the non-migrant has been considered as an indolent person, and the one who is waiting for family's inheritance. Unlike the non-migrants, some of the migrants remit their family almost continuously all through the year. And, majority of the migrants support their family in some occasions, especially at the Meskel festival. Therefore, this is along the reasons that why migration has been encouraged and given a value than staying in the village. Besides to this, the discussants added that inadequate food to eat, poor state of opportunities, lifestyles and social status have been widely observed phenomena which have faced majority of the residents in the rural area. This has created despondency among the residents to continue their life in the area. For this reason, most of them have been pushed to depart their rural way of life and extended family.

Therefore, this shows that the rural area is not appropriate for most of the inhabitants for living and to bring any progress in their life. Thus, people move to the place of destination with the optimistic assumption that they will have a chance to get the things which they were unable to obtain in their village. In consistent with this, Birhan (2011) stated that in most of rural areas of Ethiopia, a substantial number of people have been leading a deteriorated and poor way of life. Consequently, many of the people move to urban centers almost spontaneously, without having rational decision perhaps under the perceived notion of things must be better than what they were in. This is due to the dully living conditions of rural areas. Hence, this finding implies that the prevailing culture of the community and deteriorated nature of the rural area have accelerated the rate of rural-urban migration.

## d) Social links between place of origin and destination

Table 2: Responses on Contacts before Migration and Its Contribution

| Variables   | Categories                       | Frequency | Percent |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Knowing a person at the place of destination before migration |                                  |           |         |
|   | Yes                              | 359       | 93.5    |
|   | No                               | 25        | 6.5     |
| Total`  |                                  | 384       | 100.0   |
| Type of relationship with the person:                         |                                  |           |         |
|   | Relative                         | 125       | 32.6    |
|   | Friend                           | 139       | 36.2    |
|   | Parent                           | 95        | 24.7    |
| Total   |                                  | 359       | 93.5    |
| The decision to migrate was contributed by the person         |                                  |           |         |
|   | Yes                              | 329       | 85.7    |
|   | No                               | 30        | 7.8     |
| Total   |                                  | 359       | 93.5    |
| The contribution which has done by the person was:            |                                  |           |         |
|   | Promise to provide accommodation | 112       | 29.2    |
|   | Promise to welcome               | 99        | 25.8    |
|   | Promise to help me to find a job | 118       | 30.7    |
| Total   |                                  | 329       | 85.7    |

Source: own survey, 2016

As it could be observed from the table 4, the results of this survey revealed that more than half 359(93.5 %) of the migrants had known a person at the place of destination before they had left their place of origin. The remaining 25(6.5 %) didn't know anyone at the place of destination prior to their migration. Those who had known a person were asked to state their relationship with the person, and that 139(36.2 %) of the respondents stated their relation as they were friends to each other. The respondents who mentioned their relationship as a relative with the person of destination were 125(32.6 %). The respondents who had a relation with the person as a parent consist 95(24.7 %). On the other hand, the respondents who did know a person in the town before their migration were also asked if the person had a contribution on their migration decision. Majority 329(85.7 %) answered that the person was played a role for them to migrate. While the remaining 30(7.8 %) reported that the person had nothing contribution for their migration.

It is easy to understand from the table 4 that those who were settled in the town from the place of origin before had played different roles on the migration decision of later migrants through the promises of a support. Thus, 118(30.7 %), 112(29.2 %)and 99(25.8 %) of the respondents replied that they were given a promise of helping them to find a job, to provide accommodationandwelcome them respectively from the person with whom they had a contact at the place of destination.This reality shows that the early migrants were more likely remaining connected with the community of their village. They do things that seem essential for the migration of non-migrants to migrate.

In discussing about this, interviewees draw round corresponding statement which uncovers the influence of social contacts in rural-urban migration decisions of the people. Hence, one of the key informants explains the influence in this regard as follows:

*"...most often, the social relation between the place of origin and destination play a key role in the decision of rural-urban migration. I have witnessed that almost every household from the rural area have a migrant in the town. Strong and close contact has been kept between them. With such a contact, the early migrants from the place of origin vowed to take the responsibility of providing a necessary supports such as searching a work, adjusting with the town life and housing tothe later migrants. This boostoptimism to take migration decision."*

This reveals that the tradition of cooperative relationship of the rural people was yet functioning which helped to keep in touch with previous migrants. Even though migrants have stayed a long time in the town, they would not left behind this tradition. This increased a confidence for thesubsequent migrants to leave, and move to the town.

In support with this, the FGD participants agreed that there has been a strong solidarity among the rural community. Hence, most of the migrants did keep such solidarity though they migrated early and settled in the town. This creates a tie between those who migrated from the place of origin and inhabited in the rural area. For this reason, the early migrants did not refuse to undertake the promising tasks behind the process of rural-urban migration.Hence, people think more likely to move to the destination place where they

know a person who can make their migration easy. Also, there is a belief that it will become a potential for the former migrants to come-up with different urban constraints and problems if there would be a person with them from their family members or village in general. Thus, they often endeavor, and make the migration possible for the one who is very intimate for them.

This finding was supported by the literature of De haan and Yakub (2009), which indicated that there is strong social bond that connect migrants and non-migrants of the rural area through ties of kinship, friendship and shared values of the local communities.

For this reason, most of the time the place of destination where relatives or family members, friends, neighbors have been settled from their rural area is more preferable for migrants to relocate than some other town. This is due to the belief that it assures safety, and reduce/simplify psychological and financial costs or any possible challenges that can encounter the subsequent migrants in their way to the town and after their arrival. Hence, the result of this study uncovers that the presence of social capitals from a durable tie between migrants and community of their birth place has contributed to migration from district to the town.

*Table 3:* Responses related to information about life in the town

| Variables   | Categories                                   | Frequency | Percent |
|---|--|-----------|---------|
| Having information about the life in Sodo town before departing the place of origin |  |           |         |
|   | Yes  | 345       | 89.8    |
|   | No   | 39        | 10.2    |
| Total   |  | 384       | 100.0   |
| The main source of information was:   |  |           |         |
|   | Previous migrants                            | 99        | 25.8    |
|   | Family members                               | 132       | 34.4    |
|   | Friends                                      | 114       | 29.7    |
| Total   |  | 345       | 89.8    |
| The information which migrants had about the life in Sodo town was:                 |  |           |         |
|   | Life in the town is better                   | 129       | 33.6    |
|   | Life in the town is more than better         | 76        | 19.8    |
|   | Life in the town is easy to success          | 103       | 26.8    |
|   | Life in the town is difficult                | 34        | 8.9     |
|   | Life in the town is worst                    | 3         | .8      |
| Total   |  | 345       | 89.8    |
| The view about the town was influenced by the information                           |  |           |         |
|   | Yes  | 326       | 84.9    |
|   | No   | 19        | 4.9     |
| Total   |  | 345       | 89.8    |
| The nature of influence:  |  |           |         |
|   | Negatively changed my outlook about the town | 18        | 4.7     |
|   | Positively changed my outlook about the town | 308       | 80.2    |
| Total   |  | 326       | 84.9    |
| Life in the town was as it would be informed before migration                       |  |           |         |
|   | Yes  | 57        | 14.8    |
|   | No   | 288       | 75.0    |
| Total   |  | 345       | 89.8    |

Source: own survey, 2016

When we look at the responses of information about life in the town, significant proportion of the respondents had information before they leave their village 345(89.8 %), and 39(10.2 %) were not previously aware about life in the place of destination before they move. The respondents who had heard about life in the town from family members were 132(34.4 %), and those who have received the information about life in the town from friends comprise 114(29.7 %). Some replied that their source of information was previous migrants 99(25.8 %).

Results in the table 5 depicted that respondents have informed differently about life in the town before their move to the town, and that 129(33.6 %) of respondents have heard as life in the town is better while 103(26.8 %) were informed that life in the town is easy to success. About 76(19.8 %) were well-versed that life in the town is more than better, and 34(8.9 %) and 3(.8 %) had information like life in the town is difficult and life in the town is worst respectively. The respondents who replied yes about the influence of mentioned information on their view about the town were

asked how they could be influenced, 308(80.2 %) responded that their outlook about the town was positively changed. But, 18(4.7 %) said that they negatively changed their view towards the town. Additionally, 288(75.0 %) of respondents answered that they did not get life in the town as they were informed prior to their migration while 57(14.8 %) replied that they did get. This indicates migrants had informed about the place of destination. However, what they had heard is more about the impressive one. Thus, they were inspired to migrate by the information they had about the lifestyles of destination place.

In correspondence to the above data, during the interview it was possible to identify how flow of information inspired the people to migrate. The following statement from key informant interview with a migrant reinforces this fact:

*"Before my departure, I was easily communicating with my friend through phone. In our communication he always told me that I am nothing more than a farmer, and fool who only knows farming. Moreover, in his return trip, he told me that it was good for me to look for a better livelihood in the town rather than killing my time. He further informed that the gain was very less than exerted effort in our vicinity. But, in the town many options and opportunities were available that could give me a chance to bring change in my life and realize my dream. Also, my friend said that, beside to fulfilling necessary things, in his two years of staying in the town he managed to save money that enabled him to buy an Ox. However, after my arrival, things became difficult. It took three months to find regular jobs. Even after finding a job the employers were not paid my salary properly."*

From the aforementioned statement it is possible to reveal that friends or relatives and neighbors from the town want to keep a positive image about the town and themselves as well. As the results of overblown information of the alternatives and life chances available in the town, people pulled to resettle in the place of destination. It is also possible to underline that through the use of modern technology like mobile phone, different information have directly transferred from the place of destination to origin. Hence, the non-migrants have firsthand intangible success stories about the place of destination. Besides, the new migrants never get worry at the time of their migration that how they can meet with early migrants when they arrive to the town. This is because, mobile phone is there, and enables them to meet one another easily. So, this indicates that the advancement of technology, especially mobile phone has significantly intensified the process of rural-urban migration.

In addition, the FGD discussants indicated that the flow of information to the village regarding to the availability of various opportunities in the town is mostly

beyond the reality and exaggerated, which in turn enhances new migration. Only inclining to its upbeat one, many of the former migrants share an idea related to life in the town to the non-migrants. Due to this case, the rural people develop an assumption that life is better in the town. In addition to what they have heard, the non-migrants see some changes on the migrants who return to the village.

The result of this study is in line with previously conducted researches. Rayhan and Grote (2007) revealed that various factors are involved before people's decision to migrate. Besides to the challenges of the rural area, expectation of life in the town and flow of information which the rural people receive play a significant role in the decision of migration. According to Getahun (2007), the influence of information of those who migrated early is very considerable in driving a large number of people to Addis Ababa. He further stated that information in facilitating migration is vital. This is because, most of the rural people who are generally low in their educational status and encircled with different limitations are highly depend on the information they have from their friends or relatives and influenced to make their decision to migrate.

As observed from both quantitative and qualitative facts above, the decision of migration was influenced by the information that conveyed by prior migrants who either return to home or have settled in the town. Thus, many of the migrants had information about the town before their migration. But, mostly the information was much more inflated than the existing reality of life in the town. This significantly augmented the number of people's movement from rural area to the town with a wrong interpretation of its real situation. Moreover, the rural people might be able to look for other options than migration if they were informed and aware in the right manner about the town life.

e) *Desire for personal freedom and independence life***Table 4:** Responses on the family's degree of controlling a behavior and probability to spend a leisure time

| Variables  | Categories  | Frequency | Percent |
|--|---|-----------|---------|
| Family's degree of controlling the behaviour or deeds in the birth place was:                    |   |           |         |
|  | Low   | -         | -       |
|  | Somehow low   | 37        | 9.6     |
|  | Very low  | -         | -       |
|  | High  | 159       | 41.4    |
|  | Somehow high  | 165       | 43.0    |
|  | Very high   | 23        | 6.0     |
| Total  |   | 384       | 100.0   |
| Having the opportunity to spend a leisure time with friends and relatives in the place of origin |   |           |         |
|  | Yes   | 93        | 24.2    |
|  | No  | 291       | 75.8    |
| Total  |   | 384       | 100.0   |
| Reason for the inability to had such an opportunity was:   |   |           |         |
|  | Family constraints                                      | 91        | 23.7    |
|  | It was considered as insignificant within the community | 64        | 16.7    |
|  | No suitable conditions to spend such a time             | 97        | 25.3    |
|  | There was no such a time                                | 39        | 10.2    |
|  | I didn't want to spend such a time                      | -         | -       |
| Total  |   | 291       | 75.8    |

Source: own survey, 2016

The results from table 6 portrayed that 165(43.0 %) of the migrants were reported that their family degree of controlling is somehow high. The respondents whose family degree of controlling their behavior was high accounted for 159(41.4 %), and somehow low consists 37(9.6 %) and 23(6.0 %) were answered that their family degree of controlling their behavior was very high. Beside to this, majority 291(75.8 %) of the respondents did have no prospective to spend a leisure time with their friends and relatives while some of 93(24.2 %) respondents replied that they had such a time. Those who were unable to spend a leisure time had different reasons for their inability. Thus, 97(25.3 %) of respondents pointed having no suitable conditions as the factor. Others 91(23.7 %) stated that they were unable to have such a leisure time due to family constraints. Those who mentioned as the reason that it was considered as insignificant within the community comprise 64(16.7 %). Some of the respondents 39(10.2 %) also didn't have the prospective to spend a leisure time with their friends and relatives due to the absence of such a time. This asserts that the rural area was characterized by rigid informal social norms that enforce persons to act accordingly, and inhibited not to go beyond the socially accepted standards. Community's recognized norms related to age, mate selection and social class prohibited persons from socializing their expectations that seems to be possible. Consequently, this encouraged the decision of migration to the town by calculating the likelihood of achieving things that had been proscribed by the norms of rural area.

In line with the above data, the FGD discussants and key informants have pointed out that in

the rural area, persons have a limited chance to accumulate and diversified their asset until they get married. Even the marriage arrangement was mostly decided by a family, and based on the stated norms of the community of that particular area where this study was undertaken. In addition, one of the FGD participants stated that females are allowed to have cut their hair just like as males and at the same time males are allowed to make their hair long as females in the town. But, doing such things in the place of origin is a taboo. So, the rural communities have a rigid tradition that tied them, and enforce to live and act according to the norms which they have been socialized. However, many of the people, especially, but not only, the new generation did not want to be controlled and looked after themselves by some others. Furthermore, they added that there was no suitable time and places to enjoy except sitting under the tree, so that people could meet to each other more than ten times per a day in the village. Thus, every aspect of movement within the community is known, and thereby none of the actions could be hidden. But, majority of the people were decidedly uninterested to lead under controlled life of the rural area, and pushed to leave their village.

Research conducted by Birhan (2011) confirmed this fact that persons were not in a position to lead their own autonomous life in the way that enables them to act and behave according to their wishes in rural areas because they were under the guidance of informal social norms. He further pointed out that what an independent life mean. As of him, it could be interpreted to include marriage, own income management, not being considered as a family burden, supporting

parents, not being overworked, and taking one's own decisions. However, such a life of persons in the rural area has been restrained by rigid standards of the community. Thus, person's enthusiastic of having such a capability and willing to escape from rural cultural restrictions and obligations was one of the contributing factors that induce rural-urban migration.

Therefore, this study reveals that unwillingness of personsto view and act on the behalf of stated norms of the community, and inability to apply what they wish to do due to rigidity of informal social standards were mainly triggered people to leave the rural area.

*Table 5:* Frequency and Percentage Distribution about Recreation/Entertainment

| Variables  | Categories  | Frequency | Percent |
|--|---|-----------|---------|
| Going out more in the town for recreation than the place of origin                             |   |           |         |
|  | Yes   | 313       | 81.5    |
|  | No  | 71        | 18.5    |
| Total  |   | 384       | 100.0   |
| Having the perception prior to migration that town life permits to have one's own private life |   |           |         |
|  | Yes   | 284       | 74.0    |
|  | No  | 29        | 7.6     |
| Total  |   | 313       | 81.5    |
| The perceptionwas:   |   |           |         |
|  | Less face to face interaction in the town, so that I can act freely | 80        | 20.8    |
|  | The town culture is more flexible that I can realize my wish        | 103       | 26.8    |
|  | Urban places are more conducive for recreation                      | 101       | 26.3    |
| Total  |   | 284       | 74.0    |

Source: own survey, 2016

As illustrated in the table 7 above,313(81.5 %) of respondents to whom the place of destination became more suitable for recreation/entertainment than their village were asked if they had previously perceived that the town life let them to lead their own private life. From those who replied yes 284(74.0 %); before their migration, 103(26.8 %) of respondents had the perception that the town culture is less rigid, so as they can realize their wish. Those respondents who had the perception that urban places are more conducive for recreation were 101(26.3 %) and 80(20.8 %) had the awareness that there would beless face to face interaction in the town, so that they can act freely. This reveals that people highly motivated to relocate to the town from the rural area due to their rising ambition of accessing an open place which enables them to act in a more self-directed manner than they were in the rural area. They had a motive to apply their needs which help them to maintain their physical, mental and social wellbeing. But, the local area was failed to be conducive, and unable to build necessary aspects like cafes and particular places to play games or for relaxation. Hence, people have been very less passionate to live in their birth place. On the other hand, they have believed that town way of life facilitate them to lead their own life, and pave the way for effective function and contribution in their day to day life.

Moreover, it is possible to observefrom the FGD discussants, they all indicated that the presence of appropriate situation for entertainment apart from a work is very essential to develop social cohesion and bring economic success. They also argued that the green areas and public spaces are significantly needed to

create healthy life and positive relationship, and contribute to reduce juvenile delinquency and negative behaviors within the society. Despite this fact, these spaces are much better in the place of destination than its counterpart of the rural area. For this reason, a substantial number of people become bored to stay in the rural area, and basically motivated to move to the town with a perceived presence of advantageous social settings than their birth place.

Besides, the place of destination allows people to build their personal competence. The external influence is very limited in the town that people can easily develop their personality and meet their needs. This condition of the town certainly attracted majority of those people who are dissatisfied with rural way of life. The FGD participants further indicated that various leisure activities of the town and the possibility to lead an autonomous life become other attractive force for migration from the rural area. For this reason, the result of this study indicates that the rural people had a great value towards their autonomous way of life. Thus, strong desire to lead one's own life without external constraints and looking for apposite conditions to undertake the felt needs have resulted rural-urban migration.

## f) Food Shortage

Table 6: Responses on the Availability of Enough Food in the Place of Origin

| Variables  | Categories | Frequency | Percent |
|--|------------|-----------|---------|
| Having enough food in the place of origin  |            |           |         |
|  | Yes        | 63        | 16.4    |
|  | No         | 321       | 83.6    |
| Total  |            | 384       | 100.0   |
| If no, do you believe that you would be exposed to hunger in your place of origin? |            |           |         |
|  | Yes        | 278       | 72.4    |
|  | No         | 43        | 11.2    |
| Total  |            | 321       | 83.6    |
| The decision to leave the birth place was influenced by hunger                     |            |           |         |
|  | Yes        | 271       | 70.6    |
|  | No         | 7         | 1.8     |
| Total  |            | 278       | 72.4    |

Source: own survey, 2016

As indicated from the results in the table 8, more than half 321(83.6 %) of respondents pointed that they hadn't enough food in their village. In contrast, 63(16.4 %) mentioned that they had enough food before they move to the place of destination. Form those who had hardly enough food, 278(72.4 %) were exposed to hunger. However, 43(11.2 %) of respondents acknowledged that they were not exposed to hunger in their place of origin. On the other hand, the respondents who forced to leave their village due to hunger were 271(70.6 %), and hunger had nothing influence for their decision to left their birth place consists 7(1.8 %). This imply that in the rural area, due to various constraints, the likely chance for the availability of enough food was less, and limited in itsaccessibility to majority of the people. As the data obtained from FGD, including the supply of food, almost all of the rural community's life has been dependent on the agricultural production. However, effective agricultural production in general and the supply of food in particular has mostly affected by weather conditions. Thus, the quality and quantity of agricultural production was negatively influenced by the variability of rainfall and temperature. As the result of this, the availability, and also accessibility of food to consume become a fiddly issue for most of the rural residents. Hence, it has been a problem to eat significant amount of food per a day.The FGD added that the community has been often challenged to attain food apart from agricultural production. As a result,they were derived to leave the area to search for livelihoods in the town that help them to get out from the problem. The FGD participants further indicated that although the residents have trying a lot to provide a food for their family, many of them have been failed to satisfy their family's needs. Consequently, this increases frequency and severity of famine which likely to cause people's decision to migrate. In line with this, as World Bank (2010), food insecurity was becoming a challenge for most of the rural area of Ethiopia, and could be a key

driver of historical and present rural-urban migration of the country.

In line with this fact,from the study area,one of the kebele chairs persons in key informant interview recited the situation as follows:

*" it is adistressful that our community longing for a food which they had an easy access to consume. For instance, as every one and all knows that it had not been a big deal to get potato for household consumption. Despite this fact, currently, it is a great trouble even to see such food item. So, I can say that accessing not a preferable one but any consumable food becomes defy for many of the people within the community. For this reason, people have no option except abandoning their uninhabitable rural homes."*

The above facts, without a doubt, signify that there was an immense food crisis. Thus, people have faced problem of securing the sufficient amount of food to consume in the rural area, and they used migration as a means to escape from thisdifficulty. Moreover, limited availability and accessibility of food, which contributed to recurrent hunger, was influenced people to leave their rural area.

## VI. CONCLUSION

This paper has managed to thoroughly discuss the existing socio-cultural factors in the movement of people from the rural Sodo Zuria district to Sodo town.

The reasons given by majority of the migrants for their migration were the respect that has been given from the rural community, positive accounts about the town, hunger and a need to be free from family's under control. Furthermore, the findings underlined the main socio-cultural factors which contribute to rural-urban migration.

Based on the findings, like intimate and strong social relationship between the early migrants at the place of destination and the community, rigid informal social norms, inability to spend leisure time, and

inaccessibility of sufficient food and hunger were mainly triggered to migrate from the village. Also, exaggerated information about life in, and adequate conditions of the town to act according to one's own interest and needs attracted many of the people from the study area.

### REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Belay Zeleke. 2011. Push and Pull factors of Rural-urban Migration and its Implication on the Place of Origin: The Case of Ankasha Wereda. MA thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
2. Birhan Asmame. 2011. Causes And Consequences Of Rural-Urban Migration: The case of Woldiya Town. Master Thesis, University Of South Africa.
3. Birru Busha. 1997. Rural-urban Migration in Ethiopia: The Case of Arbaminch Town: MA Thesis in Geography, Arbaminch University, Arbaminch, Ethiopia.
4. Clemens, M. and L. Pritchett. 2008. Income per Natural: Measuring Development as if People Mattered More than Places. Centre for Global Development Working Paper, No. 143.
5. Conway, G. (2009). The science of climate change in Africa: Impacts and adaptation. Grantham
6. Institute for Climate Change Discussion Paper.
7. Czaika, M and de Haas, H. 2011. The role of internal and international relative deprivation in global migration. IMI Working Papers Series 2011, No. 35.
8. Khan, A., and Somuncu, M. 2013. Rural Urban Migration in Mountain Areas and its Compatibility with in Natural, Social and Economic Regimes: A Case of Kırisciık District, Bolu Province, Turkey. Ankara Üniversitesi, Çevre Bilimleri Dergisi, 5(1), 95-104.
9. King, R. 2012. Theories and Typologies of Migration: An Overview and a Primer, Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations, Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare (MIM), Malmö University, Sweden.
10. Kiros, G-E., and White, M.J. 2004. Migration, community context and child immunization in Ethiopia. *Social Science and Medicine*, 59: 2603-2616.
11. Kristiansen, S. 2004. 'Social networks and business success: The role of Sub cultures in an African context', *The American Journal of Economics*, 63(5): 1149-1172.
12. Lalem Berhanu. 2002. The Livelihood Strategies of Rural-Urban Migrants in Addis Ababa: Case Studies of Amhara and Gurage Migrants. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
13. Leavy, J., and Smith, S. 2010. "Future farmers: Youth aspirations, expectations and life choices", Discussion Paper 013, Future Agricultures.
14. Lucas, R. E.B. 2015. Internal Migration in Developing Economies: An Overview. Knomad-Working Paper 6.
15. Sen, A. 1999. *Development as freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.
16. Van Dijk, M. P. & Fransen, J. (2008). *Managing Ethiopian Cities in an Era of Rapid Urbanization*. The Netherlands: Eburon Academic Publishers.
17. Worku Nida. 2006. The impacts of urban migration on village life, the Gurage case social Anthropology Dissertation series No.8, Addis Ababa University.
18. World Bank. 2010. *The Ethiopian Urban Migration Study 2008: The Characteristics, Motives and Outcomes of Migrants to Addis Ababa*. Report No. 55731-ET. Poverty Reduction and Economic Management: Africa Region.
19. World Bank. 2016. *Migration and Remittances Factbook 2016*, 3rd edition. Washington, DC: World Bank. doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-0319-2. Available at: [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)
20. Zemen Haddis. 2014. *Rural-Urban Migration and Land and Rural Development Policies in Ethiopia*. Paper Prepared For Presentation At The, 2014 World Bank, Conference On Land And Poverty, The World Bank - Washington Dc, 24-27 March 2014.

# GLOBAL JOURNALS GUIDELINES HANDBOOK 2018

---

[WWW.GLOBALJOURNALS.ORG](http://WWW.GLOBALJOURNALS.ORG)