Transition into adulthood: Experiences of return independent child migrants in northern Ghana

By
Stephen O. Kwankye (RIPS, University of Ghana, Legon)

Abstract

North-south independent child migration has become an important feature of migration flows in Ghana. Moving as children, they grow into adulthood and may eventually return home. This paper examines the extent to which return north-south child migrants realise their main aim of migrating out of poverty, having transited from childhood into adulthood. It answers the key question of how beneficial migration has been to the independent child migrants who eventually return home. Among other things, the paper notes that return migrants who purposely made savings in order to return were more likely to re-migrate compared to their counterparts who did not, suggesting that migrating as a child does not always guarantee the migrant an escape from poverty as they transit from childhood into adulthood.

Key words: Transition; Adulthood; Return; Independent; child migrants; Northern Ghana.

INTRODUCTION

Independent child migration has become an important feature of contemporary internal migration flows in Ghana. This is particularly visible with regard to the north-south migration movements in the country. For several years in Ghana, there has been a dichotomous spatial development with the northern half of the country being relatively less developed than the south. This has resulted in a perception that the south has opportunities for jobs and has since been a centre of attraction for migrants from other parts of the country particularly the northern regions. The contribution of migrant labour to the development of cocoa and mineral extraction in Ghana is well known (Nyame and Grant, 2007). Against this background, this paper examines the extent to which return migrants (with origins from northern Ghana) demonstrate that migrating as children is

beneficial and that they are able to live lives that depict them as better off than their peers upon their return.

Migration of people from northern Ghana to southern cities and communities is not of recent development. The composition of migrants has changed beginning with more adults to the contemporary situation where increasingly more children are migrating independent of their parents and other relations. Initially, children moved mainly accompanying their parents but this has since changed with children migrating on their own to destinations mainly in southern Ghana.

At the destination areas, especially in the cities in southern Ghana, child migrants spend a greater part of their life on the streets working to make a living amidst various challenges they face daily. Entering as children, they grow into adulthood and may eventually return home. In fact, in earlier studies, children who migrated to Accra and Kumasi reported that their main aim for moving to the two cities was to find jobs, work and accumulate some resources and to return home (Anarfi and Kwankye, 2005; Kwankye et al, 2009; 2009; Tagoe and Kwankye, 2009). This means that child migrants from northern Ghana always harbour the desire to return home.

The decision of children from the north to migrate to the south is also the result of poverty which is recorded to be higher in the northern parts of Ghana relative to other regions (Ghana Statistical Service, 2004). As a result of this poverty situation in the north, children from the north migrate to southern communities in response to poverty which is seen as the main factor that underlines the north-south migration of children in Ghana (Anarfi and Kwankye, 2005 and Kwankye et al, 2009). It is also recorded in these earlier studies that there are other children who leave school to look for money down south with

the intention of either going back to continue their schooling or to support their other siblings and families left behind. Quite clearly, although migration could disrupt the schooling of some children, others decide to take advantage of migration to accumulate resources for their future career development or in support of their families left behind.

While a lot has been written on the experiences of these young migrants who move from the north to southern destination communities, there is a huge literature gap on the socio-economic circumstances of the child migrants after they return as a way of assessing how beneficial their migration in their childhood ages has been for them. This paper, therefore, attempts to contribute to filling this gap in the literature. To achieve this goal, the paper aims at answering the following important research questions: Which of the independent child migrants return? How difficult is it for them to decide to return and what happens upon their return home? How are they able to adjust to living conditions after their return home? How are the return migrants perceived at the sending communities? Did the return migrants achieve their objective for migrating and what lessons are to be learnt?

THEORETICAL CONTEXT

The paper is conceptualised on the basis of two theoretical frameworks: the modernisation and poverty intensification or reduction frameworks. First, with regard to the modernisation framework, child migration is in response to the development imbalance between areas of origin in the north and southern destination areas. As Gurung (2000) assets, child migration in Nepal is informed by this framework which is driven by the perceived modernisation in the cities relative to the rural areas, a situation that attracts

children to migrate from the rural areas into the cities as a way of taking advantage of some of the opportunities that the cities are perceived to present. This is exactly the situation in Ghana with the south perceived to present opportunities for enhanced livelihood for migrants from the north.

Secondly, migration as an economic benefit is based on the reasoning that migration could either intensify the poverty situation of the migrants or move them out of poverty based on the outcome of their migration and the benefits that they are likely to derive from the movement (Oropesa and Landela, 2000). The paper, therefore, is conceptualised on both frameworks to assess to what extent the perception that the south presents socio-economic opportunities for the child migrants is real and how their socio-economic situation after their return is supported by the benefits they derived from having migrated as children in the first place. In effect, since many of them at the time of the survey had transited from childhood to adulthood, this paper is interested in finding out the role migration has played in this transition to make them better or worse off relative to their situation before they embarked on the migration to southern Ghana.

By transition into adulthood, the paper is looking at a situation where the return migrants migrated during their childhood ages but by the time of the survey, most of them had crossed over from childhood into adulthood (18 years and above). It does examine the possible change in their socio-economic circumstances having migrated as children and now returned as adults or getting closer to becoming adults. It, therefore, does not look at the whole process of the transition but with reference to the time of the survey, looking back to when they migrated and the experiences they have had and lessons learnt.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The paper examines a sample of 300 return migrants in respect of their livelihood styles as child migrants and the benefits they derived from migrating as children and the challenges they face as they integrate into their communities of origin upon their return. The data are from a 2007 survey conducted in two districts in Northern Region of Ghana among return migrants who had migrated to southern Ghana when they were children (less than 18 years) but had since returned to their places of origin. The sample population was made of both males and females 15-30 years and included both return migrants and non-migrants. However, this paper examines only the return migrants.

The study districts were the two main districts of origin mentioned by child migrants in a 2005 study (Anarfi and Kwankye, 2005). The selection of the sample was based on random sampling procedure after zoning the districts into clusters to facilitate the survey. In each cluster, enumerators randomly selected a point where they chose a house at random. In the first house they entered, the enumerators again randomly selected one household for enumeration based on the presence or otherwise of either a return migrant (between 15 and 30 years) who ever migrated as a child (less than 18 years) or a non-migrant of the same age range or both. Where an eligible migrant was found in that household, he/she was interviewed together with the non-migrant (if both of them were present) otherwise only one of them was interviewed. Thus, respondents were selected from one household in every other house the enumerators visited.

The data include both quantitative and qualitative information but the paper uses only the quantitative data and methods of analysis to present the results. Results are presented largely using cross tabulations. In addition, binary logistic regression analysis

is employed to assess the extent of benefit derived by the migrants from migrating as children.

RESULTS

Characteristics of the Return Migrants

The analysis of the data shows some interesting variation between the male and female return migrants interviewed in the survey in terms of their age, education, marital status, their relationship with heads of household and their age at first marriage for those who were married at the time of the survey. The results of the analysis on these characteristics are presented in Table 1. From the table, it is clear that females formed the majority (about 60%) of the sample with the males making 40%. In terms of the age break down, the return migrants had a higher concentration within ages 20-24 years particularly among the males among whom a little more than half were in this age group compared to 48% among the females. It is also seen that the females were relatively younger compared with the males on the basis that while close to a third of the females reported their ages within 15-19 years, just about 10% of their male counterparts did so. In contrast, more than a third of the males were aged 25 years and over compared to 21% of the females.

****Table 1 here*****

With regard to education, the results from Table 1 depict a variation between the males and females. Overall, more than half of the return migrants have no form of education but by sex, a huge chunk of the females (70%) compared to the males (36%)

reported to have no form of education. The highest level of education attained by any of them was secondary or senior high school (senior secondary school) and at this level, the variation between the sexes is quite wide with about 17% of the males relative to only 5% of the females reporting to have attained that level. On the other hand, in terms of marital status, more females had ever been married (more than 50%) compared with about two in five of the males. Thus, for all categories of ever-married persons (i.e., currently married, divorced or separated and living together in some form of consensual union), the proportion reporting for females is higher than the males. However, analysis based on age at first marriage does not reveal big variations between the sexes with very high proportions of either males or females marrying for the first time within ages 15-17 years. It is also seen that a relatively higher proportion of the males who had ever married did so for the first time within ages 10-14 years.

Table 1 further reveals that almost half of the return migrants continued to be resident in the households of their parents and this was largely the case for the males among whom about 60% said they were sons of their heads of household compared with 42% of the females who were daughters of their household heads. A little above 10% of the males were household heads relative to just one percent of the females who were heavily represented in households which were headed by their in-laws (23%), other relatives (19%) or spouses/partners (17%). For the males on the other hand, about 17% and 11% respectively reported to be resident in households headed by other relatives and brothers/sisters while less than one percent of them were in households headed by their spouses and none in their in-laws' households.

Migration Experience

The investigation also examined the main reasons cited by the return migrants for their decision to migrate, how long they stayed at the destination area before returning and how long since returning prior to the survey. These are presented in Table 2. The results of the analysis indicate that for a high proportion of the return migrants, the desire to look for money for their education was paramount with 61% and 46% of the males and females respectively citing this reason for migrating. Related to this reason is lack of work and financial constraints at the origin cited by 14% of the males and about 13% of the females. Again, for the females, the need to acquire some basic items particularly for marriage was a major consideration. Other relatively less important reasons that were cited by the return migrants included a visit to relatives, peer pressure and the desire to experience life in a new environment (adventure).

****Table 2 here****

Table 2 further shows that most of the return migrants were short-term migrants and close to two-thirds of them stayed up to two years or less before returning, with not much variation between the males and females although on a scale of balance a relatively higher proportion of the males reported to have stayed longer at the destination than the females. While 28% of the males stayed 3-4 years before returning, about 23% of the females did so. At the same time, 14% of the males compared to 8% of the females said they stayed five years or more at the destination area before returning home.

On the question regarding how long since returning, more than 60% of them (74% of the females and about 60% of the males) returned home less than five years prior to the survey. This means that a relatively higher proportion of the males than the females stayed longer before returning home.

Type of Work Engaged in

The study examined the type of work the return migrants were engaged in at the destination area and currently upon their return. From the results of the analysis presented in Table 3, it is quite clear that for the females, two kinds of jobs were prominent. These were *kayayoo* (head porterage) and sale of iced water (popularly called "pure water" in Ghana). On the other hand, the males were spread across several different jobs, the more important ones including working as farm labourers (24%), truck pusher (17%), iced water vendors (12%) and in some form of apprenticeship training (11%).

Comparing the situation at the destination area with that upon their return, we find a high proportion of the females reporting to be doing no work (46%) relative to less than 20% of the males. Another visible variation between the sexes is that while about a third of the males reported to be engaged in farming activities at the time of the survey, almost about the same proportion of the females were working in the trading economic activity. The results also reveal a relatively higher proportion of the females than the males to be engaged in some form of apprenticeship, the reverse of which was the case regarding the type of work they did at the destination before they returned.

****Table 3 here*****

Further analysis of the data (not shown in Table 3) revealed some variation in the earnings and assets owned by the return migrants prior to returning. For example, about 3% of the males and less than one percent of the females said they earned a monthly income of GH¢100.00 (approximately $100 at the time). However, as high as 40% of the males and 58% of the females reported that they were earning less than GH¢10 a month. It also has to be noted that more than two in three of the return migrants reported to have returned home with less than GH¢100. For those who reported to have gone back home with some property, they estimated them to be less than GH¢100.

In terms of assets owned, the variation between the sexes was that 23% and 39% of the males and females respectively reported to own no assets; 46% of the males and just one percent of the females owned a bicycle; 2% of the males and 32% of the females owned cooking utensils. At the same time, 12% of the males possessed livestock compared to only two percent of the females. In spite of these variations in assets and incomes earned and the value of property sent back home, a higher proportion of the females (52%) said they found it easier deciding to return home compared to the males (36%).

Another area of interest the paper examined was the perception of the return migrants from the stand point of the community of origin. From the return migrants' own account, the perception was mixed. This is because while some thought they were perceived as "badly behaved", others were of the view that they were seen as having made it, changed positively, returned with wealth or were enlightened. Yet, another group felt the perception very much depended on whether or not the migrant returned with considerable amount of wealth or resources. According to this group of return migrants,

they were respected if only they were conceived as having returned home with money or wealth. There is, therefore, not a one-way of perception by the community of return migrants.

Examining Migration Benefits and Re-migration Intentions

Two binary logistic regression models were run to examine the possible benefits the return migrants had from having migrated as children. First, a model was run on their own account with respect to their intention to re-migrate in the next year or two. The second model looked at whether or not they had regretted ever returning home. The results of the two models are presented in Table 4.

As was shown in the results of the two logistic regression models that were run, either model explained just about 11% variation in the respective dependent variable. In the first model, the R^2 was 11.5% and in the second, it was 10.9%. It also shows that return migrants who stayed at the destination for 1-2 and 3-4 years before returning were respectively 0.71 and 0.74 times less likely to want to migrate again compared to their counterparts who stayed less than a year ($p<.01$). Furthermore, the males were 1.8 times more likely to report that they had regretted returning compared to their female counterparts ($p<.10$). Again, return migrants who were divorced or separated were found to be 0.78 times less likely to report of having regretted returning home compared to the never married ($p<.10$). Another important finding was that those who indicated it was easy for them to decide to return were 2.1 times more likely to report that they had regretted returning home relative to their counterparts who had difficulty deciding to return ($p<.01$). Finally, return migrants who made savings for the purpose of returning

were 2.2 times more likely to migrate again compared to their counterparts who did not ($p<.05$).

****Table****

DISCUSSION

From the analysis and results presented, it is quite evident that the females far out-number the males as return migrants. This is to be expected because as seen in earlier studies, the north-south migration of children in Ghana is dominated by females (Anarfi and Kwankye, 2005, Kwankye et al. 2007, 2009), and consequently, if they are returning, it is likely that the females would be in the majority. This is also supported by the analysis on how long since their return to the effect that relatively more females were recent return migrants, suggesting that they are more likely to migrate for a shorter period and go back home perhaps quite regularly after acquiring some important items for their marriage. This is also consistent with the results from the analysis of their duration of stay at the destination area before returning. This may also be due to the fact that socio-culturally, the expectation from the society of male migrant may be much higher, the result of which is that it may take relatively longer for the males to achieve their objectives for migrating compared with the females.

The variation between the sexes in terms of education is also to be expected because in Ghana, males are relatively more educated than females and this is supported by the Ghana Demographic and Health Survey reports (Ghana Statistical Service et al., 1989, 1994, 1999, 2004 and 2009). Again, in the Northern Region, educational level

particularly among females is among the lowest in the country. Furthermore, in earlier studies, it has been shown that some children even leave school to embark on migration often when they see their peers also migrating (Kwankye et al, 2009).

It is also to be noted that in Ghana, women are more likely to marry earlier than males. This is supported by the results of the analysis on marital status and age at first marriage where a higher proportion of the female return migrants reported to be currently married or ever married. What is quite intriguing is the observation from the results of the analysis that all the return migrants who reported to have ever married did so in their childhood ages (less than 18 years), which is quite inconsistent with the laws of Ghana which put the minimum age at marriage at 18 years. Admittedly, however, this is happening against a background of a socio-cultural environment in the north where early marriage especially among females has been a practice often because many of them do not attend any form of formal education. Having a law or policy in the books may, therefore, not necessarily address the challenge of early marriage if not it is not backed by effective sensitisation before enforcement.

It is further to be noted that for many of the children in northern Ghana, migration appears to be an unavoidable option for them to acquire a living since to them, remaining at the origin presents them with no alternative route out of the poverty they perceive themselves to live in. Interestingly, the analysis shows that while some of them in spite of the challenges they faced at the destination areas were convinced they had benefited from having migrated as children to southern Ghana, their residential accommodation alone shows that not much had changed between the time they migrated and the time of their return. This is because a very high proportion of them notably the males, were still

resident in the homes of their biological parents. While this could have a foundation in the cultural residential arrangement that prevails in the north, it is also an indication that many of them upon their return are unable to find their own accommodation due to their inability to make adequate savings before returning home. The fundamental reason behind this is further explained by the fact that most of them had little or no education and, therefore, had no strong employable skills that would enable them secure jobs that promise them relatively higher incomes.

The distribution of the return migrants by the type of work they reported to have been engaged in at the destination area particularly the females is consistent with studies by Awumbila (2007), Kwankye et al (2009) which found majority of the female child migrants in the destination areas working as *kayayei* (head porters). Again, the observation that a third of the females were selling iced water in addition to a little more than half of them working as *kayayei*, is suggestive of most of the females having migrated to cities and large towns as their destination areas because these are the places where these activities thrive. In contrast, with a quarter of the males reporting to have worked as farm labourers, it provides some indications that they most likely migrated to rural communities particularly cocoa-producing areas since the cocoa industry tends to attract cheap labour from migrants as farm labourers.

When one juxtaposes work done at the destination area with that currently engaged in at the origin after returning, it is noteworthy to point out the huge chunk of them especially among the females who said they were doing no work. This may be consistent with one of the main reasons why they migrated in the first place i.e., lack of work and financial constraints at the place of origin. This could also suggest that the

return migrants might not have benefited much from having migrated with respect to wealth accumulation that could assist them invest in some businesses to engage them upon their return. This reasoning is consistent with the results of the analysis that point to the fact that as high as two-thirds of them returned home with less than GH¢100. Similarly, those who said they brought home some property estimated their value to be less than GH¢100. Linked to this is the average monthly earning they reported which was put at less than GH¢100. Quite clearly, many of the return migrants returned home with not much to boast of and, therefore, did not appear to have had positive economic changes in their lives between the period before and after migration and return.

The results of the multivariate analysis are also quite consistent. For example, with return migrants who stayed at the destination area for 1-2 and 3-4 years before returning being less likely to want to migrate again compared to their counterparts who stayed less than a year, it means that those who stay relatively longer than one year are more likely to be able to assess their economic situation at the destination area and by extension, how beneficial migration has been to them. Such persons are in a better position to make a definitive decision regarding their intention to migrate again.

Furthermore, from the results of the analysis, the male return migrants were more likely to report of having regretted returning home compared to their female counterparts. This may be largely due to the socio-cultural expectation that is placed on the shoulders of males to accumulate wealth before returning as bread winners of their families. Consequently, if upon returning, they realise that their expectation was not met, they would be the first to acknowledge that perhaps they should have stayed a little longer to try their luck in respect of wealth accumulation. For the females, not much is expected of

them and consequently, they may be satisfied with any small amount of money they return home with since their responsibility may not be as high as the males. This also explains why the females reported that they had no difficulty deciding to return home relative to the males. It is also very much to be expected that return migrants who made savings for the purpose of returning were more likely to migrate again compared to their counterparts who did not. This is because such persons are the ones who may think they had benefitted from migration and that by migrating again they anticipate being able to earn more and or accumulate more wealth.

The views of the return migrants as to how they are perceived by society, are consistent with what one is likely to find anywhere in Ghana. This is especially with regard to the assertion that the perception could be either positive or negative depending on how much wealth the return migrant is able to send back home upon return. Throughout the world, persons who make it in life are obviously accorded respect while the not-so-successful are seen as not in a position to make contributions to the welfare of either the family or society and, therefore, accorded little or no respect or dignity in society. There may, thus, not be any uniform perception of society about the return migrants as a group but certainly at the individual level which is a very consistent observation which may not be peculiar to the Northern Region of Ghana.

CONCLUSION

From the presentation so far, it is concluded that in order that children could positively transit from childhood into adulthood, they need to ensure that they acquire at least senior high school level of education before they migrate such that they would be in

a position to work even in the informal sector to earn relatively higher incomes that would aid their return and smooth re-integration into the economy as adults. Quite clearly, however, it is noted that migrating as a child from the northern to southern Ghana appears to be a gamble because while some of them report to have succeeded, others fail woefully and may not even be happy to advise their younger siblings to follow their footsteps (Kwankye et al. 2010). Interestingly, it has almost become a culture in the Northern Region where the average child would want to migrate in his/her childhood to southern Ghana either due to peer pressure or as a route out of poverty.

REFERENCES

Anarfi, J. and Kwankye, S. 2005. "The Costs and Benefits of Children's Independent Migration from Northern to Southern Ghana". Paper presented at the *International Conference on Childhoods: Children and Youth in Emerging and Transforming Societies*. Oslo, Norway, 29 June – July 3, 2005.

Awumbila, M. 2007, Internal Migration, Vulnerability and Female Porters in Accra, Ghana, Dept of Geography and Resource Development, University Of Ghana, Legon. http://.paa2007.princeton.edu/download.aspx?submissionId=70865

Ghana Statistical Service and ORC Macro. 1989. Ghana Demographic and Health Survey 1988. Calverton, Maryland: GSS and ORC Macro.

Ghana Statistical Service and ORC Macro. 1994. Ghana Demographic and Health Survey 1993. Calverton, Maryland: GSS and ORC Macro.

Ghana Statistical Service and ORC Macro. 1999. Ghana Demographic and Health Survey 1998. Calverton, Maryland: GSS and ORC Macro.

Ghana Statistical Service. 2004. Ghana Living Standards Survey (GLSS4, 1998/1999), Ghana Statistical Service, Accra, Ghana.

Ghana Statistical Service, Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research (NMIMR), and ORC Macro. 2004. *Ghana Demographic and Health Survey 2003*. Calverton, Maryland: Ghana Statistical Service, NMIMR, and Macro.

Ghana Statistical Service, Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research (NMIMR), and ORC Macro. 2009. *Ghana Demographic and Health Survey 2008*. Calverton, Maryland: Ghana Statistical Service, NMIMR, and Macro.

Gurung, Y.B. (2000) 'Can Child Migration in Nepal be Explained under the Modernization Perspective?' *Population and Development in Nepal*. May 7: 135-52.

Hashim, I. 2005. Research Report of Children's Independent Migration from North Eastern Ghana to Central Ghana, Research Report, Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty, Brighton, University of Sussex.

Kwankye, S.O., Anarfi, J.K, Tagoe, C.A. and Castaldo, A. 2007. Coping Strategies of Independent Child Migrants from Northern Ghana to Southern Cities". Migration DRC WP-T23. November.

Kwankye, S.O., Anarfi, J.K, Tagoe, C.A. and Castaldo, A. 2009. "Independent North-South Child Migration in Ghana: The Decision Making Process". Sussex Centre for Migration Research Working Paper T-29. February.

Kwankye, S.O., Anarfi, J.K., Tagoe, C.A. and Castaldo, A. 2009. "Independent North-South Child Migration in Ghana: The Decision Making Process". Sussex Centre for Migration Research Working Paper T-29. February.

Kwankye, S.O. 2010. The Social and Reproductive Health Implications of Independent North-South Child Migration in Ghana. *Research Review. NS 26.2*, 19-27.

Nyame, F.K. and Grant, J.A. 2007. *Implications of Migration Patterns Associated with the Mining and Minerals Industry in Ghana*. http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/pdfs (downloaded on 07/03/08).

Oropesa, R. S. and Landele, N. S. 2000. From austerity to prosperity? Migration and child poverty among mainland and island Puerto Ricans. Demography 2000; 37(3):323-38.

Tagoe, C.A. and Kwankye, S.O. 2009. Returning Home and Re-integrating as an Independent Child Migrant in Ghana. *Independent Migration of Children in Ghana.* Anarfi, J.K. and Kwankye, S.O. (eds), Accra, Ghana, pp. 206-247.

Table 1. Percent of return migrants by sex and their background characteristics

Characteristic	Male	Female	Total
Age			
15-19	9.9	31.3	22.7
20-24	53.7	48.0	50.3
25+	36.4	20.6	27.0
Education			
No Education	35.5	70.3	56.3
Religious (Islamic)	7.5	2.3	4.4
Primary	15.7	14.5	15.0
Middle/JSS	24.0	7.3	14.0
Secondary/SSS	16.5	5.0	9.7
Not stated	0.8	0.6	0.7
Marital status			
Never married	61.2	44.6	51.3
Currently married	36.4	47.5	43.0
Divorced/separated	2.5	3.4	3.0
Living together	0.0	4.5	2.7
Age at first marriage			
< 10 years	0.8	1.7	1.3
10-14 years	19.8	17.3	18.3
15-17 years	79.3	81.0	80.4
Relationship to HH			
Head	11.6	1.1	5.3
Spouse/partner	0.8	17.3	10.6
Son/daughter	59.5	41.9	49.0
Brother/sister	10.7	3.4	10.0
Other relative	16.5	19.0	18.0
In-law	0.0	22.7	13.5
Unrelated/friend	0.8	0.0	0.3
Total Number	121	179	300

JSS: Junior Secondary School; SSS: Senior Secondary School; HH: Head of Household.
Source: Generated from Return Migration Survey, 2007.

Table 2. Percent of return migrants by sex, duration of stay and years since return

Variable	Male	Female	Total
Reason for migrating			
Work for money to fulfil responsibility	3.3	2.8	3.0
Lack of work and financial constraints	14.0	12.8	13.3
Because friends were going	2.5	3.9	3.3
To get some basic items	1.7	10.1	6.7
For better education and self improvement	4.1	0.0	1.7
To experience life in a changed environment	2.5	1.7	2.0
Visited/sent by relative/joined relative	5.8	3.4	4.3
Attracted by what other migrants brought home	0.0	1.7	1.0
To get basic items for marriage	0.0	11.7	7.0
Look for money for education	0.0	4.5	2.7
To look for work	61.1	45.7	52.0
To learn a trade	5.0	0.0	2.0
Other reasons	0.0	1.7	1.0
Duration of stay (years)			
< 1	10.7	12.8	12.0
1-2	47.1	55.9	52.4
3-4	28.1	22.9	25.0
5+	14.1	8.4	10.7
Years since return (years)			
< 1	9.1	11.2	10.3
1-2	30.6	40.2	36.3
3-4	19.0	22.3	21.0
5-9	33.1	20.7	25.7
10+	7.4	5.6	6.3
Not stated	0.8	0.0	0.4
Total Number	121	179	300

Source: Generated from Return Migration Survey, 2007.

Table 3. Percent of Return migrants by sex and type of work engaged in

Type of work	Male	Female	Total
At destination			
No work	3.3	0.6	1.7
Head porterage (*kayayoo*)	5.0	52.5	33.4
Truck pusher	17.4	0.0	7.0
Apprentice/student	10.7	1.7	5.4
Mechanic	0.8	0.0	0.3
Domestic help	4.1	3.9	4.0
Sale of Iced water	11.6	33.5	24.7
Farm labourer	24.0	0.6	10.0
Shop/chop bar worker	0.8	6.7	4.3
Labourer	9.9	0.6	4.3
Other	12.4	0.0	4.9
On return (currently)			
No work	18.2	45.8	34.7
Farming	34.7	1.1	14.7
Trading	13.2	31.3	24.0
Vocational	9.1	1.7	4.7
Non-paid family business	2.5	3.9	3.3
Formal sector paid job	2.5	1.1	1.7
Apprenticeship	9.9	12.3	11.3
Other	9.9	2.8	5.6
Total Number	121	179	300

Source: Generated from Return Migration Survey, 2007.

Table 4. Results of Binary Logistic regression Analysis

Model 1: Intention to re-migrate				**Model 2: Whether they have regretted returning**			
Independent Variable	B	S.E	Odds ratio	Independent Variable	B	S.E	Odds ratio
Age group (RC=<10)				Age group			
20-24	.390	.419	1.476	20-24	-.538	.392	.584
25+	.276	.503	1.317	25+	-.169	.479	.845
Education (RC = No education)				Education			
Primary	.193	.435	1.213	Primary	.171	.397	1.187
Middle/JHS+	.547	.397	1.729	Middle/JHS+	.330	.370	1.390
Type of destination (RC = rural)				Age at first migration			
Urban	.463	.477	1.588	10-14	1.575	1.182	4.831
Marital status (RC = Never married)				15-17	1.549	1.138	4.708
Married	-.392	.342	.676	Marital status			
Divorced/separated	-.203	.910	.816	Married	-.259	.310	.771
Duration of stay (yrs) RC = <1 yr)				Divorced/separated	-1.531	.811	.216*
1-2	-1.237	.451	.290***	Duration of stay (yrs)			
3-4	-1.346	.522	.260***	1-2	-.626	.462	.535
5+	-.093	.633	.911	3-4	-.078	.528	.925
Sex (RC = female)				5+	.039	.656	1.039
Male	-.336	.372	.715	Sex			
Savings for returning (RC = No)				Male	.572	.327	1.772*
Yes	.772	.383	2.164**	Did work at destination	.439	.308	1.550
Constant	-1.064	.654	.345	Easy deciding to return	.717	.285	2.048**
				Constant	-.771	1.294	.463
***p<.01; **p<.05; R^2 = .115				**p<.05; *p<.05; R^2 = .109			

Source: Generated from Return Migration Survey, 2007.