Outcomes of Rural-out Migration as Livelihood Strategy to the Rural People: The Case of Iringa and Njombe regions, Tanzania

Rwechungura, F.A[1]

Abstract

This study assessed whether rural-out migration as a livelihood strategy enhanced livelihoods of rural households in Iringa and Njombe regions in Tanzania. Specifically, the study tried to examine what were the outcomes of rural-out migration and remittances from it to household assets. The study used cross-sectional data involving 272 migrant and non-migrant households which were analyzed purely descriptively to generate the information sought out of it.

Findings revealed that out of 272 households, 93(34%) had out-migrants. On the outcomes of migration to the households' assets, migration did not have any significance to the households; instead it had more detrimental outcomes, including withdrawal of productive human resource/labour from the migrant households; family abandonment; erosion of social morals; spread of HIV/AIDS; increasing number of vulnerable children; and school drop-out.
The main conclusion from these findings is that unlike what many other studies had found (in other countries), out-migration did not have better outcomes to the livelihoods of rural households in the studied districts. The policy implication of these findings is that unless rural livelihoods are improved, rural-out migration will continue, as rural dwellers continue searching for 'greener pastures.' As this continues, poverty is perpetuated. Consequently, not only will this affect urban and other economically vibrant areas where migrants continue flocking to by saturating these destinations' capacity to handle the migrants, it will also affect poor rural areas negatively by draining their energetic and productive human resource.

Key words: Rural Livelihoods, Rural Livelihoods diversification, rural-out migration, Remittances & Rural Development

[1] Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, Mzumbe University, P.O.Box 5 Mzumbe, Tanzania

Introduction

Understanding peoples' poverty and their livelihoods, whether they are sustainable or not, has become an important focus within international development literatures and policy debates (Waddington, 2003). The Sustainable Livelihoods approach advanced (mainly) by the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom, defines livelihoods as 'the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living' (Carney 1998: 213). According to Ellis (2000:10) "a livelihood comprises the assets[2], the activities, and the access to these (mediated by institutions and social relations) that together determine the living gained by the individuals or households". The very much known broad and basic categories of livelihood strategies that a household located in a particular context and economy may choose from includes three major bunches of livelihood options which involve agricultural intensification and extensification, income diversification, and migration (Scoones, 1998). More importantly, De Haan and Rogaly (2002), in their significant collection on labour mobility and rural society, argue that migration is much more common as a livelihood strategy for the poor than is frequently suggested.

Various literatures on livelihood diversification strategies acknowledge that rural-out migration is one of the major possible strategies open to rural households to diversify their portfolio of activities and thus alleviate their poverty. Migration includes people who move for different reasons across different spaces (see Skeldon, 2002). This paper defines rural-out migration which is

[2] Natural assets, physical assets, financial or economic assets, social assets and human assets

undertaken by households and individuals with a purpose of gaining returns or enhancing their livelihoods as the "*departure of an individual(s) or households, for more than a week or so, from the small, primarily agricultural communities in which they live and move out to reside in another locality in order to engage in one or more livelihood activities*" (Adapted from Ellis, 2000). In this case I focus on voluntary migration (mainly involving jobseekers who move rom their locality to another locality for better economic opportunities) rather than all other types of (e.g. forced) migration. However, in migration studies it is worth noting that the term "voluntary" needs to be thought of advisedly since the majority of rural dwellers live so close to livelihood failure such that the actions they take towards preventing such failure can hardly be described as free choices (Ellis, 2003). I also, propose that, the forms of migration patterns or options which are open to poor rural people and which are considered to be part of their livelihood diversification strategies takes place within national borders (i.e. internal migration) or can be cross-border (i.e. moving to neighboring countries, the move that does not require strict conditions to be fulfilled). I believe these types of movements form a major part of livelihood diversification strategy due to their ease accessibility to the rural poor as compared to those which take place far beyond national borders.

Rationale for the study

Throughout the literature, it is widely acknowledged that the effects of rural-out migration are more controversial and least clarity exists on its developmental outcomes to sending households and areas of origin. This controversy has become an issue of concern for development studies and policy makers (Ghatak *et al.*, 1996). It is conceived that there may be a two-way relationship between improved household income and migration, resulting in mixed verdicts on this point (Deshingkar and Start, 2003). For instance, a study conducted in Palamur labour in India, Chakrapani and Vijaya Kumar (1994) noted that there was an increase in migrants' incomes compared to before migration. Also, research on migration in Dungarpur by Haberfeld *et al* (1999) found that households that were sending migrants had higher income levels than those not sending migrants. But on the other hand, Kothari's (2002) review of migration studies found that migration can both reduce and perpetuate poverty. More specifically, internal migration which involves people moving from one community or administrative unit to another community of the same cultural space for settlement or for work is not widely addressed in the current literature. For that case its effects on the livelihoods of the sending households or communities is uncovered or remains unclear. For example in the case of Punjab, India, an area with a long tradition of out-migration, very few studies trace the effects of migration and remittances on the villages of origin (Helweg, 1993). Various authors have acknowledged that rural-out migration does exist and can be an important parameter in population change, but there are neither the data nor the techniques to deal with it adequately, either in its own right or in its relationship with other aspects of population dynamics (Ayiemba, 1990).

While from the literature we note that a lot of scholarly work in the area of rural-out migration has been undertaken in Asian countries (e.g. India, Bangladesh and China) and some African countries (e.g. Egypt, Kenya and South Africa), very scant by way of serious research has been undertaken in Tanzania. Even in cases where migration has been observed or studied, the outcomes of rural-out migration to the sending (migrant) households or areas of origin has not been adequately investigated. The few existing Tanzanian studies include for example that of Mbonile (1996) entitled "Towards Breaking The Vicious Circle of Labour Migration in Tanzania: A Case of Makete District" that explored a few options which people from former labour reserve areas such as Makete District could use to reduce overdependence on labour migration. The study suggested establishment of small businesses to address the problem. Katalyeba's (2002) "Study on rural - rural movements in East Africa: A study of Rwandan and Southern Ugandans in Karagwe District, Tanzania" suggests that there are unattended movements especially by researchers and academicians which have a significant contribution in population dynamics and of course that can have varying outcomes to sending households. However, with these attempts to study rural-out migrations, the puzzle of "the outcomes of rural-out migration as rural households' livelihoods option to enhance the livelihoods of sending households" has been left unresolved. Based on the existence of this ambiguity of the outcome of migration to sending households and having less done towards solving it, this paper attempts or rather augments previous studies to contribute towards solving it by investigating the outcomes that rural-out migration have had to the sending households in Tanzania, particularly in the research areas.

Data and Methods

The data for this study was collected from 12 villages of Makete District in Njombe Region and 12 villages in Iringa Rural District of Iringa Region of Tanzania during August – September 2012. A mixed sampling procedure was adopted whereby while on the one hand the regions and districts were selected purposively, on the other hand fishbowl draw simple random sampling technique was used to select wards.

Based on village registers, a partial-random (systematic) sampling procedure were adopted to select a sample of 272 households that were covered throughout the study. In order to cover the information on migration, a ~~modified~~ definition of a household as put forward by Agesa and Kim (2001) and Hossain (2001) was modified and adopted for the purpose of this paper. A household was defined as "*a dwelling unit where a group of persons usually live together in the same home or compound (commonly referred* *to as the "extended" African family) and takes food from common kitchen and are bound by ties of kinship in that they are answerable to the same household head.*" By employing this definition, the study also included household members who live outside the village but claim the household to be their own. Persons of this category are those who work outside the villages and often send remittances. Such persons are called migrants or the migrated members of the household and such households are known as migrant household (Hossain, 2001). This households' definition fits exactly to Tanzanian context and serves the purpose of this paper because without incorporating household members living outside it would be difficult to associate migrants with sending (migrant) households. For that case this definition properly links migrants and sending (migrant) households which makes possible to trace the remitting behavour of migrants.

Rural-out migration as a livelihood strategy

From the livelihood approach context, sustainable livelihoods are achieved through access to a range of livelihood resources which are referred to as 'assets' or 'capitals'. Moreover, it is worth noting that the things that people or households do by using the asset base owned or accessed in pursuit of a living are the ones referred to in the livelihood context as livelihood 'activities or strategies'(Ellis, 2000; Scoones, 1998 and Chambers and Conway, 1992). Consequently, migration as an undertaking done by households in the study areas was considered to be one of the main activities or strategies that households in Iringa Region undertake in order to enhance their living. According to Ellis (2003), people's livelihood efforts conducted in order to improve their living result in outcomes: higher or lower material welfare (human capital), reduced or raised vulnerability to food insecurity (physical capital), improving or degrading environmental resources (natural capital), and so on. Equally important, this context applies to rural-out migration (the subject under study) undertaken by rural households in the study areas, it may as well result into improved or worsened livelihoods of sending households.

Drawing on this approach, the outcomes of rural-out migration to migrant households in the study areas were assessed based on whether their asset base had improved or impoverished as a consequence of sending out a migrant(s). The asset base or portfolio of the studied households was composed of five (make use of asset pentagon) types of capital assets i.e. human, social, natural, physical, and financial as suggested by Scoones (1998:4) and Carney (1998:5), which are owned, controlled, claimed and/or in some other means accessed by rural households and individuals. For that case, this study focused on assessing whether rural-out migration practiced as the households' livelihoods strategy had contributed to improving or impoverishing the household's asset base. In other words the study was about investigating what was the outcomes of rural-out migration to these household's capital assets in their totality or singly. Each of these household assets was treated/assessed separately so as to easily identify the contribution of migrants in building up or eroding them. As stated previously, the study aimed at assessing the outcomes that rural-out migration might have to sending households through the actual contribution of migrants in order to create or improve household assets such as widening their social networks, to supporting agricultural activities and opening up new non-farm employment opportunities. It was assumed that income from remittances sent back home by migrants would enable households to invest in farm and non-farm activities and entrepreneurial endeavours which may in turn create employment opportunities for other villagers. Other ways that migrants were assumed to contribute to households and the development of their place of origin was through collective donations of time, business networks, investments and the transfer of skills, culture, knowledge and experience obtained from destinations.

Results and Discussion

a) Migration attributes

A total of 272 households were surveyed, out of which 93(38%) had migrants i.e. they were migrant households and these had a total of 187 migrants, while 179(78%) surveyed households did not have migrants i.e. they were non-migrant households.

However, the study recognized the fact that migrants were not expected to contribute or remit uniformly to their remaining households. It was assumed that migrants' contribution could be affected by factors (migration attributes) such as migrants' places of migration or destinations, duration of stay, educational achievement and occupations at destinations. Based on these migration attributes, the results show that 147 (79%) out of the total 187 migrants had migrated to urban areas (to cities, municipals and towns) while only 40 (21%) had migrated to rural areas. Furthermore, out of 147 urban migrants, 86 (59%) were male and 61 (41%) were females, while out of 40 rural migrants, 27 (67%) were males and the remaining 13(33%) females. Having more migrants moving to urban areas as compared to rural areas signified the potentiality of urban areas in attracting rural populations arguably due to vibrant economic activities found there which acts as pull factors to them. This finding is supported by the results on the reasons for migration which show that, a large proportion of migrants (90%) of the 187 had migrated from their areas of origin due to economic reasons while only 10% had migrated due to other reasons. None of the migrants had crossed borders to neighbouring countries for search of better livelihoods. Most migrants (81%) had stayed for more than one year while only 19% had stayed for a period of between 1-12 months. The main point drawn here is that urban migration is dominant over rural one due to reasons mentioned previously and thus economic reasons were the major motive for most households to send out migrants. These findings seem to be consistent with other studies mentioned previously for instance Ellis (2003) and. Francis. and Hoddinott, (1993).

Furthermore in terms of occupations, the findings show that migrants were engaged in different occupations both at origin and destination. The essence for analysing migrant's occupations was mainly to find out what were migrants' occupations at destinations which could suggest migrants' earnings and subsequently their remitting power. Table 1.1 provides more information and particularly shows that at destinations migrants were engaged into the same kinds of jobs they were engaged in at origin but at varying proportions or extent.

Table 1.1: Migrants' occupations

Nature of occupation	Number of migrants at origin in ac occupation	Number of migrants at destination in an occupation
Students	34(18%)	15(8%)
Farming/livestock (wage)	31(17%)	13(7%)
Off-farm (agricultural)	33(18%)	12(6%)
Non-farm wage (non-agricultural)	51(27%)	65(35%)
Non-farm (self-employment)	38(20%)	82(44%)
Total	**187(100%)**	**187(100%)**

From Table 1.1, it is obvious that the number of migrants per occupation category at destination decreased compared to origin with the exception of two which include non-farm wage i.e. non-agricultural and self-employment. For instance, the number of migrants engaged in non-farm wage (non-agricultural related activities) increased from 27% at origin to 35% at destination, while non-farm (self-employment) increased more than twice from 20% at origin to 44% at destination. These results are actually telling us that most migrants had shifted from the occupations they were engaged in at origin to the two types of occupations which were non-farm wage (non-agricultural) and non-farm (self-employment) at destination. More importantly, these results revealed that this occupational shift had no impact on migrants' earnings i.e. it did not make them different from what they originally were in terms of earning power. More specifically, this occupational shift did not enable them to remit more at home as was expected of them, and thus suggesting that migrant's remitting behaviour might be highly dependent on the nature of occupation at destination (this study has shown that most migrants are engaged in poorly paying jobs at destination).

Additionally, the results on the analysis of migrants' occupations at destination are also telling us that the two sectors at destination are attracting more migrants than others. According to the responses obtained from surveyed households and key informants was that these kinds of occupations were the easiest to get compared to professional ones which required high levels of education attainments. Table 2.1 shows that migrants' education levels were very low (low human capital) such that this was an entry barrier to professional jobs and thus poor earning potential. In simple terms, migrants were switching from agricultural related activities which are the main engagements in rural areas where migrants originate to non-agricultural activities at destination which are more dominant in urban areas as compared to areas of migrants' origin.

Table 2.1: Migrants' educational levels

Variable	Education attributes	No. of migrants	%age
Education level	Never schooled	8	4
	Primary school	146	78
	Secondary school	28	15
	Others	5	3

According to sending households and key informants, the kinds of occupation migrants are engaged in at destinations are mainly low paying jobs such as selling hand held items “machingas”, working in shops (shop keepers), house helpers (maids), bar maids, conductors in commuter buses, feeding animals especially for those who migrate to urban areas. For those migrating to rural areas they were mainly engaged in planting crops (for wages), weeding, harvesting especially in areas where large farming agricultural activities takes place such as Usangu rice farms, tea plantations, and so on. None of the migrants were engaged in public/private sector employment both at origin and destination.
Another interesting finding was that the number of those who left home for schooling was found to be 34(18%), but it was only 15(8%) who were in school at the time of field work. It was later found that the other 10% had quitted school for work. In this way migration had contributed to school dropout and therefore depletion of households’ human capital. Generally, since there were no major changes in the occupations migrants were engaged in at origin and destination, certainly migration did not add value in terms of occupational advancement, suggesting low or no earnings that could be obtained from them.

b) Outcomes of migration

In order to get insights on how rural-out migration had contributed to build up various assets owned or accessed by the households, firstly households were asked if they owned or had access to a certain type of asset. Secondly, households were asked if migrant(s) had contributed anything to the creation or maintenance or development of that particular asset at least within the past one year. For that case, the following section presents the findings on selected attributes of household asset portfolio and forms the core of the paper.

a) Human capital

i) Skills development

Responding to a question as to whether the household had benefited/gained in anyways in the form of skills brought back by a migrant member, a total of 13(14%) out of 93 total migrant households responded to have in some extent gained while a total of 80(86%) households responded not to have gained. The composition of the kinds of skills gained is presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Type of skills gained by migrants

Type of skills gained	No. of households benefited	Percentage (%)
Carpentry	7	54
Driving	4	30
Cookery	1	8
Animal keeping	1	8
Total	**13**	**100**

From Table 3.1, one could see that in terms of skills gained from migration, it was only a small proportion of them (less than $1/4^{th}$)

that had benefited from migration. Since the number of beneficiary households was far below half the total number of migrant households, this means our assumption was not met and this means migration did not potentially contribute to building household's human capital. It was further revealed that, migrants had acquired these skills as a result of the occupations they were engaged in at destinations (i.e. in the industry that had absorbed them). Moreover, the information obtained from the households showed that the skills acquired were completely new, since at origin the migrants concerned were farmers and had no any other skills. In this case, at an individual level, migration had slightly contributed to building human capital; but not at household level. In a way, this had shown a direct relationship between the nature of occupation at destination and skills that might be acquired by migrants and thus its potentiality to building this household asset.

ii) Household health status

When respondents were asked whether for the past one year there was any household member (at home) who had suffered from any illness or injury which required to spend money for treatment, out of 93 migrant households, 59 (63%) responded to have had members who had suffered from various illnesses and needed assistance in getting treated for some illness while 34 households (37%) responded not to have any suffered members. The incidents of household members falling sick varied from one household to another and for the purpose of the study only the first two incidents were considered. But also the kind of sickness differed from one household to another and within the household, and this had the implication for the amount of money required for treatment and therefore the amount to be contributed by a migrant member(s). The (most common) types of sickness included high and low blood pressure, coughing, delivery, eye problems, fever, fire burn, flu, hand injuries, HIV/AIDS, insanity, lame, leg injuries, leukemia, malaria, stomach operation, pneumonia, respiratory tract problems, running stomach, skin diseases, stomach problems, tuberculosis, asthma, headache, heart problems, and wounds.

To get insights of how migration had contributed to the betterment of the household health status, the 59 households whose members had fallen sick were asked if there were an incidence where they had contacted a migrant member to help with the treatment expenses of the suffering household member. Out of 59 migrant households with suffered household members only 15(25%) responded to have sought and received assistance from their migrant members while 44(75%) households responded to have sought but not received any assistance. These results showed that it was only a quarter (25%) of total households with suffered members that had received assistance from migrants while three quarters (75%) sought for assistance but could not be assisted. This number of households which benefited from migration again falls far below the assumption made earlier (i.e. below halfway of total migrant households that sought assistance from migrants). Once again, this shows how migration did not potentially contribute to building up the health status of sending households. Since there were several incidences household members had fallen sick, respondents from these households were further asked how often migrants were approached for help. Out of 15 households which responded to have received help from migrants, ten (10) of them responded to have contacted and received assistance from migrants every time a household member fell sick while five (5) responded to have received assistance from migrants once in a while when a member of household fell sick.

Furthermore, 44(75%) households which had responded not to have received any assistance from migrants were further asked what the reasons for their migrant member(s) failing to assist with the treatment expenses of the sick members were. All 44 households responded to this question and it was found that

26(59%) households reported to have informed the migrant(s) but they failed to assist on the grounds that they were willing to assist but they had no money, 12(27%) households responded to have informed migrant members who simply promised to assist but they did not , and 6(14%) households responded to have informed the migrant but never received any assistance and did not know what might have been the reasons for them not to assist. Again, these findings reveal that migration and remittances from it did not have any significant contribution to building up of the household asset base/portfolio.

b) Financial capital (assets)

Economic or financial assets of households were defined by this study to include attributes such as cash, savings facilities (types and number of savings facilities accessible to households e.g. bank accounts), credit facilities (number and credit facilities accessible to household) and claims (number and quantities of claims that either institutions or individual owe the household). In order to get insights of the outcomes of migration on various attributes of household assets, migrant households were asked to respond to questions as to whether they had access to the above mentioned facilities and if a migrant member had in anyway helped the household to get access to the facilities. For example, households were asked if there were any member(s) who were operating bank accounts and if a migrant member had helped to open and/or run the account.

The results showed that out of 93 migrant households which responded to this question, it was only 6(7%) households which had bank accounts, three (3) households from each district. But due to the importance of this information about how rural people accessed financial services, it was of interest to know from which wards and villages these households were coming from. It was found that, the three households in Makete district, two of them were from Lupalilo ward in Ilevelo and Ugabwa villages. These villages are located close (around 25-30kms) to Makete district headquarters where the National Micro Finance Bank has its branch. The last household from Makete District was from Matamba ward in Ndapo village, a village located very far from the district headquarter (=>60 kms one way). The remaining three households were from Iringa Rural district, two were from Ismani Tarafani village of Kihorogota ward while the last one was from Nzihi village of Nzihi ward. This distribution of households assessing bank services basically were suggesting that modern financial services in the study areas and possibly many other rural areas in the country were missing or rather inaccessible by the poor rural households for the reasons that are not well explained.

Data from the field revealed that the low rate of using banks was caused mainly by the long distances between where the banks were located (mainly in towns) and the rural areas. This could be translated into higher transport costs which if included to other costs involved to opening and running bank accounts, lead to rural people using other unsafe traditional ways of keeping the little money they have. But also it was learnt that rural people had less cash to deposit in banks, since in economic terms any banked money is idle money, therefore these rural people had no idle money to keep in the banks. When responding to the question as whether migrant member(s) had contributed to the opening and running of the bank accounts, out of the six (6) households with bank accounts, only one (1) household responded to have received some money once in year 2008 from a migrant member to maintain or run the account. This household was from Makete district, Lupalilo ward in Ilevelo village and the amount received was Tanzanian Shillings 50,000/= (equivalent to USD 30). The possible reasons provided as to why migrants were not sending money which they ultimately save into bank accounts, most of them responded that their migrant members had no money to send back home. However, very interestingly one respondent from

Matamba ward responded by posing a question that, *if migrants could not send back home money for taking care of the remaining families, how could they send money to save/keep in the bank account?*

Furthermore, we wanted to get an idea if Makete and Iringa Rural people had saved their money in non-productive assets such as gold and jewelry (another form of households' financial asset) and if migrants had contributed for the possession of these items. The results were not much surprising as none of the 93 migrant households that responded to this question had received any contribution from a migrant member. The main reason we could draw out of this was that, these items are very expensive for rural households to afford and probably less valued like in urban areas but also migrant members mostly those in urban areas could not send them back to their families in form of gifts. Thus, the study concludes that, migrants (rural-out migration) had not contributed in building the financial asset of households by enabling them possess any wealth in savings in non-productive assets such as gold and jewelry which in time of need could be transformed into cash to meet various the households' needs.

c) Physical capital

Selected physical assets attributes which were addressed under this construct (variable) were basic household infrastructures which included transport facilities, shelter, communication facilities, and production equipment, being the major means that enabled people or households to pursue their livelihoods. In order to get an insight of the contribution of migration to this household asset, all of the above mentioned household infrastructures were assessed one after another and the contribution from migration to the creation and/or maintenance of the asset was identified and assessed. To some infrastructures the contribution of migration was magnificent but to some it was very insignificant. But the main objective was not to calculate how much migration had contributed to building this capital asset; instead it was to assess the potential of migration to building the capital asset in terms of how many households had benefited from migrants' contribution against those that did not benefit.

i) Contribution to transportation

In order to get insights of the contribution of migration to the provision and maintenance of transport services to the household, a list of transport facilities were identified and respondents were required to respond as to whether they were present in their household and whether migrant(s) had contributed to their acquisition and maintenance. Transportation facilities included bicycles, tricycles, motorcycles, cars/vehicles, donkey carts, tractors and trailers and wheel barrows owned by the household concerned. The results revealed that, none of 93 migrant households were found to own tricycles, cars/vehicles, motorcycles, and tractor and trailers. Since these transport facilities are the ones used in other areas for transporting people, goods and harvests from the farms and for other transport needs, their absence in the study areas portrays the extent of transportation problems in the research areas and possibly this could also apply to other rural areas of developing countries and Tanzania inclusive.

For example, only a total of 31 (33%) households out of 93 migrant households were found to own bicycles and one household (1%) were found to own a donkey cart all of which were acquired by purchasing. However, none of these households had received contribution from migrant member(s) for acquiring these facilities. The only explanation for migrants not contributing to acquisition of transport facilities was that, when migrants were approached for assistance some would say they had no money to send back home while others would just keep quiet and others would promise to assist but never assisted. This might be suggesting that either the earnings migrants were getting were not enough to sustain themselves and send back home for keeping the remaining household i.e. for purchasing transport facilities, or if they were getting enough earnings to retain some savings, then there were no willingness to remit home. However, this is the area where this study would propose further research to study migrants remitting behaviour. More importantly this study found that most migrants were self-employed or employed in very low paying jobs and which were very much informal such as street vending of goods, feeding animals for food and little pay by the end of the month and others of the like, these kinds of engagements at destination did not enable migrants to remit anything back home. This could initially possibly explain the reason for poor remitting behaviour amongst migrants in the study areas. These results shown that migration had not potentially made any significant contribution to household's transportation services and therefore suggesting that there were no potentialities for rural out migration to build this component of household's physical capital asset.

ii) Contribution to shelter

Another attribute of physical capital was shelter which basically meant buildings or houses where household members find their shelter. On this aspect, the main concern was on how migration had contributed to building houses (if the members were living in own built houses), purchasing houses (if members were living in purchased houses), renting houses (if members were living in rented houses), but also if migration had contributed to the repair and maintenance of houses built, purchased and/or rented. The results shown that out 93 migrant households, 85 households (91%) reported to live in own built houses, six (7%) households reported to live in inherited houses from their parents while two (2%) households reported to live in purchased or bought houses. None of the households were found to live in rented houses suggesting that renting houses is more applicable in urban than in rural areas.

Moreover, the results shows that out of 85 households which were living in own built households, only seven (8%) households had received contribution from migrants to build their houses. The minimum amount contributed by migrants was Tshs 20,000/= (equivalent to USD 15) (8%) for a household which required a total of Tshs. 250,000/= (USD 150) while the maximum amount contributed by migrant was Tshs. 1,500,000/= (USD 897) (60%) for a household which required a total of Tshs. 2,500,000 /= (USD 1495) for building a living house. None of the households reported to have received assistance from migrant(s) for maintenance and repairs of their houses. These results were telling us that migration had not potentially made any significant contribution to household's shelter provision and therefore there were no potential for rural-out migration to build this component of household's physical capital.

iii) Contribution to communication facilities

Communication services or facilities were also addressed under this household capital asset. Mainly the facilities assessed under this attribute were equipment for information sharing and communication, in which included radios, television sets, mobile phones and fixed/landline phones. Respondents were required to respond to a question as to whether they owned these facilities and if migrants had contributed to their acquisition and maintenance. Out of 93 migrant households, 91 (98%) of them responded to own at least one of the communication and information sharing equipment listed above. More specifically, 59 (65%) households responded to own mobile phones while 31 (34%) households reported to own radios and one (1) household (1%) reported to own television set. No single household reported to own fixed phone lines, this was mainly due to the nature of the rural setting where the only service provider (Tanzania Telecommunication Company Limited) hasn't reached the locality.

The results revealed that two (3%) out of 59 households which reported to own radios reported to have had received assistance or contribution from migrant members for their acquisition. Also, three (10%) households out of 31 which reported to own mobile phones had received contribution from migrant members for their acquisition. These results were telling us that, as whole the contribution of rural-out migration was very marginal such that it was insignificant to the acquisition and maintenance of the communication facilities and thus had no potential to promote rural-livelihoods for rural households. However, for those households which received migrant's assistance, it was obvious that this contribution was significant at individual household level as revealed by the results above.

iv) Contribution to production facilities/equipment/inputs

The last attribute to be assessed under this construct (physical capital/assets) was production facilities which included production equipment and agricultural inputs. The essence was to assess the contribution of migration to assets which were used to create cash directly or indirectly by creating items which could be later converted into cash for the household. For example, shops create cash directly by selling items to customers while power saws are used to produce timbers which later are sold to create cash for households. Production facilities included hand hoes, oxen ploughs, power saws, sewing machines, shop/kiosk, pit saw blades, spraying machines, milling machines, fishing equipment, fertilizer distributors, planter & harvesting machines, incubators, power tillers, animal feeding & milking machines, hand milling & coffee pulping machines, fertilizers, improved seeds, herbicides and pesticides.

In order to get insights of the contribution of migrants to the ownership of particular production assets, respondents were subjected to a couple of question. For production equipment respondents were required to answer whether the household owns a certain asset and whether the migrant member(s) had contributed to their acquisition. But for agricultural inputs, households were required to answer whether in the past two seasons they had used certain agricultural input and whether migrant member(s) had contributed to their acquisition. The results showed that all 93 migrant households responded to own hand hoes, and there were between one to seven hoes per households. This asset was the one owned by all migrant households because most of them were peasant farming households whose main farming implement was hand hoes and also possibly due to its low purchase price as compared to other farming equipment and the nature of farming scale.

However, the results revealed that only six (6%) households out of all 93 migrant households reported to have received contributions from migrants for hoes acquisition. Moreover, four (14%) out of 29 households reported to have received migrant contributions for purchasing fertilizers, while two (8%) out of 24 households reported to have received migrant contributions for purchasing improved seeds. The rest equipment and inputs were reported to be used by households but no any contribution from migrant members was obtained for their acquisition. These included Oxen Ploughs (7 households), Power saws (4 households), Sewing Machines (3 households), Shop/Kiosk (2 households), Pit saw blades (2 households), Spraying Machines (1 household), herbicides (3 households) and pesticides (2 Households). These results were showing that rural-out migration had not made any potential significant contribution to the acquisition and/or access to production assets/facilities for the households. Therefore, this meant that there were no potential for rural-out migration to enhance the livelihoods of the rural households by contributing to build up this component of capital asset of rural households.

Conclusion

With respect to asset creation, accumulation and maintenance in rural households and rural areas in totality, this study concludes that rural-out migration to surveyed households had mostly contributed to impoverish their asset base or portfolio instead of improving them. And for this reason, the study has found migration to have contradicting outcomes with other existing empirical studies which have shown migration to have diverse positive ways of enhancing households' asset portfolio and thus livelihoods enhancement. Some of the various positive ways that earnings and remittances from migration can strengthen livelihoods have been found to include; investment in land, or land improvements, including reclaiming previously degraded land (Tiffen *et al*, 1994 provided 'The Machakos, Kenya Case Study' as one of the better-known examples of this); purchase of cash inputs to agriculture (hired labour, disease control etc), resulting in better cultivation practices and higher yields (Carter, 1997); investment in agricultural implements or machines (water pumps, ploughs etc); investment in education, resulting in better prospects for the next generation (Francis & Hoddinott, 1993; Hoddinott, 1994); and investment in assets permitting local non-farm income to be generated (bicycle taxi, motorbike, milling machine, kiosk etc.(Ellis, 2003)).

Various sources of literature have indicated that, in order to move out of poverty, poor households have to increase the assets (asset portfolio) that they can deploy productively in order to generate higher incomes. This study has acknowledged that numerous studies have observed that moving out of poverty is a cumulative process, often achieved in tiny increments. This meant that assets are traded up in sequence, for example, chickens to goats, to cattle, to land; or, cash from non-farm income to farm inputs to higher farm income to land or to livestock (Ellis & Mdoe, 2003). It is also well established that a critical constraint slowing down or preventing such 'virtuous spirals' is the inability to borrow or to generate cash (often discussed under the rubric of credit market failures). Earnings and remittances from migration therefore can play a pivotal role in initiating and sustaining such cumulative processes. Nor do the cash flows in order to do this have to be large. In the context of so-called dollar-a-day poverty i.e. when the poor are defined as those getting by on under the equivalent of a dollar per day worth of consumption per person, very small amounts of additional cash can make huge differences to the options available to people to get a toehold on ladders out of poverty.

Various empirical studies on migration have shown how various researchers attempts to display the fundamental ways that migration and remittances from it can help to reduce vulnerability and poverty for people trying to put together adequate and improving livelihoods. They tend to display that migration is having more benefits to sending households and communities than evil ones. The existing literature on migration very seldom identifies negative attributes of migration and when they do, they consider the adverse experiences of migrants themselves at destinations such as weak social status, harassment, violence, debt bondage, lack of redress against mistreatment by employers and public officials (Ellis, 2003) as compared to the positive roles that migration can play in reducing the vulnerability and poverty of the resident group, as detailed above. None of the existing literatures or studies apart from identifying the positive roles of migration and the adverse effects of it to migrants, have attempted to explore the negative attributes of migration to sending households as well as sending communities. This study augments these studies by identifying the negative outcomes of migration to sending households as well as sending communities at large by examining the contribution of migration on building up selected household assets.

The study also concludes that despite some of surveyed households in the study areas do send out some of its members elsewhere for earning additional income, none of the household was found to have significantly benefited from migration and remittances from it. None of the five household assets (human, physical, financial, natural and social) studied were found to have been significantly created, improved and/or maintained as a result of the contributions from migration. More importantly, it was found that, even though households have continued to practice migration expecting that it would be economically helpful to the sending households, this expectation has never been met. Contrary to migrant households' expectations, rural-out migration was found to have more detrimental outcomes to sending households as well as communities. Migration was found to be associated with the spread of HIV/AIDS as result of family abandonment by married migrants, school drop-outs, underutilization of government funded development projects, and reduced household/community productive human resource, erosion of morals especially amongst the youths, increasing number of orphans and children living in harsh conditions are amongst the many detrimental effects of rural-out migration.

Even though in the literature there are evidences that migration can contribute positively to the livelihoods of sending households elsewhere, in Iringa Rural and Makete Districts, rural-out migration did not seem to be of any good to these (migrant) households. Respondents reported that the reasons why they keep sending out household members while knowing that it will not work for better, was due to the fact that during non-farm seasons most human resource in the areas finds itself lying idle with less opportunities to engage them, as a result they decide to let them go. They think and believe that, by having a vast majority of idle youths in the areas may render them vulnerable to bad social behaviour such as theft, use of drugs, prostitution and so on. As a result they decide to let them try their luck elsewhere though they know success history is not in their favour. For that case, households in these areas choose to migrate not because it is the next best alternative for their livelihoods it was rather chosen or undertaken on the basis of "*the lesser of two evils principle*". In this case, surveyed households had two bad choices available to them i.e. staying idle in the village or migrating out. In their situation they saw that migrating was not as bad as staying idle. As a result the lesser evil i.e. migrating-out was chosen instead of staying in the villages the evil that was seen to be of greater threat to households and the society at large. For this case, this study strongly concludes that rural-out migration currently does not seem to offer any potential as a households' livelihood diversification strategy, instead it offer more as a households' "livelihoods devastation" strategy.

References

Ayiemba, E. H .O. (1990). 'Migration and Urbanization: Kenya's Experience since 1948'. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Migration Flows in Eastern and Southern Africa. Nairobi, 25-28 February, 1990.

Carney, D. (1998) (ed). Sustainable Rural Livelihoods. What contribution can we make? Paper presented at the DFID Natural Resource Advisers' conference, July 1998. DFID, London.

Carter, M. R. (1997). *Environment, Technology, and the Social Articulation of Risk in West African Agriculture*, Economic Development and Cultural Change, *45(3), 557-591*.

Chambers, R. and Conway, G. R. (1992). Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. Institute of Development Studies (IDS). Discussion Paper No.296. Brighton.

de Haan, A. and B. Rogaly (eds), (2002). *Special Issue: Labour Mobility and Rural Society,* The Journal of Development Studies, *Vol.38 (5).*

Deshingkar, P and S. Daniel (2003). *Seasonal Migration for Livelihoods in India: Coping, Accumulation and Exclusion*. Working Paper No.220, Overseas Development Institute, UK.

Ellis, F. (1998). *Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversification. Survey Article*. The Journal of Development Studies, *Vol. 35 (1), pp. 1-38*.

Ellis, F. (2000a). *The Determinants of Rural Livelihood Diversification in Developing Countries*. Journal of Agricultural Economics *51 (2): 289-302*.

Ellis, F. (2000b). *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Ellis, F. (2000c). *Peasant Economics. Farm Households and Agrarian Development 2nd ed).* Cambridge University Press, UK.

Ellis, F. (2003). A Livelihoods Approach to Migration and Poverty Reduction. Department for International Development (DFID). UK

Ellis, F. and N. Mdoe. (2003). *Rural Livelihoods and Poverty Reduction in Tanzania*, World Development, *Vol.31 (8), pp: 1367-1384* .

Francis, E. and J. Hoddinott, (1993). *'Migration and Differentiation in Western Kenya: A Tale of Two Sub-Locations*', Journal of Development Studies, *Vol.30, No.1, pp.115-145*.

Ghatak, S., P. Levine and S. Wheatley Price (1996). *Migration Theories and Evidence: An Assessment*. Journal of Economic Surveys *10(2), 159-98.*

Haberfeld, Y., Menaria, R.K., Sahoo, B.B. and Vyas, R.N. (1999a). *Seasonal Migration of Rural Labour in India*. *Population Research and Policy Review 18(4), pp.73–89*.

Haberfeld, Y., R.K. Menaria, B.B. Sahoo and R.N. Vyas (1999b). *Seasonal Migration of Rural Labour in India*. Population Research and Policy Review, *18(6): 471–487*.

Helweg, A.W., (1993). '*Emigrant remittances: Their Nature and Impact on a Punjabi Village*', New Community, *Vol. 10 (3)*, pp: 435-43

Hoddinott, J., (1994). *A Model of Migration and Remittances Applied to Western Kenya'*, Oxford Economic Papers, *Vol.46 (3), pp:459-476.*

Hossain, M. Z.(2001). Rural-Urban Migration in Bangladesh: A Micro-Level Study. Paper presented at the Brazil IUSSP Conference, 20-24 August.

Katalyeba, P.O (2002). Rural - Rural Movements in East Africa: A study of Rwandan and Southern Ugandans in Karagwe District, Tanzania. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.

Kothari, U. (2002). Migration and Chronic Poverty. *Working Paper No 16,* Institute For Development Policy And Management, University Of Manchester.

Mbonile, M. J. (1996). *Towards Breaking the Vicious Circle of Labour Migration in Tanzania: A Case of Makete District*. *UTAFITI (New Series) Vol. 3 No.1*, 1996: 91-109.

Scoones, I. (1998). *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods. A framework for analysis*. IDS Working Paper No 72. IDS, Brighton.

Skeldon, R. (2002a). *"Migration and Poverty"*. *Asia-Pacific Population Journal,* December, pp: 67-82.

Tiffen, M., Mortimore, M., and Gichuki, F. (1994). More People, Less Erosion: Environmental Recovery in Kenya. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Waddington, C. (2003). Livelihood Outcomes of Migration for Poor People. Sussec Center for Migration Research Working Paper No. T1. University of Sussex, UK.