ABSTRACT

NEET - Not in Employment, Education, and Training, is a term used to measure the disengagement of people from economic activity within a population. Internal migration is an important livelihood strategy among young people to expand employment or educational opportunities in sub-Saharan Africa. This study examines the interaction between intra- and inter-provincial migration patterns and type of destination (urban-rural), and their impact on NEET status among youth in Ghana, from a gendered perspective. With data from three quarterly waves of the 2022 Ghana Annual Household Income and Expenditure Survey (AHIES), this study employs logistic regression models to examine the influence of migration status on NEET. Overall, female youth are more likely to be NEET than their male counterparts. Urban destination for intra- and inter-regional migration significantly reduces the likelihood of being NEET among males, though this is not significant for females. migration (both intra- and inter-regional) into Rural areas decreases the likelihood of NEET status for both genders, though the effect is more pronounced for males. These findings highlight the nuanced dual labour market theory and place-based human capital theory of migration destination on youth NEET. This gendered disparity in outcomes highlights the need for tailored gender-sensitive policy interventions addressing the unique challenges and opportunities faced by migrant youth in different regions.

Introduction:

NEET refers to a situation where a person is Not in Employment, Education and Training. NEET is a state of youth disengagement which has adverse consequences for their subjective wellbeing and national progress. NEET status can easily become permanent and could lead to chronic unemployment and poverty (Backman & Nilsson, 2016; Tele, 2017). Gribble and Bremner (2012) suggest three pre-conditions a country must met to achieve the demographic dividend. One condition is investing in education and skill development for children and young people. Based on these pre-conditions, one can conclude that achieving the demographic dividend is reliant on a low NEET rate. In contrast, a high NEET rate indicates that the youth population are facing challenges finding jobs and do not have access to educational and training opportunities. This is an inhibition to the achievement of the demographic dividend. Therefore, the influencers of NEET status must be investigated and addressed to ensure that Africa benefits from the demographic dividend. Migration is a sociodemographic process by which people can reach economic and social

empowerment opportunities. Migration and Youth NEET are topical issues in the sustainable development discourse, as they are both critical for population redistribution in sub-Saharan Africa. Nevertheless, the association between the two is unclear and inconclusive. According to Caroleo et al. (2020) and Zudina (2022) migrant youth are generally more likely to be NEET. This is because their qualifications are not recognized leading to unemployment or underemployment (Cortina et al. 2014). Language barrier and social networks are other factors that make migrants vulnerable to NEET (Pattinasarany, 2019). However, Yang (2020) argues that migration could be a protective factor against being NEET.

Internal migration in Ghana opens up the youth to employment opportunity (Assan & Kharisma, 2019) which is fundamentally due to the fact that employment opportunities are not evenly distributed across the country. According to Ackah, and Medvedev (2010), internal migration is low for communities with higher literacy rates, better access to water, sanitation and medical care. This points to the fact the migrants are mostly in search of better socioeconomic conditions such as employment, education, and training opportunities. Internal migrants in Ghana are more likely to be younger, males, and less educated. Migrants are more likely to stop schooling after primary school, compared to non-migrants (Ackah & Medvedev, 2010). It must be noted that migrants are likely to be educated persons from communities with lower average levels of education. Which means it is the most educated among the less educated that move. The low level of education among migrants make them particularly vulnerable to being NEET.

The dual labour market theory argues that the labour market is divided into primary sector which comes with secure and well-paid jobs with opportunities for advancement, and the secondary sector, where jobs are low-paying and insecure (Rabossi, 2020; Rebitzer & Taylor, 1991). Migrants who settle in urban areas often face structural barriers to accessing primary sector employment pushing many into the secondary labour market (Banerjee & Bucci, 2009; Mueller et al., 2019; Mbatha & Roodt ,2014). This increases their vulnerability to NEET.

The nuances of how migration status influences NEET status is still unclear especially from a gendered perspective. This study seeks to fill this gap by examining the influence of migration status on NEET. This is premised on the assumption that young persons are willing to be in employed or engaged in some skill acquisition or enhancement activity

Data & Methods:

This research utilizes data from the Ghana Annual Household Income and Expenditure Survey (AHIES), which was conducted across three quarters in 2022. The AHIES is a comprehensive, nationally representative survey that gathers information on household expenditures and the overall wellbeing of the population. In addition, it collects detailed demographic, migration, education, health, and employment data at both household and individual levels.

Sample: The survey for this study sampled 10,800 households from 600 enumeration areas. Approximately 54,000 individuals from these households were included in the analysis. The sampling frame was based on the 2021 population and housing census, and a random selection process was employed. In each of the chosen enumeration areas, 18 households were randomly selected across all regions to ensure the sample was nationally representative.

Analysis: The associations between migration status and Youth NEET were examined at the bivariate (not shown) and multivariate levels separately for men, women, and the total population. The outcome variable, Youth NEET, is dichotomous; hence, we employed binary logistic regression models using maximum likelihood estimation techniques (Table 1), adjusting for selected socioeconomic and demographic variables. The separate models for men and women examine the within-group differences.

***Results*:** The results from model 1 (both sexes) indicate that urban inter-regional migrants, rural non-migrants, rural intra-regional migrants, and rural inter-regional migrants are less likely to be compared to urban non-migrants. Specifically, rural inter-regional migrants have the highest likelihood of not being NEET. This implies that migrants, especially those in rural areas or who move between regions, are less likely to be NEET compared to those who do not migrate. However, urban intra-regional migrants do not show a significant difference in NEET status compared to urban non-migrants.

When comparing model 2 (males only) and model 3 (females only), we found that male urban intra-regional and urban inter-regional migrants are less likely to be NEET compared to male urban non-migrants only while female urban intra-regional and urban inter-regional migrants show no significant difference in NEET status compared to female urban non-migrants. The effect of being an urban intra-regional migrant or urban inter-regional migrant is significant for males reducing the likelihood of NEET. However, this effect is non-significant for females, indicating a gender difference in how urban intra-regional and inter-regional migration influences NEET status.

Again, rural migration (both intra- and inter-regional) reduces the likelihood of being NEET status across genders, but the effect is greater for males. And urban migration influences NEET status for males than females.

Overall, females have significantly higher odds of being NEET compared to males. Generally, persons between the ages of 15-19 have a significantly lower odds of being NEET compared to persons between 20-24 and 25-29 years while those between 30-35 years have a lower odd of being NEET. As the educational attainment of an individual increases, their vulnerability of being NEET reduces. Both married and formerly married individuals have lower odds of being NEET compared to the never married individuals. Living in the Northern Belt is associated with higher odds of being NEET compared to living in the Coastal belt. Compared to Christians, Muslims have higher odds of being NEET while those in other religions have lower odds of being NEET. Individuals belonging to the Mole-Dagbani/Grusi/Gurma ethnic groups have lower odds of being NEET compared to other ethnic groups.

	Total (n=54,063) *Pseudo R^2=0.0398* *Prob>χ^2=0.000*		**Men (25,345)** *Pseudo R^2= 0.0447* *Prob>χ^2=0.000*		**Women (28,718)** *Pseudo R^2= 0.0339* *Prob>χ^2=0.000*	
	Odd Ratios	[95% Conf Interval]	Odd Ratios	[95% Conf Interval]	Odd Ratios	[95% Conf Interval]
15-19(R)						
20-24	1.966*	1.871, 2.066	1.695*	1.579, 1.821	2.16*	2.016, 2.316
25-29	1.505*	1.416, 1.599	1.53*	1.397, 1.675	1.509*	1.389, 1.639
30-35	.867*	.808, .929	.994	.889, 1.111	.854*	.78, .936
Male(R)						
Female	1.542*	1.484, 1.603				
Urban Non-migrant (R)						
Urban Intra-regional	.979	.919, 1.044	.871*	.785, .966	1.051	.968, 1.141
Urban Inter-regional	.903*	.828, .986	.779*	.673, .902	.988	.885, 1.103
Rural Non-migrant	.842*	.804, .883	.765*	.714, .819	.929*	.87, .991
Rural Intra-regional	.768*	.718, .823	.682*	.61, .762	.817*	.748, .891
Rural Inter-regional	.753*	.689, .824	.647*	.558, .751	.829*	.739, .93
Never Married (R)						
Married	.594*	.563, .627	.374*	.34, .411	.716*	.669, .767
Formerly married	.633*	.534, .751	.884	.627, 1.246	.598*	.491, .729
Southern Belt (R)						
Northern Belt	1.269*	1.183, 1.36	1.387*	1.246, 1.543	1.185*	1.08, 1.3
Middle belt	.971	.924, 1.021	.949	.88, 1.024	.995	.932, 1.063
Christian (R)						
Islam	1.141*	1.082, 1.203	1.093*	1.01, 1.184	1.185*	1.104, 1.273
Other	.827*	.76, .899	.885*	.794, .987	.769*	.672, .881
No Education (R)						
Tertiary	.402*	.367, .441	.416*	.361, .478	.401*	.354, .454
Secondary	.632*	.589, .679	.646*	.578, .723	.641*	.584, .705
Primary	.83*	.779, .885	.742*	.669, .824	.91*	.839, .988
Akan (R)						
Ewe/Ga- Dangme	.942*	.89, .998	.944	.865, 1.031	.948	.879, 1.023

Mole-Dagbani//Grusi/Gurma	.755*	.712, .801	.724*	.663, .792	.783*	.724, .847
others	.843*	.781, .91	.726*	.645, .817	.961	.868, 1.064

*significant result

Reference

Abayasekara, A., & Gunasekara, N. (2019). Determinants of youth not in education, employment or training: Evidence from Sri Lanka. Review of Development Economics, 23(4), 1840 1862.

Ackah, C., & Medvedev, D. (2012). Internal migration in Ghana: Determinants and welfare impacts. International Journal of Social Economics, 39(10), 764-784.

Assan, J. K., & Kharisma, D. D. (2019). Political Economy of Internal Migration and Labor Seeking Behavior of Poor Youth in Ghana. Ghana Studies, 22(1), 3-35.

Bäckman, O., & Nilsson, A. (2016). Long-term consequences of being not in employment, education or training as a young adult. Stability and change in three Swedish birth cohorts. European Societies, 18(2), 136-157.

Banerjee, B., & Bucci, G. (2009). ON-THE-JOB SEARCH AFTER ENTERING URBAN EMPLOYMENT: AN ANALYSIS BASED ON INDIAN MIGRANTS*. Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 56, 33-47. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1468 0084.1994.MP56001003.X.

Caroleo, F. E., Rocca, A., Mazzocchi, P., & Quintano, C. (2020). Being NEET in Europe before and after the economic crisis: An analysis of the micro and macro determinants. Social Indicators Research, 149(3), 991-1024.

Gribble, J. N., & Bremner, J. (2012). Achieving a demographic dividend. Population Bulletin, 67(2).

Tele, A. (2017). Exploring the perceptions of rural youth not in education, employment or training (NEET) on factors that influence their employability.

Mbatha, C., & Roodt, J. (2014). Recent internal migration and labour market outcomes: Exploring the 2008 and 2010 national income dynamics study (NIDS) panel data in South Africa. South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences, 17, 653 672.

Mueller, V., Schmidt, E., Lozano, N., & Murray, S. (2019). Implications of Migration on Employment and Occupational Transitions in Tanzania. International Regional Science Review, 42, 181 - 206. https://doi.org/10.1177/0160017617751029.

Pattinasarany, I. R. I. (2019). Not in employment, education or training (NEET) among the youth in Indonesia: The effects of social activities, access to information, and language skills on NEET youth. Masyarakat, Jurnal Sosiologi, 24(1), 2.

Rabossi, M. (2020). Dual Labor Markets in Higher Education? The Case of Two Schools at the University of Buenos Aires. Higher Education Policy, 34, 1010-1026.

Rebitzer, J. B., & Taylor, L. (1991). Work incentives and the demand for primary and contingent labor.

Yang, Y. (2020). China's youth in NEET (Not in Education, Employment, or Training): Evidence from a national survey. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 688(1), 171-189.

Zudina, A. (2022). Non-Cognitive Skills of NEET Youth in Russia. Voprosy Obrazovaniya/Educational Studies Moscow, (4), 154-183.