

Published as:

Abu, M., Codjoe, S.N., Adger, W.N., Fransen, S., Jolivet, D., De Campos, R.S., Gavonel, M.F., Agyei-Asabere, C., Fábos, A.H. and Zickgraf, C., 2024. Micro-scale transformations in sustainability practices: Insights from new migrant populations in growing urban settlements. *Global Environmental Change*, 84, 102790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2023.102790>

## **Micro-scale transformations in sustainability practices: insights from new migrant populations in growing urban settlements**

### **Abstract**

Development that is inclusive and sustainable requires significant social and environmental transformations from current trajectories, building on demographic realities such as changing profiles of populations, and increased levels of mobility. Migration is a major driving forces of urbanisation in all global regions, partly facilitated through emerging technology and declining costs of movement and communication. Social transformations associated with increased migration are highly uneven but include shifts in the location of economic activity, major urban growth, and changing individual incentives and social constraints on sustainability trajectories. Yet, there is limited empirical evidence on how observed population movements can both challenge and promote sustainable transformations. This paper examines how migration transforms places and societies, by providing new evidence on the behaviours and practices of individuals who are part of such transformations as they assimilate, converge or remain distinctive to prior populations. Focusing on individuals in rapidly expanding cities in the Global South, this study uses new biographical life-history survey data from Accra, Ghana, to examine the barriers and enablers of sustainability practices among diverse types of migrants and a sample of non-migrants. The study uses data from 1,163 individuals: international migrants from the West African sub-region (559), internal migrants (299), and non-migrants (305) in Accra. The findings show that sustainability practices established before migration are predictors of current sustainability practices, including proactive recycling, conservation activities, and choice of mode of transportation, but that there is some convergence between behaviours, reflecting assimilation, place attachment and other factors. Internal migrants in Accra exhibit stronger sustainability practices than international migrants. Individual levels of poverty, poor infrastructural development, and perceptions about life satisfaction in the neighbourhood negatively affect sustainability practices among all respondents. These results suggest that poverty and social exclusion are critical to addressing sustainability issues in urban contexts. It is important for policy makers to address issues of urban poverty, cumulative deprivation, and inequality as strong barriers to the adoption of sustainability practices in urban areas.

### **KEYWORDS**

migration, sustainability practices, relative deprivation, infrastructural index, informal settlement

### **1. Introduction**

The world is gradually recovering from the shock of the COVID-19 pandemic while simultaneously seeking to address the long-term challenges of climate change as a threat to sustainable development. The United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development advocates for development processes that are inclusive and sustainable, which require significant social and environmental transformations from current trajectories. Trends towards sustainability, such as reduction in levels of absolute poverty

worldwide, have in many cases been facilitated by increased movement and mobility of populations: many millions of people have in effect moved out of poverty. Yet the SDGs are largely silent on the social transformative role of migration, for example in its role in raising millions out of poverty and in driving global urban growth in the past decades (Tacoli, McGranahan and Satterthwaite, 2015). There are few targets or indicators specifically on migration and mobility across the 17 SDGs (Adger et al., 2019). While governments are implementing programmes and actions towards achieving the diverse SDG targets, action on urban sustainability cannot be complete without accounting for population movement and the contributions of migrants themselves as actors in social change (Franco Gavonel et al., 2021).

Even though migration is a major driving force of urbanisation globally, the geopolitics around migration have focussed primarily on international migration from the global South to the global North and the benefits to receiving economies of skilled migration (World Bank, 2023). Much policy attention has been exerted on making migration flows safe and regular as espoused in the UN initiative on the Global Compact on Migration. However, the reality of global migration trends is that there are greater south-south flows than south-north flows (UN DESA, 2017) and domestic migration to urban growth poles remains dominant in the world (FAO, 2018, p. 34). In 2016, south-south migration constituted 90.2 million international migrants compared to 85.3 million south-north migrants (IOM, 2017). Substantial internal and international migration flows within the Global South themselves present opportunities and challenges for those who move and their places of origin and destination.

Migrant populations influence the social transformative processes of both sending and receiving areas in profound ways (De Haas, 2010; Portes, 2010), as evidenced by examples of sustainable practices of migrants, and new forms of multi-cultural social innovation (Agrawal and Gupta, 2018; Elf et al., 2019; Head et al., 2019; MacGregor et al., 2019; Jaeger and Schultz, 2017). Migrants are recognized as agents of social transformation as a key component of larger processes of social development (Castles, 2014). The transformation of economic, social, and political life in the places of origin and destination is largely attributed to the flows of ideas, remittances, and social capital that result from migration. These social transformations are a result of the behaviours that are maintained or changed through migration because people's behaviour is influenced by what others do (Omarova and Jo, 2022). The concept of assimilation, developed in sociological studies of migration, provides insights into potential transformation of behaviour post-migration (Alba and Nee, 1997). But most studies of migration and social integration emphasise the evolution of practices rather than simple assimilation into dominant cultures: migrants either modify their sustainable behaviours or maintain them as a part of their pre-migration identity (Head et al., 2019; MacGregor et al., 2019). Despite constant migration inside and among countries in the Global South, there is only limited evidence on migration and sustainability in such contexts. Moreover, there is limited information on the motivations, trajectories and practices of new populations arriving in urban areas and what motivates or limits these outcomes.

This study addresses three key questions to illuminate the migration-sustainability relationship: i) What are the sustainability practices of migrants and non-migrants in Accra? ii) What are the predictors of sustainability practices in Accra among diverse migrant groups? iii) Do the behaviours before migration increase or decrease sustainability practice after migration, in the context of convergence and assimilation?

This study uses evidence from Accra, the capital city of Ghana, the dominant destination for internal migration within Ghana and with a sizeable international migration flow from other parts of Africa because of its relative high income and stability (Awumbila, Teye and Yaro, 2017; Awumbila, Owusu, and Teye, 2014). We focus on internal migration (migrants from other parts of Ghana to the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area (GAMA) at least one year prior to the survey), international migration (migrants from across international borders to the GAMA) and non-migrants (individuals who were born in the GAMA and who never migrated or lived outside).

The study employs a cross-sectional survey that incorporated event history techniques to gather retrospective data on migrants' prior and current sustainability practices. As such, the data offer a unique longitudinal insight into the sustainability practices of migrant populations, and on how these practices relate to their migration trajectory. Studies on sustainable behaviour among specific populations variously collect data on stated and revealed behaviour through extensive surveys (Takahashi and Selfa, 2015; Soopermans et al., 2023) and indepth ethnographic methods (McGregor et al., 2019, Head et al., 2021). Here we seek the methodological benefits of survey methods, but augmented through reflective data on past experiences: these are found through life history analysis widely used in migration studies and in studies of mobility and life satisfaction (Coulter et al., 2016; McCollum et al., 2020). The survey method allowed for more representation of the study population and conclusions that can be applied to a larger population to some extent. It was also cost effective, time efficient and safe to collect at a time in Ghana when COVID-19 Pandemic restrictions were being enforced.

The migrants interviewed in this study live in low-income communities and our findings can therefore not be generalised to represent all migrants in Accra. However, the sampled population is a fair representation of migrants that reside in areas with limited infrastructure in the city, which is a major destination for new migrants. Regression models reveal the factors that affect sustainability practices among the study population in Accra. The primary stated motivations for migrating into the city are economic and educational purposes. Like any other city in Africa, Accra has densely populated informal settlements that serve as destinations for new migrants because of easy access to accommodation, proximity to business opportunities and the presence of networks. However, these settlements are vulnerable to floods, poor sanitation, and have high levels of crime as well as issues of social conflict (Abu and Codjoe, 2018). Therefore, understanding the different population groups in the city and their sustainable practices is critical to the development of well-structured and carefully planned urban policies.

## **2. Transformation and sustainable practices among diverse populations in urban settings**

Over half of the global population currently lives in urban areas (Cui et al., 2019). Urbanisation provides opportunities and challenges for urban populations, with implications for sustainability practices. In terms of opportunities, urbanisation creates markets for various economic activities and leads to the provision of infrastructure services such as water, electricity, hospitals and schools. But many experience urbanisation through high socio-economic inequality and exposure to hazardous environments and social marginalization (Cui et al., 2019). Sub-Saharan Africa has a distinctive migration and urbanisation trajectory with challenges of poverty and weak institutional guidelines to address the challenges of urbanisation (Smith & Parnell, 2012). Also, there is increasing evidence of accelerated migration to cities as agricultural livelihoods are disrupted by climate change and environmental degradation (Borderon et al. 2019; Thalheimer et al. 2021).

Transformations to sustainability suggest radical amendments to social and economic structures, ranging from reforming international trade and comparative advantage to rapid exit from fossil fuel dependence (Scoones et al., 2020). Yet transformations to sustainability are multi-scaled beyond the structural and political to the personal sphere (O'Brien, 2012). Transformations therefore build on individual action, not as an end in themselves but as an integral component of societal change. Sustainable practices are therefore a central element of transformative change, representing actions, often unconscious or routine, that are core to a perceived dignified life.

Migration is well understood to have transformative potential at individual and collective levels: including positive economic effects on labour markets, congestion, and overall economic activity (Franco Gavonell et al., 2021; De Haas, 2010). It also results in social remittances or norm transfers (Levitt, 1998) that potentially impact both the individual and family wellbeing. With remittances and

other mechanisms, such as knowledge and norm transfers, in-kind transfers, and shifting household dynamics, migrant families can spend more on necessities, services, and investments (Bertoli and Marchetta, 2014). Yet the phenomenon of migration creates its own risks and vulnerabilities, notably for low income migrants. The conditions in destinations can entrench poverty, including living conditions subject to health risks from low air and water quality and limited access to services, low wages, and poor working conditions (Hagen-Zanker et al., 2014). Furthermore, migrants may not appropriately use their education and skills as skills recognition processes tend to be lacking, especially with low-and medium-skilled migrants (ILO, 2016). Compared to non-migrants, migrants frequently report lower levels of subjective well-being, in part because they assess their circumstances relative to the status of native urban residents who become their new social reference group rather than in absolute terms (Szaboova et al., 2022; Mulcahy and Kollamparambil, 2016). These challenges associated with the destinations coupled with the conditions of migrants have implications for sustainable practices (Tacoli, McGranahan and Satterthwaite, 2015).

Sub-Saharan Africa is fast urbanising, but there are also challenges related to poverty and weak institutional guidelines to address the challenges of urbanisation (Smith and Parnell, 2012; Zerbo et al. 2020). One effect of urbanisation, a major challenge to city planners in the region, is the development of informal settlements. A large proportion of low-income recently arrived migrants live in slum areas because they provide cheaper housing and good networks. Slums are frequently geographically isolated, not connected to infrastructure, and exposed to hazards such as landslides or being flood-prone (Ajibade et al., 2013). These conditions increase exposure to health risks for hundreds of thousands of people across Sub-Saharan Africa (Zerbo et al., 2020). The urban environment, however, provides a level playing field for both migrants and non-migrants to take advantage of economic opportunities in the city. Migrants generally engage in more economically sustainable activities than non-migrants because most of them are self-employed and are not usually affected by layoffs when employers have difficulties (Borjas, 1986).

Sustainability practices and indeed what are generally perceived to constitute sustainability practices, vary across cultures. Within populations such behaviours also diverge, depending on demographic and socio-economic factors including age, class gender and ethnicity. In general, research in this area shows that material and structural factors, underlying values, and social context are the major constraints on practices around issues such as waste, use of green space, and energy and transport use that have major implications for air quality (Hargreaves and Middlemiss, 2020). Much research finds that new migrant populations 'bring with them' practices from the home regions, that are often manifest in lower levels of consumption and thrift, awareness of environmental harms, and retention of practices that alter and energise social norms in the new destinations (Head et al., 2019; MacGregor et al., 2019; Maller and Strengers 2013). The opportunities for sustainable practices are constrained by quality of infrastructural resources such as housing, water and sanitation, roads, transportation systems and options (Elf et al., 2019). In Accra specifically, a significant proportion of the population lives in slums (Somanje et al., 2020), and are exposed to environmental hazards and social and economic exclusion including exposure to insecurity and health risks (Abu and Codjoe, 2018; Arimah and Branch, 2011; Oppong et al., 2020). Generally, different populations within various neighbourhoods will most likely exhibit different sustainable behaviours depending on their socio-cultural beliefs and economic activities.

### **3. Methods**

#### **3.1 Source of data and sample**

This study uses new bespoke biographic data that was collected in Accra, Ghana from November to December 2020. The total sample for the study is 1,200, which returned 1163 valid responses. The study sample is comprised of international migrants of Nigerian (300) and Nigerien (300) origin,

internal Ghanaian migrants (300) in Accra and non-migrants (300) in the communities in Accra where these migrants reside. The determination of the sample size was done purposively to have a statistical representation in each of the study populations. The total response rate is about 97%.

Sampling was done in two stages. First, we used the 2010 Population and Housing Census (PHC) data in Accra to identify the country of origin of the majority of international migrants into the city. We found that most migrants were of Nigerian, Togolese, Burkinabe, Nigerien, Gambian, and Ivorian origins. For this study, we selected migrants from both anglophone (Nigeria) and francophone (Niger) countries that had a significant number of nationals in Accra at the time of the study. Second, we identified leaders of migrant groups and religious denominations of migrants to enable us to identify where most migrants reside in the city. This was because the 2010 PHC data was old, and the location of many migrants might have changed. Specifically, we spoke to leaders of migrant traders and religious leaders to get first-hand information about where the majority of their members reside. We sampled six communities (Madina, Adenta, Accra Central, Accra Circle, Teshie and Ashaiman) which are located in four different administrative districts (Madina/Adenta, AMA, LEKMA and Ashaiman) in the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area because these were the places where the majority of international migrants of interest reside and do business. The areas in which these migrants and non-migrants reside are low-income neighbourhoods with about one-third of housing facilities made of made-shift structures and poor urban services such as water and sanitation (Mansour and Esseku, 2017; Awumbila, Owusu and Teye, 2014). There are also disparities in the living arrangements of migrants and non-migrants with non-migrants residing in their own houses and renting unoccupied rooms in their structures to migrants (Awumbila, Teye and Yaro, 2015). Moreover, because these neighbourhoods are located close to major market centres, most of the non-migrants provide store facilities on their land, which they rent out to migrants who engage in trading activities.

We undertook household listing in neighbourhoods close to the market centres in the six communities to identify potential participants because most migrants have their businesses in the major market centres in the districts of interest. We obtained the telephone contact details of potential respondents, enabling enumerators to conduct both telephone and in-person interviews as preferred by the respondent. This was necessitated by the restrictions brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic at the time of data collection, though most of the data collection was done in-person. We sampled respondents using a simple random sampling technique based on the list generated from the household listing. However, we used a snowballing method to reach international migrants due to their limited numbers in the study communities. Through our initial respondents we reached additional international migrants of interest in neighbouring communities.

### 3.2 Dependent variables

The dependent variable, sustainability practices, was computed as a score using multiple survey questions on environmental, economic, and social dimensions of sustainability practices. These three dimensions of sustainability were computed as indices and the scores used to compute the overall sustainability score. Table 1 shows the questions used to compute the various scores. Variables used to create indicator scores were measured on a 5-point Likert scale 'Strongly Disagree' =1, 'Disagree', 'Neither agree nor disagree' 'Agree', and 'Strongly Agree' =5. Variable items measured in the negative were recoded into opposite values to ensure they contribute equally with the measurement variables in generating the scores. Also, the three dimensions of sustainability scores were treated as dependent variables. The number of variables that constituted each of the dimensions of sustainability are environmental sustainability score (3 variables), social sustainability score (4 variables), and economic sustainability score (5 variables). In constructing sustainability score, weights were applied to individual responses for variables measuring environmental, social and economic sustainability scores. Each of the 3 dimensions carried a weight of 0.333 approximately summing to a total 1. Variables measuring environmental, social and economic sustainability scores were assigned a weight of (1/9"), (1/12), (1/15) each, respectively (Appendix A). The weighted responses were then summed

to derive a sustainability index score for each participant. This approach to computing sustainability scores was adopted from the computation of the multidimensional poverty index (Alkire et al., 2017). The multidimensional poverty index uses three primary dimensions that align with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): health, education, and standard of living. Each dimension is given equal weight, which is shared among the variables in each dimension. We applied a similar technique in the computation of the sustainability scores because of the robustness of the method.

### 3.3 Independent variables

The independent variables considered in the study include individual characteristics and external factors that influence individuals' behaviour (Table 1). Individual characteristics such as age, sex, and level of education influence one's sustainable practices. Again, the number of children and the number of partners an individual has also influence the individual's sustainability practices. Other factors, such as the district of residence and the number of moves that an individual has made, influence one's sustainability practices. Other factors that affect sustainability practices are place attachment, sustainable attitudes, access to infrastructure, relative deprivation and subjective wellbeing. These were estimated as mean scores - relative deprivation and subjective wellbeing score (3 variables), place attachment score (7 variables), infrastructure score (13 variables).

Pre-and post-migration practices were identified by accounting for practices of individuals at their place of origin prior to migration, and practices they engaged in at previous and current migration destinations. Data on the individuals' behaviour pre-and post-migration was collected as part of the event history technique employed during data collection.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

### 3.4 Analytic Approach

We employed descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis to understand the enablers and barriers of sustainability practices among migrants and non-migrants. We first computed the sustainability scores for each of the three domains of sustainability to examine how each of them contributes to overall sustainability practice. We also examined the factors that affect sustainability practices and modelled the predictors of sustainability practices among the study population. In all, four ordinary least square models were fitted, because the dependent variables consisted of sustainability scores. The first model examined the factors related to sustainability practices while controlling for migration status to determine which group was more or less, positively or negatively, engaged in sustainability practices. The second model examined the factors associated with sustainable practices among the non-migrant population. The third and fourth models examined the factors associated with sustainability practices among internal and international migrant populations, respectively, while controlling for sustainability practices prior to migration. The equations for the regression analysis are as follows:  $y = B_0 + B_1.X_1 + B_2.X_2 + \dots + B_n.X_n + \epsilon$ , where  $y$  is sustainability practices, and the  $X$  are the explanatory variables. All categorical variables were converted into a series of binary variables where one category is chosen as the reference category and the indicator variables are created for each of the other variables.

To ensure reliability of the results, we tested for multicollinearity by computing the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for the independent variables in all the regression models (Appendix B) and observed a low correlation among the variables.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of the study population. A little over two-fifths (43%) of the respondents resided in the Madina/Adenta Municipal Assembly, 31% in the Ashaiman Municipal

Assembly, and 21% and 5% in the Accra Metropolitan Area and the Ledzokuku Municipal Assembly, respectively. The Madina/Adenta and the Ashaiman Municipal Assemblies are hubs for migrants in the Accra Metropolitan Area because of their easy access to accommodation and networks that help migrants settle in the city. There are also major market centres in these areas that facilitate the business activities of migrants. The Accra Metropolitan Assembly is the central business area of Accra, and there is limited residential accommodation in this area. Some of the migrants reside in the LEKMA because of its proximity to the market centres in Ashaiman and the Accra Metropolitan area. The mean age of the sampled population is 29 years old, with international migrants having the lowest mean age of 27 years, compared to a mean age of 33 and 31 years for internal migrants and non-migrants, respectively. In all, internal migrants have the highest mean number of partners and children compared to international migrants and non-migrants. More than half (59%) of the internal migrants and 49% of the non-migrants interviewed were females, as compared to only 5% of the international migrants. More than a quarter (30%) of the respondents have attained secondary school education, and less than 10% have attained tertiary level education. The majority of the migrants of Nigerian origin had Koranic education, and that constituted 21% of the level of education among international migrants.

Table 2 shows that non-migrants have a higher sustainability score (2.66) compared to internal (2.61) and international migrants (2.47). Both internal and international migrants had higher sustainability practice scores prior to migrating to Accra. This is an indication of how migration influences the sustainable practices of migrants through the process of assimilating into the life conditions in urban areas (Omarova and Jo, 2022). In terms of the sustainable attitude score, non-migrants (3.95) and internal migrants (3.94) have a higher sustainable attitude score compared to international migrants (3.85). The current status of households in neighbourhoods among the study population shows that non-migrants witnessed higher improvements in their lives compared to internal and international migrants. Non-migrants have access to resources such as housing that is rented to migrants for additional income, which adds to the income inequality situation between migrants and non-migrants in low-income urban places (Kessides, 2006). A similar trend is observed in comparing their status in the city. Overall, non-migrants witnessed a higher improvement in their lives compared to internal and international migrants. There are, however, varied responses in relation to satisfaction with life in the current neighbourhood among the study population. While there is a decrease in life satisfaction between current and previous neighbourhoods among non-migrants and internal migrants, international migrants saw an increase in their life satisfaction in the current neighbourhood. Furthermore, internal migrants had a higher place attachment score prior to migration compared with their current place attachment score. International migrants, on the other hand, have a higher place attachment score at their current place of residence compared to their previous place. However, non-migrants (3.51) and international migrants (3.51) have similar place attachment scores at their current place of residence, which is higher than that of internal migrants (3.41). In terms of infrastructure, even though non-migrants have a higher infrastructure score than internal and international migrants, there is a reduction in the current infrastructure score of internal and international migrants compared to their prior migration infrastructure score. Low-income urban areas lack basic infrastructure and migrants that reside in these communities are exposed to lower infrastructure compared to their place of origin (Tacoli and Satterthwaite, 2015).

(Insert Table 2 here)

#### *4.2 Factors associated with sustainability practices*

Table 3 presents the predictors of sustainability practices in Accra. The results revealed that overall, international migration decreases an individual's sustainable practices across the three dimensions of sustainability compared to being a non-migrant. This can be attributed to the fact that migrants need to integrate into their new environment, and this sometimes requires adopting certain behaviours to

be able to facilitate such integration. Further, the factors that predict sustainable practices vary across the three dimensions of sustainability. The predictors of environmental sustainability are district of residence, age, sex, education, number of children, status of household in neighbourhood, status of household in the city, current infrastructure score and sustainable attitude, while those of social sustainability are district of residence, age, sex, number of children, number of partners, status of household in neighbourhood, status of household in city, place attachment and infrastructure score. Economic sustainability is predicted by education, number of children, the number of neighbourhoods moved, the neighbourhood status of households, status of household in the city, infrastructure score and sustainable attitude score. District of residence, age, number of children, number of partners, status of household in neighbourhood, status of household in city, current place attachment, and infrastructure are predictors of the overall sustainability score.

Age appears to be a significant predictor of sustainability practices in the sampled population. A unit increase in one's age increases the overall sustainability score, which also holds for both environmental and social sustainability dimensions, but not a predictor of economic sustainability. This suggests that environmental consciousness increases with age. Furthermore, it appears that household size has negatively influenced the overall sustainability score as well as across all three dimensions of sustainability practices. On the other hand, the number of partners one has positively influences the overall sustainability score and social sustainability score, but not the predictor of environmental and economic sustainability. Another key predictor is the income and the general wellbeing of the population. The neighbourhood status of household has both a negative and positive impacts across the various dimensions of sustainability. Households that rate themselves as average relative to those who are below average negatively impact on environmental and social sustainability, while those who rate themselves above average relative to those who are below average positively impact on economic sustainability. Moreover, the city status of household has both negative and positive impacts across the various dimensions of sustainability. Households who consider themselves above average relative to those below average in the city impact negatively on environmental sustainability, but positively on social sustainability. On the other hand, households in the city that rate themselves average relative to those below average impact positively on social and economic sustainability. Further, an increase in infrastructure score positively influences the overall sustainability score and all three dimensions of sustainability practices. Place attachment score positively influences the social sustainability score but is not a predictor of environmental and economic sustainability.

(Insert Table 3 here)

The predictors of overall sustainability practices vary among migrants and non-migrants and among internal and international migrants across the various dimensions of sustainability practices. Table 4 shows that among the non-migrant population, the district of residence, age, education, number of partners of the individual, place attachment, and infrastructure indices are significant predictors of overall sustainability practices. There are, however, variations in the predictors of the various dimensions of sustainability practices. While the district of residence, sex of the respondent, status of household in the city and place attachment are significant predictors of environmental and social sustainability practices, age of the respondent, the status of the household in neighbourhood, and infrastructure score are predictors of only environmental sustainability practices among the non-migrant population. Also, the number of partners and number of neighbourhoods moved is a predictor of only social sustainability practices while education level of the respondent and infrastructure score are the predictors of economic sustainability practices among non-migrants. All these variables positively contribute to sustainability practices among non-migrants, except for the sex of the respondent, number of neighbourhoods moved and the status of the household in the city, which negatively contribute to social and environmental sustainability practices. Households that rate themselves as average or above average compared to other households in the city are as less likely as



those households who rate themselves as below average to engage in environmental sustainability practices. A unit increase in place attachment and infrastructure indices increases overall sustainability behaviour among non-migrants. Also, a unit increase in age increases environmental sustainability behaviour among non-migrants.

(Insert Table 4 here)

Among internal migrants, Table 5 shows that the predictors of overall sustainability practices are the district of residence, number of children of the migrant, number of partners, sustainability practices of the individual prior to migration, status of household in the city, satisfaction living in previous neighbourhood, current place attachment and sustainable attitude. Except for the number of children per migrant and satisfaction living in previous neighbourhood all these variables have a positive impact on sustainability practices. A unit increase in the sustainability attitude score leads to a 0.1210 increase in the overall sustainability score among internal migrants. Migrants who consider their households in the city as average or above average compared to other households were more likely to engage in sustainability practices compared to those who considered their families as below average in the city.

Across the various dimensions of sustainability practices, there are also variations in the predictors among internal migrants. While sustainability practice prior to migration is a predictor for all the three dimensions of sustainability among internal migrants, sex of the respondent is only a predictor for both environmental and social sustainability practices. On the other hand, the district of residence, current and prior status of household in the city, place attachment and sustainable attitude are predictors of social sustainability practice while prior infrastructure score, satisfaction living in previous neighbourhood, prior infrastructure score and sustainable attitude are predictors of economic sustainability practice.

(Insert Table 5 here)

Regarding international migrants, Table 6 shows that the overall sustainability practices are predicted by the sustainability practice score prior to migration, the number of neighbourhoods moved to, the current status of households in the city, the current infrastructure score, and the place attachment score prior to migration. All these variables positively predict overall sustainability practices among international migrants, with the exception of the place attachment score prior to migration. A unit increase in place attachment score prior to migration leads to a 0.084 decrease in overall sustainability practices among international migrants. Also, a unit increase in the prior sustainability score leads to an increase in overall sustainability practices. International migrant households in the city who currently rate themselves as average households are more likely to engage in sustainability practices compared to those who are below average.

The predictors of environmental sustainability practices among international migrants are the district of residence, age, education, number of children, number of partners, number of neighbourhoods moved, current and previous neighbourhood status, current and previous status of household in city, current and previous satisfaction of life in neighbourhood, place attachment score now and prior to migration, current and previous infrastructure score, and current sustainability attitude score. Apart from age, number of neighbourhoods moved, and current place attachment score, all the other predictors negatively affect environmental sustainability. Conversely, the drivers of the social sustainability score among international migrants are number of neighbourhoods moved, the sustainability score prior to migration, current neighbourhood status of household, the current status of a household in the city and current infrastructure score, while that of the economic sustainability score is the sustainability score prior to migration, current status of household in the city and current infrastructure score of the household.

(Insert Table 6 here)

## 5. Discussion

The mobility pathways of populations clearly challenge or promote the sustainability practices of those who move. Controlling for migration status, we found that migration negatively affects sustainability practices across all the three measured dimensions. For instance, both internal and international migrants are less likely to engage in environmentally sustainable behaviour as compared to non-migrants, even though the coefficients were higher among international migrants than internal migrants. The estimated sustainability score was higher prior to migration, as compared to the current sustainability score among migrants; an indication of other factors contributing to the negative sustainability practices and not just being a migrant. Relative deprivation and subjective wellbeing played a critical role in people's sustainability practices. Related to this is access to infrastructure, place attachment and poor environmental and social conditions.

Accra, the capital city of Ghana, has been very attractive to both domestic and international migrants over recent decades, especially from neighbouring West African countries, due to political stability and growing economic opportunities (IOM, 2020). It has also attracted migrants from other parts of Ghana who seek to take advantage of available economic opportunities (Awumbila, Teye and Yaro, 2017; Awumbila, Owusu and Teye, 2014). Despite the promising opportunities, there are several environmental, social and economic problems confronting the city. The development of informal settlements, increased crime, and conflicts among foreign retail traders and their Ghanaian counterparts have become synonymous with the city over the last three decades. In addition, increased mobility into the city has consequences for sustainability in the city. We examined the predictors of sustainability practices and the predictors of three dimensions (environmental, social, and economic) of sustainability practices. We discuss these issues under two broad sub-headings: enablers and barriers to overall sustainability practices and enablers and barriers to sustainability practices among migrants and non-migrants.

### 5.1 Determinants of overall sustainability practices

Overall, controlling for migration status, place attachment is positively associated with sustainability practices. All things being equal, individuals exhibiting higher attachment to place also show higher social sustainability score. This could be explained by the high level of cohesion among people who reside in slums and the kind of support migrants offer one another to navigate difficult situations in the city (Amoah and Addoah, 2021). Similarly, access to infrastructure is positively correlated with sustainability practices, specifically, by positively affecting the environmental, social and economic components of the sustainability score. This could be explained by the general collective responsibility by households to keep their environment clean (Amoah and Addoah, 2021) and the strong community identity in the study area that brings people together and promotes economic activities in these low-income settings. In addition, those who rate their household's condition as average or above average compared with other households in the city are positively associated with sustainability practices, and positively affecting social and economic dimensions of sustainability indices.

Among the study population, individual factors such as age, sex, number of partners, number of neighbourhoods moved to, and place attachment are significantly associated with sustainability practices, while factors such as relative deprivation, subjective wellbeing, and sustainable attitude equally play a significant role. We found that non-migrants have a higher sustainability score (2.66) compared to internal (2.61) and international migrants (2.47). This is expected because migrants were relatively younger than non-migrants and older adults reported to becoming closer to nature and exhibit positive sustainability practices (Otto and Kaiser, 2014). Also, both internal and international migrants have higher sustainability practice scores prior to migration, an indication of the critical role

migration plays in influencing individuals' sustainability behaviour (Franco Gavonel et al., 2021; Adger et al., 2019).

We further observed that in terms of infrastructure, even though non-migrants have a higher infrastructure score than migrants, there is a reduction in the current infrastructure score of sampled internal and international migrants compared to their prior migration infrastructure score. More than half the population in Accra resides in places that have poor infrastructure, and the quality of housing is usually poor. Most migrants reside in these locations because of lower costs, access to job opportunities and the availability of networks. The standard of infrastructure in these areas is usually poor, exposing internal and international migrants to the high inequality situation in these locations, thus potentially limiting their capacity to enact sustainability practices (Elf et al., 2019; Oppong et al., 2020; Somanje et al., 2020).

On the other hand, migration is a barrier to sustainability practice as it is negatively correlated with all the dimensions of sustainability practices. This is because the conditions that migrants are exposed to in the city drive them to change their behaviour towards unsustainable ways to be able to survive. Migrants in low-income areas in Accra are engaged in hazardous environmental, social and economic activities to earn some income (Somanje et al., 2020; Oppong et al., 2020; Aryee et al., 2018).

## 5.2. Determinants of sustainability practices among non-migrants and migrants

The determinants of sustainability practices vary among migrants and non-migrants and among internal and international migrants across the three dimensions of sustainability practices. For example, place attachment enables sustainability practices among non-migrants and internal migrants. In the case of the former, attachment to place is positively correlated with the environmental and social dimensions of the score, whereas in the latter, it is positively associated with only the social dimension. Non-migrants' own properties in these low-income areas that bring them income and as a result are more concerned about the environment and the social relations that exist in the community (Awumbila, Teye and Yaro, 2015). Similarly, access to infrastructure enables sustainability behaviours among non-migrants and international migrants. Among international migrants, access to infrastructure is positively correlated with environmental, social and economic sustainability while among non-migrants, it is positively associated with both the environmental and social dimensions. The availability of the right infrastructure in an urban area will promote positive behaviour among the population (Amin, 2006). Finally, sustainability practices prior to migration are predictive of sustainability behaviours after migration, both for internal and international migrants. The results revealed that among internal migrants, sustainability practices prior to migration is positively associated with all the three dimensions of sustainability, but only positively associated with social and economic dimensions among international migrants. This is an indication that among these groups of migrants' the assimilation theory does not fully explain their behaviour, because prior sustainability behaviours are maintained especially among internal migrants across all dimensions of sustainability, while international migrants only maintain their social sustainability practices to stay closely with others from their country of origin (Head et al., 2019; MacGregor et al., 2019).

To validate how these results explain the assimilation theory, we used two auxiliary regression models (Appendix C) to test the role of place attachment as a potential mediator of the association between migration status and sustainable behaviours. We found that place attachment predicts sustainability behaviour over and above migration. Given this auxiliary analysis, assimilation may involve other elements that are not captured by place attachment. For example, one could think that assimilation can have temporal and spatial components that can affect sustainable behaviours in opposite directions (Alba and Nee, 1997). On the one hand, the longer a migrant stay at destination, the more likely they are to adopt sustainable behaviours from non-migrants, and as indicated in Table 2, the

current sustainability score is higher for non-migrants than for internal and international migrants. On the other hand, the farther the migrant's place of origin relative to the destination, the less likely they will adopt non-migrants' sustainable behaviours as there is a lack of common identity between these subpopulations (Vogiazides, 2018).

One key enabler of sustainability practices among the study population is the community of residence. Because the study population reside in low-income areas in Accra, migrants are exposed to difficult situations that limits their sustainability behaviour compared with non-migrants who have good socio-economic standing in such localities. Also, the current status of households in the city compared to other households enables sustainability practices among internal and international migrants. It is positively correlated with all three dimensions of sustainability among international migrants, and positively correlated only with the social dimension among internal migrants. Thus, improvement in the wellbeing of migrants promotes sustainable practice among the study population (Aryee et al., 2018).

Furthermore, there are also some unique predictors across the different dimensions. For instance, age and sex positively predicts environmental dimension among non-migrants, whereas only sex positively predicts environmental dimension among internal migrants and age positively predicts environmental dimension among internal migrants. Also, sex of the respondent negatively predicts social dimensions among internal migrants and non-migrants. Females engage in positive environmental sustainability practices compared to men because of the gender role ascribed to women which brings them closer to nature (Navarro et al., 2020, Eisler et al. 2003). Similarly, cultural norms also expose females to several social activities contributing negatively to their engagement in social sustainability practices. However, contrary to expectations, international migrants with higher sustainable attitude scores have a negative impact on environmental sustainability. This may be explained by the socio-economic differences of the migrants, which have not been explored in this study. For instance, migrants with higher socio-economic status in low-income areas may have a more sustainable attitude but invest in environmentally unsustainable businesses that will enable them to achieve their migration aspirations.

Finally, the study results support findings from other studies that sustainability practices of migrants are explained and shaped by issues such as age, sex, income, place attachment and access to infrastructure (Franco Gavonell et al., 2021; Adger et al., 2019; Awumbila, Teye and Yaro, 2017), in similar ways to resident non-migrant populations. Migrants cannot be classified as a homogenous group because even among the study population who reside in low-income neighbourhoods in Accra, there are differences among them in terms of income, and level of education. There are also differences in the sustainability practices between internal and international migrants, even though all the migrants in our study have stayed in the study area for not more than five years. The findings here are indicative of processes of sustainability behaviour principally in low-income urban communities, and are likely to be repeated in similar settings of African urbanism. Yet as Coulter et al. (2016) and others point out, there are diverse experiences of migration in cultural contexts, with vastly different trajectories of assimilation, distinctiveness and convergence in all aspects of social life. The analysis here is also limited through not disaggregating the socio-economic differences of migrants or examine this effect on sustainability practices. Further micro-level data, both quantitative and exploratory, could enhance greater understanding of individual drivers and motivations. This is a critical area that future studies can explore among the migrant population in relation to sustainability practices.

## **6. Conclusions**

The evidence presented here shows that sustainability transitions are challenged by the social dynamics of people moving. It is multi-dimensional: migration exposes individuals to environmental, social, and economic conditions that negatively impact their sustainability practices compared to resident populations. Further these practices are likely to evolve over time with processes of assimilation and distinctive practices within clustered communities of migrants. The evidence gathered through life history survey methods here confirm that prior sustainability practices (in previous locations) have an influence on the present sustainability practices: migrants carry practices and knowledge to new places across their lifecourse (Head et al., 2019). And the poor infrastructural and environmental conditions that migrants are exposed to, in effect alter and constraint their current sustainability practices. In Accra, the example of African urbanism studied here, majority of the study population resides in informal settlements lacking basic infrastructure and exposing migrants to some social, economic, health, and environmental vulnerabilities that drive them into unsustainable practices just to survive. The social, economic, and environmental factors in low-income urban areas influence the behaviour of migrants and transform them into actors of sustainable or unsustainable practices, depending on the prevailing conditions of the neighbourhood. This study has focused on migrants in low-income urban areas, and the prevailing socio-economic conditions in the neighbourhood shaped the sustainable practices of both migrants and non-migrants.

The study finds differences in sustainability practices among internal and international migrants, highlighting how transformation processes are not uniform, but driven by underlying economic structures and often deep-seated social attitudes. International migrants in the case of Accra do not enjoy the same social privileges and extensive networks as internal and non-migrants. According to trade regulations in Ghana, foreign traders cannot engage in retail businesses, and it is usually difficult for these migrants to have the capital to engage in business, often to the detriment of their sense of integration and belonging. International migrants, therefore, take advantage of every opportunity available to them to achieve their migration goals.

Poverty and related social exclusion are critical to addressing sustainability issues in urban contexts. Urban poverty is a major problem in sub-Saharan Africa that requires policy attention to address the situation. The different dimensions of sustainable practices are influenced by different individual and external-level factors that affect the overall sustainability practices of individuals. It is important for policy makers to address issues of urban poverty, cumulative deprivation, and inequality as strong barriers to the adoption of sustainability practices in low-income urban areas.

The poor living conditions in low-income urban places disrupt migrants' sustainable behaviour. This study suggests that prior migration behaviour across the social, economic, and environmental dimensions of sustainability was higher for many sampled populations than current sustainability practices. Living in poor neighbourhoods that are characterized by inequality and low levels of services and infrastructure negatively affects the behavioural outcomes. Low-income neighbourhoods in sub-Saharan African countries lack basic urban services such as water and sanitation, and there has also been very limited government intervention in these areas. Attaining inclusive and sustainable development in sub-Saharan Africa cannot be achieved without policymakers paying critical attention to the provision of basic services in low-income urban settings and other dimensions of urban sustainability for the benefit of all.

## References

- Abu, M. and Codjoe, S.N.A., 2018. Experience and future perceived risk of floods and diarrheal disease in urban poor communities in Accra, Ghana. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(12), p.2830.

- Adger, W.N., Boyd, E., Fábos, A., Fransen, S., Jolivet, D., Neville, G., De Campos, R.S. and Vijge, M.J., 2019. Migration transforms the conditions for the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 3(11), e440-e442.
- Agrawal, R. and Gupta, S., 2018. Consuming Responsibly: Exploring Environmentally Responsible Consumption Behaviors. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 31(4), pp.231–245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2017.1415402>
- Ajibade, I., McBean, G. and Bezner-Kerr, R., 2013. Urban flooding in Lagos, Nigeria: Patterns of vulnerability and resilience among women. *Global environmental change*, 23(6), pp.1714-1725.
- Alba, R. and Nee, V., 1997. Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International migration review*, 31(4), pp.826-874. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019791839703100403>
- Alkire, S., Jindra, C., Robles, G., Vaz, A., 2017. Multidimensional poverty index summer 2017: Brief Methodological note and results. OPH Methodological Notes, 45.
- Amin, A., 2006. The good city. *Urban studies*, 43(5-6), pp.1009-1023.
- Amoah, A. and Addoah, T., 2021. Does environmental knowledge drive pro-environmental behavior in developing countries? Evidence from households in Ghana. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 23(2), pp.2719–2738. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-020-00698-x>
- Anarfi, K., Shiel, C. and Hill, R. A., 2020. Assessing How Sustainability Is Promoted in Ghana's National Urban Policy and Action Plan. *Sustainability*, 12(18), p.7556. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12187556>
- Arimah, B.C. and Branch, C.M., 2011, January. Slums as expressions of social exclusion: Explaining the prevalence of slums in African countries. In *OECD International conference on social cohesion and development, Paris* (pp. 20-21).
- Aryee, M. K., Pumijumnong, N., Punwong, P. and Roachanakanan, R., 2018. Assessment of the Sustainability of Accra Metropolitan Area, Ghana. *Applied Environmental Research*, pp.23–35. <https://doi.org/10.35762/AER.2018.40.1.3>
- Awumbila, M., Owusu, G. and Teye, J.K., 2014. Can rural-urban migration into slums reduce poverty? Evidence from Ghana.
- Awumbila, M., Teye, J.K. and Yaro, J.A., 2017. Social networks, migration trajectories and livelihood strategies of migrant domestic and construction workers in Accra, Ghana. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 52(7), pp.982-996
- Bertoli, S. and Marchetta, F., 2014. Migration, remittances and poverty in Ecuador. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 50(8), pp.1067-1089. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2014.919382>
- Borderon, M., Sakdapolrak, P., Muttarak, R., Kebede, E., Pagogna, R. and Sporer, E., 2019. Migration influenced by environmental change in Africa. *Demographic Research*, 41, pp.491-544.
- Borjas, G.J., 1986. The self-employment experience of immigrants. *Journal of Human Resources*, 21(4), pp.485-506.
- Castles, S., 2014. International migration at a crossroads. *Citizenship Studies*, 18(2), pp.190-207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2014.886439>
- Clark, C. F., Kotchen, M. J. and Moore, M. R., 2003. Internal and external influences on proenvironmental behavior: Participation in a green electricity program. *Journal of*

- Environmental Psychology, 23(3), pp.237–246. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944\(02\)00105-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(02)00105-6)
- Coulter, R., Ham, M.V. and Findlay, A.M., 2016. Re-thinking residential mobility: Linking lives through time and space. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(3), pp.352-374.
- Cui, X., Fang, C., Liu, H. and Liu, X., 2019. Assessing sustainability of urbanization by a coordinated development index for an Urbanization-Resources-Environment complex system: A case study of Jing-Jin-Ji region, China. *Ecological Indicators*, 96, pp.383-391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.09.009>
- De Haas, H., 2010. Migration Transitions: A Theoretical and Empirical Inquiry into the Developmental Drivers of International Migration. Oxford: University of Oxford, International Migration Institute, IMI/DEMIG Working Paper No. 24.
- Elf, P., Gatersleben, B., and Christie, I., 2019. Facilitating Positive Spillover Effects: New Insights From a 64 Mixed-Methods Approach Exploring Factors Enabling People to Live More Sustainable Lifestyles. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, p.2699. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02699>
- Eisler, A., Eisler, H. and Yoshida, M., 2003. Perception of human ecology: Cross-cultural and gender comparisons. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23, pp.89–101. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944\(02\)00083-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(02)00083-X)
- FAO., 2018. The State of Food and Agriculture 2018. Migration, agriculture and rural development. Rome. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
- Gavonell, M.F., Adger, W.N., de Campos, R.S., Boyd, E., Carr, E.R., Fábos, A., Fransen, S., Jolivet, D., Zickgraf, C., Codjoe, S.N. and Abu, M., 2021. The migration-sustainability paradox: transformations in mobile worlds. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 49, pp.98-109.
- Hagen-Zanker, J., Mallett, R., Ghimire, A., Shah, Q. A., Upreti, B. and Abbas, H., 2014. Migration from the margins: mobility, vulnerability and inevitability in mid-western Nepal and north-western Pakistan. *Researching Livelihoods and Services Affected by Conflict, Report*, 5.
- Hargreaves, T. and Middlemiss, L., 2020. The importance of social relations in shaping energy demand. *Nature Energy*, 5(3), pp.195-201. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-020-0553-5>
- Head, L., Klocker, N. and Aguirre-Bielschowsky, I., 2019. Environmental values, knowledge and behavior: Contributions of an emergent literature on the role of ethnicity and migration. *Progress in Human Geography*, 43(3), pp.397–415. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518768407>
- Head, L., Klocker, N., Dun, O., Waitt, G., Goodall, H., Aguirre-Bielschowsky, I., Gopal, A., Kerr, S.M., Nowroozipour, F., Spaven, T. and Toole, S., 2021. Barriers to and enablers of sustainable practices: insights from ethnic minority migrants. *Local Environment*, 26(5), pp.595-614.
- Hugo, G., 1996. Environmental concerns and international migration. *International migration review*, 30(1), pp.105-131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019791839603000110>
- International Labour Organisation, 2016. Non-standard employment around the world: Understanding challenges, shaping prospects. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- International Organisation for Migration (IOM), 2017. Global Migration Trends. Berlin: IOM Global Migration Data Analysis Centre.

- Jaeger, C. M. and Schultz, P. W., 2017. Coupling social norms and commitments: Testing the underdetected nature of social influence. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 51, pp.199–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.03.015>
- Johnson, C. Y., Bowker, J. M. and Cordell, H. K., 2004. Ethnic Variation in Environmental Belief and Behavior: An Examination of the New Ecological Paradigm in a Social Psychological Context. *Environment and Behavior*, 36(2), pp.157–186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916503251478>
- Kessides, C., 2006. *The urban transition in Sub-Saharan Africa: Implications for economic growth and poverty reduction* (p. 116). Washington, DC: Cities Alliance.
- Levitt, P., 1998. Social remittances: Migration driven local-level forms of cultural diffusion. *International migration review*, 32(4), pp.926-948. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019791839803200404>
- MacGregor, S., Walker, C., and Katz-Gerro, T., 2019. 'It's what I've always done': Continuity and change in the household sustainability practices of Somali immigrants in the UK. *Geoforum*, 107, pp.143– 153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.09.013>
- Maller, C. and Strengers, Y., 2013. The global migration of everyday life: Investigating the practice memories of Australian migrants. *Geoforum*, 44, pp.243-252.
- Mansour, G. and Esseku, H., 2017. Situation analysis of the urban sanitation sector in Ghana. *Urban Sanitation Research Initiative Ghana: Accra, Ghana*.
- McCollum, D., Keenan, K. and Findlay, A., 2020. The case for a lifecourse perspective on mobility and migration research. In *Handbook on demographic change and the lifecourse* (pp. 200-212). Edward Elgar.
- Mulcahy, K. and Kollamparambil, U., 2016. The impact of rural-urban migration on subjective well-being in South Africa. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 52(9), pp.1357-1371. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2016.1171844>
- O'Brien, K., 2012. Global environmental change II: From adaptation to deliberate transformation. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(5), pp.667-676.
- Omarova, L. and Jo, S.J., 2022. Employee pro-environmental behaviour: The impact of environmental transformational leadership and GHRM. *Sustainability*, 14(4), p.2046. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14042046>
- Oppong, B. E., Asomani-Boateng, R. and Fricano, R. J., 2020. Accra's Old Fadama/Agbogbloshie settlement. To what extent is this slum sustainable? *African Geographical Review*, 39(4), pp.289– 307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19376812.2020.1720753>
- Otto, S., and Kaiser, F. G., 2014. Ecological behavior across the lifespan: Why environmentalism increases as people grow older. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 40, pp.331–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2014.08.004>
- Owusu, G., Agyei-Mensah, S. and Lund, R., 2008. Slums of hope and slums of despair: Mobility and livelihoods in Nima, Accra. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 62(3), pp.180–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00291950802335798>
- Navarro, O., Tapia-Fonllem, C., Fraijo-Sing, B., Roussiau, N., Ortiz-Valdez, A., Guillard, M., Wittenberg, I., and Fleury-Bahi, G., 2020. Connectedness to nature and its relationship with spirituality, wellbeing and sustainable behavior (Conectividad con la naturaleza y su relación con la espiritualidad, el bienestar y la conducta sustentable). *PsyEcology*, 11(1), pp.37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21711976.2019.1643662>



- Portes, A., 2010. Migration and social change: Some conceptual reflections. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 36(10), 1537-1563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2010.489370>
- Schraven, B. and Rademacher-Schulz, C., 2016. Shifting rainfalls, shifting livelihoods: Seasonal migration, food security and social inequality in Northern Ghana. *Environmental Migration and Social Inequality*, pp.43-56. <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-25796-9>
- Schmitt, M. T., Akin, L. B., Axsen, J., and Shwom, R. L., 2018. Unpacking the Relationships Between Proenvironmental Behavior, Life Satisfaction, and Perceived Ecological Threat. *Ecological Economics*, 143, pp.130–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.07.007>
- Scoones, I., Stirling, A., Abrol, D., Atela, J., Charli-Joseph, L., Eakin, H., Ely, A., Olsson, P., Pereira, L., Priya, R. and van Zwanenberg, P., 2020. Transformations to sustainability: combining structural, systemic and enabling approaches. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 42, pp.65-75.
- Smit, W. and Parnell, S., 2012. Urban sustainability and human health: An African perspective. *Current opinion in environmental sustainability*, 4(4), pp.443-450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2012.07.004>
- Somanje, A.N., Mohan, G., Lopes, J., Mensah, A., Gordon, C., Zhou, X., Moinuddin, M., Saito, O. and Takeuchi, K., 2020. Challenges and potential solutions for sustainable urban-rural linkages in a Ghanaian context. *Sustainability*, 12(2), p.507.
- Soopramanien, D., Daryanto, A. and Song, Z., 2023. Urban residents' environmental citizenship behaviour: The roles of place attachment, social norms and perceived environmental responsibility. *Cities*, 132, p.104097.
- Szaboova, L., Safrá de Campos, R., Adger, W.N., Abu, M., Codjoe, S.N.A., Franco Gavonell, M., Das, S., Siddiqui, T., Rocky, M.H. and Hazra, S., 2022. Urban sustainability and the subjective well-being of migrants: The role of risks, place attachment, and aspirations. *Population, Space and Place*, 28(1), e2505.
- Tacoli, C., McGranahan, G. and Satterthwaite, D., 2015. *Urbanisation, rural-urban migration and urban poverty*. London, UK: Human Settlements Group, International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Takahashi, B. and Selfa, T., 2015. Predictors of pro-environmental behavior in rural American communities. *Environment and Behavior*, 47(8), pp.856-876.
- Tapia-Fonllem, C., Corral-Verdugo, V., Fraijo-Sing, B., & Durón-Ramos, M., 2013. Assessing Sustainable Behavior and its Correlates: A Measure of Pro-Ecological, Frugal, Altruistic and Equitable Actions. *Sustainability*, 5(2), pp.711–723. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su5020711>
- Thalheimer, L., Williams, D.S., Van der Geest, K. and Otto, F.E., 2021. Advancing the evidence base of future warming impacts on human mobility in African drylands. *Earth's Future*, 9(10), p.e2020EF001958.
- Thomas, G.O., Fisher, R., Whitmarsh, L., Milfont, T.L. and Poortinga, W., 2018. The impact of parenthood on environmental attitudes and behaviour: a longitudinal investigation of the legacy hypothesis. *Population and environment*, 39(3), pp.261-276.
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2017. International Migration Report 2017: Highlights (ST/ESA/SER.A/404).

Vogiazides, L., 2018. Exiting distressed neighbourhoods: The timing of spatial assimilation among international migrants in Sweden. *Population, Space and Place*, 24(8), p.e2169.

World Bank 2023. World Development Report 2023: Migrants, Refugees and Societies. World Bank: Washington DC. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2023>

**Table 1: Description of variables**

Variable	Reference	Label
<b>Sustainability score</b>		A composite score of environmental, social and economic sustainability indicators
<b>Environmental Sustainability Score</b>		
418. How often did you use your own bag when carrying groceries?	MacGregor et al., 2019	1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always
420. How often did you separate organic waste (coffee grounds, fruit and vegetable peels, garden waste etc.) from the rest of your everyday waste?	MacGregor et al., 2019	
424. How often did you or your household members wear second-hand clothes? (only ask for family members)	Agrawal & Gupta, 2018	
<b>Social Sustainability Score</b>		
422. How often were you volunteering in any organisation aimed at preserving the environment?	Tapia-Fonllem et. Al. 2013	1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always
423. How often were you volunteering in any community/national/international organisation aimed at preserving people's rights (e.g. right to equality, health, housing, religion, etc.)?	Tapia-Fonllem et. Al. 2013	
426. Apart from family members and friends, how often did you help people who were worse off than you, e.g. through giving food, gifts, donations, or money?		
427. How often did you borrow, rent or swap products such as a hammer, a car or a ladder instead of buying them?	Tapia-Fonllem et. Al. 2013	
<b>Economic Sustainability Score</b>		
416. When you were living in NEIGHBOURHOOD, how often did you move around by foot, bicycle or public/shared transport.	Agrawal & Gupta, 2018	1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always
417. How often did you grow your own fruit, nuts, vegetables, cereals, or other food and/or keep your own animals (for instance chickens, sheep or pigs)	Schraven & Rademacher-Schulz, 2016	
419. How often did you take care of the common areas near your house (pavement / staircase / green area, etc)	Tapia-Fonllem et. Al. 2013	
421. How often did you make efforts to save everyday water use (through less number of baths in a week, cleaning and cooking, immediate action to repair leaks in water pipe or tap, ensuring multiple uses of used water etc.)?	MacGregor et al., 2019 Fielmua & Dongzagla, 2020	
425. How often did you choose certain products to consume because the people involved in their production were treated and paid fairly?	Mair et al., 2019	
<b>Relative Deprivation and Wellbeing</b>		
410. Compared to other households in NEIGHBOURHOOD, your household was	Schmitt et al., 2018; Navarro et al., 2020	1. Among the poorest 2. Below Average 3. About Average
411. Compared to other households in that city/town/village, your household was		



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Good quality healthcare</li> <li>j. Good quality education (schools, higher education)</li> <li>k. Good quality of housing</li> <li>l. Good quality of support from the local government</li> <li>m. Good quality of support from NGO's and local associations</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics**

	Non-Migrant	Internal Migrant	International Migrant	Total
Variable	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
<b>District</b>				
Madina/Adenta	35.08	48.83	43.29	42.56
AMA	29.84	18.73	17.17	20.89
LEKMA	7.54	8.03	3.76	5.85
Ashaiman	27.54	24.41	35.78	30.70
<b>Age</b>				
Age	30.29 (11.47)	32.96 (12.22)	26.84 (6.78)	29.32 (10.07)
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	51.15	41.14	94.98	69.62
Female	48.85	58.86	5.02	30.38
<b>Education</b>				
No Formal	4.26	6.69	10.80	8.08
Primary	13.77	19.06	17.07	16.75
JHS	23.61	34.78	12.72	21.17
SHS	39.67	28.43	25.44	29.93
Post-Sec	8.20	5.69	6.62	6.63
Tertiary	9.18	4.01	6.62	6.63
Koranic	1.31	1.34	20.73	10.80
Number of Children	1.11 (1.51)	1.46 (1.70)	0.56 (1.11)	0.95 (1.44)
Number of Partners	0.69 (0.67)	0.88 (0.77)	0.55 (0.63)	0.67 (0.70)
Number of Neighbourhoods Moved to	1.53 (0.85)	2.65 (0.91)	2.36 (0.63)	2.22 (0.88)
Sustainability Score (current)	2.66 (0.36)	2.61 (0.38)	2.47 (0.43)	2.55 (0.41)
Sustainability Score (before)	-	2.77 (0.50)	2.69 (0.50)	2.72 (0.50)
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household (Current)</b>				
Below Average (ref)	9.87	20.00	33.58	23.67
Average	67.11	65.76	57.22	62.10
Above average	23.03	14.24	9.19	14.22
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household (Before)</b>				
Below Average (ref)	20.43	24.13	27.85	25.93
Average	67.74	60.14	62.24	62.14
Above average	11.83	15.73	9.91	11.93
<b>City Status of Household (Current)</b>				
Below Average (ref)	18.48	28.47	36.59	29.62
Average	61.72	62.03	53.85	58.09
Above average	19.80	9.49	9.57	12.29
<b>City Status of Household (Before)</b>				
Below Average (ref)	29.03	31.23	36.64	34.17
Average	61.29	55.44	54.02	55.20
Above average	9.68	13.33	9.35	10.62
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood (Current)</b>				
Unsatisfied (ref)	11.15	15.44	6.27	9.91
Neutral	7.21	10.07	9.68	9.13
Satisfied	81.64	74.50	84.05	80.96
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood (Before)</b>				
Unsatisfied (ref)	12.90	11.58	14.75	13.59
Neutral	6.45	8.07	13.11	10.90
Satisfied	80.65	80.35	72.13	75.51
Place Attachment Score (Current)	3.51 (0.40)	3.41 (0.50)	3.51 (0.45)	3.48 (0.45)
Place Attachment Score (Before)		3.49 (0.52)	3.49 (0.45)	3.49 (0.47)
Infrastructure Score (Current)	4.41 (0.82)	4.16 (0.89)	4.26 (0.85)	4.27 (0.86)
Infrastructure Score (Before)	-	4.54 (1.00)	4.34 (1.04)	4.41 (1.03)
Sustainable Attitude Score	3.95 (0.33)	3.94 (0.36)	3.85 (0.33)	3.9 (0.34)
N	305	299	559	1163

**Table 3: Factors affecting sustainability practices in Accra**

	Overall Sustainability Score	Environmental Sustainability Score	Social Sustainability score	Economic Sustainability Score
Variable	Coeff. (SE)	Coeff. (SE)	Coeff. (SE)	Coeff. (SE)
<b>Stream of Migrant</b>				
<i>Non-Migrant (ref)</i>				
Internal	-0.055 (0.037)	-0.148** (0.056)	-0.006 (0.057)	-0.013 (0.043)
International	-0.149*** (0.036)	-0.224*** (0.055)	-0.129* (0.055)	-0.095* (0.042)
<b>District</b>				
<i>Madina (ref)</i>				
AMA	0.083* (0.032)	0.137** (0.049)	0.117* (0.050)	-0.005 (0.037)
LEKMA	0.055 (0.051)	0.138 (0.078)	0.025 (0.079)	0.002 (0.059)
Ashaiman	0.107*** (0.029)	0.174*** (0.044)	0.143** (0.044)	0.003 (0.033)
<b>Age</b>				
Age	0.005** (0.002)	0.009*** (0.003)	0.006* (0.003)	0.001 (0.002)
<b>Sex</b>				
<i>Male (ref)</i>				
Female	0.046 (0.030)	0.323*** (0.046)	-0.208*** (0.047)	0.024 (0.035)
<b>Education</b>				
<i>Tertiary (ref)</i>				
No Formal	0.020 (0.065)	0.036 (0.100)	-0.064 (0.101)	0.087 (0.076)
Primary	0.091 (0.056)	0.147 (0.087)	0.036 (0.088)	0.089 (0.066)
Junior High School	0.112* (0.054)	0.151 (0.082)	0.099 (0.083)	0.087 (0.062)
Senior High School	0.105* (0.051)	0.157* (0.078)	0.031 (0.079)	0.126* (0.059)
Post-Secondary	0.064 (0.066)	0.102 (0.102)	-0.014 (0.103)	0.105 (0.077)
Koranic	0.110 (0.062)	0.109 (0.095)	0.057 (0.096)	0.164* (0.072)
Number of Children	-0.039** (0.012)	-0.038* (0.018)	-0.050** (0.018)	-0.028* (0.013)
Number of Partners	0.066** (0.020)	0.041 (0.031)	0.115*** (0.031)	0.042 (0.024)
Number of Neighbourhoods Moved to	0.019 (0.016)	-0.008 (0.024)	0.024 (0.024)	0.041* (0.018)
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
Average	-0.096** (0.036)	-0.119* (0.055)	-0.223*** (0.055)	0.055 (0.041)
Above average	0.009 (0.056)	0.011 (0.086)	-0.140 (0.087)	0.155* (0.065)
<b>City Status of Household</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
Average	0.162*** (0.033)	0.016 (0.051)	0.364*** (0.051)	0.107** (0.039)
Above average	0.154** (0.056)	-0.175* (0.085)	0.587*** (0.086)	0.051 (0.065)
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood</b>				

<i>Unsatisfied (ref)</i>				
Neutral	-0.053 (0.053)	-0.040 (0.081)	-0.041 (0.082)	-0.079 (0.062)
Satisfied	-0.029 (0.043)	-0.119 (0.066)	0.046 (0.066)	-0.014 (0.050)
Place Attachment Score	0.059* (0.028)	0.022 (0.043)	0.160*** (0.043)	-0.006 (0.033)
Infrastructure Score	0.089*** (0.015)	0.109*** (0.024)	0.051* (0.024)	0.105*** (0.018)
Sustainable Attitude Score	-0.005 (0.037)	-0.131* (0.056)	-0.055 (0.057)	0.172*** (0.043)
Constant	01.689*** (0.187)	02.393*** (0.287)	01.344*** (0.290)	01.331*** (0.218)

\* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001



**Table 4: Factors affecting sustainability practices among non-migrants in Accra**

Variable	Overall	Environmental	Social	Economic
	Sustainability	Sustainability	Sustainability	Sustainability
	Score	Score	Score	Score
	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.
	(SE)	(SE)	(SE)	(SE)
<b>District</b>				
<i>Madina/Adenta (ref)</i>				
	0.12*	0.28**	0.07	0.01
	(0.05)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.07)
AMA	0.26**	0.31*	0.31*	0.18
	(0.08)	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.11)
LEKMA	0.11*	0.19*	0.13	0.00
	(0.05)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.07)
Ashaiman				
<b>Age</b>				
	0.01*	0.01*	0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Age				
<b>Sex</b>				
<i>Male (ref)</i>				
	0.00	0.34***	-0.30***	-0.04
	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)
Female				
<b>Education</b>				
<i>Tertiary (ref)</i>				
	0.21	0.17	0.15	0.30
	(0.12)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.17)
No Formal	0.11	0.23	-0.04	0.15
	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.13)
Primary	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.17
	(0.08)	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.11)
Junior High School	0.17*	0.18	0.05	0.29**
	(0.07)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.10)
Senior High School	0.21*	0.26	0.08	0.28*
	(0.09)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.13)
Post-Secondary	0.04	-0.23	0.02	0.33
	(0.18)	(0.32)	(0.30)	(0.25)
Koranic	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	-0.02
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Number of Children	0.09**	0.05	0.14*	0.08
	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.05)
Number of Partners	-0.03	-0.06	-0.10*	0.06
	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Number of Neighbourhoods Moved to				
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
	0.11	0.24	-0.02	0.10
	(0.08)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.11)
Average	0.15	0.36*	-0.08	0.17
	(0.10)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.14)
Above average				
<b>City Status of Household</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
	-0.03	-0.30**	0.17	0.05
	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.08)
Average	0.02	-0.37*	0.42**	0.01
	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.13)
Above average				
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood</b>				
<i>Unsatisfied (ref)</i>				
	-0.01	-0.03	0.06	-0.07
	(0.09)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.13)
Neutral	0.04	-0.13	0.20	0.05
	(0.07)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.09)
Satisfied				

	0.15**	0.20*	0.34***	-0.08
Place Attachment Score	(0.05)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.08)
	0.10***	0.13**	0.07	0.10*
Infrastructure Score	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)
	-0.06	-0.19	-0.13	0.14
Sustainable Attitude Score	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.09)
	01.44***	01.79**	01.04	01.51**
Constant	(0.32)	(0.57)	(0.53)	(0.44)

---

\* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001

**Table 5: Factors affecting sustainability practices among Internal migrants in Accra**

Variable	Overall	Environmental	Social	Economic
	Sustainability	Sustainability	Sustainability	Sustainability
	Score	Score	Score	Score
	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.
	(SE)	(SE)	(SE)	(SE)
<b>District</b>				
<i>Madina/Adenta (ref)</i>	0.106*	0.041	0.326**	0.074
AMA	(0.052)	(0.089)	(0.098)	(0.078)
LEKMA	0.032	0.164	-0.011	-0.042
	(0.071)	(0.122)	(0.136)	(0.107)
Ashaiman	0.005	-0.057	0.181*	-0.050
	(0.048)	(0.082)	(0.091)	(0.072)
<b>Age</b>				
Age	0.002	0.006	0.002	0.002
	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
<b>Sex</b>				
<i>Male (ref)</i>				
Female	0.050	0.239**	-0.202**	0.107
	(0.040)	(0.069)	(0.075)	(0.059)
<b>Education</b>				
<i>Tertiary (ref)</i>				
No Formal	-0.084	0.189	-0.222	-0.158
	(0.129)	(0.222)	(0.246)	(0.194)
Primary	-0.196	-0.034	-0.293	-0.124
	(0.113)	(0.192)	(0.213)	(0.168)
Junior High School	-0.156	0.027	-0.213	-0.115
	(0.104)	(0.179)	(0.197)	(0.156)
Senior High School	-0.181	0.048	-0.365	-0.111
	(0.105)	(0.180)	(0.199)	(0.157)
Post-Secondary	-0.205	0.109	-0.397	-0.249
	(0.127)	(0.218)	(0.242)	(0.190)
Koranic	-0.271	-0.299	-0.377	-0.070
	(0.198)	(0.339)	(0.376)	(0.297)
Number of Children	-0.041**	-0.042	-0.049	-0.032
	(0.015)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.023)
Number of Partners	0.066*	0.079	0.081	0.052
	(0.029)	(0.050)	(0.056)	(0.044)
Number of Neighbourhoods Moved to	0.038	0.060	0.010	-0.002
	(0.023)	(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.034)
Sustainability practice score (before)	04.989***	0.242***	0.454***	0.309***
	(0.508)	(0.057)	(0.078)	(0.065)
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household (Current)</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
Average	-0.089	-0.064	-0.160	-0.085
	(0.059)	(0.101)	(0.111)	(0.088)
Above average	0.045	0.027	-0.027	0.085
	(0.091)	(0.156)	(0.173)	(0.137)
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household (Before)</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
Average	0.019	0.123	-0.065	-0.044
	(0.062)	(0.106)	(0.118)	(0.093)
Above average	-0.037	0.060	-0.215	-0.005
	(0.085)	(0.146)	(0.162)	(0.127)
<b>City Status of Household (Current)</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
Average	0.174**	-0.014	0.417***	0.133
	(0.056)	(0.097)	(0.107)	(0.085)

Above average	0.226*	-0.103	0.616**	0.186
	(0.097)	(0.166)	(0.184)	(0.147)
<b>City Status of Household (Before)</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
Average	0.005	-0.022	0.125	-0.004
	(0.059)	(0.101)	(0.112)	(0.088)
Above average	0.050	0.016	0.368*	-0.118
	(0.084)	(0.144)	(0.160)	(0.126)
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood (Current)</b>				
<i>Unsatisfied (ref)</i>				
Neutral	-0.078	0.060	-0.193	-0.114
	(0.078)	(0.135)	(0.149)	(0.117)
Satisfied	0.011	0.141	-0.030	-0.055
	(0.065)	(0.112)	(0.124)	(0.098)
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood (Before)</b>				
<i>Unsatisfied (ref)</i>				
Neutral	-0.092	0.128	-0.168	-0.278*
	(0.088)	(0.150)	(0.167)	(0.131)
Satisfied	-0.139*	-0.128	-0.151	-0.197*
	(0.065)	(0.112)	(0.124)	(0.098)
Place Attachment Score (Current)	0.090*	-0.076	0.267**	0.097
	(0.043)	(0.074)	(0.083)	(0.065)
Place Attachment Score (Before)	-0.039	-0.008	-0.026	0.023
	(0.043)	(0.073)	(0.082)	(0.063)
Infrastructure Score (Current)	0.005	0.028	-0.009	0.016
	(0.027)	(0.046)	(0.051)	(0.040)
Infrastructure Score (Before)	0.021	0.051	-0.057	0.084*
	(0.027)	(0.047)	(0.052)	(0.041)
Sustainable Attitude Score	0.121*	-0.180	0.242*	0.329***
	(0.056)	(0.096)	(0.105)	(0.085)
Constant	0.641*	02.082***	-0.212	-0.118
	(0.302)	(0.516)	(0.580)	(0.458)

\* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001

**Table 6: Factors affecting sustainability practices among International Migrants in Accra**

Variable	Overall	Environmental	Social	Economic
	Sustainability	Sustainability	Sustainability	Sustainability
	Score	Score	Score	Score
	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.
	(SE)	(SE)	(SE)	(SE)
<b>District</b>				
<i>Madina/Adenta (ref)</i>	0.000	0.028***	0.043	-0.086
AMA	(0.046)	(0.077)	(0.075)	(0.056)
LEKMA	-0.063	-0.064***	-0.201	-0.094
	(0.080)	(0.136)	(0.132)	(0.099)
Ashaiman	0.036	0.145*	0.038	0.018
	(0.037)	(0.062)	(0.061)	(0.045)
<b>Age</b>				
Age	0.005	0.003***	0.009	0.001
	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)
<b>Sex</b>				
<i>Male (ref)</i>				
Female	0.115	0.327	-0.085	-0.046
	(0.070)	(0.118)	(0.115)	(0.087)
<b>Education</b>				
<i>Tertiary (ref)</i>				
No Formal	-0.061	-0.145***	0.041	-0.174
	(0.085)	(0.143)	(0.140)	(0.105)
Primary	0.031	-0.014***	0.152	-0.126
	(0.079)	(0.133)	(0.130)	(0.097)
Junior High School	0.074	0.112***	0.179	-0.138
	(0.078)	(0.131)	(0.128)	(0.096)
Senior High School	0.036	0.069***	0.080	-0.106
	(0.070)	(0.118)	(0.115)	(0.086)
Post-Secondary	-0.053	-0.243***	0.004	0.000
	(0.094)	(0.158)	(0.155)	(0.116)
Koranic	-0.001	-0.102***	0.147	-0.076
	(0.080)	(0.134)	(0.131)	(0.098)
Number of Children	-0.014	0.019***	-0.045	-0.024
	(0.018)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.022)
Number of Partners	-0.006	-0.033***	0.021	0.019
	(0.030)	(0.051)	(0.050)	(0.038)
Number of Neighbourhoods Moved to	0.109***	0.119*	0.120**	0.024
	(0.026)	(0.044)	(0.043)	(0.032)
Sustainability practice score (Before)	06.743***	0.405	0.578***	0.302***
	(0.401)	(0.044)	(0.054)	(0.044)
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household (Current)</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
Average	-0.079	-0.197***	-0.216**	0.028
	(0.044)	(0.074)	(0.072)	(0.054)
Above average	-0.083	-0.234***	-0.205	0.131
	(0.078)	(0.131)	(0.128)	(0.097)
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household (Before)</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
Average	0.012	-0.026***	-0.032	0.113
	(0.049)	(0.082)	(0.080)	(0.060)
Above average	-0.008	0.005***	-0.093	0.121
	(0.079)	(0.134)	(0.130)	(0.098)
<b>City Status of Household (Current)</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
Average	0.118*	0.076***	0.347***	0.114*
	(0.046)	(0.078)	(0.075)	(0.056)

	0.084	-0.159***	0.507***	0.057
Above average	(0.077)	(0.130)	(0.126)	(0.095)
<b>City Status of Household (Before)</b>				
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>				
	0.013	0.064***	0.062	-0.008
Average	(0.047)	(0.079)	(0.077)	(0.058)
	-0.027	-0.051***	0.142	-0.056
Above average	(0.077)	(0.130)	(0.126)	(0.096)
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood (Current)</b>				
<i>Unsatisfied (ref)</i>				
	-0.034	-0.147***	0.105	-0.045
Neutral	(0.075)	(0.126)	(0.124)	(0.092)
	-0.007	-0.272***	0.147	0.091
Satisfied	(0.065)	(0.110)	(0.108)	(0.081)
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood (Before)</b>				
<i>Unsatisfied (ref)</i>				
	-0.054	-0.028***	-0.091	-0.066
Neutral	(0.057)	(0.095)	(0.093)	(0.070)
	-0.033	-0.090***	-0.057	-0.046
Satisfied	(0.052)	(0.087)	(0.085)	(0.064)
	0.013	0.026***	-0.023	-0.030
Place Attachment Score (Current)	(0.038)	(0.064)	(0.062)	(0.046)
	-0.084*	-0.015***	-0.048	-0.078
Place Attachment Score (Before)	(0.040)	(0.068)	(0.066)	(0.049)
	0.080***	0.074**	0.099**	0.098***
Infrastructure Score (Current)	(0.022)	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.027)
	-0.011	-0.059***	0.024	0.040
Infrastructure Score (Before)	(0.020)	(0.034)	(0.032)	(0.024)
	-0.063	-0.166***	-0.131	0.009
Sustainable Attitude Score	(0.051)	(0.086)	(0.084)	(0.063)
	0.755*	01.895	0.251	01.336**
Constant	(0.319)	(0.527)	(0.521)	(0.392)

\* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001

**Appendix A: Weights assigned for computation of sustainability scores**

Dimension	Indicator	Definition	Weight
Environmental Index	q418	How often did you use your own bag when carrying groceries?	1/9
	q420	How often did you separate organic waste (coffee grounds, fruit and vegetable peels, garden waste etc.) from the rest of your everyday waste?	1/9
	q424	How often did you or your household members wear second-hand clothes? (only ask for family members)	1/9
Social index	q422	How often were you volunteering in any organisation aimed at preserving the environment?	1/12
	q423	How often were you volunteering in any community/national/international organisation aimed at preserving people's rights (e.g. Right to equality, health, housing, religion, etc.)?	1/12
	q426	Apart from family members and friends, how often did you help people who were worse off than you, e.g. through giving food, gifts, donation or money?	1/12
	q427	How often did you borrow, rent or swap products such as a hammer, a car or a ladder instead of buying them?	1/12
Economic index	q416	When you were living in NEIGHBOURHOOD, how often did you move around by foot, bicycle or public/shared transport	1/15
	q417	How often did you grow your own fruit, nuts, vegetables, cereals, or other food and/or keep your own animals (for instance chickens, sheep or pigs)?	1/15
	q419	How often did you take care of the common areas near your house (pavement / staircase / green area, etc.)?	1/15
	q421	How often did you make efforts to save everyday water use (through less number of baths in a week, cleaning and cooking, immediate action to repair leaks in water pipe or tap, ensuring multiple uses of used water etc)?	1/15
	q425	How often did you choose certain products to consume because the people involved in their production were treated and paid fairly?	1/15

Source: Source: Alkire et al. (2017)

**Appendix B: Test for multicollinearity among independent variables**

Variable	Table 3		Table 4	
	VIF	1/VIF	VIF	1/VIF
<b>Stream of Migrant (non-migrant)</b>				
Internal	2.01	0.498024		
International	2.46	0.406646		
<b>Locality (Madina)</b>				
AMA	1.29	0.77625	1.61	0.620146
LEKMA	1.12	0.895833	1.25	0.799041
Ashaiman	1.36	0.736739	1.54	0.651258
<b>Age</b>	2.14	0.466884	2.46	0.406184
<b>Sex Female</b>	1.5	0.665906	1.19	0.841235
<b>education (Tertiary)</b>				
No Formal	2.33	0.429879	1.64	0.609523
Primary	3.45	0.289491	2.66	0.376104
JHS	3.79	0.264128	3.42	0.292528
SHS	4.28	0.233509	3.76	0.265864
Post-Sec	1.85	0.541636	1.86	0.53738
Koranic	2.86	0.349164	1.19	0.838269
<b>Number of Children</b>	2.14	0.467533	2.39	0.4182
<b>Number of Partners</b>	1.52	0.658746	1.53	0.653543
<b>Number of Neighbourhoods Moved to</b>	1.46	0.685656	1.15	0.866305
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household (Below Average)</b>				
Average	2.31	0.433759	3.51	0.285057
Above average	2.95	0.338667	5.03	0.19872
<b>City Status of Household (Below average)</b>				
Average	2.08	0.481737	2.44	0.41064
Above average	2.59	0.386447	3.76	0.26604
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood (Unsatisfied)</b>				
Neutral	1.85	0.539739	1.6	0.625749
Satisfied	2.23	0.449437	1.91	0.522716
<b>Place Attachment Score</b>	1.22	0.816721	1.37	0.729766
<b>Infrastructure Score</b>	1.29	0.775672	1.46	0.683715
<b>Sustainable Attitude Score</b>	1.18	0.850107	1.27	0.787905
Mean VIF	2.13		2.17	



Variable	Table 5		Table 6	
	VIF	1/VIF	VIF	1/VIF
<b>Locality (Madina)</b>				
AMA	1.27	0.78826	1.31	0.762804
LEKMA	1.2	0.83481	1.25	0.800958
Ashaiman	1.35	0.741662	1.57	0.638576
<b>Age</b>	2.26	0.441804	2.36	0.423906
<b>Sex Female</b>	1.22	0.817925	1.17	0.856299
<b>education (Tertiary)</b>				
No Formal	3.44	0.290961	3.29	0.304285
Primary	6.22	0.160648	4.44	0.225376
JHS	8.11	0.12333	3.48	0.287149
SHS	7.09	0.141065	4.68	0.213674
Post-Sec	2.67	0.374688	1.86	0.537398
Koranic	1.79	0.557277	5.37	0.186267
<b>Number of Children</b>	2.09	0.478043	1.96	0.509056
<b>Number of Partners</b>	1.67	0.597148	1.78	0.562209
<b>Number of Neighbourhoods Moved to</b>	1.23	0.810507	1.29	0.773952
sustainabi~2	1.33	0.75379	1.25	0.798262
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household (Current)</b>				
Average	2.52	0.39745	2.33	0.428985
Above average	3.16	0.316513	2.38	0.420041
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household (Before)</b>				
Average	2.97	0.336603	2.73	0.366172
Above average	3.05	0.327763	2.62	0.381695
<b>City Status of Household (Current)</b>				
Average	2.4	0.416919	2.58	0.387622
Above average	2.56	0.390069	2.51	0.39878
<b>City Status of Household (Before)</b>				
Average	2.74	0.365247	2.71	0.369402
Above average	2.59	0.386824	2.46	0.406178
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood (Current)</b>				
Neutral	1.85	0.540099	2.58	0.386895
Satisfied	2.65	0.377953	3.02	0.3314
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood (Before)</b>				
Neutral	1.81	0.552843	1.85	0.540322
Satisfied	2.19	0.45642	2.72	0.36753
Place Attachment Score (Current)	1.53	0.655161	1.33	0.75136
Place Attachment Score (Before)	1.49	0.671197	1.38	0.725838
Infrastructure Score (Current)	1.87	0.535671	1.52	0.657768
Infrastructure Score (Before)	1.93	0.51748	1.77	0.565939
Sustainable Attitude Score	1.29	0.777119	1.33	0.754443
Mean VIF	2.55		2.34	

**Appendix C: Place attachment as a potential mediator of the association between migration status and sustainable behaviours**

	<b>Model 1</b>				<b>Model 2</b>
	<b>Sustainability Score</b>	<b>Environment Score</b>	<b>Social Score</b>	<b>Economic Score</b>	<b>Place Attachment Score</b>
Variable	Coeff. (SE)	Coeff. (SE)	Coeff. (SE)	Coeff. (SE)	Coeff. (SE)
<b>Stream of Migrant</b>					
<i>Non-Migrant (ref)</i>					
Internal	-0.057 (0.037)	-0.148** (0.056)	-0.011 (0.057)	-0.013 (0.043)	-0.030 (0.039)
International	-0.147*** (0.036)	-0.223*** (0.055)	-0.124* (0.056)	-0.095* (0.042)	0.032 (0.038)
<b>Locality</b>					
<i>Madina (ref)</i>					
AMA	0.080* (0.032)	0.136** (0.049)	0.110* (0.050)	-0.005 (0.037)	-0.041 (0.035)
LEKMA	0.051 (0.051)	0.137 (0.078)	0.014 (0.079)	0.003 (0.059)	-0.071 (0.055)
Ashaiman	0.105*** (0.029)	0.174*** (0.044)	0.138** (0.045)	0.003 (0.033)	-0.028 (0.031)
<b>Age</b>					
Age	0.006** (0.002)	0.009*** (0.003)	0.006* (0.003)	0.001 (0.002)	0.004* (0.002)
<b>Sex</b>					
<i>Male (ref)</i>					
Female	0.043 (0.030)	0.321*** (0.046)	-0.217*** (0.047)	0.024 (0.035)	-0.054 (0.032)
<b>Education</b>					
<i>Tertiary (ref)</i>					
No Formal	0.012 (0.065)	0.033 (0.100)	-0.084 (0.101)	0.088 (0.075)	-0.122 (0.070)
Primary	0.086 (0.056)	0.145 (0.086)	0.022 (0.088)	0.090 (0.066)	-0.088 (0.061)
JHS	0.107* (0.054)	0.149 (0.082)	0.086 (0.084)	0.088 (0.062)	-0.085 (0.058)
SHS	0.099 (0.051)	0.154* (0.078)	0.015 (0.079)	0.127* (0.059)	-0.099 (0.055)
Post-Sec	0.058 (0.066)	0.100 (0.102)	-0.031 (0.103)	0.105 (0.077)	-0.104 (0.071)
Koranic	0.108 (0.062)	0.108 (0.095)	0.051 (0.097)	0.164* (0.072)	-0.038 (0.067)
Number of Children	-0.039** (0.012)	-0.038* (0.018)	-0.052** (0.018)	-0.028* (0.013)	-0.012 (0.012)
Number of Partners	0.067** (0.020)	0.041 (0.031)	0.118*** (0.032)	0.042 (0.023)	0.017 (0.022)

Number of Neighbourhoods Moved to	0.017 (0.016)	-0.008 (0.024)	0.019 (0.025)	0.041* (0.018)	-0.030 (0.017)
<b>Neighbourhood Status of Household</b>					
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>					
Average	-0.095** (0.036)	-0.119* (0.055)	-0.221*** (0.056)	0.055 (0.041)	0.016 (0.038)
Above average	0.008 (0.056)	0.011 (0.086)	-0.143 (0.088)	0.155* (0.065)	-0.019 (0.060)
<b>City Status of Household</b>					
<i>Below Average (ref)</i>					
Average	0.165*** (0.033)	0.017 (0.051)	0.370*** (0.052)	0.107** (0.039)	0.039 (0.036)
Above average	0.162** (0.056)	-0.172* (0.085)	0.606*** (0.087)	0.050 (0.065)	0.122* (0.060)
<b>Satisfaction Living in Neighbourhood</b>					
<i>Unsatisfied (ref)</i>					
Neutral	-0.035 (0.052)	-0.033 (0.080)	0.009 (0.082)	-0.080 (0.061)	0.312*** (0.056)
Satisfied	0.000 (0.040)	-0.108 (0.062)	0.124 (0.063)	-0.016 (0.047)	0.487*** (0.044)
Infrastructure score	0.091*** (0.015)	0.110*** (0.023)	0.057* (0.024)	0.105*** (0.018)	0.039* (0.016)
Sustainable Attitude score	-0.003 (0.037)	-0.130* (0.056)	-0.052 (0.057)	0.171*** (0.043)	0.020 (0.039)
Constant	01.857*** (0.169)	02.455*** (0.260)	01.801*** (0.264)	01.315*** (0.197)	02.852*** (0.182)

\* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001.