



## Assessment of Rural – Urban Migration in South – Western Nigeria

O. M Apata<sup>1</sup>, S. O. W Toluwase<sup>1\*</sup> and O. J. Saliu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Services, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Kogi State University, Nigeria.

### Authors' contributions

*This work was designed and carried out by the three authors. The protocol and the first draft was written by the first and the second authors while the author OJS managed the literature searches. Analysis of data was performed by the authors OMA and SOWT designed and administer questionnaire. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

### Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2015/9782

#### Editor(s):

(1) Angel Paniagua Mazorra, Centre for Human and Social Sciences. Spanish Council for Scientific Research, Spain.

#### Reviewers:

(1) Sergey N. Polbitsyn, Institute of Economy, Urals Branch, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia.

(2) Anonymous, Ghana.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=895&id=25&aid=7582>

### Research Note

Received 28<sup>th</sup> February 2014

Accepted 30<sup>th</sup> May 2014

Published 31<sup>st</sup> December 2014

### ABSTRACT

The study examines rural urban migration in south – western Nigeria. Population of the study is the rural households of southwestern Nigeria Multi Stage random sampling technique was used to select two out of the six states that make up the south – western Nigeria. Five Local Government Areas were also randomly selected from each of the state while one rural community was randomly selected from each of the Local Government Area making a total of ten communities used for the survey. Twelve respondents were selected from each community making a total of one hundred and twenty (120) respondents for the study. Data collected were analyzed using Descriptive Analytical tools while Chi-square were used to establish relationship that existed between respondents' socio – economic characteristics and their annual income among others. Findings revealed that there are more male (62.2%) than the female (37.8%) migrants, that income was one of the major determinant of migration (23.300,  $p = 0.000$ ). Also majority migrated as a result of lack of social amenities such as health facilities (69.2%), and job opportunities (65.0%) coupled with higher standard of living in urban areas (74.2%) than rural areas.

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [simboapata@yahoo.com](mailto:simboapata@yahoo.com);

*Keywords: Migration; poverty; food security; infrastructures.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Migration is a selective process affecting individual or families with certain economic, social, educational and demographic characteristics. Migration occurs as a response to economic development as well as social, cultural, environmental and political factors and have its effect on both the area of origin (rural) as well as the destination (urban). [1], Revealed that people tend to move away from a place or location due to the need to escape violence, political instability, drought, congestion in various dimensions, adverse or real persecution. He further stated that adverse physical conditions such as flood, landslide (erosion and earthquake), insect and pest, soil infertility, unemployment, all these contribute immensely to the reason why people leave one environment for another. In the same vein, [2] reported that migration of people from rural to urban areas resulted as a result of decreasing contribution of agricultural production to Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This had led to rural – urban migration of young able bodied men and women to the cities where they engaged in off and non-farm activities. There is more emphasis on and implementation of an educational system that does not take agriculture as the alternative career vocation. Other vocations that naturally depend on agriculture for survival now suffer lack of raw materials as a result of rural-urban migration. Aged – men and women are left on the farm with crude implements and farm tools to till the land and tend the animals. Also, total lack of interest of young people in agriculture because of drudgery involved and security of essential farm inputs coupled with lack of social infrastructures have led to rural-urban migration. He concluded that the results of this entire negative attitude include; soaring unemployment among youths, increasing rate of social menaces, poverty in the land, food insecurity and environmental degradation.

The central theme to the understanding of rural – urban migration flows is the traditional push – pull factors [3]. “Push” refers to the circumstance at home that repel while “Pull” refers to those abroad that attract us. Generally, rural – urban migration has been explained as a function of several indicators which includes income, socio – economic variables, gender factors, age, education etc. It has been explained by [4,5] that the surplus cash from urban areas in term of remittances help in the development of social

and infrastructural amenities in the rural areas. The main current of migration is associated with a compensating counter current in form of rural development, including family support.

It has been revealed by [6] that migrants from rural to urban areas are always many compared to those coming from urban to rural areas. The movement from rural to urban areas makes a negative impact on the quality of rural life especially when such migrants take away their needed consumption into the city. He further submitted that the migrations of young adults from the rural areas to urban places a greater burden on the farmers. For farmers to cover the same area of land as when he had extra assistance, he must work much longer hours thus depriving him of sometimes for leisure or participation in various social activities. On the other hand [7], reveal that rural – urban migration has a positive impact on the urban growth and social development which make generation of employment opportunities and provisions of educational facilities and transportation infrastructure for the migrant. In fact the people left behind in the villages often look forward for remittances from urban areas for their supports [8]. Another school of thought also viewed that rural – urban migration rob villagers of both human and productive resources and explain this manifestation through four channels; by their absence, visits and remittances for cash and by becoming urban beach head for prospective village out migrants [9]. It is also presumed to weaken social bonds [10] and also diminishes trust, reciprocity and exchange.

Finally [11], puts the rate of urbanization in Nigeria at 5.3 % per annum and thereby making urban growth in Nigeria the fastest in the world. Hence the need for the study to examine and assess rural – urban migration in South Western Nigeria.

## 2. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Migration is a relocation of residence from an area to another. Migration can be defined as a temporary or permanent change in usual place of residence across a space in a given time period [12]. Rural- urban migration dominates the domain of research and planning as its role in changing the lives of migrants’ families both of the place of origin and destination. However, people migrate based on prevailing conditions

and the reasons for it vary from one person to the other, depending on the situation that brought about the decisions. It was reported by [1] that people tends to move more away from a place or location due to need to escape violence, political instability, drought, congestion in various dimensional adverse or real persecution, he further stated that adverse physical conditions such as flood, land slide (erosion, earthquake), insect and pest, soil fertility, unemployment are the attributes that immensely contributed to the reasons why people leave one environment for another. [3] Is of the opinion that rural-urban migration flow is the traditional push-pull factors. Push refers to circumstances at home that repel while pull refers to those abroad that attract. [8] Asserted that in most cases people leave the rural areas for their support. The school of thought view that rural-urban migration rob villagers of both human and productive resources and explained this manifestation through four channels by their absence, visits and remittances for cash and by becoming urban beach head for productive village out migrants [9]. The study is based on this model and was designed to see the effects on rural-urban migration on the rural households.

Migration is the movement of people or animals from one place to another. At different point in-time, entire groups of people or animals have left their abode and moved to new ones. In terms of human, migration specifically refers to movement of people from one locality to another sometimes over long distances in large groups [13]. It is the movement of people leading to permanent settlement elsewhere.

Migration can be internal and international. Internal migration refers to the movement of people within their country of origin (in-migration or out-migration) which could be influenced by various social, economic and political factors.

It was revealed by [6] that migrants from rural to urban areas are always many compared to those coming from urban to rural areas. In a similar vein, [7] asserted that rural-urban migration has a positive impact on the urban growth and social development which make generation of employment opportunities, provision of educational facilities and transportation infrastructure for the migrants to increase proportionally.

International migration is the movement of people outside their country of origin (emigration) into another country (immigration).

### 3. METHODOLOGY

The South Western region of Nigeria popularly called Yoruba land had two distinct seasons; these are raining season (April – October) and dry season (November – March). The region transverse six of the thirty – Six states making up the federal republic of Nigeria including Ekiti, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, Osun, and Oyo states. The South Western s lies between 3°E and 6°E of the longitude and also between 6°N and 9°N of the latitude. Its population is estimated at about fifty million people and accounts for 20.5 percent of Nigeria's total land mass.

Rural households of southwestern Nigeria form the population of the study. Data was obtained from primary and secondary sources. Primary source was the use of structured interview schedule and secondary data from journals and textbooks. Data were collected on the socio – economic characteristics of the respondents, reasons for rural – urban migration in south western Nigeria, cause, and possible ways of reducing rural-urban migration among the people.

Multi stage sampling technique was used for the study. There was random selection of two out of the six states that make up south western, Nigeria. These states were Ekiti and Osun states. Five Local Governments Areas were randomly selected from each state and one community was selected from each Local Government Area making a total of ten communities. Finally twelve respondents were selected from each community to make a total of one hundred and twenty respondents used for the study.

Descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviation, frequency distribution and percentages were used to analyze the socio – economic characteristics of the respondents and Chi – square was used for inferential statistical tool to establish relationship that existed between the respondents and their associated variables.

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1 Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

From Table 1, the mean age is approximately 45.88 years with the standard Deviation of 11.529. The results revealed that 20.5% have ages between 25 – 35 years while those with their ages between 36 – 45 years were 28.6%.

Only 3.2% had their ages above 65 years. This revealed that most of the respondents were younger in age and hence still at their active and productive stages.

Gender variable revealed that 63.3% of the respondents were male while 36.7% were female. Household size variable revealed that 25.3% had household size that ranges between 1-5 while majority of the respondents had household size that ranges between 6–10 members. The distribution generally reveals that household size in the study area is fairly large. Marital status of the respondents shows that 23.3% were single, 44.2% were married while 7.5% and 25.0% were divorced and widowed respectively. The proportion of widows among the respondents is very high but there is no information why this is so.

**Table 1. Socio – economics characteristics of the respondents**

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Age</b>		
25 – 35	25	20.5
36 – 45	35	28.6
46 – 55	30	26.5
56 – 65	26	21.2
Above 65	4	3.2
<b>Sex.</b>		
Male	76	63.3
Female	44	36.7
<b>Household size</b>		
1-5	29	25.3
6-10	81	66.5
11-15	9	7.4
Above 15	1	0.8
<b>Marital status</b>		
Single	28	23.3
Married	53	44.2
Divorce	9	7.5
Widow	30	25.0
<b>Educational status</b>		
No formal education	39	32.5
Non-formal education	5	4.2
Primary education	29	24.2
Secondary education	28	23.3
Tertiary education	19	15.8
<b>Primary occupation</b>		
Farming	48	40.0
Trader	23	19.2
Civil service	14	11.7
Artisans	18	15.0
Others	17	14.2

Sources: Field Survey, 2011

The educational status of respondents reveals that 32.0% of the respondents had no formal education, 4.1% had non-formal education while 23.7% and 23% had primary and secondary

education respectively and only 17.2% had tertiary education. Also respondents were classified according to their primary occupation, from Table 1 above, it revealed that 40.0% were farmers, 18.9% were traders, 9.6% were civil servants while 16.5% were artisans and 16% engage in other type of occupations apart from the above.

#### 4.2 Distribution of Annual Income among Respondents

According to Table 2 below, the Distribution of the respondents by Annual income shows that 7.5% of the respondents earn below ₦ 50,000 annually, 13.3% earn between ₦ 50,001 – ₦ 100,000 annually, 25.0% earn between ₦ 100,001 – ₦ 150,000 annually while 35.0% earn between ₦ 150,001 – ₦ 200,000 annually and 19.2% earn above ₦ 200,000. The mean income of the respondents is ₦ 162,916.67. This income is viewed rather too small compares to the larger household size recorded in the study area and this might lead to migration of people especially the youths in the study area.

**Table 2. Distribution of the respondents' annual income**

Annual income (₦)	Frequency	Percentage
Below ₦ 50,000	9	7.5
₦ 50,000 – ₦ 100,000	16	13.3
₦ 100,001 – ₦ 150,000	30	25.0
₦ 150,001 – ₦ 200,000	42	35.0
Above ₦ 200,000	23	19.2
Total	120	100.0
Mean	162,916.67	

Source: Field Survey, 2011

Table 3 show the migration status of household members and the sex of the migrants. Table 3 above revealed that 37.5% of respondents have members of their households migrated to urban areas while 62.5% of the respondents did not. On the other hand, 62.2% of the migrants were male and 37.8% were female revealing that male migrated from rural areas to urban areas than female. This may be due to the fact that male are usually the head of the family who shouldered greater responsibility within the family. Hence they may need to migrate in search of greener pasture so that they can adequately cater for their family members. It is not usually easy for female to migrate from one place to the other because they need to look after the children.

Table 4 revealed the perception of respondents towards rural-urban migration in the study area. From the analysis, that 65.0% of the respondents

agreed that people migrate from rural to urban areas as a result of availability of job vacancies in urban areas than that of the rural areas and 74.2% agreed that people migrated as a result of higher standard of living of the urban areas than that of rural areas. In the same vein, 69.2% agreed that people migrate from rural to urban area as a result of available health care delivery services in urban centre while 80.0% agreed that migration of people from rural areas to urban areas is as a result of marriage influence and 60.0% agreed that education influences the influx of people from rural to urban areas. Only 32.5%, 10.3% and 18.3% agreed that migration from rural to urban areas involved youths mainly. Also migration from rural to urban areas had effect on the workforce of the rural areas and also that rural-urban migration had effect on the development of rural areas respectively.

**4.3 Hypothesis 1**

There is no significant relationship between rural-urban migration and socio-economic characteristics.

The chi-square analysis shown above revealed that the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) is accepted denoting a significant relationship. This is an indication that the chosen variables greatly

influence migration from rural to urban area in the studied area.

**Table 3. Migration status of household and gender status of the migrant**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Migrated members</b>		
Yes	45	37.5
No	75	62.5
<b>Sex of migrants</b>		
Male	28	62.2
Female	17	37.8
Total	45	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2011

The result of hypothesis II revealed that there is a significant relationship (X = 23.300, p = 0.000) between annual income of respondents and rural-urban migration.

This shows that inability of respondents to meet financial obligation of their households can lead to rural-urban migration. On the other hand, the result revealed that there is no significant relationship between attitude towards rural-urban migration and migration.

**Table 4. Respondents' perception towards rural- urban migration**

S/N	Statement	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
1	There are many job opportunities in the urban area than the rural area.	78 (65.0)	26 (21.67)	16 (13.33)	120 (100)
2	The standard of living of the urban people is higher than that of the rural people.	89 (74.17)	16 (13.33)	15 (12.50)	120 (100)
3	Health care delivering is more available in the urban centre than in rural area.	83 (69.17)	20 (16.67)	17 (14.17)	120 (100)
4	Marriage influences rural urban migration.	96 (80.00)	16 (13.33)	8 (6.67)	120 (100)
5	Youth are mostly involved in rural urban migration.	39 (32.00)	32 (26.27)	49 (40.83)	120 (100)
6	Education influence rural-urban migration.	72 (60.00)	35 (29.17)	13 (10.83)	120 (100)
7	Effect of rural-urban migration on the workforce in rural area.	12 (10.33)	66 (55.00)	42 (35.00)	120 (100)
8	Rural-urban migration affects the development of rural area.	83(69.17)	22 (18.33)	15 (12.50)	120 (100)

Source: Field Survey, 2011

**Table 5. Relationship between socio- economic characteristics and rural-urban migration**

Socio- economic characteristics	Chi- square value	Df	P value	Decision
Age	181.700	4	0.0001	Significant
Household size	135.400	3	0.0001	Significant
Marital status	103.083	3	0.0001	Significant
Sex	102.833	1	0.0001	Significant
Educational background	71.900	4	0.0001	Significant
Primary occupation	41.200	4	0.0001	Significant

Source: Field Survey, 2011

## 5. CONCLUSION

The study revealed that majority of the respondents are married and most of the migrants are male. The factors that is responsible for their movement from rural area to urban area according to the research finding includes, the search for greener pastures in the cities, access to good health care services, access to quality education and that educated migrants secure better job in the urban area than the rural area.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

The following recommendations were made to reduce the rural-urban migration in the study area.

Since farming is the predominant source of income and the primary occupation of the rural people, Government need to provide upgraded technologies for agricultural production in order to further improve the output level of the respondents.

Provision of social amenities such as electricity, healthcare services, establishment of higher institution of learning, good road network, portable and drinkable water should be priorities of rural development agencies.

Provision of employment opportunities in the rural area by establishing cottage industries will minimized or reduced people migration from rural to urban areas. There should be creation of mini urban centre or mega towns in the rural areas, which will hasten the development of the rural areas by the government.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Adewuyi G, Ebigbola J. A conceptual framework for migration. Dynamics and charging rural-urban migration in Imo State, Nigeria; 1990.
2. Ali CN. Gender analysis of rural-urban migration in Imo State. Nigeria; 2005.
3. Faborode M. A key note address at the united small and medium scale farmers association (USMEFAN) Conference. Ibadan, Nigeria; 2008.
4. Fadayomi TO. Rural development and migration in Nigeria, Impact of eastern zone of branch state agricultural development project. Nigeria Institute of Social and Economic Research Ibadan, Nigeria; 1988.
5. Fadayomi TO. Socio-economic factors associated with urban-rural migration; 1998.
6. Ijere NJ. Gender and rural-urban migration in the Ecuadorian Sierra Columbia University Press. Columbia. 1994;3(2):76.
7. Kartz PJ. Conceptual framework for migration dynamics and charging linkage in Nigeria; 2000.
8. Makinwa PK. Conceptual framework for migration dynamic and changing rural-urban linkages in Nigeria; 1981.
9. National Population Commission NPC. Gender analysis of rural-urban migration in Imo state, Nigeria; 2005.
10. Okpara EE. The Impact of migration on the quality of Nigeria Rural Life Nigeria. Agricultural Research Management and Training Institutes Services Series. 1983;3:116-117.
11. Ravestin EG. The law of migration, Journal of Royal Statistical society. 1985;48(2):99-101.
12. Weeks JR. Population: An introduction to concepts and issues. Wadsworth Publishing Company Belmonts; 1999. Available:[www.wikipedia/human migration/2009](http://www.wikipedia/human migration/2009)

© 2015 Apata et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:  
<http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=895&id=25&aid=7582>