



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

**Factors Influencing Migration and the Poverty Profile of  
Migrants in Ilorin South Local Government Area of Kwara State,  
Nigeria**

**Amao J.O<sup>1\*</sup>; T.T. Awoyemi<sup>2</sup>; K.Y. Ogunleye<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Agric. Econs. and Ext. LAUTECH. Ogbomosho. Oyo State. Nigeria*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Agricultural Economics. University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria*

**Abstract**

This study examined the causes of migration and the poverty profile of migrants in Ilorin South Local Government Area of Kwara State. Primary data were collected from a total of 110 migrants using two staged purposive sampling procedure. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics and Foster, Greer and Thorbecke poverty analysis method. The results showed that the average sampled migrants were about 41 years old. Majority of them were male, married and literate. Majority of them had household size of between 6 and 10 members. The study underlined the rural push, owing to low level of income as a major determinant for the process of migration. The possibility of getting job in Tedun was highest for migrants than in any other town in the study area. The period of waiting for job was lowest in Tedun and highest in Agoos than in any other town in the study area. Getting jobs through friends and relatives as sources of employment was highest in Tedun and Nigerb. The study revealed that, low income and better standard of living were the major factors causing migration in the study area.

**Keywords:** *Poverty, Migration, Migrants, Poverty profile*

\*Correspondence E-mail: [abimbola.adepoju@yahoo.com](mailto:abimbola.adepoju@yahoo.com); Telephone number: +2348067509216

**Introduction**

Migration is the movement of people from one geographical location to another either on a temporary or permanent basis. Migrants are people who in an effort to improve their lives, move for a temporary or permanent period from their place of birth and who do not necessarily enjoy the same right and entitlements available to non migrant individual of that place. Migration and migrants should not be seen as problem to be dealt with as

migration presents both challenges and opportunities (Bosewell and Crisp 2004). The history of migration originated from peoples' struggle to survive and to prosper, to escape insecurity and purely move in response to opportunity.

Dike (2002) stated that the poor are those that have limited and insufficient food, poor clothing, living in crowded and dirty shelters, cannot afford medical care and recreation, cannot meet family and community obligations and other necessities of live. He also stated that

people are poverty striking when their income, even if adequate for survival, fall markedly below the average obtained in their immediate community. Furthermore, Windanapathirana *et al.*, (1993), defined poverty as a situation whereby one cannot generate sufficient income required for life sustenance.

Poverty has narrow and broad definitions partly because poverty is relative. On one hand it is physical because one can note its effects on those affected by it, and on the other, it is relative because a poor person in any country may not be perceived as such in another country. According to Aromolaran (1998), poverty is a condition in which an entity does not have enough resources at its disposal to meet its short time consumption needs. Not only does poverty influence who can migrate where, when and how but it may also be a primary cause of migration. Solemink (2002) also added that internal migration in Vietriam relates to lack of land right in custom land for certain excluded social groups.

Movement of population away from the home region, either from one country to another (international migration) or from one part of a country to another (internal migration) is termed migration. Migrations may be temporary (for example, holidaymakers), seasonal (transhumance), or permanent (people moving to cities to find employment) (Grant, 2005). For people, migration is often a permanent (or long-term) movement, which involves the break-up of a person's residential and social environment. People leave areas due to push factors (negative factors such as overcrowding and lack of employment) and are drawn to areas by pull factors (such as better housing, better jobs, and improved facilities). Barriers such as cost, language, politics, and knowledge also influence migration.

Migration has both positive and negative effects on the home region

(source). It can lower the birth rate or increase the average age of the population, ease unemployment or cause a shortage of workers, cause an influx of new skills that are brought back or a loss of the more skilled and highly educated. At the destination, migration can introduce new foods and cultures or cause racial tensions, solve labour shortages or increase the stress on social services. If immigration exceeds emigration, the population of an area will rise beyond the natural increase. Forced migration occurs due to war, religious persecution, famine, slavery, politics, or natural disasters, creating refugees.

Rural-urban migration is a serious problem being encountered by developing countries. Fraser (1993) revealed that the personal characteristics of the household heads had a bearing on the probability of migration. The coefficients of the household characteristics, with the exception of the number of adults in the household, were found to have a statistically weak association with the decision to migrate.

Migration is a never-ending problem in modern society. In the traditional view point, migrant move across borders and barriers in search of a better life resulting from lack of opportunities at home and pulled by hope of economic gain and freedom abroad (World Migration,2003). Many migrants, particularly those who migrate through irregular channels find themselves in vulnerable position before, during and after their journey. This study aims at analysing factors influencing migration and poverty profile of migrants in Ilorin South Local Government Area of Kwara State, Nigeria. Specifically the study examined the characteristics of migrants, factors influencing migration and poverty status of migrants in the study area.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Study area

The study was carried out in Ilorin South Local Government Area of Kwara State, Nigeria. It's headquarter is situated at Fufu. Ilorin South Local Government Area comprises of villages and towns which are divided into four wards: Akanbi 1-5, Balogun Fulani 1-3, Okaka and Okeogun. Ilorin South Local Government share boundaries with Ifelodun Local Government Area to the east, Ilorin East to the north, and bounded by Asa Local Government Area to the South and Ilorin West Local Government Area to the West. The study area is also located between 8°5 North of equator and longitude 4°35' East of the Greenwich Meridian. It is situated in the transitional zone between Northern and Southern parts of Nigeria. The vegetation of the area is Guinea wooded Savannah with umbrella shaped trees. Temperature of the area ranges between 25°C and 37°C while the rainfall distribution is seasonal starting from April to November. The people in the area are mainly Yoruba, Tapa, Fulani and Hausa. Their major occupations are farming, trading and civil servants.

### 2.2 Data Collection

Data were collected through interview schedule. A two stage purposive sampling technique was used in collecting the data from the respondents. In the first stage 5 villages were randomly selected. In the second stage, snowball sampling method was employed to select 22 migrants from each village which added up to 110 respondents in all for the study.

### 2.3 Method of analysis

Descriptive statistics and Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) index were used to describe and analyse the data collected. The FGT method subsumes the head count ratio and poverty gap or income short fall. In addition, it allows for the decomposition of poverty levels among the various categories of a population (FGT, 1984). It is generally given as:

$$P_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{(Z_i - Y_i)^{\alpha}}{Z_i} \quad (1)$$

Where  $\alpha = 0, 1$  and  $2$

$N$  = Total number of migrants

$Q$  = Number of migrants below poverty line

$Y_i$  = Income of the migrants

The  $\alpha$  takes a value of 0, 1 and 2 with different implications such as:  $P_0$  when  $\alpha = 0$ , measures poverty incidence (the index of the people that are impoverished);  $P_1$  = when  $\alpha = 1$ , measures the poverty depth or gap, (proportion of the income that the average poor will attain to get out of poverty); and  $P_2$  when  $\alpha = 2$ , measures the severity of poverty, giving more weight to the poorest. The closer the FGT index is to 1, the greater the poverty level. The FGT index had been widely used to determine the level of poverty by various studies (Anyawu, *et al.*, 1997). Anyawu, *et al.*, 1997 opined that the head count ratio measures the percentages of the population below the poverty line while the poverty gap measures the depth of poverty. The headcount ratio is given as:

$$H = \frac{q}{n} \quad (2)$$

where  $H$  is head count ratio with value ranging from 0 to 1. The closer the value

is to 1, the higher the proportions of people below the poverty line given by:

$$\frac{Z_i - Y_i}{Z_i} \quad (3)$$

where z is the poverty line and y<sub>1</sub> the average income of the poor population. The value obtained gives an indication of the amount of money that would make the poor to cross the threshold of the poverty (Aigbokan, 1997). Poverty line on the other hand is the “cut-off” (the minimum) standard of expenditure on food or per capita expenditure/income (Kanbur, 1990). Various deviations of the minimum per capita income have been reported (Ekong, 2003).

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1 Socio-economic characteristics of migrants

Table 1 shows that 34.6% of the migrants were within the ages of 35-45 years, 20% were within the ages of 45-55 years, 16.4% were within the ages of 25-35 years, 12.7% were within the ages that were less than 25 years and 6.4% were within the ages of 65 – 75 years. The average age was 40.5 years, therefore it implied that younger people had higher tendency to migrate tertiary education. The majority of the migrants were literates, meaning that most of them migrated to get better economic activities to improve their standard of living in order to get out of poverty trap. About 20% of the respondents had households of between 1 and 5 persons, while 66.3% of the households had membership between 6 and 10 and just 13.6% of the households had membership above 10.

**Table1: Distribution of the respondents’ personal characteristics**

Age (years)	Frequency	Percentage
>25	10	9.1
25-30	18	16.4
35-45	38	34.6
45-55	22	20.0
55-65	15	13.6
65-75	7	6.4
<b>Marital status</b>		
Single	29	26.4
Married	72	65.5
Divorced	6	5.5
Widowed	3	2.7
<b>Educational level</b>		
No formal Education	25	22.7
Primary education	35	31.8
Secondary education	28	25.5
Tertiary education	22	20.0
<b>House size</b>		
1-5	22	20.0
6-10	73	66.4
Above 10	15	13.6
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	72	65.0
Female	38	25.0

than older people meaning that, migration declines with age, which is in conformity with the study of Rado (1956) who found out that majority of the migrants were between the ages 40 and 50 years. The results further show that 65% of the migrants were male. This is in conformity with Ominde (1968) who found out that there was predominance of masculine migration. It was also revealed that 65.5% of the migrants were married, 26.4% of them were single, 5.5% were divorced and 2.7% of them were widow. This implies that majority of the respondents were married. About 22.7% of the migrants had no formal education, 31.8% had primary education, and 20.0% of them had.

#### 3.2 Factors causing migration

Table 2 revealed that about half of the respondents in Tedun (50%), Okakae (55%) and Agoos had low income as reason for migrating, while majority in Nigerb

(70%) and Al. centre also had low income as cause for migration. This implies that expectation of high earning had pushed the workers to migrate. Some 30% of the migrants in Tedun and Okakae cited poor job prospect as the cause of migration and in all villages together an average of 23% indicated this reason. Family conflict was

a primary reason for migrating by 13.3% in Tedun, 15% in Okakae, 10% in Ago, 5% in Nigerb and non in Al. centre and 9.2% in all villages together. Thus, rural push on account of low level of income had been found as the main determinants of migration.

**Table 2: Factors causing migration**

Factors causing migration	Tedun		Okakae		Ago		Nigerb		Al. centre		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Low income	15	50	11	55	10	50	14	70	17	85	67	60
Poor Job Prospect	9	30	6	30	5	25	4	20	2	10	26	23
Family Conflicts	4	13.3	3	15	2	10	1	5	0	0	10	9.2
Others	2	6.7	-	0	3	15	1	5	1	5	7	6.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>

### 3.2.1 Economic activities before migration

Table 3 presents the economic activities engaged in by the immigrants before migration. Half (50%) of the respondents in Tedun were involved in agriculture. This also ranked highest (40.9%) activity in which respondents were involved across the study area. This activity is followed by civil service and by studying. Their percentages were 36.1% and 6.7% respectively. The majority of migrants in Okakae were practicing agriculture 60%. In Ago 55% of the migrants also practiced agriculture. In Niger majority were unemployed (40%) while half (50%) in Alcentre were studying before migrating. In all the villages agriculture and civil service are the main economic activities of migrants before migration with percentage of 40.9% and 21.8% respectively.

### 3.2.2 Distribution of migrants according possibility of getting job

Table 4 shows that in Tedun job was found by 53.3% of the migrants that came in to the village. Twenty six point seven percent (26.7%) of the migrants came in with an assurance of job and 20% came in with the hope of getting job. In Okakae, job was fixed for 25% of the migrants, 20% came in with the assurance of getting job. In Ago 20% came in with job fixed, 35% came with the assurance of getting job, and 45% came with the hope of getting job. In Nigerb none of the migrant came in with their job fixed, 50% of the migrants came with the assurance of getting job and 50% with the hope of getting job. Lastly Alcentre had 65% of migrants hoping to get job.

**Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to economic activities before migration**

Economic Activities	Tedun		Okakae		Agoo		Nigerb		Al. centre		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Agriculture	15	50.0	12	60.0	11	55.0	5	25.0	2	10.0	45	40.9
Business	1	3.3	1	5.0	3	15.0	2	10.0	-	-	7	6.4
Civil Service	11	36.7	4	20.0	5	25.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	24	21.8
Studying	2	6.7	1	5.0	1	5.0	3	15.0	10	50.0	17	15.5
Unemployment	1	3.3	2	10.0	-	-	8	40.0	6	30.0	17	15.5
Total	30	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	110	100

**Table 4: Distribution of migrant workers according to possibility of getting job**

Migrant workers For whom	Tedun		Okakae		Agoo		Nigerb		Al. centre		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Job found	16	53.3	5	25	4	20	-	-	2	10	27	24.5
Assurance of job	8	26.7	4	20	7	35	10	50	5	25	34	30.9
Hope to get job	6	20	11	55	9	45	10	50	13	65	49	44.5
Total	30	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	110	100

**Table 5: Distribution of migrants according to period of waiting to get job**

Waiting Period of getting job	Tedun		Okakae		Agoo		Nigerb		Al. centre		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1 – 10 days	11	36.7	4	20	-	0	1	5	-	0	16	14.5
10 - 20 days	9	30	4	20	2	10	-	0	2	10	17	15.5
20 days – 1 month	5	16.7	2	10	5	25	1	5	2	10	15	13.6
1 month – 6 months	-	0	2	10	3	15	3	15	1	5	9	8.2
Above 6 months	2	6.7	6	20	7	35	10	5	8	40	33	3.0
1 year	1	3.3	1	5	2	10	4	20	5	25	13	11.8
Above 1 year	2	6.7	1	5	1	15	1	5	2	10	7	6.4
Total	30	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	110	100

**3.2.3 Waiting period of migrants before getting job**

Table 5 showed that 36.7 % of the migrants in Tedun did not wait at all to get job, 30% of migrants waited up to 10 days; 16.7% waited for 10-20 days; none waited from 20 days to 1 month, 6.7% waited for 1-6 months; 3.3% waited for 6 months to one year before getting job and 6.7% waited for more than a year before getting job. Okakae had 20% of migrants with no waiting period, 1 – 10 days and 1 – 6 months before getting job which accounted for 35%, and 50% of migrants in Nigerb waited from 1 - 6 months, while in Al.centre 40% waited from 1 – 6 months likewise. Thus, the study finds out that, to enter in to the cities, the migrants requires more than 6 months getting job which is the longest period for all villages.

**3.2.4 Sources of employment to migrants**

Table 6 showed that 72.7% of respondents in the study area had relatives or friends as sources of their employment. The job in this segment is provided generally by relatives/friends. Also, 90% of the migrants in Tedun, 75% Okakae, 90% in Nigerb, 70% in Al centre and 89.1% in all villages got job through relatives/friends. Thus, close links with relatives and friends were found as the basis for getting job. Migrants that secured their employment through advertisement were 6.7% in Tedun, 5% in Okakae, 20% in Agoo, 5% in Nigerb, 25% in Alcentre respectively and 11.8% for the total sample. For the migrants that got their employment through other means apart from friends/relatives and advertisement, the study revealed that 3.3% of them were in Tedun, 20% in Okakae, 10% in Agoo, 5% in Nigerb, 5% in Al centre and 8.2% for the whole sample respectively.

**Table 6: Sources of employment to migrants**

Employment types	Tedun		Okakae		Agoo		Nigerb		Al.centre		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Relative/friends	27	90	15	75	14	70	18	90	14	70	98	89.1
Advertisement	2	6.7	1	5	4	20	1	5	5	25	13	11.8
Any other means	1	3.3	4	20	2	10	1	5	1	5	9	8.2
Total	30	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	11	100
											0	

**3.3. Poverty profile of migrant households by types of dwellings**

It has been noted that during 1993 – 1994, in urban areas, persons having per capita income of N258.70 or more were below the poverty line. By implication, people having below monthly per capita income of N258.70 were defined as being below the poverty line. The moderate poverty line was defined as N1, 524.57, while the core/extreme poverty threshold was put at N762.29. In the households

having monthly per capita income of N360.00 or more have been defined as above the poverty line while household having less than N360.00, were below the poverty line.

The poverty profile of households in Tedun is portrayed in Table 7. There were 20 households out of 30 (or 66.7%) living below poverty line. About 77.8% of this group of people live in a room apartment, 73.3% in bungalows/ flats and 33.3% in Duplets. In sharp contrast to the above, 10 households (33.3%) were above the



poverty line. It suggests that as we move from inferior type of dwelling to superior ones, the households living below the poverty line declines, whereas, non poor households tend to increase. The monthly per capita expenditure of households living below poverty lines come to ₦306.21 for one room dwellers, ₦298.61 for bungalow/flats dwellers, ₦351.42 for duplets dwellers and ₦303.22 being average for all dwellers. The monthly per capita expenditure comes to ₦334.04, ₦311.7, ₦350.11 and to ₦239.02 respectively for the non poor. This is also in conformity with the study by Tiwari and Goel (2002).

The poverty profile of households in Okakae is shown in Table 8. It was found that 5 households (83.3%) in room apartment; 6 households (60.0%) in bungalow or flats; 2 households (50%) in duplets types of dwellings, and 13 households (65%) in all types of dwellings were below the poverty line. On the other hand, one household (16.7%) in a room apartment, 4 households (40%) in bungalow or flat, 2 households (50%) in duplets and 7 household (35%) in all types of dwellings had been found to be living above the poverty line. Thus like Tedun, poverty tends to come down as we move from inferior type of dwelling to superior ones. Also, households living above poverty line increases from inferior types of dwellings to superior ones. It was observed that the monthly per capita income of a room apartment dwellers living below poverty line came to ₦321.22, while for those living in bungalow/flats, duplets and all types of dwellers it was ₦301.14, ₦354.01, and ₦311.09 respectively. The monthly per capita expenditure for the corresponding households came to ₦296.77, ₦245.20, ₦280.00 and ₦261.32 respectively for the different types of dwellers. This is also in conformity with the study of Tiwari and Goel (2002).

Poverty profile of households in Agoos is presented in Table 9. It was found that 75% of dwellers in a room apartment, 70% of dwellers bungalow/flat, and 65% of dwellers in all types of dwellings were living below poverty line. In sharp contrast to the above 7 households (35%) were above poverty line. It suggests that as we were moving from inferior type of dwelling to superior ones, the number of households living below the poverty line declines, whereas, non poor households tend to increase. The monthly per capita income of the household living below poverty line who dwell, bungalow or flat, duplex and all type dweller is ₦311.20, ₦300.04, ₦356.17 and ₦312.10 respectively, while their monthly per capita expenditure comes to ₦293.13, ₦255.61, ₦293.00 and to ₦274.14 respectively. This is also in conformity with study of Tiwari and Goel (2002).

Poverty profile of households in Nigerb is presented in Table 10. It was found out that 71.4% of dwellers living in a room apartment, 66.7% dwellers in bungalow/Flats, 25% of dwellers in duplets types of dwelling, and 60% of dwellers in all types of dwelling were below the poverty line. On the other hand, 2 households (28.6%) in a room apartment, 3 households (33.3%) in bungalow/flats; 3 households (75%) in duplets, and 8 households (40%) in all types of dwelling lived above the poverty line. Thus, poverty tends to come down as we move from inferior type of dwelling to the superior ones, also the number of households living above poverty line increases from inferior types of dwellings to superior ones. The monthly per capita income of a room apartment dwellers living below poverty line comes to ₦311.03, while for bungalow/flat and duplets types of dweller it was ₦301.29, and ₦323.4 respectively. The month per capita expenditure for the corresponding households came to ₦293.04, ₦207.04,

₦254 and ₦213.00 for single room apartment, bungalow/flat, duplets and all types of dwelling respectively. This is also in conformity with the study of Tiwari and Goel (2002).

Poverty profile of households in Alcentre is displayed in Table 11. It was found out that 75% of one room apartment, 50% of bungalow/flat, 33% of duplets and 50% of all types of dwellings were living below poverty line. In contrasts to the above, 10 households (50%) in all were living above the poverty line. It suggests that as we move from inferior type of dwelling to superior ones, the households living below the poverty line declines, whereas non-poor households tend to increase. The monthly per capita income of households living below poverty lines comes to ₦324.63 for a room dwellers, ₦309.46 for bungalow/flats, ₦315.07 for duplets dwellers and ₦3319.00 for all types of dwellers, while the monthly per capita expenditure came to ₦286.11, ₦249.3, ₦261.00 and to ₦253.00 for one room apartment, bungalow/flat, duplets and all types of dwelling respectively. This is also in conformity with the study of Tiwari and Goel (2002).

#### ***3.4. Poverty profile among different occupational groups***

The household heads that were not yet employed had the highest poverty incidence (46%). Civil servants headed households had least poverty incidence of (22%). Student headed households also had 35% poverty incidence while the business headed households had 27% poverty incidence (Table 12). Poverty gap or depth is the average gap between expenditure or income of the poor and poverty line. This measures the extent to which the income of the poor lie below the poverty line- the higher the figure, the wider the gap. Table 12 showed that

the civil servants needed about 4 percent income increase to get out of poverty line, while household headed by Business men, farmers, students and unemployed had the highest poverty gap and they required 28% percent increase in income to get out of poverty.

#### **4. Conclusion and recommendations**

The major findings of this study show that about 67.3% of the migrants were between the ages 25 – 55 years, more than 60% of the migrants were male, majority (52.7%) of the migrants received either primary or secondary education while 20% received more than secondary education, 22.7% had received no formal education. Most (65%) of the migrants were married while 26.4% were single. Low income was found to be the major factor causing migration. About 60.7% migrated because of low income while 23.6% migrants moved because of poor job prospects. The study also showed that majority (40.9%) of the migrants were farmers while about 15.8% were formerly unemployed. Most (44.5%) of the migrants moved with the hope of getting job while only 24.8% had their job fixed. Majority (30%) of the migrants waited for 1 – 6 months before getting jobs in their new locations and 80% of the migrants got their jobs through relatives and friends. The study further reveals that poverty tends to come down as we move from inferior types of dwellings to the superior ones. Member of households living above poverty line increase from inferior types of dwellings to superior ones Household heads that were not yet employed had the highest poverty incidence (0.46) while the civil servant headed households had the least poverty incidence of (0.22).

**Table 7: Poverty profile of migrants household by types of dwelling in Tedun**

Particulars Dwellings	Tedun			Total
	A room	Bungalow/Flat	Duplets	
Household size	3.5	6.3	8.5	5.9
No of households	9	15	6	30
Households living below poverty line (Nos)	7 (77.8)	11 (73.3)	2 33.3	20 66.7
Households living above poverty line (Nos)	2 (22.2)	4 (26.7)	4 66.7	10 33.3
Monthly per capita income of households living:				
(a) Below Poverty Line	306.21	298.61	351.42	303.22
(b) Above Poverty line	776.15	841.29	1,121.20	863.20
Monthly per capita expenditure of Households living:				
(a) Below Poverty line	334.04	311.07	350.11	320.06
(b) Above Poverty Line.	542.19	643.44	771.03	671.26

**Table 8: Poverty profile of migrants households by types of dwelling in Okakae**

Particulars	Dwellings			All
	A room	Bungalow/Flat	Duplets	
Household size	2.9	3.4	5.1	4.7
No of households	6	10	4	20
Household living below poverty line (Nos)	5 (83.3)	6 (60.0)	2 (50)	13 (65)
Household living above poverty line (Nos)	1 (16.7)	4 (40.0)	2 (50)	7 (35)
Monthly per capita income of household living:				
(a) Below Poverty Line	321.22	301.14	354.01	311.09
(b) Above Poverty line	701.05	761.91	1,201.40	907.25
Monthly per capita expenditure of Household living:				
(a) Below Poverty line	296.17	245.20	280.00	261.32
(b) Above Poverty Line.	624.10	549.04	805.61	593.44

**Table 10: Poverty profile of migrants households by types of dwelling in Nigerb**

Particulars	Dwellings			All
	A room	Bungalow/ Flat	Duplets	
Household size	3.61	5.42	3.54	5.03
No of households	76	9	4	20
Households living below poverty line (Nos)	5 (71.4)	6 (66.7)	1 (25)	12 (60)
Households living above poverty line (Nos)	2 (28.6)	3 (33.3)	3 (75)	8 (40)
Monthly per capita income of households living:				
(a) Below Poverty Line	311.04	301.29	323.40	310.91
(b) Above Poverty line	640.14	593.09	740.1	680.81
Monthly per capita expenditure of Households living:				
(a) Below Poverty line	293.04	207.04	254.71	213.00
(b) Above Poverty Line.	761.23	707.43	853.12	782.20

**Table 11: Poverty profile of migrants' households by types of dwelling in AI centre**

Particulars	Dwellings			All
	A room	Bungalow/ Flat	Duplets	
Household size	2.61	4.05	2.1	4.32
No of households	4	10	6	20
Households living below poverty line (Nos)	3 (75)	5 (50)	2 (33.3)	10 (50)
Households living above poverty line (Nos)	1 (25)	5 (50)	4 (66.7)	10 (50)
Monthly per capita income of households living:				
(a) Below Poverty Line	324.63	309.46	315.07	319.00
(b) Above Poverty line	967.07	943.07	1,143.00	963
Monthly per capita expenditure of Households living:				
(a) Below Poverty line	286.11	244.03	853.03	253.00
(b) Above Poverty Line.	769.00	743.15	753.13	720.00

**Table 12: Poverty Profile among different occupational groups**

Occupational group	Poverty profile		
	P <sup>0</sup>	P <sup>1</sup>	P <sup>2</sup>
Farmers	0.32	0.24	0.15
Business	0.27	0.17	0.08
Civil servants	0.22	0.15	0.09
Studying	0.35	0.16	0.10
Unemployed	0.46	0.18	0.12

Young people between ages 28 – 55 years were likely to migrate than the aged

people. Men had higher propensity to migrate than women. People who were literate had high tendency to migrate than those who were illiterate. Married people migrated more than the unmarried people. Low income and better standard of living were found to be the major factors causing migration.

In the light of the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

\* Provision of more job opportunities for the people, which could be achieved

by the establishment of cottage industries by both individual and government.

\* Educational institution should be established in the rural areas up to the tertiary level for the benefits of the rural populace and to prevent further migration.

\* Provision of social amenities for the rural dwellers is inevitable.

\* Migration should also be well managed in order to move the benefits to poor people and also to ensure that movement occur to the mutual benefits of migrants, society and government. Mutual benefit can be achieved through policies, laws and administration that balance the right and obligations of migrants with social interests and government responsibilities.

\* Participation in secondary occupation should be encouraged to boost income earning of the migrants and capacity to increase their per capita income.

## References

- Afolabi, A.O.(2003); "Migration and Development." How to make migration work for poverty reduction, Sixth Report of Session 2003-03. House of Common International Development Comm Atsaineta (eds). Economic Policy expenses in Africa – what have we learned AERC, Nairobi Pp4-6.
- Afolabi A.O. (1998); "Psychosocial effects of migration on Nigeria's security." A post graduate seminar paper presented at the University of Ibadan.
- Aigbokan B.E.(1997);"Poverty alleviation in Nigeria: Some macroeconomic issues" In Egbon, P.C. (Ed.). Poverty alleviation in Nigeria proceeding of Nigerian Economic Society (WES) Annual Conference, Pat Mag Press Ltd Ibadan Pp. 19.
- Anyawu J.D.(1997); "Poverty in Nigeria Concepts, measurements and determinants." P.J. Obaseki (eds.) Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria. Nigerian Economic Society (NES). Pp. 93 – 120
- Aromolaran, A.B (1998); Analysis of households consumption pattern of animal products in South Western Nigeria. In, *Animal Agriculture in West Africa: The Sustainability Question*. Proc. Silver Ann. Conf. NSAP and Inaug. Conf. WASAP, Abeokuta, 21-26 March, 1998, p. 458-459.
- Bosewell, C. and Crisp, J. (2004); "Poverty, international migration and Asylum, policy Brief" No. 8, United Nations University – World institution for Development Economic Research.
- Dike, V. (2002); "Poverty in Nigeria." The Daily Independent (Opinion column), October 6, 2002, Pp. 15.
- Ekong E.E. (2003); "Contribution of recent metro non metro migrants to the non-metro population and labor sources" *Agricultural Economic Research*, Vol. 30, No. 4, Pp. 15-26.
- Foster, J.E. Greer, J. and Thorbecke, E. (1984); "A class of decomposable poverty measures. *Econometrica* 52 (1) Pp. – 761 – 766.
- Fraser G.C.G (1993); An economic analysis of factors influencing rural urban migration in Southern Africa. *Journal of Development Southern Africa* 10(3)437.
- Grant S. (2005); International migration and human rights. A paper prepared for the policy analysis and research programme of the Global Commission on International Migration p1.
- Kanbur, R. (1990); "Migration and development:" Blind faith and hard to find fact, migration policy institution, /November.
- Kanbur, R. (1990); "Poverty and social dimensions of structure adjustment in Cote D'Ivoire," a social dimensions of the Adjusted in sub-saharan Africa. S.D.A. working Paterscenece, the world bank, Washington D.C. Pp.

- Ominde, S. H. (1968); "Land and population movement in Kenya. North-Western University Press.
- Rado, S. (1956); "Migration and poverty:" *Asia Pacific population Journal*, 17(4): 67 – 82.
- Solemink, M. (2002); "Measuring changes in Poverty: A Methodologies case study of Indonesia during the adjustment period" *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 5, No. 1, Pp. 57 – 82.
- Tiwari R.S and Goel M.S (2002); "Migration pattern, poverty profile and consumption pattern: A case study of unregistered informal sector workers in cities of Agra and Canpur in Uttar Pradesh and Puri in Orissa. *The Indian Journal of Economics*. Vol 52 No326 pp303-311.
- Widanaparathirana, A.S. (1993); "Poverty and Remittances in Lesotho" *Journal of African Economics* 2 (1) Pp. 49 – 73.
- World migration (2003); "*Migration and Urbanization in Africa*," Columbia University Press, New York and London. Washington D.C. Pp. 89.