



**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.*



**EFFECTS OF URBAN-RURAL MIGRATION ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF RURAL DWELLERS IN IPOKIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, OGUN STATE, NIGERIA**

**Akinbile, L. A., Aminu, O. O., Amoye, S. K.**

Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

E-mail: lakinbile@yahoo.com

**ABSTRACT**

*This study examined the effects of urban-rural migration on the socio-economic status of migrants in Ipokia local government area of Ogun State. Ninety respondents were sampled through the use of purposive sampling method. Descriptive and inferential statistical tools were used to analyse the data collected. Majority of the respondents were male (55.6%), married (63.3%), Christian (71.1%), had tertiary education (54.4%), within the age range of 30-36 years (51.1%) and income ranges of N21,001 - N 30,000 (46.7%). More of the respondents were civil servants (57.8%) and into business (59.9%), while 33.3% had spent between 6 and 10 years in the community after they had migrated. Majority of the respondents migrated due to inadequate income (52.2%) and unemployment (35.7%) confronting them in urban centres. After migration, respondents' possession of car increased by 82.5% and those that were landlords by 70.8%. There was a slight improvement in the socio-economic status of respondents after migration (mean = 87.6) compare to before migration (mean = 68.6). A significant relationship exist between respondents' religion ( $\chi^2 = 118.4, p = 0.000$ ), marital status ( $\chi^2 = 151.4, p = 0.001$ ), educational level ( $\chi^2 = 239.4, p = 0.000$ ) and their socioeconomic status. Number of years spent by the migrants in the rural areas after migration implied that the people were relatively comfortable in the rural areas. However, governments should give more attention to rural development through provision of basic amenities, establishment of cottage industries and institutions that will encourage drift of people from the urban areas to rural areas.*

**Keywords:** Urban-rural migration, socioeconomic status, migrants

**INTRODUCTION**

Migration is the movement of people from one place to the other. It can be spatial, occupational or physical. It is a selective process affecting individuals or families with certain economic, social, educational and demographic characteristics (Angol *et al*, 2014; Adewale, 2005). Migration plays an important role in economic development in rural areas. It occurs as a response to economic, social, cultural, environmental and political factors (Adewale, 2005). People migrate based on the prevailing conditions and the reasons for it vary from one person to another depending on the situation that brought about the decision.

According to World Migration project report, the movement of people in modern times has

continued under the form of both voluntary migration within one's region, country or beyond and involuntary migration such as slave trade, human trafficking and ethnic cleansing (International Organisation for Migration, 2010). According to World Development Report 2009, voluntary migration is based on pull factors, while involuntary migration is based on push factors (World Bank, 2009). Push factors are things that are unfavourable about the area in which one resides, which result in desire of people to migrate while pull factors are generally benefits that attract people to a certain place. Push factors that induced migration from urban area include overpopulation, unemployment, political fear, loss of wealth and poor housing while pull factors include

employment opportunities, security, family links, higher income and lower taxes.

Between 1999 and 2004, the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development in collaboration with the World Bank, FAO, USAID, DFID and some Nigerian organizations carried out studies to determine ways to improve the quality of life of rural dwellers. Specifically, the studies were tailored towards identifying the main problems of the rural dwellers and how they could be tackled. The outcome of these studies led to the development and launch of the National Policy on Integrated Rural Development Strategy and Rural Travel and Transport. The two policies aim at creating an enabling environment to boost agriculture and other rural productive activities.

Urbanisation of rural areas has made the rural areas to change from agriculture to other pursuits common to cities and corresponding change of behaviour patterns. The adoption of the modern ways of life and values by the rural folks has triggered the movement of people from urban areas to rural areas. Salt (2001) reported that there have been large movements of people to rural areas seeking "lifestyle changes" while Haxton (2005) suggested that the growing preference for rural areas is that people are seeking lifestyle and amenities that emanates from living in rural settings particularly among the retirees. People move from urban areas when they are not gainfully employed and when housing prices get too high. The desire for peace, quietness, security, and necessity of some of the natural rural environment itself compelled people to move out of the urban areas. The desire for rurality is an idealized construction of a mythical rural lifestyle which has both tangible and intangible aspects to which people aspire or assume they will receive in rural living (Mitchell *et al*, 2004). Mitchell *et al* (2004) said the move to rural areas has predominantly

been conceptualized as a retiree or more recently a middle class aspiration movement, but there are also people who moved out of the urban areas searching for affordable housing and living options. The migrants expectation was that they will find a menial jobs in the rural areas to earn their living, thus overcoming the economic crunch of the urban areas while some may receive remittances from members that stay behind to support their livelihoods and such remittances can be used for investment in land or purchase better farm inputs. Even if the remittances are small, the limited amounts of additional income will make a huge difference in improving migrants' standard of living.

Therefore, this study aims to find out if people that are involved in the urban-rural migration process were able to sustain a desirable standard of living after their movement to the rural areas. Specifically the objectives of the study are to ascertain the personal characteristics of respondents, investigate the reasons why respondents migrate to the rural areas, identify the various forms of livelihood activities engaged in by migrants, examine the level of importance attach to livelihood activities engaged in by migrants and determine the change in the migrants' socioeconomic status.

There is no significant relationship between the personal characteristics of the respondents and their socioeconomic status.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study was carried out in Ipokia Local Government Area of Ogun state. Ipokia Local Government area was created on the 1<sup>st</sup> of December 1996 and it is located in latitude 6° 32' N and longitude 2° 51' E and shares boundaries with Badagry to the south, Yewa North to the north and international boundary with the Republic of Benin. It is rural in nature with a few towns, but

more villages and hamlets spreading over an area of approximately 180,535 sq. km. The vegetation of the area is more of the savannah type. The type of vegetation and climatic conditions found supported the planting of palm trees on a large scale. The main agricultural products found in the area are cassava, melon, maize, yam while oil palm produce forms the major cash crop. The local government is blessed with oil rich Tongeji and Whekani Island (a tourist centre) which is a veritable source of revenue generation to the Federal Government.

Ipokia Local Government Area comprises of fourteen communities. Eight out of fourteen communities were randomly selected while ninety respondents that are migrants were purposively selected from these communities through the use of snowball technique. Purposive selection was used because the study deals with only the respondents who migrated to the communities. A well-structured interview schedule was used to collect data utilised for the study. Data collected was analysed using frequencies, percentages and Chi-square.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Personal characteristics of respondents

Table 1 shows that 51.1% of the migrants were between 30-36 years of age with mean age of 38.38. This shows that the migrants were young adults who are agile with lot of energy which can allow them to engage in various economic activities that they can use to improve their standard of living. This agrees with the study of Echebiri and Ndukwu (2006) that mature youths have greater tendency to migrate than the younger ones and that young adults are returning into the rural communities (Oyesola *et al* 2006 cited in Alade 2010). Majority (55.6%) were male while (44.4%) were female. This implies both male and female are involved in urban rural migration.

Majority of the respondents were married (63.6%). This implied that being married is likely to have a positive influence on their movement from the urban area to rural areas because of the need to secure a conducive environment for their families. This agrees with the findings of Ani *et al* (2007) who reported that married persons have more financial obligations than those who are single. Also, a study carried out by Adewale (2005) shows that most migrants are married. Almost all (95.5%) the respondents had formal education. This disagrees with the findings of Okunlola *et al* (1998) that a larger percentage of illiterate Nigerians are in rural areas. However, it agrees with Adewale (2005) that that people who had received formal education also moved from urban to rural areas to settle down. The high literacy level of the respondents may be due to importance attached to education and the respect their educational level will earn them which will invariably had positive effect on their socioeconomic status. Higher percentage (71.1%) of the respondents were Christians, 27.8% were Muslims while 1.1% were traditionalists. This implies that migration cut across all religious belief. Almost half of the respondents (46.7%) were within the income range of N 21,000 - 30,000. This implies that respondents have means of livelihood that ensure a steady flow of income and afford them the opportunity to live a comfortable life. Furthermore, Table 1 reveals that respondents who spent between 6-10 years after migration were 33.3%, while 27.8% and 26.7% spent between 11-15 years and less than 6 years respectively. This is in agreement with a study conducted by Alade (2010), where it was found that majority of migrants have stayed up to 10 years since after migration to the rural community. This result is in consonance with Adewale (2005) who found out that the length of stay of migrants in rural areas is an indicator that if rural areas are well

developed, it will encourage influx of people into rural areas from the urban areas.

**Table 1: Distribution respondents based on personal characteristics**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard Deviation
<b>Age</b>				
30-36	46	51.1	38.38	7.18
37-43	27	30.0		
44-50	9	10.0		
51-57	4	4.4		
58-65	4	4.4		
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	50	55.6		
Female	40	44.4		
<b>Marital status</b>				
Single	33	36.7		
Married	57	63.3		
<b>Educational status</b>				
No formal education	4	4.4		
Primary education	4	4.4		
Secondary education	33	36.7		
Tertiary education	49	54.5		
<b>Religion</b>				
Christianity	64	71.1		
Islamic	25	27.8		
Traditionalists	1	1.1		
<b>Income level (N)</b>				
<10,001	7	7.8		
10,001-20,000	24	26.7		
20,001-30,000	42	46.7		
>30,000	17	18.9		
<b>Lengthofstay (yrs)</b>				
<6	24	26.7		
6-10	30	33.3		
11-15	25	27.8		
16-20	11	12.2		

Source: Field Survey, 2012

### Reasons why respondents migrate to the rural areas

The result on Table 2 reveals that majority (52.2%) of the respondents migrated due to inadequate income, while 36.7%, 27.8% and 26.7% migrated due to unemployment, large household and poor public services respectively. Migration due to inadequate income implies that migrants could not cope with the cost of living in the urban areas. Income is necessary to meet up with family basic needs especially settling of utility bills. Inability to meet up with one's financial commitment always has a negative influence on socioeconomic status. This agrees with the findings of Echebiri and Ndukwu (2006) that the need to source for stable means of livelihood either through

paid or self-employment with availability of social infrastructure enhance high standard of living. It is however noteworthy that more than a quarter of the respondents migrated due to marriage. Therefore, urban-rural migration is a peculiar matter that concerns members of the family. Also, the result was also in consonance with Oyesola *et al* (2006) cited in Alade (2010) that young adults are returning into the rural communities to engage in agricultural production due to lack of white collar jobs in the cities.

**Table 2: Distribution respondents based on reasons for migration**

Reasons for migration	Frequency	Percentages
Inadequate income	47	52.2
Large household	25	27.8
Small size of agricultural holding	11	12.2
Poor public services	24	26.7
Inability to secure employment	33	36.7
Marriage (with spouse)	25	27.8
Family network	24	26.7
Job transfer	10	11.1

Source: Field Survey, 2012

**Livelihood activities engaged in by respondents**

Table 3 shows the breakdown of livelihood activities engaged in by respondents. Majority of the respondents were traders (59.9%), civil servants (57.8%) and into crop farming (23.4%). The result on Table 3 points to the fact that respondents have streams of income generating sources which they use to augment their most important livelihood activities and help them to meet their basic needs as and as well provide for their family needs.

**Table 3: Distribution of respondents based on their livelihood activities**

Livelihood activities	Frequency	Percent
Crop farming	21	23.4
Livestock rearing	15	16.6
Trading	54	59.9
Food processing	7	7.7

**Table 4: Distribution of respondents based on the level of importance of livelihood activities**

Livelihood activities	Most important		Important		Least important	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Crop farming	7	7.8	9	10.0	5	5.6
Livestock rearing	2	2.2	4	4.4	9	10.0
Trading	15	16.6	35	38.8	4	4.4
Food processing	1	1.1	4	4.4	2	2.2
Civil servant	50	55.6	2	2.2	0	0.0
Transporting	6	6.7	10	11.1	0	0.0

Civil servant	52	57.8
Transporting	16	17.8
Carpentry	2	2.2
Tailoring	8	8.8
Driver	2	2.2
Plumbing	2	2.2
Crafts making	6	6.7
Barber	2	2.2

Source: Field Survey, 2012

**Level of importance attached to livelihood activities engaged in by migrants**

Table 4 shows the level of importance attached to the various livelihood activities engaged in by respondents. Higher percentages of migrants who are civil servants (55.6%) consider their occupation as the most important livelihood activities. This implies that being civil servants is their primary source of income and this is made possible because of their level of formal education and availability of organisations where their educational certificate are usable. Also, about half of the migrants (43.2%) consider trading as being important and less important. This implies that some of the respondents engaged in trading as a secondary means of livelihood. This is similar to the findings of Omoregbe and Okoedo-Okojie (2007) who asserted that rural dwellers engaged in occupational diversification to take advantages of income generating activities in the rural areas.

Livelihood activities	Most important		Important		Least important	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Carpentry	1	1.1	1	1.1	0	0.0
Tailoring	4	4.4	4	4.4	0	0.0
Driver	2	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Plumbing	1	1.1	1	1.1	0	0.0
Crafts making	0	0.0	4	4.4	2	2.2
Barber	0	0.0	2	2.2	0	0.0

Source: Field Survey, 2012

### Socioeconomic status of respondents before and after migration

Data in Table 5 reveals that 31.1% of the respondents possessed motorcycle while 7.8% and 10.0% possessed car and bicycle respectively as means of transportation before migration. However, there was an increase in the percentage of motorcycle (56.7%) and car (44.4%) ownership after migration while possession of bicycle reduced to 2.2%. This indicates that respondents attached importance to means of transportation to enhance their status. Majority of the respondents (92.2%) were tenants before migration but this was reduced to 73.3% after migration while percentage of landlords increased from 7.8% to 26.7% after migration. This suggests that having an accommodation is an essential need which enhances quality of life. There was an increase in the percentage of people who live in painted house from 23.3% to 61.1% and block house from 83.3% to 96.7%. Respondents that possess small size generator increases from 35.6% to 76.7%, while those who possess medium size increases from 5.6% to 18.9%. This result suggests that problems of electricity still persist in the rural areas. This corroborates with Ugwoke *et al* (2007) which reported that irregular power supply and absence of electricity is a major factor in rural areas. Also, increase in possession of generating set implies

respondents had financial capability to purchase them to meet their electricity needs compare to when in the urban areas. Almost all the respondents possessed radio (98.9%), television (96.7%), fan (98.9%), and pressing iron (85.6%) after migration. The high number of radio and television possession corroborated the findings of Ajila (2005) and Ugwoke *et al* (2007) which reported that radio and television are useful electronics in disseminating and accessing information by rural dwellers. The major source of water for almost (95.6%) all the respondents was deep well/borehole. The number of respondents having carpet and rug for floor covering increases from 18.9% to 55.6% and 8.9% to 32.2% after migration respectively. While those with only cement floor drop from 83.3% to 41.1%. This implies interior decoration add more value to the status of the farmers.

Table 6 shows that the mean score (87.6) of respondents' socioeconomic status after migration was greater than the mean score (68.6) after migration. This implies that there was an improvement in the socioeconomic status of the respondents compare to when they are in the urban centres. Also, it could be inferred that the various livelihood activities engaged in by respondents has brought about an improvement in their socioeconomic status.

**Table 5: Distribution of respondents by items possession**

Items possessed	Before migration		After migration		Change %
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
<b>Means of transportation</b>					
Car	7	7.8	40	44.4	82.5
Motorcycle	28	31.1	51	56.7	45.1
Bicycle	9	10.0	2	2.2	77.7
<b>Residency</b>					
Landlords	7	7.8	24	26.7	70.8
Tenants	83	92.2	66	73.3	33.3
<b>Toilet facilities</b>					
Water system	16	17.8	33	36.7	51.5
Pit latrine	71	78.9	57	63.3	24.6
<b>House painting</b>					
Building painted	21	23.3	55	61.1	61.8
Building not painted	69	76.7	35	38.9	80.0
<b>Building material</b>					
Block	75	83.3	87	96.7	13.8
Mud	15	16.7	3	3.3	80.0
<b>Type of roofing</b>					
Aluminium/asbestos	37	41.1	41	45.6	9.8
Zinc	47	52.2	49	54.4	4.0
Thatch	6	6.7	0	0.0	0.0
<b>Generator set</b>					
Medium type	5	5.6	17	18.9	70.6
Small type	32	35.6	69	76.7	53.6
<b>Electronics</b>					
Pressing iron	56	62.2	77	85.6	27.3
Fan	70	77.8	89	98.9	21.3
Cooker	16	17.8	16	17.8	0.0
Radio	81	90.0	89	98.9	8.9
Television	57	63.3	87	96.7	34.5
VCD	19	21.1	17	18.9	11.8
DVD	23	25.6	71	78.9	67.6
<b>Sources of water</b>					
Deep well	68	75.6	86	95.6	20.9
Borehole	18	20.0	6	6.7	66.6
River rain	22	24.4	10	11.1	54.5
<b>Floor covering</b>					
Cement	75	83.3	37	41.1	50.7
Carpet	17	18.9	50	55.6	66.0
Rug	8	8.9	29	32.2	72.4

Source: Field Survey, 2012

**Table 6: Categorisation of respondents according to their SES before and after migration**

SES category	Before migration			After migration		
	Freq	%	Mean score	Freq.	%	Mean score
Low (<mean)	54	60.0	68.6	49	54.4	87.6
High (≥mean)	36	40.0		41	45.6	
Total	90	100		90	100	

Source: Field Survey, 2012

**Test of hypotheses**

Chi square analysis on Table 7 tested relationship between respondents' personal

characteristics and change in their socioeconomic status. Results show that religion (p = 0.000), marital status (p = 0.001) and educational status



( $p=0.001$ ) had significant relationship with change in their socioeconomic status of respondents. This implies religion, marital status and educational status influence respondents' socioeconomic status after migration. However, age and sex was not significantly related to respondents' socioeconomic status. This implies that respondents' age and sex do not determine change in socioeconomic status.

**Table 7: Chi square analysis of the relationship between respondents' personal characteristics and change in their socioeconomic status**

Variables	df	$\chi^2$	p-value	decision
Age	136	128.778	0.657	Not Significant
Sex	34	24.727	0.878	Not Significant
Marital status	68	151.414	0.001	Significant
Educational status	102	239.368	0.000	Significant
Religion	170	118.423	0.000	Significant

df = degree of freedom,  $\chi^2$  = chi square coefficient, p = probability level of significance.

\*\* Chi-square coefficient ( $\chi^2$ )

Significant at 0.01 level of significance

#### SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study revealed that higher percentage of the respondents were male, married, Christians, had formal education, still in their active age and had moderate income. Majority of the respondents were civil servants and into business and have spent between six to ten years in the community after they have migrated. Inadequate income and unemployment were the major reasons why respondents migrated to the rural area. There was an improvement in the socio-economic status of respondents after migration to the rural areas. A

significant relationship was established between respondents' religion, marital status, educational status and change in their socioeconomic status.

In Nigeria people do move from one geographical location to the other. Today, urban-rural migration is one of the most important nodes of migration which exist in the society. The educational attainment of people who migrated and their moderate income had helped them maintain a comfortable lifestyle. The number of years spent by the migrants after their migration testified that they are relatively comfortable in rural areas, if not; they would have left such communities and returned back to urban areas. More than half of the respondents are civil servants and about half of the migrants are into trading. Migrants who are involved in crop farming are few as revealed by this study. Migrants diversified livelihood activities was a coping strategy which help to reduce their risk vulnerability as well as meet their basic needs with a resultant effect on their standard of living.

However, governments should give more attention to rural development through provision of basic amenities, establishment of cottage industries and institutions that will encourage drift of people from the urban areas to rural areas. This will motivate migrants to stay in the rural areas particularly when they are convinced that they can make both ends meet.

#### REFERENCES

- Adewale, J. G. (2005). Socioeconomic factors associated with urban-rural migration in Nigeria. A case study of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 17(1):13-16.
- Ajila K. O. (2005). Assessment of the influence of textile clearing entrepreneurship on rural family economic empowerment and development. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology* 7(1):47-56.



- Alade J. O. (2010). Factors associated with pull and push migration in Iddo Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. An unpublished B.Sc thesis, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Ibadan.
- Ani, D. P., Achamber N. I. and B. C. Asogwa (2007). Effects of Nigerian Agricultural Cooperatives and Ryal Development (NACRDB) loan scheme on farmers' income in Makurdi Local Government Area, Benue State. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology* 9(1):107-113.
- Angol A. K., Ibrahim S. A., Yakubu A. A. and T. Usman (2014). Determination of Socioeconomic Factors Influencing Youth Rural-Urban Migration in Sokoto State, Nigeria. *J. Hum Ecol*, 45(3): pp. 223-231
- Echibire P. N. and P. C.Ndukwu (2006). Pattern and causality of rural-migration in Imo State, Nigeria: implications for rural development. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology* 7(1):16-24
- Haxton N. (2005). From sea change to tree change, sea change becomes tree change. The Australian Broadcasting Corporation Transcripts, August 17, 2005.
- International Organisation Migration (2010). World Migration Report (2010): the future of migration - building capacities for change. Retrieved from [www.gcim.org](http://www.gcim.org) on 16<sup>th</sup> of March, 2011
- Mitchell C., Bunting T. and M. Piccioni (2004). Visual artists: counter-urbanities in the Canadian countryside? *The Canadian Geographer*. p 48
- Okunlola J. O. and S. D. Y. Alfred (1998). Socioeconomic factors affecting the production and utilization of soybean in Ondo State. *Applied Tropical Agriculture, vol. II*.
- Omoregbee F. E. and D. U. Okoedo-Okojie (2007). Occupational diversification for sustained rural livelihoods by youth in Ovia North East Local Government Area, Edo State. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology* 9(1):9-16
- Salt, B. (2001). The big shift: welcome to the third Australian culture. Hardie Grant Books, South Yarra
- Ugwoke F. O., Matthews-Njoku E. C., Anaeto C. F. and E. N. Okereke (2007). Socioeconomic factors affecting farmers use of mass media agricultural programmes in Imo Sate, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology* 9(1):166-130
- World Bank (2009). Reshaping economic geography – factor mobility and migration. World development report, Washington DC