
Impact of Migration on Food Security, Social and Environmental Life, Employment and Education in Selected Locations in Nigeria

By

DR. A. D. SHOFOYEKE

*National Institute for Educational Planning,
And Administration, Ondo.*

Abstract

In Nigeria, internal migration is not regulated and has far reaching implications on the growth rate of urbanization and infrastructures. This study investigated impact of rural-urban migration on food security, social and environmental life, employment, transportation, housing and education. 287 respondents drawn from urban and rural areas of Lagos, Abuja and Abakaliki were randomly selected. A questionnaire was administered to them and data generated was analysed using frequency and t-test statistics. The study found that no significant difference in food security between rural and urban areas. Migration affects cost of food in urban areas while manufactured food items are expensive in rural areas. Unemployment of youths cuts across rural and urban areas while social life in urban areas led to cultural and value disorientation coupled with increasing crime rates than in rural areas. Rural urban drift was found to influence environment more negatively and give rise to urban slums and shortage of accommodation. The paper proposes that legislation on internal migration be enacted and implemented while poverty alleviation programme be reviewed, improved and extended to cover more school leavers and graduates.

The rate of increase in human population across the globe has been persistent since the 1800. This perhaps, engendered debate on population problems which focused on what could be the optimum size and its impact on economic growth and development (National Research Council, 1993; Onokerhoraye, 1995; United Nations, 1999; Food and Agricultural Organization, 2000; UNDP, 2001 and Onwuka, 2003). In the view of the neo-classical economist, Thomas Malthus (1803), ‘the power of population is indefinitely greater than the resources on earth to provide the needed subsistence for mankind’. While it could not be concluded on the universal applicability of the Malthusian theory in industrial countries due to technological advances that led to increase in agricultural production the ensured food security for the citizens, the conditions in many developing countries validate his theory (Olofin 1996; Smil, 2000 cited by Onwuka, 2006).

The Coconut

Rapid population growth to a large extent, is hindering efforts of governments of developing countries to feed their people and also provide quality social services for them. Substandard housing or homelessness, limited access to food and clean water lead some people to source for food and water from unsanitary means which contribute to increasing rate of diseases, increasing waste which may have serious and massive public health challenge on populace (<http://www.wisegeek.com/waht-are-th-effects-of-populaiton-growth.htm>). However, the major problem is not rapid population growth in itself but poor management of natural resources and waste. With respect to environment, (the United Nation 2006 MDGs' Report) "The proportion of people using improved sanitation in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) in 1990 and 2004 were 32% and 37% respectively while 66% is target to be reached by 2015. S.S.A. is the world's worst most rapidly urbanizing region and almost all of this growth has been in slums where new city residents face overcrowding, inadequate housing and lack of water and sanitation" (Magashi, 2007).

The population growth has been traced to improvement in human application of modern medical science to health matters, better sanitation and immunization of children which have caused the death rate to decrease (Ashford, 2001; United Nations, 2001a). Thus, rapid population growth was occasioned partly by decline in infant mortality due to improvement in health services and persistent traditional beliefs about the value of children particularly sons as asset to be relied upon by their parents in agricultural production and to support them during old age, practice of polygamy, the fear of mortality and low levels of female education that encourage high fertility. Other factors responsible for rapid increase in population include influence of religions which teach that children are gifts of God, and continue patrilineal decent group rate (Ainsworth, 1996; National Population Commission, 2003).

Nigeria has one of the fattest growing populations in the world with annual growth rate of 2.9 percent. In 1963, the population was 56 million people which rose to 88.5 million in 1991 and further to 140 million in 2006 (National Population Commission, 2004). This indicates that the population increased by 84 million within 43 years which translates to average increase of 1.95 million yearly. The increasing population momentum was occasioned by the young population with 44.9 percent being under 15 years, median age (males and females) of 17.41 years, high number of women of reproductive age and high birth rate.

The rate at which a population grows is determined by three factors namely births (or fertility), deaths (or mortality) and migration. In Nigeria, natural increase in population (more births than deaths) is responsible for increasing growth rate than net migration (balance between emigration and immigration). Internal migration takes different forms, rural-urban, urban-rural, rural-rural which redistributes population. As a result of urban pool (availability of electricity, job opportunities, education, availability of goods and services) youths migrate more to urban than other forms of

of decline (Braunvan, 2004). Youth rural-urban migration has both positive and negative sides.

In most rural areas, the impact of rural-urban migration is rapid deterioration of the rural economy leading to chronic poverty and food insecurity. Reduction in agricultural productivity is occasioned by massive rural-urban migration by youths living only old, senile men and women (Jalloh, 2010). Cities in Nigeria are characterized by challenges of human trafficking, vehicular congestions, environmental pollution, access to portable water, subsistent economic activities, various kinds of unemployment, child abuse, dwindling focus on societal norms and values due explosion of population occasioned by influx of people from rural areas. There is no legislation on internal migration in Nigeria and other African countries. Finelley, (1997: 110) aptly highlighted the volume of internal migration in African counties thus:

By any measure, millions of Africans are migrating from one place to another within their countries. Without regard for migration type... one in five Africans is no longer living in his or her birth place.... Migration to urban areas or particular cities ranges from 12 percent to 66 percent. In proportions are well above 33 percent.

In 1991, Nigeria's population was 36 percent urban and was estimated to become 39 percent in 2000. The rate of urbanization or the rate of people living urban areas increases is estimated to be 3.7 percent per year (National Policy on Population for Sustainable Development 2004). The National Population Commission (2004) estimated that the urban population will increase to 42 percent of the total population in 2010, and 46 percent by 2020. Although urbanization has its merits but severe housing shortcomings resulting in overcrowding and spread of slums and shantytowns, increased air and water pollution, increased crime, increased demand for social services and infrastructure are some of the challenges urban dwellers have to contend with.

Although, there is shortage of studies on urban-rural migration in Nigeria, however some focused on social economic factors leading to urban-rural migration (Adewale, 2005), while other studies investigated factors associated with urban-rural migration (William, 1970; Jibowo (1992). On the other hand, many studies have been carried out on the impact of rural-urban migration on the rural economy and quality of life (Mabawonku (1973), Okpara (1983), Ijere (1994), Fadayomi (1998), and Mini (2000) while Filani (2005) studied mobility and survival and Osinubi (2003) investigated urban poverty in Nigeria but there is dearth of studies on impact of rural-urban migration that embraced many variables such as food security, environmental life, education and employment. This gap therefore necessitates this study which

The Coconut

investigates the impact of migration on food security, environment, education, transportation and housing.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested 0.05 apha level.

1. There will be no significant difference in the food security between rural and urban populace.
2. There will be no significant difference in the employment between youths in the rural and urban areas.
3. There will be no significant difference in the social life between rural and urban populace.
4. There will be no significant difference in the transportation situation between rural and urban areas.
5. There will be no significant difference in the availability of accommodation (housing) between rural and urban populace.
6. There will be no significant difference in the environmental life between rural and urban populace.
7. There will be no significant different in access to education between rural and urban youths.
8. There will be no significant joint and relative effect of location in organization, position in organization and gender on food security.
9. There will be no significant joint and relative effects of location of organization, position in organization and gender on employment.

Research Methodology

The study is a survey of the impact of rural-urban migration on food security, transportation, social life, employment, housing and environmental life. 287 respondents from education, industry, trade and a commerce were randomly selected from two major cities and state capital, namely: Abuja (Federal Capital Territory, FCT) 95; and Lagos 100. Abakaliki 92. This figure consists of 121 from rural and 166 from urban. Respondents comprised 168 males and 119 females who occupied different positions in organizations such as managerial 193, supervisory 70, trading 7, and clerical 17.

Respondents were given questionnaires developed by the researcher. The research instrument on rural-urban migration and implications for food security, social life, employment, transportation, housing, education and environmental life was validated by population experts and pilot tested on comparable group to ascertain its suitability for the purpose. This led to revision of the instrument and the final version was administered to the respondents in their work places. The instruments were retrieved from the respondents immediately they were completed. The duly

completed questionnaires were computer analysed using SPSS package. t-test statistics was used to compare the mean outcomes of the responses from rural with urban on each of the variables namely food, employment, social life, transportation, housing, environmental life and education. Joint and relative effects of the moderating variables (location of organization, position in organization, gender) on dependent variables (food security, employment and social life) were determined using regression analysis.

Findings of the Study

Ho₁: There will be no significant difference in the Food Security between those the rural and urban populace.

Table 1: Food Security between Rural and Urban Areas.

Food Security	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Crit-t	Cal-t	DF	P
Rural	121	6.4711	1.1407	1.96	1.016	285	.310
Urban	166	6.3373	1.0706				

Data in the above table show that there was no significant difference in the Food Security between those in the rural and urban areas (Crit-t = 1.96, Cal.t = 1.016, df = 285, P>.05 level of significance).

The null hypothesis is therefore not rejected.

Ho₂: There will be no significant difference in the Employment between rural and urban dwellers.

Table 2: Employment between Rural and Urban Areas.

Employment	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Crit-t	Cal-t	DF	P
Rural	121	1.2479	0.4879	1.96	.387	285	.699
Urban	166	1.2711	0.05093				

Data in the above table show that there was no significant difference in the Employment between those in the rural and urban areas (Crit-t = 1.96, Cal.t = .387, df = 285, P>.05 level of significance).

The null hypothesis is therefore not rejected.

Ho₃: There will be no significant difference in the Social Life between those in the rural and urban settlers.

The Coconut

Table 3: Social Life between Rural and Urban Areas.

Social Life	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Crit-t	Cal-t	DF	P
Rural	121	5.0000	3.8514	1.96	8.249	285	.000
Urban	166	1.9096	2.4859				

Data in the above table show that there was a significant difference in the Social Life between those in the rural and urban areas (Crit-t = 1.96, Cal.t = 8.249, df = 285, P < .05 level of significance). The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Traditions, norms and culture are upheld more in rural than in urban areas.

Ho₄: There will be no significant difference in the Transportation situation between rural and urban areas.

Table 4: Transportation situation between Rural and Urban Areas.

Transportation	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Crit-t	Cal-t	DF	P
Rural	121	2.0083	1.7102	1.96	4.876	285	.000
Urban	166	1.1867	1.1421				

Data in the above table show that there was a significant difference in the Transportation situation between those in the rural and urban areas (Crit-t = 1.96, Cal.t = 4.876, df = 285, P < .05 level of significance). The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Traffic congestions are common in urban areas especially during morning when workers rush for jobs and when returning in afternoons than in rural areas.

Ho₅: There will be no significant difference in availability of rentable accommodation between the rural and urban.

Table 5: Accommodation between Rural and Urban Areas.

Accommodation	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Crit-t	Cal-t	DF	P
Rural	121	8.1074	2.4012	1.96	5.919	285	.000
Urban	166	10.0964	2.8883				

Data in the above table show that there was a significant difference in securing rented the Accommodation between those in the rural and urban areas (Crit-t = 1.96, Cal.t = 5.919, df = 285, P < .05 level of significance). The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Securing accommodation is more difficult and costlier in urban than in rural areas.

Ho₆: There will be no significant difference in the Environmental Life between those in the rural and urban areas.

Table 6: Environmental Life between Rural and Urban Areas.

Environmental Life	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Crit-t	Cal-t	DF	P
Rural	121	2.9835	2.0655	1.96	7.783	285	.000
Urban	166	1.3193	1.5572				

Data in the above table show that there was a significant difference in the Environmental Life between those in the rural and urban areas (Crit-t = 1.96, Cal.t = 5.919, df = 285, P < .05 level of significance).

The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Environmental pollution, refuse disposal challenges, slums and shanties are more of features of urban than rural areas.

H₀₇: There will be no significant difference in access to education between rural and urban youths.

Table 7: Educational difference between Rural and Urban Areas.

Social Life	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Crit-t	Cal-t	DF	P
Rural	121	2.9917	2.4341	1.96	4.936	285	.000
Urban	166	1.5843	2.3488				

Data in table above show that there was a significant difference in the Education those in the rural and urban areas (Crit-t = 1.96, Cal.t = 4.936, df = 285, P>.05 level of significance).

The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Urban children have access to school more than their rural counterparts.

H₀₈: There will be no significant *Joint and relative* effect of location of organization, position in organization and gender on Food Security

Table 8: Joint and Relative Effect of Location of Organization, Position in Organization and gender on Food Security.

Variables	F-Ratio	Sig. of P	R	R-Square	Adj. R-Square	β	t	P
(constant)								
Location of organization							24.828	.000
Position in Organization	1.499	.215	.125	.016	.005	-.086	-1.384	.167
Gender						-.034	-.565	.572

The Coconut

Data in table above show that *linear combination* effect of location of organization, position in organization and gender on Food Security was not significant ($F(3,283) = 1.499$; $R = .125$, $R^2 = .016$, $Adj. R^2 = .016$; $P > 0.05$). The independent/predictor variables jointly accounted for a variation of about 2% while other extraneous variables accounted for about 98%.

The following shows the various *relative contributions* and levels of significance of the independent variables: Location of organization, ($\beta = -.086$, $P > .05$), Position in organization, ($\beta = .111$, $P > .05$) and Gender, ($\beta = -.034$, $P > .05$).

It is noted that both the joint and relative effects were not significant as shown in the table.

H₀: There will be significant *Joint and relative* effect of location of organization, position in organization and gender on Employment.

Table 9: Joint and Relative Effect of Location of Organization, Position in Organization and gender on Employment.

Variables	F-Ratio	Sig. of P	R	R-Square	Adj. R-Square	β	t	P
(constant)								
Location of organization						-.011	9.305	.000
Position in Organization	1.024	.385	.104	.001	.001	.080	-1.178	.859
Gender						.063	1.286	.199
							1.054	.273

Data in the table above show that *linear combination* effect of location of organization, position in organization and gender on Employment was not significant ($F(3,283) = 1.024$; $R = .104$, $R^2 = .011$, $Adj. R^2 = .001$; $P > 0.05$). The independent/predictor variables jointly accounted for a variation of about 12% while other extraneous variables accounted for about 88%.

The table further shows the various *relative contributions* and levels of significance of the independent variables: Location of organization, ($\beta = -.011$, $P > .05$), Position in organization, ($\beta = .080$, $P > .05$) and Gender, ($\beta = -.063$, $P > .05$).

It is noted that both the joint and relative effects were not significant as shown in the table.

Discussion of Results

There was no significant difference between the responses of rural and urban respondents on food security. Agricultural food products were available and cheaper in the rural areas while such are expensive in urban centres. Conversely, in period of scarcity, the rural suffer shortage of food while the urban do not because they attract goods from other areas of surplus due to large population which serves as market. Similarly, manufactured/industrial food is expensive in the rural areas partly due to cost of transportation and low population occasioned by rural-urban drift. Youths drift to urban centres coupled with poor food production method using old implements might lead to shortage of food in Nigeria. Most farmers are above forty years old which means that in few years time when this group may no longer be productive; more problem of scarcity of food might suffice.

Despite the youth drift to urban towns/cities in search of employment opportunities, evidence of unemployment are in both rural and urban areas. Unemployment and under employment characterise both rural and urban areas. Most youths in the rural areas do not have sufficient interest and skill in agriculture which is the major occupation in rural areas. Besides, most youths are interested in salary jobs due to type of formal education acquired and besides, low market for vocational products exists in rural areas. On the other hand, too many job seekers are looking for few jobs resulting in under employment, unemployment and exploitation in urban areas. This has the tendency of increasing poverty and moreso, there is no evidence that the incidence will reduce in Nigeria in the nearest future judging by the country's young population and the propensity of growth. Worst still, entrepreneurship and vocational education have not been properly implemented to bring about desirable change in employment of youths. Employment and Wealth Creation programmes like poverty eradication and loan schemes have not really achieved worth-while results.

The study found significant difference in Social Life between rural and urban populace. Although urban areas have advantage of having more social amenities and exposure to information, awareness of modern experiences such as clubs, recreation centres, films among others, but its side effects like increase in crime rate, prostitution, drug addiction, increasing divorce rate, kidnapping (especially in South Eastern Nigeria), social unrest, poor dressing, increasing rate of alms begging, among others are more of features of urban and cities sampled than rural areas. High unemployment among youths, unregulated social policy could be responsible for some of the social vices.

While congestions and stress characterize transportation in cities and urban centres, means of transportation is easier to get than in the rural areas. Transportation

The Coconut

is costlier in the rural areas than cities and urban. Rural dwellers contend with and in some cases risk poor means of transportation, bad roads or waterways while cities and urban towns face the challenges of overpopulation, noise and air pollution from exhaust pipes.

The study confirmed that it is more difficult to find accommodation for rentage in cities and urban centres than rural areas. However, in some remote and riverine areas, decent rentable houses are scarce. The study revealed that residential accommodations are very expensive in cities and towns and average cost per room is five thousand naira per month and between ten and twenty thousand or higher a flat per month. This explains why residential houses are congested with people, increase in slums where accommodation is relatively cheaper and increase in shanty towns and dehumanizing living under bridges. Average number of people living per room is 5 and 6 – 10 per flat in cities and urban towns which is comparatively less in rural areas.

Litters, refuse, wastes, blocked drainages, and stinking environment constitute threat to environment in urban areas, while environmental depletion through deforestation, poor sanitation, and indiscriminate bush burning do in rural areas. Findings on rural environmental depletion is supported by National Population Census of 2004 which found that of the 13 million hectares of forests and wood lands in the early 1990s, about 400,000 hectares are being cut down annually, primarily for domestic use. Only 15,000 hectares are being reforested each year. Thus, high rate of deforestation and domestic wood consumption for energy pose danger for environmental sustainability and encourage desert encroachment.

Access to school is affected negatively more in rural areas than urban areas. Rural settlements are small and scattered, and such schools locations are far from homes of many pupils while lack of means of transportation hamper accessibility. This constitutes one of the barriers for pupils to get to school on time and when they do, they are tired even before getting to school. Often, classes are missed especially the early periods which almost always are English Language and Mathematics classes. In the same vein, teachers' attendance and contact time with pupils are affected more in remote rural areas and these have implications for quality of basic and post basic education. This finding is supported by Education Sector Analysis (2005) report, Federal Ministry of Education (2009) report on road map to education. Desire to acquire quality education is one of the push factors of youth migration to urban centres. Tertiary institutions, and other educational opportunities such as computer technology trainings, internet services are located in cities and urban areas and this agrees with the studies by (Ijere, 1994; Mini, 2000 and Braunvan, 2004)

When combined together, respondents' location of organization, positioning organization and gender have no effects on food security, and employment. On the

other hand, relative effects of respondents' location of organization and gender had influence on social life while position in organization did not.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The impact on migration is felt by both rural and urban areas. In the rural areas, youth migration due to push and pull factors to cities has led to declining production of agricultural product. The prevalence of ageing population in the rural areas could be associated with challenges of rural poverty, poor hygiene, depletion of environment, challenge of long distance in accessing schools and rural unemployment. On the other hand, over crowding, congestions, increasing growth of urban slums and poverty, unemployment of all kinds, increasing rate of crime among youths characterize urban area.

In view of the impact of rural-urban migration by youths, which is not regulated, the trend in Nigeria needs be checked through legislation. Rural electrification, citing of cottage industries, agro-allied industries need be embarked upon by government or encourage companies and individuals to aid rural development. Human activities in deforestation deserve check by providing cheaper means of fuel woods, as well as enacting and implementing legislation on deforestation related issues. Satellite primary and junior secondary schools should be built in remote and disadvantaged areas.

Entrepreneurship education at all levels should be appropriately implemented to increase entrepreneurship skills acquisition by school leavers and graduates. Programmes designed for poverty eradication should be redesigned and extended to cover more unemployed youths. Teaching of vocational and technology education should be more effective and relevant in junior secondary schools to provide necessary background for studying courses in the field. Besides, training of youth coppers in entrepreneurship and wealth creation should be followed by provision of funds for all interested volunteers. After National Youth Service, volunteers in wealth creation programme should be given take off funds, placed on monthly stipends or allowances for at least two years to serve as a relief till their business stabilise

References

- Adewale J.G. (2005). Socio-economic factors associated with urban-rural *migration in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State, Nigeria. J. Hum. Ecol.*, 17(1): 13-16.
- Ainsworth, M; Beegle, K. & Nyamete. A. (1996). The impact of women's schooling on fertility and contraceptive use: A study of fourteen Sub-Saharan African countries, in *the World Bank economic review* 10 (1): 85 – 122

The Coconut

- Ashford, L.S. (2001). New population policies advancing women's health and rights, in *Population bulletin* 56 (1): Washington, population reference bureau.
- Braunvan, J. (2004). Towards a renewed focus on rural development. *Agriculture and rural development* 11(2) 4-6.
- Fadayomi, T.O. (1998). *Rural development and migration in Nigeria: Impact of the Eastern zone of Bauchi State agricultural development project*. Nigeria institute of social and economic research, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Federal Ministry of Education (2005). *Education sector analysis draft report*. Federal ministry of education, Abuja.
- Federal Ministry of Education (2009). *Education road map*. Federal ministry of education, Abuja.
- Filani, M.O. (2005). Mobility and survival: A nation's dilemma. *An inaugural lecture*, Ibadan. University of Ibadan.
- Findley, S.A. (1997). Migration and family interactions in Africa. In Adepoju, A. ed. *Family, population and development in Africa*. London, Zeel Books
- Food agricultural organization (2000). *Population and the environment: A review of issues and concepts for population programmes*, Part III, population and deforestation, Rome, food and agriculture organization of the United Nations.
- Ijere, N.J. (1994). *Gender and rural-urban migration in the Ecuadorian Sierra*. Columbia University press.
- Jalloh, M. (2010). Massive rural urban migration and its impact on agriculture in Sierra-Leone. *Sierra-Express Media*. <http://www.sierraexpressmedia.com/archieves/11278>
- Mabawonku, A.F. (1973). *The impact of rural-urban migration on the economy of selected rural communities in Western Nigeria*. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, department of agricultural economics, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Malthus, T.R. (1803). *Essays on the principles of population*, London, Bensley publishers.
- Mini, S.E. (2001). *The impact of rural-urban migration on rural economy in rural village* <http://www.geofileonline.com>.

- Magashi, A. (2007). Nigeria's population: Implication to health and development. <http://nigeriaworld.com/articles/2007/mar/071/html>.
- National population commission (2003b). *Nigeria demographic and health survey* Calverton, Maryland: National population commission and ORC/Macro.
- National population commission (2004). *National policy on population for sustainable. Development* Abuja: National population commission.
- National research council (1993). *Population dynamics of Sub-Saharan Africa: Demographic effects of economic reversals in sub-saharan Africa* Washington, National academy press.
- Okpara, E.E. (1983). The impact of migration on the quality of Nigeria rural life *Nigerian agricultural research management and training institute seminal series*, 3: 116.
- Olofin, S. (1996). Are we destined for economic backwardness in perpetuity? A *Neo-Malthusian theory of underdevelopment*. Ibadan, University of Ibadan press.
- Onokerhoraye, A.G. (1995). Population growth and the provision of social services in Nigeria. *The Benin social science series for Africa*. Benin-City, University of Benin
- Onwuka, E.C. (2005). Another look at the impact of Nigeria's growing population on the Country's development. *African population studies*. 21 (1).
- Osinubi, T.S. (2003). Urban poverty in Nigeria: A case study of Agege area of Lagos State, Nigeria.
- Smil, V. (2000) *Feeding the world: A challenge for the twenty-first Century*, Cambridge, MIT press.
- United Nations (2001a). Population, environment and development. *The concise report*. New York; United Nations.
- William, A.H. (1970). *Population, migration and urbanization in Africa*. Colombia University press, Colombia (1970).
- WisegEEK. *What are the effects of population growth?* <http://www.wisegEEK.com/what-are-the-effects-of-population-growth.htm>