INNOVARE JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Vol 1. Issue 2 . 2013 ISSN 2347-5544

Research Article

APPRAISAL OF THE FACTORS OF RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION IN SOUTHEASTERN NIGERIA

CHUKWUEDOZIE K. AJAERO, IGNATIUS A. MADU, ARINZE T. MOZIE

Department of Geography, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Email: ajaerock@yahoo.com/chukwuedozie.ajaero@unn.edu.ng

Received:7 October 2013, Revised and Accepted:21 December 2013

ABSTRACT

This study highlighted the pattern, and examined the factors of rural-urban migration in Southeastern Nigeria. The primary data for this study was generated through questionnaire surveys and key informant interviews. A total of 225 rural-urban migrants were administered with the questionnaire across the five states, five urban areas and fifteen rural Local Government Areas covered by this study. The data generated from the fieldwork were analyzed with descriptive statistics, analysis of variance, and principal component analysis. Results of the study show that over 70% of the migrants are males while over 80% of them are also single or married. The analysis of variance shows that while some factors vary significantly across the study area in determining rural-urban migration, others do not. The principal component analysis reduced the factors to thirteen underlying components that together account for 68.95% of the cumulative variance in the determinants of migration. These underlying components include migrating to look for job, to join spouse, and to further education. Based on the results of the study, recommendations such as the establishment of skills acquisition centers and provision of social infrastructures in the rural areas are made.

Keywords: Appraisal; Factors; Migration; Rural-urban; Southeastern Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

Researches over time, attribute the rapid growth of rural-urban migration to increasing unemployment and rural poverty[1,2,3,4] and it has been noted that rural-urban migration is primarily a consequence of rural-urban wealth differentials[5,6,7]. Studies have also shown that the incidence of rural-urban migration is higher in developing countries than in their developed counterparts. Furthermore, within the developing countries, there exists a significant selectivity of migrants with respect to age, sex, caste, marital status, education, occupation etc., and the propensity of migration differs significantly among these socio-economic groups [8]. A review of rural-urban migration literature shows that migrants are predominantly young males, but research has also shown that the proportion of male and female migrants varies according to region [9]. For instance,[4] revealed that while young male adults predominantly migrate in sub-Saharan Africa, in the Philippines, it is mostly young females who migrate as independent workers to urban centers to find work mostly in the informal sector.

The determinants of migration which are diverse, may be broadly collapsed into push factors (reasons for leaving an area) and pull factors (reasons for moving into an area).These factors may also be social, political, economic, environmental, and cultural in nature [10,11]. Studies in sub-Saharan Africa have shown that employment remains a major determinant of rural-urban migration [12,13]. In this regard, men usually move to urban and semi-urban areas for mining, logging, or agricultural jobs, while the women are much less likely to move for these jobs.

Nigeria, which is also one of the developing countries of the world has a population of over 140 million, and is Africa's most populous country [14]. It not only has more large cities, but also has the highest total urban population of all countries in sub-Saharan Africa [15]. Since independence, Nigerian urban population has grown from 11% of the total population in 1952 to 46% in 2002 and 48.2% in 2005 with rates of urban population growth consistently exceeding overall population growth rate [16]. Associated with this dramatic increase in urban population has been the spectacular geographical spread of these urban areas. The National Population Commission [17] reveals that in the 1991 population census, about 359 settlements had at least 20,000 people, while estimates for the year 2000 put the number of urban areas with more than 20,000 people at more than 450. Similarly, estimates by [15] put the number of Nigerian cities with a population of over 500,000 in 2002 at 18. In 2005, there were more than 840 urban centers with over 10 cities having populations in excess of one million, while projections indicate that more than 60% of Nigerians will live in urban centers by year 2025 [16]. Consequently, unlike most African countries where one or two cities dominate the urban network, different parts of the Nigerian land space have large centres of human agglomeration yet the incidence of poverty among Nigerians is high. This level of poverty in Nigeria is generally higher in rural than urban areas, even as per capita incomes in urban areas are roughly a third higher than in rural areas [15].

Studies on rural-urban migration have been carried out in Nigeria. For instance, [18] examined the factors associated with the drift of youths from rural to urban areas in Kwara State, [19] appraised the factors of rural-urban migration into Lagos State, while [20] also studied the characteristics and determinants of rural-urban migration in Ajeromi- Ifelodun LGA of Lagos State, Western Nigeria. Other studies carried out in Nigeria such as [21,22,23,24,25], and in Southeastern Nigeria [26] concentrated on international migration thereby relegating rural-urban migration which affects majority of Southeastern Nigerians to the background. Moreover, the study carried out in Aba, Southeastern Nigeria by [27] focused only on rural-urban interactions without examining the migratory processes that yield the interactions. From the review of literature, it is clear that rural-urban migration studies done in Nigeria have concentrated on the Western Region of Nigeria, and virtually excluded Southeastern Nigeria despite the fact that migration from the rural areas to urban areas is very common in Southeastern Nigeria. These rural-urban drifts have left Southeastern Nigeria rural areas with demographically unbalanced proportions of dependent populations such as women, children and older or aged persons [15].

Subsequently, studies on the factors of rural-urban migration in Southeastern Nigeria are glaringly absent despite their relevance in the formulation of policies for the socioeconomic development of the area. This dearth of research on the factors of rural-urban migration in the study area brings to the fore the pressing need for such

studies especially in a migration-prone area such as the Southeastern Nigeria. In this regard, the comprehension of the factors of rural out-migration is of great policy importance because it is only when the operation of these factors are known that intervention measures in the rural areas of the study area can be targeted and implemented. This study is therefore aimed at examining the factors of rural-urban migration in the study area. It is hoped that the findings of this study will help in the initiation and implementation of measures that will improve the well-being of the rural dwellers and possibly stem the ever-increasing tide of rural out-migration in this area.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The conceptual framework

The conceptual framework for this research is the Lee's Theory of Migration of 1966. Lee's theory deals mainly with the factors of migration [20]. This theory of migration is classified into the pull and push factors of a potential migrants. Pull factors refer to favorable and or desirable conditions existing at the destination area of a potential migrant while the push factors are the unfavorable and or undesirable conditions existing at the origin of a potential migrant. The theory also recognizes sets of intervening obstacles and personal factors which exist between the pull and push factors and which either inhibit or encourage migration. Consequently, a potential migrant weighs the pros and cons of these factors, and if favorable decides to move but if unfavorable, may not move. For this research therefore the push factors of rural-urban migration will be considered on three bases namely; people as influencing factor of migration, sources of information for migration, and reasons for migration from different rural areas to different urban areas in the study area.

The study population.

The study area comprises the five southeastern Nigerian states of Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo. These states are located between latitudes 4080" and 8047" north of the equator and longitudes 6067" and 7013" east of the Greenwich Meridian and were selected for this study because they exhibit homogenous socio-economic and linguistic characteristics. Moreover, the populations of these states are subjected to the same agro climatic and other geographic conditions and politically, they fall under one of the six geo-political zones of Nigeria. Each of the States has at least a Local Government Area (LGA) which is predominantly an urban area(UA). An urban area has been defined in Nigeria as an area having population of more than 20,000 persons [17].These urban areas are also characterized by; dominance of non-primary economic activities; heterogeneous concentration of population; landscapes having more of artificial structures than natural features; and heterogeneity of functions which include being destination areas of rural out-migrants. These five States also have LGAs which are predominantly rural areas (RA) (i.e areas with populations of less than 20,000 persons).

From each State, the urban area with the largest population size based on the 2006 population census (not necessarily the State capital) is selected for this study on the premise that it will have the highest heterogeneous concentration of people from different parts of the State. In all five (5) urban areas (UA) were used in this study. Since each of the states also has three senatorial zones which have common characteristics, a rural LGA (RLGA) was randomly selected from each of the senatorial zones so as to ensure equal representations of all parts of the state. In all, fifteen (15) rural LGAs were used for this study. Consequently, the areas that were used in this research are as follows;

- Anambra State: Onitsha(UA),Anambra West, Dunukofia,and Ekwusigo.(RLGAs).
- Abia State : Aba(UA),Ukwa East,Isikwuato, and Ikwuano(RLGAs).
- Ebonyi State : Abakiliki (UA), Ivo, Ezza North, and Ebonyi(RLGAs).
- Enugu State : Enugu(UA), Isi Uzo,Oji River,and Uzo Uwani (RLGAs).
- Imo State : Owerri(UA),Owerri West, Nkwerre, and Onuimo (RLGAs).Data collection.

Forty five (45) rural-urban migrants were randomly selected and sampled in each of the five urban areas totaling two hundred and twenty five (225) urban households in the study area. These households sampled in the urban areas consist of fifteen (15) migrant households from each of the rural LGAs used for this study as highlighted above.

Questionnaire Survey

In addition to the participatory sessions, both structured and semi-structured questionnaires were used to capture data from respondents. The questionnaire was distributed to the rural-urban migrants and used to elicit migration information from them especially on the patterns and factors of rural-urban migration in the study area. The patterns of migration were derived based on the socioeconomic characteristics of the migrants at their time of rural-urban migration. The target respondents for the questionnaire survey were persons who migrated and are still living in the urban areas in at least the last three years (permanent migrants).

Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews or in-depth interviews (KIIs) were conducted with the traditional rulers and opinion leaders in the study area considered to be adequately knowledgeable. The interview was used to gather information which were difficult to be adequately captured by the questionnaire survey.

Data Analyses

The raw of frequency of responses generated from questionnaires were keyed into the SPSS program before the application of different analysis on the data. Subsequently, all the statistical analyses were carried out using the raw data of frequency of responses from the respondents. The characteristics of rural-urban migrants in the study area were analyzed using percentages of responses generated from the fieldwork. In addition, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was carried out on the raw data scores keyed into the statistical programme so as to examine the variability of the factors of migration between different parts of the study area. Furthermore, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to determine the underlying dimensions of the factors of rural-urban migration in the study area.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of rural-urban migrants in the study area.

The findings of this study in Table 1 show that in the study area, most of the migrants were males comprising about 71% of the rural-urban migrants. The major reason for this dominance of male migrants according to KIIs from the fieldwork is because there is more pressure on the males to succeed. Therefore, the males usually migrate earlier in life and when they have stabilized, they may come back to take their family members or to marry. It was discovered that the ages of the migrants at the time of migration in the study area fall mainly between 20 to 49 years. This concentration of migrants at this age may be because it is usually at this age that the males who are the most migratory attend university, learn a trade, engage in business or even get employed after their studies. In other words, it is usually at young ages that the males engage in the struggle for self-actualization in the study area.

Table 1: Characteristics of rural-urban migrants in the study area

Population Characteristics	Percentage of Migrants
SEX	
Male	71.9
Female	28.1
AGE	
Less than 20 years	6.0
20-29 years	22.1
30-39 years	26.1
40-49 years	23.1
50-59 years	18.2
60 years and above	4.5
EDUCATION	
Pre-primary	2.5
Primary	1.5
Secondary	22.6
Tertiary	73.4
MARITAL STATUS	
Single	55.3
Married	35.7
Separated	1.5
Divorced	2.5
Widowed	5.0

Comprehension of the marital status of migrants is a good indicator of the reasons for any migration stream as particular marital status usually points to a migration-driving factor [8,28]. For instance, migration of single persons usually points to migration for education or quest for a source of livelihood in terms of maybe looking for job, being newly employed or even learning a trade, while for married persons, it usually portends, getting married and joining spouses as the reasons for migration. In the study area, more that 80% of migration occurred between those that were single and those that were married (Table 1). In addition, most migrants fall within the group of people that are undergoing, or have concluded secondary school education. For instance, 22.6% of the migrants were secondary school students while 73.4% of the migrants were in tertiary institutions. These two educational groups usually represent the stage at which most people leave their parents to seek for education as some of these educational institutions may not be available in the rural areas of the migrants.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) of factors of rural-urban migration in the study area

In this study, the factors of migration are broadly divided into three categories which are; people as influencing factor in the decision to migrate, information sources as factor of migration, and the reasons for migration. For each of these categories of factors of migration, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test the significance of their occurrence across the States in the study area. The results of the ANOVA on Table 2 indicate that while some categories of people show significant variations in influencing the migration decision making process, others do not. For instance, no one (0.162) and spouse (0.290) categories show no significant variations in the way they influenced the decision of migrants to migrate to urban areas in the study area. Also, friends (0.664), return migrants (0.349), and spouse (0.266) do not show significant variation in the way they served as sources of information as factor of rural-urban migration in the different parts of the study area. All the remaining sources of information depict significant variation in the way they served as information sources as factor of rural-urban migration in different parts of the study area. However, three factors namely job/employment (0.020), education (0.000), and widowed (0.005) vary significantly as reasons for rural-urban migration in different parts of the study area while other reasons for migration in the study did not exhibit significant variation as factors of migration.

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of the factors of migration

The ANOVA carried out on the three categories of the factors of migration highlighted the factors that vary significantly across the study area in the way they affect rural out-migration. However, the ANOVA results despite their provision of useful insights into the operation of factors of migration in the study area have not been able to exhibit clear cut underlying determinants for rural out-migration in the study area as a whole. Consequently, principal component analysis (PCA) was carried out on the data so as to identify the underlying determinants/components of rural out-migration in the study area. The data used in the PCA were the data from the three categories of factors of migration in the study area namely; people as influencing factor of migration, information sources as factor of migration, and reasons for migration in the study area. The VARIMAX rotation technique was used to rotate the results of the PCA. Table 3 below shows the results of the rotated PCA. The rotated PCA produced thirteen (13) underlying components that determine rural out- migration in the study area. These underlying components together explained 68.95% of the total variance in the determinants of rural out-migration in the study area. For the purpose of this study, variables with loadings exceeding 0.50 were used as exhibiting significant loadings for the interpretation of the results of the rotated PCA.

Table 2: A nova of factors of migration in the study area.

FACTORS OF MIGRATION	CALC. F	TABLE. F	SIGN LEVEL
PEOPLE AS INFLUENCING FACTOR			
No one	1.656	2.37	0.162
Relatives	3.288	2.37	0.012*
Employer	3.208	2.37	0.014*
Spouse	1.254	2.37	0.290
Friends	7.613	2.37	0.000*
Others	2.425	2.37	0.049*
INFORMATION SOURCE AS FACTOR			
Radio	13.442	2.37	0.000*
Television	13.186	2.37	0.000*
Newspaper	9.896	2.37	0.000*
Friends	0.598	2.37	0.664
Return migrants	1.119	2.37	0.349
Relatives	5.071	2.37	0.001*
Parents	2.772	2.37	0.029*
Spouse	1.316	2.37	0.266
Others	3.286	2.37	0.012*
REASONS FOR MIGRATION			
Job/employment	2.999	2.37	0.020*
Education	12.670	2.37	0.000*
Marriage	1.764	2.37	0.138
To join spouse	1.887	2.37	0.114
Moved with parents	2.054	2.37	0.088
Retirement	1.076	2.37	0.370
Transfer in work place	1.454	2.37	0.218
Sickness	1.870	2.37	0.117
To live with Relatives/friends	1.463	2.37	0.215
Adventure	1.888	2.37	0.114
Divorced	0.842	2.37	0.500
Widowed	3.843	2.37	0.005*
Others	1.777	2.37	0.135

* Significant variation at 0.05 level of significance

Table 3: Results of the rotated PCA of the factors of rural-urban migration

Variables	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII
X1	−.067	.115	−.046	−.040	−.109	−.054	.078	***−.831****	−.054	.073	−.131	.031	.196
X2	−.067	.057	−.066	.088	.150	.351	−.220	.119	.031	.016	***.520****	−.227	−.441
X3	−.189	.449	−.271	.147	−.016	−.141	.247	.469	−.033	.158	−.301	.188	.169
X4	***.782****	−.015	−.020	−.066	−.030	−.026	−.123	.018	.144	−.082	−.069	.037	.116
X5	−.190	***−.754****	−.089	−.133	−.149	−.115	.018	.070	.034	−.168	−.015	.044	.044
X6	−.018	.002	***.882****	−.034	.030	−.064	−.007	.012	−.103	−.051	−.029	.033	.011
X7	−.191	.088	.158	***.510****	.012	−.168	.065	.287	−.113	.302	−.131	.140	.279
X8	−.057	.385	−.156	***.676****	.040	−.039	.029	−.065	−.134	.079	.094	.010	.006
X9	−.102	.138	−094	***.776****	−.134	−.039	.030	.045	.051	−.109	.024	.079	−.022
X10	−.252	−.205	−.343	−.189	−.376	−.291	.116	.012	−.034	−.203	−.174	.334	−.150
X11	−.053	.117	−.046	−.074	−.065	***.798****	.061	−.070	.009	−.062	−.051	−.062	.052
X12	−.057	**.605***	−.075	−.199	−.270	−.038	−.082	−.139	.105	−.130	.274	.073	−.092
X13	−.112	.228	.031	.004	***.726****	−.087	.079	.073	.021	−.095	.009	−.317	.022
X14	***.752****	.109	−.024	−.065	−.060	−.046	−.334	−.051	−.031	−.028	−.120	−.008	−.029
X15	.049	.064	***.821****	−.105	−.079	−.016	.023	.007	.058	−.003	−.023	.041	−.029
X16	−.234	**.511***	.166	−.129	−.080	.031	.187	.230	−.220	−.212	−.368	−.166	−.086
X17	−.220	−.120	.121	−.104	.083	.000	−.020	.014	***−.753****	−.034	.027	−.225	.214
X18	.308	.001	−.014	.178	−.079	−.112	***−.690****	.036	.227	−.215	−.205	.080	.035
X19	***.754****	−.002	−.020	−.092	−.030	.003	.287	.058	−.061	.047	.142	−.029	−.051
X20	−.051	.165	−.113	−.219	***.649****	−.082	−.035	.082	−.163	−.029	.009	.270	.137
X21	.025	−.026	−.032	.047	.074	.100	−.026	−.086	.041	−.004	−.068	.012	***.705****
X22	.028	−.004	−.001	.161	.003	−.019	***.744****	−.035	.158	−.121	−.094	.030	.004
X23	−.019	.051	−.018	.025	−.032	−.129	.077	.084	.076	−.064	***.740****	.104	.112
X24	−.049	−.449	−.110	.097	−.082	−.005	.045	.208	−.046	***.523****	−.040	.177	−.202
X25	.011	−.049	.085	.118	−.010	.093	−.014	−.021	.033	.032	.084	***.789****	.028
X26	−.001	−.050	−.020	−.033	−.023	***.722****	−.007	.066	.015	−.013	−.033	.145	.025
X27	−.033	.074	−.019	−.033	−.050	−.061	−.024	−.089	−.050	***.830****	−.038	−.030	.052
X28	−.126	−.113	.059	−.206	.022	.042	.038	.021	***.734****	.011	.089	−.180	.253
Eigen value	2.229	1.995	1.722	1.681	1.531	1.513	1.445	1.389	1.385	1.330	1.320	1.236	1.220
% of Variance	7.69	6.88	5.94	5.80	5.28	5.22	4.98	4.80	4.78	4.59	4.55	4.26	4.21
Cumulative %	7.69	14.57	20.51	26.30	31.58	36.80	41.78	46.57	51.34	55.93	60.481	64.74	68.95

(*Significant loadings exceeding 0.50)

Interpretation of the PCA of factors of migration

From the results, component I has significant loadings on three variables. The variables are X4(spouse influenced the migrant to migrate). This variable highlights the view that spouses influence migration decision taking of the potential migrants. For instance, a man may be convinced by his wife to leave the village to take up a job and live in the urban area with the assurance that in his absence she could take care of their children till he has settled down very well in the urban area to come and take the rest of the family in the rural area to live with him. Another variable here is X14(spouse was an important source of information for migration) which underscores the fact that spouses also influence migrants by being sources of relevant information about the urban areas , and X19(to join spouse is a major reason for migration). This variable points to the fact that some of the migrants especially the women usually migrate to urban areas to join their spouses depending on how a spouse is able to influence the other to migrate and join him or her after some period of both of then living in separate areas. Consequent upon the explanation about variable X4 above, this category of migrants are those that later migrated to join their spouses who had migrated earlier and has now settled down enough to be able to bring across the rest of the family in the urban area. Furthermore, this study discovered that some men also migrate to join their wives in the urban area especially when the woman is the breadwinner of the family and have been transferred to an urban area. In some cases, even men who work also opt to migrate and join their wives when they feel it is more convenient for them and members of their family to join their wives than for their wives to join them in the rural areas. The underlying component here becomes the influence of spouses on migration in the study area. This component accounts for 7.69% of the total variance and has an eigenvalue of 2.229.

Component II with a contributory variance of 6.88% , and an eigenvalue of 1.995 loads significantly on three variables. They are X5(friends influenced the migrant to migrate), which is an indicator that friends of migrants may have supplied the potential migrants with information about an urban area that may influence the migrants in deciding to migrate to the urban area, and X12(relatives were important source of information for migration). Through some relatives, some migrants got information about the attractiveness of their places of destination in terms of job availability and suitability from their relatives, and X16(quest for job was a major reason for migration). In this case, the potential migrants in the rural areas usually get across to relatives and friends in the urban areas and request these friends and relatives to intimate them of job openings in the urban areas. It should be noted at this juncture that the wealth differentials between rural and urban areas. In this regard, the information from relatives and the persuasion by friends are aimed at helping them succeed in their job search. The underlying component is therefore networking to secure job.

Component III has an eigenvalue of 1.722, contributes 5.94% of the total variance of the PCA, and has two variables with significant loadings. These variables are X6 (others influenced the migrant to migrate) which underscores the influence of other people that may not be friends, relatives, employees etc which the migrants find difficult to classify into a particular group during the migration decision- making period of the migrants. Such people may be mere

acquaintances they may have met at a function or people that the migrant were referred to by may be friends, relatives etc to advice them during the migration decision-taking process. This component also loads high on variable X15(others was important source of information for migration). This implies that the same people who can hardly be classified under a particular class of people as in the case of X6 made available to the migrants information about the urban areas that helped them to migrate. The underlying component of these variables then becomes impact of non- specific groups of people as a factor of migration in the study area.

Component IV has significant loadings on three variables which are X7(radio was an important source of information for migration). This is an indicator of the importance of radio in the rural areas as a veritable source of information about the nature of the urban areas. variable X8(television was an important source of information for migration) also underscores the importance of television in making information about the urban areas to the potential migrants and X9(newspaper was an important source of information for migration), meaning that newspaper is also a means through which the rural dwellers could access needed information about the urban areas they may wish to migrate to With an eigenvalue of 1.681 and variance of 5.80% out of the total variance of the PCA, the underlying components becomes mass media as a factor of migration in the study area.

Component V has significant loadings on two variables, and contributes 5.28% to the total variance and has an eigenvalue of 1.531. These variables with significant loadings are X13(parents was an important source of information for migration), this indicates that parents of the migrants helped make available to the migrants information about the urban areas they migrated to and variable X20(moving with parents was a major reason for migration) shows that some people usually migrate because their parents are migrating and they must follow them. This is true most especially for children and people that depend on their parents for their sustenance. Consequently, the underlying component is the parental factor in migration.

Component VI has significant loadings on two variables namely X11(return migrants was an important source of information). This variable shows that in some cases, many potential migrants living in the rural area get information about the suitability of the urban area they eventually migrate to from return migrants who have lived in such urban areas and variable X26(divorce was the major reason for migration) underscores the fact that most divorcees from failed marriages and who were living in the rural areas may have need to relocate to other areas away from the place they lived with their former spouses for several reasons. Instances of such reasons include escaping from the stigma of a failed marriage from the rural neighbors and relatives that knew them very well, and the need to be far away from the former spouse. However, they need to appraise the suitability of their prospective places of destination before taking the decision to migrate. In this regard, information they may get from different people such as the return migrants from the urban areas will help them to take a migration decision in their bid to move away from the rural area and further away from their former spouses because of their failed marriage. This component has and eigenvalue of 1.513 and a variance contribution of 5.22% to the total variance explained by the PCA. Subsequently, the underlying component becomes family instability as a factor of migration.

Component VII has a 4.99% contribution to the total variance of the PCA, an eigenvalue of 1.445, and loads significantly on two variables. These variables are X18(marriage was a major reason for migration), in this context, it is obvious that some people migrate immediately they get married to join their partners. This is more common among newly wed ladies that are expected to settle where their husbands live. It means that this group of migrants may not have planned to migrate to a particular urban area but did so because they became married to someone living in that particular urban area, and as such the migration decision-making was beyond their control. This component also has high loadings on X22(transfer was a major reason for migration). Transfers in some cases are for either promotional or punitive purposes. In other instances it may be just for routine reorganization of staff and duties. Subsequently, for whatever reason a person is transferred, it must involve a change in the persons' duty post and duties. For instance a teacher transferred from school A to school B is still a teacher but has ceased from being a teacher for school A and has now become a teacher in school B. Consequently, the underlying component becomes migration due to change in status. This is because marriage confers a change in social status of the married person, while transfer also confers a change in status of the person transferred which may be due to promotion, punishment, or routine change of duty posts.

Component VIII has significant loadings on only one variable, contributes 4.80% to the total variance and has an eigenvalue of 1.389. This variable X1(no one influenced the migrant to migrate) explains the independence of the migrant with regard to migration. It means that the migrant made the decision to migrate without recourse to any external factor. Thus the underlying component here is migration as a strictly personal decision.

Component IX has an eigenvalue of 1.385 and percentage variance of 4.78 with significant loadings on two variables namely X17(education was a major reason for migration) and X28 (others was a major reason for migration) .The first variable which has a negative value shows that the lower the educational attainment of rural people, the greater their propensity to migrate to urban areas to look for sources of livelihoods. It will be easier for the less educated to secure informal employments in the urban area such as being mechanics, drivers, truck pushers etc than in rural areas where these informal jobs are almost non-existent. Therefore these rural and less educated people instead of remaining in the village to engage in only agriculture usually migrate to urban areas to take up the informal urban jobs which they hope will improve their livelihoods. In addition, variable X29 captures other reasons for migration which the respondents were not able to put down during the fieldwork. In this regard, Adams (2006) noted that literature on migration has shown that migration always takes place due to the quest of migrants for better living conditions. Based on the above, the underlying component here is the search for other opportunities of livelihood as factor of migration.

Component X loads significantly on two variables which are X24(to live with friends/ relatives was a major reason for migration).This variable represents those that migrated because they may not have been involved in any meaningful activity in the village. In this category are also those who may not have any one to look after them in the village and thus have to go to the towns to stay with their relatives so as to attend schools, look for job, or even learn a trade, and variable X27(being widowed was a major reason for migration) underscores the tendency for people that lost their spouse to be lonely and in need of companionship. They may also seek for ways of fending for themselves by migrating to urban areas to look for job. In addition, if the widowed has children, he or she may not want the children to grow up in the rural areas and would want them to stay in the urban area especially close to relatives or friends where they will have better and more favorable environment for their growth and development. With an eigenvalue of 1.330 and variance of 4.59%, the underlying component becomes quest for a more convivial environment as factor of migration.

Component X1 has significant loadings on two variables, contributes 4.55% of variance to the total variance of the PCA and also has an eigenvalue of 1.320. The variables that load significantly on this component are X2(relatives influenced the migrant to migrate). This variables underscores the fact that many rural dwellers are persuaded by their relatives in the urban areas to migrate to the urban areas for several reasons such as for job and for education etc In this regard, relatives supply the rural dwellers with information about the importance and desirability of them migrating to the urban areas. With regards to variable X23(sickness was a major reason for migration). It is common practice for people living in the urban areas to bring their sick relatives living in the rural areas to the urban areas so that they could receive good healthcare. This is because, the urban dwellers believe that the rural areas lack appropriate medical facilities to take comprehensive care of the sick and that it is only in the urban areas that the sick can receive

comprehensive healthcare. Most of these sick relatives may end up staying for more than three months in the urban area which is the threshold between visits and migration [8, 6]. In some cases, even when the sick people recover, their relatives in the urban area convince them to remain in the urban area so as to make sure that their health does not deteriorate and that they receive regular and appropriate medical checks. . Thus the underlying component becomes the need for a cozier environment as factor of migration.

Component XII has a contributory variance of 4.26% and an eigenvalue of 1.236, and loads significantly on one variable only which is X25(adventure was a major reason for migration).This group of migrants are usually youths who migrate to the urban area just for the fun of living there. They may also migrate just to satisfy their curiosity about some information they may have about such urban area. The underlying component here is adventure as a factor of migration.

Finally, component XIII has a variance of 4.21%, an eigenvalue of 1.220 and has significant loading on one variable. This variable is X21 (retirement was the major reason for migration). Migrants in this group are those who worked in establishments in the rural areas such as primary schools or rural churches and after their retirement, they migrate to the urban areas to stay with their relatives. Most of the children of these retirees are grown ups and live in the urban areas and they wont want their parents to remain in the village without anybody being with them. Subsequently, they influence the retirees to come over to the urban area where they will have people keeping them company It therefore has an underlying component of retirement as a factor of migration.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of findings

This study highlighted the pattern, and examined the factors of rural-urban migration in Southeastern Nigeria. The results show that in the study area, most of the migrants were males while people in the 20-49 age bracket was also the most migratory. This concentration of migrants at this age is because it is usually at young ages that the males engage in the struggle for self-actualization in the study area. With regards to marital status, more than 80% of migration occurred between those that are single and those that are married. Majority of the migrants are people that were undergoing secondary school or tertiary education at the time they left the rural areas. With regards to factors of rural-urban migration, the results of the ANOVA indicate that as sources of influence to migrate, relatives (3.288), employer (3.208), friends (7.613) and others (2.425) exhibit significant variation in influencing migration. The ANOVA results also revealed that radio (13.442), television (13.186), newspapers (9.896), relatives (5.071), parents (2.772) and others (3.286) show significant variation across different parts of the study area as sources of information for migration. In addition, the quest for job (2.999), quest for education (12.670) and widowed (3.843) are the only reasons that significantly vary across the study area in determining if migration will occur.

The rotated PCA of the factors of rural-urban migration produced thirteen (13) underlying components that determine rural-urban migration in the study area. These underlying components together explained 68.95% of the total variance in the determinants of rural out-migration in the study area. The underlying components and their contributory variances are: the influence of spouses on migration (7.69%), networking to secure job (6.88%), impact of non-specific groups of people as a factor of migration (5.94%), mass media as a factor of migration (5.80%), parental factor in migration (5.28%), family instability as a factor of migration (5.22%), migration due to change in status (4.99%), migration as a personal decision (4.80%), the search for other opportunities (4.78%), quest for a more convivial environment as factor of migration (4.59%), need for a cozier environment as factor of migration (4.55%), adventure as a factor of migration (4.26%), and retirement as a factor of migration (4.21%).

Recommendations

Based the above findings of this study, the following suggestions are made to assist in stemming the increase in rural-urban migration in the study area. Firstly, it is recommended that, governments, development agencies, NGOs, and policy makers pay more attention to the developmental needs of the populations especially as it concerns establishment of infrastructures such as roads, water supply, and electricity. For instance, good roads ensure that agricultural produce are taken to markets as and when due to enable the rural farmers get appropriate value for their goods. In addition, there is need for the establishment of small and medium scale industries (SMEs) in the rural areas of the study area. From the results of this study, it was found that majority of the migrants are young, in school or just concluded schooling. The most important reason for their migration also hinges on quest for jobs. Therefore, if these SMEs are established in these areas, it will provide the much needed job by the youths, yield revenue for the development of the rural areas, attract more economic activities to the rural areas, and contribute to the improvement of the quality of lives of the populations. Related to the issue of SMEs above is the need for the population to acquire requisite education and skills that will enable them become productive. As also noted in the findings of this study, most youth migrate to acquire education. If the educational institutions, especially the tertiary institutions are situated in areas proximate to these communities, it will reduce the incidence of the youth migrating to urban areas to seek for education. Furthermore, it is known that not everyone is academically inclined. In this regard, siting of vocational skill acquisition centers in these rural communities will go a long way in equipping the population with the requisite skills to work in the SMEs and earn their livelihoods.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was supported by the International Foundation for Science (IFS), Stockholm, Sweden, through a grant to Chukwuedozie Kelechukwu Ajaero.

REFERENCES

1. Anarfi J, Kwankye S, Ofosu-Mensah A, Tiemoko R. Migration from and to Ghana: A Background Paper" Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty. University of Sussex, Brighton. Working Paper C4. 2001
2. Chant S. Debate: Researching Gender, Families and Households in Latin America from the 20th into the 21st Century. Bulletin of Latin American Research 2002; 21(4): 545- 575.
3. United Nations. Report of the Consultative Meeting on Migration and Mobility and How This Movement Affects Women. New York 2004.
4. Zhao Y. Rural-urban Migration in China-What do we know and what do we need to know? China Center for Economic Research, Peking University 2003.
5. Madu IA. Spatial Inequality in Nigeria: The Imperative of Geographic Perspectives in the Development Process. Journal of Social and Economic Development,2006; Vol.8, N0.2, pp105-120
6. Ajaero CK, Onokala PC. Spatial appraisal of socioeconomic impacts of rural out-migration in the Niger Delta region. Proceedings of TTI and CPED Workshop on Confronting the challenges of development, environmental management and peace building in the Niger Delta: Beyond the Amnesty, Benin, 28th -29th July 2011.pp 23-34.
7. Ajaero CK. Appraisal of the Socioeconomic Impacts of Rural-Urban Migration in Rural Communities of Southeastern Nigeria. Paper presented at the Seminar on Internal Migration and Urbanisation and their Socioeconomic Impacts in Developing Countries: Challenges and Policy Responses organized by the IUSSP Scientific Panel on the Impact of Internal Migration and Urbanisation in Developing Countries and Fujian Normal University, Fuzhou, China, 10-12 December 2011b.

8. Hossain MZ. Rural-urban migration in Bangladesh: a micro level study. Paper presented at the Brazil IUSSP conference. August 20-24, 2001.

9. Deshingkar P, Grimm S. Internal Migration and Development: A Global Perspective. Oxford University Press 2005.

10. National Geographic. What is human migration? Human Migration Guide, 2005; pp 6-8.

11. Ajaero CK. Human Migration Studies: State-of-the-art. Unpublished Ph.D Seminar, Department of Geography, University of Nigeria, Nsukka,2011a.

12. Chattopadhyay A. Gender, migration, and career trajectories in Malaysia.Demography 1998; 35(3): 335-344. doi:10.2307/3004041.

13. Roberts K. Female labor migrants to Shanghai: Temporary 'floaters' or potential settlers?" International Migration Review 2002; 36(2): 492-519.

14. Federal Government of Nigeria. Federal Republic of Nigeria Official Gazzette Vol.94,No.4 Government Printer, Lagos, 2007.

15. National Population Commission. The 2003 Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey: Findings and Implications forAction South East Zone. Government Printer, Abuja, 2004

16. United Nations. Access to Basic Services for the Poor – The Importance of Good Governance. Asia-Pacific MDG Study Series. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Asian Development Bank (ADB). Bangkok, Thailand, 2007.

17. National Population Commission. 1991 Population Census of the Federal Republic of Nigeria: Analytical Report at the National Level. Government Printer , Abuja, 1998.

18. ADESIJI GB, OMONIWA V, ADEBAYO SA, MATANMI BM, AKANGBE JA. Factors Associated With The Youths' Rural-Urban Drift In Kwara State, Nigeria. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 2009; Vol 1,No 8, pp 69-77.

19. Aworemi JR, Abdul-Azeez IA. An Appraisal of the Factors Influencing Rural- Urban Migration in Some Selected Local Government Areas of Lagos State Nigeria. Journal of Sustainable Development, 2011 Vol. 4, No. 3.

20. Ajaero CK, Okafor OI. Selectivity and Determinants of Rural-Urban Migration into Lagos State, Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Geography and the Environment,2011; Vol 2, no 1, pp. 214-229.

21. Adepoju A. Issues and Recent Trends in International Migration in Sub-Saharan Africa. International Social Science Journal, 2000; 52.

22. Adepoju A. Changing Configuration of Migration in Africa. Migration Information, 2004 (Source;http://www.migrationinformation.com/Feature

23. Hernandez-Coss R. The Impact of Remittances: Observations in Remitting and Receiving Countries. Discussion Paper prepared for the G24 XXIII Technical Group Meeting September 13-14. Singapore, 2006

24. de Haas H. Engaging Diasporas: How Governments and Development Agencies can support Diaspora Involvement in the Development of Origin Countries. A Study for Oxfam Novib. Den Haag, 2006a

25. de Haas H.(2006b): International Migration and National Development: Viewpoints and policy initiatives in countries of Origin; The Case of Nigeria. Working Papers Migration and Development Series. Report No.6., 2006b

26. Nwajiuba C. International Migration and livelihoods in Southeastern Nigeria. Global Migration Perspectives. Geneva No. 50, 2005

27. Okali D, Okpara E, Olawoye J. Rural-urban interactions and livelihood strategies series: The case of Aba and its region, southeastern Nigeria. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) United Kingdom. Working Paper Series, No. 4, 2001.

28. Afsar R. Dynamics of Poverty, Development and Population Mobility: The Bangladesh Case. Ad Hoc Expert Group Meeting on Migration and Development, organized by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, 27-29 August, 2002.