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Abstract

The study focused on the analysis of the effect and prospect of rural-urban migration on the poverty status of migrants in Abia State, Nigeria. The study analyzed the socio-economic characteristics of migrants, assessed economic activities of migrants, determined poverty status of migrants and isolated determinants of rural-urban migration in Abia State, Nigeria. Data were collected using well structured questionnaire from 116 households through a multi-stage sampling technique. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics, Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) model and logit regression model. The average age of the migrants was 35.6 years. Analyses also showed that majority (74.10%) of these migrants were males. Majority (56.90%) of the migrants were single and 98.30% of them had formal education. The average household size of the migrants was 11 persons per household. Majority (90.50%) of the migrants were employed in their destination areas. The average income of the migrants from their main economic activities was N94,034.48 (Ninety Four Thousand and Thirty Four Naira Forty Eight Kobo).

Poverty is widespread in the area and across socioeconomic conditions of the migrants. From the binary logit regression result, education, marital status and per capita expenditure of migrants were all with households’ rural urban migration status. Apart from formal educational level which was negative others have direct effect on rural urban migration. It is recommended that addition of vocational courses with skill acquisition programmes in the curriculum of scholars as well as the migrants educational programmes is imperative as that will make them take advantage of large commercial network of the area to fight poverty and reduce migration. Again, good education is expected to develop marketable and functional skills in the people and thus prepare them for the world of work. Related to this is the need to construct and equip educational institutions in the rural areas. This can help in stemming the tide of rural out migration.
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INTRODUCTION

Since the last two decades, practical considerations have given rise to vast body of research and discussions on rural to urban migration as related to with the development process in less developed countries. In developing countries especially in the less urbanized African countries, rural to urban migration is expected to improve the socioeconomic wellbeing of the migrant population. But, it has always been a turn-around as the region that receives this population attains urban poverty status instead. It is unarguable that population mobility can worsen poverty or reduce poverty.

Migrants have tendencies to contribute to poverty reduction just as they are susceptible to poverty (Moser, 1996). The relative impact of migration on poverty varies by level of development of the area under consideration. In some part of the world and under certain conditions,
poverty may be the main cause of out migration whereas in the other part, under different conditions the poor will be among the last to move. Myburgh (2004) found a positive correlation between emigration from South Africa to the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand and the gap in mean annual wages between source and destination countries, from 1987-99. In Nigeria, Nwajiuba, (2005b) found that reasons for migration were mainly economic (80 percent of migrants) or for education (16 percent). Guilmoto (1998), in a study of the Senegal River valley, stressed on the influence of social mores in determining migration, especially as migrants are mainly dependent on the family or village for advance money and access to networks.

Migration, and in particular international migration, often is not within the ability of the poorest. This is mostly associated with overseas migration. For instance, a study of rural households in four villages in Burkina Faso found that intercontinental migrants tended to come from the highest-income group and to earn more in remittances than continental migrants, while households with intercontinental migrants have higher income and are better off in terms of land and livestock than households with continental migrants (Black et al., 2005). Wouterse and van den Berg (2004) found that migration to other African countries from Burkina Faso was undertaken by comparatively poor households in response to lack of work and insufficient income, while migration to Europe was by more wealthy households in response to opportunities for accumulation of wealth. Education levels also are frequently found to be tied to the ability to migrate. Wouterse and van den Berg (2004) also found that the greater number of persons in a household with secondary education, the greater probability that someone from the household would migrate to another African country (controlling for income levels), perhaps due to greater access to information. Survey data show that migrants from Ghana, particularly international migrants, are more likely to be highly-qualified than non-migrants (Lichfield and Waddington, 2003), and that the probability of migration rose with education (Tsegai and Plotnikova, 2004). In the contrary, Findley (1989) found that there is no evidence that migration rates from the Senegal River valley are higher for literate individuals or communities with good educational facilities, and speculates that literacy levels are generally too low to distinguish the effect.

Migration is also selective in terms of age, sex, level of education and marital status. Male categories migrate more than their female counterparts (Nwajiuba et al., 2009; Ejiogu, 2009). In Nigeria people especially youth migrate to other African countries and within Nigeria (Onyeneke, 2005). Some of them choose to migrate based on proper consideration of the costs and benefits of migrating, but most youths are induced by circumstances in the rural area as well as employment.

The impact of out-migration on the rural areas is mixed, as potentially productive labour is drawn away from the village which hinders households’ abilities to make the fullest use of the productive resources such land. It also leads to labour scarcity (Onyeneke, 2005). The rural area supplies the bulk of the food needed for growth and poverty reduction, yet the rural area is most vulnerable poverty with greater proportion of their population moving out on annual basis. This movement has led to shortage of farm labour, decrease in food production, reduced income, increased poverty and vicious cycle of poverty in rural Nigeria.

A lot of studies have looked at the effect of rural to urban migration on farmers' output in Nigeria (Anyanwu, 1996; Adebayo, 1997; Onyeneke, 2005; Iheke, 2008). Others have studied the socio-economic implications of migration (Nwajiuba et al, 2009; Ejiogu, 2009; Nwajiuba and Ejiogu, 2008; Nwajiuba, 2007; Nwajiuba, 2005a; Nwajiuba, 2005b; Okonofua et al., 2004; Osili, 2004; Okike et al., 2004). However, there exists no study in Nigeria in general and Abia State in particular that has focused on the effect and prospect of rural to urban migration on poverty status of the migrants in their destination points. This has left a void in research. Empirical evidence remains largely scanty, isolated and devoid of in-depth analysis of the determinants of migration in the context of their sign and size in migrants' destination areas. This has caused a wide gap in knowledge. The broad objective of the study is analysing the effect and prospect of rural to urban migration on poverty status of migrants in Abia State, Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study include describing the socio-economic characteristics of migrants in Abia State; assessing the various income generating activities of the migrants; describing the level of income and expenditure, hence estimating the poverty profile of these migrants; and isolating the determinants of rural to urban migration in Abia State.

**Research Methodology**

The study was conducted in Abia State, South-eastern Nigeria. Abia State was selected because of proximity, cost, familiarity and high incidence of rural to urban migration. The state lies Latitudes 4°50'N and 6°N and Longitudes 7°10'E and 8°E. It has a population of 2,833,999 Persons (NBS, 2007) with farming as source of livelihood. The state is bounded on the northeast by Ebonyi State, on the north by Enugu and Anambra States, on the west by Imo State, on the south by Rivers and Akwa Ibom States, and on the southeast by Cross River State. The State has three agricultural zones (Aba, Umunia, and Bende agricultural zones). These divisions are for administrative and extension services and not for any agro-ecological difference. It is also delineated into 17 local government areas. Abia State is located in the tropical rainforest region of Nigeria. This location puts her
at the advantage of adequate seasonal rainfall and arable farming.

Multi-stage sampling techniques was adopted for the selection of migrants for this study. First to be adopted is the purposive selection of one local government area (LGA) each in each of the three agricultural zones where migrants are attracted either due to their level of development or population density. The LGAs selected are Aba south in Aba zone, Umualia south in Umualia zone and Ohafia in Bende zone. The researchers further randomly selected fifty (50) household heads in each of the three LGAs making the total number of migrants for this study one hundred and fifty (150) households heads. The main tool for data collection was the questionnaire. The study found only 116 responses valid and were used for data analysis. The questionnaire sought for information on socio-economic characteristics of migrants, aggregate household expenditure, economic activities of migrants and reasons for migration.

Data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics, Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) model and logit regression model. The FGT model allows for the quantitative measurement of poverty status among the study sample. The FGT index for measuring poverty is obtained using this formula:

\[ FGT_\alpha = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{H} \left( \frac{z - y_i}{z} \right)^\alpha \]

\(N\) is the total number of people sampled, \(H\) is the number of poor (those with incomes at or below \(z\)), \(y_i\) are individual incomes and \(\alpha\) is a "sensitivity" parameter. If \(\alpha\) is low then the FGT metric weights all the individuals with incomes below \(z\) roughly the same. If \(\alpha\) is high, those with the lowest incomes (farthest below \(z\)) are given more weight in the measure. The higher the FGT statistic, the more poverty there is in sampled units.

The FGT measure corresponds to other measures of poverty for particular values of \(\alpha\). For \(\alpha = 0\), the formula reduces to

\[ FGT_0 = \frac{H}{N} \]

as the Headcount ratio, or the fraction of the population which lives below the poverty line.

When \(\alpha = 1\), the formula becomes the poverty depth or poverty gap given as follows

\[ FGT_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{H} \left( \frac{z - y_i}{z} \right) \]

This is the average poverty gap, or the amount of income necessary to bring everyone in poverty right up to the poverty line, divided by total population. This can be thought of as the amount that an average person in the sample would have to contribute in order for poverty to be just barely eliminated.

While the two above versions are widely reported, a good deal of technical literature on poverty uses the \(\alpha = 2\) version of the metric. When \(\alpha = 2\), the formula becomes the poverty severity given as

\[ FGT_2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{H} \left( \frac{z - y_i}{z} \right)^2 \]

The implicit model of the regression is \(Y = \log \left( \frac{p}{1-p} \right) = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7, e_i)\).

Where:

- The logit of a number \(p\) between 0 and 1 is given by the formula:
  \[ \text{logit}(p) = \log \left( \frac{p}{1-p} \right) = \log(p) - \log(1-p). \]

- \(p\) is the probability while \((1 - p)\) is the corresponding odds, and the logit of the probability is the logarithm of the odds

\[ Y = \text{Migration status of respondent (Dummy variable; Migrant = 1, non-migrant = 0)} \]

\[ X_1 = \text{Respondent’s age (years)} \]

\[ X_2 = \text{Respondent’s occupation (Dummy variable; non-farming = 1, farming = 0)} \]

\[ X_3 = \text{Respondent’s gender (Dummy variable; male=1, female =0)} \]

\[ X_4 = \text{Respondent’s household size (number of persons)} \]

\[ X_5 = \text{Respondent’s educational level (years spent in school)} \]

\[ X_6 = \text{Respondent’s work experience (years)} \]

\[ X_7 = \text{Respondent’s marital status (single = 1, married =0)} \]

\(e_i\) = Error term.

Results and Discussion

Socio-economic characteristics of migrants

Table 1 reveals that majority (74.1%) of the migrants were males. This implies that there are more male migrants’ household heads than their female counterparts in the area. The reason is attributed to the fact that men are free to move to places for better living condition than women. This finding is consistent with Ejiogu (2009) who estimated that males are mainly involved in migration than females. Entries in Table 1 also reveal that about
### Table 1. Socio-economic characteristics of migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size (Number of Persons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116.00</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level (Years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Formal Education (0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education (1-6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (7-12)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education (12-18)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation/Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (private business, schooling etc)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average age of migrants= 35.6 years; Mean household size= 11 persons. Source: Field Survey, 2011

53.4% (majority) of the migrants were between 30-4 years while 20.7% were below 30 years. This implies that more than 74.0% of the migrants were below 40 years and a mean age of the migrants was 35.6 years. This result indicates that majority of the migrants are young. The implication is that young migrants have the strength and capacities of accepting risks associated with such population movement. Again, it could mean that majority of the labour force which happened to fall within this age categories are looking for jobs in these urban areas.

Table 1 also reveals the mean household size of the migrants as approximately 11 persons with 48.3% and 42.2% of the migrants having household sizes of 4-8 persons and 9-12 persons respectively. This result reveals that the migrant household have mainly large household size whose is insufficient to meet the various
their various needs. It could also be that they are not gainfully employed or well paid; so as a result, they move more to new areas they assume they may be well paid but sometimes still remain poor. Entries in Table 1 further indicate that majority (56.9%) of the migrants were single while the remaining 43.1% were married. This implies that the single move more than those that are married. This could be attributed to the fact that those that are married might have found it difficult to move without their household members unlike those that are single who can easily move at any given time when the need arises, especially in search of better employment. Another important reason could be that married ones might have large household size and might have the liquidity to move his entire household the same time. The distribution of migrants according to employment status is also reported in Table 1. Majority (90.5%) of the migrants were employed in their destination areas. This implies that urban areas engage residents in good economic activities that can generate income and consequently eradicate poverty among them. Table 1 also reveals that 32.8% (majority) of the migrants had secondary education, 37.9% received tertiary education while 0.9% had primary education. This implies that the migrants are mainly literates. This becomes obvious that majority of the migrants moved to the urban areas in search of job and good living conditions because they perceived that they stand better chance of being employed than those with no formal education who may be mainly illiterates.

The distribution of migrants according to main income generating activity. The table reveals that 32.8% (majority) of the migrants were traders followed by farmers (28.4%). The migrants who are artisans are less than 2 percent while those of them with private businesses are about 14.7 percent. The large concentration of migrant traders in the area could be due to the presence of a large commercial center in Aba zone. Farming activities could be another income generating activity that accommodated another group of migrants in the area.

**Poverty profile of migrants**

Table 2 shows the poverty profile of the migrants across their socio-economic characteristics in the area. The poverty status of the migrants according to their age reveals that from the total proportion of 54.0% of the migrant under core or poverty severity, 66.7% of them are young migrants of less than 30 years, 28.9% of them fall within the age limit of between 31-40 years while only few proportions of less than 3% are above 40 years. This implies that majority of the young migrants in the area are vulnerable to severe poverty; hence, effort to reduce their poverty situation should be encouraged to reduce/curtail certain volatility especially in the security, as this problem is perpetuated by the youth of this age. However, few migrants are observed among the older migrants of age limit of above 61 years which are less poor, with more than 66.7% of them that are not poor.

About 19.0% of the migrant household have relatively small household size of less than 3 persons per household and less than 9.0% of them are core poor. However, migrant households with relatively large household size of between 4-8 persons with about 75.0% of the population have over 88.9% of them as core poor. This result shows that poverty is ravaging populated migrant households than migrants households with small population size.

The poverty status of the migrants according to their marital status reveals that about 57.0% of the population have 82.2% as married migrants and are core poor. Migrant households that are single with about 43.1% of the population have 59.6% and 57.9% respectively falling under the poverty headcount and poverty gap groups. This implies that the married migrants are poorer than the single ones, probably because the income earned by the married migrants may be relatively low.

The poverty status of the migrants according to their gender reveals that about 75.0% of the population have 84.4% as males and are core poor. Migrant households that are females with about 25.7% of the population have 32.7% and 31.6% respectively falling under the poverty headcount and poverty gap groups. This could be that the female headed migrant households may be getting support from other sources than their male counterparts in the area. It can further be deduced that the females are more employed and better paid than the males.

Poverty status of the migrant households and educational attainment contradicts the *a priori* expectation. The result reveals that 70.0% of the migrant household heads with secondary education and tertiary education have about 76.0% of them being core poor. About 15.0% of the population of migrants' households had 17.3%, 15.8% and 11.1% of them falling under poverty headcount category, poverty gap category and poverty severity category respectively. Increasing formal education attainment may not have a significant impact on poverty reduction among migrants in Abia State than engagement in private productive activities. Migrants are expected to cash on the commercial advantages created by the location of the state to offer better opportunities to migrants in terms of poverty reduction in the state. Emphasis on vocational training in the curriculum of the scholars will help reduce this problem as that will prepare young school leavers to engage in meaningful private practices that can enhance their income and reduce poverty.

The poverty status of migrants according to their occupation shows that the proportion of 18.0% of the migrants engaged in farming and had about 20.0% of them falling under poverty severity category. About 12.0% of the migrants are schooling with about 18.0% of this proportion falling under poverty severity while 13.0%
### Table 2. Distribution of the poverty status of migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Poverty Headcount (%)</th>
<th>Poverty gap (%)</th>
<th>Poverty severity (%)</th>
<th>Proportion of population (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 30</td>
<td>24 (46.2)</td>
<td>9 (47.4)</td>
<td>30 (66.7)</td>
<td>63 (54.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>13 (25.0)</td>
<td>6 (31.6)</td>
<td>13 (28.9)</td>
<td>32 (27.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>10 (19.2)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>1 (2.2)</td>
<td>12 (11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>3 (5.8)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 61</td>
<td>2 (3.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (2.2)</td>
<td>3 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size (persons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>12 (23.1)</td>
<td>6 (31.6)</td>
<td>4 (8.9)</td>
<td>22 (19.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>37 (71.2)</td>
<td>10 (52.6)</td>
<td>40 (88.9)</td>
<td>87 (75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>3 (5.78)</td>
<td>3 (15.8)</td>
<td>1 (2.2)</td>
<td>7 (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>31 (59.6)</td>
<td>11 (57.9)</td>
<td>8 (17.8)</td>
<td>50 (43.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>21 (40.4)</td>
<td>8 (42.1)</td>
<td>37 (82.2)</td>
<td>66 (56.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17 (32.7)</td>
<td>6 (31.6)</td>
<td>7 (15.6)</td>
<td>30 (25.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35 (67.3)</td>
<td>13 (68.4)</td>
<td>38 (84.4)</td>
<td>86 (74.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult education</td>
<td>1 (1.92)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>9 (17.3)</td>
<td>3 (15.8)</td>
<td>5 (11.1)</td>
<td>17 (14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>9 (17.3)</td>
<td>1 (5.23)</td>
<td>6 (13.3)</td>
<td>16 (13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>19 (36.5)</td>
<td>8 (42.1)</td>
<td>22 (48.9)</td>
<td>49 (42.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td>14 (26.9)</td>
<td>7 (36.8)</td>
<td>12 (26.7)</td>
<td>33 (28.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>7 (13.5)</td>
<td>3 (15.8)</td>
<td>6 (13.3)</td>
<td>16 (13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil service</td>
<td>6 (11.5)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>7 (15.6)</td>
<td>15 (12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>8 (15.4)</td>
<td>4 (21.1)</td>
<td>9 (20.0)</td>
<td>21 (18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9 (17.3)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>7 (15.6)</td>
<td>18 (15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling</td>
<td>5 (9.6)</td>
<td>1 (5.23)</td>
<td>8 (17.8)</td>
<td>14 (12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading</td>
<td>17 (32.7)</td>
<td>7 (36.8)</td>
<td>8 (17.7)</td>
<td>32 (27.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>17 (32.7)</td>
<td>6 (31.6)</td>
<td>19 (42.2)</td>
<td>42 (36.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>23 (44.2)</td>
<td>6 (31.6)</td>
<td>18 (40.0)</td>
<td>47 (40.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4 (7.7)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>6 (13.3)</td>
<td>12 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td>1 (5.23)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥26</td>
<td>6 (11.5)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>2 (4.4)</td>
<td>10 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2011
Table 3. Binary logit regression estimates of the determinants of rural-urban migration in Abia State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Z-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age ($X_1$)</td>
<td>-0.922</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard error)</td>
<td>(0.641)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation ($X_2$)</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard error)</td>
<td>(0.753)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ($X_3$)</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard error)</td>
<td>(0.753)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size ($X_4$)</td>
<td>-0.664</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard error)</td>
<td>(0.677)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level ($X_5$)</td>
<td>-0.354</td>
<td>-1.72*</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard error)</td>
<td>(0.206)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience ($X_6$)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard error)</td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status ($X_7$)</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>2.41**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard error)</td>
<td>(1.027)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditure ($X_8$)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.14***</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard error)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.984</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard error)</td>
<td>(3.165)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square (q) = 55.515; Log likelihood ratio = 42.54; Pseudo $R^2 = 0.594; n = 116$

Determinants of rural-urban migration

The result of the binary logit regression in table 3 shows the determinants of rural-urban migration. The result indicates that socioeconomic characteristics of migrants determine the likelihood to migrate. Functional parameters show that the Chi-square value of 55.25 and absolute value of the log likelihood ratio of 42.54 are significant at 1% probability level indicating that the model has high explanatory power and has a good fit. The significance of this likelihood ratio statistics and Chi square statistics shows that migrant households' socioeconomic characteristics significantly affected migration. Hence the null hypothesis that migrants households' socioeconomic characteristics significantly affected migration is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted.

Rural-urban migration in Abia State, Nigeria is catalyzed by socioeconomic factors. Such factors as gender, work experience and occupation though not significant; and marital status and per capita expenditure all have direct relationship with the migration. However this is not the case with such factors as age household size and educational level. This has led to some generalizations being reconstructed while others are shown to be consistent with dominant theories. Variables such as educational level, marital status and per capita expenditure are significant at 10%, 5%, and 1% levels of significance respectively. This result further reveals that educational level though significant had a negative relationship with migration status. This implies that increase in formal educational level therefore inhibits the likelihood to migrate in the area. The finding that migrants consist of educated people is not consistent with that of the study that educational level of migrants is inversely...

Marital status and per capita expenditure were both significant and had direct effect on the likelihood to migrate. The migrants are likely ready to move to urban areas when there is an increased marriage responsibilities. The quest for increased income to take care of large family size resulting from their marriage may be responsible for this development. However, migrants in the area are less poverty-vulnerable group and poverty – migration nexus in the area is a complex one and has shifting frontiers. Relevant periodic studies should be carried out to give direction to policy. Similarly, increase in per capita migrant household expenditure increases the likelihood of rural-urban migration. This is because as per capita expenditure increases migrants households are left with no option that to seek for additional or source for income generating activities in urban areas to sustain household’s needs. Thus expands the likelihood to migrate to urban areas.

Though not significant, age had a negative relationship with the migration while gender had positive relationship with migration. The a priori expectation that migration is age and gender selective is upheld.

### Conclusion and Recommendation

Migrants households show less vulnerable to the risk of poverty and as they can withstand the shock of poverty because the take advantage improved source of income to generate additional income that can sustain their large households size. Increase marital status and formal education attainment can force severe poverty and rural to urban migration among the households in the area. It seems rural-urban migration has positive effect on the migrants but it could also have some consequences on both migrants and non-migrants in the area.

Based on the findings of this study, some important recommendations have been made.

i. Suggestions on addition vocational courses with skill acquisition programmes in the curriculum of scholars as well as the migrants educational programmes is imperative as that will make them take advantage of large commercial network of the area to fight poverty and reduce migration. This is a way the government can provide a working policy that will encourage the youths in the area towards self development.

ii. The need for qualitative functional education cannot be overemphasized. Good education is expected to develop marketable and functional skills in the people and thus prepare them for the world of work. Related to this is the need to construct and equip educational institutions in the rural areas. This can help in stemming the tide of rural out migration.

iii. Conference, seminars and workshops should be organized to enlighten the youths on the need to acquire some basic skills like craftworks, soap manufacturing, artisanal jobs and much more instead of depending on white collar jobs which relatively scarce.

iv. Again, localization of industries and increasing entrepreneurial capacity of migrant household heads are likely going to reduce migration among these categories of people.

v. Farmers should on their own form cooperative societies so as to achieve common felt needs through pooling their resources together so as to withstand poverty.

vi. Agricultural support services of the three tiers of government should be stepped up to enable all those who are engaged in agriculture to profit by it.
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