



ijcrr

Vol 03 issue 11
Category: Research
Received on: 02/04/11
Revised on: 25/04/11
Accepted on: 13/05/11

EFFECT OF RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION ON HOUSEHOLD CROP PRODUCTION IN SOME SELECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS OF KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA

Zagi Idris¹, Makarau Shehu Bako¹, Damina Ayuba¹

¹School of Agricultural Technology, Samaru Kataf Campus
Nuhu Bamalli Polytechnic Zaria, box 56, Zonkwa, Kaduna State, Nigeria.

E-mail of Corresponding Author: daminaayuba@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the differences in crop production outputs between household with migrants and households without migrants. Differences in reasons for migration and by age range were also analyzed. A structured questionnaire was used to source information from 250 heads of households. Results revealed significant difference at $P < 0.01$ in all the four crops; maize, sorghum, cowpea and groundnuts. While reasons for migration by age range revealed no significant differences among migrants at $P < 0.05$. It was recommended that government should empower rural areas economically so as to minimize out migration and enhance agricultural production in the communities.

Key Words: Migration, migrant, output and crop.

INTRODUCTION

Migration has long been part of the livelihood portfolio of poor people across Nigeria. The influx to towns or urban centers of large number of people from other areas including those of the rural areas has produced a lot of problems in Nigeria. Despite the enviable human and material resources endowed by nature in Nigeria, the country and its citizens are still classified the very poor with no fewer than 54 percent of the population living below poverty level. This has resulted in people both old and young ones migrating into the cities to overcome poverty, not minding its implications on them, their families and the society at large¹. Although data on rural-urban migration in Nigeria are lacking, a growing number of micro-studies

have established that seasonal migration for employment is growing both in terms of absolute numbers but also in relation to the size of the working population as a whole².

Migration is the movement of people from one geographical region to another which may be either on temporary or permanent basis³. Migration occurs as a response to economic development as well as social, cultural, environmental and political factors and effects on areas of origin as well as destination⁴. The movement of people away from a place is mostly as result of the need to escape tribal or religious crisis, violence, political instability, draught, floods, congestion in various dimensions and many more. Migration can be rural-rural, rural-urban, urban-urban and urban-rural. Young people moved from rural to urban, while the older and uneducated people moved from rural to rural and stressed that the movement from rural to

urban areas creates a negative impact on the quality of rural life, especially when such migrants are the productive labour force and as well carry away their needed consumption into the city⁵.

A number of empirical studies have been carried out which focused on the impact of migration on productive investment, and the potential trade-offs between the income effect of remittances and the productivity loss due to changes in labor supply. No clear pattern has emerged yet in terms of the circumstances under which migration leads to increased productive investment. As early as 1980 migrants' remittances may have a negative effect on farm productivity, as a result of a number of factors including the loss of the youngest and most productive household members and a possible substitution of labor for leisure by the less efficient household members left behind. Some recent empirical evidence seems to support that hypothesis⁶. A number of other studies reported that remittances accumulated abroad partially compensate for lost labour and allow households to improve their agricultural productivity⁷. However, the net impact is negative as the effect of migration on labor supply more than offset the remittance effect. Rural to urban migration makes a positive impact on urban growth and social development, which makes generation of employment opportunities, provision of educational facilities and transportation infrastructure for the migrants⁸.

Studies on rural-urban migration have been quite resourceful but in exhaustive as most of them were concerned with remittance to migrants' households, with less paid attention on reasons for migration within specific age range and the likely effects of out migration on farm outputs within and between families. The study

therefore, is an attempt to verify the likely effects of massive out migration on crop production outputs between households with migrants and households without migrants and the reasons for migration by age range in the selected local government areas. The effect of migration at the community level will depend, among other things, on the characteristics of the local labor market and the demographic make-up of the migration flow. In light of the likely trade-offs resulting from migration, it remains unclear whether massive migration out of rural areas has promoted or hindered agricultural production in the study communities. Therefore, the impact of massive out migration on agricultural production and their reasons for migration in the selected communities are not known, as such, this study raised these questions; do crop outputs differ between households with migrants and those without? and are there differences in reasons for migration by age range?. The selected communities are particularly good to study the impact of migration on agricultural production because of decline in agricultural production among them that were previously known for intensive crop production and likely differences in age range by reasons for migration.

The study wishes to answer these questions through the following specific objectives:

- a. To determine differences in crop output production between migrants' households and non migrants households in the selected communities.
- b. To determine differences by reasons for migration and age range in the study communities.

Hypothesis

Ho:- There is no significant difference in reasons for migration by age range among migrant households.

Ho:- There is no difference in crop production outputs between households with migrants and households without migrants.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

A descriptive survey was adopted to elicit information, as this method was necessary as it made easier the retrieval of information through questionnaire from the study population. The study was conducted in four local Government Areas (LGAs) of Kaduna State namely: (Kachia, Kagarko, Jaba and Zango) but, in some selected communities, known with pronounced cases of out migration.

Population and Sample fraction

The study targets at migrants and non migrants households from some selected communities in four local government areas; Zangon Kataf, Kagarko, Kachia and Jaba . It was a purposeful survey being that the selected communities in the local government areas have known cases of massive out migration. The communities had a projected population of 5100 as at December, 2009 from which a total of 250 households were taken as a study sample, constituting 5 percent and equal samples were taken from both families. Except that, samples vary with community population.

Sampling

It was a purposeful study as mentioned earlier, two villages with known cases of rural-urban migration were picked in each local government area thus; Zango Kataf; (Madakiya and Ashafan Sarki), Kachia; (Kurmin Musa and Awong), Kagarko; (Shadalafiya and Kasabare) while in Jaba local government area we had Fai and Nock .

Data collection and Analysis

A structured questionnaire was used as a tool to illicit information. It had two subsections; 'A and B' . Subsection 'A' sourced information on respondents' background characteristics such as age, sex, marital status, ethnic group, annual income and religion while section 'B' sourced information on the number of migrants in a family, sex of migrant, remittance in cash form migrants, crop output at harvest on maize, sorghum, millet, groundnuts and cowpea, and reasons for migration. Household heads were used as respondents in all selected communities.

ANOVA and Students' 't' test were deployed in data analysis to test differences in crop outputs and reasons for migration by age range.

RESULTS

Differences in Age Range by Reasons of Migration

According to results in table 1, all age cohorts revealed no significant difference by reasons of migration at $P < 0.05$, since 'F' calculated (1.1) was less than p. value (6.6). Therefore, Ho is retained, which suggests that migrants in selected communities had similar reasons for migration irrespective of age

Differences between Households with Migrants and Households without Migrants by Crop Production Outputs.

Results in table 2 revealed high significant differences ($P < 0.01$) in the production output of sampled crops (Maize, Millet, sorghum, Cowpea and groundnut) between households with migrants and households without migrants in all sampled villages. The output is high in the household when migrants were at home and low in households when the migrants were away

in all the sampled crops from the selected LGAs.

DISCUSSION

Results in table 1 revealed high significant differences between households with migrants and households without migrants at $P < 0.01$. This suggests that crop output was influenced in the study areas by out migration, as outputs were significantly higher in households whose farm labour could not migrate and consequently lower in households whose farm labour migrated to other areas. This could also be interpreted to mean that low output was a consequent of out migration in households with migrants while high crop output was a consequent of non migration of farm labour. The implication of the result therefore, the number of able hands on the farm had decreased hence, the decreased in output. The findings are in agreement with earlier findings who observed that the loss of family labour to migration has negative effects on agricultural production resulting in decreased output of affected families¹. This also confirmed recent findings that over the past several years, rural areas in transition countries have experienced a structural transformation of their agricultural sectors combined with profound demographic changes, primarily due to massive out-migration towards urban areas and abroad².

In table 1, results revealed no significant difference in age range by reasons of migration among migrants' families in the selected communities in the four Local Government areas. This implies, migrants in the selected communities had similar reasons for migration irrespective of age, this is obvious because most had multiple reasons. It could be that they share similar circumstances that push them to migrate as a strategy to livelihood. Studies have

confirmed that migration cut across ages, beliefs systems and ethnic nationalities⁹, which suggests reasons that pushed them to migrate are similar.

Generally, results on outputs in all the four sampled crops (maize, sorghum, millet, groundnut and cowpea) depicted the negative impact of massive out migration on agricultural production in the study areas, which implies, food security among households with migrants is threatened. It is a likely indication of such happenings in the state. Results were also clear that migrants had similar circumstances that pushed them away from their communities to the cities, which suggests, government needs to identify these circumstances with the view to finding lasting solutions to enhance agricultural production in rural areas.

CONCLUSION

Results revealed no significant difference for reasons of migration in the selected communities irrespective of age range, which suggests that migrants were pushed to migrate in these communities by similar circumstances.

In addition, results also revealed that, there was significant difference in crop production outputs between households with migrants and households without migrants in all the four sampled crops (maize, sorghum, millet, groundnut and cowpea).

Recommendation

Based on findings, the study recommends as follows;

- That migration in the selected communities was caused by the desire to learn, a trade, trading, farming, white collar jobs, disaster and other reasons. Government to provide most of these facilities in these communities to minimize migration in rural areas

- Crop outputs differs between migrants and non migrant households; government to empower the rural populace economically to check migration to cities so as to facilitate agricultural production.

REFERENCES

1. Okunmadewa, F. (2001). Socio-economic characteristics of Rural-Urban Migrants and Determinants of Migration in Imo State, Nigeria. Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference of the Agricultural Society of Nigeria; 2009 20-23rd Oct; National University Commission and Raw Materials Research and Development Council, FCT, Abuja: Nigeria.
2. McCarthy N, Gero C, Benjamin D, Irini M. Assessing the impact of massive out-migration on agriculture. ESA Working Paper 2006 ; (6-14):125-126
3. Adewale JG. Socio-economic factors Associated with Urban-Rural Migration in Nigeria: A Case study of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology* 2005; **17(1):13-16**.
4. Sheldon R. Migration and Poverty', *Asia-Pacific Population Journal* 2002:67-82.
5. Echebiri RN, Ndukwu PC. Pattern and Causality of Rural-Urban Migration in Imo State, Nigeria: Implication for Rural Development. *Journal of Rural Sociolog* 2007; 7(1):16-24
6. Azam JP, F Gubert. Those in the Kayes; the Impact of Remittances on the Recipients in Africa. Mimeo, University of Toulous 2002.
7. Mendola M. Migration and technological change in rural households: complements or substitutes?, Development Studies Working Paper . Centro Studi Luca D'Agliano, Milan 2004.
8. Ijere NJ. Socio-economic characteristics of Rural- Urban Migrants and Determinants of Migration in Imo State, Nigeria. Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference of the Agricultural Society of Nigeria; 2009 20-23rd Oct; National University Commission and Raw Materials Research and Development Council, FCT, Abuja: Nigeria.
9. McKenzie DH. Rapoport. Network effects and the dynamics of migration and inequality: theory and evidence from Mexico. *Journal of Development Economics* 2007; (195): 221-224

Table 1. Test of Difference in age Range by Reasons of Migration

Reasons	Age Range in years				Summary of ANOVA				
	15-25	26-36	37-47	48+					
					Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	Confidence level
Trading	7	19	21	14	Between Groups	652	4	163	0.05
Farming	5	30	13	11	Within Group	584	4	146	
As a result of disaster	5	6	5	2	Total	798			
To learn a trade	11	13	5	4					
Other	10	9	12	3					
Total	38	77	56	34					
									F
									1.1

Not significant at $P < 0.05$

Table 2: Quantity of Maize, Millet, Sorghum, Cowpea and Groundnut Produce by Households with and without Migrants (Kg / ha)

LGAs	Average output of households with migrants	Average output of households without migrants	T-Value
Maize			
Kachia	27750.0	1910.7	6.15 **
Kagarko	42758.6	2541.4	11.68 **
Jaba	27333.3	2200.0	9.80 **
Zango-Kataf	37576.9	3603.8	8.25**
Millet			
Kachia	4060.7	1975.0	3.34**
Kagarko	3851.7	1496.6	5.86**
Jaba	3500.0	1451.3	5.74**
Zango-Kataf	4126.9	1745.8	3.81**
Sorghum			
Kachia	4303.6	1889.3	4.23**
Kagarko	3576.0	1712.0	3.26**
Jaba	3660.0	1820.0	3.77**
Zango-Kataf	3679.0	2033.3	3.07**
Cowpea			
Kachia	3779.0	1515.8	3.63**
Kagarko	3955.6	1300.0	2.91**
Jaba	2486.7	1256.7	2.66**
Zango-Kataf	3428.6	1035.7	5.03**
Groundnut			
Kachia	3528.6	482.1	3.70**
Kagarko	2353.8	1230.8	2.75**
Jaba	4275.9	1648.0	4.78**
Zango-Kataf	3783.3	1737.7	4.12**

** Significant at ($P < 0.01$)