

**RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION AND ATTITUDE TO COMMUNITY-
BASED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES:
A STUDY OF MIGRANTS IN ENUGU METROPOLIS**

Nnorom Kingsley PhD

Department of Sociology
Federal University, Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria

Daniel Rosemary Onchi PhD

Department of Sociology
Federal University, Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria

Abstract

Migration over the years has been discovered to have both positive and negative effects on the migrants as well as the socioeconomic environments of the migrants such as the place of origin of the migrant and the migrant's destination. The present study focused on the rural-urban migrants in Enugu metropolis with major thrust on the distilled push and pull factors, attitude to community developmental activities and commitment to development-based associations in the community of origin and that of the host communities. 600 migrants from 30 streets/residential outlets in Enugu metropolis were selected for the study using random sampling techniques. The study adopted survey design and applied inclusive criteria such as duration in the city and residential categories. In view of the major thrusts of the study, annual income among the migrants before and after migration played a role as push and pull factors. This was ascertained using linear regression ($p=.000$), the study found a significant relationship between duration in the city among the migrants and remittances towards community development activities ($\chi^2 = 112.265, p .001$). This was further probed with Pearson moment correlation analysis, which showed negative relationship. equally, the study found a significant relationship between duration in the city among the migrants and membership to community development association in the community of origin ($\chi^2 = 58.746 p .001$) and this was in the positive direction according to the Pearson moment correlation analysis. The study recommends migrants inclusive development policies to harness the potentials of the migrants in developing their place of destination especially as it concerns Enugu metropolis.

Introduction

Migration has been a key human response to environmental, social, political, and economic changes. This, while creating vacuum and economic hope in the area of origin, creates some level of concern in the place of destination. The vast majority of the world's migration originates from the rural areas, where most of the world's poverty is also concentrated (Adewale, 2005). Rural-urban migration is the phenomenon of a historically unprecedented movement of people from the rural countryside to the burgeoning cities of Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America. In the post industrialization era, migration has existed internally and externally to enable excess labor to be taken slowly from the rural areas to provide workforce for industries in the urban areas and therefore aided industrial growth. However, experience in developing and underdeveloped countries has shown that the rate of rural-urban migration has ceaselessly outweighed the rate of job creation and having an overweight on the social and infrastructural amenities available in the urban areas (Adebowale, Atte & Ayeni, 2012; Ango, Ibrahim, Yakubu & Usman, 2014).

According to the United Nations (2016), migration is the movement from one place in the world to another for the purpose of taking up permanent or semi-permanent residence, usually across a political boundary. The region where people are leaving is referred to as the source region whereas the region to which people are entering is known as destination region (Lindsey & Beach, 2003). Migration occurs at a variety of scales, which includes intercontinental; intra-continental; interregional; and rural to urban migration. Individuals migrate from one location to another due to certain reasons such as natural disasters; physical conditions; worry of insecurity; differences in economic opportunities; differences in social amenities and change in social status such as high level of education and wealth (UN, 2013).

People migrate based on the prevailing conditions and the reasons for it vary from one person to another depending on the situation that brought about the decision. Migration is a selective process affecting individuals or families with certain economic, social, educational and demographic characteristics (Laah, Abba, Ishaya & Gana, 2013). Also, adverse physical conditions such as flood, landslide, erosion and earthquake, drought, famine or threat to economic livelihood such as crop extinction due to insects and pests (Moriconi-Ebrard, Harre & Heinrigs, 2016).

According to the United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs (2014), apart from socio-political conflicts and economic prospect, adolescents and youth also migrate abroad in response to globalization and the possibilities of education. After foreign education, students reportedly often seek for employment in the host country thereby establishing residence and migrant

status. Also, movements for adoptions, refugees and asylum are responsible for youth migration. However, not having a suitable job is the major drive for migration as youths move in search of greener pasture. Employment remains the main concern of youth mostly in the regions of Africa, Latin America and Asia. The exceptionally high unemployment rates in Africa can be interpreted as one of the main factors behind the high rate of rural-urban migration in the region.

Over the time, observations have shown that migration can have both positive and negative effects on economic development as well as on the level, depth and severity of poverty at the household level. At the national, regional or local level, remittances can spur development either in total or at the margin (Ajearo, Madu & Mozie, 2013). That is to say, brain gains in destination countries can spur economic dynamism (e.g. the role played by immigrants in the U.S. technology sector and return immigrants in India and China). While remittances to alleviate poverty are lauded, they contribute little to improve rural development in youth migrant's countries of origin.

Conversely, migration can exert a negative effect on the rural areas, as potentially productive labour is drawn away from the village, which hinders households' abilities to make the fullest use of the productive resources such as land, and thus leads to labour scarcity, and vicious cycle of poverty in rural areas (Ehirim et al. 2012). Also, on the receiving state, excessive migration from rural to urban areas leads to high rate of city congestion, crime, burden on existing infrastructure such as the sewage system, clean drinking water, electricity and other amenities, chronic unemployment and creation of large slums and Shanty towns, prostitution, outbreak of diseases etc.

The connectivity between migration and rural development has been an interesting scholarly issue in the present 21st century. As such, the process of people migrating from one end to the other put into perspective, the developmental implication both to the origin of migration and the receiving end of migration. The increasing voluntary movement in quest for better quality of life by low-skill and low-wage workers as well as high-skill and high-wage workers from less developed rural areas to more developed urban areas, especially among the poor in the developing countries has been object of interest to the researching community (Ajaero & Onokala, 2013).

According to the UN report (2013), despite the lack of reliable data on internal migrants, it is assumed that 40% of the migrants originated from the rural areas and many of them are youth with high propensity to migrate. Aromolaran (2013) reported that in most rural areas in Nigeria, the potential labour force that could have contributed to the improvement of the rural economy has moved into the cities in search of better standards of living and benefits they presumed could exist in urban centres. In an attempt to obtain such benefits by the youth of the

rural populace in the urban areas, many decided to migrate to the cities in quest of better livelihood. (Herreri & Sahn, 2013).

Uncontrolled migration of people from rural to urban areas calls for a serious concern. This is because steady influx of people into the cities encourages unemployment, urban slums, and pressure on available food, housing, transportation, educational institutions, and strains in social amenities such as hospitals, water, electricity and general degrading of living standard leading to increase in abject poverty. Conversely, it amounts to desertion of the rural areas by the youths who are the major force of production.

A number of studies have focused on the causes of migration and its economic implication especially in Nigeria. Such studies included the ones by Aromolaran (2013), which investigated the causes and consequences of rural-urban migration in southwestern Nigeria, also Ango, Ibrahim, Yakubu and Usman (2015) investigated the factors influencing youth rural-urban migration in some selected areas of North Western Nigeria. Similar studies have been carried out in north central Nigeria and North Eastern Nigeria (Aworemi & Abdu-Azeez, 2011).

While a number of researchers have focused on the causes of migration as well as the international migration, especially in different parts of Nigeria, others have focused on the deep economic implication of migration on the rural as well as in the urban setting. In southeast Nigeria, a number of studies have touched on the economic indices of migration. These included the studies by Ajaero and Onokala (2013) on the effects of rural-urban migration on rural communities of South Eastern Nigeria. Udentia, Nwosuji and Chukwuemeka (2015) carried out another study in the southeast Nigeria on migration and national development, with a comparative analysis of the attitude of the first-generation south-east Nigeria migrants and the new generation. The study focused on the impacts of rural-urban migration on the development of the origin of the migrants. Other studies in the southeast Nigeria have focused on the impacts of rural-urban migration on the household income, the overall wellbeing of the communities of origin, as well as the negative impacts of rural urban migration on the community of origin as well as the destinations of the migrants (Ajaero & Madu, 2014; Abanihe & International Organization for Migration Nigeria, 2014; Ajaero & Okafor, 2011; Ehirim, Onyeneke, Chidiebere-Mark & Nnabuihe, 2012). However, the study linking the attitude of the migrants to basic community development especially in the southeast Nigeria is lacking in the literature and has as such, informed the current study. This is in line with the fact that southeast Nigeria is one of the regions with heavy migration activities in Nigeria. For instance, the compilation by Abanihe and International Organization for Migration Nigeria (2014) shows that out of the 7 states among the 36 states of

the federation with heavy migrants' activities, 3 states are located in the southeast Nigeria. The states with relatively high proportion of migrants are Abia(48.7%), Ekiti (48.1%), Delta (45.3%), Imo (45.1%), Anambra (44.4%), Bayelsa(43.2%) and Lagos (40.1%). This points to the strategic position of the southeast Nigeria in the understanding of migration and community development especially with the involvement of the youth. In view of the imperative of youth migration especially internal migration to rural development indices, there is a need for further investigation into the correlation of the phenomenon and rural development in the developing nations such as in the southeast Nigeria. As such, the present paper is interested in investigating the phenomenon of internal youth migration in the southeast Nigeria using Enugu metropolis as an anchor. In the cause of the study, the following research questions were answered

1. What are the socio-economic conditions that are pulling people to Enugu metropolis?
2. What are the effects of migration on the socio-economic development of the community of origin of the migrants?
3. What is the relationship between migration and membership to community-based development organizations?
4. What is the relationship between migration and urban based development organizations?

Rural-urban Migration and its implication to the Place of Origin and place of destination

Migration being considered as the selective process affecting individuals or families with certain economic, social and demographic characteristics has led to serious problems to both the urban and the rural areas (Olayiwola, 2002). Ehirim et al. (2012) argued that the effects of rural-urban 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 as land, and thus leads to labour scarcity, and vicious cycle of poverty in rural areas.

Oke (2012) asserted that the rural areas in Nigeria are being affected by several incapacities in various levels of severity such as: inaccessibility, seclusion, underdevelopment, poverty, drabness, boredom, ignorance, depopulation, hunger, and all types of sicknesses. It is the general consensus amongst writers such as Ehirim et al. (2012), Adewale (2005) and Badru (2004) that migration from rural to urban areas leads to a reduction in the number of rural population. This has a negative effect on rural agricultural output and thus hinders the pace of development in the rural areas. Migration of youths takes away the glamorous social life in the rural areas, leaving the area in a gloomy

state. The youths migrate from the villages taking along their energy and vigour, and leaving behind the feeble old men, women and children to labour on the farm since farming is their major occupation. This has led to a reduction in agricultural produce with its consequential effect on the gross domestic product of the nation, lowered funds for development, income and standard of living of rural inhabitants, underdevelopment, and total desertion of the rural areas.

Iwayemi (2006) also argued that the impoverishment of rural areas in Nigeria is partly explainable by out-migration of able youths in search of employment in cities. Consequently, agriculture, which prior to discovery of oil was the mainstay of Nigeria's economy was far relegated to the background leading to the country's mono-economy status. Overdependence on oil, it is argued, has led to employment crisis and avoidable importation of agricultural products, which together have over the years had negative net effect on local industries and productions as well as international trade balances.

Migration is a decision that impacts the welfare of the household, the home community, and in the end the whole economy in various ways. The welfare implications of migration on the country of origin are most often, though not always, sizable and positive. The main channels through which migration alleviates poverty are increased incomes from remittances, ability to smooth consumption, access to finance for starting a new business, as well as tapping from the knowledge and resources provided by the international community. Besides pure monetary gains, migration and remittances allow for higher investment in health care and education (Bakewell & Jonsson, 2011).

While migration has economic, social, and cultural implications for the sending and host areas, remittances the migrants send home are perhaps the most tangible and least controversial link between migration and development (Rahman, 2013).

Though the channels transmitting welfare impacts of migration on the destination countries are well known in the literature, there is very limited amount of empirical evidence quantifying the impacts (Turok & McGranahan, 2013). The welfare gain for the destination country is due to the fact that immigration increases the supply of labour, which increases employment, production and thus GDP (Ortega, 2005). Immigration has also been found to increase the productivity of the receiving economies through the contribution of migrants to innovation. Another way in which immigration increases productivity is that immigrants free up the local workforce to move to higher productivity occupations (World Bank, 2017).

According to Aromolaran (2013), the drift of the rural populace to the urban areas has led to social, economic, environmental, and other severe problems such as congestion in the urban centres, which has increased the spread

of communicable diseases in the centres, insufficient physical, and social infrastructural amenities such as, electricity, health, educational, recreational facilities, motorable roads, pipe borne water, housing among others. These have caused overstretched use of physical and social infrastructural facilities. There are equally other problems emanating from rural urban migration such as traffic congestion, unemployment, high crime rate, alcoholism, drug abuse, prostitution, hooliganism, health hazard from air, water, and noise pollutions.

Consequently, Bloch, Fox, Monroy and Ojo(2015) examined the implication of overpopulation connected to rural-urban migration on development in Nigeria. They observed that due to poverty and underdevelopment in rural areas, very many persons have migrated to urban centres in search of greener pasture thereby putting pressure on existing environmental resources. The present excessively uneven population distribution between cities and towns with only a negligible proportion of people living in villages is an index of economic backwardness of Nigeria as a poor nation.

According to a literature overview of developmental implication of migration by Dilip, Lall, Harris and Zmarak(2006), international migration is an ever-growing phenomenon that has important development implications for both sending and receiving countries. For a sending country according to them, migration and the resulting remittances lead to increased incomes and poverty reduction, improved health and educational outcomes, and promote economic development. Yet these gains might come at substantial social costs to the migrants and their families. Since many developing countries are also large recipients of international migrants, they face challenges of integration of immigrants, job competition between migrant and native workers, and fiscal costs associated with provision of social services to the migrants. The report also summarizes incipient discussions on the impacts of migration on climate change, democratic values, demographics, national identity and security.

More pertinent to -the history of development in Nigeria as one of the developing nations of the world, is the implication of rural-urban migration to the community development in both the origin of the migrants as well as their destinations. While the migrants carry to their destination, skills and potential human resources, back home, they create a vacuum in human resources needs but fill the need-gap of financial support needed in the families (Ehirim et al, 2012; Adesiji, Omoniwa, Adebayo, Matanmi & Akangbe, 2009). A number of researchers have revealed the huge implications of rural-urban migration, which included financial remittance (Jennissen, 2007; Ehirim et al, 2012; Abanihe& International Organization for Migration Nigeria, 2014), new knowledge and skill back home (Abanihe & International Organization for Migration Nigeria, 2014), health related exchanges (Abanihe& International Organization for Migration

Nigeria, 2014; Aworemi & Abdul-Azeez, 2011), congestion of the migrant destinations as well as breeding of crimes and other related crises (Ajaero & Okafor, 2011) environmental degradations, distortion of agricultural activities in the rural areas due to the drift of the youth population towards the urban areas (Taylor & Mora, 2006; Nzeadibe & Ajaero, 2010), community development (Sorensen, 2006; Olowe & Awoyemi, 2012; Adesiji, Omoniwa, Adebayo, Matanmi & Akangbe, 2009), etc. While the aforementioned factors appeared to be macro indices of community development, the micro indices of community development such as the major intention of remittances by the migrants and their commitment to the overt phenomenon of community development in their community of origin as well as the community of destination is yet to be unravelled. In the case of southeast Nigeria where Enugu is situated, community development has been a long history among the population however, wherever this is obtainable in reality, it always hovers around the rural inhabitants with insignificant attention from the migrants. While this is obtainable mostly in the communities of origin of the migrants where distance sometimes become an excuse, in the community of destination of the migrants, the understanding of the place as a temporary destination due to ethnic cleavages equally affects the chances of involvement in the development activities in these communities by the migrants. This as a gap in literature has policy implication as it relates to the communities of origin as well as destination of the migrants. As such, the present study looked into the micro indices to community development with the involvement of the migrants in their communities of origin as well as community of destination, domicile in their attitude to same in both directions.

Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of this study was anchored on the New Economics of Labour Migration. NELM theory as propounded by Stark emerged a covert response to the neo-classical economics perspective on migration (Stark, 1991). According to the theory, migration flows and patterns cannot be explained solely at the level of individual migrants and their economic incentives however, wider social entities needed to be considered as well. Among other things according to the theory, the household factor cannot be muted in the understanding of individuals' involvement in migration. Migration can be viewed as a result of risk aversion on the part of a household that has insufficient income; the household, in this case, can be in need of extra capital that can be achieved through remittances sent back by family members who participate in migrant labour abroad. These remittances can also have a broader effect on the economy of the sending country as a whole as they bring in capital (Jennissen, 2007;

Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, 2012; Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, 2010)

Rural-urban migration as a phenomenon is, a product of economic situation involving not only the individual travelling but the household and sometimes the larger family structure in which the individual in question belongs to. While the uncomfortable situation created by the problem of unemployment can move the individual into the consideration for migration from rural to urban setting, the overall socioeconomic condition of the household or the family in terms of the quest for better future encourages the family to support or even initiate the proposal for migration of the family member from the rural community to the urban setting. Due to the nature of typical rural community especially in Nigeria, an average potential migrant is consciously or unconsciously looking forward for city life. While employment challenges have made the urban and semi urban settings to entice the youth, the issue of education has equally become one of the major factors behind rural urban migration. However, while migration connected to education can be irregular and create in furtherance, chain migration; migration connected to employment issues has more economic implication both on the place of origin and the place of destination such as remittance, change in demographic structure as well as productivity capacities of the origin and destination of migration.

Migrants as subject to pulling and pushing factors are invariably instrument of community development both in the community of origin and that of destination. However, this is dependent on the underlying socioeconomic factors surrounding the migrants both in the community of origin and the community of destination. While many migrants were pushed out of their communities of origin by the delapidated social infrastructures and poor community social amenities, others were specifically forced out of their communities of origin by the stark poverty of the household and family in question. Equally, while many migrants are pulled to the community/city of destination by the economic opportunities available, some migrants are pulled to certain cities because of the available infrastructures obtainable in the destination in question. In each of the situation, there is the extraneous variable, which connects the potential development contribution from the migrants towards their communities of origin and that of destination. This is locked up in the attitude of these migrants towards community development as well as commitment to community development-based organizations.

Methodology

The study was carried out among 30 streets randomly selected from Enugu metropolis with special focus on the slums and less developed areas. Adult males

and females from the age of 18 years and above were selected using modified random sampling and inclusive criteria such as none indigenes of the town and at least, two years residence in the area. The inclusive criteria in the study were chosen to specifically involve the recent migrants, experienced migrant and relatively independent migrants who are found in the circle of job migrants. The study adopted cross sectional survey design. The choice of this design was in line with the theoretical proposition about the dominant factors surrounding migration. While the push pull factors were given attention in the study, the implication of migration to the origin and destination of the migrants to socioeconomic development was considered the pivot of the study.

The study randomly selected thirty streets among the streets in Enugu metropolis. The sample size of the study was 600. The study adopted both random and modified random sampling techniques in selecting the respondents. While the random sampling technique was adopted at the area level, modified random sampling was adopted in selecting the households (households in the selected streets) and the respondents for the study. All the streets selected were equally represented in the study by adopting equal probability sampling technique. In each of the 30 streets selected, 10 compounds (residential building housing two or more households) were selected using simple random sampling technique (balloting). Here, the numbers of the compounds in each of the selected street were labelled from which the researcher selected 10 compounds, bringing together, 300 compounds selected with simple random sampling technique. Among the 300 compounds selected from the 30 street, 2 individuals were selected from each of the compounds using availability sampling, bringing together, 600 respondents for the study. The criteria for selecting two individuals from each of the selected compound, is the membership of different household/family living in the same compound. The instrument for the study was survey questionnaire developed on ordinal and nominal scale with specific focus on the indices of migration, factors of migration and socioeconomic development. The questionnaires were self-administered with some guidance from the researchers where the respondents requested for assistance. The data collected were coded and analysed using Social Science Statically Package (SPSS version 23) while the substantive issues of the study were managed with descriptive and inferential statistics such as percentages and Linear Regression.

Presentation of findings and analysis

The table 1 below displayed the linear regression explaining the relationship between migration from the rural communities (The dependent variable) and other variables such as occupation, social amenities in the rural areas of origin, availability of job in the rural area of origin, annual income in the

rural area of origin, annual income while in the city and the extent of development in the rural area of origin.

Table1 Linear regression on migration from the rural areas and other variables

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.943	.245		3.854	.000
Occupation	.111	.093	.050	1.189	.235
Social amenities in the rural area	-.051	.102	-.023	-.500	.617
Availability of job	.065	.091	.029	.719	.473
Annual income in the rural area	.635	.085	.323	7.473	.000
Annual income in the city	.119	.046	.114	2.569	.000
Extent of development in hometown	-.098	.064	-.070	-1.522	.129

a. Dependent Variable: Duration in the city

Source: field survey, 2020; $R = 0.641$, $R^2 = 0.583$; $F = 17.849$; $p = .000$ $df = 6$.

The overall power of the model in explaining rural-urban migration is 64.1% (R value), F (17.849) $p < .000$; while, the individual (independent) variables contained in the model contributed at various levels in the overall explanation. According to the coefficient values (B), annual income in the rural area of origin contributed the highest value to the model explanatory power (.635), followed by the annual income while in the city (.119). By implication, the socioeconomic factors at the background of the migrants in this area pulling them out of their communities of origin are the annual income, which seems to improve while in the city when compared to the situation at home back to the place of origin.

Table 2 Duration in the city and frequency of money transfer for community development activities Cross tabulation

		Frequency of financial remittance for community development				Total
		Annually	Quarterly	Monthly	Weekly	
Duration in the city:	Less than 5years	60 (10.0%)	40 (6.7%)	100 (16.7%)	20 (3.3%)	220 (36.7%)
	5-10years	40 (6.7%)	-	100 (16.7%)	20 (3.3%)	160 (26.7%)
	10-15years	60 (10.0%)	-	40 (6.7%)	20 (3.3%)	120 (20.0%)
	15years and more	20 (3.3%)	-	60 (10.0%)	20 (3.3%)	100 (16.7%)
	Total	180 (30.0%)	40 (6.7%)	300 (50.0%)	80 (13.3%)	600 (100.0%)

Source: field survey, 2020 $\chi^2 = 112.265$, $df = 2$, $p.value = .001$; $\rho = -.094$.

According to the table above, out of the 220 respondents who have stayed in the city in less than five years, 16% indicated that they do some level of remittance for rural development monthly, 10% do such annually, while less than five percent of the respondents do such weekly. Among the respondents who have been in the city between five and ten years, 16.7% carried out some level of remittance monthly for development related matters, 6.7% do such, on annual basis, while less than five percent do such on weekly basis. Among the respondents who have been in the city between 10 and 15 years, 10% indicated that they do some remittance for development related issues on annual basis, 6.7% do such on monthly basis, while less than five percent indicated that they carry out development related remittance to the place of origin on weekly basis. Among the respondents who have been in the city for more than 15 years, 10% indicated that they carry out development related remittances on monthly basis while less than five percent do such on annual and weekly basis respectively. With the Chi square test ($\chi^2 = 112.265$), there is a significant relationship between migration and rural development in the place of origin of the migrants. This was further ascertained as a negative relationship by the spearman correlation result ($\rho = -.094$). In specific, the more the migrants stay in the destination of their migration, the more they withdraw from community development activities, by implication, migration negatively affects community development as the distance in time continue to increase among the migrants in the metropolis.

Table 3 Membership to community development association in the community of origin and duration in the city Cross tabulation

		Duration in the city				Total
		Less than 5years	5-10years	10-15years	15years and more	
Membership to community development association	Yes	100 (16.7%)	60 (10.0%)	80 (13.3%)	80 (13.3%)	320 (53.3%)
	No	120 (20.0%)	100 (16.7%)	40 (6.7%)	20 (3.3%)	280 (46.7%)
Total		220 (36.7%)	160 (26.7%)	120 (20.0%)	100 (16.7%)	600 (100.0%)

Source: field survey, 2020 $\chi^2 = 58.746$, **df = 3, p.value = .001; rho = .245.**

According to the table, 20% of the 220 respondents who have been in the city for less than five years are not membership to any community development association, while only 16.7% belonged to community development association. Among the respondents who have been in the city between 5 and 10 years, only 10% belonged to community development association in the communities of origins, while 16.7% are not membership to any community development association. Among the respondents who have been in the city between 10 and 15 years, 13.3% belonged to community development association while, 6.7% do not belong to any community development association in their communities of origin. Among the respondents who have been in the city for more than 15 years, 13.3% belonged to community development association while less than five percent do not belong to community development association in their communities of origin. With the Chi square test ($\chi^2 = 58.746$), there is a significant relationship between migration and community-based development organizations. This was further ascertained as a positive relationship by the spearman correlation result (rho = .245). The result indicated the fact that migrants in principle, are amenable to community development inspired activities but lacks the zeal for commitment as the above table2 revealed.

Table4 Membership of development association in the city and duration in the city

		Duration in the city				Total
		Less than 5years	5-10years	10-15years	15years and more	
Membership of development association in the city	Yes	120 (20.0%)	80 (13.3%)	40 (6.7%)	80 (13.3%)	320 (53.3%)
	No	100 (16.7%)	80 (13.3%)	80 (13.3%)	20 (3.3%)	280 (46.7%)
Total		220 (36.7%)	160 (26.7%)	120 (20.0%)	100 (16.7%)	600 (100.0%)

Source: field survey, 2020 $\chi^2 = 48.701$, **df = 3, p.value = .001; rho = .056.**

According to the table3 above, 20% of the 220 respondents who have been in the city for less than five years are membership to community development association in their host city, while only 16.7% do not belonged to community development association in their host city. Among the respondents who have been in the city between 5 and 10 years (160), 13.3% belonged to community development association in their host communities, while 13.3% are not membership to any community development association in their host community. Among the respondents who have been in the city between 10 and 15 years (120), 13.3% do not belong to community development association while, 6.7% belonged to community development association in their host communities. Among the respondents who have been in the city for more than 15 years (100), 13.3% belonged to community development association in their host communities while, less than five percent do not belong to community development association in their host communities. With the Chi square test ($\chi^2 = 48.701$), there is a significant relationship between migration and membership of community development organizations in the host city of the migrants. This was further ascertained as a positive relationship by the spearman correlation result ($\rho = .056$). While there is clear indication here according to the table that the migrants are at some level committed to community development in the host communities, the spectacular thing about the finding here is, the connection between time and involvement in community development organizations by the migrants. Migrants tend to do this in connection with the duration of their stay in the host communities such that, the more they stay in the host communities, the higher the chances of involvement in the community development organizations in the area.

Discussion of the findings/Conclusion

Rural-urban migration has been one of the socioeconomic issues of the century requiring multidimensional research approach. As such, a number of researchers have given tremendous attention to the phenomenon with some level of results and explanations (Ehirim et al, 2012; Adesiji, Omoniwa, Adebayo, Matanmi & Akangbe, 2009; Ajaero & Onokala, 2013; Ajaero & Madu, 2014). Building on the existing and ongoing research in migration, the present study examined rural-urban migration in connection with development activities in the community of origin and destination community (host community) of the migrants. Specifically, the study was interested in answering the questions bordering on certain dimensions of migration such as, the socio-economic conditions that are pulling people to Enugu metropolis, the effects of migration on the socio-economic development of the community of origin of the migrants, the relationship between migration and community based development

organizations and the relationship between migration and urban based development organizations in the host communities of the migrants.

30 street/residential outlets were selected for the study with 600 respondents made up of males and females. These included recent migrants and migrants who have been in the city for a long time. While majority of the migrants (36.7%) are recent migrants, who have been in the city for less than 5 years, majority of the migrants (50%) are involved in monthly remittance in connection with community development activities. Equally, majority of the respondents (53.3%) are membership to community-based development associations in their community of origin. Among the major findings of the study, annual income of the migrants before and after migration from the rural areas appeared as the pushing and pulling factors to the migrants in Enugu metropolis.

Income as one of the socioeconomic factors to migration has been pointed out in a number of studies (Jennissen, 2007; Ehirim et al, 2012; Abanihe & International Organization for Migration Nigeria, 2014) however, these studies have appeared to be gross conclusion in nature in the face of specificity and distinction in the role of income as a pushing or pulling factors to migration especially the internal migration. In the present study, efforts were made to distinguish the specific role of income, which according to the findings here, is anchored on the disparity between the income levels obtainable in the rural setting as well as that obtainable in the urban setting. From the findings of other researchers as the current study has observed, the pushing and pulling factors have been presented in a blurred analysis however, the present study presented a form of distillation to clarify this by looking into the socioeconomic situations of the migrants before their migration and after their migration.

From the study, it was established that the more the migrants stay in the city, the less they involve themselves in community development activities. This was ascertained through the cross examination of duration of the migrants in the city and the extent of remittances for community development related activities. Although there was positive correlation between the duration of the stay of the migrants in the city and membership to community development association in the community of origin, the negative correlation between duration in the city by the migrants and remittances for community development related activities appeared to be having a spurious variable in-between the relationship. Other studies before now have pointed out the positive effects of migration on the community development of the community of origin of the migrants (Sorensen, 2006; Olowe & Awoyemi, 2012; Adesiji, Omoniwa, Adebayo, Matanmi & Akangbe, 2009; Abanihe & International Organization for Migration Nigeria, 2014) however, extraneous factor here which the present study has unveiled in the commitment and consistency, which was probed through the duration on the

city and regular remittance for community development to the community of origin of the migrants. From further cross examination, the study found the positive correlation between the duration in the city among the migrants and membership of community development association in the host communities. Although no study has specifically probed this, the finding equally contributes to the understanding of the isolation of some migrants from the development activities in their communities of origin. The more these migrants stay in their host communities, the more they unconsciously withdraw from their communities of origin and absolve themselves in their host communities. However, caution should be taken as this study did not probe the level of commitments of these migrants to the community development activities in their host communities. In this study it has been established that income levels played a significant role in rural-urban migration, consciousness for community development in the community of origin fizzles away with time while, the migrants from rural to urban areas gradually attached themselves to the community development associations of their host communities.

References

- Adebowale, S., Atte, O, & Ayeni, O (2012). Elderly Well-being in a Rural Community in North Central Nigeria, Sub-Saharan Africa. *Public Health Research*, 2(4): 92-101
- Adesiji, G., Omoniwa, V., Adebayo, S.A., Matanmi, B.M. & Akangbe, J.A. (2009). Factors Associated with the Youths' Rural-Urban Drift in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business* (1), 69-77.
- Adewale, J.G. (2005). Socio-Economic Factors Associated with Urban-Rural Migration in Nigeria: A Case Study of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 17(1): 13-16.
- Ajaero CK, Onokala PC (2013). The Effects of Rural-Urban Migration on Rural Communities of South eastern Nigeria. *International Journal of Population Research*. From <[http://www. hindawi.com/journals/ijpr/2013/610193/](http://www.hindawi.com/journals/ijpr/2013/610193/)>
- Ajaero, C. K. & Madu, I. A. (2014). Rural-Urban Migration and Livelihoods in South Eastern Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies* 4(6)6-15
- Ajaero, C. K. & Okafor, O. I. (2011). Selectivity and determinants of Rural-Urban migration into Lagos, State, Nigeria," *Nigerian Journal of Geography and the Environment*, 2(1) 214– 229.
- Ajaero, C. K. & Onokala, P. C (2013). The Effects of Rural-Urban Migration on Rural Communities of South eastern Nigeria. *International Journal of*

Population Research (2013)-610193.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/610193>

- Ajearo CK, Madu IA, Mozie AT (2013). Appraisal of the factors of rural-urban migration in southeastern Nigeria. *Innovare Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(2): 1-8
- Adewale, J. G. (2005). *Socio – Economic Factors Associated with Urban-rural Migration in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State, Nigeria*. Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, Ladoké Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomosho, Nigeria. pp. 1, 14-15. JHE-17-1-013-016-2005-21203-Adewale-J-G.PDF.
- Badru, F. A. (2004). Urbanization, Family and Social changes in Nigeria: 1950-1999. In M.O.A. Adejugebe *Industrialization, Urbanization and Development in Nigeria 1950-1999*. Lagos: Concept Publications Ltd.
- Aromolaran A. K. (2013). Assessment of benefits associated with rural-urban migration among non-migrants in Odeda Area, Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences and Technology*, 14(2): 31-38.
- Aromolaran AK (2013). Assessment of benefits associated with rural-urban migration among non-migrants in Odeda Area, Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences and Technology*, 14(2): 31-38.
- Aworemi J. R, Abdul-Azeez I. A, Popoola N. A (2011). An appraisal of the factors influencing rural urban migration in some selected Local Government Areas of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 4(3): 136-141.
- Aworemi, J.R & Abdul-Azeez, I.A. (2011). An Appraisal of the Factors Influencing Rural-Urban Migration in Some Selected Local Government Areas of Lagos State Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development* 4: 3.
- Bakewell, O., & Jonsson, G. (2011). *Migration, mobility and the African City: synthesis report on the African perspectives on human mobility research programme*. Oxford: International Migration Institute.
- Bloch, R., Fox, S., Monroy, J., & Ojo, A. (2015). *Urbanisation and urban expansion in Nigeria. Urbanization Research Nigeria (URN) research report*. London: ICF International.
- Ehirim N. C, Onyeneke R. U, Chidiebere-Mark N. M, Nnabuihe V. C (2012). Effects and prospect of rural to urban migration on the poverty status of migrants in Abia State, Nigeria. *Agricultural Science Research Journal*, 2(4): 147-149.
- Ehirim, N. C., Onyeneke, R. U., Chidiebere-Mark N. M. & Nnabuihe, V. C. (2012). Effect and prospect of Rural to Urban migration on the poverty

- status of migrants in Abia State, Nigeria. *Agricultural Science Research Journal*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 145–153, 2012.
- Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, (2010). 2010 Annual Report. Chicago: Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago,
- Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (2012). *Risk list- Safety and Soundness Update*. Minneapolis: Bank of Minneapolis
- Herreri C, Sahn D. E. (2013). *Determinants of Internal Migration among Senegalese Youth*. Sponsored by CERDI- Centre d'études et de recherches sur le Développement International, Documents No. 08, France. From <<http://www.Cerdic.org/ed>>
- Isiugo-Abanihe, U. C. & IOM Nigeria (2014). Migration in Nigeria A Country Profile 2014. Geneva: International Organization for Migration
- Iwayemi, A. (2006). *Modelling the Nigerian Economy for Growth and Employment. In Employment Generation in Nigeria: Selected Papers for the 2006 Annual Conference*. Ibadan: Nigerian Economic Society.
- Laah, D.E., Abba, M., Ishaya, D.S. &Gana, J.N. (2013). The Mirage of Rural Development in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences and Public Policy*. Vol.5, NO. 2, 148- 159.
- Oke, M.O. (2012). *Rapid Urban In-Migration and Environmental Nuisance in Nigerian Cities : The case of street vending in Lagos City*. Sustainable environmental planning and management in Nigeria; Urban and Regional Planning Department, Ladoke Akintola University, Ogbomosho, Nigeria
- Ortega, Frances C (2005). Immigration Quotas and Skill Upgrading *Journal of Public Economics*, 89 1841-1863.
- Lall, S.V., Harris, S., and Zmarak, S. (2006). Rural-Urban Migration in Developing Countries: A Survey of Theoretical Predictions and Empirical Findings. *Development Research Group. The World Bank*.
- Moriconi-Ebrard, F., Harre, D., &Heinrigs, P. (2016). *Urbanization dynamics in West Africa 1950–2010: Africapolis I, 2015 update, West African Studies*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Olayiwola FO (2002). *Perception of Rural-Urban Migration in Selected Rural Communities in Ondo State, Nigeria*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished, Department of Sociology, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba
- Rahman, M. (2013). Estimation of internal migration by the national growth rate method: an alternative approach. *Bangladesh Development Studies*, 36(3), 79–87.
- Roel Jennissen (2007). Causality Chains in the International Migration Systems Approach *Population Research and Policy Review* 26, 411–436.
- Sorensen, N.N. (2006). The development dimension of migrant remittances. *Migration Policy Research, IOM Working Papers Series, No. 1*.

- Stark O. (1991). *The migration of labor*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
- Taylor, J.E & Mora, J. (2006). Does Migration Reshape Expenditures in Rural Households? Evidence from Mexico. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3842*.
- Turok, I., & McGranahan, G. (2013). Urbanization and economic growth: the arguments and evidence for Africa and Asia. *Environment and Urbanization*, 25(2), 465–482.
- Udenta, J., Nwosuji, E. P. & Chukwuemeka, E. (2015). Migration and National Development: A Comparative Analysis of the Attitude of the First-Generation South-East Nigeria Migrants and the New Generation. *Arabian J Bus Manag Review* 2015, 5:5. doi. 10.4172/2223-5833.1000153
- United Nations. (2013). *World population policies. ST/ESA/SER.A/341. In Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations. (2014). *World urbanization prospects ST/ESA/SER.A/366. In Department of Economic and Social Affairs*. New York: United Nations Accessed 1 October 2017.
- United Nations. (2016). *Human development report 2016: Human development for everyone*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- World Bank. (2017). *World development indicators. In World Bank open data*. Washington DC: World Bank Accessed at: <http://data.worldbank.org/>.