Abstract

Basically, the paper examined rural urban migrations and its implications for development planning in Nigeria. The major causes of rural-urban migrations in Nigeria are the expectations of higher incomes and better standards of living as postulated by the Todaro model, which forms the theoretical basis for the paper. In addition, some other models that help to explain rural development such as the development theory; the capitalist ideologies of rural development; the classical and Neo-classical model, the dual economy models and the Nigerian model of rural development were equally highlighted. Finally, the paper proffers a number of policy implications for the government to reduce the spatial imbalance that exists between the rural and urban centres.

Introduction

Migration, simply put, involves a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence and is usually considered to be rational. It is an economic man's reaction to economic differentials between regions; although it has been established that factors, which are non-economic also, induce migrations (Oguntoyinbo, et al., 1978). In part, migration originated as a result of population increases in part stimulated by the "pull" effect exercised by expectation of higher incomes and better living standards outside agriculture. They occur towards the direction of urban and industrial centres, but also take the form of migration towards other rural areas in search of better marginal land, or shifts from agriculture to tertiary within the rural sector (Onokerhoraye and Okafor, 1994).

The main reason people migrate is to find better jobs and higher wages as shown by both economic analyses and surveys of migrants. At the same time the distance to potential destinations and the quality and quantity of information about them help to shape migration decisions. Migrants tend to be young and better educated, in part because young, better-educated people can best take advantage of the opportunities offered by migration. In Africa and much of Asia, most migrants are men, in Latin America and parts of East Asia, women predominate (Population Reports, 1983).

It is now generally thought that migrants move chiefly in search of higher earnings. The economic interpretation of migration developed in the 1960s out of growing concern among policy makers and planners, about the relationships among population growth, urbanization and development (U.N. 1983). In 1964 Simon Kuznets outlined largely on the basis of U.S. experience, how economic growth and development could lead to migration viz:

i) Technological advances change what people buy and so change the demand for workers in different jobs, ii) Employers often choose to locate in cities because they want easy access to raw materials,
communication and transportation and consumer markets. Thus many new jobs are created in cities, even if workers must migrate from the countryside to fill them, iii) As industrialization proceeds, a smaller proportion of people work on farms because technological changes in agriculture reduce labour needs. Also, agriculture generally expands more slowly than industry, since as income rise; people spend more of their new income on manufactured goods than on food, iv) The natural increases of the population and also the growth of the labour supply is higher in rural areas than in urban. Thus, migration must "compensate not only for the more rapid growth of demand for labour outside of agriculture but also for the higher rate of natural increase of agricultural labour" (Kuznets, 1964).

Deriving from the above, by 1970 Michael Todaro and John Harris, had proposed that rates of rural - to - urban migration depend on:

1) The difference in wages or earnings between areas of destination and origin; and,
2) The chances of finding a job at the destination (Harris and Todaro, 1970).
In addition, research findings have supported the Todaro's model that the rate of rural-to-urban migration was higher where there was a greater difference between rural wages on one hand, and urban wages multiplied by the probabilities of finding an urban job on the other hand (Bahrin, 1981).

An understanding of the causes and determinants of rural-urban migration and the relationship between migration and relative economic opportunities in urban and rural areas is central to any analysis of African employment problems. In view of the fact that migrants comprise a significant proportion of the urban labour force in most African nations, the magnitude of rural-urban migration has been and will continue to be a principal determinant of the supply of new job seekers. Therefore, the migration process must be understood before the nature and causes of urban unemployment can be comprehended. Government policies intended to ameliorate the urban unemployment problem must be based, in the first instance, on knowledge of who comes to town and why. (Todaro, 1969).

The factors influencing the decision to migrate are varied and complex. Because migration is a selective process-affecting individuals with certain economic, social, education and demographic characteristics, the relative influence of economic and non-economic factors may vary not only between nations and regions but also within defined geographic areas and populations. Much of the early research on migration tended to focus on social, cultural, and psychological factors while recognizing, but not evaluating carefully, the importance of economic variable. Emphasis has been placed on five broad areas:

1) Social factors, including the desire of migrants to break away from traditional constraints of social or kinship affiliations;
2) Physical factors, including climate and metrological disasters like floods and droughts, as well as wars and rural violence;
3) Demographic factors in mortality rates and concomitant high rates of rural population growth;
4) Cultural factors, including the security of African urban extended family relationships and the allure of modern urban amenities;
5) Communication factors, including improved transportation, urban-oriented educational systems, and the modernizing impact of radio, television and cinema (Todaro, 1969).

It has been observed that all these non-economic factors are relevant. However, widespread agreement now exists among economist and non-economists that rural-urban migrations can be explained primarily as a result of economic factors. These include not only the standard push from subsistence agriculture and the pull of relatively high urban wages but also the potential push back toward rural areas as a result of high urban unemployment.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this paper is based on the theory of Rural-Urban migration propounded by Todaro (1969).

Based on the assumption that migration is primarily an economic phenomenon, which for the individual migrant can be a rational decision to make despite the existence of urban unemployment, this model postulates that migration proceeds in response to urban-rural differences in expected income rather than actual earnings. The fundamental premise is that migrants and their families consider the various labour market opportunities available to them in the rural and urban sectors and choose the one that maximizes their expected gains from migration. Expected gains are measured by the difference in real incomes between rural and urban work and the probability of new migrants obtaining an urban job. A schematic framework showing how the varying factors interact to affect the migration decision in Africa is shown in Fig. 1 below.

In essence, the theory assumes that members of the labour force both actual and potential compare their expected incomes for a given time horizon in the urban sector (the difference between returns and costs of migration) with prevailing average rural incomes and migrate, if the former exceeds the latter.

The Todaro migration model has four basic characteristics: i) Migration is stimulated primarily by rational economic considerations of relative benefits and cost.

ii) The decision of migration depends on expected rather than actual urban-rural wage differential where the expected differential is determined by the interaction of two variables,
the urban-rural differential and the probability of obtaining employment in the urban sector.

iii) The probability of obtaining an urban job is directly related to the urban employment rate and this is inversely related to the urban unemployment rate.

iv) Migration rates in excess of job-opportunity growth rates are not only possible but also rational and even likely in the face of wide urban-rural expected income differentials.

**Figure I:** Schematic Framework for Analyzing the Migration Decision in Africa

High rates of urban unemployment are, therefore, inevitable outcomes of the serious imbalance of economic opportunities between urban and rural areas in most African countries.

**Rural Development Theory**

The literature on rural development is rich in ideology and theory. The term rural development at present means various things to various people (Williams, 1978). According to Diejomoah rural development is a process of not only increasing the level of per capita income in the rural sector, but also the standard of living of the rural population. This definition goes on to observe that the standard of living depends on a complex of factors such as food and nutrition levels, health, education, housing,
recreation and security among others. Udo (1984), Lele (1975), have observed that rural development implies improving living standards of the mass of the low-income population residing in rural areas making the process of their development self-sustaining. Thus, development is associated with changes in social and economic structure institutions, relationship and process (Williams, 1978). It entails the creation and fair sharing of social and economic benefits resulting from this growth.

The various ideologies that explain rural development are highlighted below.

**Capitalist Ideologies of Rural Development**

Rural development with respect of capitalist ideologies rest on two general assumptions. The first assumption is that scarce resources are optimally allocated when they are exchanged through the sale and purchase of commodities by firms and consumers in unrestricted competitive markets. The second assumption is that the most efficient productive units are not individual producers who exchange the products of their own labour in the market, but capitalist firms, in which wage labourers co-operate under the direction of management to produce commodities which are sold for the profit of the firm. This socialization of labour enables the firm to operate on a scale large enough to apply the production-advanced technologies, which increase the productivity of labour. The rationale behind this approach is that capitalist firms can finance the application of biological, chemical and mechanical technologies and that the profit motive will ensure that they manage these resources and market their produce profitably.

Perspective explains the expropriations peasant land, restrictions on the movement of labour or various forms of forced labour as practiced on plantations and settler farms in Central, East and Southern Africa (Williams, 1980:137).

Another alternative is that capitalist state may leave the bulk of agricultural production in peasant hands especially since the cost of subsidizing capitalist farms are high. In this situation peasants may then be directed to cultivate crops by capitalist interests and state policy and to adopt officially approved practices. The state or capitalists can control or appropriate a large part of the output of the peasant farmers through the control of the supply of means of production such as land or the purchase of crops produced by all peasants farmers.

It had been observed that the transformation of rural areas is expected to take place through large investments in agricultural development or through the introduction of subsidies to agricultural inputs, and support prices for agricultural produce (Essang, 1975). However, some other models of rural development include the classical and neo-classical model; the Dual-Economy models; and the Nigerian model of rural development to mention but a few. These are discussed below.

**The Classical and Neo-Classical Model**

The proponents of this model argue that the growth of any economy whether rural or non-rural is a function of capital investment and employment of labour. In view of the fact that capital tends to flow into sectors characterized by high rates of return and high marginal productivity of capital while labour similarly moves into a sector characterized by high wage rates, the classical and neo-classical proposition stipulates that the promotion of economic development in the rural area should involve measures which will raise the rate of return of capital investments and the earnings of labour (Essang, 1975). Although this model has some relevance to Third World Countries where the out-migration of labour and capital from agriculture is usually attributed to much lower returns to these factors of production in rural than urban investments. It had some limitations; in the first place, it ignores the importance of improved quality of labour as a factor in economic development especially since it is well known that in both the advanced and developing countries agricultural and economic development is positively related to the quality of the labour force. Secondly, the model ignores the role of community services and infrastructure, which by generating external economic account for high rates of return to capital investments. Thirdly, the model places an exaggerated emphasis on factor and input prices as a determinant of investment and growth thereby ignoring the role of institutional and organizational arrangements. Finally, the model fails to take into consideration crucial role of technology, which by shifting the production function to the right tends to reduce cost and increase the rate of return to capital investment (Essang, 1995).

**The Dual Economy Models**

The dual economy model stipulates that the typical less developed economy is characterized by the existence of two distinct sectors, namely, the modern sector and the subsistence (rural) sector.
According to the models, the modern sector is market oriented and uses considerable equipment and technology while the subsistence sector produces for family consumption and relies on non-purchased input such as family labour and land for production. Thus, the subsistence sector is said to be characterized by the absence of technology, which largely explains why the productivity of labour is very low and why resources are under utilized in this sector (Essang, 1975). The dual economy model therefore articulates a development strategy, which emphasizes the concentration of resources on the dynamic, commercial modern sector while withdrawing resources from the subsistence sector for this purpose. It is argued that this strategy would ensure cumulative growth of incomes, employment and rapid structural transformation of the under developed economies.

The dual economy model outlined above, resembles the classical and neo-classical model in its emphasis on the need to channel resources to the growing and more dynamic sector where returns to investment are presumably higher.

As framework for rural development planning, the model has some serious drawbacks. First it fails to give an accurate representation of the structure and performance of a typical underdeveloped economy. The subsistence sector is not as claimed by the theory, characterized by the absence of savings and capital formation and growth. Although savings and capital formation in this sector are low it does not imply their absence. Secondly, the theory has a very narrow conception of development, which according to it implies the concentration of resource on already developed areas. Evidence in the existing third world countries indicates that such a strategy has led to the neglect of rural areas, which has in turn led to rural-urban migration. A situation, which has led to adverse effects in the urban area. Thirdly, the model assigns very restricted role to agriculture in the development process. The model argues that the role of agriculture is to serve the materials and the release of labour and resources. Such role obviously has adverse effects on rural purchasing power and can seriously undermine the capacity of agriculture to play very limited role prescribed for it. Finally, the model has generally misled policy makers in Third World Countries by emphasizing and even exaggerating the capacity of urban industries for cumulative growth. This has not happened in many of these countries.

The Nigerian Model of Rural Development

The case which the colonial government of Nigeria made in support of peasant type farming as against the plantation system of agriculture during the early years of British colonial rule in the country reflect clearly, the peasant ideology and the associated farm family theory of tenure.

As Governor Clifford told the Nigerian Legislative Council in 1920 (cited in Williams, 1980:141) "Agricultural interests are mainly or exclusively in the hands of the native peasantry.

a) Have a firmer foot than similar enterprises when owned and managed by Europeans, because they are natural growths, not artificial creations, and are self-supporting as regards labour, while European, plantations can only be maintained by some system of organized migration or by some form of compulsory labour.

b) Are incomparably the cheapest instruments for the production of agricultural produce in a larger scale than has yet been devised and

c) Are capable of a rapidity of expression and a progressive increase in output that better every record of the past and altogether unparalleled in all the long history of European agricultural enterprises in the tropics".

Empirical evidence over the past six decades lends support to Clifford's judgments. Experience with public owned companies and corporations in Nigeria indicate that their performance has been generally poor. Consequently various governments in Nigeria have over the years focused attention on the effective and extensive mobilization of small - scale farmers which constitute the major producer of both food and industrial crops in Nigeria. In 1981, more than 90 percent of all industrial crops produced in the country still came from small - scale fanners. Small - scale owner-occupier make-up by far the largest proportion of food producers in Nigeria. The country is therefore often described as a nation of small farmers, about 79 percent of whom cultivate less than four hectares of land, often made up of two or more plots scattered about the village territory Udo (1984a). Formerly, characterized as subsistence farmers, most small-scale full time farmers occupy a position comparable to the petty trader vis-a-vis the merchant. The small farmer is a greatly handicapped adopter of innovation because of his inferior education, low income and great difficulty in obtaining financial loans and credit facilities. Further, he lives in the largely neglected areas with very poor physical infrastructure (Udo,
Despite these constraints the small-scale farmer in Nigeria has demonstrated clearly that he is capable of responding to price incentives. Relatively, low prices at harvest season act as a disincentive to increased food production while very high prices during the hunger season months create great hardship not only for the farmer but also for the public servants.

The Nigerian experience indicates that the present ideology has much prospects for less developed countries for many developing countries, the state of economic development and the level of political sophistication suggest that the family farm is quite relevant. This is so because the family farm is labour intensive and is more adapted to crisis situations characterized by widespread unemployment, food shortages and rising prices. As pointed out by (Udo, 1984a), the operators of family farms are certainly in a better position to adjust to price fluctuations and economic depressions as compared with the management of large-scale commercial farms.

Policy Implications

The Todaro theory of rural-urban migration does have important policy implications for African development strategy with regard to wages and incomes, rural development and industrialization.

i) Imbalances in rural employment opportunity caused by the urban bias of many African development strategies must be reduced. Because migrants are assumed to respond to differentials in expected incomes, it is vitally important that imbalances between economic opportunities in rural and urban sectors be minimalized. Permitting real urban wage rates to rise at greater pace than average rural incomes will stimulate further rural-urban migration in spite of rising level of urban unemployment. This heavy influx of people into urban areas not only gives rise to socio-economic problems in the cities but eventually may also create problems of labour shortages in rural areas especially during the busy season. Thus these social costs of migration may exceed benefits of individuals.

ii) Urban jobs creation is an insufficient solution for the urban unemployment problem. The tradition (Keynesian) economic solutions to urban unemployment (the creation of more urban modern sector jobs without simultaneous attempts to improve rural incomes and employment opportunities) can result in the paradoxical situation in which more urban employment leads to higher levels of urban unemployment. However, the imbalance in expected income earning opportunities is the crucial concept. Since migration rates are assumed to respond positively to both higher urban wages and higher urban employment opportunities, it therefore follows that for any given positive urban-rural wage differential, higher urban employment rates will widen the expected differential and induce even higher rate rural-urban migration. Thus for every new job created, two or three migrants who were productively occupied in the rural areas may come to the city.

iii) Programmes of integrated rural development should be encouraged. Policies that operate only on the demand side of the urban employment picture such as wage subsidies, direct government hiring, employer tax incentives, are probably less effective in the long run in alleviating the employment problem than are policies designed directly to regulate the supply of labour to urban areas. However, some combination of both kinds of policies is most desirable.

Policies of rural development are crucial to this end. Many informed observers agree on the central importance of African rural and agricultural development to the solution of the urban unemployment problem. Thus, there is the need for the restoration of a proper balance between rural and urban incomes and for changes in government policies that currently give development programmes a strong bias toward the urban industrial sector (for example policies for the provision of health, education and social services) Given the prevailing urban bias and thus the political difficulties of reducing urban-rural migrations, real expanded urban employment opportunities continuously through industries, and given the inevitable growth of the urban industrial sector, every effort must be made to broaden the economic base of the rural economy. The present unnecessary economic incentive for rural-urban migration must be minimized through creative and well-designed development. These should focus on farm and non-farm income generation, employment growth, delivery of health-care services, educational improvement, infrastructure development (electricity, water, roads and so forth)
and the provision of other rural amenities. Successful rural development programme adapted to the socio-economic and environmental needs of diverse African countries seems to offer the only viable long-run solution to the problems of excessive rural - urban and migration, iv) Reducing population growth through reductions in absolute poverty and inequality, particularly for women, along with the expanded provision of family planning and rural health services should be encouraged. Clearly, any long-run-solution to African employment and urbanization problems must involve a lowering of current high rate of population growths. Thus, reducing rural population growth with its delayed impact on the urban labour supply provides an essential ingredient in any strategy to combat the severe employment problems that African countries face now and in future years.

Conclusion
The paper examined the causes of rural-urban migration, which is based on the expectation of higher incomes and better standards of living. The Todaro, (1969), model of rural - to - urban migration formed the theoretical basis of the paper. The model is predicated on the fact that migration proceeds in response to rural - urban differences in expected incomes rather than actual earnings.

Deriving from the above, the policy implications of rural-urban migrations for Nigeria's development include reducing the existing imbalance in rural - urban employment opportunities; improving the rural incomes and employment opportunities; introduction of integrated rural-development programmes should be encouraged; and the reduction in population growth, poverty and inequality; and the expanded provision of family planning and rural health services.
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