

Causes and Consequences of Rural-Urban Migration Nigeria: A Case Study of Ogun Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria.

Omonigho T. Okhankhuele

*¹Department of Project Management Technology, Federal
University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.*

E-mail: omotonia2013@gmail.com

Tel: +234-806-282-4074

Olaniyan Z. Opafunso

*Dean, School of Management Technology, Federal
University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.*

E-mail: zopafunso@yahoo.com

Tel: +234-803-350-5007

Abstract

This study investigated the causes and consequences of rural-urban migration in Nigeria from the period 1999-2008, using Ijebu Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria, as a case study. The study attempted finding answers to research questions by using survey design and purposive sampling techniques to collect data from 144 respondents with the aid of a 10-item structured questionnaire and personal interview. The respondents comprised of heads of households of migrants' in the study area. Data for this study were edited, coded and analyzed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) and descriptive statistics. The findings revealed that majority of the migrants migrated to continue their education rather than in search of employment as concluded by a lot of past studies. It also revealed that the consequences of out-migration on the area include: absence of youths to assist parents in their profession, lack of work force to work on farms, and desertion of the area to the aged and children. The paper recommended concerted government policy aimed at closing the lacuna between wage and other socio-economic differentials between the rural and urban areas, government's support in the development and funding of small and medium scale rural enterprises, and agriculture.

Keywords: Rural-urban Migration, Causes and Consequences

1. Introduction

Rural-urban migration was formerly regarded as favourable in economic development. Today, it has become one of the most embarrassing problems in the Nigerian development experience. Rural-urban migration is “the phenomenon of a historically unprecedented movement of people from the rural countryside to the burgeoning cities of Africa, Asia and Latin America” (Todaro, 1997). “It is the movement of people from rural areas into cities” (Wikipedia). Some time ago, migration existed internally to enable excess labour to be taken slowly from the rural areas to provide workforce for industries in the urban areas and therefore aid 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. (Todaro and Smith, 2007) opined that this adds to worsen the already severe urban unemployment problems triggered by economic and physical inequality between urban and rural areas.

Prior to colonialism in Nigeria, the extended families lived a communal life. They carried out their daily activities together in accord and shared their yield adequately following a well comprehended custom. Colonialism exposed Nigerians to international market by the introduction of cash crops and creation of administrative offices in planned zones which necessitated the investment in socio-economic amenities within these areas. This stimulated the quest for paid employment and migration of workforce into these areas and therefore prompted the commencement of rural-urban migration in Nigeria. “This resulted in an increased migration into new cities such as Lagos, Port-Harcourt, Enugu, Jos and Kaduna: Unskilled labours were required for menial jobs in the urban centers of colonial administration” (Nwanna, 2004). The theory upon which this study is based is Todaro’s Model of Migration. This theory offers theoretical basis for proper understanding of rural-urban migration. It gives insight into the reasons why migration takes place. According to Todaro (1997), migration is an economic choice where individuals or households decide to migrate from the rural to urban areas, if there is a higher anticipated income in the urban areas. This model suggests that migration results in response to urban-rural dissimilarities in anticipated rather than actual incomes. The basic premise is that migrants deliberate on the various labour market prospects accessible to them between the rural and urban sectors, and select the one which maximizes their anticipated gains from migration.

Due to the establishment of urban centers by the Colonial administration, the urban centers became more appealing to young people in huge numbers since superior employment and other socio-economic conveniences resided there. The rural areas were regularly abandoned by the youths, leaving the aging men, women and children to labour on the farms. This has led to a decrease in agricultural output and its contribution to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in Nigeria, lowered the standard of living of the rural dwellers, and desertion of the rural areas.

The migration of the rural masses to the urban areas has occasioned a lot of social and economic difficulties in the rural areas. McCarthy (2004), stated that “excessive urbanization leads to high rate of city congestion, crime and poor infrastructure such as proper sewage system, clean drinking water, electricity and other amenities, chronic unemployment and creation of large slums and Shanty towns”. Many developing countries including Nigeria, have attempted to resolve their problems of rural poverty and desertion. In Nigeria, from the Colonial period till date, past administrations in the country have tried to reform the rural areas where over 75% of Nigerians live in for the sake of attaining balanced growth and development, and discourage rural-urban migration, to no avail. “While the national population is growing at an annual rate of 2.8 percent, that of the urban population is growing at 5.5 percent. This rate is among the highest in the world today” (Nwakeze, 2004). Several

methods to remove rural-urban development gap have been carried out in Nigeria with little success, therefore the rural areas still remain highly underdeveloped in comparison with the urban areas. Numerous studies have been carried out on the causes and consequences of rural-urban migration. While some of the past studies related the causes of rural-urban migration to discriminatory government policies in favour of urban development, response to disparities in income, employment and other socio-economic amenities available within the urban and rural areas, with the urban areas being privileged, others related it to spontaneous, emotional, structural, traditional and some other factors. Some studies related the consequences of depopulation of rural areas to reduction in rural agricultural produce, reduction in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the nation, decline in the standard of living, inaccessibility, remoteness, underdevelopment, poverty, drabness, ignorance, hunger and starvation of the rural inhabitants. They also related the consequences of rural-urban migration on the urban centers to serious problems such as overpopulation, insufficient physical and social infrastructural amenities. What are the causes and consequences of rural-urban migration in Nigeria? The researcher intends to find answers to these questions, using Ijebu Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria as a case study.

2. Previous Research

2.1. Existing Studies on the Causes of Rural-Urban Migration.

Todaro (1997), McCatty (2004), Nwanna (2004), Adepoju (1990), Makinwa (1981), Aboyade (1983), and Nwakeze (2004), admitted that government policies have been in favour of urban development, by purposely and continuously creating employment opportunities, educational opportunities and other infrastructural amenities more in the urban areas, compared to the rural areas. This has resulted to inequality in the development and quality of life between the rural and urban areas, and therefore enhancing rural-urban migration. “People are attracted to urban areas because they think they will have greater opportunities there” (Wikipedia).

There also seems to be a unanimous agreement among economists including; McCatty (2004), NISER (1993), Nwanna (2004), Brockerhoff (1995), Gould (1990), Ohadike and Teklu (1990), Izzard (1979), Adewale (2005), Makinwa (1981), and Olujimi (2001), that decision taken by people to migrate from the rural to urban areas is as a reaction to socio-economic issues such as; inferior social and economic facilities such as: health care, educational opportunities, transportation system, electricity, pipe borne water, housing conditions amongst others, in the rural areas compared to those in the urban areas, and degrading view of rural areas and its inhabitants.

Nwanna (2004), Morrissey (2008), McCatty (2004), and Adewale (2005), also affirmed that decision to migrate could be spontaneous. Some people may decide to migrate because their rural economy is disrupted. Such spontaneous decision could be as a result of natural catastrophe such as: flood, drought, landslide erosion earthquake, insect and pests’ infestation, escape from lack of human right and justice, political instability, infertile soil, lack of arable land for cultivation, communal clashes, family dispute, outbreak of war and other adversities. Todaro (1997), summed it up by saying:

The factors influencing the decision to migrate are varied and complex. Emphasis has variously been placed, for example, on; Social factor; including the desire of migrants to break away from traditional constraints of social organizations; Physical factor; including climate and meteorological disasters like floods and droughts; Demographic factor; including the reduction in mortality rate and the concomitant high rates of rural population growth; Cultural factors; including the security of urban

'extended family' relationships and the allurements of the so-called 'bright city lights'; Communication factor; resulting from improved transportation, Urban-orientation; educational systems and the 'modernizing' impact of the introduction of radio, television and the cinema.

2.2. Existing Studies on the Consequences of Rural-Urban Migration on the Rural and Urban Areas

(Adefolalu, 1977) 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 Udo (1997), Makinwa (1981), Adepoju (1990), Essang and Mabawonku (1974) and others that Migration from rural to urban areas leads to a reduction in the number of rural populace. 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. Rural areas in Nigeria lack socio-economic facilities including: pipe borne water, electricity, motor able roads, industries, high paid employment. They undergo a lot of deprivations. All these have confined the rural areas in Nigeria to a vicious circle of poverty. Lykke (2002), affirmed that one big worry about rural-urban migration is that it is most likely the highly educated and most agile people that migrate from rural to urban areas, leaving behind the very frail and mainly uneducated people who are not able to combat poverty successfully. This he alleged, adds to a rise in the differences in the standards of living of the rural and urban inhabitants.

Lykke (2002), McCarthy (2004), Adedeji, and Rowland (1984), Kadiri (1998), Money (1972), NISER (1993), Makinwa (1981), Mabogunje (1991), Mills (1991), Adejugbe (2004), Ayeni (1998), Badru (2004), Nwanna (2004), Eliss and Harris (2004), Iyoha (1975), Nanavati (2004), and Todaro (1997), agreed that the drift of the rural populace to the urban areas has led to social, economic, environmental, physical, and other severe problems such as congestion in the urban centers which has increased the spread of communicable diseases in the centers, insufficient physical, and social infrastructural amenities such as, electricity, health, educational, recreational facilities, motor able roads, pipe borne water, housing among others. This has caused overstretched use of physical and social infrastructural facilities. Others problems include: traffic congestion, unemployment, high crime rate – advance free fraud (419), hired assassins, armed robbery, alcoholism, drug abuse, prostitution, hooliganism, health hazard from pollution; air, water, and noise, for example, toxic smoke from industrial plants and vehicles, inadequate refuse collection and disposal system, poor drainage system which results to flood and overflowing gutters and therefore causing cholera epidemics, growth of slums leading to shanty settlements, and long distance to work as well as serious traffic jam which makes commuters spend number of hours on the road to work and other places, cultural change, juvenile delinquency, and decline in traditional values.

3. Research Questions

The following are the research questions posed to guide the study.

1. What are the causes of rural-urban migration in Ogun waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria?

2. What are the consequences of rural-urban migration in Ogun Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria?

4. Research Methodology

Since the broad objective of this study is to investigate the causes and consequences of rural-urban migration in Nigeria, using Ogun Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria as a case study, the researcher used survey design (household survey research method) to elicit information from 180 heads of migrants' families within the study area. The households used for the study were selected by purposive sampling (a non-probability sampling technique) and information was elicited from them with the aid of personal interview and a structured 10-item questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of two sections, A and B. Section A was based on personal bio-data about the respondents while section B comprised of questions drawn from respondents to investigate the causes and examine the consequence of rural-urban migration on Ogun Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria. Copies of the questionnaires were administered on a face-to-face basis. The response rate was 88% meaning 159 were returned. However, 15 out of the 159 questionnaires returned were invalid, leaving the researcher with 144 (80%) questionnaires for analysis. Data for this study were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Data gathered were edited coded and analyzed using SPSS.

5. Scope of the Research and a Preamble on the Study Area

In this research, we investigated the migration pattern, causes and consequences of out-migration on Ijebu Waterside Local Government Area, in Ogun State, Nigeria, from the year 1999-2009. Information from Ogun Waterside Local Government Handbook 1995 and 1999 respectively and the administration and staff of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Zonal Education Office of the same Local Government Area, as well as personal interview with the respondents, revealed that the study area, Ogun Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State Nigeria was created on the 15th of May, 1989. It is located in the South Eastern part of Ogun State. It is surrounded in the North by Ijebu East Local Government, South by the Atlantic Ocean, East by Ondo State, and West by Lagos State. Ogun Waterside Local Government area's headquarter is Abigi, but it has three area offices located at Ode-Omi, Itebumanuwa and Iwopin. The main economic activities that occur within the area include: fishing, hunting, farming, and sand quarrying. The Local Government Area is referred to as the garri bag and fish basket of Ogun State. Agro allied industries used to thrive in the Local Government Area. However, most of them have been deserted due to maladministration and high operating cost including: lack of electricity supply.

These industries include: Iwopin Pulp and Paper Company Limited, Palm Oil Processing Plant at Ibiade, Iwopin Rubber Processing Plant at Ilusin, Palm Oil Processing Mill at Lomiro, Rice Mill at Ode-Omi and a small paper processing Company at Ita-Otu. The Local Government Area has primary and secondary schools (public and private) but no higher institutions. "Prior to the year 1999-2003 democratic dispensation, the Local Government Area was without doubt, the only Local Government Area in the Federation where no town or village enjoyed electricity" (Ajayi, 2000). However, since the installation of the electricity poles and wires in the area, electricity supply has been highly epileptic. Power is only supplied sometimes during the festive period – Christmas, New Year, Easter, Ileya festival or during other festive periods within the Area. Pipe-borne water which is only available in few communities like Abigi, Efire, Ibiade, Oni and Iwopin hardly flows. Few members of the community depend on borehole for water while majority of them depend on stream and river as their source of water supply. Their main transportation system in the area is by water and land.

6. Data Presentation and Analysis

In order to answer the 2 research questions posed for this study, data generated from the field were analyzed. The respondents' bio-data was first analyzed for validity purposes. From the 10-item structured questionnaire with open and closed ended questions, it was discovered that out of 180 copies of the questionnaire administered 159 copies were returned, 15 out of the 159 copies were invalid, leaving the researcher with 144 copies (80%) for analysis. The response to question one, on the location of respondents, on the questionnaire revealed that the respondents were widely dispersed over the study area. However, the number of respondents in three out of the 22 locations namely: Iwopin, Ibiade and Abigi, where the administrative and commercial centers are mainly located, were higher than those in other locations, with 9.0%, 8.3% and 7.6% respectively. 83 (57.6%) of respondents were male, while the remaining 61(42.4%) were female. Majority of the respondents, 72(50%) had their ages between 50-59 years, 24(16.7%) between 40-49 years, 9(6.3%) between 30-39 years, and 39(27.1%) were 60 years and above. 102(70.8%) of respondents were married, while 42(29.2%) were widowed. Also 5(3.5%) of the respondents did not attend any formal school, 61(42.4%) attended primary school, 39(27.1%) and another 39(27.1%) attended secondary School and tertiary institution respectively. 6 households had 4 children each, 31 households had 5 children each, 69 households had 6 children each, 33 households had 7 children each, while 5 families had 8 children each.

This gives us a total number of 864 children in the 144 households. Therefore, each family within the sampled area can be said to have an average number of (864/144) 6 children. In fact, majority, 69 households, which consist of 47.9% of respondents had 6 children each. 2 of the households had 1 migrant each, 10 households had 2 migrants each, 29 households had 3 migrants each, 75 households had 4 migrants each, 25 households had 5 migrants each, while 6 households had 6 migrants each. This means that a total number of 552 children out of 864 total number of children in the 144 respondents' families migrated from the study area within ten years. That is, a proportion of 64% ($552/864 \times 100$) of youths migrated from this area within the 10 years. This is alarming. Also, the average number of children that migrated from each family is $552/144$ which is 3.8, approximately 4 migrants. Majority of the households, 75, that is 52.1% had 4 migrants each.

6.1. Results and Discussion

The results of the study were presented in line with the objectives of the study.

6.1.1. Table 1: Answer to Research Question 1, Analyzed with a Sub Question under Question 9 on the Questionnaire. Reasons for Migrating.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Education	266	48.3	48.5	48.5
Employment	120	21.814.0	21.9 14.0	70.3 84.3
Basic amenities	77			
Join relatives	59	10.7	10.7	95.1
Marriage	27 549	4.9 99.6	4.9 100.0	100.0
Total				
Missing System	2	.4 100.0		
Total	551			

Table 1 shows that while 266(48.3%) of the migrants migrated to continue their education, 120(21.8%) migrated in search of employment, 77(14.0%) migrated in search of basic amenities, 59(10.7%) migrated to join their relatives, and 27(4.9%) migrated to get married.

This revealed that the socio-economic facilities within the sampled area is grossly inadequate for the inhabitants and therefore the inhabitants, especially the youths between the ages of 18 - 29 years migrate in large number in search of these facilities especially educational facilities and employment in the towns and cities. This revelation is not too different from the studies carried out by Todaro (1997), McCatty (2004), Nwanna (2004), Makinwa (1981), NISER (1993), amongst others. However the only difference between this study, and those carried out by the scholars above, is that search for education supersedes search for employment in the case of Ijebu Waterside Local Government Area.

6.1.2. Table 2: Year of Migration * Reasons for Migrating Cross Tabulation

Year of Migration	Reasons for migrating					
	Education	Employment	Basic amenities	Join relatives	Marriage	
1999	27 49.1 %	11 20.0%	7 12.7%	8 14.5%	2 3.6%	55 100.0%
2000	25 48.1%	11 21.2%	6 11.5%	5 9.6%	5 9.6%	52 100.0%
2001	27 49.1%	9 16.4%	9 16.4%	5 9.1%	5 9.1%	55 100.0%
2002	30 50.0%	12 20.0%	9 15.0%	7 11.7%	2 3.3%	60 100.0%
2003	24 47.1%	13 25.5%	7 13.7%	6 11.8%	1 2.0%	51 100.0%
2004	24 45.3%	13 24.5%	8 15.1%	6 11.3%	2 3.8%	53 100.0%
2005	28 49.1%	13 22.8%	8 14.0%	6 10.5%	2 3.5%	57 100.0%
2006	27 48.2%	13 23.2%	9 16.1%	5 8.9%	2 3.6%	56 100.0%
2007	27 50.9%	11 20.8%	7 13.2%	6 11.3%	2 3.8%	53 100.0%
2008	27 47.4%	14 24.6%	7 12.3%	5 8.8%	4 7.0%	57 100.0%
Total	266 48.5%	120 21.9%	77 14.0%	59 10.7%	27 4.9%	549 100.0%

Table 2 reveals that education, followed by employment is the major reason for youths' out-migration from the study area yearly, within the ten years. These reasons supersede every other reason.

6.1.3. Table 3: Age at Migration in Groups * Reasons for Migrating Cross Tabulation

	Reasons for migrating					Total
	Education	Employment	Basic amenities	Join relatives	Marriage	
Age at 10-12 Migration in Groups	5 22.7%	0 .0%	0 .0%	17 77.3%	0 .0%	22 100.0%
13-15	7 22.6%	0 .0%	0 .0%	24 77.4%	0 .0%	31 100%
16-19	125 80.1%	20 12.8%	2 1.3%	8 5.1%	1 .6%	156 100%
20-24	120 71.4%	42 25.0%	2 1.2%	3 1.8%	1 .6%	168 100.0%
25-29	8 6.7%	49 41.2%	47 39.5%	5 4.2%	10 8.4%	119 100%
30+	1 1.9%	9 17.0%	26 49.1%	2 3.8%	15 28.3%	53 100%
Total	266 48.5%	120 21.9%	77 14.0%	59 10.7%	27 4.9%	549 100%

Table 3 shows that majority of migrants within age group 10-12 and 13-15, migrated to join their relatives, while those within the age group 16-19 and 20-24 mostly migrated to continue their education. However, migrants within age group 25-29 mostly migrated in search of employment

and basic amenities, while those from 30 years and above mainly migrated in search of basic amenities and to get married.

6.1.4. Table 4: Answer to Research Question 2, Analyzed with a Sub Question under Question 9 on the Questionnaire. Consequences of Out-Migration on your Area.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Dull village life	8	5.6	5.6	5.6
Lack of help	61	42.4	42.4	47.9
Lack of labour force	54	37.5	37.5	85.4
Inability to learn culture	6	4.2	4.2	89.6
No youth in the Community	15	10.4	10.4	100.0
Total	144	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 reveals that 8(5.6%) of respondents agreed that out-migration of their youths in large number has led to a dull village life, 61(42.4%) agreed that youths are no longer available to help them to carry out their house chores and assist them in their trade or profession, 54(37.5%) of the respondents agreed that it has led to lack of labour force especially on the farm which has consequently led to the reduction in agricultural produce and therefore low income and lower standard of living of the rural dwellers. However, 6(4.2%) agreed that it has led to inability of the youths to learn their culture, while 15(10.4%) stated that it has led to the abandonment of village by the youths, living behind mainly the aged and children.

7. Summary and Concluding Remarks

It can be inferred from the discussion above that majority of migrants from Ijebu Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria, migrated to continue their education while others migrated in search of employment, basic amenities, to join relatives, and get married. This means, until the imbalance or disparity in socio-economic development between the rural and urban areas are removed, no amount of persuasion or coercion can put a stop to rural-urban migration and its' multiplying effects in Ijebu Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State and the entire Nigeria. Also majority of the respondents agreed that rural-urban migration which has pulled a lot of their youths to the urban areas has made the youths unavailable to help carry out house chores and assist their parents in their trade and profession including lack of labour force to work on their farms therefore leading to low agricultural produce and low standard of living in the area. However other consequences include: gloomy village life, failure of youths to learn their culture and desertion of the village by the youths leaving behind mainly the aged and children. All these consequences can be upturned if the disparity in development between the urban and rural areas is substantially eliminated. This would make the youths sort what they go in search for in the urban areas, within the rural areas and therefore remain in there.

As a result of this study, it is hereby recommended that policy makers in Nigeria should carry out an intense effort to transform the rural areas holistically, by making available sufficient socio-economic and infrastructural amenities such as : higher income earning jobs, educational (especially tertiary education) facilities, sanitation, health services, electricity, motor able roads (including the farm roads), pipe borne water, good housing condition, financial institutions small and medium scale industries and other basic social-economic services for the rural dwellers. A concerted effort should also be made towards financing the rural enterprises and encouraging effective and efficient agricultural activities through National Policy Framework and Rolling Plans. This would assistance in increasing their productivity. Persistent efforts towards improving the urban areas without converting the rural

areas would aggravate the already problematic situation posed by rural-urban migration, since higher number of youths will migrate to the urban appealing areas. Also, insincerity of purpose, corruption, embezzlement of money meant to execute rural developmental projects by government officials in Nigeria need to stop for the rural transformation process to be fruitful.

References

Aboyade, O. (1983). *Integrated Economics: A study in Developing Economics*. London: Addison - Wesley Publishers. p. 62.

Adedeji, A. and Rowland, L. (1984): *Management Problems of Rapid Urbanization in Nigeria*. Ile-Ife: University of Ife press. pp. 8 and 218.

Adefolalu, A. A. (1977). *The Significance of Transportation in Rural Development*: Omolade, Adejuyigbe and Frederick M. Helleiner (eds): *Environmental and Spatial Factors in Rural Development in Nigeria*. pp. 158-164.

Adejugbe, M. A. (2004). *Industrialization, Urbanization and Development in Nigeria: An Introduction in Industrialization, Urbanization and Development in Nigeria 1950-1999*. Concept Publications Limited. pp. 11, 15-16.

Adepoju, A. (1990). "State and Review of Migration in Africa". In *Conference on Role of Migration in African Development: Issues and Policies for the '90s*, vol.1, commissioned paper, Dakar Senegal, Union for African Population Studies. pp. 3-44.

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 on Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria. pp. 1, 14-15. [JHE-17-1-013-016-2005-1203-Adewale-J-G.PDF](#).

Ajayi, T. (2000). *1st Anniversary of Democratic Governance in Ogun Waterside Local Government, Abigi. The journey so Far. May 29, 1999 - May 29, 2000*. pp. 1-3.

Ayeni, B. (1998). *Understanding and Planning of Cities: First Professor Nurudeen Alao's Lecture series in Urban Studies*. Lagos: Lagos State University. pp 9-11.

Badru, F. A. (2004). *Urbanization, Family and Social Changes in Nigeria: 1950-1999*. In *Industrialization, Urbanization and Development in Nigeria 1950-1999*. Edited by M. O. A. Adejugbe. Concept Publications Limited. pp. 31-34.

Brockerhoff, M. (1995). "Fertility and Family Planning in African Cities: The Impact of Female Migration". *Journal of Bio-Socio Science*. No 27. pp. 347-358.

Eliss, F. and Harris, N. (2004). In *New Agriculturist on-Line: Reporting Agriculture for the 21st Century*. 1st September 2004. p. 1. <http://www.new-ag.info/04-5/dev.1.html>.

Essang, S. M. and Mabawonku, P. A. (1974). "Determinants and Impacts of Rural-Urban Migration: A Case Study of Selected Communities in Western Nigeria". *African Rural Employment Paper*, No. 3, Michigan State University USA. pp 1-31. http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNAAA577.pdf.

Gould, W. T. S. (1990). "Migration and Basic Needs in Africa". *Liverpool Papers in Human Geography*. N. S. No. 1, Liverpool: University of Liverpool. In C. Nwanna, (2004): *Rural-Urban Migration and Population Problems in Nigeria cities, a paper presented in industrialization, urbanization and development in Nigeria 1950-1999*. Edited by M.O.A. Adejugbe. Lagos-Nigeria: Concept Publications Limited p. 58.