

**ASSESSING THE IMPACTS OF RURAL-URBAN
MIGRATION REMITTANCES ON THE RECEIVING
HOUSEHOLDS' PRODUCTIVITY IN KATSINA STATE,
NIGERIA**

BENUE JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY
Volume 11 Issue 1
ISSN: ISSN: 0386
Department of Sociology
Benue State University, Makurdi
Pg: 29 - 42

Junaidu Abdulkadir

Department of Sociology,
Umaru Musa Yar'adua University, Katsina State.

Aminu Abdullahi

Department of Sociology,
Federal University Dutse,
Jigawa State.

Abstract:

Young persons from the rural areas of Nigeria who goes to the urban centers mostly rely on temporary and menial jobs as the significant avenues to escape unemployment and poverty, where as in the interim the household members they left behind expect remittances from them as well. This study was therefore aimed to investigate the impact of rural-urban migration remittances on the agricultural and non-agricultural investments and productivity of the receiving households in the rural areas of Katsina state Nigeria. The study adopted a mixed method research design where both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered using a multi-stage cluster, purposive and snowballing sampling technique in determining the sample for the study. A survey questionnaire was distributed to 996 migrants sending households, and an in-depth interview was conducted with 32 persons 12 from the active migrants, returnees and community based traditional leaders. The Quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS, while the qualitative data was analyzed using QAQDAS. The findings revealed that, remittances received positively impact the households' agricultural productivity and investment in small and micro businesses. However, the study concluded that these positives exists as long as the households have one or more migrant sending remittances, as immediately the remittances ceased to flow due to migrants' return or ill health then whatever investment in agriculture or other investments will begin to decline in profit

Corresponding Author:

Junaidu Abdulkadir

Email: jabdulkadir93@gmail.com

and capital. Thus the study recommends a progressive family planning strategy and rejuvenating the overall agricultural value chain of these rural areas.

Key Words: Migration, Remittances, Migrants, Migrants Sending Households, Receiving Households

Introduction

Commercial activities and concentration of industries coupled with the concentration of social amenities in urban centers and neglect of the majority of the places (rural areas) of the Nigeria have made places like Lagos, Kano, Ibadan, Abuja, Port-Harcourt, Kaduna and some other major cities in country synonymous with success which has led to the influx of people and especially young ones in to these urban centers in search of greener pasture. This is because as observed by Crai, (2012), it has for long seemed as if cities had a magical power to draw people in with bright lights and the promise of advancement.

This has been so because, Redehegn, et'al, (2019), revealed that larger and wealthier households are less likely to have migrant family members, while households living below the poverty line, as well as villages with the highest unemployment rate, are the most likely to have both temporary and permanent migrants. Thus, the young persons from the rural areas of the country coming to the urban centers have largely been from poor families and they are non-literate or semi-literate population who could hardly have any certificate to fetch a white collar job for them. This category of people had to resort to menial and labor intensive as well as sometimes degrading occupations in order to earn a living while aspiring and waiting for success in the wilderness of the urban centers and their relatives are left in suspense and hope back in the villages.

Temporary job contract and menial jobs have become the significant avenues to escape unemployment and poverty especially for the poor and unskilled rural urban migrants from the rural areas of Nigeria. Migrants of this category usually have very little chance to settle permanently in the destination places (cities), therefore they remit most of their income to the home villages to improve the current livelihood of the 'left-behind' family and increase the productive capabilities of the household in general (Raghuram, 2007). Where as in the interim their left behind household members are likely to experience economic and social challenges in the rural areas.

Therefore, this study intended to examine the impacts of remittances from rural urban migration and especially from migrants in labor intensive jobs on the agricultural and non-agricultural economy of these migrants sending

households in Katsina state. This is to enable us understand as to whether participation in rural-urban migration help in improving the socio-economic circumstances and wellbeing of the members of these migrants sending households or not in Katsina state. Thus, based on the objectives of the study the following questions guided the design and conduct of this study:

- i. Do migration remittances afford receiving households in the rural areas of Katsina State with startup capital to invest in any non-agricultural activity?
- ii. Do migration remittances improve the agricultural productivity and output of receiving households?

Objectives of the Study

- i. To find out the impact of migration remittances on the nonagricultural investment in Katsina State.
- ii. To assess the impact of agricultural productivity of the receiving households in Katsina State

Literature Review

The movement of persons as a culture has always been part of the feature of humans from the very beginning as they migrate for various reasons such as their desire, for safety, for abundance and most importantly with the “push” and “pull” factors and so is it till this very day (Okheogheme, 2017). In contemporary academic and policy discourse, migration is classified into internal and international migration. As observed by Hassan and Jebin, (2020), there are many motivations for rural-urban migration incidences in developing nations of the world, the main one however has been employment.

However, whether internal or international, migration is primarily a household-based strategy; this is especially the case for youth, who often depend on family support to cover the costs associated with migration. Moreover, the migration decision process is related to the larger family system and the family may exert authority and oversight over young migrants through explicitly stated expectations, periodical personal visits or monitoring via extended social networks (WB, 2006; Konseiga, 2005; Akhter and Bauer, 2014).

Thus, despite social, economic and security risk involved in rural-urban migration, a number of researches such as one by *Tripathi and Kaur, (2017)* have indicated that people will continue to move to urban areas in developing countries, largely due to few or lack of viable and sustainable economic opportunities and social services available for the migrants in their areas of origin coupled with continuing industrialization and urbanization which has

made the cities of these countries centers of attraction and perceived economic and social opportunities. This has been largely because, migration whether at international or local level has the potential to provide escape for the migrants and sometimes financial remittances for the sending households or regions.

Loxha, (2019), argued that, the amount of money returned (remittances) by immigrant workers is thus, often valuable to most receiving members. Consequently, migration and remittances have been argued to be an effective mechanism for mitigating poverty, as well as a coping mechanism for disadvantaged households with no or little employment and earning opportunities in a number of remote and underdeveloped regions. According to Liang and Jiaotong (2018), the issue of remittances draws attention from scholars and policymakers in part because of its size. However, the large chunk of these works seems to concentrate on the remittances from international migration on the socio-economic development in the sending developing nations and newly developed nations. This has shown that, development related literature has long recognized the importance of migration remittances as tools used by households to secure income and improve welfare.

The bulk of the available existing literatures on remittances although largely of international migration, focus on its determinant, impact on poverty, labour supply, human capital development and general household welfare. For example, Arapi-Gjini, et'al (2020), in their study found that, migration remittances alleviate both absolute and relative poverty although only in the short run. Similarly, in another study Amara, et'al (2018), concluded that on average rural-urban migration increases the welfare of the participants, especially young ones. They however, concluded that whether that of migrants or non-migrant, a household's welfare is dependent on the level of education of the head.

Thus, Loxha (2019) argued that migration remittances can contribute to higher investment in human and physical capital, and thus may also have a positive impact on sustainable human development as they improve the earning prospect of the new generation. *He established the role of migration remittances as a source of startup capital for starting sustainable income generating businesses by the receiving households, by finding that migration remittances can serve as effective mechanism for mitigating poverty, as well as a coping mechanism for disadvantaged households with no or little employment and earning opportunities in Kosovo.*

However, a considerable part is reported to be directed towards consumption and very little for investment or entrepreneurship purposes.

Bredtmann, et'al (2019) in their study on migration and brain drain nexus and implications on the productivity of the sending places, concluded that even at international migration graduate migrants remits substantially far beyond what non-graduate migrants remits to their households and communities. Consequently the positive impacts of such remittances on the socio-economic development of the recipients is hugely dependent on the amount received per remittance and the frequency as well.

An investigation by **Rakotonirina and Aurelien (2014)** revealed that **internal** migration rural-urban migration specifically has positive effect on economics generally, but sometime it may have some sparks of negative effects in short term, although generally it has very positive impact on the economy of thereceiving places. However, Redehegn, et'al, (2019), observed that a rise in months spent out of agriculture as a result of a member's migration has a significant negative effect on crop income and asset accumulation on the sending households, but only for permanent migration. Contrastingly at the same time they found influx of remitted income from migrants significantly boost and increased crop income and asset values in the form of land and livestock holdings.

Conversely however, Zhang and Jiangxi (2015) revealed that in China, rural urban migration plays an important role in transforming agriculture by attracting government intervention through induced innovation and mechanization in the rural agricultural practice, which consequently lead to large scale industrialization. Ali et' al (2015), observed the effect of migration on household income in rural areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan especially in the district of Peshawar, and positive changes have been observed in pre and post facilities under consideration. Thus, IOM, (2019), observed that, many scholars in migration studies have questioned the positive role of remittances arguing that, it may even lead to negative behavioral changes among members of the receiving households' members.

In view of the foregoing it is thus, not easy to make generalizations with regards to positive or negative impacts of migration or its bye products such as remittances are complex to make, depending on the level of socio-economic development of the area (both sending and receiving) under consideration. This is largely because migration can both cause and be caused by poor and

substandard living circumstances. Likewise poverty can be alleviated as well as exacerbated by population movement. Thus, this study aimed to investigate the impact of impact remittances of rural-urban migration on the sending households in the rural areas of Katsina state Nigeria.

Method

This study adopted a combination of research methods, particularly triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data in order to allow for a deeper understanding of the phenomenon under study. The population of all adult indigenes in the rural areas of Katsina State who are members of households who had at least a member is involved in rural urban migration, active migrants in the cities of Nigeria from the rural areas of Katsina state and returnees who were involved in labor intensive occupations while in the urban centers of the country living in their villages of origin in Katsina State as well as community traditional leaders in the rural areas of Katsina State served as the population for this study.

The sample size for this study was a total of One thousand and thirty two (1032) respondents, comprising of Nine hundred and ninety six (996) selected from migrants sending households, twelve (12) active migrants from the villages of Katsina state now living and earning a living in the major cities of Nigeria and twelve (12) returnees who once participated in rural urban migration and are now back and settled in their villages of origin in Katsina state as well as twelve (12) community traditional leaders were interviewed. With regards to sampling technique in selecting the respondents for the study, due to the absence of a reliable frame coupled with the geographical spread of the target respondents for the study, this research used a mixture of multi stage cluster, purposive and snowball sampling techniques in determining the subjects for this study.

The data for this research were collected using quantitative survey and an In-depth Interview. The survey questionnaires were administered to members of migrants sending households in the rural areas of Katsina sate. Whereas in-depth interviews were conducted with active and returned migrants' population, as well as the community traditional leaders. The triangulation of these data collection techniques in conducting this work was to generate reliable and dependable data that will enable the study outcome to probe and validate itself in order to allow for accurate interpretations and conclusion.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26 was used in processing quantitative data generated for this study. Consequently, the

processed data were organised, presented and analysed using frequency distribution and percentages as well as chi-square test. While the qualitative data collected from the In-depth interviews, were textually analysed using the dedicated computer assisted qualitative data analysis package (CAQDAS software), and used where appropriate to provide insight on relevant questions raised by the research as well as to complement, corroborate, validate or negate the primary quantitative data in order to help the study answer its questions and achieve its objectives.

Results and discussion of findings

The aim of this study was to assess the impacts of remittances from rural urban migration on the sending households' agricultural and nonagricultural investments and productivity in Katsina state, Nigeria. Accordingly, below is the presentation of result and discussion of the findings of the study in accordance with the specific objectives for the study:

Table 1. Migrants' Sending Households on Receiving Financial Remittances

Receiving Remittances	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	926	93.0
No	70	7.0
Total	996	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork 2023)

Table 1 above presents the responses of respondents as to whether their households received remittances from their members that are currently living as migrants in the cities of Nigeria. It reveals that 93 percent (926) of them confirmed receiving monies as remittances from their members at intervals, however, an insignificant 7 percent (70) of the respondents admitted although they have at least an active migrant currently living in the cities they receive no remittances from them. This indicates that it is not all migrants that send back remittances back home when they settle in the cities, which means some migrants sending households do not receive any benefit through remittances even if they have an active migrant.

Table 2. Average Amount Received by Households

Amount Received	Frequency	Percent
Less than N 10,000	646	69.8
N 10,000-N 19,999	158	17.1
N 20,000-N 29,999	62	6.7
N 30,000-N 39,999	39	4.2
N 40,000-N 49,999	15	1.6
N 50,000 Above	6	.6
Total	926	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork 2023)

Table 2 above presents the distribution on the average amount received as remittances per remittance by households whose members live and works in the cities, it reveals that, 69.8 percent of them received less than N 10,000, while 17.1 percent received between N 10,000 and N 19,999, and only the remaining 13.1 percent received between N 20,000 and N 50,000 or above.

Table 3. Use of Remittances as Startup capital for Non-Farming Economic Activity.

Use of Remittances as Startup capital	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	771	83.3
No	155	16.7
Total	926	100

Source: (Fieldwork 2023)

Table 3 above presents the data on whether the remittances received by households affords them with startup capital to start any economic activity or investment other than farming. It shows that a large majority of 83.3 percent admits utilizing part of the received remittances for that purpose, but 16.7 percent of the households did not.

Table 4 Remittances and Households' Non-Farming Income Creation Capacity.

Improve Income Creation Capacity	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	828	89.4
No	98	10.6
Total	926	100

Source: (Fieldwork 2023)

Table 4 above present data on whether remittances received have been able to improve the income creation capacity of the sending households. It shows that, a large majority 89.4 percent acknowledge that remittances did indeed improve their household's income creation capacity, but a few of them on 10.6 percent believed it did not.