

THE PUSH AND PULL FACTORS OF POVERTY; MIGRATION OF NIGERIANS TO EUROPE

Anene, Chidi P. PhD¹, Njoku, Chinonyerem U. PhD², Theodore Iyala³

Department of History and International Studies

Imo State University, Owerri,

Abstract

This paper tried to establish a strong link between poverty and cross migration of the unemployed and financially strapped Nigerian youths, taking into cognizance other factors responsible for cross border migration such as need for qualitative and quantitative education and skills acquisition, conflict and political persecution, however, this paper argued that poverty-induced migration through regular and irregular routes outside Nigeria is the commonest and most visible push and pull factors of emigration of Nigerians to Europe thus any means to escape poverty. Conversely, poverty as a pull factor is associated with remittances ploughed back home by migrants to help ameliorate the impact of poverty among relatives at home. It therefore concluded that migration of Nigerian youths in (droves) large numbers has contributed in no small measure to taint the image of Nigeria as an entrenched underdeveloped nation; the approach adopted in driving home this argument is qualitative method using a chronological sequence to outline the push and pull factors.

Introduction

Migration is referred to as the movement of people from one geographical location to another either on temporary or permanent basis. Migrants therefore are people who in an effort to improve their lives, move for a temporary or permanent period from their place of birth and who do not necessarily enjoy the same right and entitlements available to non migrant individual of that place. However, as Bosewell and Crisp (2004) assert, migration and migrants should not be seen as problem to be dealt with as migration presents both challenges and opportunities.

Migration and poverty have become critical development issues in the contemporary world. In spite of this intricate linkage, the two phenomena have seldom been considered interrelated. However, a cursory look at the essence of migration whose primary goal is seeking for means of livelihood and survival entail that poverty is the major determinant factor in migration. The history of migration originated from people's struggle to survive and prosper, to escape poverty-related insecurity and purely move in response to opportunity. Dike (2002) pointedly stated that the poor are those that have limited and insufficient food, poor clothing, and are living in crowded and dirty shelters, cannot afford quality medical care and recreation, cannot meet

family and community obligations and as well as other necessities of life. Thus, people are pushed to migrate when they are poverty stricken, particularly when their income level fall below average obtained in their immediate community. Thus, there is need for migration research to include the types of migration the poor do undertake; better situate migration in the complex social-economic structures and family strategies, through which the poor secure their livelihoods; and unravel why the poor do the types of migration they do, rather than others.

For this paper, much as poverty is a push factor of migration, it is also a pull factor. This assertion is couched on the fact that if poverty is a push factor in order to remedy it, it follows that in an attempt to remedy poverty; it becomes a pull factor in terms of remittances accruing from such migration. This paper seeks to provide some insights on the interrelationship between poverty and migration as a cause and an effect of each other. First, it defines the concepts and their scope within the context of Nigeria. Thereafter, it analyses how poverty influences migration both as push and pull factors. Against the analysis made, the paper suggests some policy options for ameliorating the surge of poverty-related migration of Nigerians.

Conceptual Framework

Here the two major concepts are elucidated for a proper understanding of the variables under study. Thus, the concepts of poverty and migration are discussed within the frame of push and pull factors.

Poverty: Windanapathirana (1993), defined poverty as a situation whereby one cannot generate sufficient income required for life sustenance. Poverty has narrow and broad definitions partly because poverty is relative. On one hand it is physical because one can note its effects on those affected by it, and on the other, it is relative because a poor person in any country may not be perceived as such in another country. According to Aromolaran (1998), poverty is a condition in which an entity does not have enough resources at its disposal to meet its short time consumption needs. Not only does poverty influence who can migrate where, when and how but it may also be a primary cause of migration. Contributing to the description of poverty, Solemink (2002) added that internal migration could relate to lack of land right in custom land for certain excluded social groups.

However, the meaning of poverty is one of the issues that has generated intense debate among experts and researchers in Development Economics and such debate tends to be overshadowed by researchers' socio-cultural, ethical,

political, or ideological orientation, and norms and conventions of his/her community, institution, or organization (Iyenda, 2007). For instance, poverty is considered as an inadequacy of financial resources or low level of income by a household, or group of people, or individual to meet basic needs of life (Dasgupta, 1982; and Mowafi and Khawaja, 2005). This definition can be linked to poverty line where it can either be relative or absolute. In a contemporary world, poverty is being regarded as a social exclusion rather than a narrowed and strict definition as economic phenomenon (Skalli, 2001). Thus, from social exclusion perspective, poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon in which not only economic forces, rather, interaction of both demographic and socio-cultural forces result in an insufficiency or deficiency of physical necessities, assets and income (Chambers, 1995; Skalli, 2001; and Todaro and Smith, 2011).

Robert Chambers (1983) referred to the idea of poverty as a multidimensional concept, reflecting clusters of disadvantage. His theory covered five dimensions of poverty which, independently or combined, could make an individual or household poor: poverty proper; physical weakness; isolation; vulnerability; and powerlessness. Each of these aspects of poverty in itself is a cluster of disadvantage that can act as a deprivation trap locking people into poverty. Blanco (2002) defined poverty 'as the total absence of opportunities, accompanied by high levels of undernourishment, hunger, illiteracy, lack of education, physical and mental ailments, emotional and social instability, unhappiness, sorrow and hopelessness for the future'. Poverty is also characterized by a chronic shortage of economic, social and political participation, relegating individuals to exclusion as social beings, preventing access to the benefits of economic and social development and thereby limiting their cultural development (Blanco 2002). All these definitions define poverty from a broad perspective, providing certain criteria such as state of employment and income, food security, type of shelter, access to education, health and sanitation, and level of social and economic inclusion.

Amidst the fact that the definition of poverty appears to be most elusive given its complexity and niche at different levels in society, however the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1998:16) provides six definitions that captures virtually all the different conceptions of poverty as follows:

- a). Human poverty which denotes the lack of essential human capabilities, such as being literate or adequately nourished;
- b). Income poverty which means the lack of minimally adequate income or expenditure;

- c). extreme poverty that is indigence or destitution, usually specified as the inability to satisfy even minimum food needs;
- d). Overall poverty: This refers to a less severe level of poverty, usually defined as the inability to satisfy essential non-food as well as food needs, the former varying considerably across countries;
- e).Relative poverty which accounts is poverty defined by standards that change across countries or overtime – in terms of mean per capita income – and often used loosely to mean overall poverty;
- f). Absolute poverty on the other hand is defined by a fixed standard, for example, the international “\$1 a day” poverty line, which permits comparison of poverty across different countries, or a poverty line whose real value stays the same over time in order to determine changes in poverty in one country.

Migration: Movement of population away from the home region, either from one country to another (international migration) or from one part of a country to another (internal migration) could be referred to as migration. It follows that migration could be temporary (for example holiday makers), seasonal (transhumance) or permanent (people moving to cities to find employment (Grant, 2005). Many people often engage in permanent (long-term) movement, which involves the break-up of a person’s residential and social environment. People leave areas due to push factors (negative factors such as overcrowding and lack of employment) and are drawn to areas by pull factors (such as better housing, better jobs, and improved facilities). Barriers such as cost, language, politics, and knowledge also influence emigration.

UN defined migration as people moving for various reasons to countries other than their usual residence, for a period of at least twelve months so that the country of destination effectively becomes the new country of usual residence. According to the UN, migration is generally consensual, although it includes movement prompted by a force of socio-economic or political circumstance. The International Convention for the Protection of the Right of All Migrant Workers and Members of the Families, 1990 defined the term “migrant” as a person who is to be engaged, is engaged or has been engaged in a remunerated activity of which he or she is not a national.

However, a standard definition of migration was given by the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The IOM defined migration as the movement of person or group of persons, either across international border or within a state. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever is length, composition or causes. Migration

differs on the basis of duration, distance and organization and this makes classification into mutually exclusive categories rather difficult. This however, has made many writers to simply classify migration as either internal or external.

Adebayo cited in Adedapo (2013) offers the simplest juxtaposition between these two classes of migration by defining internal migration as the population movement from one location to another but within the same geographical boundaries, while international migration (also known as external migration) is the population movement across territorial boundaries. Furthermore, writers on migration are also suggesting that the relative importance of the different types of migration depends on the level of development concerned as well as the physical environment. Zilinsky (1971) suggested that in a developing country, rural-urban migration may be dominant while in a developed country, daily commuting to work and urban to urban movement may be more dominant. Adebayo (2000) also supported this view but added that the relative importance of the types of migration do not only depend on the level of development of the country but also on time. According to him, in recent decades, international migration has become relatively more common than internal migration especially in developing countries like Nigeria. In the context of Africa, Gould and Prothero (1975) presented a typology in which time and space provided the primary factors used. Gould and Prothero identified according to time the following grouping of migration; daily, periodic, seasonal, long-term, irregular, permanent, and according to space, rural-urban, rural-rural, urban-rural, urban-urban. Below are categories of migration as stated by (Adedapo, 2013).

Migration Categories and Characteristics as Propounded by Gould and Prothero (1975).

Seasonal Men typically migrate for physical labour during the dry season and return to farm during the wet Herders migrate to dry season pastures without their family; fishermen move to fishing camps. Permanent Educated men (20-45) typically migrate for both casual and permanent urban employment. Entire households migrate for permanent urban employment. Entire households migrate to other migration areas for new farmland Single individuals and entire households migrate outside Nigeria. Forced Rural households are forced to leave their home site as a consequence of civil disorder and discrimination and their return is uncertain. Rural households are forced to leave their home site as a consequence of infrastructure Development However, for comparative purposes, we essentially keep the

distinction between internal and external and their characteristics into seasonal, permanent and forced (Gould and Prothero, 1975).

Migration can also be classified into immigration and emigration. Emigration can be defined as movement of people, goods and services out of territorial boundary while immigration is the movement of people, goods and services into a particular geographical territory. Also, efforts have been made to explain migration and theories have been propounded on factors influencing the decision to migrate. These theories have generally been from two perspectives. In the first place, much of the early studies on migration which include geographers, sociologists and anthropologists emphasized social, cultural, spatial and psychological factors influencing migration, although they also noted the role of economic factors. Secondly, in recent years, economists have shown much interest in explaining migration especially in the context of rural-urban movement. According to this group of scholars, individuals involved in migration are viewed as rationally optimizing the cost and benefit of their decision to migrate. Although emphasis is placed on economic factors, they also recognized the non-economic factors (Adedapo, 2013).

Generally, for a long time, the most frequent quoted explanation of migration has been the "pull-push" theory which states that some people move because they are pushed out of their former location while others move because they are pulled or attracted to a place. Ravenstein (1881) was the first person to formally express the reasons for migration in what he called the "laws of migration" on the basis of his analysis of the 1881 census data of England and Wales. Some of his propositions were:

- Migration takes place from poorer to richer regions.
- Most migrants travel short distances and the number decreases as the distance increases.
- Urban dwellers are less migratory than rural dwellers (Adedapo, 2013).

However, Stoufer (1960) developed a major theory which he called the theory of "intervening opportunity" which looks not at the size of settlements or the distance between them but at the perceived opportunities between them. According to Stoufer (1940), the amount of migration over a given distance is directly proportional to the number of opportunities at the point of destination and inversely proportional between the point of departure and destination. More recently, other writers have amplified Ravenstein's basic laws and have provided a comprehensive list of determinants of migration. Bogue (1959) identified three major determinants; Migration is stimulated by

marriage, employment opportunities, political oppression, political opportunities, etcetera.

On the whole, migration for this study can be understood by using the push-pull model also known as the Lee model (1966). The basic assumption of the push-pull model is hinged on the fact that there exist push factors such as poverty, unemployment, insufficient basic socioeconomic infrastructure, and lack of economic opportunities, which compel people to move out of their locality to another in search of better opportunities. While the pull factors such as better job opportunities, living conditions, political and, or religious freedom, better education, medical care, family reunion, which attract people to move to these areas. From the foregoing it is explicitly clear that the major push factor is economic reasons which stems from poverty and the need to survive it, hence the pull (lure) to a destination with better opportunities for survival and better the migrant's lot.

Poverty as a Push Factor of Migration of Nigerians

Poor countries or societies all over the world generally produce generations of emigrants for richer or relatively richer counterparts. In the 1990s, research commissioned by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) on emigration dynamics of developing countries applied a conceptual framework, which specifies the following relationships. Emigration (dependent variable) is influenced by five independent variables – demographic setting, economic setting, socio-cultural context, political systems and environmental conditions – operating through or in conjunction with intervening variables, namely world economic/political order, regional/sub-regional economic co-operation and perceptions as well as policies of sending vis-à-vis receiving national governments (Adepoju, 1995:379). Of the five independent variables, the “economic setting” best fits our interpretation of effects of poverty on migration of Nigerians.

It has been observed that the cost of migration is a major hindrance for poor people who want to move in the sense that for them migrating shorter distances incurs lower costs. This observation has led some to argue that poor people tend to engage more in short distance (internal) migration, such as rural to rural or rural to urban migration (Abrar and Seeley 2009). However, there are a number of important exceptions to this general rule. One of the reasons why the migrants are drawn to certain destinations in particular is the available social capital and support networks there. However, policy interventions in countries of origin, the types of labour demanded in destination countries, development of social networks by migrants and access

to migration finance loans, have made various types of international migration accessible for poorer people too (Docquier, Rapoport, and Shen, 2010; Koechlin and Leon, 2007). The South Asian experience further suggests that success stories of short-term international contract migrants encourage members of poorer communities to mobilize resources through high-interest loans, dowry or by accepting bonded labour situations in order to migrate (Afsar, 2009). Compared to the non-poor, members of poorer communities often resort to risky – and generally irregular – ventures, in order to migrate internationally. In the case of Nigeria, Lack of employment opportunities in the developing countries especially Nigeria is another strong push factor for cross-border migration. There has been a drastic increase in the unemployment rate in Nigeria over the past two decades, from 3.1% in 1991 to 23.9% in 2011. The question is, what would happen to the Nigerian labour market if all Nigerians abroad returned home when the unemployment rate in the country has been steadily increasing in recent years? Such a situation might lead to more social unrest and political instability in Nigeria (Darkwah and Verter, 2014).

A brief migration history of Nigerians in relation to Nigeria's economic conditions explains better the link between poverty and migration.

Flows from Nigeria to countries beyond region did not occur on a large scale until independence in 1960, particularly when Nigeria began to experience bouts of biting economic recessions. For instance, from 1950s through the 1970s, the emerging elites moved mainly to the United Kingdom (UK) due to legacy of colonial ties, for educational pursuit, in a few cases for administrative matters. The expectation was that Nigerian students would return with valuable skills needed for nation building. As expected, most Nigerians educated abroad in the 1960s and 1970s readily came home after completing their education to assured plum jobs in the civil service or booming oil and private sectors of the economy. After independence in 1960 this kind of return migration to the UK continued, although an increasing proportion of Nigerians also migrated to the United States for study, business and work, not really on the basis of poverty (Adedapo, 2013).

This pattern of migration changed as political tension engulfed Nigeria and as its economy stagnated in the late 1970s and 1980s. Under this condition, stream of emigrants increased. Unlike previous emigrants, these later day Nigerian emigrants tended to stay abroad for longer periods after graduating, and some and some never returned. As a result, a well developed culture of professional migration emerge. By 1978, an estimated 30,000 Nigerian

graduates from UK higher institutions were living outside Africa, with 2000 of them living in the US (Adedapo, 2013). By 1984, the Nigerian population living in the US had increased to 10,000; many were highly skilled. In addition to the poor economy, Nigerian-based professionals left because of austerity measures of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), which the government agreed to as a condition for loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in the 1980s. Given that the programme included devaluing the national currency, wages for professionals became lower and working conditions worsened. As desperation in the country continued, many less educated youth became significant part of the emigration stream. By the early 2000s, an increasing number of Nigerians had migrated to countries such as Spain, Italy, Ireland and Belgium as well as Gulf States (Adedapo, 2013).

Development in Nigeria has greatly been affected by the rise in irregular migration. This is because the bulk of irregular migration in Nigeria occurs among youth age 18-35, which is the most productive age of human life and this is largely driven by economic incentives. A high youth unemployment rate of 61.1 percent and the rising cost of living are the major factors contributing to high migration levels among these groups (Adedapo, 2013).

In spite of the abundance of natural resources in Nigeria, unemployment and poverty are high in the country. For example, United States Agency for International Development (2008) submits that 70.8% of Nigerian population lived on less than \$1 per day. As a result of poverty, according to the World Bank (2011), 21.8 million people are recorded to have emigrated from Sub-Saharan African countries, and Nigeria is recorded to be one of the top ten countries that produced such massive numbers. The destination of migrants from sub-Saharan countries includes high-income countries while majority of them migrate to other African countries. Nigerians represent one of the most mobile populations in Africa and they are found virtually in every continent. They have been described as “populations moving to East, West, and South Africa, as well as North America, constitute a vibrant Diaspora with strong ties across continent” (United States Agency for International Development 2007: 3).

The harsh economic situation in Nigeria is such that even when Nigerians are repatriated from the harrowing experiences from countries such as Libya, they tend to migrate again out of the country. For instance, while several initiatives are already in place to help returnees integrate back in Nigeria, experts like Frantz Celestin predict that up to 40 percent of all returnees will take a second attempt at migrating north, as few seem to see long-term

opportunities in Nigeria (Gansler, 2018). According to IOM sources, there are currently 36,000 Nigerian refugees registered in Libya (Gansler, 2018). Only recently, the Emir of Kano, Alhaji Muhammadu Sanusi II, has attributed the excessive quest by Nigerian youths to engage in illegal migration to poverty and unemployment (Emir Sanusi attributes quest for illegal migration to poverty, unemployment (Sanusi, 2017).

Poverty as a Pull Factor of Migration of Nigerians

Majority of international migrants can benefit economically from their moves in two ways. Firstly, migration increases livelihood and employment opportunities, and secondly, it often increases their financial income (Afsar 2009; Dang 2005a; IOM and Bangladesh Bank 2009; Kwankye and Anarfi 2011; Mahmood 2011; Ranabahu 2004).

Migration increases household income and acts as insurance during unforeseen events. To this end, a range of literature is available on the economic impact of migration on migrant households and extended families, in both Asia and Africa. There is a general consensus that migrant remittances constitute a valuable input to family income (Oucho, 2019). For Nigeria, most remittances are used at micro levels for investment in businesses and human capital, family contributions, weddings, donations to charitable organizations, tithes in churches and festive celebrations (Darkwah and Verter, 2014).

Evidence shows that migration reduces poverty at the family level. Although it appears obvious that migration leads to an increase in family incomes, particularly those of internal and short-term contract international migrants, evidence linking reduction of poverty to migration at the family level is not always comparable. Adams and Page (2005), by reviewing data from 71 countries, established a broad correlation between international migration and poverty reduction, and estimated that a 10 per cent increase in official international remittances per capita would result in a 3.5 decrease in people living in poverty. This is because some migrants abroad often send money home to equip their families while non-receiving households continue to wallow in poverty (Odozi, Awoyemi, and Omonona, 2010; Dercon 2009).

Several studies have shown that income and expenditures are appropriate methods to use in addressing poverty and inequality issues (Odozi et al. 2010; Jhingan 2004; Grosh and Glewwe, 2000). Remittance is a form of income that has helped in reducing poverty in Nigeria (Odozi, Awoyemi, and Omonona, 2010). Nigerian migrants have been described a “populations moving to East,

West, and South Africa, as well as North America, constitute a vibrant Diaspora with strong ties across continent” (United States Agency for International Development 2007: 3). This implies that irrespective of Nigerian migrants distance from home, they remain closely connected to their friends and families back home. For example, Nigerians abroad particularly those in United States, Canada, and United Kingdom keep cordial relationships with their families and communities at home through different Diaspora groups (Oluwafemi and Ayandibu, 2014).

The recent publication of World Bank (2013) reveals Nigeria as the top-remittance receiving country in Africa [Fifth in the world following India (\$71 billion), China (\$60 billion) Philippines (\$26 billion) and Mexico (\$22 billion)] and this invariably reflects that more Nigerians live abroad. The World Bank reported that \$21 billion was remitted into the country in 2013 fiscal year and predicted future increment of remittances inflow into the country. Similarly, it is noteworthy that Nigerians abroad were recorded to have remitted US\$10 billion in 2010 which has put the country ahead of other African countries as the biggest recipient of remittances (World Bank 2011). Although the World Bank has predicted increase in remittances inflow into Nigeria, the country has no extant policy to regulate its use for national development apart from the usual consumption behaviour of remittances recipient households. It is imperative to mention that in spite of the position of Nigeria as top remittance recipient country in Africa and fifth in the world in 2013 financial year, the Central Bank of Nigeria is uncertain about the actual amount of money remitted to the country due to its lack of methods to measure informal/unofficial ways through which remittances enter the country. This suggests that remittances enter the country through informal ways and this could be make the official figures a less than accurate reflection of the reality as people prefer to send remittances home at low cost, mostly through friends that visiting their home country (Oluwafemi and Ayandibu, 2014).

Migration contributes to human capital formation. Ratha, Mohapatra, and Scheja (2011) highlighted that international migration contributes to the formation of human capital. Various studies showed that remittances from international migration are disproportionately spent on education and health, rather than on everyday consumption (Adams 2005; Adams et al. 2008; Nagarajan 2009; Ratha, Mohapatra and Scheja, 2011; Valero-Gil 2008; World Bank 2006a). Sanni (2007) suggests that remittances can be used to alleviate credit constraints and as a substitute for financial development’ in Nigeria. He is also of the view that remittances could encourage more consumption which invariably increases production and boosts per capita income. Odozi et al.

(2010) also suggests that remittances can aid development in Nigeria if adequate programmes are put in place.

Migrants contribute to community welfare. The left-behind community comprises an important part of self-identity of migrants both in Asia and Africa. A general understanding exists that migrants often contribute to the welfare of their communities of origin. Studies show that first-generation Diaspora members can play an important role in ensuring home community welfare through the provision of various services and donations to their educational, religious and socio-cultural institutions. While the second and third-generation offspring of migrants may not maintain very close connections with members of their immediate families, studies show that they do make attempts to connect with their roots through charity and philanthropy (Rusdiana and Saidi 2008; Sidel 2007). All major religions inspire charitable aid and donations. Muslims are supposed to annually share two and a half per cent of their assets and savings with the poor. Buddhism and Hinduism encourage donations as a method of purifying the mind. Christianity encourages church-based philanthropy. In addition to religious influences, some also donate because of a sense of civic duty or to give to those who are in need.

Migration contributes to rural economic development. A number of studies suggest that migrant remittances play a crucial role in rural economic development (Hugo 2002). Remittances can provide flows of capital into small farms in the peripheral rural areas (Ratha 2003)

Migrants contribute to the political development at origin. The political impact of the Diaspora has been demonstrated in the West African context. The European and North American Diasporas of Ghana were instrumental in the passing of the Representation of People's Amendment Law (ROPAL), which guides the presidential and parliamentary elections of the country. Both the government and the opposition generated substantial financial support through overseas branches of their respective political parties (Kwankye and Anarfi 2011). Migrants contribute to the political development at origin. The political impact of the diaspora has been demonstrated in the West African context. The European and North American Diasporas of Ghana were instrumental in the passing of the Representation of People's Amendment Law (ROPAL), which guides the presidential and parliamentary elections of the country. Both the government and the opposition generated substantial financial support through overseas branches of their respective political parties (Kwankye and Anarfi 2011). The Nigerian Diaspora groups

have been a force in the country's political development. We have witnessed the participation of the Diaspora elements in the political scene as pressure groups, political party support groups, members of various political parties in Diaspora, sponsors of party candidates of becoming candidates for election. They lend their voices to what is happening at the political arena to the extent that the Nigerian government has regarded them as partners in progress that should come home and invest. In fact, the Presidency has a portfolio for an adviser/special assistant on Diaspora matters.

Concluding Remarks

The study has made a bold attempt to establish the link between poverty and migration. The study identified the fact that poverty is both a push and pull factor in the migration of Nigerians. As a push factor the study observed that it was the condition of poverty-related insecurity in Nigeria that pushed many Nigerians to emigrate for survival through regular and irregular means and routes across the Nigerian shores in search of greener pastures, which serves as a pull factor. Subsequently, on getting to their host country, they do everything possible to ensure that they engage in income generating jobs and businesses, which they plough back as remittances to help alleviate the poverty at home. They do this by sending money and materials home for improving the welfare of the family members and contributing to the general welfare of their communities in terms of payment of school fees of indigent members, setting up income generating businesses and trades for the members, contributing to community development in terms of provision of water, erecting/rehabilitating school buildings, churches, community halls etc. The study delved into history of migration to portray that Nigerians migrated most during economic recession unlike in the early 1960s and 1970s when they travelled mostly on luxury to acquire knowledge and skill in order to come home and contribute in nation building. Having established the poverty-migration nexus, the study recommends that the government should put up sound policies that could lead to the revival of the economy so as to provide jobs as well as introduce viable economic empowerment schemes that could create income generating businesses. By such economic empowerment schemes, poverty will be reduced if not eliminated. Once this is achieved, the urge and act of our youths emigrating in droves will be drastically contained.

References

- Abrar, C.R. and Seeley, J. (2009) *Social Protection and Livelihoods: Marginalised Migrant Workers of India and Bangladesh*. Dhaka: University Press Limited.

- Adams, R.H. and Page, J. (2005). Do international Migration and Remittances Reduce Poverty in Developing Countries?', *World Development*, 33(10): 1645-1669.
- Adedapo, O. T. (2013). Migration and Nigeria Development (External and Internal), Available at https://www.academia.edu/3983941/MIGRATION_AND_NIGERIA_DEVELOPMENT_EXTERNAL_AND_INTERNAL(Accessed 24/04/19).
- Afsar, R. (2009) *Unravelling the Vicious Cycle of Recruitment: Labour Migration from Bangladesh to the Gulf States*. Geneva: ILO.
- Ar o m o l a r a n, A.B. (1 9 9 8). Ana l y s i s of Households Consumption Pattern of Animal Products in South Western Nigeria . In, *Animal Agriculture in West Africa : The S u s t a i n a b i l i t y Q u e s t i o n*. Pr o c . S i l v e r A n n . C o n f . N S A P a n d I n a u g . C o n f . W A S A P , A b e o k u t a , 2 1 - 2 6 M a r c h , 1 9 9 8 , p . 4 5 8 - 4 5 9 .
- Blanco, R.O. (2002). How We Define Poverty, *UN Chronicle*, 39(4).
- Bos ewe l l , C. a n d Cr i s p , J . (2 0 0 4) . P o v e r t y , I n t e r n a t i o n a l M i g r a t i o n a n d A s y l u m , p o l i c y B r i e f " No. 8 , U n i t e d N a t i o n s U n i v e r s i t y - W o r l d I n s t i t u t i o n f o r D e v e l o p m e n t E c o n o m i c R e s e a r c h .
- Chambers, R. (1983) *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Chambers, R. (1995). Poverty and livelihoods: Whose reality counts? *Environment and Urbanisation*, 7(1), 173-204.
- Dang, N.A. (2005a) Enhancing the Development Impact of Migrant Remittances and Diaspora: The Case of Vietnam. Regional Seminar on the Social Implications of International Migration, Bangkok.
- Darkwah, S.a. and Verter, N. (2014). Determinants of International Migration: The Nigerian Experience, *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et SilviculturevMandelinae Brunensis*, 62 (2): 321-327.
- Dasgupta, R. (1982). A cross-sectional analysis of poverty and undernutrition in rural India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 17(39),1575-1578.
- Dercon, S. (2009). Agriculture, Growth and Rural Poverty Reduction in Africa: Fallacies, Contexts and Priorities for Research. *AERC Working Paper*.
- Dik e, V. (2 0 0 2). P o v e r t y i n N i g e r i a , *The Daily Independent* (Op i n i o n

column), October 6, P. 15.

Docquier, F., Rapoport, H. and Shen I-L. (2010). Remittances and inequality: A Dynamic Migration Model', *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 8(2): 197-220.

Gänsler, K. (2018). Nigerian returnees face poverty and destitution back home, Available at <https://www.infomigrants.net/en/post/7345/nigerian-returnees-face-poverty-and-destitution-back-home> (Accessed 20/04/10).

Grant, S. (2005). International Migration and Human Rights. A paper prepared for the Policy Analysis and Research Programme of the Global Commission on International Migration.

Grosh M, Glewwe P (2000). *Consumption' in Designing Household Survey Questionnaires for Developing Countries: Lessons from 15 Years of the Living Standards Measurement Study*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Hugo, G. (2002). Effects of International Migration on the Family in Indonesia', *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 11(1): 13-46.

IOM and Bangladesh, B. (2009). *Nationwide Household Remittance Survey in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: IOM.

Iyenda, G. (2007). Researching rural poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Development in Practice*, 17(1), 27-38.

Jhingan M.L (2004). *Microeconomic Theory*. 5th Edition. Delhi: Vrinda Publications.

Koechlin, V. and Leon, G. (2007). International Remittances and Income Inequality: An Empirical Investigation, *Journal of Policy Review*, 10(2): 123-141.

Kwankye, S. and Anarfi, J. (2011). Migration Impacts within the West African Sub-region. Unpublished paper prepared for the Research Programme Consortium (RPC) on Migrating out of Poverty. Brighton: University of Sussex.

- Lee, E.S. (1968). A theory of Migration in Heer D.M.(ed) *Reading on Population*, PrenticeHall, New Jersey.
- Mahmood, R. (2011). *Cross Labour Mobility, Remittances and Economic Development in South Asia*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Mowafi, M., and Khawaja, M. (2005). Poverty. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 59(4), 260-264.
- Nagarajan, S. (2009). *Migration, Remittances, and Household Health: Evidence from South Africa*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Washington DC: George Washington University.
- Odozi, J.C, Awoyemi, T.T, Omonona, B.T. (2010). Household Poverty and Inequality: The Implication of Migrants' Remittances in Nigeria, *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, 13(2): 191-199.
- Oluwafemi, A. and Ayansola O. Ayandibu, A.O. (2014). Impact of Remittances on Development in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects, *J Sociology Soc Anth*, 5(3): 311-318 .
- Oucho, J. O. (2019).The Relationship between Migration and Poverty in Southern Africa, Available at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.453.536&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (Accessed 20/04/19).
- Gould, W.T.S., and R.M.Prothero (1975). Space and time in African population mobility. Pp. 39-49 in L.A.Kosinski and R.M.Prothero, eds., *People on the Move*. London: Methuen
- Ratha, D. (2003). Worker's Remittances: An Important and Stable Source of External Development Finance, in *Global Development Finance 2003*. Washington DC: World Bank, pp. 157-175.
- Ratha, D., Mohapatra, S. and Scheja. E. (2011). Impact of Migration on Economic and Social Development: A Review of Evidence and Emerging Issues. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Rusdiana, D. and Saidi, Z. (2008). *Diaspora Giving: An Agent of Change in Asia Pacific Communities? Indonesia*. San Francisco - Beijing: Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium.

- Sanni , H.T (2007). Remittances Inflow: A Potential Source of Economic Development in Nigeria. Nigeria: Central Bank of Nigeria. *Bullion*, 31(4): 18-35.
- Sanusi, L. (2017). Emir Sanusi Attributes Quest for Illegal migration to Poverty and Unemployment, Available at <http://dailypost.ng/2017/11/30/emir-sanusi-attributes-quest-illegal-migration-poverty-unemployment/> (Accessed 31/04/19).
- Sidel, M. (2007). *Vietnamese-American Diaspora Philanthropy to Vietnam*. Boston, MA: The Philanthropic Initiative and the Global Equity Initiative.
- Skalli, L. H. (2001). Women and Poverty in Morocco: The Many Faces on Social Exclusion. *Feminist Review*, 69:73-89.
- Todaro, M. P., and Smith, S. C. (2011). *Economic Development, 11th (Ed.)* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- UNDP Poverty Report (1998). *Overcoming Human Poverty*, New York: UNDP.
- USAID (2008). Nigeria Economic Performance Assessment. From<<http://www.nathaninc.com/>> (Retrieved on 5 April 2014).
- USAID (2007). Remittances, Competition and Fair Financial Access Opportunities in Nigeria. *United States Agency for International Development Report*.
- Valero-Gil, J. (2008). Remittances and the Household's Expenditure on Health. MPRA Paper, No. 9572, University Library of Munich, Germany.
- Widana parathirana , A.S. (1993). Poverty and Remittances in Lesotho, *Journal of African Economics* 2 (1) Pp . 49 -73 .
- World Bank (2013). Migration and Remittance Flows: Recent Trends and Outlook, 2013-2016. *Migration and Development Brief*, 21.
- World Bank (2011). *Migration and Remittances Factbook*. 2nd Edition. Washington D.C.: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/ the World Bank.
- World Bank (2006a) *Economic Implications of Remittances and Migration*. Washington DC: World Bank.

ZelinSky, W. (1971).The Hypothesis of the Transition Mobility, *Geographical Review*, 61 (2).