Sarcouncil Journal of Agriculture

ISSN(Online): 2945-3631

Volume- 04| Issue- 05| 2025

Research Article **Received:** 15-09-2025 | **Accepted:** 12-10-2025 | **Published:** 27-10-2025

Effects of Rural-Urban Migration on Nonfarm Income Generating Activities Among Farming Households

Abushe Omesiri Precious[1], Olabanji Oluwafemi Peter[2], and Nnabundo Linda[3]

[1]*Department of Agricultural Extension, Delta State University Abraka, Nigeria.*
[2] *Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, university of Ilorin, Nigeria.*
[3] *Department of Agriculture, Delta State Technical College Asaba, Nigeria*

Abstract: The study investigated the effects of rural–urban migration on nonfarm income-generating activities among farming households in Delta State, Nigeria. It focused on identifying the types and number of such activities before and after household members migrated, examining the causes of migration, and determining its overall effects. A multistage sampling technique was used to select 346 rural household heads, and data were gathered through questionnaires and interviews. Analysis involved frequency, percentages, mean, and chi-square tests. Findings revealed that prior to and after migration, respondents were largely engaged in petty trading (80.64%), transportation (73.98%), rental business (59.82%), and casual labor (58.96%). Major causes of migration included search for better job opportunities, access to education, poor social amenities, and underdevelopment. The effects of migration were evident in skill acquisition for nonfarm activities (mean = 3.12), remittance inflows (mean = 3.03), labor shortages (mean = 2.98), increased rural product demand from migrants (mean = 2.76), and human capital loss (mean = 2.66). Chi-square results confirmed a significant relationship in the types and number of nonfarm income activities before and after migration (p = 0.001, df = 16). The study recommended government, NGOs, and private sectors prioritize rural development, job creation, and skill acquisition centers to reduce rural-urban migration.

Keywords: Nonfarm income, Remittances, Rural–urban migration.

INTRODUCTION

The major driving force for rural growth and development is agriculture but unfortunately agricultural productivity in Nigeria is very low and the obvious impact is impoverishment of rural dwellers which is due to poor rural infrastructure which may constitute the major reason for rural-urban migration. Rural-urban migration is on the increase in Nigeria with consequences on agricultural production**.** As society as a whole undergoes a larger process of social transformation linked to capitalist modernization and growth, preferences alter and consumerist and materialistic aspirations tend to rise. (De Haas, 2021). However, the degree to which individuals believe their wants and desires may be satisfied locally determines the amount to which the changing preferences translate into migratory ambitions. However, greater accessibility to fresh concepts by media and education tends to change people ideas about the good life in such a way that increase their urge to travel and relocate from rural areas to cities and towns in order to pursue new opportunities. Capabilities approach to migration can be seen as not only an instrumental functional means-to-an-end to improve the living condition of people but also a potentially well-being enhancing factor in its own right. The implication of migration is bigger because it contributes to increasing the population size which leads to uttermost urban growth. The concept of migration can be seen as agent of urban growth, urbanization and social change in urban system. (Sjaastad's, 1962) human capital theory of migration conceptualizes the decision to relocate as an investment choice in which individuals weigh the long-term benefits and costs of movement. The expected returns encompass both economic and non-economic dimensions. While financial returns may involve higher wages or improved employment prospects, non-financial gains include intangible outcomes such as enhanced quality of life, psychological satisfaction, and personal fulfillment linked to regional or cultural preferences. In parallel, the costs of migration extend beyond direct monetary expenditures (such as transport, housing, and job search expenses) to include non-monetary elements such as social dislocation, the loss of community ties, and the psychological burden of adaptation to a new environment.

All dimensions of the urban system are affected by migration because is a human behaviour that interacts directly with the urban environment and activities within MohdFadzil, (2018). asserts that migrations are sparked by the interaction of "Push and Pull" variables at the origin and destination locations. Political terror, a lack of food supply, unemployment, armed conflict, and an unsatisfactory standard of living are some of the factors that lead people to migrate. The motives behind migration and the choice of destination have become increasingly complex; therefore, the patterns, forms, characteristics, and trajectories

***Corresponding Author:** Abushe Omesiri Precious

DOI- https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17455384

differ across time, locations, and individuals Jansen, (2017).

In consideration of national economy, enhancing the development of rural sector that are important to socio-economic development faces the problem of underdevelopment. The absence of comprehensive and conclusive implementation of rural development policies in Nigeria brings about the problem of high rate of migration which could have an effect on nonfarm income generating activities Ajadi (2010). Hence there is a need to examine the effects of rural-urban migration on nonfarm income generating activities among farming household. With specific focus to identify the type and number of nonfarm incomes generating activities before and after migration of household members, ascertain the causes of rural-urban migration, and determine the effect of rural-urban migration on nonfarm income generating activities. Hypothesis to be tested as there is no significant relationship in the type and number of nonfarm incomes generating activities before and after migration of household members.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was carried out in Delta state, Nigeria in November 2024. The state is located in the southern region of Nigeria between longitude $5^0.00^0$and $6^0.45^0$East and latitude $500^0$and 6^030^0 North covering a land area of 16,986km^2 with a projected population figure of 5,636,100 in 2022 (NBS, 2023). Delta state is located in the mangrove swamp and rain forest, and fresh water forest in the south and central agricultural zones respectively. The north agricultural zone is under derived savannah vegetation cover. It consists of twenty-five Local Government Areas, demarcated into three agricultural zones which include Delta North, Delta South and Delta Central agricultural zones. Having a wide range of fertile soil that is suitable for farming activities such as arable farming, livestock farming, perennial crop farming and fish farming (NIPC, 2021).

The population for the study comprises rural household heads in Delta state. A multi stage sampling procedure was employed in the selection of the respondents. The first stage involves a purposive selection of all the agricultural zones in the states because agricultural activities take place in all the zones in the state. The second stage involves a proportionate random sampling of twenty percent (20%) of local government areas in the State. The third stage involves a proportionate random sampling of twenty percent (20%) of rural communities from selected local government areas. The fourth stage involves using a preliminary survey to identify rural household heads in each sampled community in the state giving a total of 3,463 rural household heads. A proportionate sampling of ten percent (10%) of rural household heads identified were randomly selected giving a total sample size of 346 rural household heads sampled for this study. primary data were obtained by the use of structured questionnaire which were administered with the help of trained enumerators that were chosen from among agricultural science teachers within or close to the selected communities. The instrument for data collection was subjected to face and content validity by experts in the Department of Agricultural Extension, Delta state university, Abraka. Reliability of the instrument was done by the use of test-retest method. One percent (1%) of the anticipated population make up 6.6% used at two weeks interval. An r value of 0.89 showed that the instrument was reliable.

The study concentrated on variables such as type and number of nonfarm incomes generating activities before and after migration of household's members, causes of rural-urban migration, and effect of rural-urban migration on nonfarm income generating activities. The variables were measured specifically as follows: Types and number of non-farm income generating activities before and after migration of household members were measured by asking respondents to indicate the types of nonfarm income generating activities they were involved, Effects of rural-urban migration on nonfarm income was measured on a 4-point likert type scale of strongly agree (4), agree (3), disagree (2), strongly disagree (1).where 4 is weighted as 10, 3 is 7.5, 2 is 5, 1is 2.5 the total of these weight (10) divided 4 which gives a cutoff point of 2.5 thus any mean equal to or above 2.5 is regarded as having effect, while mean score less than 2.5 has no effect, causes of rural urban migration was measured with percentage by asking respondents to indicate the cause of migration, thus any causes ranging from 50% and above is regarded as major causes of migration, while below 50 % is regarded as a minor cause of migration. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percentages and means derived from a

Publisher: SARC Publisher

4-point likert type scale. The hypothesis was tested with chi square using SPSS version 2023 software.

Table 1: Selection of Respondents in the Study Area

Agricultural zone	Local Government Area (20%)	Communities	Number of Rural household heads	10% of household head
Delta North	Nndokwa East	Isumpe	264	26
		Utagbe-Uno	248	25
		Emu Ebendo	204	21
	Ukwani	Umutu	261	26
		Eziokpor-uno	276	28
		Ezionum	273	27
Delta Central	Okpe	Elume	294	29
		Okuoke	210	21
		Igbimidaka	199	20
	Ethiope East	Okpara-inland	213	21
		Kokori	220	22
		Okurekpo	193	19
Delta South	Isoko North	Otibio	201	20
		Emevor	203	20
		Ofagbe	204	21
Subtotal			3463	346

RESULTS

Types and number of nonfarm of nonfarm income generating activities

The result in table 2 indicates that 65.48% of respondents engaged in casual labor before migration of household member, while 61.02% continued this work afterward. Petty trading saw an increase, with 50.46% involved before migration and 74.53% afterward. Similarly, 50.77% participated in the transportation business prior to migration, rising to 67.39% after migration of household members. In contrast, involvement in tailoring decreased from 43.01% before migration to 29.50% afterward. Engagement in point-of-sale (P.O.S.) services grew from 24.30% before migration to 30.75% after. Participation in haircutting declined from 33.54% pre-migration to 23.29% post-migration. Hair plaiting slightly decreased from 39.59% to 37.42%. Additionally, 24.22% of rural households were involved in money lending before migration, increasing to 30.75% after. The percentage of those engaged in the production and sale of crafts also rose, from 25.78% before migration to 30.12% afterward. About 59.82% were into rentals business after migration.

Table2: Types & Numbers of Non-Farm income Generating Activities before and after Migration of Household Members

Nonfarm income activities	before migration percentage (n=346)	After migration Percentage (n=346)
POS business	24.28	31.79
Hair cutting	35.26	22.05
Tailoring	38.15	28.03
Hair plaiting	37.86	39.02
Transportation business	51.73	73.98
Money lending	28.32	29.19
Petty trading	44.22	80.64
Production and sales of craft	36.99	29.48
Casual labor	59.54	58.96

Publisher: SARC Publisher

Rentals business		59.82

Source: field survey 2024.

Causes of Rural Urban Migration

The result (table 3) revealed that the causes of rural-urban migration in Delta State were search for better Job opportunities (76.88%), educational opportunities (72.54%), under-development (57.51%), poor social amenities (68.79%), inadequate skills acquisition center (36.70%) and poor health care facilities (4.62%.

Table 3: Response to Causes of Rural Urban Migration

Causes of migration	Percentage (N=346)	Remark
Search for better job opportunities	76.88	Major cause
Under development	57.51	Major cause
Search for education opportunities	72.54	Major cause
Poor social amenities	68.79	Major cause
Inadequate skills acquisition center	36.70%	Minor cause
Poor health care facilities	4.62%	Minor cause

Source: field survey 2024. %≥ 50 = major cause, %< 50 = minor cause of migration

Effects of rural-urban migration on nonfarm income generating activities

the result (table 4) reveals that respondents agreed that new skills and knowledge applied to nonfarm activities are acquired (mean = 3.12), migrants household members send back remittance (mean = 3.03), labour shortage (mean = 2.98), demand for products from rural areas by urban migrants stimulates nonfarm income generating activities (mean = 2.76), loss of human capital needed for nonfarm income generating activities (mean = 2.66) and reduction in local investment (mean = 2.02).

Table 4: Mean response on the effects of rural-urban migration on nonfarm income

Statements	Standard deviation	Mean	Rank	Remark
New skills and knowledge applied to nonfarm activities are acquired	0.11	3.12	1st	Effect
Migrants' household members send back remittance	0.10	3.03	2nd	Effect
There is Labour shortage for nonfarm business	0.22	2.98	3rd	Effect
Demands for products from rural areas by urban migrants stimulates nonfarm income generating activities	0.26	2.78	4th	Effect
Loss of human capital needed for nonfarm income generating activities	0.34	2.66	5th	Effect
Reduction in local investment	1.45	2.02	6th	No effect

Source: Field survey, 2024 Cut off = 2.50 (>or =2.50 = effects, < 2.50 = no effects)

Estimation of the Relationship in the Type and Numbers of Non-Farm Income Generating Activities in Delta State

The result (table 5) shows the chi square correlation result revealed that there was a significant relationship in the number and types of nonfarm income generating activities before migration of household members (p = 0.001, df=16, X^2 = 158.083), also, X^2 = 352.843, df= 16, p = 0.001 shows that a significant association occurred in the number and types of nonfarm income generating activities after migration of household members.

Table 5: Relationship Between the Types and Number of Non-Farm Income Generating Activities before and after migration of household members in Delta State

Variable	Income Generating Activities Before Migration	Income Generation After Migration
Chi-Square	158.083[a]	352.843[b]
Df	16	16

Publisher: SARC Publisher

Asymp sig	0.001	0.001

Table 5b: Contingency table showing the relationship in types and number of nonfarm Income generating activities.

Nfiga	Pos	Hc	Tl	Hp	Tb	Ml	Pt	P/Sc	C/L	Total
Before	Raw:84 Row%: 6.5 Col%= 43.9	Raw :122 Row%: 9.4 Col%: 61.3	Raw:132 Row%: 10.2 Col%= 57.6	Raw:131 Row%: 10.1 Col%:49.3	Raw:179 Row%: 13.9 Col%:41.2	Raw:98 Row%: 7.6 Col%: 49.3	Raw :153 Row%: 11.8 Col%:35.4	Raw:128 Row%: 9.9 Col%: 55.7	Raw:266 Row%:20.66 Col%:56.6	1293 Row%: 100
After	Raw:107 Row%: 7.9 Col%:56	Raw:77 Row%: 5.7 Col%: 38.7	Raw:97 Row%: 7.1 Col%:42.4	Raw:135 Row%: 9.9 Col%:50.7	Raw:256 Row%: 18.9 Col%:58.8	Raw:101 Row%: 7.4 Col:50.7	Raw:279 Row%: 20.6 Col%:64.6	Raw:102 Row:7.5 Col%: 44.3	Raw:204 Row%:15 Col%:43.4	Raw:1358 Row%: 100
Total	Raw:191 Col%:100	Raw:199 Col%: 100	Raw:229 Col%:100	Raw:266 Col%:100	Raw:435 Col%:100	Raw:199 Col%: 100	Raw:432 Col%:100	Raw:230 Col%: 100	Raw:470 Col%:100	Rwa:2651 Col%:100

Note: Nfiga: Nonfarm income generating activities, Pos: point of sale business, Hc: haircutting, Tl: tailoring, HP: hair plaiting, Tb: transportation business, Ml: money lending, Pt: petty trading, P/Sc: production and sales of crafts, Cl: casual labour.

DISCUSSION

The types and number of nonfarm incomes generating activities revealed that Petty trading, transportation business, Rentals business, money lending saw an increase after migration. This indicates that most household were more involved in petty trading and transportation business after migration of household members. This could imply that since the household had shortage of labor force due to migrant household members they tend to sought for other means of income through petty trading and transportation business. This is in agreement with (Ibekwe *et al.,* 2013), who found that the reasons for diversification to non-farm activities include decline in farm incomes and the desire to insure against agricultural production risks. Most of the household in rural areas engage in non-farm activities in order to enhance their economic base. (Nishad & Tangila, 2015). this finding also agrees with (Elsie, *et al.*, 2023) who reported a decline in household agricultural labour source as an effect of migration. The result revealed that there was a decline in tailoring business, haircutting, hair plaiting, this imply that haircutting, hair plaiting and tailoring business were affected by rural-urban migration which could be attributed to the fact that most youth were the ones involve in this business and they are the ones likely to migrate, hence the absence of this youth will therefore have an effect in the business thus, rural-urban migration had a negative effect on haircutting, hair platting and tailoring business respectively . This agrees with (Abushe, *et al.*, 2023) who found that youth are the ones who migrates more to the city for either the purpose of getting a white-collar job or for the purpose of education or skill acquisition. This result also implied that more rural household became more involved in money lending business after migration of some members of their household. This business could have risen from the money remitted to them by members of migrant household this is in line with (Ofuoku, 2018) who reported that rural households ply remittance into other business rather than farming business. The additional income generated from non-form income activities can also be used to invest in farm activities (Nmeregini, *et al.,* 2019) who carried out

Publisher: SARC Publisher

a study on non-farm income generating activities of rural households in Abia State Nigeria.

The chi square result showed that there was a significant relationship between types and number of nonfarm incomes generating activities before and after migration of household's members. This implies that rural household tends to diversify their resources into various nonfarm activities, in other to cushion off season farm effects and this non-farm income generating activities such as rental business, tailoring, hair cutting, hair plaiting and pos business were affected by rural-urban migration. Farmers in the rural areas usually engaged in different nonfarm income generating activities to balance the shortfall of income due to the seasonality of primary agricultural production and create a continuous flow of income to cater for needs of various households. household are sometimes pushed into off farm sectors due to lack of opportunities but off farm activities contributes to households' income. off farm activities are supplementary or complimentary activities that farmers engaged in either in off season or on season to support themselves such as casual labor, transportation business, traditional dancing, wine tapping and petty trading (Ovwigho, 2014).

On causes of rural-urban migration, it was found that the major causes of rural-urban migration in Delta State were search for better Job opportunities, educational opportunities, under-development and poor social amenities. Also, the study recorded inadequate skills acquisition center and poor health care facilities as a minor cause of migration. The implication is that these factors are push factors to migration in rural areas this agrees with (Elsie, *et al.*, 2023) who found that the causes of rural-urban migration were education, poor social amenities, white-colar job and skill acquisition in kuje district council of Abuja Nigeria. These findings is also in agreement with todaro, (1976) model that states that migration flows from places where expected income is low to places where they are high According to Stoufters theory of Mobility, the number of migrants from a point of origin to a point of destination is directly proportional to the number of opportunities at that point in time, and inversely proportional to the number of opportunities that exist between the two points Stouffter (1940). . The absence of good schools in the rural area serves as a push factor for migration. This finding agrees with Lawal and Okeowo, (2014) who stated that people with higher education in the rural areas tends to leave the rural area to find a job that is commensurate to their skills in urban centers. it also implies that an individual who is living in an area that is underdeveloped without adequate social amenities has the tendency to migrate. This is in agreement with Raveinstein model (1887) cited by Ango (2014) that states that people move from areas of fewer opportunities to areas of perceived opportunities This finding also agrees with Alarima (2013), who carried out a study on the factors influencing rural-urban migration of youths in Osun State, Nigeria and found that the major causes of youth migration were poor electricity supply in rural areas, bad conditions of roads, and absence of pipe borne water, better employment opportunities and superior wages in the urban areas. Thus, if these major causes are addressed there will be reduction in rural-urban migration. Also (FAO, 2024), reported some of the root causes of rural-urban migration to be lack of employment and income generating opportunities, poor health care conditions and service technologies. (Danejo, *et al.*, 2015), also found that youth migrated from rural areas to urban centers due to lack of social amenities and employment in their original place of residence, also for educational pursuit and to have themselves engaged in one form of business.

On effects of rural-urban migration on nonfarm income generating activities it was found that rural-urban migration had effect on acquisition of skills and knowledge required for carrying out nonfarm income generating activities, labour shortage, demand for produce from rural areas migrant's household members send back remittances, and Loss of human capital needed for nonfarm income generating activities, This implies that family members who migrates comes back to share knowledge and skills they have acquired from the urban centers with folks at home to improve the nonfarm income generating activities thus, remittances can in be both financial and nonfinancial benefits. this agrees with (Sjaastad's, 1962) migration theory, the choice to move is regarded as an investment decision that weighs anticipated costs against expected benefits over time. The benefits include both financial and non-financial returns, with the latter encompassing factors such as psychological gains linked to regional preferences. Similarly, the costs involved

Publisher: SARC Publisher

may be monetary or non-monetary in nature. This also agrees with (Haymanot, *et al.,* 2022) who reported that Migrants send part of their earnings back home to support their families for various reasons. These remittances help ease resource limitations and enhance productivity. This finding on labour shortage agrees with Ofuoku and Aganagana,(2018) who reported that rural-urban migration brought about labor shortage in almost every farm rural household in Delta North Agricultural zone of Delta State, but in contrast with the Lewis model of development, which describes an underdeveloped economy as consisting of two sectors: a traditional, overpopulated rural subsistence sector with zero marginal productivity of labor, and a modern, high-productivity urban industrial sector. In this model, labor is gradually shifted from the subsistence sector to the industrial sector. The model assumes the existence of surplus labor, meaning workers can be moved out of rural area without reducing overall output. demand for products from rural areas by urban migrants stimulating nonfarm income generating activities, contrast with Mendola (2008) cited by Ofuoku (2018) found that domestic migration including temporary and permanent migration had a negative effect on investment and productivity. This finding is also in agreement with Haymanot et al (2022), Rural-urban migration leads to a depletion of human capital in rural communities.

CONCLUSION

The study established that rural-urban migration had both positive and negative effects on rural house hold nonfarm income generating activities and the major causes of migration included search for better job opportunities, access to education, poor social amenities, and underdevelopment. It is therefore recommended that Government, non-government organization, private sector owners should put in effort to reduce the causes of rural-urban migration by creating more job opportunities, skills acquisition center and provision of basic social amenities in the rural areas.

REFERENCES

1. Abushe, O. P., Odjebor, U., Ebewore S.O. & Ofuoku A.U. “Effects of rural-urban migration on labor availability for arable crop production among rural households in Edo state, Nigeria.” *Journal-innovations.com,* 72.5 (2023): 1043-1054
2. Ajadi, B. "Poverty situation in Nigeria: An overview of rural development institutions." *Pakistan Journal of Sciences* 7.5 (2010): 351-356.
3. Alarima, C. I. "Factors influencing rural-urban migration of youths in Osun State, Nigeria." *Agro-Science* 17.3 (2018): 34-39.
4. Aromolaran, A. K. "Assessment of benefits associated with rural-urban migration among non-migrants in Odeda Area, Ogun State, Nigeria." *International Journal of Pure & Applied Sciences & Technology* 14.2 (2013).
5. De Haas, H. "A theory of migration: the aspirations-capabilities framework." *Comparative migration studies* 9.1 (2021): 8.
6. Danejo, B. U., Abubakar, L. U., Haruna, M. A., Usman, R. A., & Bawuro, B. M. "Socio-economic factors influencing rural-urban migration in Wukari Local Government Area of Taraba state, Nigeria." *ARPN Journal of Science and Technology* 5.4 (2015): 201-206.
7. Ehirim, N.C, Onyenka, R.U, Chdiebere, N. M & Nnabuihe, V.C. “Effects and prospect of rural-urban migration on the poverty status of migrants in Abia State Nigeria.” *Agricultural Science Research Journal*. 2.4 (2022): 147-159
8. Dokubo, E. M., Sennuga, S. O., Omolayo, A. F., Bankole, O. L., & Barnabas, T. M. "Effect of rural-urban migration among the youths and its impacts on agricultural development in Kuje area council, Abuja, Nigeria." *Science and Technology* 4.2 (2023): 12-27.
9. FAO, “Rural Africa in Motion: dynamics and drivers of migration, south of the Sahara. Haymanot B, Bizuayehu, Birhanu B, & Teshome S. Rural-urban labor migration, remittances and its effect on agricultural production in migrant sending households: evidence from rural areas of East Gojjam zone, ethiopia. journal of Advances in Agriculture.” (2022): 1-8 (2024).
10. Ibekwe,U.*C*,Eze,C.C, Ohajianya, D.O,Orebiyi,J.S,Onyemauwa,C.S & Korie,O.C , “Determinantss of nonfarm income among farm households in south east Nigeria.”.*Researcher*, 2.7 (2013): 49-52
11. Jansen, K. “Patterns and drivers of rural–urban migration in sub-Saharan Africa: Migration

Publisher: SARC Publisher

from the rural areas to the cities in sub-Saharan Africa is a major contemporary social and economic phenomenon. African Studies.”76.2(2017): 243-261
12. Lawal, A. S., & Okeowo, T. A. "Effects of rural urban migration on labour supply in cocoa production in Ondo East local government area of Ondo State." *International letters of Natural sciences* 13.1 (2014): 1-11.
13. Rashid, M. F. A. "Metropolitan Kuala Lumpur as a populous migration destination in Malaysia." *Migration and Development* 8.2 (2019): 227-242.
14. Mendola, M. "Migration and technological change in rural households: Complements or substitutes?." *Journal of Development Economics* 85.1-2 (2008): 150-175.
15. Nigeria Investment Promotion commission (NIPC), *Nigeria States: Delta State Retrieved 13th December,* (2021).
16. Nasrin, N., & Wahid, T. "Contribution of rural non-farm activities in household income generation: A Study on Khulna Region." *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science* 20 (2015): 01-12.
17. Nmeregini, D. C., Nzeakor, F. C., & Ekweanya, N. M. "Non-farm income generating activities of rural households in Abia State, Nigeria." *Journal of Agricultural Extension* 23.4 (2019): 48-57.
18. Ofuoku, A.U, “Effects of rural-urban migration remittances on arable crop production in Delta State Nigeria.” *Journal of agricultural sciences* 60.1. (2018): 49-54
19. Ovwigho, B. O. "Factors influencing involvement in nonfarm income generating activities among local farmers: The Case of Ughelli South Local Government Area of Delta State, Nigeria." *Sustainable Agriculture Research* 3.1 (2014).
20. Ravenstein, E. G. "The laws of migration. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society." (1885): 167-227.
21. Sjaastad, L. A. "The costs and returns of human migration." *Journal of political Economy* 70.5, Part 2 (1962): 80-93.
22. Stouffer, S. A. "Intervening opportunities: a theory relating mobility and distance." *American sociological review* 5.6 (1940): 845-867.
23. Todaro, M. P. "Migration and economic development: a review of theory, evidence, methodology and research priorities." (1976).

Source of support: Nil; **Conflict of interest:** Nil.

Cite this article as:

Precious, A. O., Peter, O. O. and Linda, N. " Effects of Rural-Urban Migration on Nonfarm Income Generating Activities Among Farming Households."*Sarcouncil Journal of Agriculture* 4.5 (2025): pp 1-8.

Publisher: SARC Publisher