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Abstract
This study examined Management of Rural-Urban Migration and Economic Development in Nigeria: The case of Anambra State. Relevant data were elicited from both the primary and secondary sources. Questionnaire was the main instrument for data collection. Three hundred and ninety-nine (399) copies of questionnaire were administered to the respondents of the three local government areas studied. Subsequently, data were analyzed with simple percentage, and presented in frequency tables for easy comprehension. The hypotheses were also tested using chi-square parametric test ($\chi^2$). The study revealed among other things that: The housing estate are mostly owned by individuals or private companies and are very expensive; the transformers provided are not commensurate with the population increase; the state lacks available lands for agriculture as most of the lands are affected by erosion, floods and landslides. The researchers recommended among others that: Government should be in partnership with the people and companies to reduce accommodation problems, government should ensure that materials used for transformers are adequate while making sure that the agricultural extension programmes are well financed in real terms as this will help manage the problems of rural-urban migration and bring about development.
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Introduction

The burden of rural-urban migration in Anambra State is multifaceted. For instance, in examining the management of rural-urban migration and its effect on economic development, has it result to increase in population in the urban areas while the rural areas lack development or at the extreme its explosion. Various other effects are expected to be considered.

Population explosion activates the housing challenges both at micro (family) and macro (society) levels. Congestion in households and communities has implications for both the health and psychology of victims. Nigerian cities such as Lagos, Port-Harcourt, Kano, and Onitsha among others are characterized by human traffic, vehicular congestions, environmental pollution, consistent in-migration and spurious expansion of territories to accommodate human additions.

Nigeria is a Country with over 150,000,000 million people (NPC, 2006). Nigeria is also the giant of Africa. Most international organizations and foreign investors find a good market in Nigeria. The oil-boom in the 1970s has deeply affected the economic development of the country and continues to do so as government focuses on oil sector and neglects the agricultural sector which was the prime of the economy and economic development before the oil-boom. Government insensitivity to the plight of the rural communities whose major source of livelihood is agriculture has led to migration of the rural dwellers to urban cities to avail themselves of improved living standard.

Nigeria, at independence in 1960, was largely a producer and net exporter of primary products. The six major agricultural products then were cocoa, rubber, palm oil, groundnut, cotton and palm kernel (Idode, 1989). Although there existed mining and quarrying activities, these were of negligible percentage and never accounted for the economy as a whole (Olaloku, 1979). In other words, agricultural produce and raw materials constituted the main income for the country. Specifically, the Nigerian state as an exporter of agricultural goods had 69.4% of its total GDP for the year 1963/64 comprising the six aforementioned agricultural commodities (Olaloku, 1979:8).

Rural-Urban migration has led to uneven development of the country. The urban areas are over-populated while the rural areas are densely-populated, as young men and women leave the rural areas due to lack of infrastructures, social amenities, employment and economic development of the rural areas. According to Nyagba (2009), rural communities are the most important sectors of the Nigerian economy. There are several reasons to support this position.
Rural-urban migration has affected food production in the state. Most of the basic food stuffs are imported from the northern part of the country even though we have a better climate condition in the eastern region. The inadequate infrastructure and social amenities has also hampered development as most of the programmes and projects are located in the urban areas while the rural people do not benefit from the project. In Nigeria most of the developmental plans are in favour of the urban areas. Business and commercial activities are successful where the market is. The rural areas do not have that market and factors of production are inadequate for economic development in Anambra state.

Statement Of The Problem

Over the years, there have been frequent outcries of increased rural-urban migration and the attendant adverse consequences. Rural-urban migration has affected both the rural areas and urban areas negatively. It has been observed that the great pressure on economic infrastructure and accommodation facilities in terms of residential and office apartment has led to high cost of rent in the urban areas.

The migrants are in the urban area for various reasons, either for education or business. Whichever vocation they seek, they are faced with competition. This has led to frustration and psychological problems due to non-accomplishment of goals and objectives of migrating to the urban area. The state government has set up agencies and put in place programmes to address this issue. Most of the agencies responsible for management of the rural-urban migration are cited in the urban centers. Such as Agricultural Development Programme (ADP), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Ministry of Rural Development among others. They seem to forget the reason behind their establishment; likewise the personnel recruited into these agencies seem to be unwilling to enter the field to gather information that will assist them in execute these projects in the rural areas.

The state government while implementing the programmes engages in politics, as they swerve resources for economic development to inconsequential areas, while neglecting other areas like the agricultural sector. Less focus on agricultural sector brings about food scarcity and low agricultural produce for the teeming population. The fall in food production results to food insecurity and importation. The lands that were supposed to be used for agriculture or mechanized farming have been used to build hotels, accommodations, industries and mansions.

Furthermore, as attention is being directed to the urban area, major projects and programmes that ought to be directed to the rural areas are diverted to the urban area. Yet these facilities in the urban areas are not properly maintained by some of these agencies. The primary beneficiaries do
not gain or participate in such projects. Hence the rural dwellers languish in abject poverty, low life expectancy, unemployment, lack of social amenities, poor power generation and basic infrastructures which hamper economic development.

Against this backdrop, the questions that agitate the mind of the researchers are;

(i) To what extent has housing scheme helped in tackling the challenges of rural-urban migration in Anambra State?
(ii) What effort has been made by the power sector towards containing the pressure of rural-urban migration?
(iii) To what extent has the agricultural extension programme reduced rural-urban migration in Anambra State?
(iv) What are the impediments to the effective implementation of rural development programmes?
(v) How has the management of rural-urban migration affected the economic development of Anambra state?

Objectives Of The Study

- Examine the efforts made by the power sector towards containing the pressure of rural-urban migration on the economic development of Anambra state.
- Investigate if the agricultural extension programme has reduced rural-urban migration in Anambra state.
- Identify the factors that impede on the effective implementation of policy measures put in place to reduce rural-urban migration.
- Examine the effect of economic development on management of rural-urban migration in Anambra state?

Literature Review

Impact of Rural-Urban Migration on Economic Development

According to Oderth (2002) migration has shaped the nature of both receiving and places of origin more than any other phenomenon in human geography. The existence of an intricate relationship between immigration and development is also captured by Hammer et al. (2002), who claim that migration can have a decisive impact on the direction and speed of development on both origin and destination.

The existing research on the impact of rural-urban migration on development in Nigeria is also limited and inconclusive. Fadayomi (1998) reveals that internal migration has a negative impact on the quality of rural life because it reduces the number of individuals in rural areas. Migration of young adults from the rural areas places general persistence of rural-urban and rural–rural migration types.
On the other hand, studies by Ijere (1994) reveal that rural–urban migration has a positive impact on urban growth and social development, which makes generation of employment opportunities and provision of educational facilities and transportation infrastructure for the migrants possible. Until recently, researchers have not paid much attention to the management of rural–urban drift. Ekpenyong (1992) attributes rural-urban migration in West Africa to the limited economic development policy which started during the colonial era. The colonial government had an urban biased development policy. The towns where they lived consequently had social amenities and economic infrastructure while the rural areas had the following negative effects; malnutrition, insufficient housing, inadequate water supply, bad roads and poor health facilities. Likewise, Ekpenyong (1997) in his study on rural-urban migration presents a form of inequalities between the areas. “Rural-urban imbalance was not created by oil boom of the 1970’s but worsened by it because of the bias in development planning”. As the policy continued, oil or fuel replaced agriculture as the major source of revenue for the country. All the major benefits of economic development process went to the cities or urban areas. In contrasts, the villagers from where the oil is extracted suffer neglect and oil pollutions which destroy their lands (a case of Niger-Delta). It should be acknowledged that until sustainable rural development is attained there can be no claim of national economic development.

Ewimn (2010) opined that the comfort and socio-economic well-being of the rural dweller underscores the reason for rural development. It has the potentials to bring about improved access to resources, employment creation, construction and maintenance of roads, rural electrification, water supply, improved education and health care services that can improve the life of the people. According to Ogidefa (2010), overwhelming majorities of the rural dwellers are poor, illiterate, or semi literate and engage in petty trade and subsistence agriculture, providing for both the rural and urban areas. Umebali and Akunbibilo (2006) supported this claim when they stated that oil exploration and agricultural activities are carried out in the rural area and both yield revenue for the nation.

While Singh (2010) posits that rural development has always been an important issue in all discussions pertaining economic development, however, the situation in major cities like Lagos, the most affected city in terms of unplanned growth, around 85% of the country’s industrial activity is located in Lagos and it is one of the fastest growing cities in the world. Its annual growth rate was estimated at almost 14% during the 1970s and its current population is estimated to be 15million (Census, 2006). Projections suggest that by 2020 it will be the third biggest in the world (USAID, 2002). Rural-urban migration has a significant impact on unemployment levels of
the destination cities. Between 1998 and 1999, urban unemployment rose from 5.5% to 6.5%, a rate higher than the national unemployment which increased from 3.9% to 4.7% during the same period (USAID, 2002). Unplanned population increases in most cities explain infrastructural decay in relevant contexts.

According to Okafor (2005), this is especially the case in Nigeria where maintenance of existing amenities, which ab-initio are haphazardly situated due to unprecedented corruption and biased award of contracts, is not prioritized. It is interesting to note that most roads in the rural area are impassable, hospitals lack human and necessary material resource, schools are dilapidated and electricity supply is very far from stable – in most rural communities though, none of these infrastructures exists. As Nwokocha puts it:

*The people’s agony is visible in frustrations arising from avoidable diseases and deaths, lack of access to portable water, subsistent economic activities, various kinds of unemployment, child abuse in all its ramifications and dwindling focus on societal norms and values (Nwokocha, 2007).*

Rural communities share this burden through loss of manpower necessary for agricultural activities and production. The impoverishment of rural areas in Anambra state is partly explainable by out-migration of able youths in search of employment in cities. Consequently, agriculture which prior to discovery of oil was the mainstay of Nigeria’s economy was far relegated to the background leading to the country’s mono-economy status. Overdependence on oil, it is argued here, has led to employment crisis and avoidable importation of agricultural products, which together have over the years had negative net effect on local industries and productions as well as international trade balances.

According to Iwayemi,( 2006) several analyses of Nigeria’s economy insist that petroleum resources have been more of a curse rather than a blessing to the development of the country. It is imperative to note that some migrants in the category discussed in the research work overcame their locality-imposed powerlessness in new destinations, while a large majority of others became more impoverished to the point of becoming social misfits otherwise known as “area boys and girls”. Another burden imposed by rural to urban migration is the increasing number of cohabitation and consensual unions that results among the married and the not yet married. Although it could be argued in some quarters that such union, especially when it involves people from different ethnic backgrounds, could have positive implications for the country’s unity at macro level, the negative consequences on existing marriages and family unity at the micro are enormous. The above issues constitute the burden and in some cases of rural-urban migration in Anambra.
state for which organized critical thinking and context specific intervention strategies are essential.

**Problems of Rural- Urban Migration on Development**

The process of growth and development which West African countries have experienced in the colonial and post-colonial periods has been characterized by the process of areal differentiation (Riddell 1980). In a spatial sense, employment opportunities and developmental changes have been concentrated in a few areas, especially the cities; the rural areas, which dominate both in terms of population numbers and areal extent, have either undergone little growth or have felt the backwash effects of development elsewhere (Hirschman, 1958; Myrdal, 1957).

A number of other motivations for rural-urban migration including educational opportunities offered in urban areas, marriage and joining the family already at the destination are cited in the literature. Also, a few studies suggest that rural-urban migration is facilitated by the concentration of migrants of same origin in the destination city (Mora & Taylor, 2005). According to Banerjee, (1984) migrants often have a difficult time finding jobs in cities as they are more likely to have only imperfect information about the type or quality of job opportunities they face. To find a job, they usually go through friends, family and other informal networks (Banerjee and Bruce, 1995).

In addition, Yamauchi and Tanabe (2003) argue that finding a job is often facilitated if there is a large network of people from the same origin as the migrant at the destination but this could also reduce the probability of finding a job if these migrants have to compete for the same jobs. It is also important to understand how rural-urban migration evolves over the development process but the available research is limited and inconclusive.

The UN (1980) estimates a significant positive relationship between rural-urban out migration rates and the standard of living of citizens. Migration of young adults from the rural areas places a greater burden on the remaining farmers as they now have to work harder and longer to cover the same area of land thus depriving them of some of their leisure time. On the other hand, Ijere (1994) reveals that rural-urban migration has a positive impact on urban growth and social development and this helps generate employment, educational facilities and transportation infrastructure for the migrants. However, this argument is questionable when one considers the fact that it has been shown that urban areas in Nigeria are plagued with social problems, unemployment, poverty and deficit of infrastructure.
Measures and Strategies in Management of Rural-Urban Migration

Much of the development debate of the last 50 years has centered on the changing relationship between agriculture and industry and on the “correct” allocation of investment between the two sectors. Policies aiming at economic growth traditionally followed one of two different approaches. The first favours investment in the agricultural sector, which can then provide the necessary surplus for industrial and urban development, whereas the second approach argues that industrial and urban growth are requisites for a more modern and productive agricultural sector.

According to Todaro and Smith (2002), the following policy options were adduced for reducing rural-urban migration; creating appropriate rural-urban economic balance, expanding small scale labour intensive industries and eliminating factor price distortion. Escobar (1995) gives a detailed analysis of the development economics discourse. The relative influence of these theoretical positions has changed over time, as summarized below.

a. Modernization through Industrialization and Urbanization

In the early 1950s, development was conceptualized in terms of national economies taking off through the increase in the size of domestic markets and the creation of inducements to invest.

b. Structural Adjustment, Globalization and Decentralization

Neo-classical economics, underpinning IMF and World Bank reform of Third World economies, advocates rolled-back governments and public sectors and competitive free markets determining human capital formation, resource allocation and growth. Development strategies are export oriented and this, for many Third World countries, means export of primary commodities, including foodstuffs.

Emerging Challenges of Migration and Development

As from the late 1960s, the optimistic views on migration and development were increasingly challenged under the combined influence. The relationship between migration and development is highly contingent on context and history. Making migration work as an agent of personal and spatial development is a major challenge manifested in several spheres. Should migration be prevented or harnessed? Migration is ‘life’ and without movements there is no civilization. Our task is therefore to tailor movements to the benefit of both sending and receiving areas. Tailoring migration to the benefit of origin, destination and migrant- that is win-win-win situation- is the major challenge of the 21st century. The important thing today is to formulate policies to minimise the ills and to maximise the opportunities. The best migration policy is development policy (Korner 1987 in Hammer et al 1997).
Management of policies on rural-urban migration

While disparities between the urban and the rural areas have probably always existed, they became a major concern only some fifty years ago, when the region decolonized. At that time, most of the economies in the region were still agriculture based and almost the entire population lived in the rural areas. Living standards were low and the economies of the newly independent countries were dependent on the industrialized world. Improving the living conditions of the rural population became a national priority. During the 1950s and 1960s, most governments recognized the need for simultaneous development of agriculture and industry, of rural and urban areas, but this was impossible in view of the scarcity of the available resources. An exclusive focus on rural areas would result in an under-investment in urban areas and this would limit the growth of the urban sector and its ability to absorb the rural labour surplus.

According to Richardson (1987) an exclusive focus on urban development would produce similar results, because it would accelerate rural-urban migration and reduce food production per capita. In the view of Essay and Adewale (1994), they were of the opinion that rural-urban earnings gap should be narrowed. Policy makers should bear in mind that the provision of social amenities in rural areas will not stop the flow of out-migration unless employment opportunities in the rural areas are expanded along with social services. Also education should be tailored towards investment and demand for labour.

Most governments opted for industrialization, but their policies were not without problems. There was the need to import machinery and other capital-intensive industrial inputs from developed countries and the cost of importing capital goods nullified the gains made by import substitution. The import-substituting industries needed protection against foreign imports of similar goods through import tariffs, but this made the industries less efficient and competitive. Consumers had to do with locally made, low-quality products at higher prices than necessary. The situation was particularly hard for the rural population, as it faced price ceilings on farm products to keep these affordable for the urban population, but had to pay high prices for industrial goods.

According to Martinuseen (1991), argued that agriculture was the only productive sector that produced an economic surplus to finance industrial and urban development. Governments did this in many different ways, but none of them was beneficial to the rural economy.

- An unequal exchange of industrial and agricultural goods: • Extraction of the surplus from agriculture via foreign trade: • A transfer of resources from rural to urban areas via the credit system or through taxation:
One of the most influential critics of these government policies was Michael Lipton (1977) who blamed governments in developing countries for having an “urban bias” in their development policies. In Lipton’s view, governments paid lip service to rural development whose expressed aim was to improve conditions in rural areas and control rural-urban migration. In reality, governments favoured the urban population, because urban dwellers, even the urban poor, were in a better position to make their demands known than the rural population. City dwellers were visible and could influence government policies due to their numbers, their ability to organize and their proximity to the seat of government.

The actual policies improved conditions in the urban areas aimed at placating the urban population and at promoting the development of the city. Lipton concluded that the policies benefited a small portion of the population, the city dwellers, and ignored the majority of the population in the rural areas. He argued that because resources are scarce in developing countries, governments should use them in the most efficient way and where they have the most impact. Policies that supported urban development and neglected agriculture did not use scarce resources most efficiently.

Governments should invest scarce capital instead in agriculture and be used to support small farmers to increase their productivity. The problem of the urban bias was not only the apparent neglect of the rural areas, but also the apparent inability of the urban areas to absorb the surplus labour from the countryside. The policies not only failed to develop agriculture and alleviate rural poverty, but also failed to alleviate urban poverty. They improved conditions in the urban areas, but the improvements benefited only a small minority of the population: particularly the urban rich. Poor migrants ended up in slums and squatter settlements where life was possibly even more miserable than in the rural areas.

Hypotheses

- **H1** Housing scheme has effectively addressed the challenges of rural-urban migration in Anambra State
- **H2** Power sector has contained the pressure of rural-urban migration on the sector.
- **H3** Ineffective implementation of agricultural-extension has impeded rural-urban migration in Anambra state.

Methodology

This study employed a survey research design. Both intervive structured questionnaire were administered on the respondents. A sample size of 399 was selected from population of Anambra state. The researcher categorized the state into zones. Anambra state has three zones; Anambra
North, Anambra Central, Anambra South. Then by applying simple random sampling, the researchers selected one local government area each from the three zones. The selected local governments under study were Awka South, Nnewi North and Onitsha North. There were 14 items in the questionnaire rated with 5-point likert type of scale -5(SA), 4(A), 3(UD), 2(D) and 1(SD)

Data Analysis
Questions Analysis And Discussion Of Result

TABLE 1 Question 7(b) Increase in house rent is encouraged by rural-urban migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Σfx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>887</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*

Weight mean = \[
\bar{x} = \frac{\sum xf}{f}
\]

\[
\bar{x} = \frac{887}{388} = 2.28
\]

Table Analysis: Table 1 shows that 77.3% of the respondents agree that increase in the rent, is as a result of rural-urban migration. While 21.4% disagree with is opinion and 1.3% felt that other reasons may be responsible for the increase? The weighted mean calculated from the above table is below 3.00, hence it affirms the question.

Therefore the implication is that majority of the respondent believe that the high cost of rent in the urban areas is as a result of people migrating to the urban areas for a good life. Most of the residents in Awka were of view that about a decade ago the rents of apartment were affordable but as many people migrated into the capital the landlords increase the rent.

TABLE 2 Question 7 (iii) Rents in housing estates are affordable to the average family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Σfx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1160</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*
Formula: \[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum xf}{f} \]

\[ \frac{1160}{388} = 2.98 \]

**Table Analysis:** Table 2 reveals that 46.2% Agree that the rent in the housing estate are affordable, while 5.2% can’t say for certain that the houses are affordable. However, 48.8% said that the houses are in fact not affordable. The weighted mean is below 3.00 confirms the above assertion.

The implication is the houses in the estate are meant for the high class or affluence citizens in the state. They buy this house from the government and rent it the average family who still pay because they want to remain in the city. Most of these reserved areas are for the rich.

**TABLE 3 MANAGEMENT OF ELECTRICITY**

**Question 8(i)** There is shortage of electric power supply in your area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>(\Sigma fx)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1707</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*

Formula: \[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum xf}{f} \]

\[ \frac{1707}{388} = 4.39 \]

**Table Analysis:** Table 3 Shows that 93.5% of the respondents agree that there is shortage of power supply in their area. While only 6.5% of the respondents disagree. Weighted mean calculated from the table is above 3.00 confirms the above assertion. It implies that majority of the respondent are of the view that there is epileptic power supply in the state.

**TABLE 4 Question 8(iv)** Poor power supply discourages Economic Development of Anambra State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>(\Sigma fx)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1734</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*
 Formula \( \bar{x} = \frac{\sum xf}{\sum f} \)
\( = \frac{448}{388} = 2.18 \)

**Table Analysis:** Table 5 shows that 96.2% of the respondents agree that their businesses are being hampered by decline in power supply. While, only 3.8% of the respondent are of the view that the decline in power supply has not affected their business. Weighted mean calculated from the table is above 3.00 confirms the above assertion.

Therefore implies that the epileptic power supply in Anambra State has affected business output. It has also affected the price of goods and services. This is because the marketers and business men will always want to make profit. The small and medium businesses are greatly affected by this hence they have to generate light by other means or loss their customers.
TABLE 6 Question 8 (vii) You spend more on fuel and diesel as a result of lack of electricity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Σfx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2012).

Formula = \( \bar{x} = \frac{\sum xf}{f} \)

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{1720}{388} = 4.43 \]

Table Analysis: Table 6 reveals that 92.7% of the respondents agree that they spend more on fuel and diesel due to inadequate power supply. 3.4% of the respondents seem not to have noticed any difference, while on small fraction of the respondents of 15.8% disagree with the assertion.

The implication is that majority of the respondents have spent most of their resource to generate power to run their daily affairs. Going into the residential or industrial areas in the state, you will hear the sound of generator everywhere. Also there is a popular saying “I better pass my neighbor” used in market, streets and other business outlets in the state; leading to air pollution and the likes. Furthermore, the increase in price of petroleum products in the country has resulted in increase in price of goods and services. Even the prepaid meter distributed hardly gives light so at the end of the month you just pay the fixed charges. The respondents are of the view that if nothing is done to save the situation. The economic development of the Anambra State will only be mirage.

TABLE 7 MANAGEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Question 3 (i) The decline in agricultural sector negatively affects economic development of Anambra State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Σfx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2012).
Formula $= \frac{x}{\sum f}$

4.60

**Table Analysis:** Table 7 indicates that 90.8% of the respondents agree that decline in the agricultural sector is negatively affecting the economic development of Anambra state. While only 9.2% disagree. The weighted mean is above 3.00 which shows that majority of the respondents affirm the assertion above. The implication is that if government does not focus on improving agriculture in the state the economy will remain undeveloped.

**TABLE 8 Question 3(iii) Poor facilities in the rural areas is an impediment to attracting skilled manpower in agricultural production**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>$\sum fx$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*

Formula $= \frac{x}{\sum f}$

4.45

**Table Analysis:** Table 8 indicates that 89.7% of the respondents agree that poor facilities in the rural areas discourage them from engaging in agriculture. 2.8% of the respondents are undecided as to whether it is due to lack of facilities or other reasons. While, 7.5% of the respondents disagree with its affirmation. The weighted mean is greater than 3.00, this means that majority of the respondents supports the above assertion.

**TABLE 9 Question 3(iv)** Taking infrastructural facilities to rural areas will help to stabilize economic development of the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>$\sum fx$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*
Formula = \bar{x} = \frac{\sum \frac{xf}{f}}{\sum f} = 4.01

**Table Analysis:** Table 9 indicates that 84.3% of the respondents agree that taking infrastructural facilities to the rural areas will assist in stabilizing the economy and bring about development. 0.8% of the respondents are undecided. While, 14.9% of the respondents disagree with is affirmation. The weighted mean is greater than 3.00, this means that majority of the respondents supports the above assertion.

**TABLE 10 Question 3(v)** Proper management of the agricultural sector can increase the per capita income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>(\sum fx)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1571</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*

Formula = \bar{x} = \frac{\sum \frac{xf}{f}}{\sum f} = 4.04

**Table Analysis:** Table 10 reveals that 83% of the respondents believe that proper management of agriculture can increase per capita income. This will assist in stabilizing the economy and bring about development, through mass production of cash crops and other agricultural produce. 1% of the respondents are undecided. While, 16% of the respondents disagree with is affirmation. The weighted mean is greater than 3.00, this means that majority of the respondents supports the above assertion.

**Table 11 Measures Taken To Curb Management Of Rural-Urban Migration**

**Question 4(i)** Inadequate information and statistical record keeping is a serious impediment to economic planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>(\sum fx)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1786</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*
Formula \( \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x f}{\sum f} \)

\[ 4.60 \]

**Table Analysis:** Table 11 reveals that 90.8% agree of the respondents agree that inadequate information and statistical record keeping is a serious impediment to economic planning. While 9.2% of the respondents disagree. The weighed mean is above 3.00 which means that majority of the respondents affirms the assertion.

**TABLE 12 Question 4(ii)** Poor communication flow between the state and local government leads to poor implementation of policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>( \sum fx )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1370</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*

Formula \( \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x f}{\sum f} \)

\[ 3.53 \]

**Table Analysis:** Table 16 reveals that 59.3% of the respondents believe that poor communication flow between the state and local government negatively affects implementation of policies. 9.8% of the respondents are uncertain. While 30.9% of the respondents disagree with is affirmation. The weighted mean is a little above 3.00, this means an average of the respondents confirms the assertion.

**TABLE 13 Question 4(v)** Corruption at all levels of the state has affected the development of the economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>( \sum fx )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1830</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012).*
Formula \( \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x_f f}{\sum f} \)

\( \bar{x} = 4.71 \)

**Table Analysis:** Table 13 reveals that 100% of the respondents totally agree that corruption at all levels has negatively affected the development of the economy. The weighted mean is very much above 3.00 which show that all respondents affirm this assertion.

**TABLE 14 Question 13(vi)** Policies of government to address the needs of the people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Scale(x)</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>( \sum f x )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1257</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012)*

Formula \( \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x_f f}{\sum f} \)

\( \bar{x} = 3.23 \)

**Table Analysis:** Table 14 reveals that 48% of the respondents agree that government policies address the needs of the people, 6.4% of the respondents are uncertain. While 44.9% of the respondents disagree with this view. The weighted mean is a little above 3.00. The implication of this assertion is that there is no clear cut confirmation as to whether government’s policies address the needs of the people or not. Thou most of the respondents agree that governments policies address the needs of the people.

**Test Of Hypotheses**

In order to test the hypotheses formulated for this study, chi-square \( (x^2) \) statistical tool was adopted to test the hypotheses.

The formula for chi-square \( (x^2) \) = \( \sum \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} \)

**Where:**

- \( x^2 \) = Chi-square
- \( \sum \) = Summation
- \( O \) = observed frequency
- \( E \) = expected frequency
Decision Rule:

In the application of Chi-square ($x^2$) for the test of hypotheses, the following rule applies: “Reject the null hypotheses if the calculated value (cv) of the test statistics is greater than the table value (tv)”.

Hypotheses I

$H_0$: Housing scheme has effectively addressed the challenges of rural-urban migration in Anambra State

Table 16 Housing Scheme And Management Of Rural-Urban Migration In Anambra State.

Using table 4.2.7(d) to test hypotheses I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERN OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AWKA SOUTH</td>
<td>NNEWI NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012)*

Therefore in determining the expected frequency we have:

$$e = \frac{\text{marginal row Total} \times \text{marginal Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}$$

Thus:

$$\frac{100 \times 129}{388} = 33.2$$
$$\frac{278 \times 129}{388} = 92.4$$
$$\frac{10 \times 129}{388} = 3.3$$
$$\frac{388 \times 100}{388} = 33.0$$
$$\frac{388 \times 278}{388} = 91.7$$
$$\frac{388 \times 10}{388} = 3.3$$
$$\frac{388 \times 131}{388} = 93.9$$
$$\frac{388 \times 388}{388} = 34$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$o$</th>
<th>$e$</th>
<th>$0 - e$</th>
<th>$(0 - e)^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>46.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>70.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>86.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012)*

$$x^2 = 6.519$$

At 5% or 0.05 significance level and confidence level of 95% and a degree of freedom of 4, we have;
Dof = (r - 1) (c - 1)  
= (3 - 1) (3 - 1)  
= 2 \times 2  
= 4

Therefore, the Degree of Freedom (Dof) = 4

Critical Value or table value = 9.488

Thus, calculated value (6.519) is less than the critical value/table value of (9.4881) Hence the null hypothesis is thereby accepted. It is therefore based on that assertion that Housing scheme has not effectively addressed the challenges of rural-urban migration in Anambra State. The implication of this assertion is that government has not being able to address the challenges posed by rural-urban migration in the state. The so called low cost housing estate is not affordable and ‘in Onitsha north L.G.A the respondents claimed that the only housing estate is that, owned by private persons in G.R.A and 33 Housing Estate.

**Hypotheses II**

\( H_i \)  Power sector has contained the pressure of rural-urban migration on the sector.

**Table 17  Power And Management Of Rural-Urban Migration In Anambra State.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERN OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AWKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>258</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2012)

Therefore in determining the expected frequency we have:

\[
e = \frac{\text{marginal row Total} \times \text{marginal Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}
\]

Thus:

\[
\frac{527 \times 258}{776} = 175.2  \quad \frac{159 \times 258}{776} = 52.9  \quad \frac{19 \times 258}{776} = 6.3
\]

\[
\frac{527 \times 256}{776} = 173.9  \quad \frac{159 \times 256}{776} = 52.4  \quad \frac{19 \times 256}{776} = 6.3
\]

\[
\frac{527 \times 262}{776} = 177.9  \quad \frac{159 \times 262}{776} = 53.7  \quad \frac{19 \times 262}{776} = 6.4
\]

Thus:

\[
\frac{34 \times 258}{776} = 11.3  \quad \frac{37 \times 258}{776} = 12.3
\]

\[
\frac{34 \times 256}{776} = 11.2  \quad \frac{37 \times 256}{776} = 12.2
\]

\[
\frac{34 \times 262}{776} = 11.5  \quad \frac{37 \times 262}{776} = 12.5
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>o</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>o - e</th>
<th>(o - e)^2</th>
<th>(o - e)2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>175.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td>0.13150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>173.9</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>0.13807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>177.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.08336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>0.10992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.45873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.26825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>3.51239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>46.24</td>
<td>4.12857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.02174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.43008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.26557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field survey 2012

\[ x^2 = 9.59492 \]

At 5% or 0.05 significance level and confidence level of 95% and a degree of freedom of 8, we have:

\[
\text{Dof} = (r - 1) (c - 1) \\
= (5 - 1) (3 - 1) \\
= 4 \times 2 \\
= 8
\]

Therefore, the Degree of Freedom (Dof) = 8 Critical Value or table value = 15.507

Thus, calculated value (9.59492) is less than the critical value/ table value of (15.507) Hence the null hypothesis is thereby accepted. It shows that the Power sector has not been able to contain the pressure of rural-urban migration on the sector. The implication is that the economy will suffer since for any form of development to be achievable government ought to make power supply effective and efficient. Anambra state has a large market in Nnewi and Onitsha. If government is able to provide steady power supply in the state, it will be able to increase its per capita income and revenue generated by the state. Which will at the long run help economic development of the state.

**Hypotheses II**

\( H_0 \) Ineffective implementation of agricultural extension has not impeded rural-urban migration in Anambra State.
Table 18 Agricultural Extension And Rural-Urban Migration In Anambra State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERN OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AWKA</td>
<td>NNEWI</td>
<td>ONITSHA</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2012)

Therefore in determining the expected frequency we have:

\[
e = \frac{\text{marginal row Total} \times \text{marginal Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}
\]

Thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
123.3 & = \frac{371 \times 258}{776} \\
83.5 & = \frac{251 \times 576}{776} \\
7.6 & = \frac{23 \times 576}{776}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
122.4 & = \frac{371 \times 576}{776} \\
82.8 & = \frac{251 \times 576}{776} \\
7.6 & = \frac{23 \times 576}{776}
\end{align*}
\]

Thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
22.9 & = \frac{62 \times 576}{776} \\
20.6 & = \frac{62 \times 576}{776} \\
20.4 & = \frac{26 \times 576}{776}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
o & e & o-e & (o - e)^2 \\
\hline
133 & 123.3 & 9.7 & 94.09 & 0.7 \\
104 & 122.4 & -18.4 & 338.56 & 2.8 \\
134 & 125.3 & 8.7 & 75.69 & 0.6 \\
77 & 83.5 & -6.5 & 42.25 & 0.5 \\
91 & 82.8 & 8.2 & 67.24 & 0.8 \\
83 & 84.7 & -1.7 & 2.89 & 0.03 \\
6 & 7.6 & -1.6 & 2.56 & 0.3 \\
11 & 7.6 & 3.4 & 11.56 & 1.5 \\
6 & 7.8 & -1.8 & 3.24 & 0.4 \\
20 & 22.9 & -2.9 & 8.41 & 0.3 \\
23 & 22.8 & 0.2 & 0.04 & 0.001 \\
26 & 23.3 & 2.7 & 7.29 & 0.3 \\
22 & 20.6 & 1.4 & 1.96 & 0.09 \\
27 & 20.4 & 6.6 & 43.56 & 2.1 \\
13 & 21 & -8 & 64 & 3 \\
776 & 776 & 0 & 0 & 13.421 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Source: Field Survey (2012)

\[x^2 = 13.421\]
At 5% or 0.05 significance level and confidence level of 95% and a
degree of freedom of 8, we have;
\[
\text{Dof} = (r - 1) (c - 1) = (5 - 1) (3 - 1) = 4 \times 2 = 8
\]
Therefore, the Degree of Freedom (Dof) = 8
Critical Value or table value = 15.507
Thus, calculated value (13.402) is less than the critical value/ table
value of (15.507) Hence the null hypothesis is thereby accepted. It shows
that the ineffectiveness of government in managing agricultural extension
has lead to more people migrating to the urban areas for greener pastures.
The implication is that since government of Anambra state has not been able
to manage the agricultural sector properly, they will lose lots of income that
should accrue the state. However if government could invest more in
agriculture it will enable more production of cash corps as well as more food
for the teeming population.

**Hypotheses Iv**

\( H_4 \) Poor management of rural-urban migration has impeded economic
development in Anambra state.

**Table19 Management Of Rural-Urban Migration In Anambra Stat**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERN OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AWKA NORTH</td>
<td>NNEWI NORT</td>
<td>ONITSHA NOT</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012)*

Therefore in determining the expected frequency we have:

\[
e = \frac{\text{marginal row Total} \times \text{marginal Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}
\]

Thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{625 \times 258}{776} &= 207.8 \\
\frac{129 \times 258}{776} &= 42.8 \\
\frac{22 \times 258}{776} &= 7.3 \\
\frac{625 \times 256}{776} &= 206.2 \\
\frac{129 \times 256}{776} &= 42.6 \\
\frac{22 \times 256}{776} &= 7.3 \\
\frac{625 \times 262}{776} &= 211.0 \\
\frac{129 \times 262}{776} &= 262 \\
\frac{22 \times 262}{776} &= 7.4
\end{align*}
\]
\[ x^2 = 47.60 \]

At 5% or 0.05 significance level and confidence level of 95% and a degree of freedom of 4, we have;

\[
\text{Dof} = (r - 1) \ (c - 1) \\
\quad = (3 - 1) \ (3 - 1) \\
\quad = 2 \times 2 \\
\quad = 4
\]

Therefore, the Degree of Freedom (Dof) = 4 Critical Value or table value = 9.488

Thus, calculated value (47.60) is greater than the critical value/ table value of (9.4881) Hence the null hypothesis is thereby rejected. It is therefore based on that assertion. Poor management of rural-urban migration has impeded economic development in Anambra state. The implication of this assertion is that government has not been able to provided adequate means of solving rural-urban in Anambra state

**Findings**

(a) Most of the housing estate in the state are quiet expensive for the average family. They are either bungalows and duplexes’ (Ngozika, Udoka, Abuja, Iyiagu,Nwakudolu,). The housing estate owned by government are located in the capital Awka while in the other local government studied most of the housing estate are owned by rich individual and private companies they sell the lands to others who can afford to build on the lands. The housing scheme of government has not in any way solved the problem of housing as most of the respondents are of the view that house rent are increasing every day

(b) The government has not been to provide adequate power supply for effective business in the state. Most of the respondents complained that they spend more on fuel and diesel than on electric supply. There is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>o</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>o-e</th>
<th>(o - e)^2</th>
<th>(o - e)^2/e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>207.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>206.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>948.64</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>-27.6</td>
<td>761.76</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>750.76</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47.6011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey (2012)*
hardly power supply in areas like Fegge, Ukwo, Awka road, Ekwuloba, and Amoeba. While areas like Aroma, Government house, Udok, G.R.A and Artisan have moderate power supply. Constantly transformers are overloaded due to the number of users or housing unit, it breaks down and the PHCN delays in repairing them. The traders in the market said that they had to contract private people that supply them with light. They say it is better since they have steady light. However the respondents are of the view that the epileptic power supply has affected their profitability. Most of the respondents were of the view that the problem of power shortage cannot be solved by mere increase in the tariff and other charges. They were of the government should be transparent and accountable to its citizen. They were of the view that if there were steady in the state most of the people will stay in the state. Onitsha according to them could be the China, Dubai and Japan of African.

The researcher found out that the agricultural extension programme has not been successful due to the increase in rural- urban drift. The lack of available land for farmers to cultivate has slow down the economy development of the state. Most of the young male and female are found in market Onitsha or engaged in small and medium scale business to make ends meet. The respondents were of the view that if government invest in agriculture by providing improved seeding and land for agriculture and other basic facilities in their communities, they will be willingly to go back to their villages because there better security of lives than the urban centers. However some of the respondents said they will not because engaging in business brings more money and less stressful. Facilities for extension services and training for the majority of the food producing population who are in the small-scale rural units are inadequate. This limitation is the result of an insufficient number of trained extension staff and workers who are skilled in training and the dissemination of agricultural information in the State. Put simply, there is a low farmer-extension agent ratio in the State.

In the researcher’s findings it was observed that economic development has being hampered owing the mismanagement of rural-urban in the state. The researcher found out that economic development of the state must first start with transparent and honesty management of agencies (ASHCOL, ADP, PHCN). Since Lack of technical knowhow, lack of training, poor communication and politicking of government is seen in the implementations of most of the programmes and projects.

Anambra State is heavily supported by the following donor agencies. Some of the Donor Agencies and their programmes are; (a) United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) they support Social Development, Sustainable Agriculture, Environment and Rural
Development. Currently the UNDP is about to commence the implementation of the Human Development Fund (HDF) programme in Anambra State. (b) United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) the UNFPA as it is popularly known, has been supporting the under listed programmes in the State. (i) Population planning (ii) Development Strategies. UNFPA is assisting the government of Anambra state in the rehabilitation of PHC (power Holding Company) by providing the sum of 5 million dollars and requiring the state to augment with its own counterpart funding. (c) International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) IFAD currently supports the Rots and Tuber Expansion Programme and Sweet Potato. (d) The UNICEF had supported the under listed programmes namely; Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) Water, Environment and Sanitation (WES) and others

(f) In the findings of the researcher, it was clear that the (ASCOL) Anambra State Housing Corporation is engaged in (PPP) private public partnership, with a private developer (Rockland developers). The state government provide the lands while they assist with technical know - how and funds.

(g) Findings of the researcher showed that there were about seven (7) housing estate owned by the state government they include Udoka, Liberation, Hill View, Ngozika, AHOCL, Orakwe and Inner City. However, only two of the Housing Estates were fully completed. The Udoka Housing Estate which was the first estate and the Ngozika Housing Estate was commissioned in 2010. The minimum prices of the lands are 4.7million for 750sqm.

(h) The researcher found out that they lack statistical data or information on their activities. Most of their data were on pieces of paper. Since 1991 till date they have been unable to provide detailed or documented analysis on number of houses in each of these estate and plots of lands available for sale. It was observed that though they lacked manpower but seems there is nothing to do. They are not informed of the innovations going in Estate Management. There is poor ITC information (no web site and outdated email address.)

(i) It was observed by the researcher that the management of rural-urban migration and economic development of Anambra state has been crippled due to the political struggle in the state (The case of Uba, Ngige and Obi). Anambra state is one of the states in the country endowed with wealth but the continuous politics in management of rural-urban migration has left the state undeveloped.
**Recommendations**

These recommendations include the following under listed:

(a) Both the people and government must co-operate. There can be no even development if people do not support government efforts. Likewise if the government cannot communicate to its citizen what it intends to achieve through its transparency and public accountability, then we still have a long way to go.

(b) The government should make use of a bottom-up approach or management technique. If ideas and policy statement can come from the grassroots or masses then government will be able to know what the people really need. Then programmes and policies will address the needs of the people instead of the selfish interest of privileged few in the state.

(c) The government should make use of “best-practice method”. This will help bring out the best of the best. Hence projects and awarding of contracts should not be based on political patronage but on who can best deliver on the job. Hence it must employ well qualified and competent technical and scientific staff.

(d) Training and developmental programmes should be encouraged form staff. This can also be achieved if staff are allowed to go for training, seminars, conferences and workshops to meet up with modernatization and technology.

(e) The government should follow-up on projects and programmes to avoid the abandonment of project that would have generated money from the terming population. this will be achieved by putting in place solid monitoring team to ensure strict compliance to set down objectives.

(f) The Urban government must ensure that the policy it enunciates to bring about urban development is not ambiguous, vague and overtly ambitious and pursing multiple and often conflicting objectives at the same time. In fact they must imbibe the principles of “SMART” in policy making, which means that policy must be specific, measureable, achievable, realistic and time bound.

(g) The government should develop a maintenance culture. This will enable the state save a lot of money that would have used in areas of needs. Also it will make it possible for government to engage in profitable ventures that will bring about economic development.

(h) There should be regular evaluation and monitoring of these agencies by government. This will enable them to more effective in carrying out their duties to the citizen.

(i) The government should take into considerations the power sector. Expert should be attracted by government to improve the condition.
Without power supply the state continue to loss. Increasing the tariff will only make life more difficult. While many of its citizen migrate to countries with steady power supply.

(j) Land should also made available to farmers and they should be encouraged by providing them with improved seeds, credit facilities, non interest loans and create a easy access to transport these agricultural products. They should be encouraged to cultivate cash crops that will be exported. This will increase per captia income and the economic development of the state. Likewise agriculture should be introduced into the educational system as a compulsory subject to enable people appreciate agriculture.

(k) The government should Suggest addition vocational courses with skill acquisition programmes in the curriculum of scholars as well as the migrants educational programmes is imperative as that will make them take advantage of large commercial network of the area to fight poverty and reduce migration. This is a way the government can provide a working policy that will encourage the youths in the area towards self development. The need for qualitative functional education cannot be overemphasized. Good education is expected to develop marketable and functional skills in the people and thus prepare them for the world of work. Related to this is the need to construct and equip educational institutions in the rural areas. This can help in stemming the tide of rural out migration.

(l) The government should engage the services of foreign expert to help manage some of these erosion sites. If not many of our land will be lost to erosion and landslides.

(m) The government should avoid urban bias. The rural area where most of the resources are tapped. These rural areas should be able to have the basic needs of life (roads, water, shelter and electricity). Some of the government agencies and infrastructures should be located in the rural are. There cannot be development if these two areas are not in equilibrium

Finally, government has the task of sensitizing the populace on the price of economic development. Development does not come by chance. It involves imbibing positive values and perseverance by the citizen. Paradoxically, Even though there is inadequate data to properly evaluate the potential of the state in achieving the MDGs come 2015, available data indicate that the current situation is still a far cry from this target. In order to join in the national aspiration towards attaining the MDGs, Anambra state must overcome this legacy of crises and mismanagement in order to translate its potentials into improved livelihood for the people. This together with
strengthening public infrastructure, fighting corruption in government, and managing the political diversities that has emerged in recent times has the potential in turning the tide in the state.
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