

RURAL-URBANISATION EFFECT ON INFLATIONARY PRESSURE AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN URBAN AREAS OF LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA

Saheed Z. S¹, Adeneye O.A¹, Ibrahim G.U². and Alexander A.A¹.

¹Department of Economics, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Nigerian Defence Academy Kaduna

²Department of Economics, Faculty Social Sciences, Kaduna State University Kaduna

ABSTRACT: *This study examines the effect of rural-urbanisation on inflation and unemployment in urban areas with a particular focus on Lagos State, Nigeria. Primary data were collected through informal interview and structured questionnaire administered to a sample of 400 households of which 348 correctly filled and returned the questionnaire. The data were coded and rated on 5 point likert scale. Descriptive statistic and multiple regression analysis were used to analyse the data. The result shows a statistically significant positive impact of Rural-Urban Migration (RUM) on INFP. With a coefficient of 0.457, it implies that a unit increase in RUM will lead to 0.457% increase in INFP. Again, one percent unit increase in AGGCD will effect a 0.507% change in INFP, and, one percent unit increase in HEY will cause 0.085% change in INFP. Furthermore, results show that one percent unit increase in RUM effect a 0.441% change in Urban Unemployment (URUNEMP). Again, one percent unit increase in Aggregate Labour Supply (AGGLS) will lead to 0.322% change in URUNEMP and one percent unit increase in EDUL effect a 0.151% change in URUNEMP. Based on this finding, the study, therefore, recommends that appropriate urban policy that will stimulate increasing production of goods and services in the study areas should be formulates and strictly implemented. Furthermore, urban policy that will lead to more job creations in the study areas should be put in place, as this will go a long way in reducing inflationary pressure and urban unemployment.*

KEYWORDS: Inflationary Pressure, Rural-Urban Migration, Urban Unemployment.

INTRODUCTION

Rural-urban migration historically dates back to the 1880's when industrialization paved way for massive migration from rural to urban areas. Some theories suggest that surplus labour in the rural areas are required in the urban areas to fill the deficit in urban industries and, that expected higher wages in the urban industries will compensate for the zero or marginal productivity in the rural areas (Lewis, 1954; Lee, 1966; Todaro, 1971). However, the relevance of these theories in this modern day is a subject of discussion among the academia, stakeholders and governments. This is due to the fact that there are instances where inflationary pressure and urban unemployment force people to migrate back to rural areas, a phenomenon known as urban-rural migration, although, this situation has not deterred rural-urban migration from upward trend, particularly, in Lagos state, Nigeria.

With the effervescent economic and commercial activity of Lagos State, coupled with the ever busy sea port, airport, and land border with other nations, friendly business environment that encourage investment, among other pull factors, the state have been recording an upward trend in rural-urban migration into the state. Consequently, the urban growth has led to some economic challenges, ranges from urban unemployment, sustained increase in the general price

level of goods and services, high cost of living, high crime rate, pressure on infrastructures, and pollution, among others (Abbass, 2012).

In urban areas of Lagos state, increased human population tends to have impact on the general price level of goods and services, as well as, urban unemployment. According to Abimbola, (2014), empirical evidences have shown that Lagos metropolis, have in the recent time experiences inflationary pressure and urban unemployment, due to increase in the rate of rural-urban migration. The Lagos State Bureau of Statistics, (2016) further reveals that as a result of rapid population growth in Lagos, cost of housing, transportation and food is on the upward trend. In addition, the areas have witnessed upsurge of youth unemployment, that is, increase in numbers of able persons that is looking for job and cannot find any in the recent time.

Many scholars have focused their studies on internal migration in Nigeria and elsewhere, particularly focusing on causes and consequence of rural-urban migration in place of origin (Zelege, 2011; De Brauw & Mueller, 2012; de Brauw, Mueller, & Woldehanna, 2012; Moller, 2012; Ajaero & Onokala, 2013; Chukwuedozie & Ignatius, 2014; Wesen, 2015; Birhanu & Nachimuthu, 2017). However, there are scanty empirical literature on rural-urbanisation effect on the inflationary pressure and unemployment in Lagos urban areas of Nigeria. Therefore, it is imperative to ascertain the significant impact of rural-urban migration on the inflationary pressure and urban unemployment in Lagos state, Nigeria.

Giving the foregoing, the challenge of this study therefore is to critically:

- i. Examine the effect of rural-urbanisation on inflationary pressure in Lagos State, Nigeria.
- ii. Analyse the effect of rural-urban migration on unemployment in urban area of Lagos, Nigeria.

To this end, the study is organized into five sections. Following this introduction is section 2, where brief review of the literature is provided. Section 3 discusses the methodology. Section 4 analyses and interprets the data, while section 5 summarises the findings and offer some policy recommendations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Migration is a multifaceted phenomenon which in general involves the movement of people from one place to the other. It is a change of residence either permanently or temporarily (Wondimagegnhu, 2012). In the same vein, Rural-urban migration is the process of people moving from rural areas to cities (Birhanu & Nachimuthu, 2017; Marmara & Usman, 2015). The reasons for migration can be economic, social, political or environmental. Migration is classified into internal and international migration. Internal migration is when people migrate within the same country or region while, international migration is when people migrate from one country to another. Migrations usually happen as a result of either or combination of push and pull factors.

There are several factors that causes rural-urban migration in developing countries they can be seen as a simultaneous analysis of factors that force migrants out of rural areas (push-factors) and factors that attract migrants to urban areas (pull factors). Factors and determinants of

migration are rather diverse and they can be split up in economic and non-economic reasons (Aydiko, 2015; Ezra & Tesfaye, 2011; Fischer, 2009). Economic push factors of rural out migrant includes; unemployment or underemployment in rural areas, low wages and no assets, as well as land tenure system, which is sometimes due to inheritance systems that split the land among a large number of people, making it less productive.

However, it is expected that increase in human population in urban areas will increase demand for goods and services in the urban areas and if the demand for goods and services is higher than supply of goods and services, inflation is likely to occur as a result of much money in the hand of individual, pursuing fewer goods available in the urban economy. In the same vein, if supply side is greater than demand side in terms of labour supply to urban areas, unemployment occurs, this because additional labour supply will contribute zero or marginal profit, hence, it unreasonable to employ more workers.

The concept of inflation has been defined as a persistence rise in the general price level of broad spectrum of goods and services in a country over a long period of time (Mohammed, Okoroafor & Awe, 2015). Inflation has been intrinsically linked to money, a situation where more money is chasing few goods (Hamilton, 2001). Inflation is widely described as an economic situation where increase in money supply is faster than the new production of goods and services in the same economy. Piana (2001) cited by Mohammed, Okoroafor, & Awe, (2015) affirms that economists usually try to distinguish inflation from an economic phenomenon of a onetime increase in prices or when there are price increases in a narrow group of economic goods or services. Meanwhile, Balami (2006) sees inflation as a situation of a rising general price level of broad spectrum of goods and services over a long period of time. It is measured as the rate of increase in the general price level over a specific period of time.

On the other hand, the International Labour Organization (ILO) defines the unemployed as numbers of the economically active population who are without work but available for and seeking work, including people who have lost their jobs and those who have voluntarily left work (World Bank, 1998 cited by Mohammed, Okoroafor, & Awe, 2015).

Frictional unemployment may be regarded as subset of structural unemployment, mainly reflecting temporary unemployment spells as a result of job search and matching difficulties in connection with quits, new entries to the labour market, and job separation because of employers' dissatisfaction with the individual workers (Mohammed & Awe, 2015). Ordinarily, this kind of unemployment does not usually pose much threat to individual's welfare, as it is temporary in nature. However, the situation in Nigeria is that of frictional unemployment growing into a long-term unemployment and thereby resulting into a stable state of unemployment (Tairu, 2003). This is often described as equilibrium unemployment.

Theoretically, Lewis (1954), in his work on 'economic development with unlimited supplies of labour' analyzed the labour market dualism and the structural difference between the subsistence sector and capitalistic sector in developing economies. The two sectors in the Lewis representation were named as subsistence and capitalistic sectors originally and then they were renamed as traditional and modern sectors.

The model, which takes to account the context of developing countries, explains a dual economy model of economic development with an assumption that there exists surplus labour in the traditional (agricultural) sector which is to be re-allocated to fill the rising modern (urban) sector labour demands. The traditional agricultural sector is characterized by low wages and

very low/zero marginal productivity of workers. Each family member in the traditional agriculture sector earns an average product of labour, i.e. the wage in agriculture (WA) = $TPLA / LA$ (total product of labour in the agriculture sector (TPLA) divided by the total agricultural labour of the rural population (LA)).

The dual economy model, thus, suggests that agriculture provides the necessary resources for industrialization. The model also describes that rural-urban migration facilitates investments in modern labour-intensive industries, to make use of the rural labour and circumvent disguised unemployment in the traditional sector. The model in general explains the importance of labour at initial stage of economic development in developing economies (because of assumed scarcity of capital and the abundance of labour). Although the LRF model has a profound explaining power of economic development in the field of development economics, there have been some vagueness especially with respect to the concept of surplus labour, wage determination and the dynamics of labour flows between the traditional agricultural sector and the modern manufacturing sector (Wang & Piesse, 2009).

A critical review of Lewis migration theory in the context of Nigeria revealed that the pattern and trend of rural-urban migration is not fully in agreement with the Lewis theory of rural-urban migration. In the first instance, there is no surplus of labour anywhere in agriculture sector in the rural areas, following the discovery, production and oil boom in 1956, 1958, and 1970s respectively, which resulted to mass exodus of peoples from rural areas to the urban areas. This explains the increase in the price of food and raw-material at that period, since logically, economic development only occurs when there is balance between rural and urban areas. In second instance, the upsurge of urban unemployment suggested that urban industries cannot absorb the large human inflow from rural areas when it failed to provide job for the urban dwellers. More so, wage differential exist within the homogenous industry and cannot be the major factor that motivates rural-urban migration in Nigeria.

Furthermore, the issue of rural-urban migration and urban unemployment was raised by Todaro (1969), and then by Harris and Todaro (1970). The expected income model of migration was designed in HT model in the presence of labour market imperfections and an assessment of the probability to get an urban job. The HT model, postulate that, migration responds to urban-rural difference in expected income rather than actual earnings. The assumption in the Todaro and Harris-Todaro model is that, migration is primarily an economic phenomenon. Migrants are assumed to consider the various opportunities available in the urban sector. However, the theory also explains that, rural-urban migration can exist despite low opportunity in the major towns. The HT model argues that rural-urban migration is stimulated primarily by individual rational economic calculations of relative benefits and costs. In the Harris-Todaro model, more workers search for formal sector jobs than are hired. Migrants who are not hired end up entering the urban informal sector or remain unemployed.

In relating the Harris-Todaro model to Nigeria's context, recent happening in Nigeria has shown that labour is more costly in the rural areas than in urban centers, this may due to the outflow of labour force to the city, hence there is shortage of labour in rural area, with the few workers available demanding higher wages. Consequently, inflow of rural migrants to the urban centers tends to contribute to massive urban unemployment. This situation has led to a reversal whereby workers are now moving from urban to rural areas to work.

Empirically, several studies reveal that there exists a linkage between rural-urban migration and economic push and pull factors. For instances, Nor and Abdullah (2014), examine the

relationship between rural and urban migration, household income and unemployment in Malaysia by using, time series data from 1980 to 2011. Johansen co-integration, vector error correction model and granger causality test are employed to analyze the data. The findings of the study reveal that migration is positively influenced by level of household income and negatively influenced by unemployment rate for rural and urban migration in Malaysia.

Wondimagegnhu (2012), examines the impacts of rural-urban migration on income and poverty of rural households in Shebedino district, Southern Ethiopia. The study adopted survey research design using both primary and secondary data. Cobb-Douglas production function model approach was employed, thereafter; data was analyzed by descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings of the study shows that out-migration has significantly reduced the available labor in rural areas equally remittances play a positive and significant role for boosting investment on capital stock. Again, rural-urban migration increased the total farm income of migrant sending households in general. This research is commendable, however, the study failed to consider the impact of rural-urban migration on the destination, remittances back home is a linkage to urban economy.

Liu (2011) examines the impact of rural-to-urban migration on agricultural commodity inflation in China. The study used survey research technique. The findings of the study reveal that the decline in the agricultural labour force due to out-migration has had an important impact on production decisions. Labor shortages led to labor-machine substitution and the farming of large tracts of land rented from other villagers or from the state and that this trend has nearly doubled production costs in the study areas subsequently, inflation occurred. Also the findings revealed remittance back to rural areas equally contribute to inflation as much more in the hand of rural dwellers are pursuing few goods and services in the rural area. As acknowledge by the researcher the study only focus on the supply-side factors only, with the demand-side factors.

Njoku and Chikere (2015) examine the effect of rural-urban migration in the underdevelopment of selected rural communities in Imo state, Nigeria. Survey research design was employed in the study. The findings of the study show among others things that rural-urban migration is caused by low employment opportunities in the rural areas; inadequate provision of social infrastructure in the rural areas and to escape from the unattractive/dull nature of rural areas. The study failed to identify the impact of rural-urban migration in the urban areas as increase in human population in the urban areas could as well result to urban unemployment, inflation as well as possibility of over stress of urban infrastructure.

Chukwuedozie and Ignatius (2014) examine the impact of rural-urban migration on rural livelihoods in southeastern region of Nigeria. Descriptive statistics, Livelihood Asset Indices technique and Principal Component Analysis were used for the data analysis. The results show spatial variations in the impact of migration on livelihoods across the region. While, this study examine the impact of rural-urban migration on rural livelihoods in southeastern region of Nigeria our present study is a departure from the view of rural-urban migration on rural livelihoods to examine the impact of rural-urban migration on urban economy especially in relation to urban employment, cost of living and impact on the environmental resource base which is sustenance of livelihood.

Bakare (2011) examines the determinants of the urban unemployment in Nigeria. In order to test the significant relationship between the level of unemployment and demand for labour, supply of labour, population, inflation, capacity utilization, gross capital formation and

nominal wage rate, time series secondary data was collected and econometric technique was adopted to analysis the time series data. The findings of the study show that the rising nominal wages and the accelerated growth of population which affected the supply side through a high and rapid increase in labour force relative to the absorptive capacity of the economy appear to be the main determinant of high unemployment in Nigeria. Furthermore, the results of the study show that urban unemployment is positively related to population growth and inflation is negatively related to population growth.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section discusses the research design, population of the study, sampling techniques, sample size, sources and techniques of data collection, methods of data analysis and model specification.

The study adopts a survey research design; specifically both quantitative and qualitative mixed approach research design was employed. The target sample for this study comprises of 400 households selected across Lagos; the selection is based on areas observed for upsurge of rural-urban migration and heavy economic activities, as well as perceived urban growth.

Primary quantitative data for the study were sourced through questionnaires administered to a total numbers of 400 respondents, of which only 348 questionnaires (about 87%) were correctly filled and returned. Hence, the study data analysis is based on the percentage returned. Quantitative data were scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale while, the qualitative data were systematically examined, analyzed, coded, and integrated into the main data. Both quantitative and qualitative data were triangulated and analyzed using the descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage and mean), and multiple regression analysis with the help of SPSS version 20 software package.

The model specification adopted in this study follows Teilhet-Waldorf and Waldorf (1983), the model stated that urban growth is a functions of migration (especially rural-urban type). Thus, this study has tried to represent inflationary pressure and urban unemployment as a function of rural-urban migration in two different models.

The two models can be summarized as follows.

Model 1

$$\text{INFP}_i = a_0 + \sum b_0 X_i + \mu_i$$

X_i = set of explanatory variables.

μ_i = disturbance term.

For simplicity, the set of explanatory variables X_i in relations to dependent variable the model as follows:

$$\text{INFP}_i = f(\text{RUM}, \text{AGGCD}, \text{HEY}) \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

$$\text{INFP}_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{RUM} + \beta_2 \text{AGGD} + \beta_3 \text{HEY} + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots(2)$$

Model 2 similarly,

$$URUNEMP_i = f(RUM, AGGLS, EDUL) \dots\dots\dots (3)$$

$$URUNEMP_i = \alpha + \beta_1 RUM + \beta_2 AGGLS + \beta_3 EDUL + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots (4)$$

Where:

INFP_i = Inflationary Pressure at time t.

URUNEMP_t = Urban Unemployment at time t.

RUM = Rural-Urban Migration.

AGGD = Aggregate Consumption demand.

HEY = Household Earned Income.

AGGLS = Aggregate Labour supply.

EDUL = Educational level

α = intercept β_1 , β_2 and β_3 are the parameters estimate

ε = Measurement error

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents empirical analysis of returned data, results and discussions. The results of data analysis are reported in the following subsections.

Descriptive statistics help to summarize the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents captured only in the model specification stated in section 3. The results of the analysis are reported in table 1 to 2 as follows:

Table 1.
Educational Status of the Respondents

Qualification	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No formal education	60	17.2	17.2	17.2
Primary	120	34.5	34.5	51.7
Valid Secondary	141	40.5	40.5	92.2
Tertiary Education	27	7.8	7.8	100.0
Total	348	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Statistics 20 Outputs from study data, 2017

Table 1 presented educational status of the respondents in the study area. The results show that the greater percentage of the participants have secondary education qualification with 40.5% response rate, respondents with primary education are 34.5%, while about 7.8% of the respondents attained tertiary education. Only 17.2% respondents have no formal education. By implication, majority of the respondents are educated therefore are not ignorant of the subject matter.

Table 2.
Average Monthly Income of the Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than ₦10,000	21	6.0	6.0	6.0
> ₦10,000 < ₦20,000	175	50.3	50.3	56.3
> ₦20,000 < ₦30,000	81	23.3	23.3	79.6
Valid > ₦30,000 < ₦40,000	30	8.6	8.6	88.2
> ₦40,000 < ₦50,000	21	6.0	6.0	94.3
₦50,000 and above	20	5.7	5.7	100.0
Total	348	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Statistics 20 Outputs from study data, 2017

Table 2 presents the respondents average monthly earned income in the study areas. The results show that the greater percentages of the respondents average monthly earning is above ₦10,000 but less than ₦20,000 with response rate of 50.3%. About 23.3% of the respondents earn between ₦20,000 and ₦30,000 while 8.6% of the total respondents earn between ₦30,000 and ₦40,000. Furthermore, about 6.0% of the respondents earn less than ₦10,000 and above ₦40,000 but less than ₦50,000 respectively. Just 5.7% of the total respondents earn ₦50,000 and above. This result indicates that majority of the respondents are low income earners. This implies the impact of rural-urban migration as relates to inflationary pressure and urban unemployment are mostly felt by the low income earners in the study areas. The results further reveal that there is wide gap between the rich and poor people in the study area.

In order to achieve the objectives of this study, multiple regression analysis was adopted for the two objectives of the study.

Objective one: Effect of Rural-urbanisation on the inflationary pressure in Lagos state, Nigeria.

Table 3a *Model Summary*

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.971 ^a	.942	.941	.27077

a. Predictors: (Constant), HEY, AGGCD, RUM

Table 3b *ANOVA^a*

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	408.651	3	136.217	1857.979	.000 ^b
Residual	25.220	344	.073		
Total	433.871	347			

a. Dependent Variable: INFP

b. Predictors: (Constant), HEY, AGGCD, RUM

Table 3c Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-.229	.060		-3.821	.000
1 RUM	.457	.028	.481	16.433	.000
AGGCD	.507	.031	.473	16.375	.000
HEY	.085	.013	.094	6.547	.000

a. Dependent Variable: INFP

Source: SPSS Statistics 20 Outputs from study data

Table 3a to c presents the multiple regression analysis on the significant effect of rural-urbanisation on the inflationary pressure in Lagos state, Nigeria.

The table 3a presents the model summary. The R^2 of 0.942 calculated points to the fact that about 94 percent increase in the inflationary pressure (INFP) is explained by the regressors. That is, 94% increase in inflationary pressure can be attributed to increase in rural-urban migration and other explanatory variables while the about 6% can be attributed to other factors outside the model. The coefficient of multiple determinations, that is, the adjusted R^2 is very strong at 94%. This shows a very strong explanatory power of the regressor in explaining changes in the dependent variables.

In table 3b ANOVA table the F-value of 1857.979 indicate the overall model is statistical significant with Sig-value of 0.000, this explains the joint impact of the explanatory variables on the predictor.

Meanwhile table 3c presents the coefficients of the explanatory variables. The results show that one percent unit increase in RUM will lead to 0.457% increase in INFP. One percent change in AGGCD will effect a 0.507% change in INFP. Furthermore, one percent unit increase in HEY will cause 0.085% change in INFP. The t-calculated value is greater than beta value for all the variables. The Sig-value of 0.000 in all the explanatory variables less than 0.05 confident levels suggests that RUM have statistically significant impact on the INFP. This finding is in agreement with the finding of Aluko, (2010), which posited that rural-urban migrations have statistically significant impact on the cost of housing in Lagos state, Nigeria. In additions, AGGCD and HEY equally have statistically significant impact on the INFP in Lagos state, Nigeria.

Objective two: Effect of Rural-urban migration on unemployment in Lagos urban areas.

Table 4a Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.932 ^a	.869	.868	.33112

a. Predictors: (Constant), EDUL, AGGLS, RUM

Source: SPSS Statistics 20 Outputs from study data, 2017

Table 4b ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	251.135	3	83.712	763.523	.000 ^b
Residual	37.716	344	.110		
Total	288.851	347			

a. Dependent Variable: URUNEMP

b. Predictors: (Constant), EDUL, AGGLS, RUM

Source: SPSS Statistics 20 Outputs from study data, 2017

Table 4c Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.537	.110		4.898	.000
	RUM	.441	.037	.569	12.066	.000
	AGGLS	.322	.039	.272	8.310	.000
	EDUL	.151	.047	.143	3.207	.001

a. Dependent Variable: URUNEMP

Source: SPSS Statistics 20 Outputs from study data, 2017

Table 4a to c presents the multiple regression analysis on the significant impact of Rural-urban migration (RUM) on the urban unemployment (URUNEMP) in Lagos state, Nigeria.

The table 4a presents the model summary. The R^2 of 0.869 calculated points to the fact that about 87 percent of the total variation in urban unemployment (URUNEMP) is explained by the regressors. That is, 87% increase in urban unemployment is explained by increase in rural-urban migration and other explanatory variables in the model, while about 13% can be attributed to other factors outside the model. The coefficient of multiple determination, that is, the adjusted R^2 is very strong at 87%. This shows a very strong explanatory power of the regressor in explaining changes in the dependent variables.

In table 4b ANOVA, the F-value of 763.523 indicates that the overall model is statistical significant with Sig-value of 0.000, this explains the joint impact of the explanatory variables on the predictor. Meanwhile, table 4c shows the coefficients of the explanatory variables. The results show that one percent increase in RUM effect a change of about 0.441% in URUNEMP increase, and one percent increase in AGGLS will lead to 0.322% change in URUNEMP. Furthermore, one percent changes in EDUL effect a change of about 0.151% in URUNEMP. Also, all the t-calculated value is greater than beta value for all the variables. The Sig value of 0.000 and 0.001 less than 0.05 confident levels suggests that all the explanatory variables stated in the model have positive and statistically significant impact on the URUNEMP in the study areas. Thus, this finding is in agreement with the finding of Bakare (2011), who posited that

urban unemployment is positively related to population growth and that rural-urban migration is linked to population growth which has positive and statistically significant impact on the URUNEMP.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis of the primary data collected from the sample of 384 respondents, coded on five point likert scale and analysed using multiple regression method, with the aim of examine the effect of rural-urbanisation on the inflationary pressure and urban unemployment in Lagos state, Nigeria, the findings show that rural-urban migrations have positive and statistically significant impact on the inflationary pressure (INFP), and AGGCD and HEY equally have statistically significant impact on the INFP in Lagos state, Nigeria.

Furthermore, the findings of the study reveal that rural-urban migrations have positive and statistically significant impact on the urban unemployment (URUNEMP). More so, AGGLS and EDUL equally have positive and statistically significant impact on URUNEMP in Lagos state, Nigeria. The policy implication of this finding is that rural-urban migration move in the same direction with inflationary pressure and urban unemployment. This implies that the more inflows of rural-urban migration, the higher the inflationary pressure and urban unemployment.

Based on the findings of this study, it is obvious that rural-urban migration have significant impact on the inflationary pressure and urban unemployment. Therefore, it is recommended that appropriate urban policy that will stimulate increasing production of goods and services in the study area should be formulated and strictly implemented. Availability of varieties of goods and services in the market places might force down the prices of commodities, thereby controlling inflationary pressure. In the same vein, establishment of labour intensive production of goods and services is likely to create more job opportunities and lessen urban unemployment rate. Furthermore, urban economic policy that will discourage rural-urban migration should be put in place, this include provision of basic infrastructures as well as job creations in the rural areas, which will go a long way in reducing inflationary pressure and urban unemployment.

REFERENCES

- Abbass, I.M. (2012). Trends of rural-urban migration in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal*. 8(3):1857–7881. [eajournal.org/index.php/esj/article/viewFile/58/63](http://www.eajournals.org/index.php/esj/article/viewFile/58/63)
- Ajaero, C.K. & Onokala, P.C.(2013).The effects of rural-urban migration on the rural communities of Southeastern Nigeria. *International Journal of Population Research*, Article ID 610193, 10 pages <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/610193>
- Aydiko, W.A. (2015). The cause and consequences of rural urban migration, *Munich,GRIN Verlag*.<http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/307635/>
- Bakare A.S. (2011).The determinants of urban unemployment crisis in Nigeria: An econometric Analysis. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS)* 2(3): 184-192
- Balami, G. (2006).Innovation and growth in developing countries. *Journal of Development Economics*, July. Growth in Developing Countries, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33(3), September *Growth in the Global Economy* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press).

- Bezu, S & Holden, S.T. (2014) Rural-urban youth migration and informal self-employment in Ethiopia. *World Development*, 64(0), 259-272. Centre for land tenure studies/school of economics and business Norwegian university.
- Birhanu, M & Nachimuthu, K. (2017). A review on Causes and Consequences of Rural-Urban Migration in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 7(4): 2250-3153
- Chakraborty,D.(2014).Migration and urban informal sector: A study in West Bengal. A Phd thesis submitted to the University of Burdwan West Bengal
- Chukwuedozie K.A & Ignatius, A.M. (2014). Rural-urban migration and livelihoods in South Eastern Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies*, 4(6): ISSN 2224-607X (Paper) ISSN 2225-0565 (Online)
- De Brauw, A., & Mueller,V. (2012). Do limitations in land rights transferability influence mobility rates in Ethiopia? *Journal of African Economies*, 21(4), 548-579
- de Brauw, A., Mueller, V., & Woldehanna, T. (2012). 'Does Internal Migration Improve Overall Well- Being in Ethiopia?'. Paper presented at the Population Association of America 2012 Annual Meeting.
- Ezra, M. & Tesfaye, S. (2011). Ecological degradation, rural poverty, and migration in Ethiopia: A Contextual Analysis. *Policy Research Division Population Council Working papers*, No. 149.
- Fields, G.S. (1975). Rural-urban migration, urban unemployment and underemployment, and job-search activity in LDCs. *Journal of Development Economics*, 2(2), 165-187.
- Fischer, R. (2009). Rural-urban migration. A necessity to survive, Munich, GRIN Verlag. <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/180759/rural-urban-migration-a-necessity-to-survive>.
- Harris, J.R. & Todaro, M.P. (1970), "Migration, unemployment and development: A Two-Sector Analysis", *American Economic Review*, 60 (1): 126–142, JSTOR 1807860. <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-01212009-160959/unrestricted/00front.pdf>
- Lee, E.S. (1966). A theory of migration. *Demography*; 3(1): 47–57; Springer on behalf of the Population Association of America
- Lewis, W.A. (1954). Economic development with unlimited supplies of labor. *The Manchester School* 22: 139–91. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9957.1954.tb00021.x.
- Liu, K. (2011). Impact of rural-to-urban migration on agricultural commodity inflation in China. A Thesis submitted to Spring Economics Department University of California, Berkeley.
- Mohammed,Y; Okoroafor, O.K. & Awe, E.O.(2015). Analysis of the relationship between inflation, unemployment and economic growth in Nigeria: 1987-2012. *Applied Economics and Finance*, Vol. 2, No. 3; August 2015 ISSN 2332-7294 E-ISSN 2332-7308 Published by Redfame Publishing URL: <http://aef.redfame.com>
- Moller, L.C. (2012). The ethiopian urban migration study 2008 : the characteristics, motives and outcomes to immigrants to Addis Ababa. *Washington, DC: World Bank*.
- Njoku, A.O & Chikere, P. (2015). Rural-urban migration and the underdevelopment in selected rural communities in Imo State, Nigeria. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science* 10(1): 1-10, 2015, Article no.BJESBS.15420 ISSN: 2278-0998.
- Nor, E.H &Abdullah, N.(2014). The relationship between rural-urban migration, household income and unemployment: Malaysia case study. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)* 2(8):17-24. ISSN 2349-0330 (Print) & ISSN 2349-0349 (Online) www.arcjournals.org
- Okafor E.E (2011). Youth unemployment and implications for stability of democracy in Nigeria. *JSDA*, 13(1). <http://www.jsdafrica.com/Jsda/V13No1>

- Ravenstein, E.G. (1885). The laws of migration. *Journal of the statistical society of London*, 48(2): 167–235.
- Rwelamira, J.K. (2008). *Effects of rural inequality on migration among the farming households in limpopo province, south africa*. Phd dissertation, university of pretoria. Available from:
- Tairu, F.O. (2003) Urban unemployment situation in Nigeria. in *E.O.Ezeani and N.N. Elekwa (eds.). issues in urbanization and urban administration in Nigeria, 154-167*. Enugu: Jamo enterprises
- Tobler, W. (1995). Migration: Ravenstein, thornthwaite, and beyond. *Urban Geography*, 16(4):327-34. Department of Geography, University of California, Santa Barbara CA 93106-4060, Bellwether Publishing, Ltd
- Todaro, M. (1971). Income expectations, rural-urban migration and employment in Africa *International Labor Review* 5(1): 104-120.
- Todaro, M.P. (1969). A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries. *The American Economic Review*. 59 (1): 148–148.
- Wang, X & Piesse, J (2009). *Economic development and surplus labor: a critical review of the Lewis model*. BWPI Working Paper 89, Books world poverty institute, the University of Manchester, UK
- Wesen, A.A. (2015). *The cause and consequences of rural urban migration the case of Wolatia Sodd Town, SNNPR Ethiopia*. Thesis, submitted to university of Wolatia, Ethiopia.
- Wondimagegnhu, B.A. (2012). *Economic impact of rural-urban migration on income and poverty of migrant sending rural households: with evidences from Southern Ethiopia. A dissertation submitted to the institute for development research and development policy (IEE), Ruhr University of Bochum*
- Zelege, B. (2011). *Push and pull factors of rural-urban migration and its implication on the place of origin: the case of Ankesha Wereda migrant street vendors and daily laborers in Addis Ababa. A thesis submitted to the School of graduate studies of Addis Ababa university*

3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	1.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00

3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	1.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	1.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	1.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00