

## United States Immigration Policy Under President Donald Trump and the Challenges of African Deportees 2016-2025

<sup>1</sup>**Ejiofor Emmanuel PhD,**  
Madanna University,  
Nigeria, Okija Campus.  
Phone: 08033764127. Email:  
[emmaejiofor7@gmail.com](mailto:emmaejiofor7@gmail.com).

<sup>2</sup>**Odigbo Jude, PhD**  
Madonna University,  
Nigeria, Okija Campus.  
Phone: 08037549721.

<sup>3</sup>**Ike Cyraicus, PhD**  
Madonna University,  
Nigeria, Okija Campus.  
Phone: 08033337388.

<sup>4</sup>**Ubogu Festus E. PhD**  
Madonna University,  
Nigeria, Okija Campus.  
Phone: 09168606390.  
Email: [drubogufestus@gmail.com](mailto:drubogufestus@gmail.com).

<sup>5</sup>. **Uji, Ujah Oji,**  
Federal Polytechnic Nkede,  
Owerri, Imo State 08065876375.

<https://doi.org/10.56201/jhsp.vol.12.no8.2026.pg31.43>

---

### **Abstract**

*Between 2016 and 2025, United States immigration policy experienced a major shift under the administration of President Donald Trump. Characterized by executive orders, increased interior enforcement, and mass deportation, these policies had disproportionate effects on immigrant communities, including Africans. While studies on US deportation have largely focused on Latino migrants, African deportees remain under-researched despite a 43% increase in removals of African nationals between 2016 and 2019 according to the Department of Homeland Security. This study examined United States immigration policy under President Donald Trump and the challenges of African deportees from 2016-2025. Anchored on Social Exclusion Theory, Cumulative Disadvantage Theory, and Transnationalism, the study adopted an Explanatory Sequential Mixed-Methods design. Quantitative data were collected from 450 African deportees across Nigeria, Ghana, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Somalia, and Kenya using a structured questionnaire. Qualitative data were obtained from 35 In-Depth Interviews and 5*

*Focus Group Discussions. Secondary data were sourced from DHS, ICE, TRAC Immigration, IOM, and World Bank reports. Data were analyzed using SPSS v29, AMOS v28 for SEM, and NVivo 14 for thematic analysis. Findings revealed that: 1. Trump-era policies, especially EO 13768 and workplace raids, significantly increased African deportation rates  $\beta=0.438$ ,  $p<0.001$ . 2. African deportees faced five major challenges: economic precarity, skills devaluation, legal limbo, psychosocial trauma, and social stigma. 3. 76.4% of respondents experienced more than income loss and 68.9% remained unemployed 12 months after return. 4. Household remittances declined by 37% on average, increasing poverty in origin communities. 5. Policy continuity post-2021 sustained deportation levels. The study concludes that restrictive US immigration policy under Trump created structural and long-term challenges for African deportees with cross-border effects. It recommends bilateral reintegration agreements, skills recognition protocols, and a pan-African deportee support fund. The study contributes a "Deportee Challenge Framework" and the first large empirical data on African US deportees 2016-2025.*

**Keywords:** *US Immigration Policy, Trump Administration, African Deportees, Economic Vulnerability, Reintegration, Mass Deportation.*

### 1.1 Background to the Study

Prior to president Donald Trump emerging as the Republican candidate in 2015, and eventually winning the presidential election in his first tenure, the United States of America has been a country with rich history of liberal social/political philosophy among which is, the opening of its borders for legal migrants into the country. This policy is justified by the monumental milestones of migrants' friendliness in its legislation. From the Asia (Beringia), during the Ice age; to migrants from Spain, French, British and Dutch, to the European civilization; African forced migrants from the Transatlantic Slave Trade, and the Irish, German and Scandinavians of the 19<sup>th</sup> century mass immigration. This historical root further enriched the character of America as a nation of opportunities predating its current disposition. And then the colonial era, when European settlers arrived in search of religious freedom and economic opportunities. The idea of the United States as a sanctuary for immigrants gained further prominence with the enactment of liberal immigration policies in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries (Taiwo, & Charity 2025).

Subsequently, on emergence of economic powerhouse in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, America's land eventually, attracted millions of immigrants who flocked in to bridge the gap of labour demands of the Industrial Revolution. The enactment of the Homestead Act of 1862 further strengthened the legislative enshrinement of settlers' accommodation into the US legal system. Many of these immigrants settled in urban centres, contributing significantly to the economic and cultural development of the nation Gordon (2025). Also, in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, through the establishment of Ellis Island in 1892, America ratified its identity as a refuge friendly nation, opening its borders to millions of European immigrants. Sequel to these, the United States social accommodation of settlers and migrants over their history, has yielded positively to the industrial, technological development, entrepreneurship and international reputation.

In the twilight of the years 2010s, America's political dynamics shifted its policies on immigration. According to Eshbaugh-Soha and Barnes (2021), as President Donald Trump won election into the presidency, he took a forthright look on his "America First" ideology, prioritizing national interests over global cooperation, particularly in areas of immigration, trade, and foreign policy as the epicenter of his campaign running for the presidency (Hamlin, 2021; Schaffner 2020). The president pronouncing prioritizing national interest and security

immediately issued Executive Orders in which, he began to implement restrictive measures such as the travel ban, formally known as Executive Order 13769, which barred entry into the U.S. from several Muslim-majority countries (Hing2018; García, 2021; Baldwin, 2016). While criticism followed the implementation of the immigration policy, calling it a discriminatory policy that violated principles of religious freedom and equal protection under the U.S. Constitution. Mr. Trump was vehement in his planned programme and introduced the Migrant Protection Protocols, commonly referred to as the "Remain in Mexico" policy, which required asylum seekers to wait outside U.S. borders while their applications were processed. These policies marked a stark departure from America's historical identity as a refuge for immigrants and asylum seekers. On Africans, president Trump's immigration programme, targeted among other countries, African continent and especially fundamentalist Muslims from African nations known for religious radicalism and fundamentalism. Large number of these are migrants who entered the country with illegal documents and the administration says that their presence constitute risk to the US national security hence, the deportation of migrants on a large scale.

African nations, often reliant on U.S. aid, trade relationships, or international legitimacy, found themselves in a subaltern position, pressured to comply to avoid broader diplomatic and economic penalties (Shinn & Dagne, 2014). This dynamic, undermines the principle of sovereign equality, treating African nations not as equal partners but as compliant recipients of dictates, effectively using immigration policy as a lever of external control, reminiscent of how colonial powers managed territories. The choice presented was often between accepting returnees (sometimes to unsafe conditions) or facing punitive measures, leaving little room for genuine negotiation or respect for their own internal processes. The U.S. under Trump often unilaterally declared individuals as deportable without due consideration for their ties to the U.S. or the conditions in their home countries. When African nations hesitated to issue travel documents, they were swiftly penalized. This assertive unilateralism demonstrates a clear disregard for the sovereign right of African states to manage their own borders, citizens, and national interests without undue external pressure. This mirrors the colonial practice where African populations and territories were managed as extensions of European empires, with their sovereignty often subjugated or ignored. The policies often ignored the reintegration challenges or security risks that forcibly returned individuals might face, placing the burden squarely on the (often ill-equipped) African receiving states without adequate support, thus outsourcing the social cost of U.S. policy (Cassola, 2020). Beyond immigration, the broader U.S.-Africa diplomatic engagement under Trump became explicitly transactional (Africa Center for Strategic Studies, 2020). Relations were framed primarily in terms of containing Chinese influence, counter-terrorism cooperation, or specific economic deals favorable to the U.S., rather than genuine partnership for mutual development, human rights, or democratic values. This selective engagement, prioritizing narrow U.S. self-interest, mirrors the colonial period's focus on Africa as a source of resources or a strategic battleground rather than a continent with complex agency and diverse aspirations. By reducing African nations to partners of convenience or sources of unwanted migrants, Trump's policies subtly eroded the diplomatic goodwill built over decades, deepening a perception that the U.S. viewed Africa primarily through a utilitarian, often exploitative lens (Morrison, 2018). The perceived unreliability and disrespect from the U.S. under Trump may have accelerated African efforts to deepen ties with other global powers (China, Russia, EU, India) to reduce over-reliance on a single, increasingly unpredictable partner. However, these "challenges" were not the intended outcome of Trump's policies, nor did they dismantle the fundamental power imbalances. Instead, they were reactive responses to

policies that primarily sought to reinforce U.S. hegemony and national interest through coercive means, rather than to foster more equitable global relations. Immigration has been central to US nation-building. The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act opened US borders to non-European migrants, leading to increased African migration. By 2022, the African-born population in the US reached 2.4 million, making it the fastest-growing immigrant group [Migration Policy Institute, 2023]. The 2016 election of President Donald Trump marked a policy shift toward restriction. On January 25, 2017, he signed Executive Order 13767 "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements" and Executive Order 13768 "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States." EO 13768 eliminated enforcement priorities, making any undocumented immigrant deportable [White House, 2017]. ICE workplace raids increased 400% between 2017 and 2019 [ICE].[2019] Africans were not the primary public focus, but DHS data show African deportations rose from 2,583 in 2016 to 3,690 in 2019. Top countries: Nigeria 24%, Somalia 18%, Ghana 15%, Ethiopia 12%, Cameroon 10% [DHS]. Unlike border removals common with Mexicans, 78% of African removals were interior enforcement after years of US residence. [2021] Forceful removal creates economic shock. Deportees often return with no assets, no transferable skills documentation, and disrupted transnational households. Between 2021-2025, deportation levels remained high at an average of 142,000 annually, indicating policy continuity. This study examines how Trump-era policy created enduring challenges for African deportees. In conclusion, President Trump's immigration policies, particularly concerning African deportees and returnee acceptance, can be understood through a post-colonial lens as a significant perpetuation of historical power dynamics and inequalities. His administration's rhetoric, coercive diplomatic tactics, and unilateral actions demonstrated a neo-colonial disregard for African sovereignty and dignity, reinforcing a global hierarchy where the U.S. dictates terms to less powerful states. While inadvertently exposing the nakedness of these asymmetries, the policies fundamentally entrenched rather than challenged the structural disadvantages faced by many African nations in the international system.

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

Deportation, or forced removal, has become a central tool of state control over national borders and populations in an era of heightened global mobility (Andersson, 2014). Conceptually, it is an exercise of state sovereignty, allowing a nation to expel foreign nationals deemed undesirable or in violation of immigration laws. However, its practice is often contentious, frequently challenging international human rights norms and generating significant social and economic consequences (Vogt, 2015; Stumpf, 2006). Legally, deportation processes are governed by national laws, which are increasingly influenced by international obligations such as the principle of non-refoulement under the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, and prohibitions against cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam, 2017). Due process rights, the right to appeal, and safeguards against removal to countries where life or freedom would be threatened are enshrined in international law, though their implementation varies widely. Critics argue that restrictive immigration policies and accelerated removal procedures often circumvent these protections (Amnesty International, 2018). The social impacts of deportation are profound, extending beyond the individual to families and communities. These include family separation, loss of community ties, psychological trauma, social stigma, and difficulty with reintegration (Gilman, 2019; Dreby, 2012). For countries of origin, receiving deportees can present significant economic challenges, including increased social service demands, potential brain drain reversal (if highly skilled individuals are deported), and the loss

of remittances—a crucial source of income for many developing nations (Cassola, 2020; Pavan, 2017). Furthermore, the human rights of deportees can be severely compromised if they are returned to states facing conflict, political instability, or severe economic distress, raising questions about complicity and humanitarian responsibility (Human Rights Watch, 2019). U.S. foreign policy towards Africa has historically been characterized by shifting priorities, often secondary to other geopolitical concerns (Copson, 2015). During the Cold War, engagement was largely instrumental, focusing on containing Soviet influence, sometimes at the expense of democratic values or human rights (Ottaway, 2007). The post-Cold War era saw an emphasis on democratization, humanitarian aid (e.g., PEPFAR under Bush), and trade initiatives (e.g., AGOA under Clinton), signaling a more positive, albeit paternalistic, approach (Rotberg, 2012). However, U.S. engagement with Africa has also been marked by disengagement or limited interest, especially outside periods of perceived crisis or strategic necessity (Shinn & Dagne, 2014). Scholars have critiqued the tendency of U.S. policy to view Africa as a monolith or through a security-centric lens, overlooking the continent's diverse political, economic, and social landscapes (Brown, 2018). While some administrations made significant strides in public health and trade, security concerns, particularly regarding terrorism, began to dominate the discourse in the 21st century (Volman, 2012). Under the Trump administration, U.S.-Africa relations underwent a distinctive shift, characterized by what critics termed a "transactional" or "neglectful" approach (Morrison, 2018; Africa Center for Strategic Studies, 2020). Beyond the controversial "shithole countries" remark, this era saw reduced diplomatic presence, cuts to aid and development programs, and a heavy emphasis on counter-terrorism and containing the influence of rival powers like China and Russia. Immigration policy became a significant, and often contentious, dimension of this transactional approach, with the administration leveraging its power to pressure African states on return agreements (Sorensen, 2019). This shift generated considerable anxiety among African nations about the reliability and commitment of the U.S. as a partner. Despite the extensive literature reviewed above, a significant scholarly void exists concerning a comprehensive, dedicated, and interdisciplinary analysis of President Trump's immigration policy specifically tailored to African deportees and its intricate geopolitical repercussions. While there is robust scholarship on U.S. immigration policy and on general deportation practices, the unique vulnerabilities, racialized narratives, and specific diplomatic pressures exerted concerning African nationals during the Trump era have not received the granular attention they warrant. Much of the literature on U.S. deportations under Trump tends to focus heavily on Latin American migrants (e.g., Abrego & Menjivar, 2011) or broader policy implications (e.g., Varsanyi, 2011), often leaving the African experience under-analyzed or as an aggregate statistic. This thesis explicitly seeks to bridge this divide by demonstrating how domestic immigration policy functioned as a potent instrument of U.S. foreign policy towards African nations, creating diplomatic friction and reshaping bilateral relationships through coercive tactics. The "geopolitical fallout" resulting from these specific policies targeting Africans has not been sufficiently explored. While securitization theory has been applied to migration generally (Huysmans, 2006), its detailed application to the specific racialized securitization of African migrants under Trump, interwoven with post-colonial critical perspectives, offers a novel theoretical contribution. This allows for a deeper understanding of how historical power imbalances were re-activated and exploited through immigration policy. Most analyses conclude with the end of the Trump presidency. This research extends its temporal scope to 2025, allowing for an examination of the long-term legacies and potential policy continuities or reversals under a successor administration, providing crucial insights into

the evolving landscape of global migration governance beyond immediate political cycles. While challenging to capture, the lived experiences of African deportees upon forced return, their agency, and the conditions of their reintegration often remain on the margins of broader policy analyses. This thesis aims to highlight these experiences, even if through indirect means (e.g., NGO reports, interviews with advocates), to provide a more holistic understanding of the human cost. This study thus directly addresses these gaps by offering a holistic, empirically rich, and theoretically informed examination of President Trump's immigration policies, their specific and disproportionate impact on African deportees, and the cascading geopolitical consequences for U.S.-Africa relations.

Literature on deportation is dominated by Latino experiences [Golash-Boza, 2015; Dreby, 2015]. Three gaps exist for Africans:

1. **Empirical Gap:** No large-scale data on African deportees post-2016
2. **Theoretical Gap:** Existing migration theories do not explain "forced return" trauma
3. **Policy Gap:** African governments lack data to design reintegration programs

Without addressing these, African states cannot respond to the economic and social costs of forced returns.

### 1.3 Aim and Objectives

#### 1.3.1 Aim

To examine United States immigration policy under President Donald Trump and the challenges of African deportees 2016-2025.

#### 1.3.2 Specific Objectives

1. Analyze key Trump-era immigration policies and their impact on African deportation rates
2. Identify the socio-economic, legal, and psychosocial challenges faced by African deportees
3. Assess the impact of deportation on household welfare and remittances in Africa
4. Examine socio-economic factors that predict reintegration outcomes
5. Propose a policy framework for Africa-US cooperation on deportee reintegration

### 1.4 Research Questions

1. What were the key features of US immigration policy under Trump 2017-2021?
2. What challenges do African deportees face upon return 2016-2025?
3. How did deportation affect economic outcomes and remittance flows?
4. What factors predict successful reintegration of African deportees?

### 1.5 Research Hypotheses

Ho1: Trump immigration policy had no significant effect on African deportation rates.

Ho2: Deportation does not significantly increase challenges for African deportees.

Ho3: Socio-economic factors do not significantly predict reintegration outcomes.

### 1.6 Significance of the Study

1. Theoretical: Extends Social Exclusion and Cumulative Disadvantage Theories to African forced migrants
2. Policy: Informs DHS, African Union, and ECOWAS on humane deportation
3. Practical: Guides IOM, NGOs on reintegration programming
4. Academic: First 2016-2025 mixed-methods dataset on African US deportees

## **1.7 Scope and Delimitation**

The study covers 2016-2025 and 6 countries: Nigeria, Ghana, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Somalia, Kenya. It focuses on adults forcefully removed from the US.

## **1.8 Operational Definition of Terms**

1. Mass Deportation: Large-scale removal of non-citizens through coordinated enforcement
2. African Deportee: African national removed from US 2016-2025
3. Economic Precarity: Susceptibility to poverty due to income loss and asset depletion
4. Reintegration: Process of re-establishing economic and social life in country of origin

## **2.1 Conceptual Review**

### **2.1.1 The Concept of Immigration Policy**

Immigration policy refers to the set of laws, regulations, and administrative practices through which a state regulates the entry, stay, and removal of non-citizens. According to Joppke, immigration policy reflects a state's attempt to balance economic needs, national security, and humanitarian obligations. [Freeman][2006][2005]

The US immigration system is characterized by its complexity, involving multiple agencies including DHS, ICE, CBP, and USCIS. Historically, US policy has shifted between periods of liberalization such as the 1965 Immigration Act and restriction such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. [Zolberg][2006]

### **2.1.2 Mass Deportation and Interior Enforcement**

Deportation is the formal removal of an alien from the United States for violation of immigration law [8 U.S.C §1227]. Mass deportation refers to large-scale removals resulting from policy changes rather than individual adjudications [Golash-Boza, 2015].

Under President Trump, interior enforcement was prioritized. EO 13768 eliminated Obama-era "priority" categories and made any undocumented immigrant a potential target [Chishti & Bolter, 2019]. ICE workplace raids, which dropped to historic lows under Obama, surged by 400% [ICE]. Scholars describe this as the "crimmigration" era where immigration violations were treated as criminal threats.[2019][Stumpf][2006]

### **2.1.3 African Migration to the United States**

African migration to the US accelerated after the 1990 Diversity Visa Lottery. Unlike other groups, African immigrants are highly educated: 41% hold a bachelor's degree compared to 29% of US-born population. Top sending countries include Nigeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, and Somalia. [Arthur][2000][Anderson][2017]

Despite high human capital, Africans face unique challenges: visa overstays, asylum backlogs, and racial profiling. DHS data show Africans had the fastest growing deportation rate 2016-2019. [Aptekar][2015]

### **2.1.4 Economic Vulnerability**

Economic vulnerability is defined as the probability of a household falling below a poverty threshold following a shock. For deportees, vulnerability manifests as: income loss, unemployment, asset depletion, skill devaluation, and loss of remittance capacity [Hagan et al., 2011].[Chaudhuri][2003]

Cassarino argues that "preparedness" determines reintegration success. Forceful removal reduces preparedness to near zero, leading to severe vulnerability. [2004]

### **2.1.5 Reintegration**

Reintegration is the process of re-establishing economic, social, and psychosocial life in country of origin [IOM]. For deportees it is often "non-voluntary" and occurs without savings or social capital. Key barriers include stigma, lack of job opportunities, and non-recognition of foreign credentials. [2019][Peutz][2006][Alpes][2017]

## **2.2 Theoretical framework**

This study is anchored on social Exclusion Theory and Transnationalism theory to support the objectives of the study.

### **2.2.1 Social Exclusion Theory**

This theory came out of European sociology in the 1970's -1990's. It was propounded by Hillary Silver in 1994. Social Exclusion theory argues that individuals are pushed to the margins of society through denial of economic, social and political rights. In the context of deportation, forceful removal represents the ultimate form of institutional exclusion (Silver, 1994).

### **2.2.2 Transnationalism Theory**

The theory was propounded in 1992 by Glick Schiller in 1992 Transnationalism theory posits that migrants operate within social fields that transcend national boundaries. African migrants in the US maintained economic and social ties through remittances and communication. Deportation represents not just individual removal, but the severing of transnational household economics.

## **2.3 Empirical Review**

According to Olympia, and Haake (2024). Odrich, (2024). Riccardi (2024). Gabriel, (2023). Sullivan, (2023) Otterbein (2023). Savage, et al (2023), on the campaign trail in December 2023, Trump said immigrants coming to the U.S. are "poisoning the blood of our country", a remark that quickly drew a rebuke from scholars, historians, and his political opponents likening the phrase to racial hygiene rhetoric and language used by Adolf Hitler. Jennifer (2026), stated that president Trump administration came in promising mass deportation. What has followed goes well beyond border control to matters of local policing, detention, federal power, and the limits of the law inside the United States. Trump administration's immigration enforcement agenda exhumed varied consequences endangering America's moral philosophy, impacting negatively on the peace and tranquility of cities and communities across the country, racial profiling, ignored court orders, pressure on states and localities, and the widening reach of immigration enforcement into everyday civic life. In line with this, his administration has carried out deportation flights, sometimes to third countries where migrants have no existing ties; ramped up nationwide immigration raids; and granted expanded or new powers to various federal, state, and local officials to enforce domestic immigration laws. Immigration law in the US has been the prerogative of the centre ie, not given to concurrent list, nor to multiplicity of agencies of the federal government in a manner that complicity arises in the execution process. The US Supreme Court ruled in 1876 and 1891 respectively, in Chy Lung v. Freeman Immigration Act the centralization of immigration law as sole authority to regulate immigration and manage foreign relations (Julie, 2023). Since Trump began implementing his immigration policy, the

aforementioned legislations have been adjusted to reassigning multiple federal agencies into the enforcement responsibilities of immigration laws. According to Nayna (2025), As part of this approach, the Trump administration has, among other actions:

- declared an emergency at the southern U.S. border, enabling military action there;
- expanded expedited removals, which allow immigration officials to deport undocumented immigrants without a court hearing;
- initiated a mass deportation campaign.
- broadened the authority of several agencies to enforce immigration laws;
- directed the creation of Homeland Security Task Forces in all fifty states to combat cross-border crime; and

• allocated tens of billions of dollars in additional funding to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and other agencies for detention and deportation operations.

Trump's immigration policy introduced a dimension in the immigration enforcement law with a widened net targeting all undocumented immigrants for potential deportation contrary to the implementation model of previous administrations. While president Biden administration focused on individuals considered threats to public safety, border security, or national security, and introduced new rules to expedite the removal of asylum seekers with serious criminal histories or terrorism ties, President Barack Obama, was more conservative, targeted individuals with criminal records, recent unauthorized entrants, and those deemed a threat to national security. Consequently, the Immigration and Custom Enforcement ICE, the investigative unit of the Department of Homeland Security, responsible for enforcing a wide range of federal laws within the interior of the United States, primarily those related to U.S. customs, immigration, and trade has since the resent Trump administration of immigration policy expanded its enforcement and joined with other federal agencies into immigration enforcement efforts. While Trump was resolute and exact on the possible victims of his deportation being people and persons he called "criminal aliens, but unfolding events broadened to target. Resulting in escalated arrest and detention of victim using sensational and sensationalistic media campaign.

## **2.5 Extreme raid and deportation of immigrants.**

President Trump was prepared to face the politics and legal fall-outs of his immigration policy while being the president of America. Knowing that he was going to face obstacles from the legislature- the Congress especially, the opposition Democrats and their caucus who control the senate. Conscious of this picture, he relied more on executive orders, proclamations, and administrative actions than bills that would need the Congressional approval to shape U.S. immigration policy of his administration. He issued 10 executive proclamations such as:

### **1.Border Security & Interior Enforcement (2017).**

This order carried the weight of – Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements in Executive Order 13767, which included, the construction of the U.S, -Mexico border wall.

Executive Order 13768 – Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior, which Targeted "sanctuary cities" by threatening to withhold federal funds. These orders also expanded deportation priorities, increased immigration enforcement inside the U.S and the strengthening of border infrastructure.

**2. Executive Order 13769** – “Travel Ban”, which restricted entry from several Muslim-majority countries, and in 2017, Presidential Proclamation 9645 expanded restriction once again. These suspended refugee admissions temporary, introduced the controversial “extreme vetting” procedures.

**3. Refugee Restrictions order.** This temporarily suspended the U.S. refugee program, reduced refugee admissions to historically low levels resulting to sharp decline in refugee resettlement and increased screening and restrictions.

4. Sanctuary Cities Policy Proclamation, imposing federal penalties on cities refusing to cooperate with immigration enforcement, linked federal funding to compliance. This obnoxious order, ensued lots of legal battles between federal and state/local governments, caused heavy tention to all levels of government over immigration enforcement.

**2.4 Research Gap:** No study links Trump policy 2016-2025 directly to African deportee challenges.

### **3.1 Research Design:**

This study adopted explanatory sequential mixed method: QUAN and qual. (creswell and plano clark, 2018)

### **3.2Area of study:**

The study is limited to Nigeria, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Somalia, Kenya selected for highest US deportation members.

### **3.3 Population of study**

The population of study consists of 18,240 deportee’s 2016-2025. Source is DHS and TRAC Immigration.

### **3.4 Sample and sampling Techniques**

The researcher used purposive sampling and applied quantitative and qualitative approaches 450 using Cochran formula, multi-stage and snowball via 10m and diaspora groups.

**3.5 Instruments of Data collection:** The following methods were adopted by the researcher:

- (1) **Questionnaire:** 70 items Demographics, policy Exposure, challenge scale 30 items, Economic Indicators, Reintegration scale.
- (2) **IDI Guide:** 10 open questions on lived experience.
- (3) **FDG Guide:** communication participation.

### **3.6 Validity and Reliability**

Validity is the process of determining if the instruments used to actually measure what is meant to measure, while Reliability of test instrument refers to the consistency and dependability of the instrument. Face validity by 3 professors. Pilot n=50. Cronbach Alpha = 0.89

### **3.7 Data Analysis**

The data were treated statistically using:

Quantitative approach: SPSSv29.  
Descriptive, T-test, Regression, SEM in AMOS.  
**Quantitative:** NVIO 14. Thematic analysis.

#### 4.1 Demographic Characteristics

N=450. 56% Male, 44% Female. 38% Nigeria. 48% lived in US 6-10 years. 64% deported for visa overstay.

#### 4.2 RQ1: Key Trump Policy Features

Table 4.1: 87.3% agreed EO 13768 increased deportation risk. Mean=4.38, SD=0.59

#### 4.3 RQ2: Challenges Faced

Table 4.2:

| Challenge Domain     | Mean | SD   |
|----------------------|------|------|
| Economic Precarity   | 4.42 | 0.61 |
| Skills Devaluation   | 4.18 | 0.73 |
| Social Stigma        | 4.05 | 0.68 |
| Legal Problems       | 3.89 | 0.81 |
| Mental Health Issues | 3.76 | 0.79 |

#### 4.4 RQ3: Economic and Household Impact

Table 4.3 Paired T-test:

| Pre-Deportation         | Post-Deportation | t     | p    |
|-------------------------|------------------|-------|------|
| Monthly Income USD3,450 | 820              | 15.21 | .000 |
| Remittance Sent USD 420 | 265              | 9.43  | .000 |

76.4% lost >60% income. 68.9% unemployed at 12 months.

#### 4.5 RQ4: Predictors of Reintegration

Table 4.4 Regression:  $R^2=0.547$ ,  $F=82.31$ ,  $p<.001$

Significant: Social Support  $\beta=-0.33$ , Skills Transfer  $\beta=-0.29$ , Stigma  $\beta=0.38$ , Duration  $\beta=-0.24$

#### 4.6 Qualitative Findings

Theme 1: "I came back with one bag" - Total asset loss

Theme 2: "My nursing license means nothing" - Skills mismatch

Theme 3: "We are marked as failures" - Stigma

Theme 4: "My children dropped out" - Remittance shock

#### 4.7 Test of Hypotheses

All  $H_0$  rejected at  $p<0.05$ .

#### 4.8 Discussion

Findings confirm Social Exclusion Theory. Economic loss is worse for Africans due to lack of bilateral agreements. Policy continuity 2021-2025 meant challenges persisted.

### **5.1 Summary**

This study examined Trump-era US immigration policy and African deportee challenges 2016-2025. With 450 surveys and 35 interviews, it found significant policy impact, 5 challenge domains, and 37% remittance decline.

### **5.2 Conclusion**

Restrictive US policy created structural challenges that transferred poverty across borders. Deportation is not an end but the beginning of a new cycle of vulnerability.

### **5.3 Contributions to Knowledge**

1. Deportee Challenge Framework: 5-dimension model
2. Empirical: First large-n data on African US deportees 2016-2025
3. Policy: Proposed Africa-US Reintegration MoU

### **5.4 Recommendations**

1. To US Government: 90-day pre-departure asset liquidation and case review
2. To African Governments: National Deportee Fund + Skills Certification Centers
3. To AU: Negotiate Humane Deportation MoU with US
4. To IOM/NGOs: Micro-grants + Mental health services

### **5.5 Limitations**

Recall bias, 6 countries only, COVID-19 impact on data collection

### **5.6 Suggestions for Further Study**

Longitudinal study, impact on US citizen children left behind, comparative study with Europe

## References

- Alpes, M. J. (2017). Why deportation matters. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43(12), 2035-2051.
- Anderson, M. (2017). African immigrant population in the US. Pew Research Center.
- Cassarino, J. P. (2004). Theorising return migration. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 6(2), 253-279.
- Chishti, M., & Bolter, J. (2019). The Trump effect on immigration. Migration Policy Institute.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage.
- Dannefer, D. (2003). Cumulative advantage/disadvantage. *The Gerontologist*, 43(3), 308-318.
- Department of Homeland Security. (2021). Immigration enforcement actions: 2019. Office of Immigration Statistics.
- Dreby, J. (2015). *Everyday illegal*. University of California Press.
- Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L., & Szanton Blanc, C. (1992). Transnationalism. *Annals of NY Academy of Sciences*, 645(1), 1-24.
- Golash-Boza, T. (2015). *Deported: Immigrant policing, disposable labor and global capitalism*. NYU Press.
- International Organization for Migration. (2020). *World Migration Report 2020*. Geneva: IOM.
- Joppke, C. (2005). Selecting by origin. *European Journal of Sociology*, 46(2), 159-180.
- Menjivar, C., & Abrego, L. (2012). Legal violence. *Law & Society Review*, 46(2), 313-343.
- Migration Policy Institute. (2023). African immigrants in the United States. MPI Data Hub.
- Silver, H. (1994). Social exclusion and social solidarity. *International Labour Review*, 133(5-6), 531-578.
- Stumpf, J. (2006). The crimmigration crisis. *American University Law Review*, 55, 367-419.
- TRAC Immigration. (2020-2025). *Deportation data*. Syracuse University.
- US Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2019). *FY2019 Enforcement statistics*.
- White House. (2017). Executive Order 13768: Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States.
- World Bank. (2024). *Migration and Remittances Data*. Washington DC: World Bank.