

Impacts of Increased Raids and Mass Deportation by the Trump Administration on Economic Vulnerability of Forcefully Removed Africans (2016-2025)

¹Ejiofor Emmanuel PhD

Madanna University, Nigeria,
Okija Campus. Phone: 08033764127.
Email: emmaejiofor7@gmail.com.

²Odigbo Jude, PhD

Madonna University, Nigeria,
Okija Campus. Phone: 08037549721.

³Ike Cyraicus PhD

Madonna University, Nigeria,
Okija Campus. Phone: 08033337388.

⁴Ubogu Festus E. PhD

Madonna University, Nigeria,
Okija Campus. Phone: 09168606390.
Email: drubogufestus@gmail.com.

⁵Uji, Ujah Oji,

Federal Polytechnic Nkede,
Owerri, Imo State 08065876375.

<https://doi.org/10.56201/rjhcs.v12.no7.2026.pg66.77>

Abstract

The mass deportation regime under President Donald Trump's administration 2017-2021 marked a significant shift in US immigration enforcement, characterized by increased workplace raids, expansion of ICE operations, and the termination of prosecutorial discretion. Africans, though a smaller share of the undocumented population, experienced a 43% increase in deportations during this period according to DHS data. This study examined the impacts of increased raids and mass deportation on the economic vulnerability of forcefully removed Africans. Anchored on Securitization and radicalized border theories, the study adopted a mixed-methods explanatory sequential design. Quantitative data were collected from 412 African deportees across Nigeria, Ghana, Cameroon, Ethiopia, and Somalia using a structured questionnaire. Qualitative data were derived from 28 in-depth interviews and 4 focus group discussions. Data were analyzed using SPSS v28 for descriptive statistics, multiple regression and SEM, and NVivo 14 for thematic analysis.

Findings revealed that: 1. Trump-era policies significantly increased the likelihood of

deportation for Africans $\beta=0.412$, $p<0.001$. 2. Forceful removal led to severe economic vulnerability including loss of assets, unemployment, and dependence on remittances with 78.2% of deportees reporting income below pre-deportation levels. 3. Duration in the US, skills transferability, and post-deportation support significantly predicted reintegration outcomes $R^2=0.521$. 4. Households in countries of origin experienced 34% average decline in remittance income. The study concludes that mass deportation under Trump created long-term economic precarity for African deportees and their families. It recommends bilateral deportation agreements, pre-departure economic counseling, and national reintegration funds in African states. This study contributes to migration literature by providing the first large empirical data on African US deportees and a Deportee Economic Vulnerability Framework.

Keywords: *Mass Deportation, Trump Administration, African Deportees, Economic Vulnerability, Reintegration, ICE Raids*

1.1 Background to the Study

Global migration reached 281 million in 2020 with the US hosting 50.6 million migrants. Africans represent the fastest growing immigrant group in the US, growing from 881,000 in 2000 to 2.1 million in 2019. The Trump administration 2017-2021 redefined immigration enforcement through 3 pillars: border security, interior enforcement, and visa restrictions. Executive Orders 13767 and 13768 expanded expedited removal and eliminated priority categories for ICE. Workplace raids increased 400% between 2017-2025.

For Africans, consequences were severe. DHS reported 3,690 African deportations in 2019 vs 2,583 in 2016. Many were long-term residents with US citizen children. Forceful removal meant loss of jobs, homes, and savings. Upon return, deportees faced stigma, no capital, and non-recognition of US-acquired skills. This context necessitates understanding how increased raids and mass deportation created economic vulnerability for Africans.

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 focuses heavily on Mexicans and Central Americans. African deportees remain statistically invisible and theoretically underdeveloped. The Trump administration's "no exceptions" enforcement created a new class of economically vulnerable returnees.

Three gaps exist:

1. No empirical measurement of how ICE raids specifically targeted African communities
 2. Limited data on asset loss and labor market outcomes post-deportation for Africans
 3. No policy framework for African states to address economic reintegration of US deportees.
- This study fills these gaps.

1.3 Aim and Objectives of the Study

Aim: To examine the impacts of increased raids and mass deportation by the Trump administration on economic vulnerability of forcefully removed Africans.

Objectives:

1. To assess the extent to which Trump-era enforcement policies increased deportation of Africans
2. To examine the effects of forceful removal on income, employment, and assets of African deportees
3. To determine socio-economic factors that predict economic vulnerability post-deportation
4. To evaluate the impact on remittance-dependent households in Africa
5. To propose a policy framework for economic reintegration

1.4 Research Questions

1. To what extent did increased ICE raids and mass deportation under Trump affect African immigrants?
2. What are the economic consequences of forceful removal for African deportees?
3. What factors predict the level of economic vulnerability among African deportees?
4. How did deportation affect remittance flows and household welfare in Africa?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

Ho1: Increased ICE raids under Trump had no significant effect on deportation rates of Africans.

H1: Increased ICE raids under Trump had a significant effect...

Ho2: Forceful removal does not significantly increase economic vulnerability of African deportees.

H2: ...

Ho3: Duration in US, education, and support networks do not significantly predict post-deportation income.

H3:...

1.6 Significance of the Study

1. **Theoretical:** Tests Social Exclusion Theory in deportation context

2. **Policy:** Provides evidence for US DHS and African governments

3. **Practical:** Guides NGOs on livelihood programs

4. **Academic:** First mixed-methods PhD on African US deportees

5. The study of President Trumps immigration policy and deportation of African is significant for both theoretical and practical reasons. Theoretically, studies on international immigration has a long history since nations began to relate with each other. Many studies on have dealt with human migration in history whereas other examine political and social dynamics of human migration. However, none has examined the implementation of president Trumps recent programme spelling wide deportation of African. Against this backdrop, the study therefore adds to the existing literature on the human migration, immigration challenges with a contribution that is founded on understanding the current US immigration programme and the impacts it has with the US-African diplomatic and relations. The study is equally theoretically significant because it fills the gap emanating from paucity of information on the national security issues the US has undergone and informs this hardline approach of deporting many migrants on grounds of constituting a national security concern. It will also benefit student s and scholars who may find the findings relevant for their researches.

Practically, African continent has been bedeviled with varying economic and political challenges, giving the paucity of workable policies and developmental ideas, with the recent development in the treatment of migrants by the current leadership in the US that undermines the country's long history of accommodating international immigrants. Interestingly, with this development the study is of immense benefit to both the US government/policymakers, the public and the government of African region, whose citizens are deported as it opens a new vista on how Africa can fashion out better economic programmes to better their economies so as to reduce the rate of migration into the US and Europe.

1.7 Scope: 2016-2025, 5 African countries, deportees,

1.8 Definition of Terms: Mass Deportation, Economic Vulnerability, Forceful Removal, ICE Raid

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

The study adopted securitization and radicalized border governance theories. Securitization theory studies political situations seen in the deeper conception and transformed into security concerns, enabling extraordinary measures to address perceived threats. According to Rens (2012), securitization is a development of the Copenhagen school of security studies, which included Ole Wæver and Barry Buzan, and a range of others. Originally credited to Wæver (1995), a more scientific elaboration was done in the works of Buzan, et al (1998). They posit that security is not an objective condition but rather a socially constructed phenomenon. Scholars such as Peoples and Vaughan-Williams (2010); McDonald 2008; Balzacq 2010), over the decades, have thrown insightful analysis to advance the concept, providing useful insights, in a systematic discussion that situate securitization theory in critical security studies. The theory evaluates the process in which state actors interpret certain issues in the prism of security threats, thereby legitimizing the means used to achieve the end invariably, employment of lethal

measures in addressing them. This transformation is often initiated through a speech act by a securitizing actor, such as a political leader, who articulates a threat that requires urgent action. This theory presents a complex understanding and interpretation of security theories especially, national security complex and regional security complex theories which was gleaned from the works of Wolfers (1962), Buzan et al (1990), Buzan (1991), Buzan (1998), Buzan *et al* (1998), Buzan and Waever (2003), Nnoli (2006) and Buzan (2008). The regional security complex theory and its reductionist version – the national security complex theory – were developed to reflect the complex nature of international security in post-Cold War era. National security complex theory questions the primacy of the military elements and the state alone in the conceptualization of security. According to Buzan *et al* (1998), this questioning has come from diverse sources rarely coordinated with each other. Some have come from the policy side, representing organizations (including the state) trying either to achieve recognition for their concerns or adapt themselves to circumstances. But the securitization theory also a scholarly development of the post-Cold War era, is challenging the traditional conception security studies that focused primarily on military threats. It expanded the security agenda to include non-military issues such as immigration, environmental concerns, and human security, emphasizing that security is context-dependent and often politically constructed.

The basic assumptions of Securitization theory stems from the way political leaders, policy framers of nations and actors see any political, social or issue that has economic implication, in the frame of national security and threats. It takes the form of a speech-act process where an actor (state, politician, institution) frames an issue as an existential threat, enabling extraordinary measures outside normal politics. The other assumptions of this theory are: securitizing actor, referent object (what is being protected), audience acceptance, emergency measures. Border governance: The policies, institutions, practices that regulate movement across borders (immigration control, asylum, customs, surveillance). Securitisation theorists determined five sectors: the economic, the societal, the military, the political and the environmental sector. In each sector, a specific threat is articulated as threatening a referent object (Clara, 2018). For example, in the societal sector, the referent object is identity, while the referent objects in the environmental sector are the ecosystem and endangered species. It is only in the military sector that the referent object remains the state. By ‘sectorialising’ security, we understand that existential threats are not objective but instead relate to the different characteristics of each referent object. This technique also highlights the contextual nature of security and threats. Conceptualising securitisation as a speech act is important as it shows that words do not merely describe reality, but constitute reality, which in turn triggers certain responses. In the process of describing the reality we see; we also interact with that world and perform an action that will greatly contribute to seeing that reality in a different way. For example, referring to an immigration camp in Calais as ‘the Jungle’ is not simply describing what the camp really is, but portraying it as a lawless and dangerous place. Hence, threats are not just threatened by nature, but are constructed as threats through language. President Trump framed immigrants’ influx into America as a security threat stating, that continued influx of immigrants into the United States brings into the country persons from areas and countries that a prone to Islamic fundamentalism whose presence in his country is to foment terror with dare consequence to the country’s national security.

2.3 Empirical Review

Increased raid and mass deportation

The Phenomenon of Deportation: Legal, Social, and Economic Dimensions

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). From his first tenure in office as president of America, Donald Trump came with a definite agenda that spells a major step in reshaping his country's immigration policy. He has already in his campaign, promised the execution of "the largest domestic deportation operation" ever to be witnessed in U.S. history. He was consistently using racial rhetorics and dehumanizing languages in addressing and painted the influx of illegal immigrants as an assault—an "invasion" on the American public, citing baseless accounts of their proclivity for crime (Hass et al, 2025; Castillo et al 2024; Michael, 2024; Kessler, 2024; Gold, and Huynh, 2024; Shear et al (2024). 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.

2.4 Gap: "No study has quantitatively measured economic vulnerability of African deportees post-Trump."

3.1 Research Design:

This study adopted Explanatory sequential mixed methods: QUAN and qual methods.

3.2 Population of study:

The population of this study comprises 14,820 Africans departed from us 2016-2025. Source DHS, TRAC.

3.3 Sample size and sampling Technique:

The sample size comprises 400 using Cochran formula and 28 IDIS plus 4 FGDS.

3.4 Instruments of Data collection.

The instrument of data collection includes the following:

1. Questionnaire:

- A. Demographics,
 - B. Deportation Experience,
 - C. Economic indicators pre/post
 - D. Vulnerability scale 25 items,
- Cronbach $\alpha = 0.87$

2. Interview Guide: lived experience asset loss, coping.

3. FGD Guide: community stigma and support.

3.5 Validity and Reliability:

The validity of the data collection is ensured by expert validation, pilot $n=45$, $\alpha > 0.80$. For equal member checking.

3.6 Data Analysis:

The method of data analysis used include:

- (1) Quant: SPSS. Descriptive, T-test pre/post income, Multiple regression, SEM in AMOS.
- (2) Qual: NVIVO. Thematic coding and
- (3) Integration: Joint display table.

3.7 Model specification:

This study adopted a multiple regression model.

The model is functionally specified as:

$$EVI = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Raids} + \beta_2 \text{Duration} + \beta_3 \text{Skills} + \beta_4 \text{Support} + \beta_5 \text{STGMA} + \text{VARESPILON}$$

Where EVI= Economic Vulnerability Index.

4.1 Demographic Characteristics

Table 4.1: 58% male, 42% female. 41% from Nigeria. 62% lived in US >5 years. 71% deported due to visa overstay.

4.2 RQ1: Extent of Increased Raids and Deportation

Table 4.2: Mean 4.31 SD 0.62 that "ICE raids increased during Trump". Document analysis of 12 EOs confirms expansion.

4.3 RQ2: Economic Consequences

Table 4.3 Paired T-test: Pre-deportation income \$3,200 vs Post \$680, $t=14.32$, $p < 0.001$. 78.2% unemployed 6 months post-return. 84% lost US assets.

4.4 RQ3: Predictors of Vulnerability

Table 4.4 Regression: $R^2=0.521$. Significant predictors: Duration in US $\beta=-0.31$, Skills Transferability $\beta=-0.28$, Support $\beta=-0.22$, Stigma $\beta=0.41$. All $p < 0.05$.

4.5 RQ4: Impact on Households

Table 4.5: Average remittance drop 34%. 61% of households reported food insecurity.

4.6 Qualitative Findings

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

Theme 2: "My degree means nothing here" - Skills mismatch

Theme 3: "They call us deportee" - Stigma and exclusion

4.7 Test of Hypotheses

Ho1 Rejected: $\chi^2=42.31$, $p<0.001$. Deportations significantly higher.

Ho2 Rejected: $t=14.32$, $p<0.001$. Vulnerability significantly increased.

Ho3 Rejected: $F=67.41$, $p<0.001$. Predictors significant.

4.8 Discussion

Findings align with Golash-Boza 2015 on cumulative disadvantage. Contradict assumption that Africans have "safety nets". Extends Social Exclusion Theory to forced migrants.

5.1 Summary

This study examined impacts of Trump-era raids and mass deportation on 412 African deportees. Mixed methods revealed significant increase in deportation, severe economic vulnerability, and household welfare decline. Duration, skills, and support were key predictors.

5.2 Conclusion

Based on findings, the Trump administration's mass deportation regime created a new population of economically vulnerable Africans. Forceful removal erased years of capital accumulation and transferred poverty across borders. Current reintegration policies in Africa are inadequate.

5.3 Contributions to Knowledge

1. Developed and validated Deportee Economic Vulnerability Index
2. First large-n data on African US deportees
3. Extended Social Exclusion Theory to deportation
4. Proposed Africa-US Deportee Reintegration Framework

5.4 Recommendations

1. To US Government: Replace raids with case management. Provide 90-day pre-departure economic planning
2. To African Governments: Establish National Deportee Fund and skills recognition centers
3. To AU: Negotiate MoU with US on humane deportation and data sharing
4. To NGOs: Provide micro-grants and mental health support

5.5 Suggestions for Further Study: Longitudinal study, impact on US citizen children

References

- Alpes, M. J. (2017). Why deportation matters. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43(12), 2035-2051.
- Chishti, M., & Bolter, J. (2019). The Trump effect. Migration Policy Institute.
- Department of Homeland Security. (2021). Immigration enforcement actions: 2019. DHS Office of Immigration Statistics.
- Golash-Boza, T. (2015). *Deported: Immigrant policing, disposable labor and global capitalism*. NYU Press.
- IOM. (2020). *World migration report 2020*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- Peutz, M. (2006). Embarking on an anthropology of deportation. *Current Anthropology*, 47(2), 217-241.
- Silver, H. (1994). Social exclusion and social solidarity. *International Labour Review*, 133(5-6), 531-578.
- TRAC Immigration. (2020). *Deportation data by country*. Syracuse University.
- UNDP. (2021). *Human development report*. New York: United Nations.
- World Bank. (2021). *Migration and remittances data*. Washington DC: World Bank.

APPENDICES

- A. Questionnaire
- B. Interview Guide
- C. IRB Approval
- D. Consent Form