

Sokoto Journal of Geographical Studies (SJGS)



Volume 2, Issue 1, July, 2025 Edition



Sokoto Journal of Geographical Studies (SJGS)

Volume 2, Issue 1, July, 2025 Edition

***Published by the Department of Geography, Sokoto State
University, Sokoto P.M.B. 2134, Along Birnin Kebbi
Road, Sokoto State-Nigeria***



**Department of Geography, Sokoto State University, Sokoto
P.M.B. 2134, Along Birnin Kebbi Road, Sokoto State-Nigeria**

Copyright© Department of Geography, Sokoto State University, Sokoto
(July 2025 Edition, Issue 1, Number 2)

E-ISSN: 3115-5812, PRINT ISSN: 3034-551X

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, transmitted, transcribed, stored in a retrieval system or translated into any form or by any means, electronically, manually or otherwise without the prior written consent of Sokoto Journal of Geographical Studies.



ABOUT THE JOURNAL

Sokoto Journal of Geographical Studies (SJGS) is a double-blind peer reviewed journal that is being published in **July** and **December** annually, by the Department of Geography Sokoto State University, Sokoto-Nigeria. The Journal provides a platform for researchers and academicians around the world in order to promote healthy intellectual discourse concerning research, preservation and dissemination of academic knowledge. The journal adopts a multidisciplinary approach to scholarship in all areas of Geographical Studies.

Prof. I. M. Dankani

Editor-in-Chief

AUTHOR'S GUIDELINES

Manuscript should be typed, doubled line spacing, 12 fonts size Time New Romans, not more than 3000-5000 words pages including references and appendixes. The text should be organized into an introductory section, conveying the background and purpose of the paper, and then into sections identified with subheadings. References should be in APA style of references 6 edition. An abstract should not be more than 250 words. All pages should be numbered at the bottom centre of the page beginning with the title page. The abstract should not contain abbreviations or references. Keywords should be provided below the abstract in alphabetical order for indexing.

Title page should be placed on a cover sheet (less than 40 characters) and it should contain, title of the paper, the full name(s) of the author(s) and the addresses of the institution(s) at which the work was carried out along with full postal and email addresses, and phone numbers to whom correspondences about the manuscript should be sent

However, manuscripts that do not meet the criteria outlined in these instructions will be returned back to the Author without review. Similarly, views expressed in the articles are those of authors, not publishers.

The following are the instructions needs to be respected

- i. The entire article (including figures and tables) should be supplied as a single document file
- ii. Authors should supply their accepted paper as formatted text
- iii. Manuscripts are to be prepared and submitted in word document (.doc) or rich text format, only on manuscript.

Authors can only submit their manuscripts electronically in MS word format through the Journal Email: sjgs@ssu.edu.ng Papers are submitted on the understanding that they have not been published elsewhere (except in the form of an abstract, as part of a published lecture, reviewed, or thesis) will not be submitted anywhere else and are not currently under consideration by another journal or any other publications.

Acknowledgements

The sources of financial grants and other funding must be acknowledged, including a frank declaration of the authors, commercial links and affiliations. The contributions should also be acknowledged.

Assessment Fee (Non-Refundable) & Publication Fee

Account Name: Sokoto Journal of Geographical Studies

Account Number: **1312472903**

Bank: **Zenith Bank**



All correspondence shall be addressed to:

Secretary Editorial Board,
Sokoto Journal of Geographical Studies
Department of Geography
Faculty of Social and Management Sciences
Sokoto State University, Sokoto
P.M.B 2134, Along Birnin Kebbi Road, Sokoto State-Nigeria

Tel: 080-6950-1786 (Secretary Editorial Board)

Email: sjgs@ssu.edu.ng

Website: <https://sjgs.org.ng>

**EDITORIAL BOARD**

S/N	Name	University	Position
1.	Prof. I. M. Dankani	UDUS	Editor-in-Chief
2.	Prof. A. T. Umar	UDUS	Assist Chief Editor 1
3.	Prof. N. B. Eniolorunda	UDUS	Assist Chief Editor 2
4.	Dr. Mustapha Sani	SSU	Managing Editor/Secretary
5.	Dr. Rufai Abubakar	SSU	Treasurer
6.	Prof. M. A. Iliya	UDUS	Member
7.	Prof. D. D. Ajayi	UNI Ibadan	Member
8.	Prof. S. O. Efabiya	UNI Ilorin	Member
9.	Prof. Joseph A. Yaro	UNI Ghana	Member
10.	Prof. A. G. Fada	UDUS	Member
11.	Prof. Y. M. Adamu	BUK	Member
12.	Dr. Murtala M. Uba	BUK	Member
13.	Dr. Ibrahim Ishaq	FUBK	Member
14.	Dr. Muhammad Ismail	ABU Zaria	Member
15.	Dr. A. A. Bichi	FUG	Member
16.	Mal. Hayatu Dangaladima	SSU	Member
17.	Mal. Lauwali Barau	SSU	Member

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

S/N	Name	University
1.	Prof. Maharazu A. Yusuf	BUK
2.	Prof. I. A. Adamu	UDUS
3.	Prof. S. D. Abubakar	IBLU
4.	Prof. M. A. Gada	UDUS
5.	Prof. M. A. Shamaki	UDUS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>About the Journal</i>	iv
<i>Author's Guidelines</i>	v
<i>Editorial Board</i>	vii
<i>Table Contents</i>	viii
Challenges of Slums Dwellers in Sokoto Metropolis: Towards A Sustainable City <i>Rufa'i Abubakar & Usman Abdulkadir</i>	1-14
The Implications of Drug Abuse and Juvenile Delinquency in Kantin Aga, Chikun Local Government Area, Kaduna State, Nigeria <i>Faith Yahaya, B. D. Ekpo, Adamu Ahijah Amulo, Isah Shuaibu</i>	15-27
Traffic Congestion and Environmental Sustainability in Benin Metropolis, Edo State, Nigeria <i>John-Abebe R. O. & Idebaneria, K. O.</i>	28-45
An Assessment of the Patterns and Levels of Physical Forms of Domestic Violence in Nigeria <i>Abubakar Yakubu Isa Kazaure & Hafiz Darda'u</i>	46-54
Assessment of Climate Change Effects on Human Health in Sokoto State, Nigeria <i>Mustapha Sani, Hassan Muhammad Sani & Lauwali Barau</i>	55-68
The Influence of Technological Advancement on Nigeria's Administration of the Criminal Justice System <i>Ibrahim Yusuf & Lilian Ogechi Okpara</i>	69-93
The Impact of Fuelwood Harvesting on Biodiversity Loss: The Implications for Sustainable Development: A Case Study of Benin Environs <i>Emily Osa Iduseri</i>	94-110
'The United States of America' Migrants' Deportation Policy: Emerging Trends and Implications for Countries of Origin and Destination <i>Lauwali Barau</i>	111-124
The Role of Transportation in Agricultural Distribution Chain in South-West, Nigeria <i>ODULEYE, Olusola & OJEKUNLE, Joel Ademola</i>	125-133
Assessment of the Effects of Residential Segregation on Housing Conditions, Environment, and Socio-Economic Status of Households in Kaduna Metropolis, Nigeria <i>Mugu, B. A., Akpu, B. A., Yusuf, R. O. & Abbas, S.</i>	134-146
Access and Utilization of Healthcare Services in Wushishi Local Government Area of Niger State, Nigeria <i>Ishaq, A. B., Mukhtar, F., Usman, M. N., Waziri, A. M., Ahmed, Y. & Abdulkarim, I. A.</i>	147-163

‘THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA’ MIGRANTS’ DEPORTATION POLICY: EMERGING TRENDS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION

Lauwali Barau

Department of Geography, Faculty of Social and Management Sciences, Sokoto State University,
Sokoto, Nigeria



Corresponding Author’s Email: lauwali.barau@ssu.edu.ng

Abstract

The United States' migrants' deportation policy reflects a tension between national security enforcement and human rights obligations, leading to unpredictable and inconsistent deportation practices. The study examines the emerging trends in the United States' migrants' deportation policy and analyze its implications for both the countries of origin and the destination country. A mixed-methods approach, grounded in secondary data sources including policy reports, deportation statistics, news articles and academic articles, was used to perform the analysis. The study highlights that the United States' deportation policy has transitioned from humanitarian protections toward aggressive enforcement frameworks. The deportations have affected over 1.4 million individuals, prompting cooperation and resistance from over 200 countries. The study reveals significant socio-economic consequences in the countries of origin that include decreased remittances, rising unemployment, brain drain, social stigma, and reintegration challenges to deportees and the people at home. However, in the destination country, the consequences they face are: labour shortages, weakened industries, family disruptions, and damage to its global human rights reputation. However, deportations also yield potential benefits, such as skills transfer, entrepreneurial activities among returnees, and strengthened national security and legal enforcement. The deportees face reintegration difficulties ranging from psychological trauma to lack of institutional support, underscoring the need for coordinated transnational strategies. Therefore, deportation policy is not merely a domestic policy tool, but a transnational process requiring humane and development-oriented governance. This study recommends reforms including rights-based enforcement, bilateral agreements, reintegration frameworks, and diaspora engagement. Ultimately, addressing deportation effectively demands a shift from punitive control to inclusive migration diplomacy and socio-economic cooperation.

Keywords: *Deportation Policy, Countries of Origin, Destination, Deportees, and Reintegration Challenges.*

Introduction

Migration is a key aspect of globalization, with millions of individuals across borders in search of better opportunities. However, not all migrants remain in their destination countries permanently. Thus, migrants returning to their home countries after residing abroad have become a significant phenomenon in global migration dynamics (Cassarino, 2004; De Haas, Castles & Miller, 2020). Pew Research Centre PRC (2023) stated that the United States have served as one of the largest migrants receiving countries, and increasing numbers of migrants are voluntarily returning or being deported to their countries of origin. These have wide-ranging economic, social, and political implications for both destination countries and countries of origin, particularly in Latin America, Asia and Africa (World Bank, WB, 2022).

However, migration has long been a critical component of global socio-economic development, with the United States being one of the primary destinations for migrants worldwide. The stringent deportation policies have significant consequences not only for the deported individuals but also for both the destination country and the migrants' home countries. Similarly, the process of deportation by the United States creates a range of challenges for both the country enforcing the policy and the countries receiving deportees. While the United States government justifies these policies based on national security, economic concerns and legal enforcement, deportation affects economic stability, social structures and crime rates in origin countries. This policy raises ethical and humanitarian concerns, affecting international relations, human rights discussions and policy frameworks (Massey & Gentsch, 2014; Menjívar, Gómez Cervantes & Alvord, 2018).

Therefore, the study examines the emerging trends in the United States' migrants' deportation policy and analyze its implications for both the countries of origin and the destination country. This was achieved through the following objectives:

- i. to trace the immigration policy developments from 1990 to date and describe recent trends in the United States' migrants' deportation policy (2020-2025);
- ii. to evaluate the implications of the United States' deportation policy for the countries of origin and the destination;
- iii. to explore the reintegration challenges faced by deportees in origin countries.

Materials and Methods

This study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative research methods. The data were sourced from secondary sources like government reports, academic journals, and news articles to perform the analysis.

Results and Discussions

Immigration Policy Developments in the United States from 1990 to 2025

The issue of immigration in the United States has evolved significantly from 1990 to the present, with each presidential administration implementing distinct policies. For example, under George H.W. Bush (1989–1993), the Immigration Act of 1990 was signed into law. The legislation expanded the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act, increasing the annual immigration cap to 700,000 (a 40% rise) and doubling employment-related immigration. Additionally, it introduced the Diversity Visa Program to encourage immigration from underrepresented regions (Wasem, 2011). During Bill Clinton's administration (1993-2001), the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRAIRA) of 1996 was enacted. This law imposed heightened penalties for unlawful presence, broadened the list of deportable offences, instituted expedited removal procedures, and mandated the construction of physical barriers along the United States-Mexico border (Meissner et al., 2013).

However, under George W. Bush (2001-2009), immigration policy shifted notably following the September 11 attacks. The administration established the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to centralize immigration enforcement. The Secure Fence Act of 2006 authorized the construction of 700 miles of double-layered fencing along the southern border to enhance security (Alden, 2008; United States Congress, USC, 2006). Similarly, Barack Obama (2009-2017) introduced the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program in 2012, which offers just temporary protection and work authorization to eligible undocumented youth brought to the U.S. as children (Pierce & Selee, 2017). However, his administration was criticized for deporting over 2 million immigrants during his tenure (Gonzalez-Barrera & Krogstad, 2014).

Furthermore, during Donald Trump's first term (2017-2021), immigration policy became significantly more restrictive. The Zero-Tolerance Policy of 2018 led to the separation of thousands of families at the border (American Immigration Council, 2020). His administration also issued travel bans targeting several Muslim-majority countries and expanded the “public charge” rule to deny green cards to those likely to use public benefits (Pierce & Bolter, 2020). Likewise, Joe Biden (2021-2025) reversed many Trump-era policies. He rescinded the travel bans, halted border wall construction, and introduced the United States Citizenship Act of 2021, which aimed to create a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, reform the asylum system, and address the root causes of migration (Pierce, 2021).

Besides that, in Donald Trump's second term (2025), immigration policy has intensified further. On January 20, 2025, he signed Executive Order 14159, titled “*Protecting the American People Against Invasion.*” This order emphasizes strict enforcement of immigration laws and includes: expanded expedited removal processes, denial of federal funds to sanctuary jurisdictions, mandatory registration of undocumented immigrants, increased hiring of ICE and CBP personnel, restricted access to public benefits, expansion of 287(g) agreements (cooperation between federal and local authorities), and increased criminal prosecutions for immigration violations (White House, 2025). These lead to deportation policy and have been implemented in response to concerns over national security, employment competition and illegal immigration. This policy habitually can lead to economic, social and political ramifications, affecting families, labour markets, crime rates and bilateral relations between sending and receiving countries (Menjívar *et al.*, 2018). Therefore, migration policy remains one of the most contentious issues in the United States that serves as a tool of immigration enforcement, carries wide-ranging implications, not only for the individuals removed, but also for the broader society, economy and international image of the country as well as to origin countries.

Recent Trends in United States Migrant Deportation Policy from 2020-2025

Between 2020 and 2025, the United States' deportation policy underwent significant shifts, shaped by changing administrations, public health emergencies, and global migration pressures. Under the Trump administration (up to early 2021), deportation policies were notably aggressive, targeting undocumented immigrants and minimizing humanitarian protections. The implementation of Title 42 under the Public Health Service Act allowed for the expulsion of over 2 million migrants without due process, citing COVID-19 concerns (Pierce & Bolter, 2022). However, under President Biden, there was an attempt to moderate enforcement. In 2021, deportations dropped to approximately 185,000 individuals, reflecting a temporary policy shift toward prioritizing “serious criminals (Department of Homeland Security, DHS, 2022). Though backlash from conservative states and court rulings forced the administration to scale up enforcement again. Then, the emerging trends from 2022 to 2024 include increased collaboration with Latin American countries to intercept migrants in transit, the use of expedited removal processes (deportations rose again, exceeding 278,000), bypassing immigration courts, and rising deportation of families, asylum seekers, and individuals with no criminal history. These changes reflect a tension between national security enforcement and human rights obligations, leading to unpredictable and inconsistent deportation practices. The United States deportation regime increasingly criminalizes migrants through policies that disregard humanitarian considerations and disrupt transnational communities (Kerwin, 2020).

Furthermore, as of early 2025, the United States has intensified its deportation efforts, affecting approximately 1.4 million non-citizens with final removal orders (Washington Post, 2025; CBS News, 2025). These deportations span 208 countries, with varying degrees of cooperation and acceptance from the respective nations. For example, in Mexico, deportees are slated for deportation, while in India, the individuals are planned for repatriation. Nevertheless, countries accepting third-country deportees include Costa Rica that agreed to receive 200 migrants from Central Asia and India, serving as a transit point before repatriation, the Guatemala also, plans to

increase deportation flights by 40%, accommodating both Guatemalan nationals and migrants from other countries, and Panama which received its first repatriation flight with 119 migrants from countries including China, Pakistan, and Afghanistan (Associated Press, AP, 2025; Council on Foreign Relations, CFR, 2025).

Likewise, some countries are resisting or limiting deportations, such as the Bahamas, which rejected a United States proposal to accept deported third-country migrants, citing capacity concerns. Venezuela resumed accepting deportees after a hiatus in 2019, with 135 individuals returned in October 2023 (DHS, 2023; Migration Policy Institute, MPI, 2025). Thus, these developments reflect the complexities and international negotiations involved in the United States' deportation processes, with varying responses from countries based on diplomatic relations, capacity, and policy considerations. Additionally, The Supreme Court upheld the legality of third-country deportations in June 2025 (WIFR News, 2025), and ICE data confirmed that nearly half of all deportees came from seven countries, including Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Brazil, India, and Nigeria; these account for 45% out of 1.4 million non-citizens in Table 1 (TRAC Immigration, 2025; Axios, 2025).

Table 1: Countries with High Numbers of Deportees

S/N	Country Name	Number of Deportees (Approximately)	Percentage (%)
1.	Mexico	252,044	18%
2.	El Salvador	203,822	14.6%
3.	Guatemala	66,435	4.7%
4.	Honduras	45,923	3.3%
5.	Brazil	38,677	2.8%
6.	India	18,000	1.3%
7	Nigeria	3,690	0.3%
Total		628,591	45%

Source: TRAC Immigration (2025), Axios (2025), Author Computation (2025)

Negative Impacts of Deportation Policy on Countries of Origin

This section highlighted some of the negative impacts of deportation policy on countries of origin, which include the following:

Economic Impact: The reduced remittances, deportees are often breadwinners. One of the major adverse effects of deportation is the loss of remittances. Migrants usually send money home to support families, contribute to local economies, and invest in education, healthcare, and small businesses. Deportation interrupts this financial flow, impacting household livelihoods and national foreign exchange reserves. According to the World Bank, remittances represent a significant percentage of GDP for many developing countries. Deportation directly threatens this source of income (WB, 2023). A study by Clemens and McKenzie (2014) shows that remittances can reduce poverty and increase investment in human capital. Deportation reduces these benefits. The return of thousands of migrants from the United States leads to a significant decline in remittance inflows, which form a substantial part of GDP in countries like El Salvador (24%), Honduras (22%), and Nigeria (6%) (WB, 2023). This translates to national-level consequences in terms of lower household consumption, educational dropouts, and health care. A sharp decrease in remittances resulting from forced returns undermines poverty alleviation and economic development in low-income countries (Hinojosa-Ojeda, 2021).

Political and Social Impact: Many deportees return to countries with limited reintegration programs, weak labour markets, and ongoing insecurity. In Central America, deportees are mostly targeted by gangs who view returnees as having the United States and money (De Genova, 2019). While in African countries like Nigeria, reintegration is bureaucratically difficult and socially stigmatized. Returnees often report mental trauma and lack of housing, as confirmed

by the International Organization for Migration (IOM, 2022). Deportation creates a socio-political burden for sending countries that lack infrastructure for meaningful reintegration (Gonzalez-Barrera, Passel & Cohn, 2022).

Reintegration Challenges: Many deportees face stigma, lack of employment opportunities, or social exclusion in their home countries, especially if they have lived abroad for a long time. Returnees often struggle to reintegrate due to a lack of support, social stigma, or unfamiliarity with the local culture and systems (IOM, 2020).

Increase in Unemployment and Crime: An influx of deportees into labour markets already struggling with high unemployment can exacerbate poverty and may increase the risk of crime and instability. Involuntary return migration can strain labour markets and potentially contribute to social unrest or criminal activities in vulnerable regions (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD, 2017).

Brain Drain Reversal Without Benefits: Many deported migrants are skilled professionals or students who left for better opportunities. Upon return, they may not find equivalent opportunities, causing a mismatch of skills and underemployment. The deported skilled migrants usually cannot use their talents effectively in their home countries, resulting in wasted human capital (Clemens, 2011).

Family Disruption: Deportation can break apart families, especially if the deportee has children or a spouse still abroad, leading to psychological trauma and social disintegration. Thus, the forced separation of families due to deportation causes emotional and economic hardship for both returnees and those left behind (Dreby, 2015).

Public Health Strains: The deported migrants may return with untreated physical or mental health issues. This puts pressure on underfunded health systems in origin countries. In addition, the health systems in origin countries, especially developing countries like Nigeria, cannot usually treat deportees who return with physical or psychological trauma (World Health Organization, WHO, 2021).

Positive Impacts of Deportation Policy on Countries of Origin

Despite the negative impact of this policy on the countries of origin, there are significant positive impacts as follows:

Skills and Knowledge Transfer: Some deportees return with new skills, languages, and experiences that can contribute positively to the local economy if reintegration programs are in place. IOM (2019) stated that migrants who return home voluntarily or involuntarily may bring with them skills, savings, and business ideas that could foster development.

Strengthening of National Identity: Deportation can sometimes spur public discourse on migration issues, leading to improved national policies on reintegration and migration management. Return migration often pressures governments to reform policies to better manage reintegration and tap into the potential of returning migrants (United Nations Development Programme, UNDP, 2020).

Boost to Entrepreneurship: Some deportees start businesses using the knowledge or savings accumulated abroad, particularly if given access to support systems like microfinance. Returnees are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial activities than non-migrants if properly supported (WB, 2017).

Potential for Policy Innovation and Migration Diplomacy: Governments under pressure from deportations may be prompted to negotiate better migration agreements or improve bilateral relations with host countries. According to Castles (2014), migration-related diplomacy has emerged as a response to mass deportations, prompting countries to strengthen migration governance.

Civil Society and Non-Governmental Organizations Engagement: This deportation crises sometime lead to increased involvement from NGOs and civil society organizations, resulting in better social services and advocacy. The IOM (2018) believed that the deportation of nationals has increased collaboration between governments and civil society to improve reintegration services. For example, IOM's Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVRR) program in West Africa has proven effective in reducing re-migration through successful reintegration (IOM, 2022).

Reinvestment in Local Economies: The returnees sometimes bring back goods, capital, and new consumption habits that stimulate local economic demand, especially in sectors like construction, agriculture, and retail. Furthermore, return migrants can contribute to domestic demand and development through increased consumption and investment (De Haas, 2010).

Negative Aspects of the Deportation Policy on the Destination Country

However, even the destination that made the policy has some major negative impacts on their community, like:

Economic Disruption and Labour Shortages: Mass deportations can significantly disrupt key sectors of the United States economy; this is because an undocumented worker constitutes a substantial portion of the labour force in industries such as construction, agriculture and hospitality (Chojnicki & Ragot, 2016). However, a 2017 report from the American Farm Bureau Federation noted that mass deportation could cause agricultural output to drop by \$30-60 billion, as undocumented workers make up a significant portion of the United States farm workforce (American Farm Bureau Federation AFBF, 2017). In addition, the undocumented immigrants pay an estimated \$11.7 billion annually in state and local taxes (Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, ITEP, 2017). Thus, removing these workers could lead to severe labour shortages and economic slowdowns, especially in states like California and Texas (MPI, 2021; McKibbin, Hogan & Noland, 2024). Similarly, deportations can destabilize local economies, particularly in areas with high immigrant populations, leading to reduced consumer spending and business closures.

Community Destabilization and Family Separation: Deportation frequently leads to the separation of families, particularly affecting United States citizen children with undocumented parents. Such separations can cause significant psychological distress, including depression, anxiety and financial consequences, as well as increasing the burden on social services. A study found that children of deported parents exhibited higher levels of depression and somatization compared to those whose parents were legal residents (Zayas & Gulbas, 2017). Furthermore, the fear of deportation can discourage immigrant communities from engaging with local authorities, undermining public safety and community cohesion.

Adverse Health Outcomes Due to Toxic Stress: Children experiencing the trauma of parental deportation are at risk of toxic stress, which can have long-term health consequences. This stress is associated with increased risks of chronic diseases such as heart disease, diabetes and mental health disorders (Brabeck, Lykes & Hunter, 2014). However, the threat of deportation creates chronic stress, anxiety and fear within immigrant communities, reducing trust in public institutions like schools and police.

Fiscal Implications: Undocumented immigrants contribute significantly to tax revenues. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) report that, over 75 years, immigrants contribute \$237,000 more in taxes than they receive in benefits (NASEM, 2017). Deportations reduce this tax base, impacting federal, state and local budgets (American Immigration Council AIC, 2024).

Loss of Cultural Diversity and Social Contributions: Immigrants contribute to the cultural richness, innovation and entrepreneurial dynamism of communities; thus, deportation reduces this social capital (Ottaviano & Peri, 2006).

Disruption of Educational Progress: Deportation or fear of deportation negatively affects children's school performance and attendance, even among legal residents in mixed-status families (Suárez-Orozco, Yoshikawa, Teranishi & Suárez, 2011).

Damage to the United States' Global Image: Aggressive deportation policy can damage the country's international reputation for human rights and humanitarian leadership. The country has long positioned itself as a champion of human rights and humanitarian values. Hence, aggressive deportation practices, especially those targeting asylum seekers and non-criminal migrants, undermine this reputation (Kerwin, 2018). They may also strain diplomatic relations with countries of origin, particularly when deportees face danger or lack reintegration support.

Positive Impacts of Deportation Policy on the Destination Country

Equally, the policy is very essential to the United States as it will have positive impacts on the country, some of which include:

Enforcement of Immigration Laws: Deportation serves as a tool to enforce immigration laws, aiming to deter illegal immigration and uphold the integrity of the legal immigration system. It reinforces the message that unlawful entry into the country has consequences, potentially discouraging future unauthorized immigration. Nevertheless, the enforcement and deportation policy may push migrants to seek legal channels for immigration, maintaining system integrity (Chishti & Hipsman, 2015).

Resource Allocation: Proponents argue that deporting undocumented immigrants can alleviate the strain on public resources such as healthcare, education and social services. By reducing the number of individuals accessing these services without contributing taxes, resources can be reallocated to citizens and legal residents (United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, UNICE, 2020; McKibbin, Hogan & Noland, 2024).

National Security Concerns and National Sovereignty: Deportation policy is also framed within the context of national security. Removing individuals who have committed crimes or are deemed security threats is seen as a measure to protect the public and maintain order. However, strong immigration enforcement is frequently seen as an assertion of national sovereignty and a government's commitment to its citizens' interests (Huntington, 2004).

Reduction in Wage Suppression: Some argue that deportations help curb wage depression caused by undocumented labour willing to work for less, potentially benefiting low-skilled United States workers (Borjas, 2017).

Deterrent Against Human Trafficking and Smuggling: A strict deportation policy may deter migrants from using dangerous human smuggling routes or traffickers to enter the United States (Shelley, 2010). Thus, deportation policy may deter irregular migration routes, reducing dependence on dangerous smuggling networks.

Potential Job Opportunities for Citizens: Some believe that deporting undocumented workers could open up low-skilled job opportunities for United States citizens and legal residents, although evidence for this is mixed (Borjas, 2017).

Reduced Strain on Public Services: Reducing the undocumented population could alleviate perceived pressure on healthcare, education and welfare systems (Rector & Richwine, 2013).

The Reintegration Challenges Faced by Deportees in Origin Countries

Besides that, the deportees in their countries of origin face a lot of reintegration challenges, and these are, among others:

Psychological and Emotional Trauma: One of the most immediate and devastating consequences of deportation is psychological and emotional trauma. Migrants who are forcibly removed from a country often experience depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and a sense of hopelessness (Martinez & Slack, 2013). The abrupt nature of deportation, mostly involving detention and separation from family members, adds to the psychological burden. Deportees may find themselves in unfamiliar environments or dangerous conditions, especially if they fled violence or persecution originally.

Economic Hardship: Is another major consequence, migrants deported from high-income countries often face limited job opportunities upon return, especially if they have been away for many years or if their skills do not match local labour market demands (Golash-Boza, 2015). In many cases, deportees return to nations with weak economies, further exacerbating their financial instability.

Lack of Personal Safety: Many migrants are deported to regions where their safety is at risk. For example, the United States has deported individuals to countries such as El Salvador, where they faced gang violence, extortion, or even death (Human Rights Watch, HRW, 2020). For asylum seekers and other vulnerable populations, deportation can constitute a return to life-threatening situations.

The Breakdown of Family Structures: Another tragic effect, the deportation sometimes separates parents from children, disrupting family units and leading to long-term emotional consequences, particularly for children left behind. Some United States-born children have even been placed in foster care due to their parents' deportation (Dreby, 2012).

Social Stigmatization: The commonly overlooked issue is social stigmatization. In many cases, deportees are viewed with suspicion and labelled as criminals upon their return. This stigma hinders their ability to reintegrate into society and may result in exclusion from jobs, housing, and social networks (Majidi & Schuster, 2019).

Loss of Education: Additionally, deportation may lead to a loss of educational opportunities, especially for young people who have been enrolled in school in the host country. The abrupt return may result in academic disruption or complete withdrawal from education, limiting prospects (Menjívar & Abrego, 2012). Compounding these issues is the lack of institutional support in many countries of return. Without programs for housing, employment assistance, or counselling, many deportees are left without the means to rebuild their lives (IOM, 2017).

Although the majority of impacts are negative, some deportees manage to find opportunities and meaning after their return. For example, deportation may allow for reconnection with family and culture. Migrants who have spent long periods abroad may feel a renewed sense of belonging and identity upon returning to their homeland (Schuster & Majidi, 2015). However, another potential benefit is the opportunity to contribute to home-country development. Some returnees use the skills, capital, or ideas gained abroad to start businesses or engage in community development

projects (Koser, 2009). This can have positive ripple effects on local economies and social structures. For example, returnees to West Africa have created small enterprises that provide employment and services to their communities (Black, King, & Tiemoko, 2003). Moreover, some deportees become advocates and community leaders, drawing on their lived experiences to campaign for migrant rights and reform of deportation policies. These individuals often serve as powerful voices in both local and international forums (Zilberg, 2011). Nevertheless, in certain cases, deportation may free individuals from the constant fear of undocumented life, including the threat of detention, deportation, and exploitation. While life post-deportation is sometimes challenging, some migrants find relief in no longer having to live in the shadows (Coutin, 2011). Finally, deportees sometimes maintain transnational networks, facilitating social and economic exchanges between the host and home countries. These networks can enhance trade, knowledge sharing, and diaspora investment (Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007).

Conclusion and Recommendations

The evolving dynamics of the United States' migrant deportation policy between 2020 and 2024 reveal a shift from humanitarian protections to increasingly enforcement-driven strategies. The use of policies such as Title 42, the expansion of expedited removals, and intensified removals of non-criminal migrants illustrates how deportation has become both a policy tool and a political symbol. While such measures may serve short-term domestic political objectives, their transnational impacts are profound. Deportations disrupt families, labour markets, social structures and others in the destination, whereas imposing significant burdens on countries of origin such as Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nigeria that include reductions in remittances, unemployment among returnees, and insufficient reintegration support. However, the evidence clearly shows that deportees face severe challenges upon return, including social stigma, economic marginalization, mental health issues, and so for. In parallel, the United States experiences labour shortages in critical sectors, weakening its own economic resilience and social cohesion. The gap between enforcement and humanitarian obligations reveals a need for more balanced, humane, and development-oriented migration governance. Thus, addressing deportation effectively requires transnational coordination, a rights-based approach, and an understanding that migration is not merely a border security issue, but rather is a complex socio-economic process.

After a thorough and careful research on the issue, the following recommendations are made:

1. Reform the United States' deportation policy to prioritize Human Rights by ending indiscriminate and mass deportations, especially for non-criminal migrants, long-term residents, and asylum seekers. Also, reinstate and expand protections such as DACA, Temporary Protected Status (TPS), and asylum programs, ensuring due process in removal proceedings. Thus, establish clearer enforcement guidelines that differentiate between high-risk and low-risk migrants.
2. Develop comprehensive reintegration frameworks in Origin countries; this means that partner with international agencies like the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to design and fund reintegration programmes offering vocational training, counselling services, business start-up kits, language and cultural reorientation support for returnees, etc.
3. Support diaspora engagement and financial inclusion; encourage deportees to maintain ties with the United States through legal remittance channels and digital finance systems. Also, establish diaspora development funds to help deportees invest in businesses in their home countries. Likewise, provide financial literacy and entrepreneurial training to maximize the impact of remittances and savings.

4. Enhance regional and bilateral cooperation; the United States should work with countries of origin to create bilateral migration management agreements that will regulate labour mobility through seasonal work visas, promote legal pathways and share responsibility for reintegration and border management. These will yield economic benefits and minimizing irregular migration.
5. Adopt a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach; address root causes of migration such as violence, poverty, and climate change, among others, through development aid and foreign policy alignment. And, involve civil society, diaspora organizations, NGOs, and the private sector in crafting long-term reintegration and livelihood strategies. In addition, launch public campaigns in origin countries to reduce stigmatization and support community acceptance of deportees.
6. Improve data collection and transparency by establishing strong regional and national databases to track deportee outcomes, remittance trends, and reintegration efforts. Similarly, promote evidence-based policymaking by making deportation and migration data publicly accessible.

References

- Alden, E. (2008). *The Closing of the American Border: Terrorism, Immigration, and Security Since 9/11*. Harper Perennial.
- American Farm Bureau Federation. (2017). *Economic Impact of Immigration Reform*.
- American Immigration Council. (2020). *Family Separation Under the Trump Administration*. <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org>.
- American Immigration Council. (2024). *The Economic Impact of Mass Deportation*, Retrieved from <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org>.
- Associated Press. (2025, February 10). *United States Lines Up Latin American Cooperation for Migrant Deportations*, <https://apnews.com/article/27320f15ad6c316f242eae53e45f19c8/>.
- Axios. (2025, July 17). *Trump Expands Third-Country Deportations*. <https://www.axios.com/2025/07/17/trump-deportation-migrants-third-countries/>.
- Black, R., King, R., & Tiemoko, R. (2003). *Migration, Return and Small Enterprise Development in Ghana: A Route Out of Poverty?* International Workshop on Migration and Poverty in West Africa.
- Borjas, G. J. (2017). *Labour Economics* (7th Ed.), McGraw-Hill Education.
- Brabeck, K. M., Lykes, M. B. and Hunter, C. (2014). The Psychosocial Impact of Detention and Deportation on United States Migrant Children and Families, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 84(5), 496-505, <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000011>.
- Cassarino, J. P. (2004). Theorizing Return Migration: The Conceptual Approach to Return Migrants Revisited, *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 6(2), 253-279.
- Castles, S. (2014). Migration, Development, and Trans-nationalization: Towards a New Paradigm for Research on Migration and Development, *Global Networks*, 14(2), 217-235.
- CBS News. (2025, April 11). *ICE Deportations Surged to 10-Year High in 2024, Surpassing Trump-Era Peak*, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/deportations-by-ice-10-year-high-in-2024-surpassing-trump-era-peak/>.
- Chishti, M. and Hipsman, F. (2015). *Increased Border Enforcement and the Decline in Unauthorized Immigration*, Migration Policy Institute.
- Chojnicki, X. and Ragot, L. (2016). *The Fiscal Impact of Immigration in the United States*, National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies.
- Clemens, M. (2011). Economics and Emigration: Trillion-Dollar Bills on the Sidewalk, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25(3), 83-106, <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.25.3.83>.
- Clemens, M. A. and McKenzie, D. (2014). Why Don't Remittances Appear to Affect Growth? *The Economic Journal*, 125(588), F179-F209.
- Council on Foreign Relations. (2025). *Where Trump's Deportations Are Sending Migrants*, <https://www.cfr.org/in-brief/heres-where-trumps-deportations-are-sending-migrants/>.
- Coutin, S. B. (2011). Navigating with/against the Law: Central American Asylum Seekers and the Transition to Illegality. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 36(2), 527-555.
- De Genova, N. (2019). *The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering*, Duke University Press.

- De Haas, H. (2010). Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective, *International Migration Review*, 44(1), 227-264, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00804.x>.
- De Haas, H., Castles, S. and Miller, M. J. (2020). *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Dreby, J. (2012). The Burden of Deportation on Children in Mexican Immigrant Families, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(4), 829-845, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00989.x>.
- Dreby, J. (2015). *Everyday Illegal: When Policies Undermine Immigrant Families*, University of California Press.
- Golash-Boza, T. (2015). *Deported: Immigrant Policing, Disposable Labor, and Global Capitalism*, NYU Press.
- Gonzalez-Barrera, A., and Krogstad, J. M. (2014). *United States Deportations of Immigrants Reach Record High in 2013*, Pew Research Center, <https://www.pewresearch.org>.
- Gonzalez-Barrera, A., Passel, J. S. and Cohn, D. (2022). *Deportation and Migration Trends in Central America*, Pew Research Center.
- Hinojosa-Ojeda, R. (2021). *The Impact of Mass Deportations on Latin American Economies*, UCLA Center for Labor Research.
- Human Rights Watch. (2020). *Deported to Danger: United States Deportation Policies Expose Salvadorans to Death and Abuse*, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2020/02/05/deported-danger/united-states-deportation-policies-expose-salvadorans-death-and>.
- Huntington, S. P. (2004). *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*, Simon and Schuster.
- Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy. (2017). *Undocumented Immigrants' State and Local Tax Contributions*.
- International Organization for Migration. (2017). *Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration 2016 Key Highlights*, https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/avrr_2016_key_highlights.pdf.
- International Organization for Migration. (2018). *Reintegration Good Practices*.
- International Organization for Migration. (2020). *Return and Reintegration Platform*, <https://www.returnandreintegration.iom.int>.
- International Organization for Migration. (2022). *Return and Reintegration Platform: Data and Lessons from AVRR*.
- Kerwin, D. (2018). The US Immigration Detention System: A Critical Look, *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 6(2).
- Kerwin, D. (2020). "The US Deportation System: A Humanitarian and Economic Crisis", *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 8(1), 1-18.
- Koser, K. (2009). *The Return and Reintegration of Irregular Migrants*, IOM, https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/return_reintegration.pdf.
- Levitt, P., & Jaworsky, B. N. (2007). Transnational Migration Studies: Past Developments and Future Trends, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 129-156, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131816>.
- Majidi, N. and Schuster, L. (2019). What Happens Post-Deportation? The Experience of Deported Afghans, *Migration Studies*, 7(2), 212-232, <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mny029>.

- Martinez, D. E. and Slack, J. (2013). What Part of “Illegal” Don’t You Understand? The Social Consequences of Criminalizing Unauthorized Mexican Migrants in the United States, *Social and Legal Studies*, 22(4), 535-551. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663913499062>.
- Massey, D. S. and Gentsch, K. (2014). Undocumented Migration to the United States and the Wages of Mexican Immigrants, *International Migration Review*, 48(2), 482-499.
- McKibbin, W., Hogan, M. and Noland, M. (2024). *Mass Deportations Would Harm the United States Economy*, Peterson Institute for International Economics, Retrieved from <https://www.piie.com/blogs/realtime-economics/2024/mass-deportations-would-harm-us-economy>.
- Meissner, D., Kerwin, D., Chishti, M. and Bergeron, C. (2013). *Immigration Enforcement in the United States: The Rise of a Formidable Machinery*, Migration Policy Institute, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org>.
- Menjívar, C. and Abrego, L. J. (2012). Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Immigrants, *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(5), 1380-1421. <https://doi.org/10.1086/663575>.
- Menjívar, C., Gómez Cervantes, A. and Alvord, D. (2018). The Expansion of “Crim-migration,” Mass Detention, and Deportation, *Sociology Compass*, 12(4), e12573.
- Migration Policy Institute. (2021). *United States Immigration Policy and the Labour Market*.
- Migration Policy Institute. (2025, May). *Trump’s Mass Deportation Priority: What’s New, What’s Not, and What It Means*, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/trump-mass-deportation-priority/>.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine. (2017). *The Economic and Fiscal Consequences of Immigration*, Washington, DC, The National Academies Press, <https://doi.org/10.17226/23550>.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2017). *Interrelations between Public Policies, Migration and Development*, <https://www.oecd.org/publications/interrelations-between-public-policies-migration-and-development-9789264265615-en.htm>.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *International Migration Outlook 2020*, OECD Publishing.
- Ottaviano, G. I. P. and Peri, G. (2006). The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities, *Journal of Economic Geography*, 6(1), 9-44.
- Pew Research Center. (2023). *Trends in United States Immigration*.
- Pierce, S. (2021). *Biden Administration Ends Trump-Era Immigration Policies*, Migration Policy Institute, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org>.
- Pierce, S. and Bolter, J. (2020). *Dismantling and Reconstructing the United States Immigration System: A Catalog of Changes Under the Trump Presidency*, Migration Policy Institute, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org>.
- Pierce, S. and Bolter, J. (2022). *Dismantling and Rebuilding: A Timeline of United States Immigration Policy Changes under the Trump and Biden Administrations*, Migration Policy Institute.
- Pierce, S. and Selee, A. (2017). *Immigration Under Trump: A Review of Policy Shifts in the Year Since the Election*, Migration Policy Institute, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org>.
- Rector, R. E. and Richwine, J. (2013). *The Fiscal Cost of Unlawful Immigrants and Amnesty to the United States Taxpayer*, Heritage Foundation.

- Schuster, L. and Majidi, N. (2015). Deportation Stigma and Re-migration, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(4), 635-652. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2014.957174>.
- Shelley, L. (2010). *Human Trafficking: A Global Perspective*, Cambridge University Press.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., Yoshikawa, H., Teranishi, R. T. and Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2011). Growing Up in the Shadows: The Developmental Implications of Unauthorized Status, *Harvard Educational Review*, 81(3), 438-472.
- TRAC Immigration. (2025). *Immigration Court Quick Facts*. Syracuse University, <https://trac.syr.edu/immigration/quickfacts/>.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2020). *Human Development Report: Migration and Development*, <https://hdr.undp.org>.
- United States Congress. (2006). *Secure Fence Act of 2006*, Public Law 109-367.
- United States Department of Homeland Security. (2022). *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*.
- United States Department of Homeland Security. (2023, October 5). *United States to Resume Removals of Venezuelans Who Do Not Have a Legal Basis to Remain in the United States*, <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2023/10/05/united-states-resume-removals-venezuelans-who-do-not-have-legal-basis-remain-united/>.
- United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (UNICE). (2020). *Enforcement and Removal Operations Report*.
- Wasem, R. E. (2011). *Immigration: Policy Issues in the 112th Congress* (CRS Report R42036). Congressional Research Service., <https://crsreports.congress.gov>.
- Washington Post. (2025, April 12). 'One Million': The Private Goal Driving Trump's Push for Mass Deportations, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/immigration/2025/04/12/one-million-deportations-goal/>.
- White House. (2025, January 20). *Executive Order 14159-Protecting the American People Against Invasion*, Office of the President.
- WIFR News. (2025, June 23). *Supreme Court Allows Trump to Restart Swift Deportation of Migrants to Third Countries*, <https://www.wifr.com/2025/06/23/supreme-court-allows-trump-restart-swift-deportation-migrants-away-their-home-countries/>.
- World Bank. (2017). *Maximizing the Development Impact of Return Migration*, <https://www.worldbank.org>.
- World Bank. (2022). *Migration and Development Brief 37*, <https://www.worldbank.org>.
- World Bank. (2023). *Migration and Remittances: Recent Developments and Outlook: Migration and Development Brief 38*, <https://www.worldbank.org>.
- World Health Organization. (2021). *Health of Migrants-The Way Forward*, <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240028904>.
- Zayas, L. H. and Gulbas, L. E. (2017). "The Psychological Impact of Deportation on United States Citizen Children", *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 87(3), 232-240.
- Zilberg, E. (2011). *Space of Detention: The Making of a Transnational Gang Crisis Between Los Angeles and San Salvador*, Duke University Press.