

# CROSS BORDER MIGRATION AND HUMAN SECURITY IN NIGERIA

Dr. Chinasa R. Okoye<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Principal Lecturer, Department of Social Sciences, Federal Polytechnic Oke, Anambra State, Nigeria

## ABSTRACT

*The main objective of the study is to examine cross-border migration and economic security in Nigeria. The data collated were analysed using descriptive and content methods. Classical migration theory was the theoretical framework on which this study was anchored. The study revealed that cross-border migration did not alleviate poverty in Nigeria but contributed to the spread of diseases, such as the Hydro Immune Virus among women and the Ebola Virus Disease in Nigeria. Again, cross-border migration facilitated by the ECOWAS protocol promoted the incidence of cross-border criminality in Nigeria. The study concluded that cross-border migration did not enhance economic security, but rather deepened poverty incidence, contributed to the spread of diseases and heightened the incidence of cross-border criminality in Nigeria. Based on the findings, the study recommended that the government of Nigeria should regulate migration flow by formulating a policy framework that will address migrant flow and illegal migration, reduce migration of the teeming youths by creating a conducive environment for learning, and businesses, and provide infrastructural facilities, etc.*

**Keyword:** Cross Border Migration, Human Security, Nigeria

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Cross-border migration is the movement of people across national boundaries. It is the most dynamic feature of population distribution since the creation of the universe (Adeola & Fayomi, 2012). In advanced capitalist economies, cross-border migration is seen as a normal phenomenon accelerated by globalization, while in Sub-Saharan Africa it is seen as a common feature which predates colonialism. Again, free movement and trans-border security have been the crucial point of various regional and Sub-regional organizations across the world. Recent pieces of evidence had indicated that human movement and security issues in West Africa have been in existence even before colonialism. The factors that have engendered migration include trade, search for pastures, urbanization, agriculture, mining, industrial production, armed conflict, environmental insecurity, land degradation, drought, and rural poverty among others (Department for International Development, 2004).

According to Vietti (2013), for a very long time, nations have procured weapons to protect their security. While in recent times, people's perception of insecurity arises from concerns about daily existence than the dangers arising from the war. People understood security to mean safety from constant threats of diseases, crime, hunger economic recession, poverty, political repression, environmental degradation, drought, etc. It is also a means of protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the pattern of our daily life (United Nations Development Programme, 1994). The 1994 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Report posits that human security contains two complementary elements: 'Freedom from Fear' which (includes threats arising from state-sponsored violence and war) and 'Freedom from want' which also (includes threats arising from poverty, economic recession, infectious diseases) (UNDP, 1994:24). Although there have been heated debates and controversies between academics and policy experts on the importance of conceptualizing humans' security from these terms; Freedom from fear and freedom from want are intertwined and vital to human security. The inability to attain these requirements that permits individuals to live their lives from fear and want can lead to migration. There are seven categories of human security as identified by UNDP (1994). These include economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security. For instance, access to food and clean water, protection against sudden and unforeseen

violence, job opportunities and basic health care facilities are basic related requirements of human security. The inability to meet these basic human needs threatens and increases the factors that drive migration.

During the pre-colonial times in West Africa, cross-border migration was involuntary as people were forcefully taken away from their countries due to the slave trade. During this period, many people from West Africa were taken away as slaves to work in advanced countries, particularly on Europe and American plantations (Darkwah & Verter, 2014). In the contemporary world, globalization has made mobility easy and unavoidable (Darkwah & Verter, 2014). The post-independence era witnessed increased frequency and intensity of economic and political relations among states, with the objective of the attainment of sustainable peace and security which is a condition for socioeconomic and political advancement. Over the years, this mindset shaped, guided and promoted the formulation of policies that centres on socio-economic, political and security cooperation and unity of the citizenry of the West African Sub-region Nigeria and the Benin Republic in particular.

This cooperation and regional unity were informed by the Economic Community for West African States (ECOWAS) in 1975 founded to enhance regional unity without undermining the common historical ties among states that exist within the region. The organization was saddled with the task of ensuring the transformation of the sub-region into a community. This was evident in the several treaties and protocols adopted by the community which serve as the blueprint for the elimination of all barriers and obstacles to mutual interdependence and peace. In a bid to retain traditional identities, cultures, religions, and traditions of different groups within the sub-region, and the removal of barriers to the free movement of citizens of these states which was advocated for led to the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of Persons, Goods, Capital and the Rights of Residence and Establishment in 1979 (ECOWAS, 2006; Opanike Aduloju & Adenipekun, 2015). Strict adherence to this protocol enabled citizens of various communities the right to residence and establishment anywhere within the territory of member states (ECOWAS, 1979). This protocol had given rise to increased cross-border movement of people, farm labourers, traders, males, and females, etc, this had also created a borderless sub-region within which there is free movement of persons, goods, services, capital, etc.

The economic boom of the 1970s and 1980s further attracted people to Nigeria from the sub-regions. This later changed with the deteriorating socioeconomic conditions and deepening poverty in the mid-1980s which invoked a wide variety of migration. The introduction of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) led to job crises in the labour market, creating sustained pressure for emigrants, hence Nigeria and Benin citizens began to look elsewhere across their borders for better wage differentials high income, diversification, better job opportunities, good living standards and access to good Medicare, etc It is based on these dynamics that this study on Cross border migration and Human Security in West Africa, with a specific focus on Nigeria and Benin Republic between 1999 and 2017 is carried out.

### **1.1 Statement of the Problem**

Migration is a highly diverse and complex phenomenon that surpasses societies, cultures, and races. It is a phenomenon that has continued to impact and contribute to the transformation of the entire facets of various countries changing the racial, ethnic, language and socio-cultural composition of their population (Adeola & Ogirai, 2010). It is a phenomenon that cuts across every aspect of people's social existence. Earlier works by (United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs, 2005; Castles & Miller, 2009), have shown that about 97 percent of the world population in the year 2000 were not international migrants, yet their communities, environment, and ways of life were affected by migration. In Sub-Saharan Africa, it is a phenomenon that predates colonialism and took a greater dimension after countries gained independence (Adeola & Fayomi, 2012). Cross-border mobility plays an essential function across the globe, irrespective of the economy. It's one of the strong factors that drive globalization in recent times. The nature of this flow in time past has become dynamic in terms of structure size and functionality of the labour market political situation, culture, and people.

However, there have been a series of controversies about the impact of cross-border migration on the countries of origin and the place of destination as well as the people who are involved in the movement, especially, the dimensions of human security. Studies have revealed that host communities think that a high level of cross-border migration posed a big threat to their economic well-being, social order, cultural, and religious values and political stability (Campbell, 2003). Interaction between states is also affected as mobility is likely to create political tensions that can affect the cordial relationship between the two countries. Also, unrestricted movement across the border can mount pressure on the infrastructural facilities in the host communities, through frequent and increased use of health

and educational facilities, and government housing. Furthermore, the hostility and resentment meted out to the migrants by the natives who believed that they are losing their jobs to immigrants who are desperate and ready to work for low wages in several climes resulted in xenophobic attacks (Mawadza, 2008).

Again, the worrisome situations migrants find themselves in are a cause for concern. Some experience ugly incidences of sexual exploitation, which are dehumanizing during transit. At times, they even lose their lives in boat mishaps or are kept in an environment with poor hygiene conditions making them vulnerable to infectious diseases. Now in Nigeria, human insecurity has reached a crescendo as a whopping 800 million people in the continent live below the poverty line, and the figure is still rising.

In West Africa, Nigeria inclusive, the ECOWAS protocol, although reflected the human security concerns in its free movement provisions in the sub-region, fails in its implementation as it concentrated more on the traditional military threats to state (national security) and paid little attention to the non-military threats such as poverty, low-income, unemployment, the spread of infectious diseases, persistent food crisis, climate change, flood, drought, political repression, etc. to individuals.

Meanwhile, a number of the findings posit that there is a correlation between cross-border migration and economic security (Osimen, Anegbode, Akande & Oyewole, 2017; Okeke, & Richard, 2014; Idowu, 2014; Okeke & Richard, 2014). Despite agreeing that human security in Nigeria responds to cross-border migration, these studies are at variance to the direction of the effects. These conflicts make it implausible to employ the available evidence, findings, and recommendations for sound policy formulation and implementation on cross-border migration and human security management in Nigeria. For instance, Anegbode, John, Clement and Oyewole (2017) averred that all the cross-border migration variables it employed hurt human security in Nigeria in both the long and short-run which implies that growing cross-border migration will rather hamper human security in Nigeria as against the findings from studies like Adeola and Fayomi (2015) and Olakunle and Ake (2015) that cross-border migration enhances human security in Nigeria.

This disagreement makes it imperative that an inquiry into the shades and the resultant effects of cross-border migration on human security in Nigeria is made.

## **2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

### **2.1 Conceptual Review**

#### **2.1.1 Migration**

Migration is not a new phenomenon in human history. It is the movement of people from one geographical region to another, irrespective of its length, composition, and causes (ECOWAS-SWAC, 2006). In recent times, migration has shaped the nature of destination and source regions (Oderth, 2002). The disparities of opportunities in prosperous areas and lagging regions especially between countries have brought about cross-border migration/international migration.

The International Organization for Migration (2009) defines migration as ‘the movement of a person or a group of persons, either across an international border or within a State. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition, and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, economic migrants, and persons moving for other purposes, including family reunification. ‘It is thus a broadly understood phenomenon. While the majority of migrants migrate in search of work and economic and social opportunities, a relatively small percentage of migrants are people fleeing armed conflict, natural disasters, famine or persecution.

The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (2001), defines migration as the mobility of people over considerable distances and on a large scale to abandon former homes. On the other hand, Everett (1969) defines it broadly as a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence. No restriction is placed upon the distance of the move or the voluntary or involuntary nature of the act, and no distinction is made between external and internal migration.

Nigeria plays a key role in African migrations. As Africa’s demographic giant, Nigeria has become increasingly involved in international migration to Europe, the U.S.A, and South Africa. Yet, Nigeria is also a destination country in West Africa (Fadeyi, 2010). The absence of effective regulation and the porosity of Nigerian borders have made it

possible for the influx of migrant men and women from neighbouring countries to settle down and carry out economic activities in rural border communities of Nigeria.

### **2.1.2 Cross Border Migration**

According to Iheanacho and Ughaerumba (2015), migration can be traced to the existence of the first set of humans on earth. Migration has taken various patterns such as the slave trade, colonization, urbanization, industrialization, and globalization. The movement of persons (migrants) from one place to another has been a trend adopted by various individuals. Cross-Border Migration in Nigeria can be traced from the pre-colonial era (precisely the slave trade era) to the colonial era. Although the nation-state was not recognized as Nigeria at that time, it had a kingdom and empire structure. This made it difficult to be described as an internal or international structure. It is worthy of note that migration in Africa (Nigeria & Benin Republic) can be traced to this era. During these eras, migration was both forced and voluntary. In Nigeria, during the 1960s, cross-border migration became the new drift and was at its increase as Nigerians and other Africans left their respective states for Europe while the South-South pathways of migration also existed, as Africans migrated to various parts of West African neighbouring states mostly for trade purposes (regional integration). According to Fayomi (2013), cross-border migration is mostly influenced by economic reasons which can be for employment, trade purposes, the favourable standard of living and fair-weather conditions for agriculture among other reasons.

Cross-border migration according to Popoola (2016) is the movement of people beyond their country of origin. People migrate beyond the international border based on the prevailing conditions. The conditions include political instability, drought, landlessness, soil infertility, and unfavourable climate among others. Cross-border migration is on the increase. According to United Nations estimation, the number of persons/ migrants living outside the country of origin has reached 175 million, more than twice the number a generation ago (United Nations Population Division, 2002). In 2013, there were 232 million migrants in the world representing 3% of the global population (United Nation Population Division, 2013). In Nigeria, available figures indicated that the number of migrants was about 477,135 in 1991. It was projected to have increased to 1.1 million in 2010 (UNDP, 2009).

However, Tacoli and Okali (2001) referred to Cross-Border Migration as a feature of globalization as the world is interconnected and interdependent. This is an indication that Cross-Border Migration is the movement across international borders of nation-states. They further contend that Cross-Border Migration can positively contribute to the sustainable development of nation-states. Cross-border migration is the movement of individuals from one international boundary to another. Individuals who move from one place to another are known as migrants. Cross-Border Migration involves two sets of individuals; these are irregular migrants and regular migrants. WHO (2007), also argued that the movement of individuals (migrants) from one boundary to another has been on the increase. This Cross-Border Migration activity can be engaged nationally and regionally. Cross-Border Migration can be permanent or temporary. CREAM (2011) posits that Cross-Border Migration can trigger creativity, innovation, trade, entrepreneurship and development etc. The subject matter (Cross-Border Migration) has recently become a topic for debate by states.

Cross-border Migration is naturally complex. It can affect a nation-state politically, culturally and socio-economically by bringing either strength or weakness. In other words, Cross-Border Migration can bring progress in socioeconomic development and also a decline in the socioeconomic development of a nation-state. Tornimbeni (2005), cited in Fayomi (2013), argues that West African states among other countries in the globe have a trace of migration in their respective histories.

### **2.1.3 Poverty**

The World Summit on Social Development in Copenhagen (1995) defined poverty as a situation characterized by harsh dispossession of basic human needs, which includes; food, safe drinking water, hygiene facilities, health, shelter, education, and information (United Nations, 1995). Poverty is not only defined by income but also by access to services, including a lack of earnings and productive assets to ensure sustainable livelihoods; hunger and malnutrition; ill health; restricted access to education and other fundamental services; increased morbidity and transience from illness; homelessness and insufficient housing; insecure environments and social inequity and omission (United Nations, 1995).

Chambers (1983) referred to the idea of poverty as a multidimensional concept, reflecting lustres of disadvantage. His theory covered five magnitudes of poverty which, separately or combined, could make an individual or

household poor; poverty proper, physical weakness, seclusion, susceptibility and powerlessness. Each of these aspects of poverty in itself is a cluster of disadvantages that can act as a denial luring people into poverty.

Blanco (2002) defined poverty 'as the total absence of opportunities, accompanied by high levels of malnutrition, hunger, illiteracy, lack of education, physical and mental ailments, emotional and social volatility, unhappiness, sorrow and hopelessness for the future'. Poverty is also characterized by a chronic shortage of economic, social and political involvement, relegating individuals to barring as social beings, preventing access to the benefits of economic and social progress and thereby restraining their cultural development (Blanco 2002). All these definitions define poverty from general perception, providing certain criteria such as state of employment and income, food security, type of shelter, access to education, health and sanitation, and level of social and economic inclusion. This study uses these definitions as its basis and defines poverty according to these wide criteria and not only in economic terms.

Foreign Remittances broadly refer to the money and goods that are transferred to families by migrant workers' earnings outside their home country. The surge of migrant workers' remittances from developed to developing countries has been rapid. Remittances have become essential private financial assets, for families at home. Hence, they cannot be seen as supporting foreign direct investment, Official Development Assistance (ODA) debt relief or other public sources of financial development (United Nations Conference on Trade Agreement and Development, 2008).

## 2.2 Empirical Review

Jaumotte, Koloskova, and Saxena (2016) argue that no matter how controversial migration is politically, it makes sense economically. Also, in the long term, both high and low-skilled workers who migrated bring benefits to their new home countries by increasing income per person and living standards. High-skilled migrants bring diverse talents and expertise, while low-skilled migrants fill essential occupations for which natives are in short supply and allow natives to be employed at higher-skilled jobs. Gains are broadly shared by the population, so it may be worthwhile shouldering the short-term costs to help integrate these new workers.

In another study, Clemens and Pritchett (2016) argued that migration economist has traditionally stressed the effects of migration restrictions on income distribution in the host country. Recently the literature has taken a new dimension by investigating the costs of migration restrictions to global economic efficiency. A new strand of research posits that migration restrictions could not only be desirably redistributive but globally efficient. This new case rests on the possibility that without strict measures on migration, migrants from poor countries could transmit low productivity to rich countries, offsetting efficiency gains from the spatial reallocation of labour from low to high-productivity places. Clemens and Pritchett provided an assessment, and conclude that the new case for efficiency-enhancing restrictions on labour mobility turns out to be an efficiency case against most existing restrictions on labour mobility. On current evidence about the magnitudes of the relevant parameters, the dynamically efficient policy would not imply open borders but would imply relaxations on current restrictions.

Using immigration records from Norway, Furlanetto and Robstad (2016) argue that an increase in immigration lowers unemployment (even for native workers) and has no negative effects on public finances. However, they do identify a negative effect on productivity that may be a worry for long-term growth. The case of Norway is interesting because, while immigration was a marginal phenomenon in the 1990s, it became the dominant driver of population growth after EU enlargement to include Eastern European countries.

The work by d'Artis Kanés and Lecca (2016) looks at the long-term social, economic and fiscal effects of immigration in the EU, by applying a Commission macroeconomic model to alternative refugee integration scenarios. The simulation results suggest that, although refugee integration is costly for public budgets, in the medium to long run, the social, economic and fiscal benefits may significantly outweigh the short-run integration costs. Also, integration policy has the potential to play an important role in improving social inclusion, filling vacancies, improving the ratio of economically active to those who are inactive, addressing Europe's demographic challenges, and boosting jobs and growth in the EU.

In a similar vein, Portes and Forte (2009) focused specifically on the economic impact of Brexit-induced reductions in migration. Their scenarios imply that net EU migration to the UK could fall by up to 91 000 in the central scenario, and up to 150 000 in a more extreme scenario. Using the existing empirical evidence on the impact of migration on growth and productivity in advanced economies, they estimate the possible impact of falls in EU

migration on GDP and GDP per capita growth between now and 2020, compared to a counterfactual where EU migration remains constant. In their central scenario, the impact would be to reduce GDP by between about 0.63% to 1.19%, while GDP per capita would be reduced by between about 0.22% and 0.78%. In the more extreme scenario, the hit to GDP per capita would be up to 1.16%.

Another study by Peri (2016) argues that the economic impact of immigration on receiving economies needs to be understood by analyzing the specific skills brought by immigrants. The complementarity and substitutability between immigrants and natives in employment and the response of receiving economies in terms of specialization and technological choices are important when considering the general equilibrium effects of immigration. He further argues that in the United States, a balanced composition of immigrants between college and non-college educated, together with the adjustment of demand and technology, implies that general equilibrium effects on relative and absolute wages have been small.

### 2.2.1 Gaps in the Literature

The empirical review on cross-border migration and economic security in Nigeria has shown conflicting findings. A number of the findings posit significant influence from cross-border migration and economic security in West Africa (Ngboanwaji, 2011, Adeola & Fayomi, 2012; Blum, 2014; Addo, 2006; Quartey & Blankson, 2014; Popoola, 2006; Osimen, Anegbode, Akande & Oyewole 2017; Okeke & Richard, 2014; Idowu, 2011). Despite agreeing that economic security in Nigeria responds to cross-border migration, the findings of these studies are at variance to the direction of the effects. These conflicts made it implausible to employ the available evidence, findings, and recommendations for sound policy formulation and implementation on cross-border migration and economic security in Nigeria. For instance, Okeke, Orji & Richard, 2014; Addo, 2006; Ngboawaji, 2011; Isiwu, Ngwu, Chukwu, Sancho and Ojiya, 2018) averred that all the cross-border migration it employed has a negative effect on economic security in Nigeria in both long and short-run which implies that growing cross border migration will rather hamper economic security in Nigeria, as against the perception from studies like Yannick & Kaiogueng, 2018; Quartey & Blankson 2014; that cross border migration enhances economic security.

Also, from the review on cross-border movement, some hard work has been committed to the review of the state of cross-border movement in Nigeria regarding the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement Persons. In this regard, opinion appears divided as to whether the implementation of the protocol has achieved its objectives or heightened cross-border criminality within Nigeria. The majority of the observers were of the view that the implementation of the protocol has not achieved its objectives. They identified several factors responsible for the non-actualization of its objective. Including poor implementation, lack of commitment to integration by the political leaders, unemployment, lack of infrastructural facilities, corruption, etc. These explanations are however not sufficient enough for a proper understanding of the discourse. Again, most studies in extant literature have paid less attention to determining whether cross-border migration accentuated by ECOWAS protocol engenders cross-border criminality. Thus, the need for this study.

Again, the review pointed out a strong disagreement on the effect of cross-border migration on economic security in Nigeria. This disagreement comes in the form of the direction of the relationship as well as the level of significance of the relationship. Some of these studies such as Dude, (2014) (Zimbabwe); Yannick & Kaiogueng (2018), Cameroon; Quarterly & Blankson (2014) Ghana; Antwi, Mills & Zhoac (2013) Ghana; Philip, Vanlandingham, Monda-Taylor & Hens-Peter (2016) Malawi; Isodory, Mureithi & Sumpter, (2015) Kenya etc, was done in environments outside that of Nigeria.

Also, most of the extant works reviewed by the researcher used only one variable of economic security (Testaverd & Wagner, 2018; Mawadza, 2008; Yannick & Kaiogueng 2018). Even the studies on Nigeria also employed only one, economic Security variable (Ubebi, 2019; Popoola, 2014; Blum, 2014; Falomi, 2013 & Mobolaji & Alabi, 2017).

Again, some of the studies did not use a robust methodology to explore the relationship between cross-border migration and economic Security and also, the time frames considered in some of the past studies were short and not expansive enough.

These observed shortcomings have contributed to the knowledge gap in the literature, thus warranting a more systematic and comprehensive study on; Cross border migration and economic security in Nigeria

### 2.3 Theoretical Framework

This study was anchored on the Neo-classical migration theory and the Push and Pull Approach. Thus, these theories highlighted different factors responsible for migration, hence a combination of them will give a better insight into the causes and complexities of Cross Border Migration. Though the theory has several strands, each explaining the reasons for migration. The economic evaluation of migration includes both the redistribution of labour and the search for opportunity, the search for greener pastures, better livelihood, education etc. For instance, Adam Smith, the father of Economics, and Lebhast (2005) posit that the labour movement is due to Disparities in the labour market at different places. However, Ravenstein (1889), in Ravenstein's law of migration, argued that the search for opportunity is the main motive for migration. Consequently, several studies have been proposed to explain the causes of International Migration.

**2.3.1 The Neo-Classical Theory:** According to the Neo-classical theory of migration, the movement of labour is due to discrepancies in real wages between countries and migration of labour brings stability to the international labour market which eliminates the wage disparities between the countries. The neo-classical theory explains both the general (macro) and the specific (micro) aspects of migration. The neo-classical macro theory of migration dates back to Hicks (1932). According to this theory, the unequal distribution of capital and labour at the universal (macro) level causes inequity in wages and learning standards and this leads to migration. The migrant moves towards a place for a better opportunity conducive environment where wages employment and other economic conditions are more favourable. The Neo-classical micro approach of migration (the theory of New Economics of Migration), considers both the labour market as well as the conditions of other markets such as the capital market, unemployment, and insurance market as a motive for migration. This theory also considers the tactics behind migration as well as highlights the significance of the financial transport of migration in terms of sociocultural changes. Furthermore, this theory also assists to understand why individuals of a particular community are prospective migrants. It also posits that poor people are less prone to migration compared to the wealthy due to the high cost of migration (Tom, 2003). However, mass mobility does not only occur due to wage differences, as Neo-classical economists tend to believe, as a means of international price equalization between rich and poor regions but also there are other factors identified in the form of push and pull factors.

**2.3.2 Situation-Oriented Approaches (Push-Pull Hypotheses):** This approach was propounded by Lee (1966). He used this approach to explain the erratic nature of migrants. According to him, the most important factors in migration are Push-pull factors. Here, the negative factors in the place of origin are called the Push factors while the positive ones that attract migrants to the destination place are called the Pull factors, he further posits that the decision to move and the process of movement is influenced by factors associated with the areas of origin, destination, intervening factors, personal factors and fluctuation in the economy. Push factors such as natural disasters, civil wars, violent conflict, poor wages, political repression, low wages, poor remuneration, drought, famine, etc. have compelled millions of people to move from their home country to others countries. While the Pull factors include: better employment opportunities, high standards of living, better educational system, good basic infrastructures, good healthcare facilities, better wages, etc. all of which attract people from their country of origin to the host country.

This approach has become the dominant approach in the migration literature. This is because it is more comprehensive, hence it incorporates both the important factors that have an impact on migration decision-making and is also able to integrate other theoretical insights (De-Haas, 2010).

### 2.4 Theory Application

The relationship between cross-border migration and economic Security in Nigeria is better explained using the classical migration theory on which the study was anchored. The Neo-classical migration theory and the push and pull approach which are strands of the classical migration theory are apt for this study. Essentially, the thrust for migration and economic security such as trafficking, illicit drug peddling and smuggling of goods and services is a fall-out from poor wages and the apparent need to drift from the low-income economic environment to high-wage labour environments. Although the desire for more income may not always present itself as the only drive for migration, political insecurity, ecological factors, and cultural differentiation, amongst others are unarguably contributory factors for migration tendency. In Nigeria, they no doubt amount to increasing justifications for a steady mass exodus to Western Europe, Asia, and Northern America. Again, migration could also lead to the transmission of infectious diseases or acquire safe hygiene practices. Migration could lead to the transmission of

infectious diseases like (HIV, Tuberculosis, and Ebola), during the migratory process because of the overcrowded nature and poor living conditions of migrants during transit and in destination countries.

### 3. METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

#### 3.1 Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative research design in interrogating the implications of Cross Border Migration (Independent variable) on economic Security (Dependent Variable) in Nigeria. This method is suitable since the data for the study exist in a reliable documentary of well-established institutions. The study, therefore, relied on the data obtained from official reports of World Bank Development Indicators, United Nations Development Programme, Global Migration data, International Organizations for Migration, World Health Organizations, and the National Bureau of Statistics for both Nigeria.

#### 3.2 The Trend in Cross-Border Migration and Poverty in Nigeria

The study examined the implications of cross-border migration on human security. The proxy for cross-border migration was computed as the net migration as a percentage of the national population.



**Fig-1:** The cross-border movement of persons across Nigeria.

The graph of the annual movement of persons across the borders of Nigeria is captured in Figure 1. The line graph is a trend analysis of the flow of migrants in and out of Nigeria. The variable used is the net migration figure as a percentage of the population.

From the trends shown in Figure 1, Nigeria had a negative net migration flow as a percentage of her population over the period. This suggests that Nigerians, within the time frame of this study (1999 to 2021) had a high level of mass exodus out of Nigeria.

The implication of this is that cross-border migration as facilitated by the ECOWAS protocol has encouraged a high level of international migration across borders. It is therefore worthy to investigate the extent to which this trend had influenced the human security of citizens of Nigeria. The trend analyses are further used to analyze the movement of human security variables vis-à-vis cross-border migration.

**Table 1:** Analyses of the association between Cross Border Migration and Poverty in Nigeria

YEAR	Nigeria			
	Migration (as % of Pop)	Poverty Rate	Remittances	Unemployment rate
1999	-0.10	-2	3.6271	4.4010
2000	-0.08	2.71	3.0005	4.3960
2001	-0.13	1.82	2.6431	4.3990
2002	-0.13	1.2	2.0450	4.4030

2003	-0.16	7.59	1.5709	4.3970
2004	-0.17	30.36	2.5872	4.3970
2005	-0.09	0.8	13.0426	4.3040
2006	-0.21	5.42	11.6428	4.2150
2007	-0.20	4.05	10.8227	4.1300
2008	-0.20	3.49	9.2295	4.0480
2009	-0.20	4.13	10.8378	3.9710
2010	-0.15	5	5.3500	3.8990
2011	-0.20	2.12	5.0072	3.8260
2012	-0.18	1.52	4.4566	3.7610
2013	-0.22	2.61	4.0385	3.7000
2014	-0.19	3.52	3.6598	4.5600
2015	-0.19	-0.02	4.3981	4.3100
2016	-0.07	-4.16	4.8633	7.0600
2017	-0.17	-1.77	5.8548	7.0430
2018	-0.32	4.24	2.7162	2.6660
2019	-0.21	3.43	3.1342	2.5410
2020	-0.12	-0.7	2.5845	2.4630

**Table 2:** Correlation Coefficients

		Cross Border Migration	Spread of Disease	Poverty
Cross Border Migration	Pearson Correlation	1	.538*	-.248
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.021	.306
	N	19	18	19
Spread of Disease	Pearson Correlation	.538*	1	.122
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021		.630
	N	18	18	18
Poverty	Pearson Correlation	-.248	.122	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.306	.630	
	N	19	18	19

### 3.3 Cross border Migration and personal remittances in Nigeria

The study of a possible relationship between cross-border migration and unemployment (as a proxy for human security) can be carried out using trend analyses. Table 1 depicts the trend in the level of personal remittances as well as cross-border migration in Nigeria

The result revealed a sporadic movement in the trend of personal remittance for Nigeria and a feeble fluctuation in cross-border migration. As constant changes took place in the cross-border migration, so did the variables for remittance fluctuate over time. This indicated that cross-border migration could be responsible for personal remittances. This implies that as citizens search for greener pastures outside the shores of Nigeria, the rate of remittances into Nigeria tends to increase. This explains that cross-border migration encouraged capital flight and repatriation of capital. These means help foreigners to return earnings and at times, capital to their home country.

### 3.4 Cross border Migration and Unemployment rate in Nigeria

Table 1 showed the trend analyses for the relationship between cross-border migration and unemployment in Nigeria. For Nigeria, a cursory look at the line movement revealed feeble fluctuation in both cross-border migration (throughout the period) and unemployment rate between 1999 and early 2010 in the trend, unemployment moved in a slight upward trend from 1999 till 2014 and then downward in 2015, before it assumed steeply movements up and down, fluctuating between 2015 and 2017. These movements, followed the opposite trend with cross-border migration, especially in the period of steep fluctuations.

### 3.5 Cross Migration and poverty rate in Nigeria

The analyses showed the influence of cross-border migration on poverty as a proxy for economic security. The rate of poverty in Nigeria as depicted in Table 2 witnessed a periodic oscillation throughout the time frame of the study (1999 to 2017). The oscillation in the trend of poverty was negative in 1999 and 2015 through 2017. These swings seem to move in a relatively opposite direction with the net migration. This suggests a dormant negative relationship. This suggests that cross-border migration that encourages a sizeable number of Nigerians to migrate did not alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

Cross-border migration is a diverse phenomenon since the mobility of people is motivated by so many reasons. This study was motivated by the fact that several empirical works seen by the researcher had paid much attention to the impact of migration on national security giving very little attention to the human security aspect. Thus, this study investigated cross-border migration and economic security in Nigeria. The study revealed that cross-border migration did not alleviate poverty in Nigeria but contributed to the spread of diseases, such as the Hydro Immune Virus among women and the Ebola Virus Disease in Nigeria. It also revealed that cross-border migration facilitated by the ECOWAS protocol promoted the incidence of cross-border criminality in Nigeria. The study concluded that cross-border migration did not enhance economic security, but rather deepened poverty incidence, contributed to the spread of diseases and heightened the incidence of cross-border criminality in Nigeria.

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the study recommended the following:

1. The government of Nigeria should regulate migration flow by formulating a policy framework that will address migrant flow and illegal migration.
2. Reduce migration of the teeming youths by creating a conducive environment for learning, and businesses, providing infrastructural facilities, fighting corruption etc.
3. Re-jig the agricultural and productive sectors, ensure governance and employ its citizens.
4. The government of Nigeria should establish mechanisms for the screening of migrants and returnees at the points of entry to know their health status and improve health facilities by providing rapid testing equipment, mobile laboratories, and clinics.
5. The ECOWAS protocol on the free movement of persons should be reviewed and the issues contained should be clearly defined to reduce the diverse crimes across borders.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1]. Adepaju, A. (2004). Trends in international migration in and from Africa. In: Massey, D. S. & Taylor, J. E. (eds). *International Migration Prospects and Policies in a Global Market*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [2]. Afolayan, A. A. (2010). Trans-border movement and trading: A case study of a borderline in the South Western Nigeria. In: *IFRA Trans-Border Studied, Occasional Publication 13*. Ibadan, Nigeria: African Book Builders Ltd
- [3]. Anarfi J & Kwankye S. (2003). Migration from and to Ghana: A Background Paper. University of Sussex: DRC on Migration, Globalization and Poverty.
- [4]. Asante, S. (1997). *Regionalism and Africa's Development expectations, Reality and Challenges*, London: Macmillan Press.
- [5]. Ayoob M. (1997). *Defining Security. A Subaltern realist perspective* in Williams, K.K (Eds).Critical Security Studies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- [6]. Bassey, C.& Oshita, O. (2010). *Governance and Border Security in Africa*. Lagos: Malthouse Press
- [7]. O'Brien, K. (2010) Asuncion Lera St clair, and Berit Krisro Aerson, (eds). *Climate Change Ethics and Human Security*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- [8]. Oderth, R. (2002). *An Introduction to the study of Human Migration. An interdisciplinary perspective*. Lincoln: Writers Club Press.
- [9]. Onuoha, J. (2008). *Beyond Diplomacy: Contemporary issues in International Relations*. Nssuka: Great AP Express Publishers Ltd.
- [10]. Piore, M. J. (1979). *Birds of Passage: Migration Labour in Industrial Societies*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- [11]. Hugo, G. (2012). Migration and Development in Low-income Countries: A Role for Destination Country Policy? *Migration and Development*, Vol. 1(1):24 – 49.
- [12]. Idowu J. (2014). Inter-Security Agencies Conflict at Nigeria's Borders: a Challenge to Nigeria's National Security: *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 4(7)*.
- [13]. Islam, A. (2007). *Immigration and Unemployment Relationship: The evidence from Canada*. Journal Compilation, Blackwell Publishing Ltd/University of Adelavde and Flinder University: 52 – 66.
- [14]. Isodory, A.; Murethi, E.W.; & Simpter, D.J.T. (2015), The Impact of Human Mobility on HIV Transmission in Kenya. Plus one 10(11) e. 0142805.Doi 10.1371/Journal Pone. 0142805.
- [15]. James. H. A. (2014). Improving Nigerian Border Security-A Comprehensive Approach: *International Journal of Asian Science*, Vol. 2(1):25-33
- [16]. Joly, S. (2000). Some Structural Effects of Migration on receiving and sending countries. *International Migration*, vol. 38(5): 25-40.
- [17]. Kilic, C., Ycesan, M. & Ozekicioghi (2019). Relationship between Migration and Unemployment: Panel date analysis for OECD selected countries. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*. Vol. 15(3): 101 – 111.
- [18]. Kristiansen, M. & Kranik A. (2007). Health effects of Migration. *Danish Medical Bulletin*, 54: 46- 27.
- [19]. Kulkolkarn, K. & Potpiti, T. (2007). Migration, Wages and Unemployment in Thailand. *Chulalong Korn. Journal of Economic*. Vol. 19(1) 1 – 22.
- [20]. Lamptey, J.B. & Awojobi, O.N (2014). The Spread of Ebola Virus Disease and its Implications in West Africa sub-region. *International Journal of Innovation and Scientific Research*. Vol. II(1) 130 – 143.
- [21]. Latif, E. (2015). The Relationship between Immigration and Unemployment; Panel Date evidence from Canada. *Economic Modelling* vol. 80: 162 – 167.
- [22]. Legarde, E; Schim, M.; Vander Loea, C; Inel, B. Holmggren, R. Dray-Spira, Q; Pisons, G., Piau, J.P. et al (2003), Mobility and the Spread of Human Immunodeficiency Virus into Rural Areas of West Africa. *International Journal of Epidemiology* vol 32(5): 744 – 752. <http://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dvg111>.
- [23]. Levitt, P. (1998). Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-level forms of Cultural Diffusion. *International Migration Review*, Vol. 32(4):926 – 948.
- [24]. Lindey, A. (2009). The Early-Morning Phone call: Remittances from a Refugee Diaspora Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 35(8):1315 – 1334.
- [25]. Lucas, R.E & Stark O. (1985). Motivations to Remit: Evidence from Botswana. *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 93(5):901 – 918.
- [26]. Lurie, M. (2000). Migration and AIDs in Southern Africa: A Review. *South African Journal of Science*, vol. (96):343-347.

- [27]. Lurie, M.N.; William, B.G.; Zuma, K. Mkaya-Mwamburi, D., Garnett, G.; Stun, A.W, Sweat, M.D, Abdokarim, S.S., & Glittesohn, J. (2003), The Impact of Migration on HIV-1 Transmission in South Africa: A Study of Migrant and Nonmigrant Men and their partners. *Journal of American Sexually Transmitted Diseases Association*. 30(2) 149 – 156.
- [28]. Lutterbeck, D., (2006). Policing Migration in the Mediterranean, *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 11(1): 7 – 15.
- [29]. Mack, A. (2004). A Signifier of shared values. *Security Dialogue*, vol. 35(3):367.
- [30]. Makram, G & Montassar, 2 (2014). The causal relationship between remittances and poverty reduction in developing countries: using a non-stationary dynamic panel data: *Atlantic Review of Economic – Vol(1): 1-12*.
- [31]. Malcram, G. & Montassar, 2 (2014), The causal relationship between remittances and poverty reduction in developing countries using a non-stationary dynamic panel data. *Atlantic Review of Economic vol 1: 1-12*.
- [32]. Marr, W.L; Sikler, P.L. (1994). The Link between Immigration and Unemployment in Canada. *Journal of Policy Modelling* Vol. 16(1): 1 – 25.
- [33]. Martens, P. (1997) Immigrants, crime, and criminal justice in Sweden. In: Tonry, M. (ed.). *Ethnicity, Crime, and Immigration: Comparative and Cross-National Perspectives*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press: 183–255.
- [34]. Mercier, M. (2016). The return of the prodigal son: Do return migrants make better leaders? *Journal of Development Economics* 122:76–91.
- [35]. Merino, J. (2005). Transition to Democracy under a Clientelistic Autocracy: Remittances in the making of Independent citizen in Mexico: *APSA Annual meeting*.
- [36]. Mertins, P. & Midgley, E. (2003). Immigration: Shaping and Reshaping Nigeria. *Population Bulletin* 58(2) Retrieved from [www.prb.org/source/58.2immigratshaping\\_america.pdf](http://www.prb.org/source/58.2immigratshaping_america.pdf)
- [37]. Mete, F. (2004). Does Immigration have an Impact on Economic Development and Unemployment? Empirical Evidence from Finland (1981 – 2001). *International Journal of Applied Econometrics and Qualitative Studies*. 1(3): 39 – 60.
- [38]. Mobolaji, O. & Alabi, J. (2017). Trans-Border Crime and Nigeria Security: A Study of Seme Border (1999 – 2017), *Global Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. Vol. 17(2): 10 – 20.
- [39]. Musah A. (2001) Africa: The Political Economy of Small Arms and Conflicts. DPMN Bulletin, July, 2001.
- [40]. Mydral, G. (1957). Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions. London: Duckworth National Security: *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 4(7)*.
- [41]. Naiditch, C. & Vranceanu, R. (2011). Remittances as a Social Status Signalling Device. *Research in Economic*, Vol. 65(4):305 – 318.
- [42]. Islam, A. (2007). Immigration and Unemployment Relationship: The evidence from Canada. *Journal Compilation*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd/University of Adelavde and Flinder University: 52 – 66.
- [43]. Kulkolkarn, K. & Potpiti, T. (2007). Migration, Wages and Unemployment in Thailand. Chulalong Korn. *Journal of Economic*. Vol. 19(1) 1 – 22.
- [44]. Latif, E. (2015). The Relationship between Immigration and Unemployment; Panel Date evidence from Canada. *Economic Modelling* vol. 80: 162 – 167.
- [45]. Longhi, S; Njikamp; P; Poot. J. (2006). The Impact of Immigration on the Employment of Natives in Regional Labour Markets: A Meta-Analysis. For schungs institut zur zukunft der Arbeit Institute for the Study of Labour, 12A D.P. No. 2044.
- [46]. Marr, W.L; Sikler, P.L. (1994). The Link between Immigration and Unemployment in Canada. *Journal of Policy Modelling* Vol. 16(1): 1 – 25.
- [47]. Mete, F. (2004). Does Immigration have an Impact on Economic Development and Unemployment? Empirical Evidence from Finland (1981 – 2001). *International Journal of Applied Econometrics and Qualitative Studies*. 1(3): 39 – 60.
- [48]. Rios-Avila, F. & Canavire-Bacarreza, G. (2016). Unemployed-Now what? The effects of Immigration on Unemployed Transitions of Native-born Workers in United States. *Levy Economic Institute Working Paper No (870)*.
- [49]. Narazani, E. (2012). Migration and Infant Mortality in Albania. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssm.2189601>
- [50]. UNODC (2011). *Smuggling of Migrants: A Global Review and Annotated Bibliography of Recent Publications*. New York.