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Abstract
Repatriation of refugees is seen as the most durable solution to refugee problems the world over. It is amazing to know that onto this present moment, there are still Liberians and Sierra Leoneans in the Oru Camp, Nigeria who resisted the call for repatriation. The level of resistance to repatriation and factors responsible for such resistance is the core of this article. A combination of research methodology techniques was employed in the research process. These included the use of structured questionnaires, focus group discussions and observations. The outcome of the research revealed that 77.6% of refugees opted for non-repatriation but rather preferred the option of local integration or resettlement. Amongst the factors responsible for such resistance is the unattractiveness of the repatriation package. Others who were active in prosecuting the war, either because of their odd roles during the fighting are not sure of their security back home and are not readily willing to return to their countries of origin. In all of these, there is a discovery in the world of refugees, in which we now also have "Associate Refugees". These are members of host communities who because of economic reasons claim to be refugees and associate with refugees in camps because of the free social facilities at the disposal of refugees. Similarly so, Sierra Leoneans and Liberians who were in Nigeria for some other reasons finds it difficult to fit into the economic situations of the country, takes pleasure in associating with refugees in camps. The research, therefore, conclude that resistance to repatriation would always exist in Africa until such a time when the continent sees development as a primary tool for peace, garnished in the equitable distribution of resources.
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1.0 Introduction
Repatriation is one of the sustainable solutions to refugee problems world over. This is not strange in addressing the problems of refugees from Sierra Leone and Liberia, who fled fighting during the civil wars in the two sister countries. Although there have been frantic efforts on the part of governments of both countries with stronger support from the UNHCR and other agencies to ensure the safe return of these refugees, a good number of them have not still adhered to the call for repatriation, hence their continued stay in neighboring countries. Nigeria, Africa's most populous nation experiencing social and economic problems (Dike, 2015) is hosting hundreds of refugees even when there is relative peace and stability in countries of origin. The question that readily comes to one’s mind is “why are these refugees reluctant to return to their countries of origin?”

The UNHCR voluntary repatriation process for Liberian refugees started in October 2004 and officially ended on 30th June 2007. During that period, 7,021 out of 47,450 Liberian refugees were from Ghana (LRRRC report, 2007). To address the problems of refugees that were left out in the previous exercise, organised repatriation resumed in the sub-region in April 2008 and ended in October 2009. A total of 10,528 Liberian refugees returned home through UNHCR/LRRRC facilitated process. Of this number, 9,763 were from Ghana, 382 from Nigeria, 170 from Guinea, 158 from Sierra Leone, 14 from Ivory Coast, 38 from Gambia and three from Senegal (LRRRC report, 2009).

The UNHCR provided returnees with food and non-food items including blankets, soap and agricultural tools to help them start new lives in their communities. Over one thousand community
empowerment programmes were instituted across the affected countries. These programmes included the building and rehabilitation of health centers, schools, water and sanitary facilities, skills training programmes and micro-credit services especially for women affected by the civil war. Also, successive democratic elections have been held in Sierra Leone with a change of governance from one political party to the other. This is an indication that there is a cessation of hostilities and the causes that led to the flight of refugees no longer exist in Sierra Leone. It is therefore acknowledged that there has been substantial progress in legal and social reforms, which have focused on recovery and peace building at both national and district levels (UNHCR 2009).

In pursuant to the provisions of the 1951 Convention relating to the status of refugees and its 1967 protocol and that of the 1969 OAU Convention governing specific aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa, UNHCR Executive Committee concluded a Multipartite Agreement (Local Integration No.104) for the local integration of Liberian and Sierra Leonean refugees into Nigerian Communities in 2005. Stakeholders to the agreement included the UNHCR, Sierra Leone, Liberia and Nigerian Governments and ECOWAS. Specific assignments were given to stakeholders and refugees who had no interest going back home, and they were given the alternative of local integration. Some have gone through the process of local integration while others are not part of the process. Presently there are Sierra Leonean and Liberian refugees who are still residing at Oru Camp. These refugees are not part of the local integration programme neither having the hope of been resettled to another country. But yet they claim to be refugees in Nigeria. A scientific investigation that will unearth the cause of resistance to repatriation amongst refugees is at the heart of this research paper.

2.0 RESISTANCE TO REPATRIATION

The identity of refugees from the 20th – 21st century is inextricably linked to the development of the modern nation – state as the most excellent form of political organisation. Refugees were indicative of the particular uniqueness of political identity conceptualised within a nationalist framework. Similarly, the development of international responses to the crisis of displacement had direct connections to hardening conceptualizations of territorially-bounded political nations as the typical embodiment of state sovereignty. Unlike refugees, displaced persons are found in a situation in which protection is the responsibility of the state even in times of crisis when state security institutions are on the verge of collapsing. Refugees, on the other hand, are provided with security in the host countries and supported by the UNHCR and other agencies. This shows that refugee situation since the end of Second World War continued to get international protection and response as compared to Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). However, return and integration of IDPs have proved to be much easier with little costs as compared to refugees.

The involvement of the international community in the repatriation was first seen in response to the problem of Prisoners of War (POW) return following widespread displacement during World War 1. This form of repatriation was undertaken without problems regarding political thought as the overwhelming majority of POWs wanted to return home. The situation today is not only complex but different in some other countries where there is a protracted conflict situation. The exchange of POWs saw operational projects established in the 1920s with a focus on the idea of repatriation so as to manage population movement in the Balkans, most notably the compulsory exchange of POWs between Greek and Turkey that resulted from the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne.

For the past 60 years after the adoption of the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees, refugee flows have not been a thing of the past. In some instances, Host States device a policy of confinement or open encampment in accommodating refugees. This according to Kibreab (1993) is to ensure that refugees are repatriated to their countries as soon as hostilities are over. In the case of Australia, the Woomera Immigration Reception and Processing Center was a detention facility opened in 1999 in response to increased unauthorized arrivals of refugees, whereas in some other countries, a location isolated enough for reasons of national security is identified for the encampment of refugees. The later is one such policy amongst others adopted by Nigeria in the case of Liberian and Sierra Leonean refugee influx in the early 90s. This is practiced through the establishment of refugee camps in
countries like Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of Congo and in the Northern African States that were facing the 2011 Political Revolutions.

Repatriation between 2000 to date seems to be successful in Africa and other parts of the globe. Liberia, Sierra Leone, Burundi, Eritrea and Angola all witnessed successful repatriation during this period. Over three and half million Afghans have gone home since 2001. Repatriation as a durable solution, therefore, is not new phenomena as it gained prominence immediately after the cold war era (Chimni 2000: 331 – 340). Though repatriation is seen as a measure towards ending refugee problem, it has two different dimensions; voluntary and involuntary repatriation. The later is usually referred to as forced repatriation which infringes on Article 32 & 33 of the 1951 Convention based on the right not to be expelled except if actions of refugees posed a threat to national security of host states. “Returning refugees to their home countries, where the country of origin is deemed to be in crisis is like creating the same situation that led to flight” (Michael Barnet, 2001: 31). The decision to return home is based on informed judgment, and Refugees must voluntarily make decisions whether or not to be repatriated.

In 2007, UNHCR in Tanzania was running 11 refugee camps at different locations. Repatriation exercise undertaken by the UNHCR in which the refugees were fully informed became successful and today there is about four refugee camps in Kigoma. Contrary, in 2009, the government of Rwanda and the DRC decided to undertake a joint military operation to forcefully repatriate Rwandan refugees from the DRC. The military operation succeeded in repatriating 2,000 refugees to Rwanda whereas, during voluntary repatriation, 10,000 Rwandan refugees were repatriated with little cost. This underscores the fact that a comprehensive plan of action regarding repatriation is a necessary ingredient for ending refugee problems

The term refugee itself is discriminatory especially in the new world of global communication. States no longer fill they owe an obligation to refugees or asylum seekers. Instead, state policies are designed to maximise the welfare of its citizens while stringent regulations are initiated to limit entry of either refugees or migrants. In doing so, the question of protection as enshrined in the 1951 Convention is faced with the ever existing obstacle of sovereignty. This is common in countries with limited resources and the distribution of such resources faced with challenges of bad governance. Limited resources at the disposal of states are directed towards welfare services for its citizens while the interests of foreign nationals are secondary. In the DRC, Children born to Rwandese refugees in camps had to conceal their identity to access education and employment in Uganda (Clark, 2008). Survival as a refugee be it in developing the country or otherwise suggest that human dignity and identity could easily disappear, and this has a psychological effects on the individual in the long term. Where refugees are seen to be accommodated in such communities, cessation of hostilities in the country of origin is a driving force to repatriation.

In highly industrialised countries, Nkula (2003) believes that refugees provide cheap labour to host countries and as such they are exploited for economic reasons by the host state. Hardworking Somali refugees in Nairobi are seen to be contributing extensively to economic growth in the region. Repatriation of these refugees is presumed to be unrealistic as these refugees will not voluntarily abandon their investment to be repatriated back home (Campbell, 2006). Although this is to the advantage of the host state, yet refugees are not guaranteed the human rights, neither given sufficient opportunities to rebuild their lives (Chimni, 2000). Nigeria with a very high unemployment rate does not fall among the highly industrialised countries. Agricultural Productivity seems not encouraging as the nation continued to be highly dependent on import. This presupposes that asylum seekers and refugees are not seen to be contributing meaningfully towards increased productivity. Rather, citizens of communities where these refugees are staying might be right to assert those refugees are the main trust of pressure on state resources which affect their survival.

Countries, where opportunities are not in sight for refugees to build their lives and at the same time, refugees not willing to return, couple with fragile social and economic situation in host states and country of origin, repatriation then is faced with lots of challenges. But the intension of states is to see the speedy return of their citizen when once there is an end to hostilities. According to (Crisp, 1999), returnees are a symbol of political success. Safety for returnees depends therefore on the political will
of countries of origin so that lives and property of refugees are safe when once repatriation is effected. Where this is absent, the tendency for chaos is inevitable.

The post-conflict situations in both Sierra Leone and Liberia have gone a long way in addressing the core issues in the literature. The setting up of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) among other initiatives by both countries was not a mistake but to reconcile victims and perpetrators of violence that led to the war. The question of well-founded fare as emphasised in Article 1 of the 1951 Convention, therefore, ceases to exist and expected not to apply to refugees at the Oru camp if protection is taken as a factor that determines repatriation of refugee. Though this might be taken to be a basis for the return of refugee, another most important question that again struck scholarly debate is when should refugee status be revoked? Is it determined by the security situation of the host country? What about “timing of return” and other factors not written in the books but might be there affecting the return of refugees? Why are refugees not willing to return even when the above have been implemented by countries of origin? These and many set the stage for the study?

3.0 Instruments/Materials and Methods,

The study made use of both Primary and secondary data collected from the field. A total of 154 questionnaires were administered through random sampling, to the refugees and community members. The qualitative methods employed in this study seek to produce a non-quantifiable data, but rather describe behavior regarding resistance amongst refugees. The research made use of observation and participant interviews in obtaining information on refugees’ behavioral patterns. Structured questionnaires were used to collect data on demographic characteristics and factors responsible for resistance to repatriation on the part of refugees. Research findings are presented in tables, graphs, charts using various statistical measurements.

4.0 Findings and Discussions
4.1 Resistance and Durable Solutions to Repatriation

UNHCR assisted repatriation for Sierra Leonean and Liberian refugees ended in 2004 and 2007 respectively. The second phase of the UNHCR prescription (Local Integration) has been in progress with some successes and failures. This is beyond the scope of this research and can only be made mention of and not delved into. That notwithstanding, the three durable solutions for ending refugee problems according to the UNHCR are repatriation, local integration and resettlement. This section therefore will look at each of these options and how they impact on the research question “Resistance to Repatriation”.

4.2 Repatriation of Refugees

Repatriation of refugees brings dignity and respect to returnees and help to reunite families that were set apart by warring factions. It is therefore expected that refugees should be enthusiastic when once repatriation is pronounced.

![Figure 1.1: Those who opted for repatriation](image)
The diagram shows that resistance to repatriation was high among refugees with only a 22.4% of the total population willing to go back home. Comparatively, there is a slight difference between the two sister countries in terms of resistance to repatriation; 80% for Sierra Leone and 76% for Liberia.

The main reason for not opting to be repatriated back home is the unattractiveness of the repatriation package. “One hundred dollars offered to the refugees as a start-up package after repatriation for a family that has been out of their country for over ten years is ridiculous” said one respondent. Research outcome also suggests that 22.4% of respondent are of the opinion that there is insecurity in their countries of origin. This is being re-enforced with past memories especially for those who during the civil war were either trapped in fighting zones or had problem(s) with members of the fighting forces. Focus group discussions also revealed that among those who still have the conviction of insecurity back home were members of the fighting forces who would have committed crimes against their community members during the war. Such past activities now prevent some refugees from returning to their countries for fear of reprisals. These are refugees who for their role in the conflicts could chose not to return. In the case of Sierra Leone, atrocities committed by the rebels against the civilian populace are still a scar in the minds of people. Community members continue to remind young adults of the ugly past including those responsible for such past incidents.

Return for the refugee is not just about changing environment. The question is about livelihood opportunities back home that would support gradual reintegration. About 32.8% of the refugee population was not sure of livelihood opportunities back home. In situations where these refugees lost not only loved ones but also assets, repatriation to them is a challenge. The economy of Sierra Leone for example seems not to be making much progress.

4.3 Prioritizing Durable Solution

Figure 1.2 shows that Local Integration amongst refugees seems to be attractive 40%, followed by 30.4% of the refugee population opting for Resettlement. The UNHCR priority prescription, repatriation is 24% in terms of refugee priority for a durable solution. This indicates that, repatriation is the least option for refugees in the study location. Among these refugees are those who were opposed to the political and social activities back home, while some were forced to leave because of armed rebellion. This is in line with Rogge’s Typology of forced migrants in which the refugees have no option in the face of armed aggression but to leave their place of residence. Migrations in many cases are not planned and refugees end up in strange environments with harsh conditions.

Local Integration is ranked highest by refugees because of the package attached to it amongst other things. These include the provisions for a period of one year, suitable accommodation, medical facility and education for refugees at the rate enjoyed by Nigerian citizens, the issuance of ECOWAS Passport and a residential permit that ensures free movement and participation of refugees in public activities. This package formed part of the multipartite agreement signed by the two sister countries, ECOWAS, the Nigerian Government and the UNHCR.
However, there are others who did not opt for any of the durable solutions who are also claiming refugee status in the camp. This formed 4.0% of the total refugee population of the camp. These are “Associate Refugees” not because they were pushed out of their countries by war, but these are citizens of host country that are unable to create a social space for themselves in host country either as foreigners or indigenes. At Oru camp, the study revealed that there are Sierra Leonians and Liberians who are asylum seekers not because they were affected by war, but are in Nigeria for some other reasons of marriage, economic and more. The rigidity of Nigerian societal structures has prevented them from securing jobs and getting into some other economic adventures. The option therefore for these categories is to claim refugee status, hence their presence at Oru Refugee Camp. Interestingly though, another set of “Associate Refugees” are Nigerian Citizens who are also in a similar plight with no job opportunities and other economic activities, but find comfort by associating with their foreign colleagues (refugees) in camps. One major benefit for these Associate Refugees is that accommodation is free in the refugee camp, a major problem in the Nigerian society.

This latest discovery has its implications in addressing refugee problems in Africa and the sub region. It has the tendency of prolonging refugee situation in the continent and pressure on international, regional and local response.

Figure: 1.3 Liberia Repatriation

The willingness to be repatriated as seen in figures 1.3 and 1.4 for Sierra Leone and Liberia respectively are both similar. Interestingly, more Sierra Leonians are opting for Local Integration (44%) compared to Liberians (37.3%). This might not be detached from the fact that Sierra Leone and Nigeria share the same colonial background and as such are comfortable with each other particularly when it comes to communication; the use of the Pidgin English. In a similar manner, more Liberians (33.3%) believe in resettlement to a third country while 26.0% of Sierra Leonians also continue to advocate for resettlement. Like Sierra Leone, Liberia is still grappling with problems of poverty and its related consequences. The study also revealed that news filtering into the refugee camp seems not encouraging about country of origin, a factor that influences ones thought of going back home.
4.4 Repatriation * Monthly Income in Country of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income in Country of Origin</th>
<th>Less than $50</th>
<th>$100</th>
<th>$200</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>$400 - above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those who opted for Repatriation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 1.1: Willingness to be repatriated in relation to income

With the exception of those within the income bracket of $400 and above, all other income earners below this bracket are not readily willing to be repatriated. Of those within the bracket of $400 and above are graduates, some with Masters Degree who believe going back home would provide them with better job facilities. Some of their contemporaries believe that going home would bring them additional family burden and make life burdensome. Majority are refugees who are resisting repatriation, whose monthly income range from $1 to $100. Living conditions of these refugees seem not favorable but yet do not believe in repatriation. This might not be unconnected with the difficult economic conditions of their countries of origin where there are high unemployment problems especially amongst the youths.

4.5 Repatriation and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Widow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those who opted for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatriation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 1.2: Willingness to be repatriated in relation to marital status

The study revealed that most refugees be it single, married, divorced, widow or separated do not want repatriation as an option. It is expected that majority of married men and women should chose repatriation to end their refugee status. Surprisingly only 19% of married refugees are willing to be repatriated (Table 1.2). This is closely followed by singles (78.9%) that are not also prepared to return to their countries of origin. This could be understood for the simple reason that most of these refugees are without dependants and would prefer to explore and face new challenges in the quest to live a quality life. Refugees that are divorced (42.9%) are much more willing to be repatriated compared to those that are married or singles. Most of these refugees were married to other refugees in the camp. Economic hardship among others has been responsible for the frequent separations in the camp. Widows (66.7 %) seem to be reluctant also returning home even when they have lost their partners. Majority of these widows are also single parents with no substantial monthly income base. A survival therefore for this group of refugees is a difficult one and refugees could even resort to some other forms of survival activities including prostitution.
4.6 Repatriation *Age Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>11-14</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 1.3: Willingness to be repatriated in relation to age distribution

It is evident that majority of all age groups are not ready to be repatriated to their countries of residence. Among those that are ready to be repatriated are those within the ages of 21-25 years old (33.3%) and 25.0% for those within the ages of 11-14 and 36-40 years old. Children and adults between the ages of 5-10 years and 31-35 years are not ready and willing to be repatriated at all. This shows that the level of resistance is not only visible among youths but that it cuts across all ages.

4.7 Repatriation and Sex Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Distribution</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 1.4: Willingness to be repatriated in line with sex distribution

From the table it is a fact that both men and women are resisting repatriation with women the highest (81.7%). It could not be unconnected with the fact also that there are more singles or separated cases in addition to divorced cases reported in the refugee camp. In either cases, 26.2% and 18.3% of both males and females respectively are ready to be repatriated. This reinforces the assumption that it is difficult to conclude neither men nor women are willing for voluntary repatriation when it comes to the question of responding to the durable solutions in terms of ending refugee problems around the globe.

4.8 Repatriation * Meal Per Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meal Per Day</th>
<th>One per Day</th>
<th>two times per Day</th>
<th>three times per Day</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 1.5: Repatriation and Food consumption

Food intake is a necessary indicator in terms of determining survival of refugees in camps. This becomes even more important especially so when refugees at Oru camp have not been receiving food supply for years. Food intake per day was very much less amongst refugees. Most refugees who were willing to be repatriated are unable to have a square meal per day (30.9%). Surprisingly, 94.3% were
unable to have a meal per day. This shows that starvation in the refugee camp was common and only 22.7% of the population, ready to be repatriated are able to afford meal three times a day.

4.9 Repatriation * Savings

% within Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those who opted for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatriation</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 1.6: Repatriation and savings

The table above shows that 27.7% of the refugee population was saving in preparation for their return. Though this to some extent is insignificant, it shows that there are refugees who for some reasons believe that the option of repatriation is the best durable solution to ending their refugee status. In a similar manner, 72.3% of the population also does save for some other reasons. This might be in support of resettlement, education, medicare or reintegration.

5.0 Relationships

In order to determine the level of relationships between variables (option for repatriation) Pearson Correlation test was conducted and results shown below:

Table 1.7 Correlation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Age Dist.</th>
<th>Monthly income</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Meal Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repatriation (Option)</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation results above indicate that there is a positive relationship though weak between opting for repatriation and savings, age distribution, monthly income and sex. Alternatively, there is a weak negative relationship between meal per day and those opting for repatriation. This simply means that the choice of repatriation is not being influenced by the number of times a refugee has access to food. Consequently, marital status has no relationship with the choice of repatriation amongst refugees. The choice of opting for repatriation could be associated with some other factors rather than marriage, single, separated or being a widow.

6.0 Conclusion

The general objective of the study was to determine why there is resistance to repatriation among Sierra Leonean and Liberian refugees at Oru Camp, Nigeria. Research findings revealed that there was a high level of resistance amongst refugees. Most of the refugees prefer local integration and resettlement to repatriation.

The three packages presented to the refugees (repatriation, local integration and resettlement) were such that benefits and implications were not properly comprehended by the refugees. The local integration package which included a suitable accommodation, medical facilities, education and micro credits, the provision of residential permits etc were much more attractive to the refugees when compared to the repatriation package. The provision of transportation and a $100 upon return was seen as a lower repatriation package. The enthusiasm for local integration was much more focused on micro credit scheme in the local integration package which the refugees believe would allow them to undertake business ventures while they prepare for a voluntary return in dignity.

The current accommodation provided for refugees that included electricity and toilet facilities would have being a pointer that a suitable accommodation would mean something much more better as
agreed upon in local integration action plan. Resistance to repatriation could therefore be associated with the current accommodation promised for local integration in addition to other facilities. Resettlement was the second option to the refugees on the grounds that livelihood opportunities back home are not assured. The conviction of these refugees is based on information brought back to the camp by inmates who occasionally travelled to country of origins. In addition to this, some refugees are also not sure of security situation back home. There are refugees who for their role in the past conflicts are of the opinion that their return would warrant stigmatization and persecution. The best option for these categories of refugees is resettlement and not repatriation. Employment and monthly income is expected to be a major factor influencing the choice of whether to be repatriated or not to be repatriated. However, unemployment amongst refugees is very high and its implication is that income flow amongst refugees is very low. This has not influenced refugees to opt for repatriation on a massive scale. Reinforcing this is the fact that there is also no job prospects back home based on news received. The study has being able to revealed that a new category of refugees, “Associate Refugees” do exist and this has also helped to prolong refugee situations in host countries. Their contribution to refugee activities in refugee camps should not be underestimated as it can contribute to hostile refugee – community relations.
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Definition of Acronyms
LRRC - Liberia Refugee Repatriation and Resettlement Commission
UNHCR - United Nations High Commission for Refugees

Reports:
UNHCR Report 2007 and 2009
Sierra Leone, Truth and Reconciliation Report