This paper is part of a series commissioned by the Electoral Institute for Sustainable Democracy in Africa (EISA) exploring the content of APRM Country Review Reports (CRRs) currently available on issues including gender, land, youth, extractive industries, elections and violence, and government responses to the APRM CRRs.
INTRODUCTION

Migration is often identified as a last resort for people hoping to improve their standard of living. Favourable global conditions such as the demand for labour in destination countries and a booming international market have, in the past, made it relatively easy for migrants to seek a more secure life for themselves outside of their countries of origin.

However, the present global environment is increasingly characterised by economic stagnation and insecurity (partially fuelled by unemployment, shrinking resources, a decline in trade and demand for commodities and increased terrorist attacks) and this has made it difficult for individuals to migrate elsewhere.

This paper, based on the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) Country Review Reports (CRRs), analyses critically what the APRM says and does not say about migration in Africa. In doing so, it identifies migration trends and patterns by analysing the 16 CRRs available in English.

The paper has three main objectives: firstly, to compare and contrast APRM member countries where interesting comparisons can be drawn. Secondly, to analyse and scrutinise the representation of migration in the CRRs. Thirdly, to examine what the CRRs say (or don’t say) about migration. This will identify crucial questions related to migration that the APRM may be overlooking, as well as areas of specific migration-related focus.

The paper distinguishes between two types of migration: voluntary and forced. Three main types of forced migrants can be identified: refugees, asylum-seekers and internally displaced persons (IDPs). In analysing the reports the paper also seeks to analyse how the CRRs contextualise migration – in other words, does the APRM discuss and conceptualise migration in ‘one bag’ or does it conceptualise it in terms of the different typologies?

CONCEPTUALISING MIGRATION

Migration can be understood as the movement of people from one place to another – this includes internal migration (rural to urban) and international migration (from one country to another) – with the purpose of taking up permanent or semi-permanent residence (FMO 2012).

In conceptualising migration it is important to differentiate forced migration from voluntary migration. In doing so, displacement should be viewed from the point of view both of its cause and/or its purpose (Fischer & Vollmer 2009, p 11). Voluntary migrants are those who leave a particular country and settle elsewhere for better opportunities such as employment or business or educational opportunities in order to improve their lives (FMO 2012; Fischer & Vollmer 2009, p11). Forced migrants, on the other hand, are fleeing from social and political problems such as armed conflict, human rights violations and natural disasters. These unfavourable conditions force people to migrate or find refuge in a country that will provide them with more security (FMO 2012). It can therefore be said that forced migration is associated with threat or fear (UNHCR 2013).
LACK OF DISTINCTION

One of the shortcomings of the CRRs is their failure to discuss migration as a pressing issue. Although it is important to keep in mind that the APRM does not focus on or specialise in one particular issue, it regularly conflates migration with other governance issues. Under Objective 9 in the political and good governance chapter migration is directly examined in relation to IDPs and refugees. Not only does this restrict the discussion of migration to these categories, it also automatically shifts the discussion to forced migration and neglects to discuss voluntary migration, which is a meaningful governance issue in its own right. It would therefore be more useful for the APRM to distinguish between voluntary and forced migration. The conflation of the two categories is the result of recommendations and policies not being sensitive to specific migration challenges such as xenophobic attacks (the most evident ones being in South Africa and, most recently, in Zambia) and the long-term existence of refugee camps such as the controversial camps in Kenya for Somali immigrants.

The lack of a concrete definition and distinction goes beyond the CRRs, it reflects the continent’s lack of insight. Each member country is faced with different challenges, making it difficult to formulate sound migration policies. What the APRM does highlight is the fact that there is a general lack of concrete understanding of migration and its effects. This leaves room for policy makers and researchers to further broaden and expand on migration discourse.

MIGRATION IN AFRICA

According to a report published by the World Bank in 2014, the number of African migrants doubled between 1980 and 2010, reaching 30.6 million. This equates to approximately 3% of the continent’s total population.

Official data from Forced Migration Online (FMO) indicate that more than 25% of the world’s refugees live in Africa (this excludes those who are internally displaced within various African countries) (FMO 2012). Africa also has four of the top ten receiving countries in the world (FMO 2012). Forced migration is an expanding problem across Africa, with approximately 19 million IDPs in 19 countries (FMO 2012).

In 2004 Africa was identified as the continent with the most people affected by internal displacement (FMO 2012). In addition, there are an estimated 3.25 million African refugees and asylum seekers, the vast majority of them living in other African countries (FMO 2012). What differentiates migration trends and flows in Africa from those on other continents is the frequency and magnitude of the flows. The violent and intercommunal conflict that took place in the Central African Republic in 2014, left 500 000 people internally displaced (Guterres, 2014). Over 400 000 are refugees in Cameroon, Chad, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Republic of Congo (Guterres, 2014). In the same year insecurity in north-eastern Nigeria caused more than 157 000 people to flee to Niger, Cameroon and Chad (Edwards, 2015).

Discourse surrounding African migration trends tends to associate it with mass displacement caused by poverty, violent conflict, warfare and environmental degradation. The problem with accepting these factors as the sole cause is that they fail to reflect other sources of migration such as the search for family, work or study. It also fails to take account of urbanisation, another important feature in Africa.

Emigration resulting from the search for better economic and educational opportunities is also a major concern for many African countries. In 2013, sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) had 23.2 million emigrants, which represents 2.5% of the total population (973.4 million) (World Bank 2016, p 36). While SSA’s emigration rates have increased substantially over the last decades, the proportion of emigrants in total population of the country of origin remains one of the lowest in the world. However, the proportions
vary greatly among countries (Shimeless 2010, p 6). The emigration rates from countries such as Lesotho, Cape Verde, Mali and Seychelles exceeded 10% of their population (Shimeless 2010, p 7).

According to the 2016 World Bank Migration and Remittances Fact Book, between 2010 and 2011 Algeria lost 318,000 tertiary educated migrants, South Africa 294,000 and Nigeria 289,000 – among the highest figures in the world (The World Bank 2016, p. 26).

There is also very little focus on regional migration patterns, with more attention paid to south-north migration flows than to those among African counties. Only 25% of migrants from Africa go to Europe, whereas nearly twice that number choose other African countries. Migration trends within the continent indicate that a number of African countries, among them Tanzania and Ethiopia, have become both transit and destination states for irregular flows.

STANDARDS AND CODES

The signature and ratification of regional, international and continental codes indicate the levels of action taken by governments to address migration in their country. It is interesting, for instance, to note that although migration is a pressing issue in Ethiopia, the country has only signed and ratified one regional code (the OAU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugees Problems in Africa). Ethiopia has not yet signed the important core treaty, the Convention on Migrant Workers (Ethiopia CRR 2011, p 69; UNHCR 2016b).

Similarly, Kenya has signed and ratified the OAU Refugee Convention and the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees but has not yet signed or ratified the Convention for the Protection of Rights of Migrant Workers (Kenya CRR 2006, p 61; UNHCR 2016b). South Africa has signed and ratified the majority of regional and international codes and standards but has not signed the Covenant on the Protection of Rights of Migrant Workers (South Africa CRR, p 72; UNHCR 2016b). The failure to sign and ratify that particular convention is indicative of the lack of effort to address migration issues and continues to place migrants in a vulnerable position.

The signing and ratification of these standards and codes would have a direct impact on migrants, ensuring that they are protected by the law and are thus less vulnerable.

METHODOLOGY

This paper is based on a text-mining analysis through which word frequencies extracted from the 16 reports published in English can be analysed statistically. Mali’s report has not yet been translated. The word frequencies are expressed as a number per 10 000 words of text, which helps to indicate the degree to which emphasis has been placed on the paper’s key concepts. Systematic analysis of word frequencies reveals certain patterns.

Text-mining brings to light what the CDRRs say or do not say about a particular issue and helps indicate on which issues the greatest emphasis has been placed. This paper will focus on the differences between countries and the variations in word frequency.

WORD CLUSTERS

Word clusters are words that are strongly associated with a particular topic – in this case, migration. The clusters include root words such as ‘migrants’ and ‘emigration’, synonyms such as ‘urbanisation’ and ‘foreigners’ and words with strong associations (eg, ‘refugee’, ‘displaced’, ‘immigrants’, ‘remittance’ and ‘IDPs’).

Table 1 shows clusters of words that help track the emphasis placed on migration in the different chapters of the APRM country reports. The list reflects as many references as possible to words associated with migration. The words comprise both voluntary/non-forced and forced migration word clusters as well as other
migration related words such as ‘remittances’. Word frequencies are also included. The table contains analogous terminology such as ‘immigration’ and ‘immigrants’.

As Table 1 shows, the word ‘refugees’ accounts for more than half of the cluster (327 occurrences). The word ‘displaced’ has the second-highest frequency (120 occurrences) and the two together account for just less than 20% of the cluster. They are followed by the words ‘remittances’ (79 occurrences) and ‘migration’ (61 occurrences). The word ‘emigration’ appears least often (15 occurrences). The total word frequency is 938 per 10 000 words, a relatively low frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittance</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigration</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 938

It should be noted that the overall frequency of migration word clusters in the CRRs is low. Although the reason may be that the APRM Master Questionnaire indicators do not guide countries in discussing migration challenges they may be facing, they would not necessarily prohibit them from prioritising or identifying migration as a pressing issue in the cross-cutting or socio-economic chapters of the reports, so it is, perhaps, surprising that the issue receives little direct attention.
### Figure 1
Frequency of migration word clusters (per 10,000 words of text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Cross-cutting</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria (2007)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin (2008)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso (2008)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia (2011)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (2005)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya (2006)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho (2009)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius (2010)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique (2009)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria (2009)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda (2005)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone (2012)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa (2007)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania (2013)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda (2009)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia (2013)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It comes as no surprise that migration word clusters occur mostly in the political chapters, followed by the cross-cutting chapters. The only direct references to the issue of migration in the Master Questionnaires occur in the political governance chapter. The mention in the cross-cutting issues chapter is more interesting. Cross-cutting issues can be understood as issues such as land, corruption and gender, which occur in every area of governance and must therefore be understood and approached holistically.

Migration-related words occur 17 times per 10 000 words in the political chapter and 8 times per 10 000 words in the cross-cutting issues chapter. Ethiopia has the most word occurrences (11), followed by South Africa (9). Both countries prioritised migration as a political issue, with South Africa making slightly more reference to migration in the cross-cutting issues chapter.

**THEMATIC CHAPTERS**

Migration appears predominately in the democracy and political governance chapter (Chapter 3) of the CRRs. This is primarily because Objective 9 – ‘promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups, including Internally Displaced Persons, Refugees and Persons with disabilities’, and the question ‘Identify vulnerable groups in your country and outline measures your country has taken to promote and protect the rights of permanently disadvantaged or vulnerable groups including but not limited to, Internally Displaced Persons refugees and Persons with disabilities?’ appears in the that chapter of the APRM Self-Assessment Questionnaire.

There is relatively little mention of migration in the economic and corporate chapters – an overall average of 1 mention per 10 000 words. Migration has both political and economic implications. From a political perspective, migration policies should guide and determine the flow of migrants. The flow of migrants is also a direct reflection of the continent’s border management. Migration can also be a source of insecurity. If borders between countries are poorly managed there is minimal control over who enters the country and how many people do so. Poor border management has also led to IDP and refugee militarisation. In recent years there have been claims that refugee camps in Darfur and on the Chadian border are being militarised. The APRM questionnaire should include additional indicators that will guide discussion of these facets of migration.

Economically, migration broadens access to resources and is also a source of revenue for the countries of origin. The self-assessment questionnaire makes no mention of remittances, which constitute an increasingly sizeable contribution to the domestic economies of African countries.

According to the United Nations, developing countries receive double the money from the diaspora than they do from official aid (UNDP 2011, p 124). In 2002 the flow of international remittances to developing counties stood at US$72 billion, exceeding the total official aid flow to the developing world (Nigeria CRR 2007, p 344).

In 2010 Africa received $18 billion – which equates to 5% of global remittances (UNDP 2011, p 126). Although Africa received the lowest percentage of the total remittances, remittances increased by 545% from 1995 to 2010 (UNDP 2011, p 127). In addition, as a share of gross domestic product (GDP), remittances rose from 0.9% in 1995 to 2% in 2009 (UNDP 2011, p 127). In its December 2007 report on remittance flows, the International Fund for Agriculture Development estimated that remittances to Africa amounted to US$38.611 billion in 2006 (Nigeria CRR 2009, p 344). Of this, US$5.397 went to West Africa (Nigeria CRR 2009, p 344).

More discussion on migration in the economic and corporate chapters will provide a link between the political and economic aspects of migration, which cannot be treated in isolation as they are intertwined and interdependent. In
Tanzania for example, the government regards refugees as a burden. Amongst other things they contribute towards environmental degradation and an increase in violent crime and they overburden the national infrastructure, which is trying to cope with a huge number of refugees in the face of dwindling financial resources (Tanzania CRR 2013, p 105). Additional indicators in the economic chapter should therefore concentrate on the budget and resources each member country has allocated to address migration inflows.

Laws that are in place as well as legal institutions and the allocation of resources all depend on an allocated budget. Insight into each country’s migration budget will give a deeper understanding of the way migration is dealt with, as well as the migration challenges each country is faced with. In addition, greater insight into how each country provides for migration in its budget will also help explain why there is are shortcomings in the implementation of certain laws and measures.

The economic aspect of migration will also help to explain why some countries are faced with particular challenges. In South Arica, for example, the number of illegal migrants diverts the distribution of resources that were intended for legal migrants. As a result, not all migrants have access to certain resources, such as healthcare.

A number of other African countries are also unable to cater to all migrants because of limited resources. In Uganda refugees receive less than 1% of the district budget (Uganda CRR 2009, p 108). This not only exacerbates the migration issue it creates new challenges such as migrants not receiving education, employment or decent sanitation. Refugees and IDPs also live in poor shelters, lack access to safe water, nutrition, clothing and domestic utensils and are exposed to poor environmental conditions (Uganda CRR 2009, p 109). More countries need to state how much of their budget is allocated to migrants. A consideration of the economic aspects of the problem will make it easier to identify those countries that have difficulty in accommodating migrants.

**EXPLAINING DIFFERENCES IN EMPHASIS ON MIGRATION**

In analysing the discussion about migration in each of the 16 CRRs it is interesting to note that not all the reports focus on general migration trends (in other words, both voluntary and non-voluntary migration). Some countries place more focus on one type of migration than the other. This highlights the fact that not all African countries are faced with the same types of migration concerns and challenges.

In the democracy and good political governance chapter of the Lesotho report (2009, p 48) migration is primarily linked to Basotho people migrating elsewhere (South Africa, in particular) for better economic opportunities. Migration is therefore mainly voluntary.

Lesotho’s vulnerable economy makes it dependent on South Africa in a number of ways, among them the remittances from men who are employed as miners. The state is also dependent on the revenue it receives from the export of water to South Africa. In 2009 Lesotho had an unemployment rate of 46%, hence the migration of many Basotho people and government’s dependence on remittances as an alternative source of capital (Lesotho CRR 2009, p 48).

Countries such as Lesotho risk being over dependent on remittances – in 2009 they comprised between 20.8% and 29.4% of Lesotho’s GDP (Lesotho CRR 2009, p 275). Remittances contribute significantly to direct and indirect welfare and development benefits for Lesotho and help reduce poverty (Lesotho CRR 2009, p 275). This is a clear indication of the increased economic importance of remittances in Africa.

The primary reason for migration in Ethiopia, on the other hand, is violent conflict both within the country and in neighbouring countries.
Although the rate of migration (IDPs in particular) increases during periods of drought and natural disasters, ethnic conflicts as well as intrastate conflicts in neighbouring countries can be identified as two of the leading causes (Ethiopia CRR 2011, p 116).

Ethiopia’s history has been shaped by political instability, war, famine and economic challenges. Like many other African countries, Ethiopia has both sent and received migrants, however, internal migration flows – both rural-urban and rural-rural, far exceed external.

In the Nigeria CRR, both forced and non-forced migration are discussed. The Nigeria report contains the third-highest use of migration (eight occurrences), alongside Zambia, Kenya and Lesotho. Given its displacement crisis, the discussion concentrates mainly on IDPs. The huge numbers of IDPs in the country are the result of communal conflicts, land disputes, religious tensions (which have affected more than 250 000 people) and intergenerational indigene settler rights (the destruction of villages and local communities has led to the displacement of more than 200 000 people) (Nigeria 2009, p 135).

Natural disasters such as soil erosion have destroyed many communities and left about 200 000 Nigerians homeless (Nigeria CRR 2009, p 135). Voluntary migration from Nigeria is equally significant. The country has a diaspora of more than 20 million people – academics, actors, musicians, artists and international leaders (Nigeria CRR 2009, p 343).

The reports from Nigeria, Lesotho, Uganda and South Africa contain the highest frequency of migration words in the cross-cutting issues chapter, with the Nigerian report containing an entire section titled ‘The diaspora and remittances’ (Nigeria CRR 2009, p 344). Remittances made a significant contribution to Nigeria’s GDP. In April 2007 they accounted for US$7.7 billion, a sum larger than the GDP of 29 of the 53 African countries (Nigeria CRR 2009, p 344) and more than the median GDP of small African countries.

In December 2007 the International Fund for Agriculture Development estimated that remittances contributed 4.7% of Nigeria’s GDP (Nigeria CRR 2009, p 344), a fact that has been overlooked by the APRM.

In a number of the CRRs the cross-cutting issues chapter does not conform to the indicators established by the APRM Self-Assessment Questionnaire, which places great emphasis on migration in relation to legislation and neglects to cover aspects such the economy or social conditions. In addition to migrant remittances, the cross-cutting issues chapter in the Nigeria report discusses the impact of the Nigerian diaspora on the country. The cross-cutting issues chapter in South Africa’s CRR centres on xenophobia and some of the difficulties the authorities have experienced in dealing with illegal migrants (South Africa CRR 2007, p 286).

**COUNTRIES IN WHICH A GREATER FOCUS ON MIGRATION WAS EXPECTED**

Although the South Africa report contains the second-highest occurrence of migration words, this frequency is still lower than might have been expected of a country with such high levels of migration in and out of the country. The country continues to be a popular destination for asylum seekers as well as refugees and migrants seeking better economic and social opportunities. The current asylum system is overwhelmed and there is a backlog in dealing with it (UNHCR 2015). In its CRR South Africa states that the influx of illegal immigrants remains an issue of concern (South Africa CRR 2007, p 77). Some South Africans view the presence of illegal immigrants as an additional obstacle to their struggle for a better life in the face of high unemployment levels, inequality and inadequate service delivery and this has resulted in an increase in social tensions, violence and xenophobia (South Africa CRR 2007, p 77).

Kenya is another country in whose report more discussion of migration might have been expected. Although it has committed itself to protecting the rights of refugees, it has no legal framework other than the UNHCR with which...
to address the protection of migrants (Kenya CRR 2006, p 117).

Kenya is the largest recipient of Somali refugees. In 2008 alone, about 165 asylum seekers a day crossed the country’s border with Somalia, which is officially closed, in an attempt to escape the violent conflict in their own country (Human Rights Watch 2009). Acts of terror perpetrated in Kenya have created a distrust of the Somalis and this is reflected in police raids in areas where Somalis reside (Kenya CRR 2006, p 117). Apart from Somali refugees, Kenya hosts refugees from Sudan, Ethiopia, Rwanda and Burundi (Kenya CRR 2006, p 117).

The CRRs show that African countries have increasingly opened their borders. In the case of Kenya, it is evident that the government is making a great effort to accommodate migrants from neighbouring countries but is struggling to do so. The migration issue in Kenya – and in Africa as a whole – makes it evident that the challenges extend beyond the formation and effectiveness of policies. Africa is disproportionately affected by violent conflicts and that these conflicts give rise to mass migration, which puts pressure on the governments of receiving countries.

Given the fact that many of the conflicts appear to be insoluble, the migrant problem is likely to affect African countries for many years to come and governments will continue to battle to find solutions.

**REPORTING**

The differences in word frequencies and emphasis on migrants in each country report suggests that each of the 16 countries prioritises and deals with migration differently. In light of this, there appears to be no one solution – as is evident in the country-specific recommendations the APRM provides. What these differences do bring to question is the ability of the established indicators to address the different facets of migration. It also brings into question the ability of the indicators that have been established in the Self-Assessment Questionnaire to address specific migration challenges. The three indicators under Objective 9 in the political governance chapter centre on each country’s ability to provide insights into and information and documentation about the various legal provisions, institutions and resource allocations that have been put in place to promote and protect the rights of migrants and other vulnerable groups, and how effective these measures have been.

These indicators are intended to guide countries in providing information about how they are dealing with migration. The problem is that countries do not provide information beyond the identified indicators. Kenya, for example, has no legal measures and frameworks in place to protect and promote the rights of migrants. Even though migration is a pressing issue in the country, discussion of the subject is limited. The fact that the Kenya CRR only discusses migration in line with the three indicators helps to explain the low word frequency. Kenya’s CRR was one of the first to be compiled, suggesting that there has been some progress in addressing migration in later reports.

The revised Self-Assessment Questionnaire will, perhaps, go a long way towards remedying previous deficiencies and may broaden the discussion about migration. In the new questionnaire Objective 9 in the political governance chapter requires each state to identify vulnerable groups in the country and the measures that have been taken to promote and protect the rights of these groups. Identifying specific vulnerable groups could provide greater insight into the types of migrants each country is primarily dealing with. Apart from this, the revised questionnaire continues to focus on migration as a political and governance issue.
RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to make the important conversation about migration mover effective there needs to either be a further elaboration of the established indicators or more indicators should be added (in particular, relating to economic/non-forced migration). These indicators should guide countries in discussing and providing information about aspects of migration beyond compliance with and development of legislation. Some of these indicators might be: border management, urbanisation and the social consequences of large-scale migration.

Additional indicators in the political chapter should include reporting on existing refugee camps in the member country. In countries such as Kenya, refugee camps have turned into cities. In the Dadaab refugee camp, which is now home to more than 463 000 refugees, more than 10 000 are third-generation refugees.

This important aspect needs to be addressed as it highlights the fact that the measures and policies intended to address the migration challenge and promote and protect migrants in Africa are temporary solutions that are being treated as long term. This can be linked back to migration policies, which are a direct reflection of a poor understanding of migration and its consequences. Kenya is likely to be the first country to complete a second-round review under the APRM and hopefully this issue will feature more prominently in its second CRR.

Future APRM Self-Assessment Questionnaires should distinguish between voluntary and forced migration. Migration is a multifaceted issue and grouping migrants with other vulnerable groups is not appropriate.

Future reports should also avoid restricting the discussion on migration to refugees and IDPs. A distinction between the different types of migration and migrants will give more insight into the specific migration challenges facing each member country.

WHAT THE CRRS SAY AND DON’T SAY ABOUT MIGRATION

Text mining analysis reveals that migration is primarily emphasised in the political governance chapters of the CRRs. The relatively low reference to migration is a reflection of two factors: the structure of the APRM country self-assessment and the overall lack of in-depth information provided by each country. This is of concern as the minimal discussion of migration raises the question of where it comes within Africa’s priorities. This lack of prioritisation is also evident in the failure of some member countries to sign and ratify important migration standards and codes.

The APRM does not provide enough indicators to enable a deeper insight into and understanding of migration trends in Africa. The established indicators and measures provide information about efforts made by the various governments but there is not enough information to link the challenges and benefits of migration in each country and, in turn, its impact on governance, the economy and social development.

The indicators also fall short of addressing other aspects of migration such as urbanisation, remittances, refugee camps, circular migration and the militarisation of IDPs and refugees. All these facets are directly linked with the failure to address the migration challenge adequately. The failure to mitigate migration trends and patterns further exacerbates the challenges. Xenophobia is a case in point. It is the result of poor migration policies and border management as well as of the way migration is understood and conceptualised in Africa.

Since the release of the initial reports several events have affected migration on the continent. Among these are floods in Algeria, the high rate of urbanisation in Lesotho, xenophobic attacks in South Africa and Zambia and violent clashes between government forces and armed groups in northern Nigeria, which have led to more than half a million Nigerians displaced and others seeking refuge in Niger, Chad and Cameroon.
(UNHCR 2016a). In addition, terrorist attacks in Nigeria, Kenya, Sudan and Tunisia (UNHCR 2016a) have resulted in both internal and external migration. All these events are more likely than not to provoke increased discussion on migration in future country reports.

The APRM should revise and reformulate the Master Self-Assessment Questionnaire in a way that guides countries to discuss migration in more depth and more thoroughly. This does, however, require the collective action of governments, civil society and the APRM panel to engage in discussions about the impact of migration on governance, development and the economy.

Such discussions will need to be flexible enough to be applied to and put into context for each country. Future APRM reports have the potential to expand the thinking about and understanding of migration trends in Africa and, most importantly, to make stronger recommendations. This will further strengthen the already important and significant role of the APRM in its efforts to elevate the African continent to greater heights.

CONCLUSION

The fact that there is little concentration on migration in the reports should draw attention to important subjects that are not being discussed in African countries. It also shows up areas that policymakers and governments need to examine thoroughly, such as border management, refugee camps, the protection of migrant workers and security.

These reports are useful in that they indicate to researchers that there is a gap that needs to be filled by a review of current policies and an analysis of whether they are in line with prevailing migration trends and patterns. The CRRs also enables countries to review their progress since the initial release of the reports, learn how other African countries deal with migration and adopt some of these solutions in line with the aim of finding ‘African solutions to African problems’.

It is evident that member countries have made and continue to make great efforts to accommodate migrants, but the APRM can play an important role in helping them improve on the policies that have been put in place.
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Method of deriving ‘heatmap’ graphics from APRM Country Research Reports using word stemming and clustering

Grant Masterson and Rod Alence

Each APRM country review culminates in a book-length report. Given the way these reports are compiled, and their proven accuracy and reliability in identifying critical governance issues in APRM member states, they warrant further examination. However, the length and technical language of the reports is often cited as a major obstacle to broader levels of engagement with their content. To address this, the Electoral Institute for Sustainable Democracy in Africa (EISA) piloted a text-mining methodology to simplify and disaggregated specific issues from the reports in a manner which, hopefully, enhances their utility.

Text mining reduces the reports to ‘bags of words’, whose frequencies can be analysed statistically. The first step was to capture the text from the 16 reports electronically and to ‘clean’ it – by, for example, removing all punctuation and numbers and deleting page headers and footers. Next the text was summarised in a word-frequency matrix showing how often each word occurs in each chapter of each report. Using this full list of words, paper authors compiled a list of words usually associated with their specific paper topic. For example, in the paper on ‘Extractives and Mining’, words pertaining to mining, oil, and resource extraction were conceptually grouped together under these three umbrella terms. This allowed the paper authors to calculate the frequencies of these specific concepts within each chapter of each report. The frequencies, as raw word counts or as counts normalised per 10 000 words of text, provide rough indicators of the degree of emphasis on the paper’s key concepts.

The analysis is aided by the fact that all the APRM country reports have similar structures. All contain four core thematic chapters on key themes of the APRM: ‘democracy and political governance’, ‘economic governance and management’, ‘corporate governance’ and ‘socio-economic development’. These core chapters are preceded by an introductory discussion of the APRM process and country background. In early reports the introductory material occupied a single chapter, but in later reports it spans two chapters. For ease of comparison, where it occupies two chapters the text is combined into a single document, called ‘introduction’ and treated as a single chapter. The core thematic chapters are followed by a concluding discussion of ‘cross-cutting issues’, findings, and recommendations. In early reports this concluding material occupied a single chapter, but in later reports it spans two chapters. Again, where it occupies two chapters these were combined into a single document, called ‘cross-cutting issues’ and treated as a single chapter. Each report also starts with an executive summary, which is treated as a chapter in its own right. All other front matter and appendices are excluded from the analysis.

Except for the first few reports published the word counts are reasonably consistent. The first two reports, on Ghana and Rwanda, are quite short, averaging only 36 000 words. The third, on Kenya, is 75 000 words. The average length of the other 13 reports is 99 000 words, with nine falling between 90 000 and 110 000 words, and the longest two being Mozambique (17 000 words) and Nigeria (114 000 words). The four thematic chapters account for nearly two-thirds of each report, averaging 65 000 words. Among these, ‘democracy and political governance’ is longest, averaging 21 000 words; the average in the other three – ‘economic governance’, ‘corporate governance’, and ‘socio-economic development’ – is slightly more than 14 000 words. The average number of words in the remaining chapters – ‘executive summary’, ‘introduction’, and ‘cross-cutting issues’ – is about 8 000 words.
The combined word count of all 16 reports (excluding front matter and appendices) is about 1 400 000 words. Three pages of typed, double-spaced text in a standard font equals about a thousand words. Using this as a rough approximation, the text analysed is roughly equivalent to 4 200 typed, double-spaced pages.

The final heatmaps illustrate the intensity of word occurrences by country and by chapter. The higher the frequency with which a word appears in a chapter, the darker that block will appear. Country chapters with dark red blocks are therefore those with the highest frequency of a word, while those with very pale yellow blocks have no or almost no references to that word. The use of the heatmaps themselves allows for a unique and otherwise unattainable perspective on the contents of the 16 APRM Country Reports analysed. It is possible to identify trends in the occurrences of key concept words in the reports and, due to the thematically arranged structure of the reports, this provides the reader with additional perspectives on the context in which these words are being referenced.

However, caution should be exercised in reading too much into the heatmaps themselves. The brief given to all the authors in this series of papers was to view the heatmaps as an indication of which APRM Country Reports, and specifically, which chapters, warranted further examination with respect to the theme of the paper. The heatmaps are useful insofar as they point a researcher in the direction of interesting trends as well as unexpected (or expected) anomalies and outliers in terms of the referencing of a word within the reports. It is not possible to deduce the content of the reports from the heatmaps, simply which sections of which reports warrant specific referencing when examining specific issues such as those in this Occasional Paper series.
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