Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa (Volume 16, No.4, 2014)
ISSN: 1520-5509
Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Clarion, Pennsylvania

INDUSTRIALIZATION, ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND THE CYCLICAL MIGRATION FLOWS BETWEEN GHANA AND NIGERIA

Ayobade, Adebowale
Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The role of entrepreneurs in job and wealth creation cannot be overemphasized in the 21st century nation's economy. Migrants contribute to the socio-economic development and growth of their host countries in diverse ways, bringing new skills and technical competencies with them and assist in the reduction of labour shortages and unemployment. Migrants' contribution to entrepreneurial activity and employment creation in their host countries is worthy of sociological enquiry. Ironically, their country of origin suffers sustainable development set back. This is the challenging situation Nigeria industrialists find themselves because of lack of basic infrastructures such as electricity and an enabling environment. Hence, these entrepreneurs were forced to relocate their industries to where it can achieve its organizational goals and maximization of profit could also be guaranteed. The impact of this development left a wider vacuum in the provision of jobs and wealth creation in Nigeria, while Ghana's economy started experiencing tremendous progress.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurs, Industrialization, Migration and Migrants

ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND MIGRATION

There is increasing awareness on the positive influence of migrants entrepreneurs to both their home country and the country of destination. International migration creates significant financial and social benefits for migrants, their families and their host countries (Mestres, 2010). The positive effect of immigrant entrepreneurship is itself varied; for one, migrants contribute to the economic growth of their host countries by bringing new skills and competencies with them and help reduce the challenge of unemployment confronting societies. Engagement in entrepreneurship endeavours in developing countries, as Nwajiuba (2009) finds, is slightly higher among immigrants than among natives. This is because some countries formal labour laws might not be too favourable for all migrants to work in government establishments. Migrant entrepreneurship endeavours are significant even though the survival rate of their businesses is often lower than those of their native counterparts.

Migrant entrepreneurship endeavours have moved beyond traditional ethnic business enterprises into a wide range of sectors and innovative business areas. Ironically, their entrepreneurship behaviour is affected by credit constraints and duration of residence in the host country, among other factors. The selective dimension of migration processes may partly explain why migrant entrepreneurs are, on average, greater risk-takers than natives and are possessing of greater entrepreneurial spirit **(**Mestres**,** 2010). The migration patterns of entrepreneurs have changed from the search for space, in the middle ages, to that of gravitating towards congestion in modern cities. Sociologically, this type of movement is known as rural-urban migration but in contemporary times, we are experiencing regional migration across the globe and this is why entrepreneurs generally migrate from their country of origin to a destination seeking for the best entrepreneurship practices, opportunities and enabling business environments. Nwajiuba (2005) stresses that their movements could be due to inhibiting or encouraging factors prevalent in the country of origin. For the purpose of this paper, regional migration will be used in similar context with international migration.

Many studies have been conducted to document human migrations and the causes of such movement across Africa. Adejugbe's (2004) contribution is noteworthy, as he asserted that Africa has been experiencing intense migration of domestic entrepreneurs from countries that were hitherto economically viable, in the 1960s and early 1970s, to emerging economies. But only few works exist on the migration of entrepreneurs (Nwajiuba, 2009). Today, Africa remains one of the most underdeveloped continents of the world with high poverty, stagnant economic growth, high levels of unemployment and increasing domestic and foreign capital (Adejugbe, 2004). These challenges pose a great danger to the socio-economic development within the region generally. Africa's backwardness has been attributed to many factors, such as a general lack of good leadership and corruption and inadequate basic infrastructure. These factors have severely impacted the migration behaviours of entrepreneurs absconding from their country of origin to another society where to a great extent are free from these vices. Nigerian entrepreneurs, for example, move to neighbouring countries for the purpose of engagement in entrepreneurship which would have stalled in Nigeria because of its economy volatility. Ugwu (2006) argues that most entrepreneurship policies and programmes in Nigeria lack appropriate development frameworks, face too frequent change in policies and programmes, are lacking in clear entrepreneurial development vision and commitment, and therefore pose serious threats to sustainable entrepreneurship. All these problems combine to create forces of socio-economic and underdevelopment which forestalls sustainable development in Nigeria society.

Ghana, on the contrary, is improving in its socio-economic growth and development, thereby reducing both internal and external migration. This is an indicator to sustainability for any country to attain this social height in contemporary times. This paper give accounts of negative forces inhibiting viable industrialization combined with intense regional migration of entrepreneurs from Nigeria to Ghana. Official statistics reveals that Ghana receives generous grants simply because it has repositioned its economy to foster industrial growth in the manufacturing sector; and this growth is mainly attributable to the availability of electricity and sustainable development in the area of tourism and good governance (Aderanti, 2005). This paper posits that through a spate of voluntary migrations, Nigeria has lost and is still losing to Ghana entrepreneurs that would have otherwise contributed to Nigeria's industrial development**.**

HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

Ghana and Nigeria are multi-ethnic societies with people from diverse backgrounds, status and social orientations. Ghana became independent of colonial rule in 1957, while Nigeria gained Independence in 1960. Both countries have suffered economic setbacks at different times in their histories. While Nigerians were fraught with the complexities of their socio-cultural make-up as well as underdevelopment despite immense capital from its crude oil and other mineral resources, Ghanaians were contending with near-"sisyphusian" progress despite their gold and cocoa. Sometimes in the 1960s, Ghana was a wealthy nation but waned at the beginning of 1970s; at the time, Nigeria swam in *petro-dollars* yet general deep-seated socio-economic despair prevailed. Nigerian labour helped developed Ghanaian cocoa industry and later Ghanaian labour helped powered Nigerian industries and infrastructural development driven by *petro-dollars* (Aderanti 2005).

The first set of Nigerian entrepreneurs migrated to Gold Coast (Ghana) in 1920s. The availability of diamonds in Ghana led emigrants from Nigeria, specifically the people of Inisha and Oyan, to gravitate to Ghana (Stapleton, 1999). They were known to say "ise aje logbe won de leyi o; kori won ma je ki won padanu," which translates as "that they were in that country for entrepreneurship endeavour, may they not lose." Aderanti (2005) stressed that regional migrants from Nigeria to Ghana during the colonial period were predominantly traders, fishermen, and nomadic farmers. The British colonial regime altered the motivation and composition of migration through the introduction and enforcement of European political and economic structures within sub-Saharan Africa. The 1931 census shows that of the 289, 217 foreigners living in the Gold Coast, about 98% were from Africa, with less than 1% from outside of West Africa. Of the figure, Nigerians accounted for over 97%. The number of people entering Ghana surpassed the number leaving in early post-independence, creating a positive balance in migration. West Africans accounted for 88.9% in 1960. Historical and cultural ties were the predominant factors dictating migration flows between Ghana and other neighbouring African countries. Ghana is a developing country in West Africa, and the entrepreneurial environment is vibrant and growing in comparison to its other West African counterparts. Ghanaian business structure is stable and the government promotes business and entrepreneurship endeavours with vigours (International Entrepreneurship, ND). With this strategic template, Ghana has positioned itself for development capable of attracting hordes of vibrant entrepreneurs from the region.

Ghanaian economy and social conditions took a turn for the worse in 1965 (Asante, 2007), and this was because cocoa production in Ghana dropped dramatically when farmers began smuggling cocoa to neighbouring countries or switched to other crops; thus, undermining the popularity of the Nkrumah administration (Nkrumah, 2011). Ghana became an unattractive destination for migrant entrepreneurs and a challenging environment for entrepreneurship endeavours during the period. An estimation of two million Ghanaians left the country between 1974 and 1981; their primary destinations were Nigeria and Ivory Coast. As Nigeria's petroleum industry boomed, an estimated 300 migrants a day left in search of economic opportunities (Bump, 2006).

The Nigerian government overlooked Ghanaians undocumented status in the 1970s but when oil prices plummeted in the latter part of the decade and early 1980s, Nigeria's oil boom subsided. In parallel fashion to Ghana's downturn a decade earlier, Nigeria's economic deterioration caused significant political and social turmoil. Nigeria followed Ghana's example and used the migrant community as its scapegoat and issued an expulsion order in 1983 as Ghanaians were competing with Nigerians for economic resources (Bump, 2006). This period birthed the popular slogan, "Ghana must go". The United Nations reported that approximately 1.2 million Ghanaians returned home. Nigeria repeated Ghanaian expulsion in 1985, and an additional 100,000 Ghanaians left (United Nations, 2001).

Ghana later found its feet after its Presidents Jerry Rawlings transformed the country's socio-political system and restored democracy. In many cases, Ghana's success is measured in terms of the reversal of roles with respect to Nigeria. Many Nigerians and industrialists moved to Ghana not as refugees, but in search of a more enabling environment for business and tourism. Evidence of this may be found in the assertion by the Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN) that over 820 manufacturing companies had shut down and migrated between year 2000 and 2008. Inadequate infrastructure and high cost of production due to epileptic or no power supply account for this development. Nigeria's agricultural exports like cocoa, coffee suffered neglect because of the oil boom (Mayah, 2010). The garment industries were not spared in the dilemma. In 2004, a similar survey conducted by MAN revealed that only about 10 percent of industries run by its members are fully operational. Joshua (2008) also contends that about 70 percent of the small and medium scale enterprises in Nigeria are between operational or on the verge of folding-up, while the remaining 30 percent operate on low level capacity and are vulnerable to folding up in the nearest future. The constraints were further compounded by a sharp drop of manufacturing to GDP of 4.19 percent while industrial capacity utilization dropped to 48.8 percent in 2009 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2009).

Nigeria enjoyed a significant economic boom in the 1970s; so much so that General Yakubu Gowon, a former Head of State, was quoted as saying that the nation's primary challenge was not a lack of financial resources, but rather how to spend those resources. By the mid-1980s, the boom had become a distant dream from the socio-economic realities due to gross mismanagement of public funds by Nigerian leaders. When industrialization and economy development nosedived, unemployment and underemployment became wide spread because industries downsized while they actively sought alternatives that would ensure constant and cost effective production in Ghana. With this development, Ghanaian governments lured industries from Nigeria with offers of 15-years tax exemption for corporate taxes from central or regional authorities, and long-term interest-free bank loans facilitated by the government through Ghana Investment Promotion Council (GIPC). The GIPC has a mandate to dislodge major industries from Nigeria by taking advantage of the squally business climate in Nigeria with juicy offers like a decade of uninterrupted power supply as incentives to sway the interest of Nigerian entrepreneurs to their domain (Adiorho, 2009 and De Haan, (2007). Similarly, Akosah-Sarpong (2009) and Edwards (2010) corroborated the provision of unrestricted access to banks credit facilities as some of such incentives. Erratic power supply has pushed up production cost for businesses in Nigeria. Additionally, social insecurity has forced industries to relocate from Nigeria, while new social problems have emerged in the form of Niger Delta militancy, cybercrime, terrorism and kidnapping of expatriates etc.

During Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in the 1980s and beyond, Nigeria ventured into privatization and commercialization of public enterprises, and this led to the collapse of the region’s industries (Oseni, 2013). He further stressed that in Nigeria, 150 of its 175 textile industries closed down, leaving only 25 functioning below optimal capacity. 10 textile industries each having a minimum of 4000 workers wound up as at year 2013 in Kaduna state alone. More than 60% of local industries in Nigeria, mostly small-scale enterprises, folded up since 1986 when SAP was introduced. Official statistics put unemployment and underemployment at its peak; the organized private sector shed 131,000 jobs in 1997 alone, while 70,000 jobs were lost in the public sector. The 21st century experienced the worst scenario as figures have multiplied because of industries relocation to Ghana (NBS, 2007).

Companies like the Dunlop and Michelin tyre manufacturers were forced to close their plants in Nigeria. Nigerian Stock Exchange (NSE) quoted that Dunlop Nigeria Plc notified earlier to substantially scale down its activities in Nigeria while targeting Ghana as its next location. After 45 years of tyre production by Michelin Plc in Nigeria, it plans to close its ₦8 billion (about $68.3 million) plant to commence importation of tyres from its subsidiaries in South Africa and elsewhere around the world. This development present retrenchment of at least 1,200 Nigerian workers whose job security was threatened with the relocation plan Adiorho (2009).

In the same vein, Nigerian government had spent an estimated US$7 billion (N1.1 trillion) on the biggest integrated steel company in West Africa, Ajaokuta Steel Company. Monthly salaries are paid to hundreds of workers who produce not even a bar of steel in the last 30 years (Oseni, 2013). The Delta Steel Company was also not spared as it was closed by a court verdict terminating the management of the company by Indian investors who were alleged to be indebted to a consortium of three banks to the tune of ₦ 31 billion (about US$207m) (Oseni, 2013).

FACTORS INFLUENCING MIGRATION OF INDUSTRIES TO GHANA

Scholars such as Petrin (1992) stressed that countries need to accelerate their economic growth and development, as it becomes necessary for them to build up a population of first-generation entrepreneurs because development is now being linked to entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial migration research has attracted scholars from various fields. In place of queuing for jobs, some Nigerian migrants in Ghana embrace entrepreneurship endeavours and even create jobs for others. The current situation of infrastructures availability in Nigeria contradicts the assertion of job provision by industries. Entrepreneurs were motivated by several drives to improve their economic circumstances upon arrival at their destination. This could be due to many shortcomings in their country of origin as in the case of Nigeria where industries were subjected to several challenges. Bump (2006) confirmed that more organizations are finding Ghana attractive, particularly in relation to the prospects of the free trade treaty by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Entrepreneurs would need to expand their production capacity in Ghana to sustain Nigerian local market which is their biggest in Africa. Reason being that Nigeria with over 6,000 megawatts (MW) of installed capacity of electricity could barely generate 2,000MW; Energy experts says Nigeria, with a population of over 140 million, needs over 60,000MW to be self sufficient in power supply. Comparatively, in South Africa with a fewer population of 48 million boasts of over 39,500MW from Eskom, the counterpart of Nigeria's Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN). Eskom, established in 1923, generates 95 percent of South Africa's electricity and 45 percent of Africa's electricity (Adiorho, 2009).

Among industries contemplating movement from Nigeria to Ghana were Unilever Plc and PZ Plc because they could no longer bear the loss accrued from the deplorable state of basic infrastructure in the country. PZ, for instance, having spent over 100 years in Nigeria was considering disposing its stock of raw materials in a move to commence its relocation bid as a result of shortage of electricity. The complaint remains that the cost of production sky-rocketed due to the overhead cost of independently-generated electricity. Besides inadequate power supply which cost billions of naira, Unilever and Paterson Zochonis (PZ) Plc are also said to be sour about the incidence of multiple taxation in Nigeria, which has also reduced their profits severely. In fact, a reliable source said PZ may not make a public announcement of its movement from Nigeria. Both companies have a combined workforce of 5,249 staff; PZ has a workforce of 3,775 in Nigeria, while Unilever has 1,474 employees. Unilever Plc literally jumped at the offer, and is winding up operations in Nigeria and has moved over 70 percent of its production to Ghana (Kehinde, Adeleye and Edwards, 2009).

Another of such companies that have been cited as planning to relocate to its production to Ghana was Guinness Nigeria (Kehinde et al, 2009). Although the company is making efforts at maintaining optimum production capacity, it has no immediate plans to close production lines in Nigeria (and invest in a more 'economically viable' Ghana), a market that is adjudged it's second largest in the world in Guinness beer production. Coca-Cola Nigeria relocated Nigeria's only concentrate factory from Ogun State in Nigeria to Switzerland, because of high operational costs that caused their products to lose competitive edge in the export market. Adducing a reason for their departure, the firm said: "The country's manufacturing situation has made the plant's operations unsustainable in the light of today's global economic realities because the company had only been producing for the Nigerian market alone". CFAO sometimes ago applied to the NSE to be de-listed, over its inability to fulfill its obligations to shareholders four years ago.

All these evidences portend danger for the Nigerian economy given the fact that manufacturing industries are critical agent of real growth and development for the country. For instance, Mr. Jide Mike the Acting Director General of the MAN asserts that the debris of dilapidated manufacturing concerns across the country is the product of years of harsh operating conditions. He therefore reiterated by saying 30 percent of SMEs have wound up, and only about 60 percent are ailing while 10 percent operate at a sustainable level.

Ghana is equally exploiting the crisis rocking the Nigerian textile industry, which has witnessed the shutdown of almost 170 plants. They were forced out of business and the proposed N70 billion intervention funds promised is yet to be fulfilled by Federal government. The departing industries and even those considering relocating believe that they have economically valid reasons to transplant their production base to Ghana and they flaunt it. They complain of high manufacturing costs, which reduce the competitive value of their goods in the international market. There are still echoes and rumors of many more industries on the verge of departure from the country. More than over 800 firms in the grades of multinationals, service providers and manufacturing of large, medium- and small-scale levels have fully or partially relocated their bases from Nigeria. The manifest de-industrialization trend in the country has raised the corporate fatality figure to precisely 857. Corruption is another hydra-headed monster inhibiting the survival of industries in Nigeria. The supportive role expected to be played by government is grossly inadequate. No enabling environment for industries to thrive and this leads to the threat of investment climate, and this is a major contradiction to sustainable development in Nigeria.

IMPACT OF REGIONAL MIGRATION OF INDUSTRIES FROM NIGERIA

Flight of companies from Nigeria to Ghana gives room for concern for the Nigerian Stock Exchange and the Lagos parliament as the trend portends impending doom for the Nigerian economy. The mass relocation of Nigerian companies and Nigeria-based multinationals to Ghana is not just a huge blow to the country's socio-economy development but also to its prided place as the giant of Africa (Adiorho, 2009). There are anxieties in the industrial circles that the mass exit of multinationals would further bring Nigeria economy to its knees. Regional migration of industries from Nigeria to neighbouring countries and beyond is gradually and steadily ruffling the nation's socio-economic and political feathers. It would greatly hurt the economy in view of their operations that spread across the country. The Nigerian economy is jittery as a result of movements of some companies from the country to Ghana (Adiorho, 2009). These has brought a paradigm shift to the developmental process of both countries, this is because while Ghana is enjoying the proceeds of entrepreneurial activities of migrants in its society, Nigeria is paying the price of bad leaderships that have refused to address the quagmire. These issues will not continue without creating joblessness to citizens and other contradictions to development in the society.

Theoretically speaking, entrepreneurial migration gives the opportunity to design an approach built on the profit-seeking model. The concept explains why Nigerian industries migrated to Ghana to reduce cost of production and maximize profit. It combined methods of spatial economics and of social inquiry to make predictions about entrepreneurs' choice of location. Classical location explains how industries make their choice location where they can obtain maximum profit (Gouch, 1984). The optimum location in this regard gives the best opportunity for increased sales at lower costs. This theory is commonly used to explain mobility of industries in the international context. It further explains why Nigerian entrepreneurs migrated to Ghana as optimum location essential for their industries to penetrate and dominate local and international markets. Evidence of this position is confirmed when UNIDO aimed at achieving inclusive and sustainable industrial development (ISID) for its member states including Nigeria. This means that:

• Every country achieves a higher level of industrialization in their economies, and benefits from the globalization of markets for industrial goods and services.

• No one is left behind in benefiting from industrial growth, and prosperity is shared among women and men in all countries.

• Broader economic and social growth is supported within an environmentally sustainable framework.

• The unique knowledge and resources of all relevant development actors are combined to maximize the development impact of ISID (UNIDO, 2014).

THE ROLE OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN DEVELOPMENT

Abdullahi (2008) views entrepreneurship as a vehicle to improve the quality of life for individuals, families and communities and to sustain a healthy economy and environment. He posits further that acceptance of entrepreneurship as a central development force by itself will not lead to economic development and the advancement of private enterprises until an enabling environment is created within countries. Entrepreneurship has also entrenched itself among intellectuals within the globe. Burnett (2000), for instance, asserts that entrepreneurship is a necessary ingredient for stimulating sustainability in order to achieve successful socio-economic development. It has been opined that all countries who wish to pursue continued development must encourage entrepreneurship. Given the importance of entrepreneurship to socio-economic growth and sustainable development, it is paramount for governments to increase the supply of entrepreneurs (Abdullahi, 2012). The reason for this is that entrepreneurship is assumed to be an instrument of socio-economic growth and development in developed economies as experience from United State of America, Britain, Japan, and Germany etc, shows.

Contrarily, the situation defers in developing countries, specifically Nigeria, where the funding of and infrastructural provision for SMEs is appalling (Abiodun, 2011). Entrepreneurship for sustainable development lies at the nexus of innovation and sustainability concerns. It is therefore supposed to result in more than economic success; that is, other variables must be put into consideration. The creativity and ingenuity of entrepreneurs, particularly those in small-scale enterprises (SMEs) who utilize non-oil natural resources of their country of origin, provides a sustainable springboard for industrial development and economic growth as it is the case in the industrialized and economically developed societies (Schmiemann, 2008). This negates Nigerian circumstances as key indicators for such is completely not in sight due to reasons earlier discussed. Therefore, the attainment of sustainable development remains a tall order.

LINKING MIGRANT ENTREPRENEURSHIP TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Many countries increasingly perceive migration as a phenomenon whose positive impacts in development terms can be substantial, provided the appropriate policies are in place (EC Communication from the Commission - Migration and Development: Some Concrete Orientations' 2005). There is a growing recognition of the positive relationship between migration and development with great uncertainty about what this linkage means in policy terms (Grieco and Hamilton, 2004). The World Bank suggested a number of ways through which migration policies could be made "development-friendly" (Ozden, 2006). With the establishment of the Global Commission on International Migration in 2003, migration-development has turned out to be a true global policy field (Skeldon, 2008). Research on relationship between migration and development has focused largely on international migration and its impact on economic growth, poverty, and development both in countries of origin and destination. Several reports and policy statements have shown that international agencies and the governments of both migrant-sending and receiving countries believe that migration can make an important contribution to the development of countries (Social Science Research Council (SSRC), 2008).

The impact of development on human migration is celebrated by many stakeholders, including governments of receiving and sending countries (Schapendonk and Zoomers, (2012); Adepoju, Naerssen and Zoomers, 2008). The outcomes illustrate the contradictions of this celebrated link between migration and development. The debate seems to hang in the balance between two opposing logics: (1). Migrants are the new development agents, not only for their financial remittances, but also for their bridging capacities in the field of development. The point of departure is more mobility leads to more development; (2) Development policies should improve the socio-economic situations in the sending countries, so that potential emigrants are discouraged.

On the premise of the above assertions, the United Nations present mounting evidence that shows that migration is usually positive both for countries of origin and of destination. Migrants contributing their entrepreneurial capacities, boost economic growth in countries of destination (United Nations, 2006). Sustainable entrepreneurs manage to the "triple bottom line" (Elkington, 1997); in other words, they balance economic health, social equity and environmental resilience through their entrepreneurial behavior. Sustainable development, therefore, is a contested concept because, according to Bradley, it is complex and comes with high stakes (2008). Bradley described the concept as complex because it addresses some of the most basic concerns of the human condition. That is why sustainable development is coupled with the long-term survival of humanity for a qualitative improvement in the human experience. This makes sustainable development both a goal and a process, because it represents both a vision of the future worthy of human aspiration, and an unending process of adapting human activities to correspond with the aspired future (Bradley, 2008).

There are some categories of entrepreneurs who are mostly concerned that the development of their country of origin and destination is sustainable. These are sustainability entrepreneurs because they are motivated by the desire to catalyze regional development and, in so doing, instill their values into the regional economy and broader social system. Sustainable entrepreneurship is thus associated with the promise of more traditional concepts of entrepreneurship, but also has additional potential both for society and the environment (Kuckertz and Wagner, 2010). Efforts of these entrepreneurs are what actually sustain industrialization and entrepreneurship endeavour because they have the potential to serve as engine for wealth creation, employment generation, entrepreneurial skills development and sustainable economic development of Nigeria and Ghana. Migrant entrepreneurs are found to be better in leading sustainability-motivated value creation, compared to managers in existing industries (Cohen, Smith and Mitchell, 2008).

Oyelola, Ajiboshin, Raimi, Raheem and Igwe (2013) tried to examine literature which explores entrepreneurship and socio-economic development in Nigeria and discover that it is limited. The socio-economic impact of entrepreneurship on sustainability of the economy is difficult to accurately measure or estimate, but it is believed to be highly dynamic and significant (Chu, Kara and Benzing, 2010). On the impact of entrepreneurship on sustainable development, it is noteworthy that migrant entrepreneurs were noted for their ability to simultaneously meet competing objectives in their environment, social-ethics, and economic realms. This signifies that not only are the values and motivations of sustainability entrepreneurs distinct from other types of entrepreneurs, but also that they exhibit distinct capabilities (Bradley, 2008).

CONCLUSIONS

When Nigerian entrepreneurs embraced Ghanaian industrial opportunities in totality, Ghanaian governments retreated their initial position as they were somewhat threatened by the doggedness of Nigerians; with their potentials to invade and possibly overwhelm, almost literally speaking, any economy. Hence, the introduction of some stringent trade and immigration measures to regulate the inflow of Nigerians and their industries by Ghanaian governments. Recently, Nigerian migrant entrepreneurs in Ghana allege hostility from indigenous entrepreneurs and government agencies against them specifically. These people sent a save their soul message to the Nigerian government for interventions in order to check the ugly trend against them in Ghana. These developments might have informed reasons why United Nation emphasized that regulatory barriers which prevent self-employment of migrants constitute obstacles to migrant entrepreneurship endeavours and this is counterproductive to any nation’s economy. Therefore, countries wishing to promote business creation by migrants were advised to review their regulations, particularly with respect to those migrants who have acquired the right to long-term residence (United Nation, 2006).

While it is for Ghana a relatively gratifying position to be the country regulating the inflow of another country’s entrepreneurs and their endless business enterprise potentials, it is for Nigeria an uncomfortable and precarious situation to be in especially when no immediate measures or policies can possibly upturn the deficit that took decades to entrench. For Ghana to guarantee that these entrepreneurs would ensure sustainable development, decisions on international migration policy should not therefore be made on the basis of economics alone. This is because migration generates socio-cultural and political consequences that must be carefully considered (United Nation, 2006).

Therefore, Nigerian needs to cope with its predicament and probably fashion out short to medium term incentives geared at retaining its industries, while working on a more permanent plan to create an industrial friendly environment. Government should, as a matter of urgency, intervene on the deplorable situation of basic infrastructure because the consequences are grave not just on the economy but on the society. Mass relocation of Nigerian-domiciled industries to Ghana is a pointer at imminent social strife, which may in turn birth fresh social problems.

REFERENCES

Abdullahi, S.A,. *Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth: An Analysis of Impact of Public Policy on Entrepreneurship Development in Nigeria:* The 2012 International Conference on Business and Management 6th – 7th September 2012, Phuket -Thailand.

Abdullahi, S.A. (2008). *Entrepreneurship as a Force in Economic Growth and Development in Nigeria.* A Paper Presented at an international conference on entrepreneurship organized by Chike Okoli Centre for entrepreneurial studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

Abiodun, F, (2011). *Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Nigeria: The Problems and Prospect.* The Collegiate Journal of Economics.

Adejugbe, A. M. (2004). *Industrialization, Distortions and Economic Development in Nigeria Since 1950.* In Adejugbe, A (ed) *Industrialization Urbanization and Development in Nigeria 1950-1999 Lagos*: Concept Publications.

Adepoju, A., van Naerssen, T., & Zoomers, A. (2008). *International Migration and National Development in Sub- saharan Africa: Viewpoints and Policy Initiatives in the Countries of Origin*; Brill: Leiden, The Netherlands.

Aderanti, A, (2005). *Creating a Borderless West Africa: Constraints and Prospects for Intra-regional Migration-Draft, Article of the Migration Without Borders Series.* UNESCO: January, 2005.

Aderanti, A., (2005). *Migration in West Africa.* A paper prepared for the policy analysis and research programme of the global commission on international migration by human resources development centre Lagos, Nigeria.

Adiorho, Joe. (2009). *Nigeria Helpless Over Exodus of Companies*, in www.ghanabusinessnews.com/.../nigeria-helpless-over-exodus-of-companies18/10/10.

Akosah-Sarpong, Kofi (2009). *Ghana in the Mind of Nigeria*, in www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/artikel.php *Accessed on 18/10/10*

Asante, R. (2007). *Ethno-regional Inequalities, Conflict Management and Democratic Consolidation in Ghana*, unpublished report, CRISE, Oxford, UK. St. Hugh's College, Oxford University.

Bradley D. P, (2008). *Sustainability-driven Entrepreneurship: A Literature Review*. Sustainability Research Institute (SRI), School of Earth and Environment. United Kingdom: The University of Leeds.

Bump, Micah (2006). *Ghana: Searching for Opportunities at Home and Abroad*, by Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University.

Burnett, D., (2000), *Hunting for Heffalumps: The Supply of Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*, in technopreneural.com

De Haan, H. (2007). *International Migration, National Development and the Role of Governments: The Case of Nigeria in International Migration and National Development Policy*, Leiden: Brill Publishers.

Edwards, S. (2010). Ghana woos Nigerian Businesses with Juicy Incentives *in Nigerian Compass*, Tuesday, 13 April, 2010.

Elkington, J., (1997). *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom line of 21st Century Business.* New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island, Canada.

European Commission . *Migration and Development: Some Concrete Orientations,* COM (2005).

Gouch, P. (1984) . *Location Theory and Multi-plant Firm: A Framework for Empirical Studies. Canadian Geographer*, XXVIII, 2.

Grieco, E. & Hamilton, K.A. (2004). *Realizing the Potential of Migrants Earn, Learn, and Return Strategies: Does Policy Matter?* Prepared for the center for global development's 2004 commitment to development index.

Joshua, M., (2008). *Small and Medium Scale Business as Instrument of Economic Growth in Nigeria*. Lagos: Kinston Publishers.

International Entrepreneurship, (ND). *Entrepreneurship in Ghana* .

Kehinde, D, Adeleye, S., & Edwards, S, (2009). *Panic as Unilever, PZ Threatens to Leave Nigeria* in http://www.compassnews.net/news/indeessed on February on 13.April, Accessed,2011.

Kuckertz, A & Wagner, M. *The Influence of Sustainability Orientation on Entrepreneurial Intentions: Investigating the Role of Business Experience,* Journal of Business Venturing 25 (2010) 524–539).

Nkrumah, K., (2011). *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/416674/Kwame-Nkrumah. Accessed on 12/4/2011

Mayah, E., (2010). *Nigeria to Witness Rujugiro's Success Story,* in the Sun News paper of 07/11/2010.

Mestres, J. (2010). *Migrant Entrepreneurship in OECD Countries and its Contribution to Employment*. In OECD, *Open for Business: Migrant Entrepreneurship in OECD Countries*, OECD Publishing.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2007). *National and State Provisional Totals: 2006 Census of the Federal Republic of Nigeria*, www.nigerianstat.gov.ng.

Nwajiuba, C., (2009). *Participation of West African Migrants in Enterprises in Lagos State*, Nigeria Paper presented at the Oxford Business and Economics Conference, Oxford England, St. Hugh's College, Oxford University.

Nwajiuba, C., (2005). *International Migration and Livelihoods in South-Eastern Nigeria by Global Migration Perspectives.* In Rue, R.W Nigeria Global Commission on International Migration 1, Rue Richard Wagner CH: 1202 Geneva Switzerland. No 50 Imo State University,

Oseni, A. L. (2013). *Special report: Industrialization and West Africa's Future,* by Premium Times August 16, Nigeria.

Oyelola, O. T, Ajiboshin, I. O, Raimi, L, et al (2013). *Entrepreneurship for Sustainable Economic Growth in Nigeria*. Journal of Sustainable Development Studies ISSN 2201-4268 Vol. (2) (2) 197-215.

Ozden, C. (2006). *Educated Migrants: is there Brain Waste? In International Migration, Remittances and the Brain Drain,* World Bank, pp. 236.

Petrin, T., *Partnership and Institution Building as Factors in Rural evelopment*. Paper presented at the Sixth Session of the FAO/ECA Working Party on Women and the Agricultural Family in Rural Development, Innsbruck, Austria, 13-16 October, 1999.

Schapendonk, J. & Zoomers, A. (2012). *Echoes in the Netherlands of an African Migration Expert.* In *Migration in the Service of African Development*; In Oucho, J.O. (ed). Nigeria: Ibadan; Safari Books Ltd.

Schmiemann, M. (2008). *Enterprises by Size and Class: Overview of SMEs in the EU. Statistics in Focus*, 31, Luxembourg: Eurostat.

Skeldon, R. (2008). *International Migration as a Tool in Development Policy: A Passing Phase*? *Popul. Dev. Rev. 34*, 1–18.

Stapleton, G. (1999). *Nigerians in Ghana West Africa*. In Afolayan, A. (1959). Emigration Dynamics in Nigeria: Landlessness, Poverty, Ethnicity and Differential Responses, London: Routledge, Vol. I: Sub-Saharan Africa. 2184, 21 February 1999.

Ugwu, S.C. (2006). *Public Policy Analysis, Issues, Principles, Theory and Applications,* Enugu: Chiezugo Press.

United Nation Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) (2014). *Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development: Creating Shared Prosperity* | Safeguarding the environment.

United Nation, (2006). *Globalization and Interdependence: International Migration and Development. International migration and development*. Report of the Secretary-General. Sixtieth session Agenda item 54 (c) General Assembly. A/60/871.

United Nations (2001). *World Population Monitoring Report: International Migration, New York: United Nations.* In Siddique , M (ed), International Migration into the 21st Century, Essays in Honour of Reginald Appleyard, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

AYOBADE, Adebowale : Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria