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Abstract

The past few decades has witnessed a proliferate debates on diaspora communities, the role of diasporas in the development in both origin and destination countries has been emphasised in recent literature. Yet little has been written specifically about internal divisions within the Ghanaian diaspora. Drawing on interviews with, and observations of both first and second generation Ghanaian migrants in the Netherlands and in the U.K., it seeks to explore the views of diasporas on the internal diversity within one national diasporic community. This research asks why are there so many Ghanaian diaspora communities in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, and why can’t there be one bigger umbrella Ghanaian diasporan community in these destination countries? how do the diasporas cope and collaborate among themselves: the reasons for the diversity in the Ghanaian diaspora community as well as the factors shaping the decision of people to form and operate these many groups/organisations, vis-a-vis the diversity within the diaspora.

Relevance to Development Studies

The past few decades have witnessed a surge in the debates on diaspora communities. In particular, an emphasis has been placed on the role of diasporas in the development of both origin and destination countries in scholarly discourse. Yet, very little has been written specifically about internal divisions within the Ghanaian diaspora. Drawing on interviews with, and observations of both first and second generation Ghanaian migrants in the Netherlands and in the United Kingdom, this research paper explores the subject of the factors that shape internal diversity within one national diasporic community. This research asks the questions: why are there so many Ghanaian diaspora communities in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom: why diversity within one national migrant groups. The study finds that the Ghanaian diaspora community does not ascribe to fixed identity or homogeneity, although they assume closely knitted together with common national goals towards their homeland, yet as diasporas, they are not necessary homogenous as assumed, this is partly as the result of reproduction of homeland narratives within the Ghanaian diaspora which influences diversity among the diaspora communities.
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Chapter One: Background and Problem for Analysis

1.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the problem for analysis. It offers an overview of the study by setting out the context of the research, the research problem, and its specific questions. A synopsis of the relevance of the study, methodological strategies used and organisational structure of the research paper form the other core issues examined in this chapter. In this research paper I discuss the questions: Do we assume national migrant groups as bounded to their nation-state and as such, a homogenous group? To what extent does the reproduction of certain narratives from both homelands and host countries influence diaspora communities and as such, create internal diversity within diaspora communities? These questions are reframed and form the subject matter of this research. To address these questions, this research examines how Ghanaian diaspora communities in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom are organised.

Traditional thinkers of diaspora studies have tried to define and explain what the concept of diaspora entails. However, many of these studies usually posit national migrant community as homogenous groups of people in exile who are bounded to their homeland and thus carry the myths of return to their geographical origin (Clifford 1994:340; Safran 1991; Cohen 1996; 1999). One of such is Vertovec (1997) whose work viewed diasporas as social forms, types of social consciousness and also as modes of cultural production. Cohen (1997) and Gabriel Sheffer (1999) also view diasporas as ‘typologies and groupings’. Similarly, Clifford (1997) and Gilroy’s (1993) work also understand diasporas as ‘fluidise ‘essentialist’ encapsulate in commonality’ of the nation state. Although all these explanations enhance our understanding of the concept of diasporas, yet, such descriptions also limit the full meaning of diaspora communities since they fall back to normalised associations between diasporic identity and the notion of nation-state, and hence, homogenising diaspora communities (Mavroudi 2007:435). Instead, using the Ghanaian diaspora community resident in the Netherlands and United Kingdom, this study demonstrates the extent to which internal fluidity and diversity can disrupt ‘homogeneity’.

The paper is divided into six parts. The first chapter presents the problem underpinning this study whiles the second chapter examines the theoretical framework upon which the research is hinged. The third chapter gives the contextual background, whiles the fourth and fifth chapters are the epistemological analysis of empirical data/material. Chapter six concludes the study where a synthesise of the findings made in this research paper is presented along with a call to more appropriate theories for explaining internal fluidity within diasporic communities.
1.2 Problem Statement

“We are protesting against the other group because their kings and their queens are not true, they are not selected (said one group) …… I don’t want these criminals to be my leader…. they are drug dealers so they cannot be my leader…. I am raising my children and my family here; they cannot be our leaders. We decide for ourselves, they cannot decide for us…these people have to go (said the other group) …. So today, we are coming to introduce our kings and queens; that is why we are here …those are opponents and it doesn’t matter…so today we are happy … because we coming to introduce Ghana king and Ghana queen and we do not care about them”1 (these were sentiments expressed by sections of the Ghanaian community in Amsterdam)

Historically, a number of works produced on the subject of transnational diasporic communities ‘have tended to focus exclusively on the fluidity of trans-border relations involving flows of people, goods and ideas across borders (e.g. see Sinatti and Horst 2015; Silva, 2006; Calavita 2006:108; Dauvergne, 2008; Aanthias 1998:559; Amrith, 2011:63). Likewise, the traditional notion of a diasporic community has tended to focus almost exclusively on ethnic and religious entities in the transnational space (Snel et al 2006). ‘Scholars continue to view nation migrant communities as objects of analysis thereby treating national migrant groups as internally coherent and homogenous' (Bove and Elia: 2017:234; McAuliffe 2008:63). This is however limiting since no one community of people is ever entirely homogenous. Consequently, such an inherent limitation in current scholarly works on transnational studies is the neglected fact that there can be internal diversity within a diasporic community. Yet, in the case of the Ghanaian diasporic community in the Netherlands, we observe that there is some high level of heterogeneity in how this community is organised, but also how various groups collaborate their activities (Kloosterman 2016:929). Consequently, contemporary studies have stressed the need for a move beyond limiting the formative nature of relations between places to just movement between homogenously constructed nations, but instead, consider other forms and modes in which diasporans construct their identity aside the nation-state (Knott and McLoughlin 2010: 263; Werbner 2000; 2011: 476; Mavroudi 2007; McAuliffe 2008:63). Likewise, Arthur (2016) observed that, although Diaspora communities may

1 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pxXFCiCB6s
be perceived as closely knitted together with common national goals towards their homeland, yet as diasporas, they are not necessary homogenous as assumed. Instead, they are often fragmented communities with different identities (often imaginary from their origin) which they create and adopt in their host countries.

Ghanaian diaspora communities carry similar traits. An examination of the Ghanaian diaspora community in Europe revealed that there is no one single umbrella Ghanaian diaspora group, but instead, so many smaller associations/groups with a significant degree of varied activities being carried out by these individual groups and their members. (Ong’ayo 2014; 2016). Although not an accurate figure, it is believed that there are roughly 245 Ghanaian diaspora organisations in the Netherlands and about 200 in the United Kingdom (Ong’ayo 2016:12). Given these huge numbers of Ghanaian diaspora associations/groups in these two European countries, for a country of nearly 29 million people (Ghana population census: 2017), one is left to wonder the reasons that could possibly account for the existence of so many smaller diaspora associations/groups and not a single umbrella diaspora organisation. It thus begs the following important questions: why are there so many Ghanaian diaspora communities in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, and why can’t there be one bigger umbrella Ghanaian diasporan community in these destination countries? how do the diasporas cope and collaborate among themselves. The reasons for the diversity in the Ghanaian diaspora community as well as the factors shaping the decision of people to form and operate these many groups/organisations, vis-a-vis the diversity, is at the core of this study as it presents the problem for this thesis.

1.3 Research Objective and Questions

The overarching objective of this research is to explore the nature and drivers of the heterogeneity of the Ghanaian diaspora community in Europe by examining the causes of the existence of a multiplicity of Ghanaian diaspora groups/organisations in the Netherlands and United Kingdom.

The specific objectives of this research are:

1. To understand the different ways and forms in which the Ghanaian diaspora, in both case countries, are organised/mobilised and how this enforces divisions within the membership of the diaspora community.

2. To understand the nature of the diversity of Ghanaian diaspora groups/ associations in

---

2 https://africanculture.blog/2016/08/02/mapping-londons-ghanaian-community-2016-demographics-discourses/
3 http://www.worldometers.info/world-population/ghana-population/
both case countries;

3. To understand the factors that account for this diversity;

4. To understand how the homeland narrative influences diaspora formation/mobilisation and organisation.

To this end, this research is underpinned by one key research question and a number of sub-questions.

**Main research question:**

- Why is the Ghanaian diaspora community in the Netherlands and United Kingdom so diverse, and how does this diversity influence the way in which the different diaspora groups/associations are organised and collaborate?

**Sub-questions:**

1. In which ways is the Ghanaian diaspora community diverse, and how?
2. What factors/reasons account for the diversity within the Ghanaian diaspora community?
3. How do members of the Ghanaian diaspora perceive and construct their identity, and how has this contributed to the current diversity in the Ghanaian diasporic community?
4. How do second generation Ghanaian migrants engage in diaspora activities?

### 1.4 Justification

Kloosterman et al (2016) described the Ghanaian community in the Netherlands as ‘super-diverse migrant’ such that there exists huge diversity within the diaspora. Similarly, Ong’ayo (2014:22) captures the severity and implication of the fragmentation within the Ghanaian community by arguing that "………such fragmentation is a challenge to Dutch institutions: who should they deal with among diaspora groups, some of whom represent one specific group whilst others represent
a number of communities? Both at community level and also umbrella organisations such as Sikaman⁴, RECOGIN, CoGhaN⁵, and Akasanoma have to contend with different and constantly shifting loyalties’ (Ong’ayo 2014:22). Since diaspora organisations are mostly individual initiatives, any fragmentation of any kind sometimes leads to divergent loyalties and also less opportunity for the long-term commitments that are needed in order to build membership-based organisations” (Ong’ayo 2014:22).

Also, considering the growing recognition of the positive role diasporas play in the development of both host communities and country of origin, it is of no doubt that diasporas represent agent of development in both sending and receiving country which goes beyond remittances (Mazzucato 2011; Orozco et al: 2005; Van Hear et al: 2004; Nieswand: 2009; Henry and Mohan:2013:). Although Ghana is yet to explore the full potentials of its diaspora organisations (Somerville et al:2008) – partly because Ghana is still in the process of formalising an institutionalised diaspora policy (Neiswand 2009; Ragazzi 2014:78), as such members within the diaspora rely on individual connections and networks to gain policy-makers’ attention for their project plans’ (Ong’ayo: 2014) – the government of Ghana is currently in the process of setting up an institutionalised policy and participation mechanism (diaspora policies) for engaging the diasporas. In view of this, perhaps there might be some grounds for optimism about diasporas contributions that goes beyond the transfer of financial resources, but also includes the important role diasporas play in the socio-economic and political development of their countries of origin, from creating businesses and spurring entrepreneurship, to promoting trade and foreign investment, transfer of new knowledge and skills among others. (Mohamoud 2005:4; Schmelz:2009; Ong’aye: 2016; Kleist: 2014).

Diaspora studies continue to receive increased attention in the literature, especially in relation to the engagement of diasporas in developmental activities, homeland politics and being transitional actors of change (Mazzucato et al :2011; Ong’ayo;2016; Lacroix 2014, Ahmadov and Sasse 2015, Sinatti and Horst 2014). However, many of these studies treat diasporas as objects of analysis, and thereby posit migrant groups as internally coherent, congruent and homogeneous communities (Snel et al:2006; McAuliffe 2008:63). There are some who choose to join and others who do not want to, partly due to tensions, division and diversity along ethnic and religious divisions which tend to exclude groups that have no affinity with the same identity (Hall 1990: 237 Anthias 1998: 7; Ong’ayo 2014:22). Yet, this is an issue that has almost certainly been overlooked in existing

---

studies on Ghanaian diaspora communities in Europe. By demonstrating on the one hand that Ghanaian diaspora communities are not homogenous, but diverse, and by identifying and examining the factors that shape this diversity, on the other hand, this research paper is justified on the basis that it will fill the current lacuna in the literature on the discourse on the nature and organisation of migrant Ghanaian communities in Europe.

1.5 Relevance of the Study

This study has both social and theoretical relevance. Theoretically, it first offers insights into the nature and organisation of Ghanaian diaspora communities by contributing to existing traditional transnational discourses that rely heavily on a national framework in describing migrant communities as internally coherent and homogeneous groups and consequently excluding other scales and modes of belonging (Werbner 2000; Mavroudi 2007; McAuliffe 2008; Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2002). Relatedly, the traditional transnational discourses focus exclusively on fluidity across borders usually involving people sharing of ideas but ignore the internal fluidity influenced and enforced by narratives from migrants’ origin and destination countries. By so doing, this thesis points to the fact that Ghanaian diaspora communities are heterogeneous, thereby contributing to the literature on the subject as it raises concerns with the traditional assumption of homogeneity within national diasporic community.

Secondly, several studies have been conducted on diaspora communities (Mazzucato: 2008; Bauböck and Faist:2010; Calavita 2006; Dauvergne 2008; Safran 1991; Cohen 1996,1997). However, most of these studies deploy the concept of the diaspora as a homogenous group bounded to their homeland –the traditional ‘nation-state’ or the ‘Purist’ ideology as argued by Babruka (2005), Mavroudi (2007) and McAuliffe (2008). While acknowledging these works, particularly that of Mavroudi (2007:436) who advocated for a flexible use of the concept of diaspora to denote a process that is able to examine the dynamic negotiations of collective, strategic and politicised identities based around constructions of ‘sameness’ and the homeland, as well as individual identities that are malleable, hybrid and multiple’, and the contributions they have made to the literature with regards to understanding contemporary diaspora communities, this view is however at variance with the traditional understanding of diasporas. Therefore, by applying the same theory of ‘diaspora as a process’ this research paper discovers the extent to which her work is relevant in
that it reveals the extent to which the theoretical framework of the concept of diaspora holds true in practice.

Socially, this research provides a window of opportunity to identify the relevance and contributions of Ghanaians in Europe in generating ideas on the factors that impede the formation of an umbrella diaspora organisation, but also the implications on how these diverse diaspora groups are organised and collaborate among themselves. This, in turn, is very relevant for the current Ghanaian government that is seeking ideas and ways of merging all Ghanaian diaspora groups in every country for purposes of exploiting diaspora Ghanaians resources for developing the nation Ghana.

1.6 Research Methodology

To adequately address the objective underpinning this research, the study employed a qualitative method approach of data collection and analysis for the study as data was collected using the different qualitative approaches simultaneously. In view of this, data/information was sourced through key informant interviews using semi-structured interview guides; structured questionnaires administration and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). For the key informant interviews, a few suitable respondents, composed of the leaders of the umbrella Ghanaian diaspora organisation, were identified and sampled, on purpose, with the assistance of the Ghanaian Embassy in the Netherlands as well as through informal contacts with people of Ghanaian descent living in the Netherlands and the UK for the initial round of interviews. Thereafter, the snowball sampling technique was applied to identify and engage other relevant Ghanaian diaspora community leaders and members of Ghanaian diaspora groups. Additionally, the snowball sampling technique was used to identify other new and relevant contacts during the research, based on which contacts were established with these other informants for interviews and FGDs to be conducted. The convenience sampling used, allowed for easy reach of respondents of that were close at hand.

The network of respondents that emerged offered expert views and opinions that helped explain how the diasporas have organised themselves. These different qualitative methods of data collection techniques were adopted and that helped triangulating the findings. Primary data was gathered through semi-structured interviews, scheduled meetings arranged for those in the Netherlands whereas skype and phone call interviews was conducted with the Ghanaians in UK.

Principally, the semi-structured interviews, fostered a two-way communication and thus provided the opportunity for follow-up questions and further discussion. My analysis was generated from the combination of grounded theory, panel analysis and narrative analysis. These techniques allow for deep reflection and also making of comparison as soon as the data is collected at
each stage of the analysis) was useful it allowed the data to describe itself, also using the condensed ‘common stories’ of my respondents as the basis of my analysis. Finally, an ethnographic approach such as informal visits was used to observe their activities (participant observation).

A total of (23) respondents were interviewed and one focus group discussion, involving 8 participants, was also held. Of the 23 respondents, 6 were leaders of Ghanaian diaspora umbrella organisations; 4 were leaders of Home Town Associations (ethnic base organisation); 5 were youth (second generation); 5 were members of the Home Town Association and 3 were members of the diaspora who do not belongs to any association. Below, in appendix 1, is a table that provides the details of all the 23 respondents engaged. 17 of the respondents were male and 6 were female. Majority of the respondents were in The Netherlands, with only 4 in the United Kingdom. Of the first-generation respondents, 17 were above age 40. 15 of them had either an advance (A) level or University education; 1 is in vocational institute and 2 of the youth were still pursing secondary education. The o last 1 is into private business. In terms of origins, the respondent hailed from across all the ten regions of Ghana with the length of stay in the host countries varying from 10 years to over 41 years.

In addition to the interviews, participant observation was simultaneously deployed through which respondents’ non-verbal temperaments such as body language and voice tonality, which showed respondents’ emotion about the subject under discussion (Marschan-Piekkar and Welch 2004:20), were also noted. This ethnographic method was very useful as it greatly assisted me in drawing a lot more insights into the lives of my respondents, and through which, offered the opportunity for me to know and learn more about the diaspora community. Beyond these, secondary data from published works was also sourced through credible sources over the internet. Furthermore, the research made good use of communication tools such as skype, verbal telephone calls, Facebook and emails to reach out to the targeted respondents when arranging face–to–face meetings for interviews prove unsuccessful. This was particularly the case with the UK–based respondents, whom I could not engage face–to–face for reasons of distance. Finally, the research also benefitted from data from the various Ghanaian media houses, both radio and TV stations, in the Netherlands and UK.

1.7 Research Limitations
One key limitation of the research relates to the short time period within which it had to be completed. Relatedly, given that the period for data collection fell in the summer (of 2017) where
most people went abroad for the summer holidays, I encountered challenges setting up and getting appointments for my interviews. It is for this latter reason that I could not meet the heads of the umbrella Ghanaian diaspora groups in the UK, earlier planned for the month of August 2017, as they were on holidays. These challenges were however addressed through the use of Skype and telephone calls.
Chapter Two: Theoretical Context of Diaspora Studies

2.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the various debates in the field of diaspora studies. It also sets out the theoretical approach of this research as it employs two prominent theories of the concept of diaspora: (a) diaspora as a homogeneous construct; and (b) diaspora as one bounded to the nation-state. It critically analyses how the concept of ‘diaspora’ has been theorized so far by setting out the limitations inherent in the dominant transnational discourse. With empirical evidence, this chapter then provides counterarguments to the traditional notion of diaspora in transnational studies in which case, migrant groups are invariably conceived as ‘homogenous groupings’. This homogenous notion of migrant groups is itself often attributed to the national framework that excludes other scales and modes of belongings’ (Anthias 2002; 2008 Movroudi: 2007; McAuliffe 2008:63). It then critically examines other competing theories on the concept of diaspora by exploring other studies that view diaspora identities not as a fixed stance, but rather as something that is able to examine the dynamic negotiations of collectiveness; and thus, view individual identities as hybrid and multiples (Mitchell 1997:260).

2.2 Diasporic Studies

Over the past decades, the concept ‘diaspora’ has been used commonly both in academic discourse and in the public sphere. Just like many other social concepts, its meaning has been the subject of various interpretations (Brubaker 2005). Despite the wide use to which the concept has been put, particularly in the field of transnational studies, there is little agreement on the exact meaning of the concept as is evident from works on the subject (e.g. see Band 1996:236, Sheffer 1986:5, Safran 1991:84, Vetiver 1997:1), thereby subjecting it to a high degree of contestation. This is precisely what Vertovec (1996:) and Safran (1991) meant, when they described the concept of diaspora in the social sciences as being highly over-used and over emphasised yet, remains less-theorised. It is in this context that Brubaker (as cited in Mavroudi 2007:468) considers it as the dispersion vis-a-vis fragmentation of the meaning of diaspora’. However, although theorized differently by different scholars, one thing features commonly in all the different uses to which the concept has been put: the term diaspora is commonly understood as a homogenous group of people (migrants) bounded to their nation-state, as explored further below.
2.3 The Traditional Notions: Boundedness and Homogenising Perspective

The concept of diaspora is broad as it takes many forms and components because of the huge diversity in its conceptualisation. It therefore requires pertinent in theorizing and conceptualised it. Early discussions of diaspora have centred around the notion of a conceptual ‘homeland’ (Safran: 1991) as most of these studies were concerned with paradigmatic cases such as the Jewish, Greeks and Armenian diaspora. From within such paradigmatic cases, the ‘homeland’ is viewed as an authoritative source of value, identity, and loyalty (Brubaker: 2005; Mavroudi: 2007).

The traditional conceptualisation of diaspora as specified by Safran (1991:84,85) is characterised as follows; “the orientation to a homeland, which also means maintaining a collective memory or myth about the homeland; ‘regarding the ancestral homeland as the true, ideal home which they will eventually return; they retain a collective memory, vision, or myth about their original homeland; and continue to relate, personally or vicariously, to that homeland in one way or another, and their ethno-communal consciousness and solidarity are importantly defined by the existence of such a relationship”; being collectively ‘committed to the maintenance or restoration of the homeland and to its safety and prosperity’; in a way that significantly shapes one’s identity and solidarity within boundedness; ‘they believe that they should, collectively, be committed to the maintenance or restoration of their original homeland and to its safety and prosperity; and (Safran 1991:83,84).

The traditional ideologies of diaspora are concerned with the paradigmatic cases’, such is seen in the case of Jewish, Greeks and Armenian diaspora which Safran contrasts with other diaspora theorists. While the later is viewed as the creation of boundaries (of identity, community and the nation-state) and centre on origin and the homeland’, ‘the former are exclusive on ideas of fluidity, movement, trajectories and the destabilisation of (potentially) homogenising boundaries of identity, community and the nation-state’ (Mavroudi: 2007:467).

Within the traditional/classical notions, diaspora communities are depicted as ‘closed’ stereotypical ethnic, and homogenous and religious entities’ (Werbner 1998) with such views based on more purist notions of a defined culture, community and identity’ (e.g. see Safran 1991; Snel et al 2006). Furthermore, such an account describes the diaspora as a homogenous group of migrants bounded to their nation-state and oriented to a real or imagined ‘homeland’ as an authoritative source of value, identity and loyalty’ (Brubaker 2005:5). In general, the prominent traditional notions, whiles focusing on roots and the homeland and emphasising much on a national framework in describing migrants’ groups, they tend to create boundaries of identity, community, and the nation-state.
which pay less attention to other forms, scales and modes of being and belonging’ (Mavroudi 2007:469; Anthias 2008; McAuliffe 2008). Indeed, Brubaker (2005:10) sums the notion the ‘nation-state’ is the primary conceptual ‘other’ against which diaspora is defined and celebrated’

Classical diaspora theorists succeed in categorising diasporas as ‘tightly bounded communities and solidarities (on the basis of common cultural and ethnic references) between places of origin and arrival’ (Soysal 2002:2). Categorization according to Mavroudi (2008:469) is a formal way of easily identifying, classifying and portraying space, place and identity as fixed and stable categories. According to Carter (2005,54), it ‘fails to acknowledge that diasporas can also reproduce the essentialised notions of place and identity that they are supposed to transgress’. As Brubaker (2005: 10) again notes, ‘discussions of diaspora are often informed by a strikingly idealist, teleological understanding of the nation-state, which is seen as the unfolding of an idea of nationalising and homogenising of the population’. Such discussions are ‘sensitive to the heterogeneity of diasporas; but they are not always as sensitive to the heterogeneity of nation-states and thus diasporas are treated as ‘bona fide actual entities’(ibid:10). It is the premise of this view that Cohen (1999) has advocated for a lot more attention to be paid to the importance of a ‘primordial identity’ in relation to diasporas’.

Clifford (1994) has argued for the need to reconsider the ‘purist nothing’ of the nation-state. Brubaker (2005:13) has also called for the need to discuss diasporic ‘stances, projects, claims, idioms, practices and so on’, rather than ‘a’ or ‘the’ diaspora. . Alternatively, Anthias (1998) argued for an approach that will attend fully to ‘intersectionality’: class, gender and trans-ethnic alliances. Although the traditional diaspora discussions complement the arbitrary or illogical, yet it normalised associations between identity, community, culture, history and the nation-state’ (Mavroudi 2008:476). Similar to Clifford’s (1994:303) observation, ‘categorizing of diasporas as an organic community bounded by culture, by region, by centre or by peripheries: that is to say the nation boundaries may obscure as much as they reveal’. Here, the risk of ‘homogenising the differences’ can be a potentially exclusionary factor for those who fall outside certain idealised ways of being and acting. This does not mean to say diasporas do not have the affinity towards their country of origin or lack concern for nation-state. Rather, identity is a hybridized process not just as a one-way sequence to understand that ‘community collectivity’ is something which is actively struggled over rather than passively received’ (Mavroudi 2007: 470
Consequently, the Ghanaian diaspora organisation may construct boundaries in relation to the identity, community and nation-state which may enable them to feel ‘at home’ within (Mavroudi:2008). They may share a common language, beliefs and may posit culturally and politically clustering or possibly homogenise themselves because of shared common history or demarcated territory which they seek to protect. Yet, such cosy constructions consequently ignore internal differences, tensions and power relations that arise from within the diaspora themselves which disrupt homogeneity by introducing internal divisions in the diaspora groups.

2.4 Beyond the Traditional Perspectives: Diaspora into Hybridity

Beyond the traditional perspective, there is also discussion of hybridity: hybridity in simple terms is derived from heterogeneous sources or composed of incongruous elements’ (Mitchell 1997:260). It is in this light that the importance of the concept has been stressed. Therefore, it is no surprise that this definition of hybridity has ‘proven attractive for those interested in issues of identity and the constitution of subjectivity in a postmodern era’ (Mitchell 1997:260). From this same view that several diasporic theorists “herald the ways in which apparently hybrid subject positions can facilitate ‘multivocal’ communications and the production of syncretic cultural forms if that hybridity does not ascribe to essentializing or fixed identity: ‘through the derivation from heterogeneous sources and incongruous elements,’ this thus make ‘hybrid stands as the perfect conduit for post-structuralist understandings of the advantages of pluralism, ambivalence and non-fixity in understanding diaspora community” (Mitchell 1997:261). Mitchell (1997:261) asserts that hybridity in itself is ‘neither-nor nature’ rather it is celebrated as a process rather than a thing; its inherent resistance to fixed binaries causes it to remain in a perpetual state of flux, related to and yet not originating from or causing other moments, spaces, or entities’.

Emphasising on the importance of hybridity in understating diaspora communities, Ang (2005:152) asserts that hybridity then is a concept that confronts and problematises boundaries, although it does not erase them. Garcia Canclini notes that hybridity provides us with a conceptual "point of departure from which to break from fundamentalist tendencies and from the fatalism of the doctrines of civilizing wars" (2000:48). Brah and Coombs (2000) use the concept of hybridity to describe ‘a wide range of social and cultural phenomenon involving “mixing” which has become a key concept within cultural criticism and post-colonial theory’. I agree with Hannerz and Garcia Canclini who understand that ‘cultural globalisation today is the processes of hybridisation that need to be at the centre of our attention in relation diaspora identity in a global era’ (Canclini:1995,
Simply put, Ang (2005:156) suggested that while the rhetoric of hybridity can easily be put to political abuse if it is co-opted in a discourse of easy multicultural and multi-racial harmony, we cannot escape the predicament of hybridity as a real, powerful and pervasive force in a world in which complicated entanglement is the order of the day'.

In identification of groups of peoples such like the Ghanaian diaspora community 'who have multiple loyalties; move between regions; have multiple identities; do not occupy a singular cultural space; and often operate in some sense exterior to state boundaries and cultural effects, hybridity has thus proven attractive for theorists who have sought to disrupt normative narratives and understandings of nation and culture' (Mitchell 1997:262). Simply put, ‘hybridity is a heuristic device for analysing complicated entanglement such as the relationships among members within diasporic communities (Ang 2005:156.4). Young (1995:27) observes that hybridity "is a key term in that wherever it emerges it suggests the impossibility of essentialism". I agree with John Hutnyk (2010:80) when he asserts it is better to conceive of hybridity as a process in which identities are not to be considered as coherent. It is in this same view that Mercer (1994:254) ‘evoke the movement of ‘hybridization’ rather than a stress on fixed identity’. A process of cultural mixing where the diasporic arrivals adopt aspects of the host culture and rework, reform and reconfigure this in production of a new hybrid culture or ‘hybrid identities’ (Chambers 1996:50).

Garcia Canclini (2000:48) was careful when he noted the processes of hybridity should be considered a productive of "a field of energy and sociocultural innovation". To be sure of taking such processes seriously, Len Ang (2005:478) asserts that indeed, hybridisation consists of exchanges, crossings, and mutual entanglements, it necessarily implies a softening of the boundaries between "peoples": the encounters between them are as constitutive of who they are as the proceedings within. The trajectories within these encounters are not always harmonious or conciliatory; often they are extremely violent, as the history of colonialism has amply shown. However, in most oppressive situations, different "peoples" who are thrown into intercultural confrontation with each other, whether by force or by will, have to negotiate their differences if they are to pursue peace. It is the premise of the foregoing that there is need to move beyond the ‘territorial boundedness and internally homogenising perspective of the nation-state’ for the full grasping of diaspora communities in this global era.

By this I mean not to say, ‘hybridity is the solution to boundaries of the nation-state, but to recognises it as 'the double-edgedness' that alerts us to the difficulty of living with differences, their ultimately irreducible resistance to complete dissolution; it’s inevitable to rejects the tendency to
homogenising internal coherence and unity, such that it can be the site of both support and oppression, emancipation and confinement, solidarity and division’. It is in this light that the importance of hybridity is in conformity in understanding Ghanaian diaspora.

Hybridity moves beyond the boundaries of homogeneity, and ‘essentialism’ and takes into account the context of fluidity, diversity and situational context, as well as the political nature of identities (Anthias 2010:638). In this sense hybridity should be contextualised as ‘double-edgedness’ that alerts us to the difficulty of living with differences, their ultimately irreducible resistance to complete dissolution; it is inevitable to reject the tendency to homogenise internal coherence and unity, such that it can be the site of both support and oppression, emancipation and confinement, solidarity and division’. It is in this view that the concept and the importance of hybridity can help in understanding and to explain diversity within Ghanaian diaspora.

2.5 Conclusion

The literature examined in this chapter critically highlighted the theoretical complexity underpinning the concept of diaspora. It discovered that the traditional perspectives on diasporas inherent detours in diasporic studies in that it does not give the full grasping of diasporas in the global era. Using empirical evidence from various experiments with diasporas it demonstrated that though the traditional understanding compliments diaspora studies yet it is in itself arbitrary. The chapter concluded by proposing diaspora communities to be studies as hybrid instead of fixed stance. The next chapter describes the contextual background of the study – heterogeneous nature of Ghanaian society.
Chapter Three: Ghana and its Diaspora

3.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the contextual backdrop of the study, it first identifies the various historical trajectories and the patterns of emigration from Ghana towards Europe vis-à-vis the Netherlands and in the U.K. it also provides the demographics and geographical and organisational characteristics of the Ghanaian diaspora community in the two host countries. Furthermore, the chapter also critically explore heterogeneity of Ghanaian society –what I termed ‘homeland narratives’. It examines the existence of multi ethno-cultural groups and diverse religions in Ghana, the essence of which is to help understand how narratives of homeland reproduce themselves across transnational borders, and how such connotations help create diversity within a national diasporic community. With empirical evidence, this chapter subsequently assesses the dynamics involved in how diasporic communities organise themselves.

3.1 Contextual Background

Ghana was previously known as the Gold coast and was considered as home for many foreign nationals, particularly from other Sub-Saharan Africa countries due to its economic and Pan Africanist agenda, championed by its first President, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah (Adi and Sherwood 2003:9; Legum :1962). Prior to this, emigration was said to be minimal - and usually involved students or professionals who travelled to either the UK or any English-speaking countries for either educational or professional purposes (Anarfi et la.:2003; Hill: 1959; Schans et al. :2013). Following the worldwide economic depression in the 1930s, and the changes associated with formal colonial control coupled with the restricted economic opportunities ‘political instability and deficit in balance of payment and further aggravated by the commencement of structural adjustment program which involved reduced investments in the social sector such as health, transport and education all lead to the economic recession (Price:1984; Mikell :1984; Black et al :2003, Ammassari :2014, Schans et la 2013; Arthur:2016; Anarfi et al. 2003)

As a result, expatriates and also natives began to leave the country due to economic reasons to some other African countries particularly Nigeria (Anarfi et al. 2003). Consequently, emigration was no longer limited to Ghanaian students or professionals but also included both skilled and unskilled labour (Schans et la 2013). The 1983 famine, coupled with the expulsion of about 1.2

The emigration of Ghanaians towards Europe and Americas was sporadic until the late 1990s (Ceesay :2017) with the route to the destination countries often determined by where would–be emigrant’s ability to secure travel permits, but also, the economic status of the individuals involved (Grillo and Mazzucato:2008). In other instances, some of the Ghanaian emigrants used clandestine or illegal means (Mazzucato:2008; Aarfi et al.:2003; Ceesay:2017): by either transiting through North African countries, or using these African Maghreb countries as entry points to Europe or get settled there, particularly in Libya (Mazzucato:2008, Ceesay:2017). This illegal voyage is mostly done with the assistance of available networks and social links the individual has, to make it easier (Ceesay 2017, Schans et al, 2013). In relation to this, it is believed that most Ghanaian emigrant established contact through transnational networks, even before their arrival in their destination countries; with these forms of social capital or linkages subsequently helping to determine which hometown association or diaspora organization one was likely to join upon his/her successful entry into their destination countries.

3.2 Diaspora Community and Ghana’s Development

Diasporas engagement in developments in both origin and host country is not only seen from increase remittances and building of social institutions but also acting as political actors to foster political change (Mohamoud 2006:4; Schmelz:2009; Ongaye: 2016; Kleist: 2014; Nieswand 2009:17). Despite internal variance, frictions and divisions, part of primary goals of the Ghanaian diaspora organisations, is to garner collective development towards Ghana: building schools, hospitals providing or providing computers to schools and hospitals beds in particular hospitals, public infrastructure among many others. (Mohan 2006; Mazzacuto et al:2011, Ong’ayo 2016). This they usually do either through individuals mean or collective effort and are funded mainly by individual contributions or get funding through their available international networks. Such project
maybe carried at the regional or national level with or without extensive collaboration with local counterparts. As a respondent note

last year I sent 50 computers I got from my Dutch friend to my village...even though I said I won’t send anything home again because I had to pay high shipping duties.... We do all this but the so the government has to provide some subsidy for us.... we are helping a lot....... (Respondent 7, male).

This statement analysis shows the magnitude in which diaspora contributes to the development in Ghana. Although most of these projects are being carried out at the regional level that’s their village or region of origin to it also as a means through which diasporas legitimate themselves in relation to social actors in Ghana and to promote transnational politics of belonging. A similar observation from Jamila (Hamidu:2015) shows that ‘most returnee elite diaspora negotiates their place among the ruling elites by occupying strategic posts as policy advisers and consultants in various capacities whiles some others become strategic advisers to party leaders on environmental issues, economic development, international legal matters and other also uses mass media and information technology as tool of political engagement’. Generally speaking just as the diaspora express enormous interest in developing Ghana, there’s the earnest desire by different Ghanaian governments to engage the diasporas in the development of the country as well.

Several initiatives was witness from both previous and current governments. Given president Kufuor in January 2001 during his presidential inauguration speech made a special plea to the diaspora to return and support the development of the country. He stated

I must also acknowledge the contributions made by our compatriots who live outside the country. Currently, you contribute a third of the capital inflow into the country. Many of you do more than sending money home, other have also kept up a keen interest in the affairs at home and some of you have even been part of the struggle of the past twenty years. I salute your efforts and I make a special plea for your help to come home and let us rebuild our country, we need your newly acquired skills and contacts, perspective and your capital. (Kufuor 2001).

Similarly, under President Mahama’s administration, while on an official visit to Belgium, urged the diaspora community to return home and invest. He further invited
Ghanaians with the skills and resources to come home to contribute their quota by taking advantage of the Local Content Bill, as well as invest to improve the economic and social situation in the country. He called on Ghanaians to bury their political differences and work towards the common goal of rebuilding the country (Mahama 2012).

A similar observation was made from this current administration as the desire to harness the human resource potentials of diasporas and to engage in the development of the country saw the initiation of Ghana Homecoming Summit in Accra on July 2017. The Vice President Bawumia in his speech called on diasporas to serve as avenues for attracting trade and tourism promotion and urge them to become trade delegation from your countries of residence, invest in the national economy to accelerate national growth.

“In keeping with our promise to ensure that Ghanaians living abroad play positive roles in the socio-economic and political development of our country, Ghana’s diplomatic missions abroad are serving as focal points for running Ghanaian experts and attracting Ghanaian investors into the industrial sector, …“If we direct our energies to these matters, then we will be serving our nation and be building a resilient economy…together we can achieve the objectives of the United Nations’ Agenda 2030 of Sustainable Development Goals to reduce extreme poverty and improve the standards of living of Ghanaians.

The above statements analyse the impact of the diaspora contributions in nation-building. Although a lot of the initiatives may be considered to be along regional or ethnic lines -activities are more gear towards regional development and thus lead to more regional divergence yet all coalesce and link to national development: yet the intervention approaches clearly gives it national status and carries great recognition.
3.3 The Ghanaian Diaspora in the Netherlands and in UK

The Netherlands is geographically located in the Western part of Europe. It is bordered by the North Sea in the north and west; by Germany to the east and by Belgium to the south. Amsterdam is the capital and The Hague is the seat of the government. The Netherlands is highly recognised for its tolerant nature and diversity, which is epitomised in the huge number of non-western ethnic minorities groups resident in four major Dutch cities such as Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam and Utrecht.

The relationships between Ghana and The Netherlands is believed to have started on a summary “The gold coast would be a good place to trade with” by Bernard Erickszoon, a sailor from Dutch town of Enkhuizen, lost his way when sailing to Brazil in the 1590 and subsequently landed in the African, caught by the Portuguese. Upon Bernard’s return, he managed to convince some Dutch merchant to invest in a voyage to the Gold Coast to trade from gold (Doortmond 2001:6). After a while the Dutch merchants soon organised themselves into trading companies, uniting strength and capitals and the know-how because. Shortly the Dutch succeeded Portuguese since they were first to occupy the terrains and later compete with the British, Danes, French and the Germans.

Shortly, after the several incidences, mutual economic interest brought with the establishment and settlement which also marks the beginning of Ghanaians in the Netherlands. ‘The voyage, with one ship, was successful and his return with a cargo of gold’ and that marks the beginning of Dutch business in Ghana’. Since then, Ghana remains one of the Netherlands principal trading partners in Sub-Saharan Africa, (Doortmont 2001:6; Van Kessel 2002:3). As the past influencing the present many Ghanaians here also as refugees seeking asylum.

The United Kingdom is located off the north-western coast of Europe. It is made up of England and a number of other countries, including Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. London is the capital of England and is among the world’s leading commercial, financial, and cultural centres. Unlike the Netherlands, the United Kingdom has a higher population of Ghanaians and that is partly due to colonial ties. Apart from professional-related postings, Ghanaians in the UK

---

6 https://www.thoughtco.com/geography-of-the-netherlands-1435240
7 https://www.britannica.com/place/United-Kingdom
are people who went for family unification, education, businesses and tourist purposes (Chikanda et al: 2015).

Most of the Ghanaians leaving in U.K and Netherlands are considered legal migrants (Mazzucato:2007, 2008; Knipscheer et al: 2002; Sabates-Wheeler et al :2007) Nonetheless, illegal emigrants do also exist with this being one major challenge in getting an accurate figure of the Ghanaian population in these two European host countries. As pointed out by the Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics

“…’if you are an illegal immigrant it is very difficult for your information to be on the database except [if] you are staying with a relative who is sustaining you, but if not, it will be difficult to survive”

Political affiliation to the various political parties in the two host countries, among the Ghanaian diaspora, is very well pronounced. While the Ghanaian diaspora in the Netherlands prefer to align with the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) and the Labour Party, those in the UK tend to align with the Conservative Party. In view of their active involvement in the domestic politics of their host countries Ghanaians in the UK and Netherlands have used this platform to contest elections to serve in the European Parliament and represent their constituents, through which they officially discuss and present issues that concern them in their host countries legislative bodies.

3.4 Ghanaian Population in The Netherlands and in The United Kingdom

The Netherlands currently hosts about “23,000” documented Ghanaian migrants, though the actual figure is likely to be higher because it believed there are many more undocumented Ghanaians in the Netherlands (Ong’ayo:2016; Mazzucato:2008). Of this number, the first generation constitutes sixty – two percent (62%) and second generation thirty–eight (38%) (CBS:2012). The biggest Ghanaian communities are located in south-eastern Amsterdam, in the Zuidoost community; in Rotterdam and in The Hague (Ong’ayo:2016).

---

8 Informal discussion with a staff of Central Bureau of Statistics on Ghanaian migrants in the Netherlands September 2017
9 https://www.migrationwatch.org/briefing-paper/315
3.4 Diaspora Community Organisations

The concept of diasporas is open to many interpretations. However, one is common: it refers to native populations living outside their country of origin. The concept originated from the Greek verb speiro which means to sow (Choi:2003). In this sense, diasporas create bonds of relationships, form associations and organisations once outside their homeland (Walters 2005:98), whereas such associations may be formal or informal. The formal groups are established in corporate organisations with set of norms and principles, an example of which ise the Representative Council of Ghanaian Organisations in the Netherlands (RECOGIN), located in Amsterdam. The informal groups, on the other hand, are the HomeTown Associations (HTAs), an example of which is the Asanteman council and the Ga-adangbe groups.

These associations engage in various activities, some of which are purely developmental including sending remittances and donations for developmental purposes to their hometowns of origin. Other activities which these groups are involved are the integration and assimilation processes of newly arrived Ghanaian migrants and political engagement, remittance (Ongaye: 2016, Ankomah et al: 2012, Mazzucato: 2008). Some Diaspora associations also help lure investors from their host country to home country as part of fulfilling their national and civic responsibilities towards developing their homeland.

The formal groups or the umbrella organisations are composed of the individual informal groups or the hometown associations (HTAs). A classic example is Ghanatta or RECOGIN, whose membership is beyond ethnic identities. The hometown associations are loosely organised and their identity is usually based on shared ethnic commonalities – which can either be same or common language or belonging to the same ethnic group(s) – and who usually come together to carry out self-help projects, either in their homeland or the host community. Such informal groups, in many instances, have served as the main source of welfare for its members, with the support offered ranging from funerals to weddings and so many other social gatherings. Indeed, these developmental and social activities seem to underpin the existence of these groups.
3.5 How Ghanaians Diasporas communities are organised

For several reasons, Ghanaian diasporas get themselves into a variety of social and political groupings in the UK and in the Netherlands. Essentially, and as observed earlier on, the most prominent types of groupings members of the Ghanaian diaspora community engaged in are umbrella diaspora organisations, political party, religious organisations, ethnic or hometown associations, media organisations, professional or expatriate organisations, and businesses associations. In view of this, the Ghanaian embassy in the Netherlands in 2002 recorded over 70 Ghanaian organisations in the Netherlands\textsuperscript{11}, Anthony (2016:12) recorded a conservative of 245 in 2016. This number consists mainly of umbrella organisations, charities, voluntary organisations, hometown associations, churches, NGOs, media houses and businesses that are oriented along ethnic, gender, religion professional, regional and cultural lines.

The UK in 2004/2005, on the other hand, recorded about 100 Ghanaian organisations, (Van Hear et al., 2004). A conservative estimate now suggests an increase of 100 in 2015 bringing the total number to about 200 groups in 2012. Among the important umbrella organisations is the Ghana Union, which is an association of 50 Ghanaian community groups, voluntary groups and individuals (Van Hear et al.: 2004). The Ghanaian organisations in both country share broadly similar characteristics. For instance, UK based Ghanaian organisations orient themselves along ethnic, religion, political affiliations, gender, culture and ethnic lines, just as their counterparts in the Netherlands.

The major HTA in both countries includes GaAdangbe UK; Ga - dangbe, Den Haag; Asanteman; Nzema Association; Asante Town club; Fantefo Kuo; and Kassena-Nankana Development League, London. Some of the migrant NGOs include the GUBA Foundation; Noble Friends; Akwaaba UK; Ghanaian Londoners Network; Afro Pulp and MeFiri Ghana Soyaya\textsuperscript{12}( Ong’ayo 2016:12). They also include media houses\textsuperscript{13} whiles the business category includes shops; regular and microfinance banks.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] Interview with the Secretary-General of the Soyaya-the hague, August 4th, 2017.
\end{footnotes}
3.6 The Heterogeneity of the Ghanaian society: Breakdown of Ethno-Culture Profile of Ghana

Ghana is a heterogeneous ethno-cultural country of about twenty-six million population\(^{14}\) (Ghana Population Census)\(^{15}\) The country’s ethno-culture groups consist of about 86 percent of the country’s population (Langer 2009:535). Although Ghana has about fifty-two \(^{16}\)many different ethnic groups which consist of large and small ethnic groups, they are mainly classified into a few large groups (Peil 1995:6). These are the Akan (47.5%), Ewe (14%), Mole-Dagbani (17%), Ga-Adangbe (7%), Guan and Gume (Gurma) (4%) Gurunsi (2.5%), and Bissa (1%), Gurma (6%)\(^{17}\) (CIA WORLD FACTBOOK: 2017; Ghana Population Census:2016; Attafuah 2009; Langer 2009:535). As indicated above, the Akan is the most predominant group, consisting of about 47 percent of Ghana’s population. Akans are usually found along the coast; in the middle belt and southern parts of the country. Out of the ten regions of Ghana, the Akan occupy population is predominant in about five regions… that is Western, Ashanti, Eastern, Central and Brong Ahafo region Regions. The Akans comprise of about twenty different sub-ethnic groups of which the Ashanti’s and the Fanti’s are the largest groups among the Akan groups (La Ferrela 2007:287 Anarfi: 1993; Attafuah 2008: 34). The Akan share certain common features such as social, cultural and political institutions and antecedents such as matrilineal line inheritance and also most of them speak closely related similar languages.

The second largest ethno-cultural group is the Mole-Dagbani which constitutes about 17 percent of the Ghanaian population. This group is predominantly found in the northern part of the country. They are usually referred to as the ‘Northerners’ (Asante and Gyimah-Boadi 2004:8). The Mole-Dagbani consist of relatively very ‘loose ethno-cultural groupings’ in addition to many small ethnic sub-groups some of which are the Buiisa, Dagaaba, Kusasi, Mamprusi, Gurunsi, Waala, Nanumba, and Gurma (Asante and Gyimah-Boadi 2004:8; Lentz and Nugent 2000:9)


The next ethnic groups are the Ewes and the Ga-Adangbe, consisting of 14 percent and 7 percent respectively. The Ewe, Gurma and Guan also consist of small ethno-cultural groups like the Akpafu, Lolobi, Likpe, Avatime, Nyingbo, Tafi, Awutu, Efutu, Senya, Cherepong, Larteh, Anum, Gonja, Nkonya, Yefi, Nchumuru, Krachi, Guan. They are predominantly located in Volta Region of Ghana, with the Ewe in occupying the southern part whiles the Gurma and Guan occupy the northern territory of the region (Ichino and Nathan:2013; Asante and Gyimah-Boadi 2004:8). These two ethnic groups are usually portrayed as a homogenous group, but as Attafuah points out there is no homogenous ethnic group in Ghana even between ethnically identical groups (Attafuah:2009). Although they may lack sharp sub-divisions’ as they have a similar language, they may nonetheless not speak a ‘single language’ (Inchino and Nathan:2013; Langer 2009:536; Agyei-Mensah and Owusu: 2010). The last but not the least, the next largest group is the Ga-Adangbe which is mainly found in the Accra, in Greater Accra Region, which is also the capital city of the country (Lentz and Nugent 2000:4).

Regardless of the diversity, what seems to be common is that most of the sub-groups within certain ethnic tribes may have certain social and cultural institutions but they may also have ‘different histories, customs and traditions’ (Langer 2009:536) even though their language maybe similar but yet not same and definitely not a homogenous group. It is however important to understand that the relatively diverse ethnic demography, religious and political difference within the country and the inter-ethnic conflictual relations which usually thwart or occur at the local level (Langer 2009:537).

It is evident from the foregoing that Ghana is a highly diverse society consisting of multiple religions, ethnic groups, cultures and also languages. It is therefore certainly incomplete to describe the diverse nature of Ghanaian society without reference to ethnicity, religion and politics …. nor without ‘these’ serving as pivot around which Ghanaians organise themselves while not distorting the totality of the picture of how identity if envisioned in Ghana…. –Perhaps because these factors are different, yet interconnected and intertwined and thus very subtle and vital in writing about ‘us’ and ‘others’ in any given organisation. Likewise, emphasis of these factors should not be overlooked particularly in examining how diasporas negotiate their identities in transnational studies (Lentz and Nugent 2000:4).

Ghana is estimated to have about ninety-two separate ethnic groups with over sixty different languages, aside English language being the formal and also common language, each ethnic tribe has its own languages. The major language with the Akan’s is the Fante, Nzema-Twi and also Ga, and Ewe. Other language common with the northern Dagbane, Grusi, and Gurma, Hausa,
Dagari- Akan, Ewe, Ga, Nzema, Dagbane, and Hausa are the country’s principal indigenous languages that are used in everyday transaction (Asante and Gyimah-Boadi 2004:8; Salm and Falola 2002:8).

As with many African countries with similar multicultural nature, (like Kenya, Dahomey, Nigeria and Congo), Ghana’s is a multi-ethnicity, multi-religious and cultural diversity within the Ghanaian society has it rhizome from colonial days (Anderson and Campbell:1989). Before the inception of unitary tribe or national entity, neighbour’s localities and clans of the same cultural and linguistic culture were usually at war with one another yet there was no over-riding political framework embracing all the separate segment (Langer 2009:535). However, as Fortes (Fortes 2001:18) notes, just as the colonial administration often impose some degree of formal unity, which in part intensify the formation of ethnic groups in most countries. Till date inter-ethnic tensions among Ghanaians remain one of the most controversial issues in the country. Although the inter-ethnic tension within the country hardly sprout at the national level yet the communal cleavage lines and it is primarily local communal identities stand out as the main building block of Ghanaian societal identity (Asante and Gyimah-Boadi:2004).

Ghana’s heterogeneity can also be seen from the angle of religion, religions Ghana has been in existence long before colonial era even though it was also influence by western missionaries18. Likewise, the ethno- cultural differences partly influence and reinforced by religious variances which is also contributing to religion multiplicity (Langer: 2009:536). Religion in Ghanaian is a predominantly heterogeneous with Christians population consisting about 71.2%, Muslims or Islamic religion predominantly in the Northern part of the country are bout 17.6% and the Traditional religion and other indigenous religions consist of about 5.2% this includes Ninchiren Shoshu Soka Gakkai, Baha, Buddhism, Eckanker, Rastafarianism, Hare Krishna, Hinduism and Divine Light Mission.19

---

18 https://bobola21.wordpress.com/2017/03/02/religion-in-ghana/


3.7 Inter-Ethnic Tensions within Ghanaian Society

As observed from the foregoing, although ethnic conflicts and clashes do happen at the local level and do not reach the national level (Agyeman, 1998), it also does not necessary imply absence of inter-ethnic tensions country and the same way within the diaspora communities. Rather in most cases, some of the ethnic conflicts arise from the perceived relegation of certain ethnic groups, so-called “minority” groups, to “second-rate citizens” and also the struggle for power within the traditional and political administration. Similarly, to what Attafuah (2009:4) notes ‘that ethnocentrism in Ghana is deeply grounded in the belief that one’s ethnic group is superior to another group’. From the time of colonial era till date ethno-tribal associations, tribal politics orientations and ethnic racism is still affecting the country. Which are clearly seen in voting patterns in elections, appointments and termination in public office: from formulation of development policies to distribution of developmental projects are all heavily influenced by these considerations’ (Lenz and Nugent: 2000; Inchino and Nathan: 2013; Langer 2009:535). Occasionally, not only the inter-ethnic violence is spurred by arguments and conflicts arising from the mundane activities of living. Ethnic competition, rivalry, conflict, domination and marginalization often characterize inter-group relations in Ghana but also primeval ties and loyalties which binds most people far more tightly and stronger than the notion nation–state. Unfortunately, these narratives patterns in Ghana have been transported across borders: similar trajectories are being reproduced among the diaspora and thus accounts for some of the reason of the internal diversity which the next chapter will elaborate on how these homeland narratives are being reproduced and creating divisions within the diaspora.

3.8 Conclusions

In sum, this chapter was devoted to given the contextual background of this study, in view of this, it identified the various historical trajectories and the incidence of emigration from Ghana towards Europe vis-à-vis the Netherlands and in the U.K. The chapter described the demographic and geographical and organisational characteristics of the diaspora community in the two host countries. and the sources from which data and information was obtained. It further described the heterogeneous nature of the Ghanaian society as narratives of homeland. Given the relevance in the context of this study as how such narratives influence how diaspora organised themselves also how such narratives help create internal division within the diaspora. It is to this logic in answering
the question to what extent are these narratives reproduced among the diaspora and how it enforces internal division within the diaspora. Dilating on this question is the focus of the next chapter.
Chapter Four: Explaining the Reasons for the Internal Diversity

4.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the narratives of diasporic respondents about the nature and causes of diversity within the Ghanaian diaspora in the Netherlands and in the UK. It analyses the views of respondents in order to understand how they support or differ with the existing traditional and postmodern perspectives of diasporas. Whereas the traditional perspective centres around creation of boundaries, the nation-state ideology, and thus bounded to their homeland, the post-modern perspective on the other hand is concerned with the construction of diaspora ideas on the basis fluidity, movement and routes that homogenise diasporic communities. Instead of such fixed connotations of diasporas, this chapter supports Mavroudi’s (2007) argument that diaspora communities should be studied as a ‘process’ influenced by a geography of ‘time’, ‘place’ and ‘space’. Within the context of diaspora as a ‘process’, the chapter further examines how homeland narratives and discourses are reproduced across transnational borders whiles also providing further explanations on how such narratives influence how diaspora communities organise themselves. The key narrative themes of the respondents, are centred on the following issues:

- Ethno-Tribal Identity
- Politics of Tribalism
- Religious Multiplicity
- Gendered roles
- Social Class

4.2 Ethno-Tribal Identity

In this analysis, the term ethnicity is being used without reference to an explicit academic discourse, but rather, as a concept that is mentioned explicitly among respondents. The narratives point to the fact that ‘ethnicity’ is one of the main factors accounting for the internal diversity within the Ghanaian diaspora community. In addition, ethnicity is also lies at the base of the factors that trigger the formation of many hometown town associations among the Ghanaian diaspora. Ethno-tribal identity in Ghanaian community and also among the diaspora can be described as
strong bond through which members express their patriotism and also social responsibilities towards themselves and towards their communities. Hometown associations within the diaspora are ethnic base organisation, and members of the same ethnic identity or speak common ethnic language A respondent narrates her story as:

Actually, a bereavement of a brother in Rotterdam whose burial was appalling triggered the formation of this organisation…. literally speaking, other members of the Ghanaian community acted unconcerned…. I received a wakeup call amidst this situation to organize persons of my ethnicity to ensure a decent and smooth farewell to our beloved. … since then, I took it upon myself to reig-nite the union……because I noticed their action to some extent had some kind of tribal resentment …his situation wasn’t the first time such thing is happening …it been going on … (Respondent 5, female).

Here, respondent’s narratives emphasise the dimension of the ethno-tribal divisions within the diaspora. Like this respondent, most of the Ghanaian hometown associations, especially the ethnic minority groups in both the U.K and in the Netherlands, have the likelihood of starting from similar grounds and such association is along ethnic lines. The diversity and multicultural nature of the Ghanaian society in Ghana, manifested in not only ethno-tribal groups but also periodic ethnic tensions within Ghana discussed in the previous chapter, is seen as reproducing itself within the diaspora. this point was reiterated by another respondent:

The problem with us is that, there is discrimination among ourselves…. sometimes some ethnic tribe feels superior to others and will not want to contact us even if the need arises…. but it doesn’t matter as we are all Ghanaians…. even in Ghana we all live together…but here because we are migrants our identity become more emphasised and we align to our tribal identity… (Respondent 20, male)

From the responses above, respondents feel the existence of intolerance, a sense of marginalisation among the ethnic groups and an attitude of indifference which in turn contributes to shaping the contemporary internal divisions within the Ghanaian diaspora community. Although not in all cases, however, the rise and formation of most Ghanaian hometown associations has been a
derivative of the feeling of a sense of ethno-tribal insensitivity by members of the larger ethnic groups.

4.3 Politics of Tribalism

The view that political tensions are due to different political views was widely shared ‘frames’ among the respondents as another factor driving and exacerbating the internal divisions among the Ghanaian diaspora community. Interestingly, about ninety percent of the respondents held the view that the political tensions that existed among the two main political parties in Ghana reproduced itself within the diaspora community. Even though members of the Ghanaian diaspora are not able to exercise their democratic right of voting in their destination countries, by virtue of the fact that voting is only conducted in Ghana, or even directly hold their duty bearers to account for their stewardship, partly because there’re no diasporic policies ensuring these rights, yet political identity and affiliation among members of the Ghanaian diaspora community is not something to be overlooked. A respondent remarked as follows:

I am a member of political party ‘A’ … we have well organised branches …. We’re one of the party’s strong wings abroad…. and well recognised by our leaders in Ghana … … (Respondent 11, female)

The respondent’s narrative demonstrates strong allegiance to their political party back home in Ghana. To some extent, politics in Ghana can be described as ‘tribal’ because voting is increasingly conducted along ethnic and tribal lines (Lentz and Nugent: 2000; Langer: 2007). In Ghana, it is generally perceived that political appointments or public appointments are greatly influence by ethno-tribal politics, with this being influenced by voting patterns in general elections. Similarly, there is generally the perception that someone’s political affiliation correlate with their ethnic identities, though not the case in all instances. This situation is not only viewed as a serious structural problem which cuts across s every facet of the Ghanaian society, but similarly has repercussions for development in Ghana in so far as it also remains a source of tensions that the nation has faced for some time now. Reflecting on political tensions, some respondents narrated as:

It is very unfortunate we carried the tribal politics in Ghana here…. Which is a real problem among us...... we are here as migrant ...instead of thinking of how best we
can help ourselves and how we deal with relevant issues affecting …we still hold on to our colonial mentality of ethnic stereotype and that is eating us up…There’ve been instances people do not talk to each other just over politics that goes on in Ghana…. which is very unfortunate and pathetic situation (Respondent 15, male)

From this narrative, whereas the tribal politics may not necessary be a problem, however, the intolerance coupled with tension and division which respondents recounted, serve as one challenge causing internal divisions within the Ghanaian diaspora community.

4.4 Multiplicity of Religious Groups and Churches

Another dominant factor that account for the diversity within the Ghanaian diaspora, as recounted by respondents is the existence and proliferation of so many Ghanaian-affiliated religious groups and churches. The diversity of the Ghana diaspora community is manifested along religious lines. Ghana is formally and officially recognised as a circular state where religiously diversity is recognised and tolerated by the nation’s statutes. Religions such as Christianity; Islamic and the traditional African religion are however the three most dominant religious groups in Ghana. Not only religious groups, but there are so many different denominations and sects even among Christians and Muslims. This diversity in religion in Ghana has reproduced itself within the diaspora community. An anecdotal observation demonstrates that Ghanaian churches and religious organisations are scattered all over the Netherlands and the UK, and have their practices similar to churches in Ghana (Van Dijk :1997; Bryceson, and Vuorela :2002; Fumanti :2010). Although most Ghanaian churches found among the diaspora community in the two host countries have their foundations in Ghana, there are however some others that were establish as a result of a result of their leaders breaking away from other churches on the grounds of certain trivial issues, internal frictions and differences which to some extent, arises from either ethnicity or political indifference. Some respondents’ narrative emphasis this point

There are many Ghanaian churches here…there are those with genuine motives and there are a number of them who carry the religious connotations alright but also have political and economic agendas…religious extortions …. I personally do not belong to any church now… I used to but I stopped… due to this embezzlement of church funds and ‘money conscious’ trait among some church leaders (Respondent 5, female).
To another respondent also:

Sometimes you will be surprised to even find tensions and competitions even among some churches…. Most of them gears from ethnicity and sometimes politics …yes politics within the churches…. I know people stops churches to join established different some on similar grounds. (Respondent 18, male).

Interestingly, the tensions and the fanaticism among the diasporan community, which in turn gives rise to internal divisions within the diaspora community, to some extent is not across faith or inter denominations, for example, between Christians and Muslims or traditionalist as witnessed from the Baha’i and Muslim of Iranian diaspora in Sydney, London and Vancouver (McAuliffe: 2008). Most of the tension seen within the diaspora are mostly found among the Christian dominations.

Again, from the foregoing empirical findings, it is interesting in terms of the intentions behind the establishment of some churches which account for the existence of many Ghanaian churches in the Netherlands and in the United Kingdom. Respondents ‘framed’ such motives under notion of ‘religious extortions’ or ‘economic churches’, ‘politics’ and ‘ethnocentrism’. The implication of these ‘frames’ is the implicit tensions and divisions, which is similar to the situation in Ghana (Meyer :1998). Leaders are seen to hide behind religious ideology for their own personal interest. In most cases, the narratives of some respondents demonstrate that there is dishonesty and lack of trust among some leaders, not only the churches but also most importantly the leaders of the umbrella diaspora organisations. In explaining the ‘frame’ religious extortion, a respondent in defence observed that:

Many people may see it opportunistic but I don’t think so, it is the situation that determines it … I came here as a migrant who has no job and also and needed my ‘papers’ (permit)…. Fortunately, enough I had this friend in UK who was heading a church in the U.K and wanted to have a here in the Netherlands…. so, I helped and automatically I became the pastor…I don’t see this as being opportunist…rather I think ethno—tribal politics in our churches (respondent 10, male August 12th, 2017).

Whereas it has been argued (Langer:2009) that religion serves to bring people with different ethnicity or political identities together, the case of the Ghanaian diaspora community is quite
different. Similar to what Langer (2009:536) pointed out, that religion differences and religion multiplicity in Ghanaian is predominantly influenced by ethno-cultural and political differences in the country. Consequently, the ethnic bonds seem to influence their daily negotiations, politics and even in religious practices. Aside the foregoing hitches, some respondents prioritise their religious practices as very important because such associations provide them with the necessary support, both physically and spiritually, whiles simultaneously helping them keep in touch with their families in Ghana as they are constantly praying for themselves as they believe. One respondent states:

I find my church as very helpful … we help and support each other in times of need … for instance my church offered me great contribution physically and spiritually when I lost my mother in Ghana…… we sometimes connect with our friends and family Ghana and pray together either on Skype or on phone. (respondent 13, Female, UK).

In all, most respondents considered the multiplicity of churches as one big issue. Some respondents share the view that, mostly it is not the existence of multiple churches is the problem rather the impeding factors that usually leads to breaking away to establishment of new ones.

4.6 Gendered Responses

It has been said that societal norms and gendered roles of diasporas homeland do not wither away in the transnational context: diasporas carry the conations of cultural ideologies of their homeland wherein they express in their new settlement (Wong :2000; Yeoh and Willis :1999; Campt and Thomas :2008). Likewise, to some extent, gender roles that exist within the Ghanaian society have been differentially transposed from Ghana into the diaspora members host communities. Such issues as patriarchal dominancy that places women at the mercy of the socio-cultural norms are reproduced among members of the Ghanaian diaspora community. One female respondent remarked:

leadership positions are usually left to men…. we believe they are the ‘head’ in every family …. I grew up to learn that women need to respect men…therefore being a woman I know my roles…. I know what I can and cannot…even though I take part in decision making …but I prefer my husband to have the final say…
ours (women) is taking care of house chores and child care among other responsibilities. (Respondents 11, Female)

Many female respondents (both high educated and less educated) share the view that some jobs and positions are separately meant for men and women differently. The interesting thing here is that in most cases women are not forced to clinch to this repressive male dominance rather they internalised and sees it as usual traditional norms and socio-cultural values expected of every ideal woman. This point was supported by another female respondent:

women appointees to leadership position may be one out of ten… in most cases, they can be a custodian in the absence of men… I am the leader of this organisation because I came up with the idea…. women do hold leadership positions in churches but not as the main leaders rather like women fellowship, youth associations or caretaker (Respondent 10, female).

I think it’s because of how our society, religious and cultural values ….it shapes our lives…such that it refuses to acknowledge our professional competence…especially if you are a woman and you are not educated…… for you (referring the researcher) your case might be better (Respondent 16, female).

The narratives here illustrate the existence of clear distinct gendered roles within the diaspora. Both men and women attest to the fact that their roles can be different from each other. Drawing these gendered roles do not only result in patriarchy subordination of women but also illustrates how it influences the position one is likely to hold in the diaspora organisations. The respondents’ narration does not only depict the frame of male dominance, in terms of the tokenism often associated with woman’s appointment to leadership positions, but that the female identity is viewed through masculine lenses, which consequently disregard their professional competence. According to a male respondent notes:

As a real man, it is expected of me to protect my wife and children. In our Ghanaian context men are expected to work hard to be able to provide the needs of his family…. if I’m not able to fulfil that …. I feel challenged as a man….No man wants to be seen as a loser in the eyes of his family ….no! …. that is something that I can’t accept as a man (Respondent 14, male)
Wherein some expressed concerns regarding to the patriarchal male dominance among the community as one factor that disempower women in assuming some key positions, others consider it as normal society roles that cannot be change. “that is the norm we came to meet in our culture… we cannot change it”. Here two suggestive explanation can be deduced: the likelihood that the men exercise their power in ways that overrule the contribution of women or because the dominant ideologies co-opt women in ways that have blunted women’s inclination to counter-hegemonic activism (Wong :2000; Yeoh and Willis :1999; Campt and Thomas :2008). Largely, the basis of such ideology is either drawn from the ‘traditional norms and religious believes which cognate to the situation in Ghana. Nonetheless, such patriarchy oppressions operate within multiple intersecting factors –such as one’s socio-economic status, educational background, ethnicity, class, race etc.

4.7 Division along Social Class

In this discussion, social class is ‘framed’ as another factor that influences the way in which the diaspora communities organise and collaborates among themselves and thus enforcing internal division within the diaspora. Class in this context is viewed as how the dynamics of cultural, symbolic: economic and material wealth is perceived among the diaspora which intend exclusion some and including others. Class separation within the diaspora can be related to the successfulness or one’s economic status or the amount of material possession, popularity and social class of the individual. According to a respondent

> It’s easy to think that all of us here came to achieve the dreams we couldn’t achieve in Ghana...but I will say we are not equal some of us are living well others are just living hand to mouth, some are educated and have better jobs others are not ...but we all try to get along … (Respondent 9, Male,)

The narratives here illustrate an explicit class structure between the elites and non-elites, the ‘haves’ and the ‘have not’. This point is reiterated by a second-generation respondent

> There’s a lot of such things among us …showing off expensive clothes and cars churches, during funerals .... it looks as if they are in competition and rat race…. I
wonder who they’re trying to impress with all those tales of grandeur. (Respondent 17, female A second generation)

To some diasporas, the ‘show off’ and the ‘material culture’ in to consummates social pressure for themselves but most importantly for their family and friends back home to know they’re living well: ‘imaginary good life’. As another respondent explains as:

Once you travel outside Ghana …. people assume your status has changed… even if you had nothing when you were in Ghana… much is expected from you …like living a good life, sending money home… So, if you are not able to meet these expectations … you then become ‘useless’…. And everybody is striving not to be that useless person... (Respondent 7, male)

The narrative above is similar to what Oliver and O'Reilly (2010) pointed out that ‘the primary goal of most economic migrants in this case the Ghanaian diaspora is integral to the fulfilment of the self-realization dreams of that better life they hope to achieve: leaving behind the rat-race and downsize life for more ‘worthwhile life’. Relatedly, within the Ghanaian diaspora, from within the trajectories of perusing of material culture, higher educational level, better lifestyle, taste and cuisine all for dynamism of altering the rat-race living to the achieving of the better life –in the process of achieving these desires and dream usually the bedrock of competitions, tensions and the acrimony which in a way incriminate divisions within the diaspora.

Consequently, their life as migrants is essentially placed within two social spaces – origin and destination: in this case the Netherlands or United Kingdom and Ghana. Wherein their destination present and foster a cosmopolitan perspective, yet in reality, their orientation is usually towards the social space of the host community, while ‘social space of their origin provides a backdrop for evaluations of authenticity imagined in ‘the good life’ (Oliver and O'Reilly :2010). Through this trajectory of garnering of material culture to achieve the imagined ‘good life’ or good living while fulfilling social pressure and the concern about the judgement of others regarding to material possessions and wealth accumulation lies the tensions of ‘divide and conquer’. Elaborating on social class and diasporic internal divisions, one respondent notes regarding failing unity within the diaspora community that
I have houses in Ghana ... I have several means to take care of myself ...I not like some others who go to Ghana and live in rented houses...I have several other sources of income ...it is so unfortunate to think this (one umbrella organisation) feeds me ...I can decide not to work and still survive...I pity those (referring to other members within the diaspora) have no means to survive if not through what they are managing (Respondent 19, male)

From the respondent’s narratives, stratification as witnessed within the diaspora is most starkly not only in the way that they posit in the accumulation of material and economic wealth but also how it sets internal divisions within the diaspora. Consequently, daily interactions, expressions, self-projections and ambitions, competition provides enough indication for the reasons for internal divisions among the diaspora.

4.9 Conclusion

This chapter has presented some of the empirical narratives of respondents on the key causes of the internal divisions within the Ghanaian diaspora community. The discussions have shown that there are several key ‘frames’ that inform diasporic formation and enforces internal diversity within a national diasporic community: ethno-tribal identity, politics of tribalism, religious multiplicity, social class, patriarchal society and inept leadership among some leaders the diaspora community. Like several other diasporas, perhaps, the divisions among the Ghanaian diaspora community is a lot more complex than what ‘Traditional’ or ‘Purist’ ‘nation-state’ ‘Groupism’ and other conventional ‘Diasporic’ theorists suggest. The core factors relate to the heterogeneous nature of how the Ghanaian community is, but also multiple regionalism and tribal ethnocentrism, several religions but also significant divisions within Christendom due to breaking away and the establishment of new churches, politics of tribalism, and also related feelings of social class and gendered roles lead to a sense of inclusion and exclusion. The next chapter provides an analysis of which of these ‘frames’: ethnicity and religion identity override or in concomitant with the other, it thus also discusses a generational perspective on this subject.
Chapter 5: The Second Generation and their Engagement in Diaspora Activities

5.1 Introduction

This chapter set out to do two things first, it explores diasporic views on the salient of ethnic and religious identities and also other impeding factors enforcing divisions within the diaspora. Lastly, the chapter examines the generational perspective of the subject of this research. In view of this, the chapter explores how the second-generation Ghanaian migrants engage in diasporic activities. It achieves this by analysing the extent to which Ghanaian second generation migrants engage in diaspora activities in their host communities. On the basis of the factors that account for the huge diversity within the diaspora, the chapter examines how the second-generation Ghanaians participate in diasporic activities and how they perceive the divisions within the diaspora community.

5.2 Ethnic and Religious Identities: An Overlap or Concomitant Entities.

Social scientists hold the view that both religious and ethnic identities reinforce each other and play a significant role in shaping one’s identity (Vertovec :1997; Verkuyten and Yildiz :2007; Alfonso et al: 2004; Knott, and Khokher :1993). Wherein, it is not always clear which of the two dominate, partly because the analogy between these two ‘religion and ethnicity’ factors is not always clear, perhaps because both are entities of cultural materials through which identities are shaped (Langer 2010:28). In case of conflict in Nigeria, the ‘framing’ of religious identity is believed to influence in the riots, although to some extent it coincides with ethnic distinctions and other factors. Whereas in the formal Yugoslavia, it was religious dimensions and the use of religious language and symbols which instigates nationalistic/ethnic motivation to war. (Stwart 2009:8). Drawing from Sri Lanka which seems to have a different story, that to some extent, religious identity forms the core of ethnic identity: religious identity super-exceed ethnicity (Guichaoua:2006). In the case of Ghana, drawing a clear distinction between these can be very challenging and requires careful conceptualisation and contextual analysis.

Given that religious and ethnic identities, within the Ghanaian society, are the two most common identities, the question that then arises is: which of these identities do Ghanaians in the diaspora deeply associate themselves with? When this question was posed, a respondent noted as follows:
Religion is something I can choose between; I was born a Catholic but now I worship with a different denomination ...but ethnic identity is something I cannot change .... I think my ethnic identity is much more important because that is what tell others who I am, not my religion (Respondent 3, male)

From this response, it is evident that particular aspect of identities i.e. ethnic identity becomes very important in the way people identify and think about themselves. Quite a number of respondents expressed similar sentiments regarding which of their identities they most value. In contrast to those who were more akin to their ethnic identity, to some other respondents, their religious identity appeared much more important to them as compared to their ethnic identity to the extent that they associated themselves more with their religious groups than their ethnic groups. For instance, some respondents with higher education qualifications, including some second-generation Ghanaian migrants, indicated that they are more likely to consider their religious identity very important in comparison with their ethnic identity. Though the reasons for this are not readily clear, it is possible that the people with high levels of educational attainment are more likely to consider certain aspect of culture as outmoded with this thus contributing to reducing one’s attachments to their ethnic backgrounds’ (Langer 2010:13). Interestingly, respondents within this category attest even to the fact that, though they do not feel a sense of strong attachment to their ethnic identity, they however know and believe in the fact that how one’s ethnic identity influences and affects a person’s chances of getting government employment positions or even jobs in Ghana. This point was reiterated a respondent when he observed that;

it is so obvious … if you take a critical look at this current government administration… you can see that some ethnic groups are seriously under-represented whereas others have quite a good representation, in terms of number and are even considerably over-represented given the fact that we are all Ghanaians (Respondents 7, male)

I know competence counts a lot in getting jobs and certain positions in Ghana but sometimes it is really strange…sometimes nepotism overrides competence…nepotism along ethnic lines is too much…. (Respondent 14, second generation)
Although ethnicity is perceived as a significantly influential factor in the public sphere than religion, yet one cannot entirely draw the conclusion that ethnicity, among the Ghanaian diaspora, is considered more important than the religious identity. Instead, it is the specific regional, ethnic and hometown identities that prevail when a Ghanaian migrant has to identify himself/herself to a fellow Ghanaian. Invariably, the usual line of introduction is ……. ‘I hail from region ‘A’ or ‘B’ … I belong to tribe ‘A’: When introducing themselves to other fellow Africans, they are however proud to say they are Ghanaians, and not from region ‘A’ or tribe ‘X’ in Ghana. On the other hand, there are more social contacts within the religious group than within the ethnic groups by virtue of the regular meetings, functions and religious celebrations they these groups hold. In Ghana, there are a considerable number of Christians among the Northern ethnic groups, even though the Northern population is predominantly Muslims, in the same many Muslims in the south among Christian population. Similarly averring on religious identity among the diasporas, there are those who have either converted from Christianity to Islamic religion or from Islam to Christianity do not have any objections in this issue. Whereas some respondents object to inter-marriages on the grounds of ethnic and religious differences, there are others who exhibit multiple identities and have no objections to such. As noted by one respondent:

I am a Northerner …. I belong to the northerner’s association…although the majority of us are Muslims, …but I am a Christian….my wife is from the south and we go to church…..well some people may have different opinion on this (inter-marriages) but I think it is a personal choice (Respondent 2, male).

In sum, both ethnicity and religion are considered salient entities within the Ghanaian diaspora, the two may be expressed simultaneously or separately either within the public or private coalesce and overlap with each other. In Ghana and also among the diaspora, ethnic boundaries are usually expressed as strong bond and are seen as more prominent that religion, however, one cannot trivialise salient of religion. Both are widely shared identities, through which diasporas mobilise for social and political purposes in different sphere. On one hand, ethnic identities are perceived important factor in their private space, on the other hand religious identity also become salient in their public sphere and or social spheres. In this sense, both identities are held in high esteem concomitantly, but the relative importance attached to a specific identity usually depend on the context and also the spaces; public sphere and the private or social sphere in which they are expressed these identities.
5.3 Other Frames

Aside the above frames seen as shaping the internal diversity within the diaspora community, there are also other intersecting factors that are seen as disrupting unity within the diaspora, particularly in terms of having an umbrella organisation. After the 1992 plane crash in Amsterdam that affected the Ghanaian community particularly those in Amsterdam, effort had been made to have all the Ghanaians organisation in the Netherlands under one umbrella organisation. That is to have a common front at the national level—a broad-based umbrella organisations representing different segments of the community. Members within the diaspora narrate that countless efforts have been made by those who feel concern on this matter and also by previous ambassadors to achieve this goal but twenty-five years down the line that dream is yet to materialise. The quotes from respondents express this:

Power conscious! Self-interest! and inter-organisational competition among the umbrella organisations is what is hindering the formation of the umbrella organisation…leaders with no vision except their self-interest and holding on to power for so long… they cannot plan and reason together as a family …they are just divided and are enemies (Respondent 12, female).

…. Most of these things happening are as a result of subsidies, lack of loyalty, competition and long-standing rivalry over certain trivial issues but also ethnicity and politics (Respondent 1, male)

…..me as a leader what I can as what has been the wedge/problem in materialising the goal of having a common front umbrella organisation is the tension/misunderstandings between two main umbrella organisations… of which one is an offshoot of the other…. such splinter precipitated some rivalry between the two parties and that old rivalry is what we are still battling till now (Respondent 19, female)

From the foregoing narratives, respondents see inept leaderships resulting from leaders being self-centred and power conscious, rivalries and competitions among some leaders organisations as the very reasons for divisions particularly among the umbrella bodies and also hindering the formation of a common front organisation. To some diasporans, the agitations between these two and also some other associations within the diaspora which usually leads to the
splinter among the organisation is mostly due to embezzlement of organismal finances and also subsidies these registered organisations receive from within the host countries.

Wherein there are no demands for wrongs or rights but also pondering on the responses from both sides raises the concern of where lies their priority: the welfare of the diaspora community or personal hinges. A strong element in this account of the division lies massively on the shoulders of the two organisations. Here confronting the issue are pitted against one another as both sides continue to feel right.

Wherein some respondents held the view that the situation between these two organisations is nothing but struggles over power, bad leadership, mismanagement of resources and also other intersecting factors like ethnicity, class and age and the general politics involved in power seeking among the leaders of the organisation leaders from both parties hide behind blaming games.

The constantly used of the frame power, power conscious, lack of commitment and accountability among some respondents particularly most second-generations who expressed keen interest in discussing this aspect of the study, gives the impression of what is in there to struggle over? One second-generation respondent stresses:

Most cases I know and also heard of… every break away from an organisation is actually due to power conscious… everyone wants to be a leader, but none of them is ready to submit or learn from each other…. (respondent 13, Male, Second generation).

Another second generation reiterated this point as:

most so-called leaders are there because of the subsidies, their selfish interest and no vision to lead… look we have many problems to think of as migrants and most importantly for the youth like myself…. but it is very unfortunate that things like this is happening (Respondent 22, second generation).

The narratives of these second-generation respondents may also explain why the young generation of within the Ghanaian diaspora do not actively engage in diasporic activities (more on this point will be elaborated in the next chapter). As these young generation consider leaderships style within the diaspora as inept: leaders not able to think strategically to settle internal differences and not
thinking of the future of the younger generation instead of letting their personal acrimony to prevail at the expense of welfare of the community and letting these create divisions within the diaspora.

5.4 The Second-generation and the Diasporic Activities

The following quotes below represent the responses of the second generation concerning the subject of this study. These respondents were asked how they perceive and identity themselves and whether they participate in diasporic activities of the first generation and share their views regarding the reasons for the diversity within the Ghanaian diaspora community.

…I’m very dormant when it comes to their activities…perhaps because I have not lived in Ghana for so long …I have my friends and family here…although I was born in Ghana but I grew up here….and so I do not know much about Ghana…. I only know very little about the culture in Ghana …. I’m more fluent in the Dutch language than my native language…. …. However, I think myself more (90%) as Ghanaian and 10% Dutch…. (Respondent 22, Second-generation, Age:24)

I’m not a member of any of the associations within the diaspora, I know of many of my age who have not joined either … we mind our business and not division along political, and class lines, but also issues of power seeking, selfishness, tribalism and lack of loyalty among some of the leaders…I know most people of my age do not actively participate in most of their activities…. sometimes I feel they don’t think of the younger generation….it all about themselves…. there are so many issues affecting us as youth and also being migrants…but our leaders are very inconsiderate……for me that explains why I don’t like to engage so much in their activities because there are so many issues within them…. (Respondent 13, Second-generation, Age: 27, male, London).
The empirical narratives above portray a sense of emotional turmoil, unsettled identity, and possibly, a sense of disharmony between the second generation and the first-generation Ghanaian migrants. It hints at potential distinct divisions in how the younger generation interprets the infractions within the diaspora community and the resultant conclusions they draw from it. Two questions arise thereof: To what extent do the second-generation cope/get along with the first generation? and to what extent are they willing to engage in diaspora activities. Answers to these questions may partially throw more light on explain whether the second generation are actually distant from the mainstream diasporic initiatives of the older generation or otherwise. However, even without a response to these two questions, it is evident from the views shared by respondents that the activities of the second generation differ from those of the first generation, given the fact that most of the former do not belong to any diasporic association(s) within their host communities.

Again, the second generation of Ghanaian migrants differ from the older generation, in terms of the activities they associate with, even though they are identified with and feel belonged to both Ghana and the host country: This is because the former group of Ghanaian migrants nurture the belief that they better integrated into their host societies, relative to the latter. similar to what Hess and Korf (2014:426) notes ‘both transnational and diasporic in focus – are more firmly located and bounded to the context of the host country’. Consequently, the second generation, with better levels of education; superior language skills and better networking skills, are well equipped to engage in diasporic activities, although this potential is yet to be fully explored and exploited. In fact, the networks boundaries of the second-generation migrants extend beyond the Ghanaian identity as they are involved in a diverse range of non-Ghanaian activities/associations which makes them more exposed and as such, they get to assimilate and integrate better than the first-generation. In contrast to the older generation, most of their association and networks are either religious or hometown associations or more broadly associations that are more of themselves. They adhered to the culture of Ghana such as the ethnic, religion and political associations, and thus ‘always remain in their ‘bauble’.

Politically and culturally, the second-generation migrants remain disconnected from diasporic activities. In comparison to the older generation, not only do the second generation distinct themselves from politics in Ghana but also, they do not ascribe or feel a strong level of attachment to ethno-tribal identities, as a respondent noted: …I have been told which tribe I belong to but I have no interest in joining any ethnic associations…. For politics, I like some political parties but
I do not take keen interest in politics in Ghana…I don’t think politics in Ghana concerns me and so I do not have interest in it…. Obviously, I will raise my family here’…. I may marry from Ghana or find a partner here… From the responses, the second-generation justified their disinterest not only in the activities of the diaspora but also on issues that prevail in Ghana, even though they may ascribe to Ghana as their native country.

5.5 Lost Generation

Given the huge diversity that exist between the first and second generation, there is lack of clarity on whether the second generation, who distance themselves from diasporic activities of the older generation, will actively help in the development of Ghana as observed from the first generation. As observed previously, the first generations are at the forefront, and actually involved in collectively organising and mobilising resources towards the development of Ghana. In addition, they also strive to maintain original clan lines by way of their association with their hometown associations or regional and ethnic base associations or some their religious associations and political organisations. Conversely, , the second-generation share a different perspective in that they are more selective in terms of the organisations and association they choose to associate with. The share different perspective such that even though they ascribe to Ghana as their nationality but they do not feel and have strong sense of attachment as the older generation.

The fieldwork further revealed a strong degree of cultural divide between the two generations. Whiles the first generation perceive and hold fond memories of Ghana, a derivative of the fond memories they still hold about Ghana, but also the friends and family left back home in Ghana, such that most of them feel a strong sense of responsibility towards the development of Ghana by engaging in active initiatives that contribute to Ghana’s development the second generation have completely lost touch with their homeland. As such, they care less about activities or initiatives aimed at contributing to the development of their home country.

Taking into account the inter-generational dynamics between the two generational perspectives, the older generation, to some extent, describe and perceive the younger generation as non-patriotic and who do not possess a strong sense of nationalism. For instance, an adult respondent described the younger generation as follows …this (second generation) is a ‘lost generation’ they will never do anything for nothing…they aren’t like us”. Interestingly, the first generation further describes the younger generation as “lost generation” who do not know their culture, history and their traditions and also do not feel strong nationalist affection towards Ghana.
To some extent the first generation seems worried and nurture many doubts in terms of the negligence of the second-generation Ghanaian migrants toward diasporic activities. The older generation harbour very much uncertainty about the continuity of diaspora activities to their origin. Whether or not the second-generation would support in Ghana’s diaspora contributions toward their motherland is something posterity will decide.

5.6 Conclusion

In sum, this chapter has examined diasporic views on salient of ethnic and religious identity, it has also discussed other ‘frames’ that they consider as enforcing internal diversity within the diaspora. Principally the chapter was devoted to describing and also addressing the question “how do second-generation Ghanaian migrants engage in diasporic activities initiated by the first generation? The chapter identified and revealed that while the adult or the first-generation Ghanaian migrants expressed keen interest in organising, mobilising and engaging in diasporic activities, second-generation Ghanaian diaspora members demonstrate at best very little interest in diaspora activities. As a result, they are largely dormant in activities of the older generation in the host communities with regards to their involvement in diaspora activities.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

From the outset this research paper posed and sought to address the questions: Why is the Ghanaian diaspora community in the Netherlands and United Kingdom so diverse, and how does this diversity influence the way in which the different diaspora groups/associations are organised and collaborate?

6.2 Empirical and Theoretical Conclusions

Empirical evidence gathered on the views of members of the Ghanaian diaspora in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom points to the fact that there is a huge diversity/fragmentation within the Ghana diaspora community in the Netherlands and in the U.K. Data analysed on the diversity within the Ghanaian diaspora community and subsequent findings made, have essentially demonstrated that homeland narratives are being reproduced among the Ghanaian diaspora and to a large extent have significant influence in accounting for how diaspora communities organised, but also, how they collaborate among themselves in the host countries. The study found that these narratives partly but also largely accounts for the diversity within the diaspora community. Nevertheless, there are other narratives which members of the Ghanaian diaspora cited, within the host communities, all of which have contributed to explaining the diversity within the diaspora community.

In accounting for the reasons for the diversity within the Ghanaian diaspora community, and how this has in turn influenced and affected how the various Ghanaian diaspora groups collaborate among themselves, respondent’s narratives revealed that the following issues account for the huge diversity: social class among diasporas; ethnocentrism/tribalism; opposing political views/ political differences; multiple religious groups/ associations; inept leadership among leaders within the diaspora community; patriarchy involving male dominance and gendered roles. Consequently, the trajectories in which these are being negotiated give rise to grievances and tensions and thus possibly resulting in the creation of the many different Ghanaian diaspora groups/associations that presently exist in both the Netherlands and United Kingdom. The many relationships created within the diaspora, the daily negotiations and construction of identity and its social scope of inclusion and exclusions all compound and disrupt homogeneity within the diaspora.
Accordingly, some theoretical conclusions can be drawn from the question: why diversity within a national migrants’ group? The traditional perspective of diasporas highlights the relationship between the imaginary homeland to return to, and the popular nation-state: ‘bounded’ and ‘unbounded’ paradigms, purist notion, groupness and the ideal homogeneity (Anderson 1998; Safran 1991; Glick Schiller & Fouron 2001). The Ghanaian diaspora community experience transnational life along different trajectories including, but not limited to, homeland orientations. The reproduction of homeland narratives of ethnocentrism, religious multiplicity, political differences, the orientations towards collectively imagining, communal belonging alongside the national affiliation all reflect the diaspora remembering the imagined ties towards homeland-Ghana. These outcomes are consistent with the theoretical framework of the traditional notion of diaspora which highlights the correlative relationship between diaspora and the homeland.

However, the study found that the Ghanaian diaspora community does not ascribe to fixed identity or homogeneity, although they assume closely knitted together with common national goals towards their homeland, yet as diasporas, they are not necessary homogenous as assumed. The diasporans negotiates collectivise and politicised identities which they construct around of ‘us’ and ‘others’ which includes some and excludes others. Such identity politics witnessed within the diaspora are seen as malleable, hybrid and multiple which they practice within context and space. It is from within these identity constructions that stirs tensions and divisions within a national migrants groups. Certainly, discussions on diaspora do not have to be exclusively tied to national discourses and the transcendence of national borders. Rather, they should be flexible enough to move beyond ‘bounded’ and ‘unbounded’ paradigms: either as contingent on physical mobility across borders or as purely emancipatory nor reactionary, (Mavroudi: 2007: 475).

My analysis on the Ghanaian diaspora communities demonstrates that the diaspora identity negotiations seems consistent with Anthias, Mavrodi MaCualiffi, Brubaker and Cho theories on diaspora which treats diaspora communities as a ‘category of practice’, project, claim and stance and as a process. Their understanding bid diasporas as condition of ‘subjectivity’ and not as an object of analysis’. These lens help view diaspora formation as it is based on constructions of shared but also politicised identities of belonging and not as bounded, or homogeneous. From this we will be better equipped to understand the changing relationships between people and places through time and space.
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# APPENDICES

## Appendix 1  
Table 1.1: List of Interviews, Date & Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gender M/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>25/07/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>25/07/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>31/07/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>4/08/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>4/08/2017</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 6</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>4/08/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 7</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>8/08/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 8</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>8/08/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 9</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>14/08/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 10</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>18/08/2017</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 11</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>18/08/2017</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 12</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>18/08/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 13</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>20/08/2017</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 14</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>20/08/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 15</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>27/08/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 16</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>27/08/2017</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 17</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>28/08/2017</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 18</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>31/08/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 19</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>3/10/2017</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 20</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>4/10/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 21</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>4/10/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 22</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>7/10/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 23</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>9/10/2017</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group discussion of 8 participant were not included
Appendix 2
Table 1.2: Category & Number of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession/Position</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers/Academics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Business/ Informal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multinationals/International Civil Servants</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors Construction, 2017