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ABSTRACT

Internal migration in Ghana has attracted a great deal of research attention and inspired by demographers and other social scientists. This is attributed to the implication that the movement can pose on the economy. People of the savannah regions of Ghana have had a long history of movement into other part of the country. Some of the reasons accounting for this phenomenon can be traced to different ecological zones in Ghana. As a result, people move from these areas into other part of the region in search of jobs. In certain part of the year especially in the dry seasons, movement of man-power labour from the savannah into other region increases. The Upper West Region has been the leader in net-migration in Ghana according to the 2010 Population and Housing Census and Wa Municipal its capital is no exception.

Return migration is an important part in the study of migration. This is because it can replace the loss of man-power labour deficit of emigration regions. The study looks into what accounted for the return migrants leaving Wa. It also investigates the factors associated with return migration into the Wa Municipality. Finally, this study looks into re-integration among the return migrants, migration and improved living standard and remittances. This study goes ahead to suggest recommendation for policy formulation in the Wa Municipal and other part of savannah Ghana.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECLARATION</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER ONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Background of Study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Problem Statement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Objectives of the Study</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Rationale of the Study</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Organization of the Study</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER TWO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Overview of Return Migration</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Theories of Return Migration</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Factors Associated with Return Migration</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Return Migration in Ghana</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Effects of return migration</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE ............................................................................................................. 24

Study Area and Methodology ............................................................................................................. 24

3.1 Introduction .............................................................................................................. 24

3.1.1 Profile of Upper West Region .............................................................................. 24

3.1.2 Study Area – Wa Municipal ................................................................................ 25

3.1.3 Methodology ....................................................................................................... 25

3.2 Data Collection ..................................................................................................... 27

3.3 Data Analysis ........................................................................................................... 27

3.4 Data collection Problems ........................................................................................ 28

CHAPTER FOUR ............................................................................................................... 29

Data Analysis and Presentation ........................................................................................... 29

4.1: Socio-demographic characteristics of Return Migrants .............................................. 29

4.1.1. Sex of return migrants ............................................................................................... 29

4.1.2: Educational levels of return migrants by time of migrating and current ............. 30

4.1.3 Age of return migrants before migrating and current ........................................... 31

4.1.4 Region of migration .............................................................................................. 32

4.1.5 Place of migration by rural-urban .............................................................................. 33

4.1.6 Current marital status of return migrants ................................................................... 34

4.1.7 Current employment status of return migrants ........................................................... 35

4.1.8 Type of engagement of return migrants before migrating .................................... 36

4.1.9 Type of engagement of return migrants at destination............................................... 37

4.1.10 Ethnicity of return migrants ..................................................................................... 38

4.1.11 Religious affiliation of return migrants .................................................................... 39

4.2 Reasons for Migrating ................................................................................................... 40

4.2.1: Networks and decision to migrate ............................................................................. 41

4.3: Decision to return ..................................................................................................... 43
LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 Percentage of return migrants by time of migrating and current educational levels ................................................................................................................................... 30
Table 4.2 Percentage of return migrants by Region ......................................................................................................................... 33
Table 4.3 Percentage of current marital status of return migrants .................................................................................................. 35
Table 4.4 Percentage of type of engagement of return migrant at destination ...................................................................................... 38
Table 4.5 Reasons for Migrating ...................................................................................................................................................... 41
Table 4.6 Percentage of decision to return ....................................................................................................................................... 44
Table 4.7 Return migrants intention to re-migrate .......................................................................................................................... 51
Table 4.8 Return migrants and re-integration ................................................................................................................................... 53
Table 4.9 Return migrants response on remittance .......................................................................................................................... 54
Table 4.10 Return migrants frequency of remitting home ................................................................................................................. 55
Table 4.11 Means of remitting home ................................................................................................................................................ 56
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1 Percentage of return migrants by sex ................................................................. 29

Figure 4.2 Percentage of return migrants at the time of migrating and current by age ...... 32

Figure 4.3 Percentage of return migrant by rural-urban .................................................... 34

Figure 4.4 Percentage of current employment status of return migrants ....................... 36

Figure 4.5 Percentage of type of engagement of return migrants before migrating .......... 37

Figure 4.6 Percentage of ethnic composition of return migrants ...................................... 39

Figure 4.7 Percentage of religious affiliation of return migrants ...................................... 40

Figure 4.8 Percentage of return migrants who used networks to migrate ....................... 43

Figure 4.9 Return migrants meeting their Expectations/Objectives at the destination ..... 46

Figure 4.10 Reasons for returning to origin ..................................................................... 48

Figure 4.11 Return migration and improved living standard .......................................... 50

Figure 4.12 Return migrants reasons to re-migrate at another time ............................... 52
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLSS</td>
<td>Ghana Living Standards Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>Ghana Statistical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHS</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELM</td>
<td>New Economics of Labour Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRGS</td>
<td>Non-Resident Ghanaian Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Overseas Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>Population and Housing Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOKTEN</td>
<td>Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD</td>
<td>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFR</td>
<td>Visiting Friends and Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

As stated by King (2000, p7) return migration is the great unwritten chapter in the history of migration’, going on he laments that ‘the historiography of migration studies has nearly always tended to imply that migration is a one-way process.’ notably focusing on the return of forced migrants (Black and Koser 1999; Long and Oxfeld 2004, Hammond 2004), but also dealing with return of labour migrants (see, for example, Ghosh 2000).

Well over a century ago Raveinstein (1885) observed that every migration stream generates a counter-stream which suggests that return migration is taken for granted with any migration. This may explain the initial silence over the issue in the literature until the global economic crisis of 1973 (Ammassari and Black 2001). Return migration is a central part of the ongoing migration process in this development, implying that it is no longer seen as the closure of the migration cycle, but rather as one of many steps within a continued movement (King, 2000). Migrants returning home could be as a result of either being forced or returning voluntarily.

An International Labour Organization (ILO) document for instance indicated how in late October 1990, amid the Gulf Crisis, thousands of Yemenis began to return home from Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia had placed new restrictions on Yemenis residing in the kingdom, which triggered this mass exodus. Although the exact number of Yemenis who returned from Saudi Arabia is not known, it has been estimated to be approximately 800,000 (ILO, 1991:2).
Also as result of the political and economic climate that changed in Yemen due to the discovery of oil and the prospects for employment that this would bring to Yemen, 4.5 percent of migrants returned. Another 38.1 percent returned because their work ended, and 56.9 percent stated other reasons (ILO, 1991). These reasons fall into On-Jook's (1980:107) category of "affective" reasons for return family, one's country. It can be argued that what these reasons really represent are the majority who actually did not plan out their return, but who on a visit home decided to stay there.

One commonly cited benefit of return migration for sending countries is the return of migrants (with its human capital implications), as well as the financial and social capital and savings they may take back with them. The World Bank suggest that an increase in temporary international mobility of the order of 3 percent of developed countries workforces could generate up to $356bn in benefits annually, fairly evenly distributed between rich and poor countries (World Bank 2006). It is further argued that these benefits vary significantly depending on the level of analysis applied and on which critical factors are considered, including the volume of return migration, characteristics of migrants, degree and direction of selectivity, types of migration, reasons for return, and situation existing in the countries involved in the migration (Ammassari and Black 2001).

Despite its diversity of types of migration, West Africa remains an under researched region in migration studies, especially as regards to return migration. However in recent times there has been substantial return of migrants in many West African countries as the political and economic climate has changed. Since the mid-1990s, there has been some evidence of return migration to Ghana. This has been attributed partly to the improvement in the Ghanaian economy vis-à-vis the economies of the neighbouring countries that once
attracted Ghanaians (World Bank 1994) as well as restrictions on Ghanaians travelling abroad (for instance, those travelling to EU countries) and repatriation of those without valid documents. Nonetheless, a second generation of Ghanaians living abroad is also growing, often settling there, but maintaining links and identifying with Ghana. Data from the Ghana Immigration Service also indicate that more than 2,000 Ghanaians were deported from 58 countries around the world in 1993 by Van Hear (1998: 206-7).

Among the countries, the largest number came from Germany, the UK, the Netherlands and Italy, who between them accounted for over two thirds of deportations of Ghanaians that year. It is also estimated that of the two million people deported from Nigeria in 1983, between 900,000 and 1.2 million were Ghanaians (Adeku, 1995). The Ghana Living Standards Survey (GLSS) also provides information on whether individuals are migrants or not, based on whether they are living outside their place of birth, or have lived outside their place of birth for more than one year. It allows an estimate of the total number of residents who have lived abroad and then returned.

Various theories have been propounded to justify the decision to return. This study is backed by Lee’s (1966) theory when he argued in the sixties that some migrants return because they have acquired need attributes at destinations, which promise to be advantageous at origins. The New Economics of Labor Migration theory (NELM) support Lee’s theory when it conceptualizes return migration as part of a defined plan conceived by migrants before their departure from their countries of origin, the original plan involves the eventual remigration to their home countries after accumulating resources abroad (Galor and Stark, 1990; Stark, 1991).
Hugo, (1983) as stated in (GSS, 1995 p163) stated that the decision to return to place of origin, to a large extent, will be influenced by the person involve in the initial decision making process to migrate. Based on the source of the decision making regarding migration, migrants can be divided into those who take the decision to migrate for themselves and/or for other members of their family and those who migration is derived from the decision made by others. The latter may also involve group decision making as part of the process of optimizing household resources.

Internal migration research conducted by the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS, 1995 p100) has documented that two scenarios of return migration may occur. The first one is where the migrant fail to adjust to the way of life in the urban area. This happens when the pull factor to the village and the push factor from the urban area are strong. Caldwell and Caldwell (1987) found that in Ghana the strongest rural pull was a reluctance to break close family ties with family and the village. This was reinforced by the fact that for most rural Ghanaian town life was still alien and somewhat frightening. The situation has undergone change however, and today most migrants only return permanently when they die and are sent home for burial. Another situation that leads to return migration is when the migrant return home after retirement probably because living in an alien environment without regular income becomes a little unbearable.

Literature on return migration has been concentrated on international. Internal return migration has been recorded by Abdulai (1999) when he based his argument on the study conducted by the Ghana Statistical Service publication with the World Bank on current and prior employment for over 8,000 individuals in Ghana that revealed that among individuals who had changed occupations during the period, those moving from non-
agriculture jobs to the agricultural jobs outnumbered those moving from the opposite direction by a ratio of one-to-two. These survey data suggest that reverse migration from the rural to urban areas have increase after policy reform in 1983 put in place to favour the rural sector.

Internal migration has been under studied especially in the Upper West Region. Some studies on internal migration in Ghana have been documented by Nabila (1986), GSS (1995), Anarfi et al (2003), Codjoe (2006), and Abdulai (1999). However, there still remain some areas within internal migration that needs further studies. Internal migration dynamics has serious implication for countries if not well managed. Some of the types of migration within Ghana include return, stepwise, rural- urban and chain migration. Some of the reasons accounting for this phenomenon can be traced to different ecological zones in Ghana. For instance, migrant farmers from the savannah zones at the destination return at the beginning of every rainy season to prepare their land for farming. Codjoe (2006) observed that seasonal migrants involves farmers who move to work in the cocoa and oil plantations in the south during the dry season when farming activities slacken in the savannah agro ecological zone. Nabila (1974) also found that the significant of kinship lineage ties and the need to work on farms to support their aged parents or relatives as major reasons for some migrants to return to their origins.

1.2 Problem Statement

Return migration is very important area in the study of migration. However, there is relatively little information on return migrants within Ghana especially reasons that accounted for their return. This assertion is supported by King who indicated that theories of return migration are very limited, available materials are either quite small scale or anecdotal (King, 2000). Thus King (2000, p7) laments that ‘return migration is the great
unwritten chapter in the history of migration’, going on to say that ‘the historiography of migration studies has nearly always tended to imply that migration is a one-way process. It is therefore true to conclude that return migration was under-researched.

International migration is governed by laws in the destination countries. The entry into and departure from another sovereign country is therefore not as easy as internal migration. Internal migrants have the freedom to move within their national boundaries whereas international migrants are constrained by laws at the destination countries such as refusal of entry permit, deportation for various reasons and expiration of visa (GSS 1995). In spite of the freedom to move within their national boundaries, a lot of migrants return to origin voluntarily. McDonald (1963) has noted that there are the poorer unskilled migrants who tend to be pushed out by the adverse socio-economic conditions in the origin. On the other hand, there are the highly skilled and educated migrants who usually come from the ranks and files of the urban elite. Some migrants pulled out of work opportunities existing in the well-endowed regions in the south. Studies have shown that migration has a lot of benefits to the origin, destination and the migrant. However, some migrants return to their homelands. Why are they willing to give up a comparatively high standard of living in the advanced industrialized destination in order to return to a less developed society? It is in this view that this researcher has sought to look into the contributing factors that influence return migration in Wa community.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Given the background information of this study, the general objectives are:

i to find the factors that are associated with Return Migration in Wa.

ii to analyze the factors influencing the decision of the migrants to return to origin
iii to examine why some return migrant re-migrate

The specific objectives are:

i. to examine the socio-economic background of the return migrant in the context of the factors that influenced their return

ii. to assess the extent to which migration actually improved their living standard and

iii to establish if return migrants were able to re-integrate

1.4 Rationale of the Study

Various kinds of migration that have been identified include seasonal, step, stage, chain and return migrations. In Ghana, rural-urban migration has been the focus of studies by demographers and migration experts. Presently, there are some areas in migration studies that have been over studied for instance rural-urban migration. Other areas relating to return migration have been under researched. According to Rajulton, migrants return home based on the reaction of the host country or community can influence the migrant to continue to stay at the place of destination, move to a new destination or return to place of origin (Rajulton, 1991).

Deciding when to return permanently is a difficult decision. Even migrants who originally migrated in pursuit of a goal find themselves hooked in the migration cycle long after they have taken wives, built homes or bought land. Whereas other migrants return to origin for good, others return and re-migrate. What necessitated their return in the first place need to be researched into? Besides, this study will find answers to some return migrants who are not able to re-integrate well when they move to origin. This has a serious socio-cultural
implication on the origin. The study is again significant because it will help policy makers to know the pattern, trend, and direction of return migration and the socio-economic characteristics of return migrants. Finally, answers can be found to the motivating factors that fuel return migration in Wa Municipal.

1.5 Organization of the Study

The following outline how this dissertation has been structured.

- The study is structured into five chapters. Chapter one composed of the background where literature of the study and topic areas is introduced. Also included are problem statement, research questions, objection of the study, rationale for the study and how the study has been organised.

- Chapter two has an in-depth literature review of both the study and topic areas. It also contains literature of migrants and return migrants from global, Africa, Ghana, Upper West and the study area Wa Municipal, their integration at the destination and re-integration back home. Also are remittances, reason(s) accounting for their return to the origin and issues of employment.

- Chapter three contain the research design and methodology adopted to gather data for the study. It also includes information on the physical features of the study area, map of study area and issues of data collection. Also are data to support the methods of selection of respondents and problems encountered during data collection.

- Chapter four contains the analysis and presentation of the data collected from the field, and interpretation of the study.

- Finally, summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendation as well as the limitations of the study are contained in chapter five.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview of Return Migration

Although, various migration literatures have been focused on return migration internationally, internal return migration aspect has also become a very important dimension in the study of migration due to the impact on both the rural and urban setting. It was generally assumed that those who left the Old World never returned. As early as 1885, however, Ravenstein had noted the principle of return migration in his renowned list of migration laws: "Each main current of migration produces a compensating counter-current." Nevertheless, the view of migration as a once and only phenomenon which arose from the nineteenth century transatlantic experience dominated migration studies (Gmelch, 1980).

While scholarly approaches related to return migration can be traced back to the 1960s, there is no question that, with hindsight, it was in the 1980s that stimulating scientific debate among scholars took place on the return phenomenon and its impact on origin countries. King (2000) has noted return migration is a central part of the ongoing migration process in this development, implying that it is no longer seen as the closure of the migration cycle, but rather as one of many steps within a continued movement. A return migrant is defined as any person returning to his/her country of origin, in the course of the last ten years, after having been an international migrant (whether short-term or long-term) in another country. Return may be permanent or temporary. It may be independently decided by the migrant or forced by unexpected/adverse circumstances (Cassarino 2008, 3).
Gmelch (1980) defines return migration as the movement of emigrants back to their homelands to resettle. Migrants returning for a vacation or an extended visit without the intention of remaining at home are generally not defined as return migrants, though in some settings it is difficult to distinguish analytically the migrants returning home for a short visit or seasonally from those who have returned permanently. A related concept is re-emigration. This refers to people who move back to their homelands and then emigrate a second time. The frequency of movements between two or more places, such as in seasonal labor migration is referred to as circular migration.

Hugo, (1983) as stated in (GSS, 1995 p163) stated that the decision to return to place of origin, to a large extent, will be influenced by the person involved in the initial decision making process to migrate. Based on the source of the decision making regarding migration, migrants can be divided into those who take the decision to migrate for themselves and/or for other members of their family and those who migration is derived from the decision made by others. The latter may also involve group decision making as part of the process of optimizing household resources.

Internal migration research conducted by the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS, 1995 p100) has documented that two scenarios of return migration may occur. The first one is where the migrant fail to adjust to the way of life in the urban area. This happens when the pull factor to the village and the push factor from the urban area are strong. Caldwell and Caldwell (1987) found that in Ghana the strongest rural pull was a reluctance to break close family ties with family and the village. This was reinforced by the fact that for most rural Ghanaian town life was still alien and somewhat frightening. The situation has undergone change however, and today most migrants only return permanently when they
die and are sent home for burial. Another situation that leads to return migration is when the migrant return home after retirement probably because living in an alien environment without regular income becomes a little unbearable.

As documented by Gmelch (1980 p137) most typologies of return migration have dealt with two dimensions along which there is considerable diversity the length of time migrants intended to remain abroad and their reason(s) for returning (Rhoades 1978). In each scheme a basic distinction is made between those migrants who intended their emigration to be temporary and those who intended it to be permanent. The former usually returned to their country of origin after accomplishing the specific objective(s) they had set out to achieve, most often to accumulate a sum of money. By returning they are merely fulfilling their original plans.

The second type, on the other hand, had intended, or at least hoped, their emigration to be permanent-that they would be able to create a better life abroad. But for various reasons they decided or were forced to return. King (1977), Lianos (1975), and Cerase (1967) categorize two or more subtypes among these "permanent" migrants according to the cause of their return. First are those who were forced to return due to some outside factor, either family circumstances, such as the need to look after an ill or elderly parent, or faltering economic conditions in the host country. These migrants were satisfied with their situation a broad and would have preferred to remain had they been able to do so. Second are those who failed to adapt to the way of life in the host society, perhaps because of the strangeness of the language, people ,and customs or because they could not bear the psychic costs of being separated from close friends and the familiar environment of home.
According to a migration research in Ghana Statistical Service (GSS, 1995) considering the time dimension in returning to origin, there is no general agreement as to what constitute short, medium or long term stay. In general, however, the decision to migrate may also be a function of time spent outside. All things being equal, the longer the stay, the less the likelihood that the migrant will return permanently. For instance, migrating for 10 years or more tends to be associated acceptance and possible assimilation of the migrant, particularly when the family members are involved. There is however, those who return to their place of origin after retirement irrespective of duration of stay at the place of destination.

2.2 Theories of Return Migration

The neoclassical perspective has been used to explain return migration processes in general and those of skilled migrants in particular (Borjas, 1989). According to neoclassical migration theory, the migration process is motivated by wage differentials between origin and destination countries (Massey et al., 1998). The attraction to higher wages in destination countries causes migrants to extend the length of their stay abroad in an effort to maximize their wages. Within this framework, return migration is seen as a consequence of failure (Borjas, 1989). In order words, assuming that there are no changes in wages at the origin or destination countries, migrants will only return to their places of origin if they fail to derive the expected benefits of higher earnings abroad (Constant and Massey, 2002; Cassarino, 2004).

There is scattered evidence associated with neoclassical explanations of the causes and consequences of return migration. Cohen and Haberfeld (2001), for example, find that although returning migrants had a lower predicted probability of success in the US labor
market than migrants with similar schooling levels who remained, returning migrants had higher levels of schooling than migrants who did not return. However, Reagan and Olsen (2000) find no skill bias in their analysis of the composition of returning migrants from the US. Among returning African immigrants, evidence suggests that some retuning migrants may have had very little success while living abroad. For example, Carling (2004) identifies a group of returning Cape Verdean migrants he refers to as “empty-handed returnees” who returned looking no better off than they were before they migrated. However, he further points out that not all returning Cape Verdean migrants fall into this category.

Unlike neoclassical theories, the New Economics of Labor Migration theory (NELM) conceptualizes return migration as part of a defined plan conceived by migrants before their departure from their countries of origin (Galor and Stark, 1990; Stark, 1991). The original plan involves the eventual remigration to their home countries after accumulating resources abroad. Consequently, potential returning migrants are highly motivated to gain additional skills and increase their savings while abroad, since these resources are expected to make them more productive in their countries of origin after they return (Cassarino, 2004). In terms of employment outcomes, the NELM is likely to predict a greater probability of employment among returning migrants than non-migrants insofar as returning migrants may have acquired more skills and more marketable educational credentials while living abroad.

Increasingly, recent studies are showing some support for the NELM theory in their analyses of the socioeconomic outcomes of returning emigrants. For example, among
African countries there is some evidence pointing to a greater level of entrepreneurship among returning migrants that may be associated to savings accumulated abroad (Ammassari, 2004). Similarly, Alberts and Hazen report that the Tanzanian students in the US believed that obtaining a degree from a university in the US would significantly improve their job prospects after they return home (Alberts and Hazen, 2005). Thus, the return of emigrants to their home countries with the resources they acquired abroad can be considered to be the ideal end of the international migration cycle (Nyberg-Sørensen, Van Hear, and Engberg-Pedersen, 2002).

Structural theories of the return migration of skilled migrants offer a different perspective on the return migration process (Cassarino, 2004). They emphasize the importance of the home country’s socioeconomic and political context as important factors that affect the ability of returning migrants to utilize the skills they acquired abroad (Diatta and Mbow, 1999; Thomas- Hope, 1999). Structural theories do not consider the decision to return to be associated with a successful or failed migration experience, but rather focus on the ability of return migrants to be productive after arriving. They emphasize the “reality” of the home economy (Cassarino, 2004) and stress the importance of local contextual factors, e.g., economic development as factors necessary to the successful integration into the local economy. In short, structural theories argue that the ability of returning migrants to utilize their skills and resources after they return largely depends on the operation of background factors specific to the areas and countries that they return to.
2.3 Factors Associated with Return Migration

Many factors according to Gent and Black (2005) may influence the sustainability of return. Research has shown that the most important factors are voluntariness of return and the environment at origin (Gent and Black, 2005). If return is not voluntary the returnee is more likely to re-migrate and it is less likely to lead to poverty reduction. Return is also more likely to be sustainable if there are social and economic opportunities and political freedom in the environment of origin. Policies have the ability to affect these important factors by encouraging voluntary return and influencing the economic and social environment to make return an attractive option.

Another factor that fuel return migration internationally is that international migration is governed by laws in the destination countries such as refusal of entry permit making non-national entry from another sovereign country difficult. Also in international migration a migrant can be deported for variety of reasons for instance on grounds of expiration of visa. Finally, prospected asylum seekers can be refuse permit and can be repatriated to the origin. Internal migrants have the freedom to move within their national boundaries without any hindrance. The reaction of the host country and or community can influence the migrant to continue to stay at the place of destination, move to a new destination or return to place of origin (Rajulton, 1991)

Other writings on reasons accounting for return migration point to unfavorable economic conditions in the host society, such as recession or layoffs and unemployment within a single industry, as the primary cause of return migration. (King, 1978) has documented the massive return flows of European guest workers or ‘Gastarbeiter’ from Germany and other industrialized northern European nations due to recent economic recessions. Although
most literature on reasons for return migration point to economic, other non economic reasons are strong family ties and the desire to be in the company of one’s own kin and longtime friends at the origin and the desire to return during vacation trips home.

The consequences of migration can also vary considerably according to the time perspective that is chosen. Certain consequences that appear positive in the short run may turn out to be negative in the medium or long run. For instance, Fischer et al. (1997) have stressed that migration eases labour market and balance of payment problems and sometimes produces some growth effects to greater consumption determined by remittance flows. The influence of return migration on socioeconomic change in the emigration country also varies depending on the motives for return and the problems that returnees encounter. Return motives include a variety of economic, social and family-related, as well as political reasons (King, 2000). Existing empirical evidence shows that social and family-related reasons are of particular importance. The wish to rejoin family and friends, homesickness, problems of adjustment in the host country, racial harassment, and the aim to enjoy an improved social status back home are significant reasons for return.

There are other factors that relate to migrants ‘stage in the life-cycle, as age brings changing needs and preferences. For instance some migrants may wish to raise their children back in their origin, to care for elderly parents, return to get married or to take on particular family related responsibilities. Some migration scholars have examined the relationship between integration and assimilation and return. They have claimed that return occurred because migrants were unable to integrate or assimilate into the host society. Rogers (1984: 233) has argued that ‘Returns may indeed indicate failure to
become integrated and assimilated into the host country, but they may not do so. For some migrants they may be ‘new’ decisions, arrived at on a basis of changed personal and societal circumstances. Al-Ali et al. (2001) in his study show how increased engagement of Bosnian and Eritrean refugees in their home countries including a willingness to contemplate return can sometimes come more from security in their host state, rather than rejection by it.

2.4 Return Migration in Ghana

Data from the Ghana Living Standards Survey (GLSS) indicate that in 1998-1999, there were approximately 50,000 return migrants living in Ghana. This particular data set merges returnees from Africa, Europe, and North America, but it is thought that the majority come from Europe. Research in this area has shown that migration can be a form of poverty alleviation as migrants tend to return with more capital and education than they had on departure. Other studies suggest that in mid 1990s there has been some evidence of return migration to Ghana, with return migrants sometimes bringing significant sums in savings (Black et al. 2003). A 1995 Ghana Migration Survey showed that approximately one third of return migrants interviewed had received some form of formal education abroad (Adeku, 1995).

A migration research study in Ghana (GSS, 1995) indicated that the possibility of migrants returning to place of origin ranges from the personal decision of the individual (for example, the achievement of objective(s) for migrating) to a situation where the migrant has no control over the decision for returning, for instance someone being deported. Within this continuum are various categories of situations such as the joint decision of
family members, joining of spouse or return from assignment such as foreign affairs posting. Thus, migration decision or behavior can be seen as an outcome of influences which are either external or internal to the individual. In general two paradigms have been used to explain return migration. These are the normative and the behavioural approaches. According to the normative approach, the decision to migrate is influence by the rational analysis of the cost and benefits of the move to the individual and or the group. The behavioural approach on the other hand, emphasizes differential perception of, and responsiveness to, advantageous moves (Rajulton, 1991: 32). In international migration, however, the normative versus behavioural approaches get blurred due to intervening factors beyond the control of the migrant such as repatriation, refusal of entry permit or expiry of resident permit. (GSS, 1995)

People who migrate with a specific objective in mind have been found to return to their place of origin when the objective is met. As pointed out by Rajulton (1991), however expectations tend to change over time leading to extension of stay or re-emigration after return. In particular, repatriated migrants with unfulfilled expectations tend to migrate again in the hope that in the next trip their expectation would be fulfilled. With this context, a return migrant may also be a potential emigrant (GSS, 1995).

Others migrate to a more favorable destination as a result of the changing climatic conditions. This movement is known as seasonal migration and it has traditionally been related to agriculture and the practice of transhumance. For example, during the dry season, nomads move in search of water and pasture for their animal stock. This is common with the cattle ranchers in the dry savannah areas, especially in the northern Ghana. This kind of migration tends to be rural to rural. Sometimes, seasonal migration
involves farmers and labourers during the dry seasons of the year when agricultural activities slackens, as with migration of farmers leaving the drier areas in the north and moving down south to work. During the wet season, they go back to cultivate their farms. Laboureres, mainly men, also move from rural areas to urban areas or to other rural areas where there is economic activity. (GSS, 1995)

In addition to the factors discussed above, family oriented issues have also contributed to migration. Women migrate to join their husbands. A nationwide survey conducted by the Ghana Statistical Service in 1995 revealed that as much as 64 per cent of the rural-urban migrants moved to join their families. Similarly, data from the Ghana Living Standards Survey of 1997/98 shows 60 per cent of migrants reporting marriage or other family reasons as the cause of their migration, with only 25 per cent reporting work reasons (Abdulai 1999).

2.5 Effects of return migration

Return migration can have both positive and negative effects on the place of origin of the migrants. Some of the positive effects include developments undertaken by return migrants to improve the living conditions of the relatives. Return migrants have been noted for development in the origins through regular visits, by contributing cash and gifts to non-migrants family members and extended relations, and by making substantial investments in durable capital goods such as houses, farms, etc (GSS 1995). The ILO stated in their document that, men, who left approximately eleven years ago to better their standard of living, have in many ways, accomplished this goal. There is no question that the vast majority of returnees view their experience abroad as being positive. The reason
being they have been able to build homes, buy land, start businesses and rear families in a style unheard-of in this region until the past two decades. (ILO, 1991:2).

The return of migrants with its human capital implications is one of the most commonly cited benefits of migration for the sending country, along with remittance and labour market effects (Todaro, 1976). This however, is not the only form of capital transfer involved with return migration. Others benefits to the origin include financial and social capital that are mobilized by the migrants. They accumulate savings while living and working abroad and bring them back once they return. The migrants may also make professional and personal contacts, which prove useful and productive for their endeavours back home. In modern migration study the term ‘TOKTEN’ meaning Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate National has been one of the much talk about benefit that emigration countries especially developing countries stand to gain through the knowledge their returned national have acquired as a results from migrating to more developed countries.

Lowell and Findlay (2002) have indicated that there are major feedback effects of skilled emigration. Migrants bring back the skills and work experience acquired during their stay in the host country by helping to boost productivity. Technology and knowledge transfer contribute to increasing productivity and economic development especially in developing counties. As noted by Asiedu (2004 p1) another very significant dimension to this emotional attachment of expatriate communities to their birthplace is the return visitation of migrants to friends and relatives for the purposes of re-establishing old ties and re-
affirming blood relationships. These are referred to in the text as ‘visiting friends and relatives’ (VFR) tourism.

The current importance of the sector has been achieved in spite of initial skepticism about its viability (Braunlich and Nadkarni, 1995). Current expectations are that certain African countries could become major destinations for VFR tourists due to the large number of their people who have migrated to other continents (Wyllie, 1990; King, 1994). Ghana has frequently been cited as one of the leading potential markets for VFR tourism in Africa because of her unique role in the transatlantic slave trade that shipped millions of Africans into slavery in the New World (Government of Ghana, 1996).

Several evidences for this critical view are now easy to spot. For example, in 2005, between a third and a half of the so-called developing world’s science and technology personnel lived in OECD countries. And it is almost unnecessary to note that a differentiated view of the movement of brains has produced ‘brain strain hotspots’ (Lowell et al., 2004), such as the healthcare sector in sub-Saharan Africa. This experience stands in stark contrast to that of countries (such as Taiwan, South Korea and the People’s Republic of China) whose very rapid economic development could change the situation into a ‘reverse brain drain’ (Zweig, 2006).

(Faist, 2007) noted that recently, major political actors such as international organisations and state governments have started to focus on not only the emigration, re-migration or return of highly skilled professionals, but also on the formation of transnational networks. In short, the role of knowledge exchange for economic growth and development has regained importance over recent years. Indeed, academic and policy actors nowadays
discuss resource transfers across countries within the framework of the knowledge society (Stehr, 1992; Scott, 2004). There are numerous claims about the importance of knowledge transfer and scientific cooperation for development (World Bank, 1999).

In Ghana, Micah (2006) observed that the Ghanaian government realizing the economic importance of the Diaspora has sought to keep its citizens abroad engaged. In 2002, the Ghana Dual Citizenship Regulation Act was passed, which, for the first time, made it possible for Ghanaians to keep their Ghanaian citizenship after obtaining the citizenship of another country.

The government also organized a Homecoming Summit in 2001, which invited members of the Diaspora to the capital city of Accra in order to promote their efforts in national development.

A Non-Resident Ghanaians Secretariat (NRGS) was instituted in May 2003 to promote further links with Ghanaians abroad and to encourage return.

As noted by Anarfi et al (2000) some studies have shown the importance of remittances in the form of goods. For instance, among the return migrants interviewed in the 1995 study, about 95 per cent of remittances were in the form of goods including vehicles (private and commercial vehicles), household appliances, equipment and machinery such as corn mills, outboard motors and business machines. Of these, personal and consumer items were more significant, with nearly two-thirds of the returnees bringing durable goods for their personal or family use and a further 18.3 per cent bringing goods for relatives and friends. In contrast, only 4.7 per cent of the returnees interviewed brought goods for commercial purposes (either to set up a business or to sell). The evidence seems to suggest therefore that the remittances sent by the returnees and the durable goods they brought with them
were for private consumption as opposed to using them for productive investment purposes, thus devaluing the contribution to capital.

Return migration can also be a path to job creation. In 2001, researchers from the UK-based Sussex Centre for Migration Research interviewed 152 Ghanaian returnees. Over 55 percent of those surveyed were self-employed on return, and the vast majority of these individuals employed other Ghanaians in their business. It should be noted, however, that existing data do not indicate whether migration is a form of poverty alleviation for the poorest of the poor, because studies have focused on Ghanaian returnees who were relatively well-off before they migrated. (Micah, 2006)

Migration scholars argued that these implications of return migration can vary significantly according to the level of analysis that is chosen and based on several critical factors. The factors include the volume of return migration, characteristics of migrants, degree and direction of selectivity, types of migration, reasons for return, and situations existing in the destination involved in the migration.
CHAPTER THREE
STUDY AREA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter describes the study area and the methodology of the study. It begins with the overview of the physical features of Upper West Region and the study area Wa Municipal. It explains the sample design adopted for the study and justifies the data collection method employed for this research. Also included in this chapter are tool for data analysis, problems encountered during data collection and the organization of the questionnaire.

3.1.1 Profile of Upper West Region
The population of the region as enumerated in the 2010 Population and Housing Census (PHC) is 702,110, with 48.6% (341,182) males and 51.4% (360,928) females. The population aged less than 15 years constituted 41.7% of the total, while those aged between 15 and 64 constituted 52.3%. The rest (6.0%) were persons 65 years and older. The proportion of the urban population was 16.3% in 2010. The regional population density was 38.0 persons per square kilometer, an increase from 31.2 persons per sq. km. in 2000 (GSS 2010 PHC).

The climate of the Upper West Region follows a general pattern identified with the three northern regions. It has a single rainy season from April to September, with average annual rainfall of about 115 cm. This is followed by harmattan, a prolonged dry season characterized by cold and hazy weather from early November to March, followed by intensely hot weather that ends only with the onset of early rainfall in April. The mean monthly temperature ranges between 21° and 32°. Temperatures rise to their maximum (40°) in March, just before the onset of the rainy season, and fall to their minimum (20°) in December during the harmattan brought about by the north-east trade winds. Among the
eleven districts in the region, Wa Municipal had the highest share of 15.3% of the population (2010 PHC).

3.1.2 Study Area – Wa Municipal

Wa is the capital of the Upper West Region and has a population of 107,214 according to the 2010 Population and Housing Census (2010 PHC) results. It has a Municipal status and bordered on the north by the Nadowli district, on the East by Wa East District, Tuna Kalba District in the Northern Region. On the Western side it shares boundaries with Wa West District.

From the 2000 PHC results, literacy rate 69%. Wa is predominantly a Moslem community. Moslems constitute about 44% of the population. Christian’s population is about 24.7%. Traditionalist 27%, other religion 0.1% and those without religion constitute about 2.8%

The indigenes are the Walas forming 40.3%, other ethnic groups are the Dagaabas 42.9%, Sissala 5.8%, Akan ethnic groups forming 3.8%, and all other ethnic group 2.1%.

The major occupation in Wa is agriculture and related works constituting 72.0%. The main industrial activity in Wa is agriculture including Hunting, forestry and related works also constituting 73.3%. The employment rate in Wa is 55.2 %.( GSS 2005) 2000 PHC.

3.1.3 Methodology

This research is focusing on internal return migration within the Wa Municipality. For the purpose of this research a return migrant is an individual who was away from the household for a period of six months in the last one year but have since returned to the household. In other to achieve its objectives, the mixed method (combination of qualitative and quantitative methods) was employed. On the quantitative method the
purposive sample method was also employed. Migrants with age fifteen (15) years and above were considered for this research because according to the Ghana living Standards Survey-6 (GLSS-6) analysis of the sixth cycle, for the working population 15 to 60 years about three quarters (77.4%) or 10, 517,394 are economically active with 98.1 percent employed. The proportion of the employed is higher in rural areas (99.2%) than in urban areas (96.6%). The unemployment rates are higher in the urban areas than rural areas (3.6% and 0.8% respectively) (GLSS6/LFS, 2012/2013).

Recent statistics from the Ghana living Standards Survey-6 (GLSS-6) show that 25.7 percent of the population or 1,234,788 children aged 5 to 14 years are currently economically active, while 74.3 percent or 5,106,845 children aged 5 to 14 years are economically not active (GLSS6/LFS). The statistics provided above therefore support the assertion those 15 years old and over are more active economically than below 15 years population.

In addition, the sampling procedure was based on urban and rural. In terms of the rural and urban proportion of the sampling Wa town being an urban got fifty-two (52) respondents or 66 per cent while the remaining twenty-six (26) respondents or 34 per cent came from rural communities that form the Wa municipal. This was done to satisfy the urban-rural population distribution of the Wa municipality which constitute 66.3 per cent for urban and 33.7 per cent for rural.

Besides, a qualitative interview guide was prepared for selected respondents as focus group discussions for one rural community and one urban community. Finally in-depth interview of key members (an opinion leader) of the Wa community was also recorded.
3.2 Data Collection

Since this research is about return migrants the best method employed was moving to the various homes in search of respondents who are return migrant and who meet the selection criteria for this survey. In order to locate more return migrants, respondents were asked to assist in providing information and contact details of other return migrants whom they know and who fulfil the required sampling criteria. Face to face interviews were conducted. In all a total of seventy eight (78) return migrants fifteen (15) years and above within the Wa municipal were interviewed using a structured questionnaire.

Also a focus group discussion was organised for one rural community and one urban community. In-depth interview of key member (an opinion leader) of the Wa community was also recorded. The main questions asked during the interviews were about the situation at origin before emigration, the experiences in the destination, networking, what accounted for their return to origin and the post return conditions especially re-integration in the origin.

3.3 Data Analysis

Field data from the completed questionnaires were captured by manual data entry using the SPSS version 16.0 programme for analyses. The interpretation of findings was done using descriptive techniques such as pie charts, bar graphs, tables and cross tabulations. Qualitative analysis was also used to explain the qualitative data collected.
3.4 Data collection Problems

The following difficulties were encountered during the field work:

1. Language barrier:

The researcher could not speak the dominant languages (Wala and Dagaare) very well. As a result, interpreters were at times used to assist in data collection. This situation prolonged the duration of the data collection and retarded the progress of the research.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

4.1: Socio-demographic characteristics of Return Migrants

This section examines the socio-demographic characteristics of the return migrants. Migration is selective with regards to variables such as ones age, sex, place of residence, place of birth, occupation, marital status and ethnicity. These variables to a large extent determine individual probability to migrate.

4.1.1. Sex of return migrants

Table 4.1 shows the return migrants by their sex. It became evident during the study that male dominate in return migration. Of the seventy-eight (78) return migrants interviewed forty-nine (49) were male representing 62.8 per cent. Females return migrants were twenty-nine (29) forming 37.2 per cent.

Figure 4.1 Percentage of return migrants by sex

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014
4.1.2: Educational levels of return migrants by time of migrating and current

The educational level of an individual is one of the selective variables when it comes to migration. Literature on migration point to the fact that there are job opportunities for the more educated and as a result their migration rate is higher compared with less educated. Table 4.1 shows that in some levels the return migrants prior to their migrating were less educated compared to their current educational status and vice-versa at different levels. The table indicates that after returning to origin, return migrants educational level improved from 11.6% to current level of 24.4% at the tertiary level, 17.7% to 28.2% at the SHS level, and 32.8% to 19.2%. However, at the primary and JHS levels current educational levels were lower compared with before migrating. 25.6% to 16.7% at the JHS and 12.3% to 11.5% at the primary levels.

**Table 4.1** Percentage of return migrants by time of migrating and current educational levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Before migrating (%)</th>
<th>Current level (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/JHS</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/SHS</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014
4.1.3 Age of return migrants before migrating and current

Age is one of the demographic characteristics that have serious implications in the study of return migration. It has implication for migration policy formulation and implementation. As shown in Figure 4.2, return migrants 15-44 years constituted more than three-fourth (78.3%) of the entire study. This implies that migrants in their prime age (15-44) return to origin more often than 45 years old and above constitute 22.0 per cent. This phenomenon can probably be explained by the fact that most of the migrants were students in their youthful age who have returned home after completion of various levels of education at the destination. This pattern also confirms earlier studies that revealed that in Ghana it is young adults who migrate leaving behind children and old people (Nabila, 1974).

A comparative analysis of the ages of the return migrants also reveals that the aged are returning more than those in their prime ages. This observation is supported by the data provided. Before migrating 15-24 age cohort constituted close to three-fourth (70.5%) of the respondents while 21.8%) represent current return migrants. 20.5% represent before migrating as against 32.1% current return migrants for 25-34 age cohort. Others are before migrating 6.4% and current return migrants 24.4% for 35-44 age cohort, 2.6% before migrating and 11.6% current return migrants for 45-54 age cohort. Finally, no one above 55 years migrated as against 10.3% current return migrants.
Figure 4.2 Percentage of return migrants at the time of migrating and current by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age cohorts</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and above</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

4.1.4 Region of migration

Most migrants tend to stay within their own region or closer due to the cost of travel. This is supported by Ravenstein’s (1885; 1889) law of migration which states that most moves are only a short distance, in other words migration flow reduces with distance. Table 4.2 supports these views as it was revealed that 30 per cent of the return migrants interviewed migrated within the same region (Upper West). This was followed by Ashanti (19%), Brong Ahafo (14%), these are well endowed region in the middle belt especially for agriculture, Northern (12%), Western (10%), Greater Accra (9%), Eastern (3%), Central (3%) and Upper East (1%). There was no return migrant from the Volta region. This is
also consistent with previous evidence that point to distance as a strong deterrent to internal migration in Ghana (Beal, Levy and Moses 1967).

**Table 4.2** Percentage of return migrants by Region they returned from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Country</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gt. Accra</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashanti</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brong Ahafo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper West</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own fieldwork, 2014*

4.1.5 **Place of migration by rural-urban**

Figure 4.3 indicates the type of place the return migrants’ emigrated to in term of whether the place was a rural or an urban setting. It was shown that 53.8 per cent migrated to a rural setting and this could probably be attributed to almost 40 per cent of the return migrants (37.12%) engaged in agricultural activities in the destination. Agricultural
activities mostly take place in the rural settings of the economy of Ghana. The remaining 46.2 per cent lived in an urban area in their destination.

**Figure 4. 3** Percentage of return migrant by rural-urban

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

### 4.1.6 Current marital status of return migrants

Married return migrant represented half of the population interviewed during the study. They form 50 per cent. Table 4.3 shows those who are never married followed with 34.6 per cent, widowed 9.0 per cent, divorced 3.8 per cent, those separated and in loose union/living together constituting 1.3 per cent each.
Table 4.3 Percentage of current marital status of return migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loose union/living together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

4.1.7 Current employment status of return migrants

Figure 4.4 illustrate the employment status of the return migrants. It was discovered that close to three-fifth of the return migrants (72%) are currently working while those not engaged in any work form 28 per cent. It is possible that the working populations are the category of return migrants who are back to their farms now that farmers are preparing their farm lands awaiting the rains. Codjoe (2006) observed that seasonal migrants involves farmers who move to work in the cocoa and oil plantations in the south during the dry season when farming activities slacken in the savannah agro ecological zone. It is also possible that those who are not into any work are returned students and those back home after retirement.
4.1.8 Type of engagement of return migrants before migrating

People migrate as a result of economic and non-economic reasons; Figure 4.5 shows the engagement of return migrants at the destination. More than one-third of the respondents (37.12%) were farmers. Students constituted (15.36%), pito brewers (11.52%), traders (8.96%), miners (6.4%), teachers (6.4%); civil servants (5.12%), others (5.12%) and mechanics forming (4.0%). From the above statistics, it has become clear that the main reason for migrating was economic.
Figure 4. 5 Percentage of type of engagement of return migrants before migrating

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

4.1.9 Type of engagement of return migrants at destination

Table 4.4 shows the various occupations of return migrants at the destination. Those engaged in agricultural activities formed a little over one-fourth (26.9%) of the respondents. This was followed by others (20.5%) including students constituting more than half. Mining follows with (14.1%), construction (6.4%), those without work (5.1%) and security (2.6%). People migrate as a result of economic and non economic reasons. Comparing migrant’s engagements before migration and in the destination it came out that farming remains the dominant occupation. Before migrating, the respondent’s main occupation was farming (37.12%) against return (26.9%). Students also constitute 15.4% before migrating as against others (20.6%) in the destination; however, students formed
more than half 55.0% of the others responses at the destination. Pito brewers represent 11.52% before migration as against mining (14.1%) at the destination.

**Table 4.4** Percentage of type of engagement of return migrant at destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

4.1.10 Ethnicity of return migrants

Almost half of the return migrants were found to be Dagaabas (46.2%). The next major ethnic group were the Walas constituted one-third of the respondents (33.3%). They are followed by Sissalas (10.3%). From Figure 4.6, the Lobis form (5.1%) and others (5.1%). This conclusion is in line with the ethnic composition of the study area where the Dagaabas (42.9%) are the majority, followed by Walas (40.3%), Sissalas (5.8%).
4.1.11 Religious affiliation of return migrants

As shown by Figure 4.7 over half of the return migrant interviewed were Christian forming (51.3%), they were followed by Moslems (42.3%), traditionalists (5.1%) and those without any religion only (1.3%). This data is contrary to census results that Wa Municipal is predominantly a Moslem community where Moslem constitute about 44% of the population. Christian population is about 24.7% and Traditionalist constituting 27%. The results of data analysis from the field also support this finding because the Dagaabas who are predominantly Christian return to origin (46.2%) more as compared with the Walas who are predominantly Moslems and has return rate of (33.3%). In addition, the Dagaabas in the study area are more than the Walas. The Dagaabas constitute 42.9 percent whereas the Walas form 40.3 per cent and Sissala 5.8 per cent.
4.2 Reasons for Migrating

Migration has always been a key feature of people’s survival and advancement strategies especially in Africa and other developing countries. Various reasons accounts for why people migrate. However, the major reasons according to migration studies are social, economic, physical, demographic, cultural and communication factors (GSS 1995). Table 4.5 shows the reported reasons by the return migrants leaving the Wa Municipal their origin. The economic reason (job) constitutes 35.9%.

Out of the seven member focus group discussants, all of them stated lack of jobs in their area as the main cause. They went further to state that it is only four out of the twelve months that they can farm.
Cletus is one of the group members and this is what he said ‘after completing harvesting our crop by November, the rest of the months ahead we have no work to do so most of us travel to Sefwi and Afram plains to look for jobs to do to help us earn a living.’

When the researcher asked the kind of job they do at Sefwi and Afram Plains, Cletus stated that, ‘Farming of course, every year we move there during the same period so looking for jobs there is not difficult. Damata is one female member contributed that ‘this has been the trend yearly and they leave us the women to cater for the children and parent in laws’

Apart from the economic factors the focus group discussants did not indicate any other cause as being responsible for their migration. Education is the second forming close to one-third (31.8%). Social reasons (join family/marry 14.1% and avoid family pressure 7.7%) constituted 21.8 per cent of the responds. Seasonal migration constitutes 10.3% and other reasons for migrating forming only 1.3 per cent.

**Table 4. 5 Reasons for Migrating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Looking for job</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Migration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid family pressure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join family/ marriage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

4.2.1: Networks and decision to migrate

A social network is one important determinants of the likelihood to migrate. It involves connections made up of individuals and associations or organizations which are held
together by different sort of relationship such as friendship, kinship, community members, religion, schoolmate, and common interest. As noted by Caldwell (1968) networks include presence of friends or relatives in the destination locality, also refer to as migration networks. Poros (2011) noted that a migrant’s ability to move to a particular destination, find a job and housing, open up a business, participate in the development of their home country, and access health care can all be directly impacted by or even dependent upon the migrant’s social network. Migrant networks also determine whether and to what extent immigrants integrate into their host community while also maintaining a connection to their origin. In Figure 4.8 it is observed that more than four-fifth of the return migrants (82%) stated that networks influenced their decision to migrate.

Using a qualitative interview, the researcher wanted to know why they migrate to specific locations and this was what Nanjama said,

Long long ago our fore fathers migrated to some of these towns like Obuasi, Prestea, Tarkwa and Bogosu to mine gold. Now the gold business is collapsing so our attention was drawn to new areas we can live and have access to vast land for farming to seed ourselves and see some to pay our children school fees. Afram plain has become one such place because you can farm all year round. Our senior brother Kanyiri went there in the 1980s and realizing that the place was good sent message home so in this community, Afram plains is where most of us migrate to because our senior brother I told you about has build a house there and have farms there’

This statement was supported by Kobina in his contribution stated that,

‘Some of our relatives are living there so we do not have problem when we go there, I even have a farm over there’

A little below one-fifth of the respondents (18%) however, indicated that they did not benefit from networks to migrate.
Various theories have been propounded to justify the decision to return. Hugo, (1983) as stated in (GSS, 1995 p163) documented that the decision to return to place of origin, to a large extent, will be influenced by the person involved in the initial decision making process to migrate. Based on the source of the decision making regarding migration, migrants can be divided into those who take the decision to migrate for themselves and/or for other members of their family and those who migration is derived from the decision made by others. The latter may also involve group decision making as part of the process of optimizing household resources.
Table 4.6 indicates the decision of the respondents to return. Based on the source of decision making process to return, personal decision (57.7%) was the highest decided on their own to migrate. Close to two-fifth of the return migrants (38.5%) indicated that their decision to return was influenced by family/household consideration. Other decision constituted (3.8%).

Table 4.6 Percentage of decision to return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision to return</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/household</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

4.4: Migration and integration

Integration of migrants in the host community is a determining factor whether the migrant can stay, move to another place or return to the origin. Nabila (1974) has documented that return migration occurs when the migrant fails to adjust to or fit into the way of life in the new environment. One of the objectives of the study was to find out if the return migrants were able to integrate in the host community. All the seven member focus group discussants agreed to the response by Prudence, one of the group members as she indicated that,
‘We are all Ghanaian so everywhere you go within this country you are welcome, Sefwi is more than Dagaaba community because we the migrants are hard working so the natives like us and also every village you go you are sure to meet a Dagaaba’” Kobina on his contribution stated that ‘I even married a native of Sefwi and we have one child’.

4.5: Meeting Expectation(s) at the Destination

Most migrants had expectation and objective for migrating. Whereas some return to origin, others move on to different destinations. During the study, more than three-fourth of the respondents (76%) had their expectation and objective met at the destination.

I planned to make a lot of money at Sefwi Bekwei four years ago before migrating so I can come back and invest. By God’s grace I have been able to raise some funds to support my mother’s shea butter business at home, according to Prudence. Three others supported her claim. An opinion leader also a return migrant however, indicated that his expectation were not met simply because his objective was to land a job as a security officer with the Anglogold Ashanti at Obuasi and all the methods I employed was fruitless and after three years decided to return home to sell home used bicycles. I also did not meet my expectation at Afram Plains because my intention was to become a caretaker in one of the large plantation. However everywhere I went I was told I am a (small boy) not old enough to be entrusted plantation. I therefore resorted to engaging in by day which does not gain you the much needed money, a 24 years old young man story.

The respondents whose expectation and objectives not met were 24 per cent. These results could be that since most of the respondents migrated using networks as has been recorded above, the system seems to help them in the destination in terms of securing accommodation, jobs and were well integrated. They probably could feel at home. See Figure 4.9
4.6: Reasons for returning to origin

The main objective for this study is to investigate the reasons that are associated with return migration in the Wa Municipality. Various literatures have given a host of factors that are responsible for migrants returning home. Although most literature on reasons for return migration point to economic, other non economic reasons are strong family ties and the desire to be in the company of one’s own kin and longtime friends at the origin and the desire to return during vacation trips home (King, 2000). Also during the wet season, migrants go back to cultivate their farms. Labourers, mainly men, also move from rural areas to urban areas or to other rural areas where there is economic activity. (GSS, 1995)

The reasons given by the return migrants for returning to origin are shown in Figure 4.10. Over two-fifth (41%) returned because of family reasons such as coming back to take care.
of sick parents at home, coming home to marry and coming back home to cater for other siblings after the death of parent(s). This reason was supported by member of the focus group,

Bagyo and three others indicated that ‘it is primarily due to family reasons, you see, every year we have to come home to visit our left behind family members and look at the condition of the other relations. We also return to renovate the houses we left and prepare our land awaiting the rains to start so we can plant our usual yam, maize and other cereals

Return motives include a variety of economic, social and family-related, as well as political reasons (King, 2000). Existing empirical evidence shows that social and family-related reasons are of particular importance. The wish to rejoin family and friends, homesickness, problems of adjustment in the host country, racial harassment, and the aim to enjoy an improved social status back home are significant reasons for return.

Those returning for seasonal farming constitute 7.7%.

Another member of the group Cletus and two others in their contribution indicated that, ‘We returned to cultivate our farms in the origin since the rains have just started to store food till next year, it will be difficult for us to transport food from Plains to this place to feed our relatives here. If we do not come home to farm what are our children left behind going to feed on till the lean season’

This was followed by others who have saved enough money (21.8%), those with no job (10.3%), completion of education (7.7%). There are those who returned due to old age or on retirement (5.1%), homesick or not able to integrate (3.8%) and sickness only (2.6%).
Figure 4.10 Reasons for returning to origin

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

4.7: Return migration and improved living standard

The Ghana Living Standard Surveys aimed to measure the living standard of people including migrants, non-migrants and return migrants. One of the objectives of the study was to find out if the return migrants’ living standards improve after return.

Figure 4.11 indicates the respondent’s living standards after their return. Close to 90 per cent of the return migrants (87.2%) stated that migrating has improved their living standard. When this question was posed to the group all the members except one stated that their living standard has seen huge improvement after returning to origin.

Nanjama’s contribution was corroborated by five others when he stated that, ‘As you can see this motorbike was brought when I returned home last year, now I am mobile, previously I used to walk to Wa on market days with my wife with our
farm produce, but now life has been very easy because of the migration’. Other also stated that they have been able to roof their houses with aluminum sheets brought when returning home. ‘After I returned two years back I started renovating our mud family house with cement blocks’ according to Cletus.

A little over 10 per cent of the return migrants (12.8%) however, indicated that migrating did not improve their living standard.

Kobina corroborated this assertion during the focus group indicated that his migration and subsequent return home has not improved his living standard. He did indicate that

Although I integrated very well in the host community migration has made me worse of’ my farm was destroyed by cattle and could not raised funds to repay the loan of three thousand five hundred Ghana cedis (3,500) I contracted from a rural bank. In spite of this predicament, I intend re-migrate another time.

This result is supported by Anarfi and Kwankye (2009) who found in their studies that most independent child migrants eventually return to their places of origin. They observed that when they return the independent child migrants are better off in terms of personal possessions, at least in the short run, than their non-migrant counterparts. Also using data from the 1991/92 and 1998/99 rounds of the Ghana Living Standards Survey (GLSS), it was found that migrants have a higher standard of living than non-migrants.
As I told you earlier this motor-bike was brought when I was returning home two year back, besides I am constructing a new cement block house out of the money I made some years back, a statement by Cletus. Another middle aged man Bagyo, I brought a motor-king three years ago and gave to my junior brother to use for commercial purpose. It is given me some returns. Most of the relatives I returned with came home with monies to expand their farms here. If you are only hard working you are likely to return with one asset or the other. Another lady remarked, I returned with personal cooking utensils last two years and when returning this year I brought cloths and bed for myself.

Contributing to this is the fact that migrants returned with better inputs, equipments and machinery which, for instance, led to a reduction in family dependence on hired or manual labour. Both in the short and long run it is family output, and hence, incomes and welfare increased or were enhanced (GSS, 1995 p208)
4.9: **Return migrants intention to re-migrate**

Migration literature has documented that most return migrants re-migrate as a results of several factors. During the study, respondents’ intentions to re-migrate were somehow balanced. Whereas 37.2 per cent indicated their intention to re-migrate, one-third (33.3%) of the respondents did not intend to re-migrate. There are others who were undecided (21.8%) as at the time they were interviewed. Others constituting (7.7%) however, did not know if they will re-migrate or not. See Table 4.7

In this area the drought is fast approaching some farming these day is becoming a disappointed profession. Look this year the rain is supposed that fall on our crops as we have already planted but it is becoming erratic. If it refuses to rain at the right time and our crops die, you can be sure most of the youth will re-migrate again. After harvesting of the farm produce most of the farmers will re-migrate and this has been the trend yearly. An opinion leader told the researcher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Response</strong></th>
<th><strong>No. of Respondents</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per cent (%)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014
4.10: Respondents’ reasons to re-migrate at another time

Out of the thirty (30) respondents who had intention to re-migrate, Figure 4.12 indicates that twelve (12) of the respondents stated that their expectations/objectives in the origin were not met. This category of return migrants were of the view that the origin has seen some improvement in terms of developments and based on that they moved back only to be disappointed. Another eleven (11) of the return migrants stated that they needed more money to support their household. Five (5) return migrants will re-migrate to complete their unfinished businesses at the destination. Only two (2) others stated their reasons as not able to re-integrate at the origin.

![Pie chart showing reasons for re-migration](image)

**Figure 4.12: Return migrants reasons to re-migrate at another time**

**Source:** Own fieldwork, 2014
4.11: Re-integration of Return Migrants

Re-integration is a determining factor when it comes to return migrants deciding to stay or re-migrating. In Table 4.8 respondents who did not face any problem of re-integration back at the origin were about four-fifth (78.2%). Close to one-fifth of the return migrants (19.2%) however stated that they faced difficulty re-integrating back at the origin. (2.6%) did not know if they had problem re-integrating or not.

During the qualitative study, when the members were asked whether they faced difficulty re-integrating at home all the seven group members agreed that they did not face any difficulty re-integrating at home. Damata has this to say,

‘This is our home and home sweet home, if not poverty why do we travel and leave our spouses behind’. Another member Prudence also stated that ‘even though we migrate to other places we still communicate with our relatives at the origin constantly, besides we do come for funerals so although we seems to be far away from home we are no strangers any time we return home.

Table 4.8 Return migrants and re-integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faced difficulty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not face difficulty</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own fieldwork, 2014*
4.12: Remittance and return migration

Remittances from the migrants to relatives back home play a key role to improve the living conditions of the relatives. According to a migration research study in Ghana, migrants have been noted for establishing links with their origins through regular visits, by remitting cash and gifts to non-migrants family members and extended relations, and by making substantial investments in durable capital goods such as goods, farms etc (GSS1995).

4.12.1: Return migrants and remittance

It was discovered that a little over half of the return migrants (55.1%) actually sent remittance home. Those who did not remit home were 44.9 per cent according to Table 4.9. This result could be that a sizeable number of the respondents were full time students who did not engage in any paid job.

Table 4.9 Return migrants response on remittance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

4.12.2 Return migrants frequency of remitting

Table 4.10 indicates the frequency at which the return migrants remitted home. Out of the forty-three (43) return migrants who remitted home majority of them twenty-eight (28)
remitted home as and when their support were needed. Eight (8) remitted home between every six to twelve months and seven (7) remitted home between every one and five months.

**Table 4. 10** Return migrants frequency of remitting home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As and when my support needed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014

4.12.3: Means of remitting home

Remittance is one of the important aspects in the study of migration. On what means the respondents remitting home, Table 4.11 shows that majority of twenty-nine (29) out of the forty-three (43) return migrants indicated that they remitted through relatives and friends. Other means of remitted were through bank accounts five (5), Bank (instant money transfer) four (4), Mobile money two (2), other two (2) and through Post office one (1).
Table 4.11 Means of remitting home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Money</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Accounts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank (instant money transfer)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative/friends</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own fieldwork, 2014
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.0 Introduction

Chapter five consists of the Summary, Findings, Conclusion, Recommendations and Limitations of the Study.

5.1 Summary of Findings

Migration has been a way of life in Ghana. Boahen has documented that virtually all the ethnic groups in present Ghana claim to have emigrated from somewhere other than their present location (Boahen 1975). People migrate mainly for socio-economic reasons. Return migration has become very important in migration studies. This is because of remittances that the origin seeks to gain as well as the epistemic transfers by the return migrants. Internal migration like international migration need more focus by social scientists especially demographers because of its implications on the economies. Whereas migrants return home for good other return and re-migrate. Others do not return at all. In Ghana, there is the perception that migrants who refused to return home are seen as failures and aimless according to Caldwell (1969). As a result, migrants maintain close ties with origin and occasionally move back home to participate in funerals, marriage ceremonies and festive occasion. The objective of this study was to investigate the factor associated with return migration in the Wa Municipality in the Upper West Region. The study was motivated by data from (GLSS 6) report that put the Upper West as the region with the highest net-migration in Ghana. The main occupational activity of the region is agricultural. Manpower labour is lost especially during the dry season. Wa Municipal is predominantly an agricultural area (72%) also affected. As a result return migration into the region is very important. This study has been able to find out some of the factors that
are associated with return migration into the Wa Municipal. Family reasons (41%) were the major factor identified during the study. Some of the findings include looking for job (35.9%) as the reason for migrating.

During the study it was also discovered that return migration is higher for younger and more educated individuals. Return migrants 15-44 years constituted more than three forth (78%) of the entire study. This phenomenon can probably be explained by the fact that most of the migrants were students in their youthful age who have returned home after completion of various levels of education at the destination.

Another important determinant of the likelihood to migrate include the presence of friends or relatives in the destination locality. (migration networks). Majority of the return migrants (82.1%) used networks to migrate.

The incentive to return to origin is greater for those whose objectives were met. During the study, more than three-fourth of the respondents (76%) had their expectation and objective met at the destination.

Migrant farmers (37.12%) returned to origin more than any other profession. This could probably due to seasonal migration as a result of rainfall pattern in the savannah belt.

Family reasons (41%) identified as the main reasons for returning home. A little over two-fifth (41%) returned because of family reasons such as coming back to take care of sick parents at home, coming home to marry and coming back home to cater for other siblings after the death of parent(s).

Finally, return migration home has improved the living standard of migrants as close to nine-tenth of the return migrants (87.2%) stated that migrating has improved their living standard. Only a little of (12.8%) did not see improvement in their living standards.
Migration which existed in the colonial era has been a way of life and it will continue to be so due to the imbalance of resources within the system. Migration, both within and across borders, has long been a significant livelihood strategy for Ghanaians (Anarfi and Jagare, 2008; Kabki 2007). This is expected to continue in the coming years in Ghana as a major livelihood-enhancing strategy for many people irrespective of the geographical location in the country. People migrate in response to needs such as better job opportunities, favourable ecological conditions, fertile land for agriculture, and family reasons among others. There has been an increase in internal migration due to improved transportation system that has facilitated movement. The pattern of internal migration in Ghana is characterised by north to the south, rural urban migration and return migration even though the latter have been under studies. Data on return migration has been recorded in the Ghana Living Standard Survey (GLSS 4) document. Migrants return to origin after retirement, education, and when their objectives of migrating are met among others. In addition, with migrants always maintaining close ties with their relatives in the origin will return home no matter how long they stay in the destination.

Many theories support migrant returning to origin. Galor and Stark (1990) have noted that, the original plan of migrants involved the eventual return to their origin after accumulating resource abroad. The Wa municipal is the capital of the Upper West Region which is among the three (3) most under developed in regions in Ghana. According to the Ghana living Standard Survey (6) (GLSS 6) the region is the leader in terms of out net-migration. This implies that the region lose its labour man-power to other regions and attract less more than any other region in Ghana. Return migrants contribution therefore is very important to study since its implications can have both negative and positive impact on the
communities. The importance of return migration such as remittances and epistemic transfer brought to the origin can impact positively on the origin. Besides, refusal of the migrants to return to the origin can also impact negatively on the origin. Considering its importance return migration will continue to be part of the migration cycle.

Finally, the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods has enable us to gain a richer and much more understanding on the impact of return migration on the sending areas than by using just one methodology. In this case, evidence from the two sets of data has reinforced and confirmed each other.

5.3 Recommendations

After a careful examination of the findings of the study, the following recommendations are proposed for consideration.

Firstly, it is recommended that there should be construction of infrastructure like dams and other irrigation facilities to provide all year round farming to encourage prospective migrants to stay and cultivate the land especially during the dry season.

Also, policies and programs must be designed to both retain population in, and attract population to the region. Effort must therefore be made to ensure that the Savannah Accelerated Development Authority (SADA) project succeeds and the lessons learnt applied to other regions of the country that are experiencing this phenomenon.

In addition, data collection on internal return migration in Ghana needs to be improved and timely. This will go a long way to help researchers, policy makers and planners in studying how issue relating to return migration can impact the country.
Also, efforts must be spared to ensure that the on-going process to develop a National Migration Policy for the country become operational by passing it into law in the shortest possible time.

Finally, the academia and other sectors of the field of migration (multi-sectoral) collaborate and find solutions to the negative aspect of return migration in particular and migration in general.

5.4 Limitations

- The duration of the research is too short for further literature readings. As a result of limited time constraint, the original sample size of the quantitative responses from one hundred (100) respondents was cut short to seventy eight (78). The responses of the one hundred respondents would have enriched this study.

- The timing of the study could also affect the final results in that the period coincided with the beginning of farming where migrant farmers return to origin to prepare their land awaiting the rains to begin. Large scale return could influence the outcome of the findings.
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Hello, I am Joseph Tenkorang, a Student of University of Ghana, Legon, and as part of the requirements for the award of a Master of Arts degree in Migration Studies, students are to collect information from some selected communities for academic exercise and Wa happened to be one of such community. I would like to talk to Return Migrants aged 15 years and above. I assure you that all the information obtained will remain confidential. I would very much appreciate your participation in the research.

Thank you.
SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Sex
   Male………………………………1
   Female……………………………2

2. How old are you?(in completed years)
   15-24………………………………1
   25-34………………………………2
   35-44………………………………3
   45-54………………………………4
   55 and above………………………5

3. What is your marital status?
   Never married…………………....1
   Married……………………………2
   Loose union / living together……..3
   Separated………………………….4
   Divorced…………………………..5
   Widowed………………………….6

4. To which ethnic group do you belong?
   Wala………………………………1
   Dagaaba…………………………..2
   Sissala……………………………..3
   Lobi……………………………….4
   Other (specify)…………….………5

5. What is your religious affiliation?
   Moslem……………………………1
   Christian…………………………...2
   Traditionalist……………………….3
   Other religion………………………4
No religion……………………….5

6. In which Region/Country were you born?
   WR……………………………..1
   CR……………………………..2
   GAR…………………………..3
   VR……………………………..4
   ER……………………………..5
   AR……………………………..6
   BAR…………………………..7
   NR……………………………..8
   UER…………………………..9
   UWR…………………………10

7. What is the highest educational level you completed or currently attending?
   None…………………………….1
   Primary………………………..2
   Middle/ JSS……………………3
   Secondary /SHS……………….4
   Tertiary……………………….5

SECTION B: MIGRATION EXPERIENCES

1. What was your main occupation before you migrated?
   ………………………………………………………………………...

2. What was the main reason for migrating?
   Looking for job……………………………...1
   Seasonal farming……………………………2
   Education……………………………………3
   Avoid family pressure…………………………4
   Join family/ marriage………………………5
   Other (specify)……………………………..6
3. How old were you at the time you migrated?

15-24………………………………………1
25-34………………………………………2
35-44………………………………………3
45-54………………………………………4
55 and above……………………………5

4. What was the highest educational level you completed at the time of migration?

None………………………………1
Primary…………………………….2
Middle/ JSS………………………..3
Secondary /SHS…………………4
Tertiary……………………………5

5. In which Region/Country were you living previously?

WR…………………………………………1
CR…………………………………………2
GAR………………………………………..3
VR………………………………………….4
ER…………………………………………..5
AR………………………………………….6
BAR………………………………………..7
NR………………………………………….8
UER…………………………………………9
UWR………………………………………10
Country (Specify)…………………………11

6. Where were you living previously?

Rural……………………………………1
Urban……………………………………2

7. How long have you stayed in this community after you returned

Less than 3 months…………………………1
3 to 6 months……………………………2
8. Now that you are back home, how long do you intend to stay in this community?

Less than 3 months.................................1
3 to 6 months.................................2
7 to 9 months.................................3
10 to 12 months.................................4
More than 1 year.................................5
Undecided........................................6
Forever...........................................7

9. What was the main reason for moving back to the origin?

Sickness.............................................1
Not able to integrate/ homesick...............2
Family reasons (marriage, funeral, to take care of home)............3
To establish business/saved enough money.........................4
Old age /Retired..................................5
No job..............................................6
Seasonal farming..................................7
Other (specify)....................................8

10. Would you say the migration has improved your living standard?

Yes.................................................1
No.................................................2
Don’t Know.....................................3

11. Did you have any expectations/objectives before migrating?

Yes.................................................1
12. Were your expectation(s)/objective(s) met?
   Yes…………………………………………….1
   No……………………………………………2

13. Did you migrate with any of your household/ family member?
   Yes………………………………………………1
   No………………………………………………2

14. Who was/were left behind?
   Wife alone………………………………………………..1
   Wife and children /child………………………………….2
   Children/ child alone……………………………………..3
   Other relative (s)………………………………………....4
   Other (specify)…………………………………………..5

15. Did you benefit in terms of information from someone you know in connection with how to get to destination or someone who live in the destination? (Networking)
   Yes…………………………………………………………1
   No…………………………………………………………2
   Don’t Know………………………………………………3

16. Were you able to integrate well in the destination?
   Yes…………………………………………………………1
   No…………………………………………………………2
   Don’t Know………………………………………………3

17. Did you face any difficulty re-integrating into this community after return?
18. How long did you stay in the destination before your recent return?
   Less than 6 months.............................................1
   6 months to 1 year.............................................2
   1 year to 2 years..............................................3
   More than 2 years.............................................4

19. Whose decision did you return?
   Personal.............................................................1
   Family/household...............................................2
   Other (specify)....................................................3

20. Did you acquire any asset(s) as a result of your migration?
   Yes........................................................................1
   No........................................................................2 (skip to q. 22)
   Don’t Know..........................................................3 (skip to q. 22)

21. What asset(s) did you acquire? (Maximum of 3 from most important)
   _____________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________

22. Do you intend to re-migrate at another time?
   Yes........................................................................1
   No........................................................................2 (skip to section D)
   Undecided..............................................................3 (skip to section D)
   Don’t Know..........................................................4 (skip to section D)
23. Would you like to re-migrate to the same destination or to somewhere else?

Same destination…………………………………………………………1

Somewhere else………………………………………………………….2

Undecided……………………………………………………………………3

24. Why do you want to re-migrate?

Expectation/objectives not met in destination……………………………1

Expectation/objectives not met in origin………………………………….2

Need more money to help improve household living condition………..3

To complete unfinished business……………………………………..4

Other (specify) …………………………………………………………….5

SECTION C: EMPLOYMENT

1. Are you currently working?

   Yes………………………………………………………………………..1

   No………………………………………………………………………….2

2. In what industry did you work at the destination?

   Agric……………………………………………………………………….1

   Mining/(galamsey)………………………………………………………2

   Construction………………………………………………………………3

   Security………………………………………………………………….4

   No work…………………………………………………………………5 (skip to section D)

   Other (specify)………………………………………………………….6

3. Who were you working for?

   Government………………………………………………………………1

   Private formal……………………………………………………….2

   Private informal………………………………………………………….3

   Self……………………………………………………………………….4
4. Comparing the work in the origin before you migrated and the work at the destination, which of them would you consider as better?

Work at the origin………………………………1
Work at the destination…………………………2
No difference…………………………………..3
Don’t Know…………………………………….4

5. Did you gain any work/job experience which has helped you at the origin?

Yes………………………………………………1
No………………………………………………2
Don’t Know……………………………………3

SECTION D: REMITTANCE

1. Did you remit household/family at origin?

Yes…………………………………………….1
No…………………………………………….2 (End interview)

2. Who did you often remit?

Spouse and children…………………………..1
Spouse…………………………………………2
Children/child…………………………………3
Parents…………………………………………4
Other relatives…………………………………5
Non relative…………………………………6
Other (specify)…………………………………7

3. Through what means did you often remit

Mobile money transfer…………………………….1
Banks accounts……………………………………2
Bank (Instant money transfer) ........................................3
Post Office ..........................................................4
Relative/friend .......................................................5
Other (specify) ......................................................6

4. How frequent did you remit?
   6-12 months ....................................................1
   1-5 months .....................................................2
   As and when my support is needed ......................3
   Other (specify) ................................................5

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING
Appendix B: Interview Guide for Focus Group Discussion
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FOCUS DISCUSSION GROUP – SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>RELIGION</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NO. OF CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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</tbody>
</table>
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INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

SECTION A: MIGRATION HISTORY

1. What motivated you to migrate?
2. Did anyone assist you to migrate? (Social network) Probe for the kind of assistance
3. Were you able to integrate in the destination?
4. Can you tell about your living condition before and after migration?
5. What are the factors associated with your return to origin?
6. Were you able to re-integrate well in the origin?
7. Do you intend to re-migrate at another time?
8. Did you migrate with household member(s) and if no, who was/were left behind?
9. Were your expectation(s) met at destination?
10. Did you bring any asset(s), if yes what are the main assets you brought.