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ABSTRACT

The importance of social capital is not only recognized in the sphere of migration but also embedded in economics, social and political scope which makes it a significant tool in social setting. This study focused on how migrants accessed social capital in the process of migration and its effect on their livelihood at the destination. This study examined the various forms of social capital that migrants use in their migration process as well as their livelihood strategies. It also explored how existing social capital can be improved to address the needs of migrants at their destination. The theoretical background encompasses the social capital concept, its related models and how it results in migration. Semi structured questionnaires and an interview guide were the data collection tools used. The study involved both qualitative and quantitative data. The quantitative data made use of the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents as well as the forms of social capital they employed. The qualitative data involved key informant interviews used in obtaining adequate knowledge on social capital and its related networks that were patronized by would be migrants. The sample size was 120 migrants within the study area (Mamobi and Madina). The quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS version 32 while the qualitative was done thematically by referring to the objectives. Findings from the study indicated that a substantive number of migrants relied on social capital not only in their migration but also as a livelihood strategy. The most form of social capital relied on by migrants was the bonding social capital from relations and friends. From the findings, it was evident that migrants were confronted with certain challenges in relation to accommodation and employment. It is concluded that the reliance on social network impacted positively on the lives of migrants as well as their families. The study recommended that government through its local agencies (Ministry of Works and Housing) as well as NGOs ought to provide temporary shelters in migrant prone areas in order to reduce migrants prevailing usage of the street and shops of urban settlement as their abode.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Mobility of people from one place to another is a common phenomenon in the world. The liberalization of most economies and the reduced restriction on movement through policy has increased migration in both time and space (Abel & Sander, 2014). Critical to migration is the movement of people from one part of a country to another part of the same country and movement across countries. The former is what is commonly called internal migration and the other constituting international migration (Czaika & De Haas, 2014). The decision to migrate is a well thought out activity which is tied to several reasons and its effects can move beyond the individual’s decision to move (Ellis, 2003; Carling & Collins, 2018). In addition, people may move for several reasons including for leisure or social activity. Invariably, economic motives are always the main drivers for most migration (Heery, Kelly, & Waddington, 2003). The search for opportunities to make a better living and the need to escape from current economic hardships have always been noted as the main reasons people adopt migration as a livelihood strategy.

Development studies have not paid much attention to labour migration but it however, makes an appeal to participate in the analysis of migration within agricultural and rural developments. It highlights that the movement of people is more common than often presumed, and this recurs throughout the existence of humans (de Haan, 1999).

The significance of migration cannot be underestimated, due to the intricate role it plays in advancing socio-economic development for most countries and regions across the world.
(Sampath, 2014). Due to the importance of migration in terms of the rural livelihoods of many people, there ought to be policies that support population mobility. Possibilities should equally be explored to enhance the positive effects of migration through remittances (Sikder & Higgins, 2017).

There are several case studies that portray how migration is embedded in the social and economic organization of most societies. For instance, in most countries in South Asia such as Bangladesh and Philippines, there are communities and tribal groups who migrate to different parts of Europe and the Gulf countries with the migration pattern very well socially organized (Asia-Pacific Migration report, 2015). They also use this strategy as major means of escaping poverty and helping their family members (Murphy, 2002). It has been reported that in the year 2000, about 150 million people lived outside their place of birth. Out of this estimated number, the share proportion of migrants who can be described as economic or labour migrants were about 97 million (Colby & Ortman, 2017). These figures are expected to increase due to increasing economic stress conditions in most developing countries.

While migration has become more pervasive across the world and within individual countries, there are issues relating to access to migration, decisions about when, where and how to move and knowledge regarding outcomes of migration as a livelihood strategy which most migrants must consider in the quest to move (Kothari, 2002). These factors are also dependent upon the resources and official policies available mostly at the destination countries. According to De Haan, & de Haan, (2000); Van Hear et al. (2018), resources and assets available to migrants will determine the distance, opportunities and the specific livelihood activities available to migrants. Thus, the socio-economic differentiation of migrants has significant effects on the outcomes of migration.
In addition to the above factors that shape migratory patterns, migrants are also faced with several challenges after arrival. Most economic migrants have to juggle their way through the new environment due to factors that hinder their integration process. Some migrants also move from deprived areas of a country to major urban centers with little or no capital to start life with. Again, this problem becomes more pronounced, especially when formal institutional support to help migrants make a living or engage in useful economic ventures is minimal or non-existent.

In view of these difficulties, it is noted that migrants rely on various forms of social organization to make decisions about their migration in order to find and sustain a living in the urban environment. One of such feature of social organization that migrants normally utilize is social capital. Social capital in its simplest forms describes the various forms of social relations and networks that people fall on as a means of assistance to juggle their way through difficult circumstances or make their lives productive (Pieterse, 2003). The concept has received much attention in migration studies, especially how migrants are able to use it as a means of helping them survive in their new environment. This study adds to the literature on migration by exploring how migrants can use social capital in the migration process and maintain their livelihoods in poor urban communities.

1.2. Problem statement

The need to address economic challenges is a critical factor that drives mobility from one area to another. Studies conducted on migrants’ resettlement in host communities have shown that migration has had positive impacts on the lives and living conditions of migrants. Drawing lessons from Pakistani cities, Adams (1996) and Lu (2014) argue that migration is employed to diversify income sources, and remittances from migrants by providing for the needs of families left behind. In Lesotho, a study by Gustafsson and Makonnen (1994) also highlighted how
migration to South African mining communities was used as a livelihood strategy and by extension reduced poverty. In Ghana, a study by Awumbilla et al. (2014) also shows that migrants were of the opinion that their lives have improved since they found jobs in the informal sector.

In circumstantial terms, migrants’ journeys may be precarious as they may be met with little social support in host communities. Again, the poverty situation of migrants may be worsened as they may not find existing jobs; they may also experience difficulties accessing basic social services and infrastructure. It is within this context that migrants depend on social capital to seek the needed information and help on the prospects of the journey. Social capital refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Siisiainen, 2003). Some studies have focused on how important social capital is for migration processes but little attention has been paid to how social capital contributes to livelihoods at their destination. In Ghana, studies by Awumbilla et al. (2016) expound on how different categories of migrants can fashion out their stay in major cities by relying on complex forms of social capital, especially on social network.

Given that the study conducted by Awumbilla et al. (2016) has been useful in understanding the link between social networking, migration and livelihoods, much attention was paid to domestic and construction migrant workers. The current study also seeks to move further to other categories of migrant workers especially those engaged in trade. Again, the study contributes to filling the knowledge gap by exploring social capital as a livelihood strategy among traders to address their livelihood needs in the Ghanaian context. The study further examined the use of social capital as a tool for migrants’ migration decisions and addressed their livelihood needs in urban poor communities in Ghana.
1.3 Research objectives

- To examine the socio-demographic characteristic of migrants in Madina and Mamobi communities.
- To examine the forms of social capital used by migrants in their migration process and livelihood.
- To examine the ways by which the existing social capital can be improved to address the existing needs of migrants.

1.4 Research question

- What are the various forms of social capital available for migrants and how have they used them to sustain their livelihoods?
- How did migrants use social capital in their decision to relocate into their present residence and choice of livelihood?
- In what ways can the existing social capital be improved to help in addressing the livelihood needs of migrants?

1.5. Relevance of the study

This study adds to the literature on how social capital becomes a resource when individuals are able to draw on them when needed, not only in their migration process but also in their livelihood.

The study brought to bear the various forms of social capital migrants draw on in their livelihood, how migrants access social capital when they are relocating and how the various forms of social capital available to them can be improved to positively impact their livelihood at their destination.
Based on findings from the study, recommendations were made for which policy makers in Ghana can adopt to reduce the rate of rural urban migration and the concentration of migrants in urban slum areas within the capital city.

1.6. Definition of concepts

This section gives clarification to definitions of some concepts this study adopted.

Migration process: Though this is quite complex in relation to where it ends, for this study it begins from the individual’s decision to migrate while at the origin, the preparations involved before migration and the time frame (one month and above) before the individual finally gets to the destination. It ends at the destination because that is the interest of this study.

Social capital: Relationship with another person that results in having access to information, a job, accommodation or any help.

Migrant: A person living outside a known region where he or she is familiar with.

Livelihoods: An activity one engages in to help secure certain basic necessities of life.

Private Public Partnership: It is an agreement between government and Private Agencies in funding projects.

Offtake Agreement: An agreement between government and a private producer, where the government buys an amount of the produce from the private producer within a period of time or buys from the private producer when the producer does not get a number of customers.
1.7. Organization of the study

The study contains six relevant chapters including this chapter. Chapter two encompasses the literature review and the theoretical foundations of the study. The third chapter comprises of methodology the study adopted. Chapters four and five contain discussions of results on findings from the analysis done on data from the study. Chapter six, which is the final chapter presents summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literature and theoretical framework. This includes various studies done by other researchers, institutions and countries with respects to theoretical perspective on migration, migration as a tool for livelihood, social capital as a tool for improving livelihood, and the effects of social capital in the migration process.

2.1 Migration and reasons for migrating

Despite the channels migrants rely on, other motivational factors at the destination serve as pull factors for migrants to move (Rozek, Svoboda, Harackiewicz, Hulleman, & Hyde, 2017).

The intention to migrate is based on individual choices which are related to their level of deprivation or the desire to better themselves. They have the perception that through migration the potential to achieving such aspiration becomes valid (Näre, Walsh, & Baldassar, 2017).

Migration has been defined in various ways by different scholars; however, there are some basic tenets that run through all these scholarly definitions. That is, the movement across spatial location, thus from origin to a destination. This implies living outside one’s origin, as well as the length of time spent at the destination by the migrants (Greenwood, 1985).

The duration of stay could however be permanent or temporary because decisions for migrating can be influenced based on factors at both origin and destination. The Human Rights Commission defines migrants as persons living outside their state who are not subjected to the
legal protection in the resident state or do not enjoy the general legal rights intrinsic to the host country (Sewell, 2015).

A migrant is a person who has moved or is moving across international borders or within a state away from his or her habitual place of residence regardless of the individual’s legal status, whether the movement is voluntary or involuntary as well as taking into consideration the length of stay (Andrijasevic & Walters, 2010). Migration can be voluntary or involuntary as acknowledged by various international organizations’ who manage aspects of it.

Voluntary migration is based on an individual’s decision to migrate which can be influenced by push or pull factors. These factors can be linked to economic and socio-culture reasons which attracts migrants to their expected place of destination by being dissatisfied with the place of origin (Skeldon, 2005).

Voluntary migration involves a person’s choice to move freely from origin to a destination of choice based on economic and non-economic motives (Vega, Traut, & Neil, 2008). The involuntary migration is however more of forced movement due to political or environmental crises. The under taking of developmental projects which may result in the movement of mass population who are internally displaced can also be classified as involuntary migration (McMichael, Barnett, & McMichael, 2012). With involuntary migration, there are factors like violence and the abuse of power which displaces people who are victimized on reason of their race, religion, ethnic group or political opinion.

This threatens such individuals’ rights and compels them to migrate, resulting in protection by foreign countries in relation to international contracts (Federal Department of Justice and Policy, 2014). There is the environmental aspect such as drought, famine and also flood which leads to the displacement of people involuntarily (Emmers, 2007).
The relevance of the discussion on migration and reason for migrating to this work has to do with the willingness and unwillingness which results in people migrating from their known origin to their destination with the hope of meeting the purpose for which they migrated.

**Theoretical perspective of migration**

There have been several debates on migration and development which keeps emphasizing on the positive and negative aspects of migration and its impacts on development.

This begun from the developmentalist optimism era during the 1950’s and 1960’s which saw migration as brain gain in developing countries. By the 1970’s and 1980’s, neo-Marxist equated migration to brain drain.

However, Skeldon (2005) has made it clear that the issue of brain drain should not be viewed only from the viewpoint of international migration but rather internal migration, and this has been backed by De Haas (2005). Findings show that though this is a myth we live in an age of unprecedented migration; international migration is still 3% while internal migration is 97% globally (De Haas, 2005). This implies that migration is more of internal than international.

Moreover, this perception changed during the 1990’s on the bases of return and remittances as well as transnational migration and how it influenced the origin of migrants. Especially, when these high skilled migrants return and influence their origin through the skills acquired, by training people through the establishment of companies and also bringing expertise which leads to increase in human capital levels at their origin (Skeldon, 2009).

Currently, from 1990s and 2000s, more optimistic views have been brought up in relation to migration such as remittance, brain gain and brain circulation (De Haas, 2009). This has
transformed the situations of migrants and their left behind families, the origin communities as well as their chosen destination.

De Haan (2010) conducted study on how such conversational changes in the migration and development debate should be principally viewed as part of a more general model in social and development theory. Notwithstanding this, the classical disagreement between pessimistic and optimistic views have been challenged by a clearer evidence showing the various impacts of migration.

Scholars have tried using various theories to explain why people migrate and these have been viewed from economic, social, political and personal perspective of the migrant(s) in question. Some of such scholars are Revenstein’s theory, Lee theory, New Economics of Labour Migration theory, Todaro model just to mention a few. These theories seek to give explanation to individual and household perspectives for migration.

The first to contribute to the knowledge on migration in 1881 was Ravenstein, through his seven laws related to migration. These laws focused on what will facilitate the movement of people, how far they are willing to move as well as focused on the gendered aspects of migration. It considered where migrants are likely to move to and in what form this migration process will take, be it circular or step-wise.

The Push-Pull theory by Lee came as a critic to modify Revenstein’s theory on migration. It suggested that the decision to migrate is not only based on Push and pull factors but also on intervening factors. These intervening factors constitute physical barriers, political, psychological, immigration and legal constraints as is more prevalent in contemporary times (Piche, 2013). This does not only look at the deprivation at the origin or the attraction at the
expected destination, however, it focuses on what might impede the movement from origin to destination and what can prevent a successful stay at the destination be it racial attacks, discrimination as well as constraints to guarantee legal status of the migrants.

The theory for explaining Labour migration in West Africa began with Todaro’s model during 1969 which was modified from the human capital theory of migration. This model looks at migration from the cost-benefit analysis just as the Neo-classical theory. Thus, implying that the individual decision to migrate presumes that expected return to be gained will be greater (Kennan & Walker, 2011). All this decision is based on the perceived outcome rather than the actual outcome that will be gained from migration.

In explaining migration in Africa, the system theory that was propounded by Mabogunje in the 1970’s is adopted. Internal migration in Africa specifically, rural-urban migration has to do with system interrelationships, where the rural area is viewed as the mass resource for pool of potential migrants, not individuals but a group of people, whiles the urban area is seen as the hub for receiving these pool of resources (King, & Skeldon, 2010).

The linkage between these two systems can either result in positive or negative outcomes depending on the situation at the urban area which includes government policies, social conditions such as the availability and expansion of communication and infrastructural facilities and upgrading economic conditions like job availability, technological and wage rates.

From the standpoint of new economics of labor migration, livelihood perspectives in development studies and transnational in migration studies which share several though yet overlooked theoretical ties (Castle, De Haas, Miller, 2013)
The New Economics Labour migration theory which was propounded by Stark 1990 observed migration in the African context not being an individual decision as the Neo-classical presumes, but rather households’ decision. In terms of risk and resource base diversification, migrants’ remittances act as source of insurance for households in case of economic downstream at the origin.

New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) which evolved in the 1990s viewed labour migration as a strategy that reduces household risk, increases income and at the same time overcomes constraints created by market failure (de Haan, 1999).

Transnational migrants are migrants considered to have links with their origin even though they leave at their destination. Scholars like Kelly (2003) and Hiebert and Ley (2003) considered transnationalism as a component of globalization, while Kenndey and Roundomemetof (2000) view transnationalism as grassroots reaction to globalization. Since, these migrants have interactions with their origin by engaging in transnational practices such as return visits, remittances, and establishment of transnational businesses, skills transfers and communication.

2.2. Effect of social capital in the migration process

Globally, migration has been used as a tool for livelihood since it helps in the adaptation and survival strategy of the migrants as well as their households in responding to poverty and global environmental change which tends to reduce the vulnerability by increasing security of the households involved (Kanji, MacGregor, & Tacoli, 2005; Scheffram, Marmer, & Sow 2012).

Studies done on Mexican-U.S. migration flows showed how migrants access social capital through household or community ties and increases the potential for individuals to migrate (Garip, 2008, Curran, Garip, Chung, and Tangchonlatip 2005; Davis, Stecklov, and Winters 2002)
More specific, it is used by skilled migrants from developing countries to developed countries as a means to attain better wage, better standard of living and working conditions which they feel they are being deprived of at their origin. Studies on livelihood have shown the role of migration in reducing susceptibility and poverty in low-income countries (De Haas, 2012).

Understanding from migration literature about migrant social capital involves the information or assistances that old migrants give to potential migrant that decrease their migration cost (Garip, 2008, Massey and Zenteno, 1999).

Social capital is commonly theorized as resources of information or assistance that individuals obtain through their social ties to prior migrants. These resources reduce the costs and risks of migrating for potential migrants (Castles, De Haas, & Miller, 2013).

When migrants’ accumulate social capital, it initiates a process of “cumulative causation”. This helps migration flow to become self-sustaining (Massey 1990, Garip, 2008). Through this, migrants create a network that connect potential migrants to old migrants which expands and accumulates their social capital enabling more migrants to rely on these resources which has the capability to increase migration (Garip, 2008).

This results in the creation of feedback mechanism indicate that migrant social capital has the potential to decrease the consequence of other social and economic factors on migration (Massey & Espinosa, 1997).

According to Garip (2008), migrant social network can be defined as information or direct assistance provided by old migrants to potential migrants due to the relationship that exist between them. The information may be in relation to employment, wages, living arrangement as well as transportation and other relevant information which will help potential migrants to
integrate at their destination. Sources of migrants’ social capital can influence migration decision as researchers have argued using labour market network.

Nevertheless, the stronger the tie to the source of information, the more useful and reliable the information about jobs (Boyd, & Ellison, 2007). This information can act as resources embedded in social relations (Lin, 2017).

According to De Haas (2009), the various perspectives on migration reveals the simplicity of the process and celebrates it as self-help development; limiting it to the household level. Therefore, shifting the impact from structural constraints and the responsibility of states in implementing favorable conditions which will result in migration yielding positive impact on development.

Notwithstanding this, the status of the migrant comes to play; a high skilled migrant with legal status has the potential to improve his/her livelihood by accessing jobs in the relevant skilled institutions.

This has resulted in the creation of recognized associations of doctors, nurses and other high skills professionals who provide services for free and in addition donate to support organizations at the origin of most developing countries; leading to a renewed focus of the diaspora being seen as heroes (Mangala, 2017).

This have resulted in the building of hospitals or patronizing sophisticated equipment which helps save the lives of people. However, this is linked to the capability of the migrant to integrate into the destination.

Through migration, there has been the formation of informal associations at both origin and destinations of migrants (Portes, Escobar, & Arana, (2008). For instance, hometown association
like the Nigerian in Diaspora Organization (NIDO) of Nigeria, the Kwawuman association, Ashantiman association of Ghana and others.

Moreover, there are organizations like transnational churches which also impact the lives of the communities they live in by providing employment opportunities and enrolling locals into training services like sewing, beads making and other skills acquisition trainings. These churches undertake development projects.

For decades, migration especially seasonal migration has served as a means of livelihood for those living in agriculturally marginalized areas with extensive climatic problems. For instance, pastoral farmers depend on it to feed their cattles (Deshingkar and Farrington, 2009), especially in some parts of Africa and Asia where agriculture is rain fed.

Seasonal migration permits households to benefit from seasonal patterns of food production and labour. This enables them to cope with indigenous inconsistencies at home (de Haan, 1999).

Moreover, through migration, slums have been formed in urban areas; serving as hubs for migrants of lower status. Though these communities seem deprived, migrants have access to several livelihood strategies which they depend on for their day to day survival at their destination (Owusu, Aqyei-Mensah, & Lund R., 2008). A typical example is the North-South migration experience in Ghana which shows that migration impacts on the livelihood of those involved. For instance, the northern part of Ghana is highly deprived of infrastructure and has high rates of poverty, consequently, the youth there move to major markets in the southern urban centers. These major markets are in the cities of Accra and Kumasi for which most of migrant youth engage in the informal sectors by rendering porter services to eke out a living (Awumbila, M., Ardayfio-Schandorf, E., 2008).
Some engagement in these informal sectors is temporal with an aim to enable them save money to further their education or start a business as well as remit their vulnerable families back home. Notwithstanding this, they are exposed to rape and other physical abuses. A study by (Yaro, 2006) on livelihood activities in rural Northern Ghana shows that, in the northern part of Ghana, natives move out from their rural communities which is predominantly a farming community to a non-farming community to engage in other livelihood strategies for survival and this is mostly done in the dry season to earn some money.

Migration affects the origin negatively, especially in the rural areas since it reduces the number of labour force working to maintain livestock rearing and agriculture production; worsening the diminishing of food crops by exacerbating food insecurity (Rademacher-schulz, Schraven & Mahama, 2014).

2.3. Social capital as a tool for improving livelihood of migrants at the destination

This aspect looks at various forms of social capital and the role it plays in improving livelihood of migrants.

The concept of social capital has intensely gained popularity especially due to studies done by Bourdieu (1986), Coleman (1988, 1990) and Putnam (1993, 1995). Bourdieu (1998) describes social capital in the category of social networks and connections and proposed social capital through which one has access to resources and support. Coleman (1988, 1990) is of the view that, by considering families as social structures and communities, they provide an environment for the objectives and interests of people to be met. This increases the level of trust in the social environment.
Putnam (1993, 1995) defines social capital as a central part of getting everyone to participate in grassroots policies, empowerment of people as well as development of communities. Despite various research on social capital, the definition of it has remained subtle due to its uniqueness (Durlauf, 2002).

In recent times, there has been recognition for social capital in societies as well as countries economic and their social development (Lundvall, 2010). The core of social capital involves unity, self-organization and social ties and provides an avenue through which resources and support can be accessed at vulnerable life cycles (Kirori, 2015). This emanate from the endowed riches that social capital possess as shown in available research through its achievements in relation to development.

During the 18th century, the Scots were informed of how social capital can guide economic activities (Woolcock, 1998). Without prior existence of moral principles and cultivating norms, the market could not function. Based on this, Burke (1757) posited that, to guide a market there should be an emergence of an appropriate moral sense.

Through a possible key factor such as human relationship which is embedded in social capital, efficiency in production is created (Lehto, 2001) with reference to trust, mutual support and cooperation forming part of social factors and economic performance (Kirori, 2015).

Bourdieu (1985), was the first to analyze social capital systematically and give a definition of it as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition.” Subsequently, Coleman (1988) defined social capital as a resource for action which is embodied in relations among persons. This he said, emerges from bridging the gap in social
structure which is charged to other forms of capital (Prayitnoa, et al., 2014). Thus, they become resources that actors can use to achieve their interests.

There is a difference between migrant social networks and other networks in terms of their arrangement, how they are used, and their effects on the lives of several people currently living and working away from home (Poros, 2011). In relation to the view that social networks play a role in one’s life, the relevance of migrant networks affecting migration outcome, their families and communities cannot be overstated (Poros, 2011). While it has been acknowledged that migration helps improve the lives of migrants, in most cases migrants encounter a number of challenges; most of which are due to lack of formal support by state institutions and private organizations (Castles, De Haas, & Miller, 2013).

It is based on this that informal mechanisms are relied on by migrants, right from the start of their migration process and in their livelihood. Through this, the use of social capital is employed by migrants as a means of making a lot out of their migration, theories have emphasized on the human capital available to person(s) have resulted in them making a lot out of their lives (Barr & Toye, 2000). However, migrants are not the only ones who draw on social capital but also individuals from social, economic and political sphere assist one another in achieving a common goal (Teye, 2013).

Portes (1998) indicates that social capital recently used by communities and nations can be traced to classical times. Morrow (1999) cited in Putnam (1993) referred to social capital as a key characteristic of communities rather than individuals and also identified four components of social capital which are the following:
1. Network which constitute civil communities (institutions, facilities and relationship) in the voluntary, states and personal spheres which implies firmness of the networking between these three spheres.

2. People’s sense of belonging to civic community together with a sense of solidarity and equality with other community members.

3. Norms of cooperation, implying reciprocity and trust which govern the functions of networks.

4. Social capital consists of positive attitudes to the institutions, associated facilities and relationships constituting the civic community, as well as civic engagement which involves participation in the process of sustaining or using such voluntary state and interpersonal networks.

This idea of social capital was cited in Loury’s (1977) work on income differential in the neoclassical economics. According to Portes (1998), this provided the platform for Coleman (1988) to define social capital in terms of two entities with a common element which make up two social structures and facilitate certain actions or actors. He further analyzed social capital as a concept in American Sociology. He explained why the concept, though not new, has gained popularity using two sources. The first phase focused on positive consequences of sociability by putting aside its less attractive features, while the second phase placed those positive consequences in the framework of broader discussions of capital and called attention to how such non-monitory forms can be important source of power and influence like one’s own bank account (Unpublished article).

Wacquant (1992) defined social capital as the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that is accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less
institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition. Portes (1995) further elaborated on this that the ability of individuals to mobilize resources on demand makes it the capital and not resources without mobilization.

However, for migration to occur, network is needed to create the platform for it because without networks, the migration process can be constrained. Tilly (1990) noted that networks not people are the center for the migration process. This implies that a potential migrant at an origin having a social connection with a migrant at a destination shows the representation of resources that can be drawn upon to facilitate migration.

On this note, (Boyd, 1989) applied the network theory which is embedded in social capital to migration studies. He opined that migration network is the recurrent sets of interpersonal ties that binds migrants and non-migrants together within a web of reciprocal obligations that can be drawn upon to facilitate entry, adjustment and employment at the point of destination.

This indicates that migrants do not only rely on the resources that social capital possesses in their migration process but they also rely on it for accommodation and livelihood purposes from which they benefit. Vulnerable migrants have substituted social capital for economic capital to enhance their livelihoods as the study conducted in Ghana by Teye and Yeblah (2014) revealed. This further supports Bourdieu’s (1985) statement that social capital can be converted into other forms of capital to advance or sustain individuals’ positions in a society.

Even though many researchers have focused on positive aspects of social capital, it has also been subjected to some negativity as scholars like Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) have shown. For instance, the excessive claim made on successful members by other members of the community and the exploitation migrant’s face from relations who helped them has been exhibited by work
done by (Awumbila et al, 2016). Coleman (1988), made a distinction of social capital within family and outside the family. This he argued, makes “Single parenting and dual wage earner families (thus families having both parents working to earn income) lack social capital since they do not have enough time to help their children socialize”. To some extent, his argument can be critiqued because these parents can create social networks which their children can draw upon in times of need through socializing with community members and associations in the community.

Coleman (1988) further noted that social capital can be reduced in families with large size. He identified some mechanisms that generates social capital such as reciprocity expectation and group enforcement. Due to reciprocities which arises, social capital and the value for achieving mutual goals, social capital has been linked to social network. After resources have been mobilized on demand and migrants have gotten to their destination, works done by Awumbila et al. (2016) shows that migrants depend on at least one of Woolcock’s (2001) three types of social capital to survive. These are bonding social capital, bridging social capital and linking social capital.

Boateng (2012) stated that bonding social capital exist among close relations like friends, family members and neighbors. According to Wilson (1996), this type of capital enables one to secure a good job and decent housing. However, work done by Awumbila, Teye & Yaro, (2016) on migrant domestic and construction workers show that migrants rely on the bonding social capital from their initial stage of migration and livelihood.

Bridging social capital exist among people who do not have a close relationship. For instance, distant relations like church members, fellow workers and even service providers. This helps people not to be left out of the loop when it comes to making important decisions and also
getting ahead in new ventures (Woolcock, 2001). With this, migrants’ clients link them to other clients as shown in work done by Awumbila et al. on migrant domestic and construction workers.

The social capital that exists between people who are not connected in any way is the linking social capital. This is between migrants, government officials, city planning authorities and other relevant organizations as indicated in work done by Awumbila et al. (2016). Especially, with migrant recruiting agencies and policies employed by government to prevent migrants from being exploited since they are normally employed in the informal sector which lacks policies implementation to help migrants enjoy their rights and freedom.
Figure 1 Conceptual framework

Source: Author’s Own Construct, 2018
2.4 Conceptual Framework

2.1.5 How social capital is being mobilized by individuals on demand.

Based on Bourdieu and Wacquant theory (1996) on social capital, the conceptual framework was drawn. The significance of social capital being a means of survival when relied on by individuals and potential migrants makes resources such as political, economic and social available at destination (Teye, 2013). The two main variables that play in relation to Figure 1, rural-urban nexus with respect to social capital surfaces when social capital (bonding, bridging and linking) is relied on. This is consistent with Woolcock (2001), where individuals draw on social capital especially in their migration process which has the potential to impact positively or negatively on migrant livelihood at destination. However, it is the ability of the individuals to draw on it in the migration process and livelihood or either one of it that is essential for the process (Portes, 1995). The positive outcome of social capital relied on has the sustaining power of making one’s livelihood even before migrating as compared with non-users of social capital. The migration process is made simple because much of the cost prior to migration as well as adjustment and integration process at the destination are catered for depending on the type of social capital one relies on.

This helps in the maximization of returns from the reliance of any type of social capital the migrant uses. The ability of a migrant to rely on the social capital in the migration process will lead to a potential migrant gaining information on channels to use in migrating to minimize cost, when to start the migration journey and also the benefit of accommodation as well as integration. Studies done by Awumbila et al. (2016) with reference to Ryan (2011) work’s on accessing resources and constructing relationships on post-migration emphasized that literature on
migration studies postulate the notion that migrants will have access to bonding social capital as compared with other types which in itself propels their adjustment and integration processes.

In terms of application of social capital in livelihood, there is the opportunity for potential migrants to have access to employment, accommodation among others on arrival. These assertions emanating from the reliance on social capital forms the basis of one’s livelihood and shows whether it is likely to be positive or negative.

Conversely, the non-reliance on social capital by migrants poses severe challenges especially when it comes to information about the destination, accommodation and employment opportunities. However, the consequences are that, migrants struggle at the destination in order to get accommodation or employment or both as indicated in Figure 1. Again, it is emerging that failure on utilizing one’s social capital is likely to have the same effect as migrant without social networks at the destination. This discourages migrants if the output of their social capital used does not influence their livelihood at their destination. The further implication is that migrants without social capital prior to migration have the same attribute as migrants whose reliance on social capital yield no result.

Finally, social capital being a subset of migration allows individuals to draw on social networks and social capital to overcome challenges at the destination such as accommodation and employment which impedes their quest to integrate fully. This when extensively managed in terms of it forms and nature of usage will help impact livelihood positively regarding new migrants.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section of the thesis gives clarification on the appropriate research method used for the data collection and analysis of data for the study. Data was gathered from both the primary and secondary sources. The study adopted methodological triangulation which comprises the quantitative and qualitative approaches. Kitchin and Tate (2013) describe methodology as a compressible systematic procedure used in investigating a phenomenon. The reason for choosing a mixed method, how the research was conducted as well as the challenges will be elaborated in this section. This section also describes the methods of data analysis, sampling technique and a description of the study area.

3.2. Study area

Madina is located within the La Nkwantanang Municipal District which is one of the sixteen districts in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana. It is one of the most populated settlements in Ghana and has become an attractive destination for migrants across Ghana and West Africa, which has a population of about 137,167 people (GSS, 2010). It is bordered to the West by Ga East District, to the East by Kpone Katamanso District and Adenta Municipal District, to the South by the Accra Metropolis District and the North by Akuapim South District. The district covers a total land area of 70.887 square kilometers.

Mamobi is in the Ayawaso East district with Nima being the capital and is located in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana. It is a populated place with population of about 558,300 people (GSS, 2010). It also has an attractive destination for migrants within Ghana and West Africa. It is also a hub for most economic activities. The topography of the land is 18 meters above sea level.
Figure 2 Map indicating Mamobi, one of the study areas
Figure 3 Map indicating Madina, one of the study areas
3.3. Research design

The choice of research design is important for the overall research process as it provides the bases and guidelines with respect to the organization of the work/research report (Bryman, 2008). In the case of this study, a mixed method approach was used. Mixed methods involve the use of both quantitative and qualitative approaches in a single research. The purpose is to overcome the inherent weaknesses of each of the individual methods (Teye, 2012). This method is useful in most cases in cross-validating and corroborating findings emanating from either the quantitative or the qualitative method. Again, an advantage of the mixed method is that, whiles it allows for generalizing findings, it also provides insights on individual experiences and other nuances which under normal circumstances will escape quantitative analysis (Neuman, & Dickinson, 2003; Teye, 2012).

In addition to the mixed methods approach, the study adopted a sequential exploratory mixed-method approach. According to Creswell et al. (2003), with the sequential exploratory mixed-method approach, the research began with the qualitative research strategy that is the qualitative data collection and analysis before following with the quantitative research strategy. According to Creswell (2003), a few reasons might account for the choice of this research approach. First, the area is relatively underexplored and there is the need to engage with stakeholders to have general or background information about the topic. This inquisition then informed specific issues to be explored in the quantitative data collection. Again, when there are no tested theoretical frameworks that can guide the formulation of research questions and hypothesis, the use of qualitative research was used to gather some information before the use of quantitative approach. In the case of this study, the aim was to find out at the initial stage what forms of social capital exist and the general understanding about the concept. It is after this that the study examined the
extent of social capital and how it has been able to influence livelihood strategies adopted by migrants.

3.4. Data sources

Most of the data used for this research was largely primary and secondary data. The information needed to fulfil the objectives of this research emanated directly from participants from the study who were acquired on the field of study. Two primary data sources were used; that is, quantitative data sources and qualitative data sources. With respect to the quantitative data source, it led to the administering of questionnaires to our target population, whiles the qualitative adopted the use of an interview guide to interview association heads within the two migrants’ communities specifically, Madina and Mamobi. Information that was solicited from them included period of movement, livelihood activities currently engaged in, and what forms of social network they relied on to take a decision to move.

3.5 Target population and sample size

The target population refers to the set of unit under study. Accordingly, the target population was in the position to have adequate knowledge and information about the questions for which answers were solicited for (Creswell, & Creswell, 2017). The target population for this study were migrants currently residing in urban communities in Accra specifically, Madina and Maamobi. Migrants selected were from households, and preferably migrants who used social capital in their migration process and livelihood. A total sample size of 120 was used for the study which included 60 respondents each from Madina and Madina. Ideally, the sample size should have been huge, however, due to time and logical constraints, a sample size of 120 was agreed on.
3.6. Sampling Technique

A screener survey was used in selecting the communities which helped in locating migrant households. This was used to select the migrant households in these communities who provided information on the number of houses that the target population can be sampled from. After getting the number of houses, a simple random sampling method was used to select houses from the list of migrant households. The second stage involved a simple random sampling of any migrant household member, preferably migrants who used social capital in the migration process and livelihood.

3.7. Mode of Procedure

Initially, a visit was made to the study areas to get opinion leaders as contact persons before the start of the data collection. This however, led to seeking permission from the Assembly men of the two communities. The student identity card of the researcher was shown to the opinion leaders and heads of migrant associations to establish the confidentiality of the research purpose.

The use of questionnaires were administered in English, however the researcher translated it into Ga and the Akan language when necessary. The researcher expressed her appreciation to the respondents when the questionnaires where completed for their contributions and patience. The data collection started from June 30, 2018 to July 8, 2018.

3.8. Data Analysis

The statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used in analysing the quantitative data by cross-tabulations and frequencies. The qualitative data adopted a thematic analysis for data organisation, since it led to development of basic themes which were put in groups from the text transcribed. Results from the qualitative data was used to support the quantitative data obtained.
3.9. Field Ethics

The purpose for the research was made clear to respondents, the University of Ghana’s student identity card was shown as proof of studentship before administering the questionnaires which came after consent of respondents have been sought. However, respondents were told to opt out at any time to discontinue in the research if they were not comfortable. Their anonymity was assured just as their confidentiality. The in-depth interviews included the use of phones in recording and where there was no consent, it use was redrawn.

3.10. Limitations

Researches are subjected to challenges even though they are conducted methodologically (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). In the process of administering the questionnaires and conducting the interviews for this study, the researcher faced the following challenges;

1. Even though I showed my university identity card to respondents, they were sceptical about giving information due to current issues evolving from the “Tiger Eye P.I” investigative team, who secretly investigated people by recording them without their consent. This posed a lot of difficulties for people to contribute even in the presence of the opinion leaders.

2. Most respondents requested for financial gain before engaging in the research. This led to giving out souvenirs after the completion of the interviews.

3. Schedule of time with respondents for the qualitative interviews was difficult since they kept changing the time booked earlier without communication.

4. Some respondents refused to appropriately answer all the questionnaires. Due to this, such questionnaires were discarded. This did not have any effect because the sample size had already been met.
Since my student identification card was not enough, an introductory letter from the Centre for Migration Studies was shown in addition to my student identification card which convinced most of the respondents. Also, due to the constant changing of interview time, most of the interviews were conducted during the weekends when most of the respondents were at home.
CHAPTER FOUR

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS AND MIGRATION PROFILE

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents results on the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents interviewed for the research. This chapter discusses the profile of migrants sampled in both Madina and Mamobi.

4.2: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

The discussion in this section include responses from 120 migrants’ respondents through the administering of questionnaires in Madina and Mamobi. It contains variables like age, sex, marital status, region and level of education among others.

In terms of migration decision of persons, age plays an important role (Migration and Youth report, 2014). As Table 1 indicates, out of the sampled population, ages 20-34 falls within the working age which constitutes 41.6 percent. Whereas ages 35-39 is less than one-fifth (22.5%). A more striking category is the age group 40-49 years which represents 23.7 percent of the total sample. This provides a clearer evidence that the youthful population has the potential to migrate (Hardman et al., 2017).

From the study, the sample data shows significant proportion to be males representing more than half (56.7%) of the general population interviewed. Again, the percentage intervals between the male and female respondents was 13.4 percent. This tends to back the evidence that, there is feminization of migration even within internal migration and more women are taking the chance
to explore other parts of the world independently for reasons such as economic, education and even marriage (Pickbourn, 2018).

Data from respondents indicated that, 60.0 percent of the sample population are married, whiles 5.8 percent epitomizes respondents who were once married (separated, divorced and widowed). Yet, a little over a third (34.2%) of the population sampled signified the never married population. This throws more light on the youthfulness of the population.

There were three zones from which these respondents migrated from to the Greater Accra region, capital of Ghana. This is the migration flow which can be traced to historical antecedent linked to certain policies which were adopted as well as the unequal distribution of resources which has created spatial inequality in terms of development as indicated in Awumbila et al. (2016). The coastal zone, forest zone and savannah zone are the three main zones from which these respondents migrated from. The coastal zone received the highest supply of migrants (45.0%) consisting of regions like Central, Eastern, Western and Volta; with Volta region being the highest supply of migrants. One-third (31.7%) of these respondents migrated from the savannah zone. This confirms works done by Awumbila et al. (2016) on migrants in domestic and construction work. Their respondents were from the Volta region and the Northern part of Ghana and they attributed reasons for their migration to poverty. This is linked to Ghana’s colonial policies which were reinforced by post-colonial policies and has widen the inequality gap over the years (Aryeetey et al., 2009) along with climate change. The cause of migration from the Volta region was attributed to the construction of the Akosombo Dam in the early 1960’s. This disrupted the livelihood of these indigents who resorted to migrate to other regions in Ghana (Yaro and Tsikata, 2015).
From the study, respondents who had their level of education up to JHS/middle school and SHS/secondary school level represented 50 percent of the migrants’ population, whereas that of those who have had tertiary and postgraduate education was 11.7 percent. This contradicts Awumbila et al. (2014) findings from the study in Old Fadama where the migrant community had 1 percent of respondents who had attained tertiary education. The table further showed the population without formal education and only primary education represented 21.7 percent of the entire sampled population.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social demographic</th>
<th>Frequency (N=120)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah zone</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest zone</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal zone</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS/JHS/Middle school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND/Diploma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS/SHS/Secondary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Technical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3. Socio-economic characteristics

This section is a continuation of the socio-demographic characteristic, however, it emphasis on variables like occupation, period of stay in the community as well as the religion of respondents of the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 120)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical/Manager</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale/Service</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Manual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Manual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of stay at destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month-6 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 months-11 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year-5 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years-9 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years and more</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Field data, 2018**

It was evident from the study that half (50.0%) of the sampled respondents had their occupation in the Sales/Service sector. 11.2 percent worked in the skilled manual and the rest constituted less than 10 percent of the total workforce. Work done by Alhassan (2017) on rural-urban migration and employment in Ghana focusing on migration from Northern region to Kumasi is consistent with the above assertion. Notwithstanding, occupations within the Professional/technical and manager curriculum recorded an appreciable percentage of 28.3.
With regard to the length of stay at the two study areas, more than half (53.3%) of respondents had lived in the study communities for ten years and their reasons for their residential choice included proximity to the Central Business District where they could engage in economic activities, easy access to transportation and the friendly environment for economic activities. Those who had spent less than a year constituted 10.0 percent of the study population with more than a third (36.7%) of them, having resided at the study area as migrants for about one to nine years.

Most respondents from the population sampled where Christians with the Muslim faith representing 41.7 percent. Though the difference between the Christian and Muslim respondents was 15.0 percent of the study population, those who did not belong to any religion were few (1.7%).
CHAPTER FIVE

TYPES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL MIGRANTS ACCESS AND THE EFFECT ON THEIR LIVES

5.1. Introduction

The chapter entails the main objectives and reasons for migrating; how migrants use social capital in their migration and livelihood strategies, the forms of social capital used by migrants in migrating and advancing their livelihood (bonding, linking and bridging social capital) and the ways the existing social capital can be improved to address the existing needs of migrants.

5.2. Purpose for migrating

Table 3: Purpose for migrating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose for migrating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Opportunities</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family reason</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018

Job Opportunities was the main driver which prompted migration from respondents’ origins to destinations such as Mamobi and Madina. Anarfi et al. (2000), in their work on Push and pull factors of international migration referred to economic challenges during the 1960’s and 1980’s as the main reason which drove those in the deprived regions of Ghana to migrate to Accra.
Thus, supporting the International Migration Report (2017) which concluded that most migrants across the globe are economic migrants. The bonding social capital these migrants accessed, enabled them to fulfill their purpose of migrating. Juxtaposing this with the findings, it was evidential that out of sampled population, close to three-quarters (73.3%) of the respondents expressed the major cause for their migration as in search of job opportunities. This acted as a driving force for migration to Accra and more specific, to slum areas. These areas have become the accommodating option for all migrants with little or no income (Addoquaye, Tagoe & Kwankye, 2009; Awumbila et. al., 2014). Other reasons such as health purposes and unattractive agriculture output represented 4.2 percent. Educational purpose was the second highest (15.8%) since most migrants were of the view that the best education system could be accessed in the urban areas. One respondent had this to say in that regard:

“I have not regret coming to leave in Madina. I made the decision to migrate when my business collapsed in Bawku due to high rate of dependency from my family and I wanted to give up on life since I could hardly take care of myself. My maternal uncle who visited our village promised to assist me. After seven month I got a feedback from him that he has gotten an employment in the security agency for me.” (Farid, 39 years, 7th July, 2018)

5.3 Persons who aided migrants to migrate to their destination

Table 4 shows people who aided migrants in getting to their destination through information on channels to use, jobs and accommodation availability and directed them on how to overcome the challenges that may arise in migrating. A little over one-third (35.0%) mentioned sibling as a contributing factor in their migration process, while the contribution of uncles, aunties, in-laws and cousins constituted 18.3 percent. It was evidential that assistance from both parents and
friends together recorded a little more than two-fifth (42.5%) of the total responses. This supports works done by Awumbila et al. (2016) on domestic and construction migrants’ workers who relied on bonding social capital in their migration process. Only 4.2 percent of respondents relied on themselves to get to their destination, yet they confirmed that thy relied on the bonding social capital to have access to accommodation and employment. The following views were expressed in that regard:

“I came on my own from Bawku to Madina and ended up sleeping in front of someone’s shop for some months, fortunately I met one of my uncles who took me home and offered his porch for me to sleep, however, an old classmate offered me a job as a packing guy”.

(Mahama, 37 years, 3rd July, 2018)

“I was living with an aunt of mine who was then living in Madina when I arrived from Techiman. I was assisting her in the sales of Jewelries, due to my loyalty after six years she opened a small shop for me and by the grace of God it has gotten to this level

(Farihart, 33 years, 5th July, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons who helped migrants to get jobs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own self</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018
5.4 Assistance acquired during migration transportation

After the decision to migrate has been made, migrants often received assistance not only in finding jobs, accommodation and integrating but also in transportation. This is backed by the fact that the social setting helps to transform the social capital that the migrants have acquired to economic capital (Awumbila et al., 2016; Bourdieu, 1985).

Figure 4 gives an indication that, half (50.0%) of the respondents who relied on social capital in their migration were assisted with transportation cost and this is in consonance with work done by Awumbila et al., (2016) and Yaro et al., (2011). The remaining 4.3 percent who said they did not rely on their social capital whom they had feedbacks from made it clear that they relied on the bonding social capital from other relatives and friends for their transportation.

However, the 5.3 percent indicated that other constituted migrants supported them to pay their own transportation.

Figure 4 Assistance for transportation during migration

Source: Field data, 2018
5.6 Migrants currently living with provider of social capital

Out of the sampled population, a large proportion (82.2%) of the respondents had been living with their social capital between two and five years whereas (2.5%) of the study sample had been living with the ones who assisted them for ten years and more. These are the respondents living with their spouses or those living in shared accommodation belonging to their relatives.

In relation to the period of stay with migrants who once lived with their relatives and later moved out, more than half (52.5%) of the respondents lived between six to nine years with relations and friends before finally moving out to rent an accommodation of their own. Meanwhile, as little as 6.7 percent lived with those who helped them in their migration process for one month to a year before moving out. The general implication is that the number of years one spent with his or her network depended on the relationship and the ability to sustain it.

Table 5: Migrants currently living with provider of social capital.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of stay</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>6Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 120)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month-1year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those currently living with their social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2years-5years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6years-9years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10years and more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1month-1years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period living with their social capital before moving out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2years-5years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6years-9years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10years and more</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018
5.7 Social capital in migrant’s job acquisition

Table 5 indicates that close to three-quarters (73.3%) of respondents confirmed that the social capital they used in migrating also contributed in their job search. The section of the respondents who were still relying on the jobs provided by their networks constituted two-thirds (41.7%). Meanwhile, 58.3 percent confirmed they had disengaged themselves from those jobs because they got better jobs with better wages or they upgraded themselves (education/profession wise) and needed a more stable job.

Table 6 Social capital in migrant’s job acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The use of social capital in acquiring jobs</th>
<th>Frequency (N=120)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants who used social capital in getting a job</td>
<td>Social Capital Used</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent engaged in the job acquired</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018

The following responses from the in-depth interviews shared some views in this regard:

“For fifteen years, I have been engaged in the sales of tiles, is the only business my elder brother introduced me to. Nine years ago, he helped me establish this business which has improved my life in various ways, I am grateful to Allah for giving me an angel as a brother.” (Saddick-Mamobi, 43 years, 7th July, 2018)
“Initially when I arrived, I was helping my brother in the sale of fast food which I engaged in for almost three years, with time there was so much competition which dropped the income we use to get. I decided I needed a stable job, so I undertook driving lessons and later got employment as a personal driver to a rich man which I have been doing till date” (Osei-Madina, 38 years, 5th July, 2018)

5.9 Relationship between current migrants’ job and impact on livelihood

Social capital plays an important role in assisting migrants during their migration process and acquiring jobs at the destination. However, among the three types of social capital that Woolcock (2001) identified, migrants in the two communities used the bonding social capital which connects people in similar situations and exists among friends, neighbors and family members; just as the research by Boateng (2012) established.

Out of the sampled population, half (50.0%) of the respondents relied on social capital in securing sales and services jobs. A careful observation of the Table 6 indicates that with respect to the sales and services, it had impacted positively on the livelihood of migrants as they were able to acquire properties and take care of their households and diversified their business (100.0%). Similarly, on the part of the nature of work and its impact on livelihood, skilled manual jobs served as means of taking care of their households (22.7%) and diversify business in addition to their household responsibility represented (27.8%). In terms of percentages, the unskilled and unemployed had significant impact on one’s livelihood and that of their families. The overall implication is that social capital does not only aid in the migration process but is also responsible in providing jobs for migrants.
Table 7 Relationship between current migrants’ job and impact livelihood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kind of job currently engaged in</th>
<th>Undertaking a project and taking care of one’s household</th>
<th>Being able to take care of one’s household</th>
<th>Diversify business</th>
<th>Diversifyin g business and taking care of household</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No such improvement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical/Manager</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>4(18.2%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>2(11.1%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>26(43.3%)</td>
<td>32(26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Services</td>
<td>3(50.0%)</td>
<td>12(54.5%)</td>
<td>1(100.0%)</td>
<td>11(61.1%)</td>
<td>9(69.2%)</td>
<td>24(40%)</td>
<td>60(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Manual</td>
<td>3(50.0%)</td>
<td>5(22.7%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>5(27.8%)</td>
<td>1(7.7%)</td>
<td>4(6.7%)</td>
<td>18(15.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>1(4.5%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>1(0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>3(23.1%)</td>
<td>6(10.0%)</td>
<td>9(7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(100.0%)</td>
<td>22(100.0%)</td>
<td>1(100.0%)</td>
<td>18(100.0%)</td>
<td>13(100.0%)</td>
<td>60(100.0%)</td>
<td>120(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018
5.9.1 Period it took for respondents’ social capital to assist in migration of migrants from their origin to destination

The time limit migrants waited for response in order to begin the migration process is presented in Table 8. The highest waiting period was between one week and three months, representing half (50.8%) of the views of the respondents in the study areas. Those who waited for one year and over before getting assistance from their social capital constituted 24.5 percent of the population interviewed. While ‘other’ (on the questionnaire) represented those who could not recall how long it took for them to be assisted.

One respondent in an interview had this to say:

“A week after I completed SHS I moved from Tarkoradi to Accra and joined my brother who owns a Forex Bureau”. (Yaw-Madina, 29 years, 3rd July, 2018)

Table 8: Period it took for respondents’ social capital to assist in migration of migrants from their origin to destination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 week-3months</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 months-7 months</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 months-11 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year and more</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018
5.9.2 Dependency on social capital and the rate of dependency

As at the time of the data collection, most of the sampled population who occupied 66.7 percent of the entire sample established that, they no longer depended on their social capital due to reasons such as independence gained by respondents through the acquisition of jobs and the death of the persons whom they relied on. Those who confirmed they currently rely on their social capital were 20.8 percent of the respondents’ population. They forms of dependency such as financial, accommodation and even advice for business or personal life. On the other hand, those who do not depend on their social capital anymore had to the support their social capital because of the help previously rendered to them. This has to do with reciprocity expectation and group enforcement as stated by Coleman’s (1988) work on social capital in the creation of human capital. Sometimes, this create inconveniences for the migrants as posited by Portes and Sensenbrenner’s (1993) work on social determinants of economic action which is in relation to the excessive claim made on successful migrants.

The rate of dependency as Table 8 illustrates indicate majority (81.7%) of the sampled population hardly rely on their social capital yet, 13.3 percent said they depend on their social capital very often for accommodation, finances among others.
Table 9: Dependency on social capital and the rate of dependency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependency on social capital</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 120)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current dependency on social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of dependency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite often</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not often</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018

5.9.3 Cross-tabulation between remittances sent by migrants as against their sex

The study conducted confirmed that migrants send remittances as demonstrated in the study by Castaldo et al. (2014). Comparing the two sexes, the male population remit their families at their origin more than the females. The difference was 8 times (86.8% - 78.8%) higher. The reason is that males are likely to secure jobs than their females, though all of them rely on social networks. However, the chi-square test shows no statistical relationship (p-value=0.285>0.05) between sending of remittances and one’s sex since any sex group is likely to remit if they acquire a job.
Table 10: Cross-tabulation between Remittances sent by migrants as against their sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability to send remittance</th>
<th>Sex of Respondent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59(86.8%)</td>
<td>41(78.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7(10.3%)</td>
<td>6(11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2(2.9%)</td>
<td>5(9.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68(100.0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>52(100.0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(χ² = 2.514, df = 2 and p-value = 0.285 > 0.05)

Source: Field data, 2018

5.9.4 Content of trust between migrants and their social capital and the extent of trust

From the study, an overwhelming majority (91.7%) of the respondents established trust between themselves and their social capital. More than half (59.2%) of the respondents admitted that the rate of trust between migrants and their social capital was being very strong. Nevertheless, an appreciable percentage (20.0%) of the respondents revealed that they had their trust issues with their social capital.
Table 11: Trust establishment between migrants and their social capital and the extent of trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust establishment</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 120)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust establishment between migrants and their social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate of trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of trust</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not strong</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly strong</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018

5.9.5 Willingness to help migrants who are not relations and the rate at which such help is rendered

This study found out that most migrants from the sampled population representing 72.5 percent are willing to render help to migrants whom they are not related to. Comparing that to the rates at which this help is rendered, whether often, quite often, not often and very often, 74.2 percent of the total responses interviewed was 89 respondents. Nevertheless, 25.8 percent of these respondents said they do not render help at all to migrants they do not know. The general implication is that one needs to have networks at the destination but not all of them are in the position to assist.
Table 12: Willingness to help migrants who are not relations and the rate at which such help is rendered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help rendered to migrants who are not related</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 120)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants willingness to help migrants who they are not related to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate at which help is rendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite often</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not often</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018

5.9.6 Reliability of support by members of the community to each other

In terms of how these migrants rely on other members in their community, there is low reliance in terms of the support since significant proportion (86.7%) of respondents acknowledged that they do not rely on each other when it comes to that. However, 13.3 percent said they relied on members of their community for support. This was confirmed by most Muslims who said they had donations monthly or randomly to support orphans and widows in time of needs termed as *Fisebidialie*. One opinion leader in Mamobi had this to say:

“There is no support from the community, unless you have a friend(s) whom you can fall on in time of need, we are a group of friends who save Ghs 20 weekly and it is collected weekly by one person from the group.” (Twumwaa-Mamobi, 32 years, 3rd July, 2018)
Another respondent shared a view in that regard:

“There is an association that provides helps to their members and I am part of it. We help members in Jobs acquisition, accommodation and loans, currently, we have two sprinter buses which is used for commercial purposes. Also, we have acquired hectors of land which we intend to build a school and housing facilities for our members. Yearly, we organize the Damba festival and we invite various tribes from the Northern part of Ghana who displayed their tribal dance to foster unity.” (Alhaji Hamsa-Madina, 54 years, 6\textsuperscript{th} July, 2018)

\textbf{Figure 5: Reliability of support by members of the community on each other}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Reliability of support by members of the community on each other}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Source: Field data, 2018}
5.9.7 Relationship among the various social capital actors.

The relationship between most migrants and those who assisted them in their migration process have a positive relationship which implies a strong or very strong relationship (93.4%) while those who have not established any form of relationship between themselves and their social capital were just few (4.1%) of the total population.

The response from the sampled population about the relationship between other migrants and their social capital showed a stable relationship of 96.7 percent with 3.3 percent having fairly strong relationships with their social capital. An example is Vera’s case below. Looking at the relationship between the indigenous community members and migrants, it shows a firm relationship between migrants and members of the communities within which they have settled.

“I wanted to learn hair dressing which I discussed with my brother whom I was leaving with when I arrived from Agogo, however, he had his own perception about hair dressers so said I should go and learn dress making which I refused. This resulted in the bad blood among us which destroyed the friendly relationship we had” (Vera-Madina, 28 years, 7th July, 2018)
Table 13 Relationship between individual migrants and their social capital, other migrants and their social capital and migrants and their community members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 120)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between migrants and the one who assisted them in their migration process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly strong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between other migrants and their social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly strong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between community members and migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly strong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018

5.9.8 How useful Social capital has been to respondents

Figure 6, indicates that 94.2 percent of the respondents acknowledged that the social capital they used were helpful giving reference to the fact that their livelihood had been impacted positively. Even though not all respondents used social capital in their livelihood, they referred to the social capital they used in their migration process which opened opportunities at the destinations. This affirms Waldinger (1997) who reported about the strong bond amongst immigrant community networks. However, 5.8 percent of the same population said the social capital they used have not been helpful, yet they had no choice since they were already at the destination and were hoping for the best in future.
“I am grateful to my brother and I tell him often, if it was not for him I would not be the banker I am today. He did not only pay my fees but also constant advice” (Adams-Madina, 33 years 1st July 2018)

“I though live here was better, but it has rather worsened my status, my aunt I leave with do not support me as she did previously. I do have some regrets, but I have already found my way here and I hope things get better”. (Botchey, 40 years, July 2018)

**Figure 6: How useful Social capital has been to respondents.**

![Pie chart showing the percentage of respondents who found social capital useful.](image)

Source: Field data, 2018

**5.9.9 How existing relationships and arrangements in the study communities can be improved to support new migrants**

According to works done by Kirori (2015), trust, mutual support and cooperation form part of social factors and economic performance.
Illustrations from Table 14 suggests that these migrant communities do not have arrangements to support new migrants as confirmed by (91.7%) of the respondents. The few (8.3%) of respondents who acknowledged the presence of such supports are those in the savannah zone of Ghana. Through this research, it was discovered that these Heads of associations give orientation to migrants on how to integrate. They support them by paying medical bills and rescue these migrants when the need arises. An association in Madina known as Malzini Youth Association, whose President I interacted with said, it members were from different areas of the Northern sector of Ghana. He stated that the association had been in existence for almost ten years. He said what initiated the establishment of the association was the stereotype they faced because of the chieftaincy crises at the North which resulted in the murder of the late Yaa Naa. The incident caused them to be labeled as quarrelsome and this affected their chances of securing jobs at their destination. Through the establishment of this association, they have helped new migrants with jobs, accommodation and financial support. The association has also purchased several acres of land at Bawaleshi and Dodowa with the intension of building a school and a community that will portray the symbol of migrants’ unity. However, they aspire to help develop the Northern part of Ghana. In addition, they have opened up their association for other migrants all over Ghana to join. All these go to confirm what the respondents in both Madina and Mamobi said are ways through which the various social capital they used can be improved. Their well-being constituted 99.2 percent which needed support in the areas of respect, honesty, communication, being appreciative and patience from both the migrants and their social capital accessed. Most respondents who were not from the Northern part of Ghana said they did not have associations and this was due to the collapse of the associations formed earlier since the heads of those associations were not honest.
“Our association have been in existence for almost ten years now, the reason for its establishment was because we migrants from the northern part of Ghana is being stereotyped against as a result of the Murder of the Late Ya Naa. We were tagged as quarrelsome and wicked, this made it difficult for us to have access to jobs in our new location. This motivated me to sensitize my fellow migrants from the North, on the importance of us coming together, which resulted in the establishment of this association to support each other. So, we came up with the name Malzini meaning support which begun with four people. We help new migrants with accommodations and jobs currently. However, we have acquired some acres of lands in Bawaleshi and Dodowa with an intension of building school in future and serve as a neighborhood where members of the association can build their own houses”. (Amdu-Madina, 42 years, 8th July, 2018)

“This association started about three years ago, with the motive of providing support to those from Mamprusi’s, Walewale and Damgaba . We provide orientation for new migrants, especially, the Kayayei found here, since they are vulnerable. We support them by paying for their medical bills and rescue them when they have issues that involves the police. Even though we wish to do more financially we are constraint. Sometimes, there are some greedy people who go in the name of the association and get help financially but the money never gets to us which is dishonest and disrespect to this association.” (Banda-Mamobi, 38 years, 30th June, 2018)
Table 14: How existing relationships and arrangements in the study communities can be improved to support new migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways to improve existing social capital</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 120)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How existing social capital can be improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support, Respect and Honesty</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Patience and Appreciative</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement to support new migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2018

5.9.9.1 Expected government initiatives to improve social capital

While it has been acknowledged that migration helps improve the lives of migrants in most cases, migrants face a number of constraints due to lack of formal support by state institutions and private organizations (Pretorius, 2017).

From the study, respondents expect the government to help them by improving the various social capital they used. Majority, representing 61.7 percent complained about accommodation and employment opportunities at the destination.

The difference between respondents who chose accommodation and employment opportunities to social amenities and financial aid, with the hope that government could establish and provide support financially to migrants who have already established businesses and those who wish to establish businesses yet are financially constraint formed 22.5 percent.
The 10.0 percent who said their needs where accommodation confirmed getting employment was not difficult since they relied on their social capital, but due to the small nature of rooms available in these migrant communities, a lot of inconveniences are created.

“Having access to job was not an issue for me since my brother owned a business which deals in the sales of car batteries and tyres. However, the issue was accommodation the size of the rooms available in Mamobi is very small as compared to those in 37 area, this made it very difficult for me. So I resorted in sleeping in front of his room for almost three months since, his wife and four children have occupied the single room”. (Kwasi Agyapong, 37years, 2nd July,2018)

“I migrated from the Bole to Madina through the help of my sister, unfortunately, my sister who is married with children could not accommodate me due to the small size of her room. This led to me sleeping at the mosque square for four months it was there that I met my brother who offered his porch for me to sleep in for about six months. After, there was vacancy in one of the rooms in the house which he offered to me without a fee in about two weeks we became seven in the small sized room”. (Umar, 40 years, 3rd July, 2018)

Findings from the responses emphasized the expectations of migrants’ on how to improve the social capital that they used. This study showed that four in every five (80.0%) respondent who accessed social capital in their migration process relied on the bonding social capital. This kind of social capital exist among close relations like siblings. Thus, confirming Awumbila et al. (2016) and Boateng (2012).
Table 15: Expected government initiative to improve social capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways through which government can improve social capital</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and employment</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Accommodation and financial support</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Accommodation and social amenities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field data, 2018*
CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

6.0 Introduction

This dissertation threw more light on the problem statement which examined the use of social capital as a tool for migrants’ migration decisions and addressed their livelihood needs in poor communities in urban Ghana. However, the objectives met were the socio-demographic characteristics of migrants in Madina and Mamobi communities, the forms of social capital migrants use in the migration process and livelihood as well as ways by which the existing social capital can be improved. The mixed method was employed in the data collection and analysis.

This chapter encompasses the summary of the findings which is in line with the research objectives, conclusion and policy recommendation.

6.1 Summary of Findings

With regards to socio-demographics, majority of the respondents interviewed fell within the youthful population who were susceptible to migration. However, the male population was more than half their female counterparts. Again, a significant proportion (60.0%) of respondents were married. In terms of education, a quarter of the sampled population were Senior Secondary School graduates.

It was evident from the study that social capital plays a major role in the life of migrants. More evidentially, the role of social capital is not only visible in the migratory process of migrants which entails the decision to migrate in addition to the feedback mechanism that exist between potential migrants before embarking on migration itself. Also, it plays a facilitating role in
migrants’ livelihood strategies which helps them cope at their destination, for survival or transformation to better standards of living.

However, the study found that few migrants did not depend on their social capital to migrate but on arrival at their destination, they relied on the bonding social capital to have access to jobs and accommodations.

Empirical evidence from the findings showed that migrants used social capital to overcome obstacles during the migration process and to sustain their livelihood at their destinations.

The study revealed that migrants originated from the three zones of Ghana namely; the savannah, forest and coastal zones. The coastal zone was the major hub for sending migrants which included the Central, Western, Eastern and Volta regions. Among these regions in the coastal zone, Volta region represented the highest sending migrants’ region.

Assessing the role of social capital in migration and livelihood of migrants, it was evident that the male migrants significantly explored the use of social capital. This is because most males do not consider accommodation out of the reach of their social capital as an inconvenience. But the females’ vulnerabilities linked them to social capitals that were ready to accommodate them before they embark on the migration journey.

In general terms, though the social capital theory consists of three types namely, bonding, bridging and linking social capital, the most applicable one by respondents is the bonding social capital. A successful way to improve upon the type of social capital migrants relied on is to eliminate the challenges they faced. The government through the Ministry of Works and Housing and other agencies should assist them with accommodation, employment and financial
assistance. However, respondents want the expansion of social amenities to make the environment where they live conducive.

6.3. Conclusion

It is evident that the coastal zone, which consists of four regions; Western, Eastern, Central and Volta remain the highest migrant origins, with Volta region being the largest migrant supplier. However, the savannah zone, which encompasses the northern part of Ghana, is the second largest migrant producing zone.

The study identified economic challenges as the leading cause of migration, which was in line with the International Migration Report (2017). Economic challenges were cited as the primary reason why most migrants tend to settle in informal settlements like Madina and Mamobi. In these areas, overcrowding, poor ventilation, improper disposal of waste, poor drainage systems and poor toilet facilities are common.

Examining the sex of migrants’ who accessed social capital in their migration process and livelihood, a little more than half were males. However, this tend to prove the fact that there is feminization of migration which is not only associated with international migration but internal migration as well. Even though it turned out the males who migrated where more than the females. The findings further suggest that reliance on social network impacted positively on the lives of migrants together with their families.

Subsequently, the study brought to bear that with remittances, there was no statistical relationship between sex of respondents and the sending of remittances. This can largely be
attributed to the fact that both males and females have equal access to facilities without restrictions in the urban setting.

Finally, there were significance differences between those who helped migrants in their migration and the assistance offered them in paying transportation cost. However, those who helped migrants were their relations and friends; this is supported by the work done by Woolcock, (2001).

6.4. Policy recommendations

Based on the findings from the study, the following policy recommendations are made:

The challenges head porters (Kayayei) face regarding accommodation extends to the general migrant population. Government initiative to build housing structures for Kayayei should incorporate other migrants especially those who cannot afford accommodation. However, there should be temporary shelters within migrant prone areas to house migrants until they integrate fully. The mounting of these shelters within these areas will limit the rate at which migrants use the streets as their home.

Secondly, government, through its local agencies should liaise with other development partners to create sustainable employment in rural areas in other to minimize the rate of migration. Rural job creation efforts should focus on value addition. The government should leverage on current exports from these migrant regions to expand value chains and attract investors through Private Public Partnership (PPP) and offtake agreements. A value-added approach to job creation ensures sustainability and private sector participation. The PPP agreement between government and the private sector limits risks borne by private sector participants by ensuring efficiency and
sustainability of private businesses and projects. The government further agreeing to offtake deals reduces risks of private sector participants, thereby increasing their appetite for high capital investments. This will address the unequal distribution of the national cake which has left some parts of the country deprived in terms of the provision of certain basic infrastructures and social amenities like standardized schools, hospitals, potable water and good roads. The provision of employment opportunities in the formal and informal sectors at migrants’ origin areas will at least limit the rate at which people move with the aim of pursuing economic motive.

The formal institutions should also get involved in the migration process and livelihood of migrants and provide confidential agreements to prevent these immigrants from being exploited by the institutions while keeping migrants’ interest at heart.

Government and private organizations who are involved in the financial sectors should make available access to loans to cover migrants with no collateral through Non-governmental organizations (NGO’s) or migrants associations established by old migrants to help new migrants have access to loans to enable them venture into businesses of their choice with supervision from the old migrants to help prevent them from getting into risk.

This initiative will help broaden the scope of migrants being able to start their own businesses in the origin or destination, and will enhance their integration at the destination by limiting the burden that would have initially fallen on the social capital they used as well as the challenges it creates for government.
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APPENDIX ONE

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MIGRANTS RESPONDENTS

CENTRE FOR MIGRATION STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF GHANA-LEGON

CONFIDENTIALITY

Place of interview ----------------------------------

I am a postgraduate student from the University of Ghana (Centre for Migration Studies) undertaking a research project on ‘How migrants in the urban communities of Ghana use social capital as a tool in their migration decision and in addressing their livelihood’. This study is in fulfillment of the requirement of my course work. Your participation in the study is important for me but you can decide not to start at all or you may withdraw at any point in time if you wish. I want to assure you that the information provided would be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used only for academic purpose.

SECTION A – BIODATA

Name of community  ………………………………

1. Sex of Respondent
   1. Male (   )                  2. Female (   )

2. How old are you ------------------ years.

3. What is your marital status.
   1. Never Married (   )    2. Married (   )   3. Consensual Union (   )  4. Separated (   )
   5. Divorced (   )    6. Widowed (   )

4. Which region were you born?
   1. In the Northern part of Ghana ________________
   2. In the Volta region _____________________
   3. In the Ashanti region ______________________
   4. In the Central region _______________________
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5. In the Western region _________________________

6. In the Eastern region ………………………………….

5. What is your highest level of education?
1. None (No formal education) ( )
2. Primary ( )
3. JSS/JHS/Middle ( )
4. HND/Diploma ( )
5. SSS/SHS/Secondary ( )
6. Vocational/Technical ( )
7. Tertiary( )
8. Postgraduate ( )
9. Nursing/Teacher ( )
10. Other (specify)

6. What is your occupation? ____________________________
1. Professional/technical/manager ( )
2. Sales/Service ( )
3. Skilled manual ( )
4. Unskilled manual ( )
5. Unemployed ( )
6. Other (Specify)……………

7. How long have you been living in this community?
1. 1 to 6 Months ( )
2. 7 to 11 months ( )
3. 1 year to 5 years ( )
4. 6 years to 9 years ( )
5. 10 years and more ( )

8. What is your religious affiliation?
1. No religion ( )
2. Christian ( )
3. Islam ( )
4. Traditionalist ( )
5. Believer ( )
6. Others (specify) ( )

SECTION B- USE OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN RELOCATION AND LIVELIHOODS OF MIGRANTS

9. What prompted your migration decision.
1. Economic purpose ( )
2. Education ( )
3. Marriage ( )
4. Other (specify)

10. Who aided with you getting to your destination?
1. Uncle ( )
2. Auntie ( )
3. Sibling ( )
4. Own self ( )
5. Parent ( )
6. Other (specify)

11. Are you leaving with the person currently?
1. Yes ( )
2. No ( )
12. If Yes? How long have you been leaving with the person?
   1. 1 Month to 1 year ( ) 2. 2 years to 5 years ( ) 3. 6 years to 9 years ( ) 4. 10 years and more ( )

13. If No? How long did you live with the person before leaving?
   1. 1 Month to 1 year ( ) 2. 2 years to 5 years ( ) 3. 6 years to 9 years ( ) 4. 10 years and more ( )

14. Did the person help you get a job?
   1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

15. What kind of job is that? _______________

16. Are you currently engaged in that kind of job?
   1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

17. If Yes? How long have you been engaged in it?

18. How has it improved your livelihood?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

19. If No? How long did you engage in it?
   1. 1 Month to 1 year ( ) 2. 2 years to 5 years ( ) 3. 6 years to 9 years ( )
   4. 10 years and more ( )

20. Why did you disengage from the previous job?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

21. What kind of job are you currently engaging in now?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
22. How has it helped you improve your livelihood?


23. Are you able to support your family back home with your current job?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

24. Would you want to change your current job in the near future?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

25. If yes? why


26. If no? why


SECTION C- FORMS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL AVAILABLE FOR MIGRANTS

27. How long did it take for your relative to help you get to your destination?

1. 1week to 3Months ( ) 2. 4Month to 7months ( ) 3. 8Month to 11Months ( )

4. 1year and more ( )

28. Did the person assist in your transportation?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

29. If No? Who did?

1. other sibling ( ) 2. Other Uncle ( ) 3. Other Aunty ( ) 4. Own self ( ) 5. Other (specify) …………………

30. Do you still depend on the person who assisted you?

1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

31. How Often do you depend on his or her support?

1. very often ( ) 2. Often ( ) 3. Quite often ( ) 4. Not Often ( ) 5. Other ( )
32. Are you able to support family back home through your earnings from your current job?
   1. Yes (   )  2. No (   )

33. How often do you remit back home?

34. Do you see it as a responsibility to help other migrants?
   1. Yes (   )  2. No (   )

35. Have you helped prospective migrant(s) in their migration process since you arrived?
   1. Yes (   )  2. No (   )

36. Have you established any form of trust between you and the one who helped in your migration process?
   1. Yes (   )  2. No (   )

37. How strong is the trust?
   1. Not strong (   )  2. Fairly Strong (   )  3. Strong (   )  4. Very Strong (   )

38. Are people willing to offer help to migrants whom they are not related to?
   1. Yes (   )  2. No (   )

39. How often is such help rendered?
   1. Often (   )  2. Quite Often (   )  3. Not Often (   )  4. Very Often  5. Not at all (   )

40. In time of need do members of this community rely on each other for support?
   1. Yes (   )  2. No (   )

41. How reliable is that support?
   1. Not reliable (   )  2. Very reliable (   )  3. Quite reliable

SECTION D- WAYS THE EXISTING SOCIAL CAPITAL CAN BE IMPROVED TO ADDRESS MIGRANTS LIVELIHOOD NEEDS.

42. Do you think the social capital form you used has been helpful?
   1. Yes (   )  2. No (   )
43. What is your current relationship with the one who assisted you in your migration?
   1. Very strong ( ) 2. Strong ( ) 3. Fairly strong ( ) 4. No relationship ( )

44. What is the relationship between migrants and those who assisted them in migrating?
   1. Very Strong ( ) 2. Strong ( ) 3. Fairly Strong ( ) 4. No relationship ( )

45. What is your relationship with community members you came to meet?
   1. Very Strong ( ) 2. Strong ( ) 3. Fairly Strong ( ) 4. No relationship

46. How do you think the existing relationship can be improved?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

47. Is there any arrangement in the community to support new members?
   1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

48. What are some of these arrangement?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

49. Is support limited to only community members?
   1. Yes ( ) 2. No ( )

50. What do you think government should do to improve the various forms of social capital?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX TWO

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR KEY INFORMANTS

CENTRE FOR MIGRATION STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF GHANA-LEGON

This study forms part of my MA studies currently being undertaken at the University of Ghana, Legon (Centre for Migration Studies). The study seeks to understand how migrants are able to use social capital in their migration process and also in their choice of livelihood after getting into the city. Please you are not obliged to complete the interview and can opt out anytime you want to do so. Information given will also be treated as confidential.

1. Why did you decide to migrate to the city or your current residence?
2. What form of support did you get from family, relatives and friends prior to and after your movement?
3. Did you get support from any person before starting your present business?
4. How would your situation have been if you had no support during the migration process and in starting your present business?
5. Do you still depend on the social capital you had earlier benefited from, if yes in what form?
6. Can you tell me the current relationship you have with your benefactors and close residents?
7. Do you have any social support system in your family presently and how is it helping family members?
8. Do you have any social support system in this community?
9. How long has this social support been available?
10. Is this kind of social support available to new migrants, and what kind of support is being rendered?
11. What are some of the achievements and challenges this system has faced in administering support to migrants?
12. What support are you expecting government to render in the near future to enhance the social support system already existent?
Background of interviewee

Name:

Age:

Occupation:

Position in the community