

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA, LEGON
CENTRE FOR MIGRATION STUDIES

**THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT OF IVORIAN REFUGEES ON THE
FETENTAA HOST COMMUNITY**

BY

SIKA AGBESI

(10290436)

**THIS THESIS IS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GHANA
LEGON, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE AWARD OF MA MIGRATION STUDIES DEGREE**

MARCH, 2019

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this project work is the result of my own original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in the university or elsewhere.

Candidate Signature Date

Name:

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of this project work were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Ghana

Supervisor's Signature Date.....

Name:

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my mother, my siblings, my wife and children, and also to all my friends, for their love, support, and sacrifices that has enabled me to complete this work.

MAY GOD BLESS YOU ALL

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the almighty God for the opportunity to pursue this course, and also for how far he has brought me.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Leander Kandilige for his professional guidance, advice, encouragement and the goodwill with which he guided this work. I am really grateful. I also wish to thank my family and friends for their support.

MAY GOD BLESS YOU ALL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 Problem statement.....	2
1.3 Research Objectives.....	5
1.4 Significance of the Study	5
1.5 Delimitations of the Study	6
1.6 Limitations of the Study.....	6
1.7 Organisation of the Study	6
CHAPTER TWO	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Migration.....	7
2.3 Types of migration.....	8
2.4 Refugees.....	9
2.5 Characteristics of Forced Migrants.....	10
2.6 Causes of the Sub-Saharan Africa Refugee Problem.....	11
2.7 Political causes.....	11
2.8 Social causes.....	13
2.9 Ethnic and Religious persecution	13
2.10 Economic causes.....	14
2.11 Other causes.....	15
2.12 Ghana’s History with Refugees	16
2.13 The Influx of Ivorian Refugees in Ghana	17
2.14 Impact of hosting refugees.....	19
2.15 Economic Impacts of Hosting Refugees.....	19
2.16 Social Impacts of Hosting Refugees.....	25
2.17 Empirical review	30

CHAPTER THREE	34
RESEARCH METHODS	34
3.1 Introduction.....	34
3.2 Research Design.....	34
3.3 Study Area	35
3.4 Population of the study area.....	35
3.5 Sampling Procedure	36
3.6 Data Collection Instruments.....	36
3.7 Ethical Consideration.....	37
3.8 Data Collection Procedures.....	37
3.9 Data Processing and Analysis	38
CHAPTER FOUR	39
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	39
4.1 Introduction.....	39
4.2 Demographic Information of Respondents	39
Table 1: Respondent’s sex, academic qualification, age distribution and years of residence.	40
4.3 Analysis pertaining to research questions	41
4.5 Economic Benefits of Refugees on the host community	41
Table 2: Economic benefits of Refugees on the host community	42
4.6 Social Benefits of Refugees on the host community	45
Table 3: Social benefits of refugees on the host community	45
4.7 Effects of refugees on the host community	48
Table 4: Regression Model Summary	48
4.8 Challenges refugees pose to the host community	49
Table 5: Challenges refugees pose to the host community.....	49
CHAPTER FIVE	54
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	54
5.1 Summary	54
5.2 Major Findings of the Study	54
5.3 Conclusion	56
5.4 Recommendations.....	56
5.5 Suggestions for Further Research	57
REFERENCES	58
APPENDIX	67

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Respondent’s sex, academic qualification, age distribution and years of residence.	40
Table 2: Economic benefits of Refugees on the host community	42
Table 3: Social benefits of refugees on the host community	45
Table 4: Regression Model Summary.....	48
Table 5: Challenges refugees pose to the host community.....	49

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to assess the socio economic impact of refugees on their host community. A descriptive survey was adopted for the study. Questionnaires were given to one hundred and nineteen (119) respondents to obtain responses from them. The data collected from the questionnaire was coded, edited and analysed using Microsoft Excel. It is concluded from the study that the economic benefits of refugees on Fetentaa are: attracting international organisations, creation jobs, improving productivity, boosting income and providing important goods and services. The study also concluded that the social benefits of refugees in Fetentaa include refugees adding to peaceful coexistence and integration, refugee presence leading to the construction of important amenities, refugees bringing improved social services, refugees bringing about improved health services in Fetentaa, and refugees bringing improved educational facilities in Fetentaa. It is recommended that Stakeholders should team up and provide more resources and amenities for the host community, Fetentaa. This will help solve the challenge where refugees' presence in the host community overwhelms the available resources such as health facilities and schools. Also the stakeholders in the host community need to work on seeking the help of security personnel who would help improve the security of residents in the host community.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

In times past, it was recounted that humans migrated purposely in search of food, fertile land and for security (Marlowe, 2007). In contemporary times, these forms of movement are no different. It is evident that people move from one geographical space to the other mainly for trade, to better their economic status and also for security. In Lee's theory of Migration (1966), referred to as the 'Pull – Push' factors of human migration, factors in the destination that attract persons to migrate are referred to as the pull factors and those at the origin that compel persons to migrate are referred to as the push factors. In migration, people move from one geographical space to the other with the purpose of residing there temporarily or permanently over a period of time usually a year.

Over the past years, there is a class of migrants known as the refugees. These categories of persons are also referred to as forced migrants. To this effect the question of who a refugee is comes to bear. In accordance with the 1951 UN convention, a refugee is a person owing to well-founded fear of persecution, has fled his or her country of origin due to his or her affiliation to a political party, religion, race or ethnic group. To this extent it is very clear that the refugee situation is a growing phenomenon as these social elements aforementioned would invariably generate possible conflict. According to the (UNHCR, 2018), 68.5 million persons are forcibly displaced worldwide. Among the stated number are 25.4 million being refugees all over the world, over half of which are under the age of 18 years (UNHCR, 2018).

Most refugee hosting states are from the less developed countries. These less developed countries are already overstretched with their resources. The coming of these refugees will mean more burden on these countries (UNHCR, 1997). The influx of refugees into a country will most definitely have implications on the host, and this is seen both on the negatives and the positives. Undoubtedly, the refugee situation to the host community will definitely have an adverse effect on the host community but can also be a source of an 'open up' development for the host community (World Bank, 2016).

1.2 Problem statement

The nature of impacts of refugee influx and camp establishments on host communities are many and diverse. It is widely accepted that the influx of refugees could have considerable impacts on natural resources and socio-economic aspects (Martin, 2005). Refugee camps are commonly established in remote areas with poor and underdeveloped conditions where often host populations are struggling to sustain their livelihoods. This implies that refugee influx will have some effect on the lives of the people living in the area. How it will impact, nonetheless, depends on several factors and approaches where both positive and negative outcomes are possibilities (Maystadt and Verwimp 2009:1-2).

Some of the funds for the camp operation are allocated to infrastructure investments that benefit the host community. The impact of the camps on the local host community are widely felt through trading opportunities and reduced food and commodity prices. Furthermore, refugee camps have developed major local markets with considerable purchasing power in relation to pastoral products such as milk and livestock. One of the positive contributions that refugees can make to host countries is skills and knowledge that can be utilized for the benefit of local people. In this regard, the multiple ways in which refugees pursue their livelihoods can make significant

contributions to the local economy. Another important contribution of refugees to local economies is associated with their access to transnational resources provided by other refugees and co-nationals living abroad, including remittances and social networks (Jacobsen, 2002). A study of Somali refugees and remittances explains how cash transfers to refugees have impacts on receiving communities (Horst and Van Hear, 2002). Individual remittances that often go to displaced families and relatives are used to meet basic livelihood needs. Similarly, research on the Somali Diaspora in Canada points out how informal banking systems have facilitated cash transfers to Somali refugees in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Yemen (Hamza, 2006). These resources have contributed not only to the improvement of living conditions at the household level, but also to those in refugee camps, especially in terms of housing, water provision, and telephone services.

In Tanzania, refugees have provided cheap labor in sectors such as agriculture, construction, housekeeping, and catering. In this regard, the refugee presence has affected the wages of local non-skilled workers and benefited local entrepreneurs (Maystadt and Verwim, 2009). Similarly, an increase in the demand for rental housing from either well-to-do refugees or expatriate aid personnel in Peshawar, Pakistan during the 1980s and 90s, particularly benefitted local property owners and disadvantaged less well-to-do Pakistanis looking for rental housing (Schmeidl, 2002). This illustrates that when refugees arrive, those among the host population who have access to resources, education, or power are better positioned to benefit from the refugee presence, while those who lack these resources in the local context become further marginalized (Maystadt and Verwim, 2009).

However, despite these positive indicators, the presence of refugees is also associated with the depletion of firewood and building materials as well as competition for grazing land in

the immediate vicinity of the camps. Issues of gender-based violence have also been examined in the context of livelihood opportunities in situations of displacement. Some studies show that gender relations within households are affected by the increasing participation of women in income-generating activities, which affects not only the distribution of resources within households, but also traditional roles of family structures (Women's Refugee Commission, 2009). In a traditionally patriarchal society, this dependency situation can lead to psycho-social disorders, distress, and domestic violence (Morris, 2010).

The presence of large influx of refugees has also been associated with environmental impacts on land, water, natural resources, and slum growth. Various studies provide examples of different types of environmental impacts related to the influx of refugees and their long-term presence (Jacobsen 1997, UNHCR 1998, FAO 2005). The most evident environmental impacts include: (i) deforestation and firewood depletion, (ii) land degradation, (iii) unsustainable groundwater extraction, and (iv) water pollution. In addition, human waste disposal by displaced persons can contaminate local groundwater and cause the spread of diseases (United Nations Environment Program, 2005). Other impacts from the initial and long-term displacement are related to uncontrolled slum growth.

From the ongoing discussions, although a lot of research has been conducted on the impact of refugees on host communities and countries worldwide (Chambers 1986, Whitaker 1999, Alix-Garcia 2007), little empirical studies have been conducted about the study in Ghana. Even the studies conducted in Ghana concentrated on the Budumburam and Krisan refugees camps. No study was found on the Brong Ahafo region or the Fetentaa camp precisely. Also the studies in Ghana employed weak statistical techniques and therefore makes it difficult for the results of the studies to be generalized. This study seeks to bridge the research gap by

investigating the socio economic impact of the Ivorian refugees on the Fetentaa community in Berekum in the Brong Ahafo Region of Ghana. The study will employ inferential statistical tools in analyzing the effects of refugees on host communities in Ghana. This will facilitate the generalization of results from the findings of the study.

1.3 Research Objectives

The general objective of the research is to examine the socio economic impact of Ivorian refugees on their host community. The research sought to achieve the following specific objectives

1. To examine the economic benefits of refugees on Fetentaa as the host community
2. To identify the social benefits of refugees on Fetentaa as the host community
3. To find out the challenges refugees pose to Fetentaa as a host community

1.4 Significance of the Study

It is hoped that the findings of this study will bring to limelight the economic benefits of having refugees in the Fetentaa community in the Berekum District in the Brong Ahafo region of Ghana. Also the study will investigate the social benefits of having refugees in the Fetentaa community in the Berekum District in the Brong Ahafo region of Ghana. These will help stakeholders appreciate the refugees in the host community.

The study will also find out the effect of refugees in the host community. This will help policy makers harness these effects to promote community development.

The study will also investigate the challenges refugees pose to the inhabitants of Fetentaa in the Berekum in the Brong Ahafo region of Ghana. This will provide information to authorities to find ways of curbing the challenges the refugees pose to the inhabitants of Fetentaa.

To researchers, students and individuals interested in the subject of migration, refugees and their socio economic impact, the findings of the study will serve as a reference point or literature for review, reference, and basis on which further studies can be undertaken.

1.5 Delimitations of the Study

The study was narrowed to the socio economic impact of refugees on Fetentaa in the Berekum District. Therefore, caution is advised on any attempt to generalize the findings of the study.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

Due to the limited time, some respondents were not cooperative because of the length of the questionnaire. Some respondents also were not able to provide vital information in much detail due to time and the structured nature of most of the items.

1.7 Organisation of the Study

The study is organized in five chapters. Chapter One is the introduction and it provides the background to the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, scope and limitations of the study, and the organisation of the study. Chapter Two provides a review of pertinent literature on the subject of the study addressing key concepts and providing empirical information. Chapter Three presents the methodology which includes a description of the research design, study population, sample and sample procedures, data collection instruments, data collection procedure validity and reliability concerns, data analysis procedure, and ethical considerations. Chapter Four presents results and analysis. Finally, Chapter Five concludes the research with a summary findings, conclusions and recommendations from the study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews literature on refugees and their effect on host communities. It defines migration and its types. It also looks at who is a refugee and the characteristics of forced migrants, the causes of the sub-Sahara refugee problem in Africa, the economic impact of refugees on their host communities and the social impact of refugees on their host communities.

2.2 Migration

Migration can be defined as the movement of people across a specified boundary for the purpose of establishing a new or semi-permanent residence (Awuku, 2017). Emigrants are those who leave their country, while immigrants are those who enter a country. Migration has impacts on both the place left behind and on the place where migrants settle. The reasons why people might want to move from one place to another are many. These reasons may be economic, cultural, social, political or environmental (Gheasi, 2017).

There are usually push factors and pull factors at work for migration to take place. Push factors are the factors or conditions within a country that push people out (Opoku-Asare, 2018). They are the reasons that make someone decide to move. This is their own experience of life in one place which gives them good reasons to leave it. Push factors include low productivity, unemployment, poor economic conditions, and lack of opportunity for advancement (Kaith, 2009). Often push factors are negative things.

Pull factors are the expectations which attract people to the new place. They are conditions within another country that pull or attract and draw people from their homeland to it

(Gussin, 2013). They are usually positive things such as job opportunities, better standard of living, better education or better healthcare, better employment, high wages, better facilities, and better working conditions. Many people choose to migrate. These are voluntary migrants. Many are economic migrants. Other voluntary migrants include older dependents who want to live somewhere warm and sunny in their retirement. However many other people have no choice and are forced to leave their homes. These are involuntary migrants. Due to war or a natural disaster their lives and homes may be in danger. These people are also called asylum seekers. According to (Habitat for Humanity, 2018), an asylum seeker is someone who claims to be a refugee but whose claim has not been evaluated. This person would have applied for asylum on the grounds that returning to his or her country would lead to persecution on account of race, religion, nationality or political beliefs. Their situation is so dangerous that they cross national borders to seek safety in nearby countries and become recognised as refugees with access to assistance from states and aid organisations. An important piece of this is that refugees are protected by international law, specifically the 1951 Refugee Convention (Habitat for Humanity, 2018).

2.3 Types of migration

Cohen (1996) and King (2012) offer typologies of migration, mainly based on what they variously call migration binaries, dichotomies or dyads. They have been referred to as: internal verses international, temporary verses permanent, and regular verses irregular migration. Another important divide is that between voluntary and forced migration, for instance ‘economic’ migrants verses refugees. Many migrants move internally and internationally, one type of move followed by the other.

Temporary migration can turn into permanent settlement, as migrants who intended to stay for a limited period of time continually postpone their return until it never happens – like the

‘guest workers’ in Germany and Switzerland who ended up ‘here for good’ (Castles et al. 1984). Irregular migrants can become legalised through special schemes for regularisation, such as those periodically implemented by the southern European countries of Spain, Portugal, Italy and Greece (Fakiolas, 2003). Conversely regular migrants can lapse into irregularity after their permits expire or because of the bureaucratic obstacles and delays they face in renewing them (Fakiolas, 2003). Finally the forced or voluntary divide is seen often to be too simplistic in practice. Sales (2007) critically notes that the theoretical distinction between refugee migration and ‘voluntary’ economic migration neglects the fact that conflicts can produce economic devastation which forces people to leave.

2.4 Refugees

In general, a refugee is someone who has been dislocated for various reasons from his or her home country and fled to another country (Girma, 2016). There are usually different cogent reasons for fleeing ranging from civil war, conflict, or political violence to persecution or discrimination, including ethnic, social grouping, religious beliefs and political affiliation. Those genuine refugees who seek refuge and safety in another country by crossing international borders either officially or illicitly usually apply for political asylum on arrival in the host country (Dusenbury, 2013:9).

The United Nations Conventions of the 1951 and 1967 Protocol relating to the status of refugees define a refugee as follows; any person who: ...owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and

being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (UNHCR, 2015:2)

Regional bodies such as the Organization of African Unity (OAU) developed agreements like the OAU convention of 1969, expanded the definition of refugees found in the 1951 Convention to include a more objectively based consideration (Krui, Peter and Mwaruvie, John, 2012:62). The OAU convention Article 1 sub-articles 2 states refugee as: any person compelled to leave his/her country owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or the whole of his country of origin or nationality, is compelled to leave his place of habitual residence in order to seek refuge in another place outside his country of origin or nationality (OAU, 1969:3).

The 1984 Cartagena Declaration on Refugee gives a broader definition of a refugee. It extends the definition of a refugee to a person who has fled his or her country because their safety or freedom have been threatened by generalized violence, foreign aggression, internal conflicts, massive violence of human rights or other circumstances which have seriously disturbed the public order (UNHCR,2013)

2.5 Characteristics of Forced Migrants

There are some differences between forced and voluntary migrants, which carry important economic and policy implications. Voluntary migrants are people who move for economic gain or to unify their family, and so go at a time and to a place of their choosing, but forced migrants are those who flee, often to the nearest safe haven, to avoid bodily harm. Therefore, forced migrants, unlike voluntary migrants, may end up losing most of their assets, or may end up in a place where job opportunities for them are scarce or completely absent, and may even be unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin regardless of how they fare in

their adopted place of abode. This compared to voluntary migrants, their adjustment to new conditions may take longer, and may require more support from the host community or from others. These features lead to a number of complex economic challenges which are not present, or not present to nearly to the same degree, in the case of voluntary migration.

2.6 Causes of the Sub-Saharan Africa Refugee Problem

The causes for the refugee problems in Africa are political, social, economic, ethnic and environmental.

2.7 Political causes

The African continent is one of the major areas with refugee problems. The flow of refugees in Africa became acute in the 1960s coinciding with the struggle for the attainment of independence by most African States. The process of decolonisation brought new and powerful political forces into play and released new conflicts that created mass displacements (Nobel, 1987).

In the late 19th century Africa had experienced the division of the entire continent-with the exception of Ethiopia and Liberia among European rulers. In this early period, conflicts between the colonial armies and the Africans caused refugees flow in many parts of the continent (Bulcha, 1988). Once their control over their subjects was consolidated the European settlers also started to use forced labor for the production of commercial crops and mining of minerals. In addition, heavy taxation was levied on Africans as a means of enforcing the recruitment of labor to the mines and plantations (Wallerstein, 1965). Resistance to forced labor and taxation was met with brutality by the colonial establishments, causing internal displacements as well as flights across colonial borders. "The complex and often violent process of "nation-building" in the

newly independent states often representing minority nations within the boundaries of the new states brought about refugee flows fleeing across national boundaries such as the Ewe from Ghana, the Hum and Tutsi from Rwanda and Burundi, the Lampa from Zambia, and the Asians from Uganda. Chad, Angola and the Sudan are some other examples in Africa” (Tureti, 2003.pg 26). Liberation struggles, civil wars and sudden changes in the political regimes because of frequent coup d'états have also caused the refugee displacements. (Tureti, 2003.pg 27).

Moreover what one finds peculiar to Africa is the fact that arbitrary rule, injustice and terror are not only directed towards those who are supposedly the authors of 'political infractions', but also affect their families, their friends, more distant relations and the members of their tribes. In such an atmosphere, whole families and even villages leave. Guinea, Democratic Republic of Congo, Angola and Uganda are illustrations of the fact that the movement of refugees has continued in Africa. To emphasize further on this, (Smyser, 1987) cited that, the most serious crises arose in South Africa, where an intensification of the Mozambique civil war after 1985 drove hundreds of thousands from Mozambique into the neighboring countries of Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe, and even into South Africa itself. In addition, many Angolans fled from an expansion of their civil war to find refuge in Southeast of the Democratic Republic of Congo, in the province of. Shaba, others fled into Zambia (Tureti, 2003. Pg 27).

In Ethiopia for instance, large numbers of refugees also fled from other parts to Sudan in 1970s. The bloody and prolonged revolution, which followed the overthrow of the autocratic Emperor Haile Selassie in 1974, was known at its peak as the "red terror" (UNHCR, 2000). The left wing military faction that seized power, known as the `Dergue', killed or imprisoned thousands of political opponents, labor activists and students, and caused a continuing exodus of refugees from the country. In 1987-88, some 365,000 Somalis also fled to Ethiopia to escape

fighting between Somali government forces and rebels seeking independence for northwest Somalia (UNHCR, 2012).

In recent times, following the election in November 2010, Ghana recorded large numbers of asylum seekers numbering to 17,985 in 2011 as a result of election controversy on outcome of election which triggered into generalized violence. It was recounted that the opposition leader Alassane Ouattara was declared winner of the presidential election by the electoral body but the incumbent president President Laurent Gbagbo, who was declared winner by the constitutional council, refused to step down. In the same year Ghana again recorded an influx of Sudanis and Togolese flees their country on grounds of persecution by their government (UNHCR, 2012).

2.8 Social causes

People who differ either politically, ethnically or religiously from the ruling majority, cross international borders to safety in order to escape the eventual violence they may suffer at the hands of this majority which unlike the past, now has the state power under its control. The Bokongo in Congo, fits into this category. Among the other important reasons of the refugee problems in Africa are the local ethnic, tribal based political rivalry, internal conflicts between ethnic groups over political economic spoils to see which tribal group will dominate national life. These problems are further compounded, as these hostile tribes are now fellow citizens (Tureti, 2003. Pg 28).

2.9 Ethnic and Religious persecution

Ethnicity is the root cause of the refugee crises prevalent today. However, it is also worth noting the role that refugees play in sustaining, if not creating, ethnic conflict. Refugee camps occasionally see fighting between rival ethnic groups. Ethnic repression has taken many forms in

Africa. However, the cases of Rwanda and Burundi provide examples, par excellence, of where one ethnic group has oppressed the other because of ethnicity. What is clear is that refugee situations in Africa have resulted from political domination of one ethnic group by another and from the upheavals that have followed coup d'état and attempted coups in the new African governments (UNHCR, 1972).

Religious intolerance and religious persecution is too a factor responsible for the African refugee problem. And it is quite common to see two clans fighting, not for the good of the country or even the interests of the men in power, but simply for objectives which interest the clans. The struggle for power takes places in the same socio-cultural group. And the most regrettable aspect of this situation is that populations run in every direction as refugees to find peace in neighboring states (Tureti, 2003. Pg 27).

2.10 Economic causes

Various economic problems have caused refugee flows in Africa. A large number of African countries have very small populations and very fragile (weak) economies. Among the structural features of these least developed countries of Africa are "climatological handicaps such as land lockedness, drought and desertification and high exposure to flood or disaster." (Adepoju, 1982). Other factors such as the loss of property, heavy taxation and poverty due to the loss of family breadwinners contribute to economic problems, which lead to flight (d'Orsi, 2015). Certain political conflicts have their roots in economic factors. Areas rich in minerals are often tempted to secede, sometimes with the active support of outside powers.

Countries of Africa also face a foreign debt problem, which has rendered them incapable of realizing their potential and forced them to resort to import of food grains and other essential consumer goods, leading to a retarded development. Nobel (1987) citing Bulcha (1987) makes a

mention of the allocation of scarce funds to prestigious projects, lack of priorities in economic development, corruption, and disparity in the distribution of social and economic resources rendering the struggle against poverty ineffective. Hence these attitudes and practices of African leaders in their own right make conflict inevitable; the end result — triggering the mass flight of refugees across international borders. If the economic problems of the African remain unsolved for long period, the refugee problem cannot be solved.

2.11 Other causes

Denial of fundamental human rights has been one of the most profound causes of seeking asylum. The African refugee problem derives directly from the prevalent concrete conditions in independent African states especially the manner these states are organized tending to undermine the effective promotion and protection of human rights. To compound Africa's refugee burden, new and sometimes massive flows of refugees have taken place from 1984-1987 across virtually every section of the continent. The most dramatic took place during the latter part of 1984 and the beginning of 1985, when devastating drought hit Africa, particularly the countries around the Horn of Africa, hundreds of thousands streamed into Sudan from Ethiopia and Chad. They presented a grim image of famine - despite uncertainties as to whether they were refugees or famine victims or both, the UNHCR played a central role in providing relief for them while they were in Sudan. What is clearly evident is that when people decide to leave their own home country there are many reasons. Environmental disasters such as floods, droughts and earthquakes are displacing more and more people every year. In Sudan alone, at least 1.5 million people have left their homes in search of food. Recent research reveals that such disasters are not just the wrath of nature but also people and governments of many developing countries are changing their physical environment in a way that makes it more prone to disaster.

2.12 Ghana's History with Refugees

Ghana received its first influx of refugees in large numbers in the 1990s, a period which was characterised by proliferation of conflicts in Africa. The country's relative political stability made it a good and obvious home for refugees who had been displaced by civil wars of all kinds in the region (Awuku, 2013, pp 22). By 2004, for instance, Ghana was host to about 48,034 refugees living mainly in three camps – Krisan camp in the Nzema East District of the Western Region near the Ghana -Cote d'Ivoire border; Klikor in the Ketu South District of the Volta Region near Ghana's eastern border town of Aflao; and Buduburam in the Gomoa East District of the Central Region (UNHCR, 2011).

The diversity of countries from which refugees had fled was striking: Krisan refugee camp for instance hosted refugees from eleven African countries (Sudan, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Togo, Eritrea, Congo DR, Rwanda, Congo Brazzaville, Cote d'Ivoire, Chad and Somalia) totaling about 1,321 in 2005 (Awuku, 2013).

With a number of conflicts in the region and beyond reaching resolution, many of these refugees have returned home. For Liberian refugees in Ghana, who have dominated the Buduburam camp since its creation, the process of repatriation was officially initiated by a tripartite agreement signed between the government of Ghana and the government of Liberia and UNHCR after the signing of the Liberian peace agreement in August 2003 (Awuku, 2013). The repatriation exercise initially targeted 14,000 refugees, but in reality this has not been achieved as many of them have refused to go home. Security considerations and the lack of economic opportunities back in Liberia have been cited as the main reasons why refugees were reluctant to return to Liberia (Agblorti, 2011). Some of the refugees were also wary of the fact that, on earlier occasions when Liberians had decided to return home (following an earlier lull in the conflict)

the journey itself had been fraught with danger. As a result, many Liberian refugees continue to remain in Ghana: a verification exercise by the Ghana Refugee Board in 2012 put the total number of refugees in the Buduburam camp in excess of 10,000 (Awuku, 2013).

2.13 The Influx of Ivorian Refugees in Ghana

After a five-year delay, the first round of the Côte d'Ivoire's presidential elections finally went off peacefully and without technical hitches on October 31, 2010, leading many people to think that the country had taken a miraculous turn for the better (Loetzer and Casper, 2011). The incumbent Laurent Gbagbo had been in power since 2000, but his administration lost control of the northern region of the country to the Forces Nouvelles (FN) rebels after a failed coup d'état in September 2002. Organized under the auspices of the United Nations (UN), the presidential election was meant to settle the leadership contestation that had defined Ivorian political history in the past few decades and set the country on the path to reconciliation and economic recovery. Whereas the first round of the presidential election was relatively uneventful, the same could not be said of the November 2010 run-off, which pitted Laurent Gbagbo and Alassane Ouattara, the candidate of choice for the rebel-controlled north of Cote d'Ivoire. At the end of the hotly contested election, there were two official versions of the results. The one pronounced by Cote d'Ivoire's Electoral Commission awarded victory to Ouattara, while the other, originating from the Constitutional Council, declared Gbagbo as winner. These two interpretations of the election outcome triggered a complex and drawn-out political crisis where many lives were lost. As a result of the political crisis more than 200,000 Ivoirians left the country and sought refuge in neighboring countries (Awuku, 2013). More than 17,000 refugees were registered in Ghana and most of them are in Western and Brong Ahafo regions (World Food Program, 2011). Most of the Ivorian refugees in Ghana fled their homes with no assets and money. World Food Programme

(WFP) initially responded with an immediate response emergency operation (IREMOP) from targeting 10,000 refugees living in camp-like settlements. Members of the United Nations country team in Ghana (specifically UNHCR, UNICEF and UNFPA) have supported the Government in providing assistance to the refugees by setting-up reception centres, refugee camps and providing humanitarian assistance: food, shelter and non-food items, hygiene kits and reproductive health kits: NGOs are working in close collaboration with United Nations agencies in the camps to implement relief programmes. The National Catholic Secretariat is the cooperating partner working with UNHCR and WFP for the provision of assistance. Arrivals in the Western Region of Ghana were predominantly from Abidjan but also included people originating from locations in the central, northern and western parts of the country. The majority of refugees who arrived in the Brong Ahafo Region were from the North-Eastern part of Côte d'Ivoire, particularly Bondoukou. Refugees who arrived in Oseikojokrom were from the border town of Niabli. Most of the refugees left their homes promptly, after seeing people being executed around their houses or when bombs fell and destroyed parts of their houses or when they saw neighbours being taken away and shot dead (World Food Program, 2011). It was difficult in the circumstances to find a better place than Ghana which was closer to them and also peaceful. The government was prompt in providing assistance to the refugees by providing a camp for them where food, clothing and other basic necessities were provided for them. In addition, there were assistance from, civil society, the generosity of ordinary Ghanaian families, especially the host traditional rulers obligated by custom to provide help to strangers in their midst, the Christian Council of Ghana and other philanthropists. There has also been massive support from the UNHCR, NGOs- the European Union, Ghana Red Cross Society, National Catholic Secretariat, World Vision International, the Adventist Development and Relief Agency

(ADRA). The greatest credit goes to the refugees themselves, who have determined against all odds to work hard to make a decent home away from home for themselves and their children. Many of them are driven by their faith in God; they were willing to let go of the feuds, ethnic, sectarian and factional hostilities that intensified the brutalities of the war that claimed many lives, which caused inestimable property and environmental damage and forced hundreds of thousands from their homeland (B Crawford,1998).

2.14 Impact of hosting refugees

Refugees impact their host communities in several ways. These include economic impacts, social impacts, political and environmental impacts. However, because the present study focuses on the socio-economic impact of hosting refugees, literature will be reviewed only on the economic and social impact of refugees on their communities

2.15 Economic Impacts of Hosting Refugees

There is extensive research on the economic impacts of hosting refugees (Gomez and Christensen, 2010; Landau, 2008; Miller, 2017; Milner, 2009; Harrell-Bond, 1986; Harrell-Bond, 2002; Long, 2013; Jacobsen and Fratzke, 2016). According to (Miller, 2018) some view the impact through the lens of protracted displacement, local integration, resettlement, burden/responsibility sharing, urban displacement, the rights of host states vis-à-vis protection responsibilities, or financial reform.

The host states often argue that refugees are a strain on local resources; overwhelm health facilities and schools; strain infrastructure such as roads, bridges, warehousing facilities and the availability of land; and place a burden on social and administrative services (Miller, 2018). Arguments have also been raised that refugees take jobs from nationals, and drive up the cost of

housing, goods and other services. The presence of refugees may also mean that a host government must pay salaries and expenses related to security and other officials, who are needed to carry out refugee-related tasks, such as processing, setting up camps or settlements, and providing health, education or social services. The host state may also bear the cost of building supplies, and purchasing and maintaining vehicles. According to the (UNHCR, 2011), the fact that refugees are often hosted in isolated, remote border areas that tend to be poor or limited in natural resources, only compounds the economic challenge of hosting refugees. These challenges are often used to justify border closures, refoulement, confinement to camps and arbitrary detention, and other protection violations.

However, there is also a large body of scholarship that demonstrates how refugees can be an economic benefit (Miller, 2018). In terms of local economic activity, the arrival of refugees has the potential to prompt economic expansion and innovation, breathing new life and dynamism into a regional economy (World Bank, 2011). Increased market, business and job opportunities are some of the most reported favourable impacts by the host community. Hosts have experienced more opportunities to generate income and provide livelihood through trading with refugees in the camp or working for them in exchange for food or money. This has been the most significant change in terms of their livelihood approach for many of the host respondents (Alix-Garcia and Saah, 2009). This is confirmed by Maystadt and Verwimp (2009) who show that refugee camps create a larger market for generating income and better opportunities to provide basic needs such as food and water. The majority of the host population use refugee camps for providing livelihoods. The authors such as B Rutinwa (2005) and N Maple (2016) who conducted their study in refugee camps in Tanzania, also showed that the creation of new

common marketplaces within refugee camps enabled external food aid to be sold or exchanged with the host community.

Refugees can have positive economic impacts by creating jobs, services and facilities, or by contributing to agricultural production and the local economy when they have access to land, the labour market and livelihood opportunities and enjoy freedom of movement (UNHCR 2011). For example, refugees report higher rates of employment, higher incomes and pay more taxes compared to other immigrant groups in Canada. Uganda's policy of allowing refugees to self-settle, for example, has enabled refugees to become more self-reliant and thus less dependent on aid and better able to contribute to their local communities (Hovil 2007; Dryden-Peterson and Hovil 2004; Jacobsen 2001).

Betts et al. (2014) elaborate on refugee livelihoods in Uganda and challenge the idea that refugees are a burden on their host society. Their argument is that refugees can be economic assets; many are networked within settlements — nationally and transnationally — and, in many cases, use or create technology at higher rates than the local population through internet and mobile phone usage. Likewise, there are numerous examples of refugees in Uganda becoming successful entrepreneurs (Global Agenda Council on Risk & Resilience 2016; Macchiavello, 2003).

Refugees can also have positive economic impacts on their hosts by attracting development actors to work with the local community alongside aid workers, and refugees who are allowed to work can contribute to agricultural production and the local economy (Milner, 2016). A study on Congolese camps in Rwanda by (Taylor et al., 2016) indicates that both cash aid and in-kind assistance provide a boost to local economies by increasing the spending capacity

of refugees in their host communities. Another study on Mozambican refugees in Malawi by (Dzimhiri, 1993) highlights the creation of employment, the accrual of benefits to the local population, the stimulation of local commerce and an improved international image. Indeed, the presence of international aid can greatly alter local economies by bringing in new actors (the United Nations, NGOs and other groups), which affect everything from cash flow in local markets to housing costs to infrastructure and relations with local authorities. Thus refugee self-sufficiency can help to reduce aid costs (Jacobsen and Fratzke, 2016).

Studies on refugees in Kenya have also found that refugees can be an economic benefit through the international aid that they attract (Sanghi, Onder and Vermuru 2016). It is stated that the refugee presence in Kakuma, Kenya, boosted the gross regional product by over three percent and increased employment by about three percent (ibid). Similarly, as a result of the presence of refugees the Turkana area also experienced development and economic integration raised per capita host incomes by six percent. Other research cites examples in Malawi, Albania, Macedonia, Jordan, Pakistan and Tanzania where refugees have had positive effects, either through camps stimulating local economies with greater demand or by attracting international organizations that help to bring resources, technology and jobs to an otherwise poor or remote area (Gomez and Christensen, 2010; Landau, 2008; Miller, 2017; Milner, 2009b; Harrell-Bond, 1986; Harrell-Bond, 2002; Long, 2013; Jacobsen and Fratzke, 2016).

Recent studies on Syrian refugees indicate the potential positive economic impacts of hosting refugees (Rubin, 2017). Syrian refugee entrepreneurs have also boosted the economy with new firms, jobs and services or products. Even within the very large Zaatari camp in Jordan, Syrian entrepreneurs have built a range of businesses, from pizza shops to barber shops, travel agencies, vegetable stalls and wedding rentals (Gavlack, 2014).

Other research on Europe and North America also points to potential benefits — refugees often bring capital with them and add to entrepreneurial activity upon resettling. A study published by the European Parliament (Karakas 2015) shows how refugees can positively affect the economy by addressing demographic trends, contributing to innovation, entrepreneurship and GDP growth. A similar study that focused on Europe also found that refugees can contribute to greater market flexibility, and improve fiscal sustainability (European Commission, 2016).

According to Legrain (2016) a Tent Foundation report also emphasizes the positive contributions that refugees can make to developed economies. The argument raised from the report indicates that one euro invested in refugees can yield nearly two euros in economic benefits over time; as refugees are given the opportunity to become entrepreneurs, innovators, taxpayers, consumers and investors, they create jobs, raise productivity and wages of local workers, lift capital returns, stimulate international trade and investment, and boost innovation, enterprise and growth (Miller, 2018).

The study further argues that refugee populations tend to have younger, working-age individuals that could support aging societies such as Germany or Italy. Refugees boost the sending country's income by providing remittances. Data for refugees in the United States, for example, indicates that despite an initial cost in assistance to refugees resettling to the United States, over the years, refugees are a net gain to the economy (Refugee Council USA, 2017; Capps et al., 2015). Local studies in Ohio, for example, argue that refugees have been an asset to the local and regional area over the years (Chmura Economics and Analytics, 2013; US Together et al., 2015). The study posits that refugees tended to find employment within five months of their arrival and to work their way off of government assistance within the first few years. The effect is that refugees that own businesses create jobs and provide goods and services;

resettlement agencies spend money to provide services; and refugee workers contribute to the local economy (US Together et al., 2015).

Another study on the economic impact of refugees and immigrants in Akron, Ohio, also pointed to positive returns via taxes, purchase of homes, and work in manufacturing and service sector jobs. They note that some 86 percent of refugees were of working age in 2013, which helped to support an aging population (New American Economy and Knight Foundation, 2016). For instance Capps et al. (2015) observed that refugees resettled in the United States are more likely to be employed than the US-born population, and that their incomes rise substantially as a function of the length of time that they are in the United States. Over time, refugees' participation in public benefit programs declines, and they generally come to own their own homes and become US citizens (Kallick and Mathema, 2016).

Indeed, refugee camps tend to become the new town and business centres of the surrounding host communities, as camps are where food, water and business opportunities are found. Employment opportunities for hosts in camps have been a significant livelihood resource. However, the experience in Kakuma has been the opposite of what Maystadt and Verwimp (2009) describe in camps in Tanzania where hosts employed cheap labour from refugees related to agriculture. Kakuma's extreme dry environment makes agriculture on land and soil limited. In term of access to food and water the refugees are in an advantageous position over most hosts (Aukot, 2003). This results in refugees employing hosts to do small jobs for them. These jobs might not be ideal or well paid, but it has created livelihood opportunities for the host community.

2.16 Social Impacts of Hosting Refugees

There are potential social impacts on the ethnic balance of hosting areas, social conflict, and delivery of social services due to the presence of refugees in hosting communities. Simply because of the presence of refugees, host communities will experience socio-cultural impacts. When large numbers of refugees arrive in a country — and especially when they are in a destitute situation and do not share ethnic or cultural linkages with the host community — there is always a risk that social tensions, conflicts and even violence might arise (UNHCR, 2011). According to the World Development report (2011), if traditional animosities exist between cultural or ethnic groups, it may cause problems when one group becomes exposed to another that has been forced to become refugees. For instance, in the late 1990s the mere presence of Kosovo-Albanian refugees in Macedonia generated tensions between ethnic Albanians and Serbs in Macedonia (Pini, 2008).

Nevertheless, UNHCR has also found that when refugees are from the same cultural and linguistic group as the local population, there are greater opportunities for peaceful co-existence and interaction among them (UNHCR, 2007). For example, approximately 25,000 refugees from the Central African Republic were in the Democratic Republic of Congo during the 1990s. The refugees belonged to the Yakoma ethnic group, like their Congolese host, so their integration into the host society was smooth and peaceful. Similarly, 3 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan, mostly ethnic Pashtun resided for more than a decade among fellow Pashtun communities in the North-West Frontier Province (NWFP) (The World Bank, 2012). During the entire period, there were peaceful relations between refugees and the host population. This is similar to the scenario where massive influx of Somali refugees into the Dadaab area in Kenya, which is inhabited by

people sharing the same culture and language, and which are often related by clan or tribal ties to the refugee population (Joel, 2011).

Other studies show that while refugees might be able to economically integrate with ease, social integration can be more difficult (Institute for Market Economics, 1999). According to (Betts, 2009) in refugee-affected and hosting areas, there may be inequalities between refugees and non-refugees that give rise to social tension. Likewise, there are a number of studies that discuss how refugee camps are perceived as increasing social problems and tensions in communities, including alcohol consumption, gambling, prostitution and crime (Codjoe et al., 2013). Enforced idleness and poverty within a refugee camp may cause an escalation of such tendencies, particularly if there are groups of young men who are not meaningfully occupied (UNHCR, 1997).

The mass influx of refugees have added to security problems on the social life of a host community in general and crime rates, theft, murder in particular. Along with other social problems such as prostitution and alcoholism are also claimed to rise in the refugee areas (Girma, 2016).

Collier (2003) argued, as cited in Atim (2013), that refugees can be a source of negative public health with adverse consequences for their host countries. Refugee camps are often crowded and unsanitary, creating conditions ripe for infectious diseases; refugee inflows stretch domestic medical resource thin; divert health resource away from normal care; and refugees may have specific health needs related to war trauma that overwhelm the host (Girma, 2016). In addition different studies have also shown that refugees have contributed to the spread of diseases such as HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and diarrhea among other infectious diseases (M. Lowicki-Zucca,2005). According to Miller (2018), additional research reveals some concern about the

long-term mental health impacts on members of the host community, in particular when they are hosting refugees or other displaced groups for long periods of time.

Also, refugees are frequently viewed as benefitting from privileged access to resources unavailable to the local host population. It is thus argued that refugee status offers an opportunity for education, literacy, vocational training, health, sanitation, and basic livelihood (Betts, 2009). However, according to the World Development Report (2011), when social services provided through international funding also target host communities, the likelihood that the local population will have a positive view of refugees increases significantly. Thus, the Special Program for Refugee Affected Areas (SPRRA) in Tanzania (1997-2003) benefited host communities by promoting farming activities, road construction, and income-generating activities in surrounding areas (World Bank, 2010).

According to Mekuria (1987) the much talked-about African hospitality is diminishing in many asylum countries, including the Sudan, not because the hosts have become less hospitable but because of the deterioration of their own standards of living. He notes that in some cases the initial attitudes of hospitality and accommodation have turned into hostility and resentment because of increasing competition between the local population and the refugees over scarce resources (Nobel, 1987).

Gomez and Christensen *et al* also add that refugees impacted the social problem such as gender- based dominance and violence often increase during conflict and in displaced setting. This is particularly the case of women's vulnerability to sexual abuse and exploitation, domestic violence and trafficking (Gomez and Christensen *et al*, 2010). According to the (Women's Refugee Commission, 2009) Some studies show that gender relations within households are affected by the increasing participation of women in income-generating activities, which affects

not only the distribution of resources within households, but also traditional roles of family structures. For instance, the majority of male Somali refugees in Sanaa in Yemen face serious challenges to access employment opportunities in the city and have to depend on incomes earned by female family members. In a traditionally patriarchal society, this dependency situation can lead to psycho- social disorders, distress, and domestic violence (Morris, 2010). Similar situations have occurred in contexts such as the West Bank and Gaza, where measures that restrict freedom of movement have significantly affected livelihood opportunities for men. Women are increasingly participating in informal activities to support their families, including petty trading in Gaza, management of grocery shops, and sewing, as a result. (World Bank, 2009).

Omeokachi (2013) added that the mass influx of refugees extensively degrades the environment by way of polluting water resources, cutting down trees, creation of rubbish and refuse dumps, and other destructive environmental practices. Such squalid living conditions in slum areas constitute a serious health hazard because slum dwellers in the rural areas and informal settlements by the nature of their existence, are prone to disease, suffer from malnutrition and hunger are more vulnerable to natural disasters. Many of the slum dwellers in squatter communities are unable to access basic social services such as potable water, sanitation, energy supply, and health and education facilities.

Therefore it is evident that the presence of refugees especially in substantial numbers has resulted in pressure on social services and infrastructures (e.g.schools, clinics and health centres,water electricity and agricultural, extension services) in destination localities (Unesco, 1992).

According to Miller (2018), not all social impacts of hosting refugees or other displaced people are necessarily negative. The flow of refugees into a particular area of the host country may have positive effects. Refugees can bring assets to the hosting locals. Refugees undeniably bring skills and knowledge with them that can be utilized to the benefit of host people. These skills may vary, but those of the more educated refugees such as health professionals and teachers, even if limited numbers, can make a significant role in remote areas of host. For example, Refugees in Nepal have introduced new techniques of cultivating cardamom, an important cash crop in the south-east of the country (UNHCR, 1997:6; Gomez and Christensen *et al*, 2010:8).

In terms of social services it may mean that areas such as health and education receive assistance through construction of schools and hospitals. In the initial phase of refugee influx is it typical that these services are reserved for refugees, although in long term they may also bring benefits to local communities as they will also receive increased access to these services (Chambers, 1986). According to the World Bank Development Report (World Bank, 2011) social services are often improved in refugee hosting communities, with reference to communities in Mexico in the early 1990s. Improved access to health services is the third most reported positive impact by the host community respondents. Free medical services at clinics in the camps provided by humanitarian organizations have become available for the host community. Services in the camp are free of charge in contrast to the hospital in Kakuma town. However, host communities may be denied access to these services, based on host country policies of segregating refugees from the host population, which may diminish the benefits of hosting refugees. A study on health systems in Cameroon, for example, also found that refugees did not necessarily have negative impacts on health systems, and in some cases, they even

contributed to improvements (Tatah et al. 2016). Other research by (Jacobsen 2002) shows that the refugee presence and “pursuit of livelihoods can increase human security because economic activities help to recreate social and economic interdependence within and between communities”.

Both the host community and refugees can gain through inclusive policies, leading to less aid dependence and more resiliency. According to Miller (2018) social impacts are also highly contextual: the effects of refugees staying with family members in a host country, versus those in a camp or settlement for decades, might present very different social outcomes for displaced persons and hosts. Other studies on social cohesion, for example, also demonstrate how protracted situations and policies that foster integration can positively or negatively affect social cohesion: when refugees are better able to integrate and given greater access to their rights, social cohesion is greater within the community.

2.17 Empirical review

A study by Callamard (1994) provides a descriptive account of flourishing trade and income-generating activity in Malawi based on the interaction between Mozambican refugees with the local population. Loschmann, Bilgili and Siegel (2017) further went on to posit that framed within the structural and political constraints of the environment, this robust economic activity is understood to have been driven by the lack of variety in the refugee food basket, the ability of refugees to ‘misuse’ the assistance program (i.e. access additional rations), and the local demand for items distributed to refugees that were not available in the limited local economy.

Whitaker (1999) also highlights the economic opportunities for host communities in western Tanzania due to the influx of Burundian, Rwandan and Congolese refugees and

associated relief resources. The study revealed that an increase in market activity due to an upsurge in business and trade between local hosts and refugees, as well as the arrival of entrepreneurs from around the country. Local farmers were particularly seen selling and trading a wide range of products to the refugee and expatriate markets, while refugees provided hosts with food and non-food items received from relief distributions.

Alternatively, Bakewell (2000), Polzer (2004) and Betts et al. (2014) concentrated their studies on the integration of refugees in Zambia, South Africa and Uganda, respectively, and similarly report instances of increased trade between refugees and host communities. Taylor et al. (2016) and Alloush et. al (2017) also investigated some of the same Congolese refugee populations in Rwanda and described active economic interaction between refugees and host communities. They found a significant income spillover effect from refugee camps to the host economies through a simulation exercise, and speculate that refugees likewise fueled trade between the local economy and the rest of the country.

Local commodity prices may experience noticeable effects due to such economic interaction. In a study in western Tanzania, Whitaker (1999) describes an increase in the price of local crops in response to the sudden higher demand in the market due to refugee presence. A study by Landau (2002) compares market prices near the refugee camps in Tanzania with others in another region of the country and finds little evidence of rising prices due to refugees and associated humanitarian resources. Going a step further, Alix-Garcia and Saah (2009) use more rigorous quantitative methods to re-investigate changes to food prices due to the inflow of refugees in this same context. They found a significant increase in the prices of some agricultural goods (bananas, beans and milk) in markets closer to refugee camps using variations in refugee population and food aid over time to examine the impact of proximity to refugee camps and aid

on prices of Tanzanian goods. The study also finds a modest decrease in the prices of aid-related food items like maize and legumes, showing that assistance helped to offset this increased demand and consequential inflationary pressure by refugees.

The presence of refugees is also likely to have consequences for the labor market. Again in the case of western Tanzania, Whitaker (1999) highlights that fact that refugees often represent a source of cheap labor for local agricultural producers, allowing for increased cultivation and production. Maystadt and Verwimp (2014) used a robust quantitative approach in the same setting, using a measure of refugee presence based on both proximity to and camp size to provide a better source of local variation. The study revealed that local agricultural workers did face fiercer competition in the labor market due to refugees, while self-employed agricultural producers (i.e. farmers) benefited from this supply of cheap labor. In addition, skilled workers particularly those outside of the agricultural sector were able to benefit from increased job opportunities in international organizations focused on refugee programs, while those self-employed in business activities possibly as a result of increased competition from outside entrepreneurs were worse off. A study by Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2016) found that refugee shock made it more likely that a native will be engaged in within-household agriculture activity instead of working outside the household as employees. This adjustment by natives in the presence of refugees similarly showed up with respect to casual labor, where competition with refugees is presumed high. Correspondingly, Tumen (2016) looks at the influx of Syrian refugees in Turkey, finding a modest decline in natives' informal employment and slight increase in natives' formal employment within the local economy.

Quite a number of these studies also investigate changes to general welfare. Alix-Garcia and Saah (2009), for example, look at household assets as an indicator of wealth and find

suggestive evidence of a positive wealth effect of refugee camps on nearby rural household and negative wealth effects on households in urban areas. They interpret this as evidence of a scenario where producer households benefited from higher prices in agricultural goods, and then invested that money in durable goods. Similarly, Maystadt and Verwimp (2014) show that refugees on average had a positive impact on household consumption (per adult equivalent) even though this effect is highly differentiated by occupation. Along the same line, Maystadt and Duranton (2014) found that the refugee presence significantly increased real consumption, and turned their attention towards the channels of transmission of such a persistent and positive welfare effect. The study revealed that the most important driver of this change was a sizable decrease in transport costs following increased road building, which continued to benefit the local population. Additionally, Kreibaum (2015) studies the impact of Congolese refugees in Uganda and shows increased monthly consumption due to the refugee presence, although economically small. Despite this objective finding of improved wellbeing, the author also finds a contradicting subjective result in that on average locals felt they are worse off in areas with a higher level of refugees, and even more so when living close to settlements.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methods used to collect data in assessing the socio economic impact of refugees on their host communities. It describes the Research Design, Study Area, Population, Sampling Procedure, Data Collection Instruments, and Data Collection Procedures. It also looks at the Data Processing and Analysis procedures.

The Fetentaa refugee camp is a camp that is located at the Brong-Ahafo Region of Ghana. This Camp is among the three camps for the Ivorian refugees in Ghana. It is situated on the Berekum– Drobo trunk road after about one kilometer from the Fetentaa Township. It has been in existence since June, 2011. The camp currently hosts a refugee population of 979 Ivorians. This is made up of 510 females and 469 males (UNHCR Progress database, 2018). The host population also stands at about 3000.

3.2 Research Design

Research design is the overall plan for collecting data in order to answer the researcher's questions and or test hypothesis, the specific data analyses techniques and methods that the researcher intends to use in the research process. It denotes all the stages and the process involved in reaching the respondents.

To assess the socio economic impact of refugees on their host communities, a descriptive research design was used. The descriptive research design was considered appropriate for this study because it is suitable for describing the way things are.

A descriptive study identifies and defines the problem, selects tools for collecting data, describes, analyzes and interprets the data. Descriptive research design involves systematic gathering of data about individuals in order to test hypotheses or answer research questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh & Sorensen, 2010). A descriptive survey was considered appropriate for the current study because it allow the use of questionnaire to seek for in-depth information.

3.3 Study Area

The research was conducted at Fetentaa. Fetentaa is a rural community situated in the Berekum West Constituency of the Brong Ahafo Region. The local community there are mainly into farming; growing cassava, tomatoes, cashew and mango. The community is the host of Ivorian refugees. The Fetentaa Camp was established by the Government of Ghana and the UNHCR in June, 2011 to serve as one of the camps hosting Ivorian refugees in Ghana. As with all refugee camps in Ghana, the Fetentaa Camp is managed by the National Disaster Management Organization (NADMO) staff seconded to the Ghana Refugee Board. The camp which occupies an area of about 25 acres has a combination of plastic tents and semi- permanent transitional shelters and hosts a refugee population of about 1,041 people.

3.4 Population of the study area

The population of this study consisted of the residents at Fetentaa in the Brong Ahafo region. Data available from Ghana Statistical Service indicates that there are about 782 households in Fetentaa with a total population of 3000.

3.5 Sampling Procedure

The sample size for the research was One hundred and nineteen (119) respondents. This is because the study population is so large and it will not be possible to obtain and collect data from all the respondents in the population for the study. The sample size was determined using Bartlett, Kotrlk & Higgins table of sample size determination. The table was developed using the

$$\text{formulae } n = \frac{n_0}{(1+n_0)/\text{Population}}$$

Where

n_0 = required return sample size according to Cochran's formula

n = required return sample size because sample > 5% of population

The simple random sampling technique was then used to select the respondents for the study. This is because the respondents are relatively homogeneous and the simple random sampling technique is appropriate for such instances.

In using the simple random sampling technique for the study, the list of names of all respondents were first obtained and reordered into a random order. Random numbers were assigned to the list of names and the respondents were chosen based on the assigned random names and numbers.

3.6 Data Collection Instruments

Questionnaires were used to collect primary data from the field. The questionnaire used in this research study consisted of two parts: Parts one and two. Part 'One' contained questions to establish the respondent's biographical information. This was to enable the researcher establish a profile of the sample group in relation to sex, educational qualification, age, and how long respondents have lived in the host community. The demographic variables assisted in establishing relationships with other variables in the study.

Part two of the questionnaire focused on the measurement of variables. It looked at the economic benefits of hosting refugees, the social benefits of hosting refugees and the challenges refugees pose to the host community. Part two of the questionnaire was presented in a five-point Likert scale. Respondents were requested to indicate their preference by rating the statements on a scale of 1 to 5.

To enhance the validity of the research instrument, the questionnaire was made available to the researcher's supervisor to review and comment on with the view of establishing content validity. Under the guidance of the supervisor, materials of the study considered inaccurate or which the study felt infringed on the confidentiality of the respondents were modified or deleted.

3.7 Ethical Consideration

One major ethical consideration is to ensure respondent's anonymity throughout the analysis process. They were allowed to respond freely to all, some or more of the questions asked. And also be assured of complete confidentiality and their identity protected, as a result names were not required on the questionnaire.

3.8 Data Collection Procedures

To facilitate quick data collection, the researcher recruited and trained ten research assistants to help in data collection. The researcher obtained an introductory letter from the University of Ghana to facilitate the data collection process. Data were collected during a two month period. Some of the respondents for the study had very tight schedules so the researcher and the research assistants had to continually reschedule the meetings to enable them obtain the

data. There were also instances where the researcher and the research assistants were not clear on certain responses and had to make follow ups to rectify the issue.

3.9 Data Processing and Analysis

Data collected from the field were processed and collated for easy comprehension. The raw data was thoroughly edited and cleaned to remove inconsistencies and errors. After editing to remove mistakes such as typographical errors, wrong replies completeness of entries and consistency of entries, the data were coded to facilitate enumeration and addition. The coding enabled the researcher to group responses into limited number of categories for easy analysis. Data was analysed with the aid of Microsoft Excel and SPSS. Data was presented in tables and charts using descriptive statistical tools.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This Chapter presents the results and discussion from the data collected from respondents. It also discusses the findings of the study in relation to prior studies, theory and their practical implication.

4.2 Demographic Information of Respondents

The demographic information consists of data such as age and gender of respondents. Data was also collected on certain variables such as the academic qualification of respondents, and how long the respondents have been resident in Fetentaa. These factors were deemed important to study and would help to explain certain observations and establish some facts about the study.

Table 1 presents data on the sex of the respondents, academic qualification of respondents and age group of respondents used for the study.

Table 1: Respondent’s sex, academic qualification, age distribution and years of residence.

Background Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	48	40
Female	71	60
<i>Academic qualification</i>		
WASSCE	36	30
Diploma	4	4
HND	16	13
Degree	8	7
Post graduate		-
Others	55	46
<i>Age distribution</i>		
20-29	32	27
30-39	36	30
40-49	27	23
50 and above.	24	20
<i>Length in years</i>		
Less than 5 years	32	27
5 - 10	20	17
11- 15	8	7
16 -20	8	7
20 and above	51	42

Source: Field Data (2018).

From Table 1, 40% of the respondents were males and 60% of the respondents were females. This means that the female respondents dominated the study. Also, 30% of the respondents held a WASSCE qualification, 4% have a diploma, 13% have a HND, and 7% have a bachelor’s degree, 46% of the respondents held other qualifications. This means that respondents with other qualifications dominated the study.

Also, from Table 1, 27% of the respondents were within 20-29 years bracket, 30% of the respondents were within 30-39 years bracket, 23% were within 40-49 years age bracket and 20% were 50 years and above. This also means that respondents in the 30- 39 years age group dominated the study.

Finally, 27% of the respondents have lived in Fetentaa for less than 5 years. 17% of the respondents have lived in Fetentaa for 5 to 10 years. 7% of the respondents have lived in Fetentaa for 11 to 15 years. 7% of the respondents have lived in Fetentaa for 16 to 20 years and above 42% of the respondents have lived in Fetentaa for 20 years and above. Thus table 2 reveals that respondents who have lived in Fetentaa for 20 years and above dominated the study.

4.3 Analysis pertaining to research questions

This section presents the analysis of the data pertaining to the research questions. It starts with the results on the economic benefits of refugees on the host community. Statistical tools such as means and standard deviations were used to discuss the results obtained from the study.

4.5 Economic Benefits of Refugees on the host community

Research Question One: What are the economic benefits of refugees on the host community? In identifying the economic benefits of refugees on the host community- Fetentaa, 9 items were used to measure this variable. Respondents were to indicate their agreement or disagreement on a 5 point Likert-type scale. The scores “Strongly agree” and “agree” were represented by mean score, equivalent to 5 to 3 on the continuous Likert scale ($5 \leq \text{Agree} \leq 3$); the scores of neutral was equivalent to 3, (neutral = 3); and the scores of ‘Disagree’ were represented by a score equivalent to 1 to 3, ($1 \leq \text{‘Disagree’} \leq 3$).

The results presented in Table 2 show the economic benefits of refugees on the host community

Table 2: Economic benefits of Refugees on the host community

Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.
Refugees stimulate local commerce	3	0.22
Refugees attract international organisations who bring in resources	3.133	0.233
Refugees bring in entrepreneurial skills which benefits the host communities	3.533	0.283
The presence of refugees lead to improve fiscal sustainability	2.667	0.146
Refugees help create jobs in the host community	2.833	0.240
Refugees help improve productivity in the host community	3.2	0.201
Remittances received from refugees boost income	3.233	0.157
Refugees that are in employment provide important goods and services to the host communities	3.6	0.232

Refugees pay taxes which brings income to 2.6 0.260
the host community

Source: field Data (2018)

From the table, the mean score for the statement that refugees stimulate local commerce is 3 with a standard deviation of 0.22. This implies that respondents for the study were neutral to the statement that refugees stimulate local commerce in Fetentaa. From the table, the mean score for the statement that refugees attract international organisations who bring in resource is 3.133 with a standard deviation of 0.233. This implies that respondents agree that refugees attract international organisations who bring in resources to Fetentaa, the host community. This findings support previous studies of (Gomez and Christensen, 2010; Landau, 2008; Miller, 2017; Milner, 2009b; Harrell-Bond, 1986; Harrell-Bond, 2002; Long, 2013; Jacobsen and Fratzke, 2016) where refugees have had positive effects, either through camps stimulating local economies with greater demand or by attracting international organizations that help to bring resources, technology and jobs to an otherwise poor or remote area.

From the table the mean score for the statement that Refugees bring in entrepreneurial skills which benefits the host communities is 3.533 with a standard deviation of 0.283 indicating that respondents agree that refugees bring in entrepreneurial skills which benefits Fetentaa the host community. This findings support the (Legrain, 2016) who emphasized the positive contributions that refugees can make to developed economies by saying that as refugees are given the opportunity to become entrepreneurs, innovators, taxpayers, consumers and investors, they create jobs, raise productivity and wages of local workers, lift capital returns, stimulate international trade and investment, and boost innovation, enterprise and growth.

From the table the mean score for the statement that the presence of refugees lead to improve fiscal sustainability is 2.667 with a standard deviation of 0.146 implying that respondents disagreed that he presence of refugees lead to improve fiscal sustainability in Fetentaa. From the table, the mean score for the statement that refugees help create jobs in the host community is 2.833 with a standard deviation of 0.240 indicating that respondents disagreed that refugees help create jobs in Fetentaa. These findings counter those of the (European Commission, 2016) whose study focused on Europe also found that refugees can contribute to greater market flexibility, and improve fiscal sustainability.

From the table, the mean score for the statement that refugees help improves productivity in the host community is 3.2 with a standard deviation of 0.201. This indicates that respondents agree that refugees help improve productivity in Fetentaa. From the table, the mean score for the statement that remittances received from refugees boost income is 3.233 with a standard deviation of 0.157. This shows that respondents agree that remittances received from refugees boost income in Fetentaa. This finding provide support to the earlier studies of (Refugee Council USA, 2017; Capps et al., 2015) who posits that refugees also provide remittances that boost the sending country's income.

From the table the means score for the statement that refugees that are in employment provide important goods and services to the host communities is 3.6 with a standard deviation of 0.232 indicating that respondents agree that refugees that are in employment provide important goods and services to Fetentaa.

From the table, the mean score for the statement that refugees pay taxes which brings income to the host community is 2.6 with a standard deviation of 0.260 indicating that respondents disagree that refugees pay taxes which brings income to Fetentaa. This finding goes

contrary to that of (New American Economy and Knight Foundation, 2016) where the economic impact of refugees and immigrants in Akron, Ohio, also pointed to positive returns via taxes, purchase of homes, and work in manufacturing and service sector jobs.

4.6 Social Benefits of Refugees on the host community

Research Question Two: What are the social benefits of refugees on the community? In identifying the social benefits of refugees, 6 items were used to measure this variable. Respondents were to indicate their agreement or disagreement on a 5 point Likert-type scale. The scores “Strongly agree” and “agree” were represented by mean score, equivalent to 5 to 3 on the continuous Likert scale ($5 \leq \text{Agree} \leq 3$); the scores of neutral was equivalent to 3, (neutral = 3); and the scores of ‘Disagree’ were represented by a score equivalent to 1 to 3, ($1 \leq \text{‘Disagree’} \leq 3$).

The results presented in Table 3 show the social benefits of refugees on the host community

Table 3: Social benefits of refugees on the host community

Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.
Refugees add to peaceful coexistence and integration in the host community	4	0.218
Refugee presence leads to the construction of important amenities for the host community	3.433	0.278
Refugees bring improved social services to	3.167	0.225

the host community

Refugees bring about improved health services 3.5 0.261

services in the host community

Refugees bring improved educational facilities 3.433 0.257

facilities to the host community

Refugees increase human security in the host community 2.3433 0.207

host community

Source: Field Data (2018)

From the table the means score for the statement that refugees add to peaceful coexistence and integration in the host community is 4 with a standard deviation of 0.218. This implies that respondents agree that refugees add to peaceful coexistence and integration in Fetentaa. This finding supports the literature of UNHCR who found that when refugees are from the same cultural and linguistic group as the local population, there are greater opportunities for peaceful co-existence and interaction among them (UNHCR, 2007).

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugee presence leads to the construction of important amenities for the host community is 3.433 with a standard deviation of 0.278. This implies that respondents agreed that refugee presence leads to the construction of important amenities in Fetentaa. This finding also support (Chambers, 1986) who posits that in the initial phase of refugee influx is it typical that social services such as health and education receive assistance through construction of schools and hospitals are reserved for refugees, although in long term they may also bring benefits to local communities as they will also receive increased access to these services (Chambers, 1986).

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees bring improved social services to the host community 3.167 with a standard deviation of 0.225. This indicates that respondents agree that refugees bring improved social services to Fetentaa. This is in line with the World Bank Development Report (World Bank, 2011) which stated that social services are often improved in refugee hosting communities. They report further stated that improved access to health services is the third most reported positive impact by the host community respondents. Free medical services at clinics in the camps provided by humanitarian organizations have become available for the host community. Results from the study also indicate that refugees bring improved educational facilities in Fetentaa.

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees bring about improved health services in the host community 3.5 with a standard deviation of 0.26.1. This indicates that respondents agree that refugees bring about improved health services in Fetentaa. From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees bring improved educational facilities to the host community 3.433 with a standard deviation of 0.257. This indicates that respondents agree that refugees bring improved educational facilities in Fetentaa.

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees increase human security in the host community 2.3433 with a standard deviation 0.207. this indicates that respondents disagree that refugees increase human security in Fetentaa. This finding is contrary to earlier reports by (Jacobsen 2002) whose research shows that the refugee presence and pursuit of livelihoods can increase human security because economic activities help to recreate social and economic interdependence within and between communities.

4.7 Effects of refugees on the host community

Research Question three: What are the effects of refugees on the host community? In identifying the effect of refugees on the host community, a regression analysis was performed. The results presented in Table 2 show the effects of refugees on the host community.

Table 4: Regression Model Summary

Regression statistics	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error
	0.408053	0.166508	-0.04187	0.309003

Source: Field Data (2018).

From the table the R value of 0.408053 indicate that refugees have a positive effect on the host community. The R square explains the amount of variation that exists in the dependent variable caused by the independent variable. And from the model summary, the result which is 0.166 indicates that 16% of the socio-economic development in Fetentaa can be explained by refugees. The adjusted R square of 4% explains the variation in the dependent variable that is being explained by an adjustment in the independent variable in the regression model.

This supports earlier studies such as (New American Economy and Knight Foundation, 2016; UNHCR, 2011; Milner, 2016; Gomez and Christensen, 2010; Landau, 2008; Miller, 2017; Milner, 2009b; Harrell-Bond, 1986; Harrell-Bond, 2002; Long, 2013; Jacobsen and Fratzke, 2016; Legrain, 2016) which all posits that refugees can also have positive impacts on their host communities.

4.8 Challenges refugees pose to the host community

Research Question four: What are the challenges refugees pose to the host community? In identifying the challenges refugees pose to the host community, 13 items were used to measure this variable. Respondents were to indicate their agreement or disagreement on a 5 point Likert-type scale. The scores “Strongly agree” and “agree” were represented by mean score, equivalent to 5 to 3 on the continuous Likert scale ($5 \leq \text{Agree} \leq 3$); the scores of neutral was equivalent to 3, (neutral = 3); and the scores of ‘Disagree’ were represented by a score equivalent to 1 to 3, ($1 \leq \text{Disagree} \leq 3$).

The results presented in Table 5 show the challenges refugees pose to the host community.

Table 5: Challenges refugees pose to the host community

Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.
Refugees cause social tensions in the host community	2	0.252
Refugees bring about social problems such as gambling and prostitution	2.433	0.266
Refugees add to security problems such as crime, theft and murder	2.3	0.231
Refugees can be a source of negative public health	1.867	0.157
Refugees contribute to the spread of disease such as HIV, Malaria , diarrhoea and other infectious diseases	2.433	0.266
Refugees contribute to long term mental health issues	2.167	0.179
Refugees contribute to deteriorating standard of living in the host community	2.8	0.211
Refugees degrade the environment in the host community	2.1	0.222

Refugees put a strain on resource	2.3	0.167
Refugees overwhelm health facilities and schools	3.167	0.179
Refugees strain infrastructure such as roads, bridges, warehousing facilities and the availability of land	2.633	0.194
Refugees place a burden on social and administrative services	2.567	0.141
Refugees take jobs from nationals, and drive up the cost of housing, goods and other services	2.233	0.218
The presence of refugees lead to inflation in the host community	2.167	0.179

Source: Field Data (2018)

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees cause social tensions in the host community is 2 with a standard deviation of 0.252. This indicates that respondents disagree that refugees cause social tensions in Fetentaa. From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees bring about social problems such as gambling and prostitution is 2.433 with a standard deviation of 0.266. This implies that respondents disagree that refugees bring about social problems such as gambling and prostitution to Fetentaa. These findings contradict the literature of (Codjoe et al., 2013) who posits that there are a number of studies that discuss how refugee camps are perceived as increasing social problems and tensions in communities, including alcohol consumption, gambling, prostitution and crime. Along similar lines the findings counter the literature of (Girma, 2016) who wrote that the mass influx of refugees have added to security problems on the social life of a host community in general and crime rates, theft, murder in particular. Along with other social problems such as prostitution and alcoholism are also claimed to rise in the refugee areas.

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees add to security problems such as crime, theft and murder is 2.3 with a standard deviation of 0.231. This implies that respondents disagree that refugees add to security problems such as crime, theft and murder.

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees can be a source of negative public health is 1.867 with a standard deviation 0.157. This implies that respondents disagree that refugees can be a source of negative public health in Fetentaa. From the table the mean score for the statement refugees contribute to the spread of disease such as HIV, Malaria, diarrhoea and other infectious diseases is 2.433 with a standard deviation of 0.266. This implies that respondents disagree that refugees contribute to the spread of diseases such as HIV, Malaria, diarrhoea and other infectious diseases. These findings contradict the research of Collier (2003) who argued that refugees can be a source of negative public health with adverse consequences for their host countries.

From the table mean score for the statement that refugees contribute to long term mental health issues is 2.167 with a standard deviation 0.179. This indicates that respondents disagree that refugees contribute to long term mental health issues in Fetentaa.

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees contribute to deteriorating standard of living in the host community is 2.8 with a standard deviation of 0.211. This implies that respondents disagree that refugees contribute to deteriorating standard of living in the Fetentaa. The results contradict the literature of Omeokachi (2013) who posits that the mass influx of refugees extensively degrades the environment by way of polluting water resources, cutting down trees, creation of rubbish and refuse dumps, and other destructive environmental practices.

From the table, the mean score for the statement that refugees degrade the environment in the host community is 2.1 with a standard deviation of 0.222. This indicates that respondents disagree that refugees degrade the environment in Fetentaa.

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees put a strain on resource is 2.3 with a standard deviation of 0.167. This indicates that respondents disagree that refugees put a strain on resources in Fetentaa.

From the table the mean score for the statement that refugees overwhelm health facilities and schools is 3.167 with a standard deviation of 0.179. This indicates that respondents agreed that refugees overwhelm health facilities and schools in Fetentaa. This finding support the (UNHCR 2011) who wrote that host states often argue that refugees are a strain on local resources; overwhelm health facilities and schools; strain infrastructure such as roads, bridges, warehousing facilities and the availability of land; and place a burden on social and administrative services.

From the table, the mean score for the statement that refugees strain infrastructure such as roads, bridges, warehousing facilities and the availability of land is 2.633 with a standard deviation of 0.194. This implies that respondents disagree that refugees strain infrastructure such as roads, bridges, warehousing facilities and the availability of land in Fetentaa.

From the table, the mean score for the statement that refugees place a burden on social and administrative services is 2.567 with a standard deviation of 0.141. This indicates that respondents disagree that refugees place a burden on social and administrative services. Therefore it is evident that the findings are contrary to that of (Unesco, 1992) where it was made known that the presence of refugees especially in substantial numbers has resulted in pressure on

social services and infrastructures (e.g.schools, clinics and health centres, water electricity and agricultural, extension services) in destination localities.

From the table, the means score for the statement that refugees take jobs from nationals, and drive up the cost of housing, goods and other services is 2.233 with a standard deviation 0.218. This means that respondents disagree that refugees take jobs from nationals, and drive up the cost of housing, goods and other services

From the table, the mean score for the statement that the presence of refugees leads to inflation in the host community is 2.167 with a standard deviation of 0.179. This indicates that the respondents disagree that the presence of refugees leads to inflation in Fetentaa. This finding also contradicts earlier research by the (UNHCR 2011).

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

Ghana has been a home to some refugees from Liberia and Cote d'Ivoire in the past years. Refugees are usually known to have social, economic, environmental impact on their host communities in many nations that house them. In the Brong Ahafo region, the Fetentaa community became the home to Ivorian refugees that fled their country due to political conflict. Their presence therefore necessitates research into the socio-economic impact they have on their host community.

The purpose of the study was to examine the socio-economic impact of refugees on their host community. Fetentaa was used for the study. The research objectives included the economic benefits of refugees on Fetentaa as a host community, identifying the social benefits of refugees on Fetentaa as a host community, investigating the effect refugees have on Fetentaa as a host community and finding out the challenges refugees pose to Fetentaa as a host community. A descriptive research was adopted for the study. Questionnaires were administered to One Hundred and nineteen (119) respondents to obtain responses from them. The data collected from the questionnaire was coded, edited and analysed using Microsoft Excel. It was then presented using tables.

5.2 Major Findings of the Study

It was revealed from the study the economic benefits of refugees on the host community include attracting international organisations which bring in resources, equipping them with entrepreneurial skills, creation of jobs, improving productivity, boosting income through remittances and providing important goods and services.

The study also found that the social benefits of refugees in Fetentaa include refugees adding to peaceful coexistence and integration, refugee presence leading to the construction of important amenities, refugees bringing improved social services, refugees bringing about improved health services in Fetentaa, and refugees bringing improved educational facilities in Fetentaa.

The study also found that refugees overwhelm health facilities and schools in Fetentaa. However, respondents disagreed that refugees bring about social problems such as gambling and prostitution, security problems such as crime, theft and murder, negative public health and the spread of disease such as HIV, Malaria, diarrhoea and other infectious diseases. This is contrary to the studies of A Pavli (2017) and AH Eiset (2017) which identified asylum seekers and refugees to be the main cause of spread of infectious diseases in Europe in 2015. Refugees also do not contribute to long term mental health issues, deteriorating standard of living, degrade the environment nor put a strain on resources in Fetentaa. This is also different from the studies of D Silove et al (2017) which showed that, the influx of refugees mostly into low income countries increases mental health issues due to the limited mental health care in these host countries. The study UNHCR (2011) also went further to indicate that refugees contribute to the deteriorating standard of living in the host as pressure is put on the limited resources. They also do not strain infrastructure such as roads, bridges, warehousing facilities and land in Fetentaa nor place a burden on social and administrative services. The study by unesco (1992) is contrary to this finding. The finding revealed that the inflow of refugees mostly into developing countries puts a lot of pressure on infrastructure such as roads, bridges and warehouse facilities. Refugees do not also take jobs from nationals nor drive up the cost of housing, goods and other services. The study by Whitaker (1999) the case of western Tanzania highlights the facts that refugees often

represent a source of cheap labour hence taking the available jobs from the host community people. Their presence as refugees does not lead to inflation in Fetentaa. The study by Maystadt and Duranton (2014) contrary to the above reveals that refugees presence significantly increase real consumption and as such leads to inflation.

5.3 Conclusion

It is concluded from the study that the economic benefits of refugees on Fetentaa are: attracting international organisations who bring in resources, bringing in entrepreneurial skills, creation jobs, improving productivity, boosting income through remittances and providing important goods and services.

The study also concluded that the social benefits of refugees in Fetentaa include refugees adding to peaceful coexistence and integration, refugee presence leading to the construction of important amenities, refugees bringing improved social services, refugees bringing about improved health services in Fetentaa, and refugees bringing improved educational facilities in Fetentaa.

5.4 Recommendations

It is envisaged that the following recommendations based on the findings of this study will enhance the impact of refugees on their host communities.

Stakeholders should team up and provide more resources and amenities for the host community, Fetentaa. This will help solve the challenge where refugees' presence in the host community overwhelms the available resources such as health facilities and schools.

Since the presence of refugees do not improve human security in the host community, Fetentaa, the stakeholders in the host community need to work on seeking the help of security personnel who would help improve the security of residents in the host community.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

The findings of the study have given certain indications with regard to possible directions for further research. The following areas can therefore be looked at: First, the environmental impact of refugees on their host community. Secondly, a longitudinal study is highly recommended if replication of this study is made due to the high probability of respondents changing their preferences.

REFERENCES

- Alix-Garcia, J. & Saah, D. (2009). The Effect of Refugee Inflows on Host Communities: Evidence from Tanzania. *World Bank Economic Review*, 24(1), 148-170
- Alix-Garcia, J. (2007). *The Effects of Refugee Inflows on Host Country Populations: Evidence from Tanzania*. University of Montana, USA.
- Alloush, M., Taylor J. E., Gupta, A., Rojas Valdes, R. I. & Gonzalez-Estrada, E. (2017). Economic Life in Refugee Camps. *World Development*, 91, 334- 347
- Atim, Grace. 2013. *The Impacts of Refugees on Conflicts in Africa*. Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution Abuja.
- Bakewell, O. (2000). Repatriation and Self-Settled Refugees in Zambia: Bringing Solutions to the Wrong Problems. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 13(4), 356- 373.
- Betts, A., Bloom, L., Kaplan, J. & Omata N. (2014). *Refugee Economies: Rethinking Popular Assumptions*. Humanitarian Innovation Project, University of Oxford.
- Bulcha, M. (1988). *Flights and Integration: Causes of Mass Exodus from Ethiopia and Problems in the Sudan*. Uppsala: The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.
- Callamard A (1994) Refugees and local hosts: a study of the trading interactions between Mozambican refugees and Malawian villagers in the district of Mwanza. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 7(1):39–62
- Capps, R., Newland, K., Fratzke, S., Groves, S., Fix, M., McHugh, M. and Auclair, G. (2015). *The Integration Outcomes of U.S. Refugees: Successes and Challenges*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

- Castles, S., Booth, H., & Wallace, T. (1984). *Here for good: Western Europe's new ethnic minorities*. London: Pluto Press
- Chambers, R. (1986). Hidden losers? The Impact of Rural Refugees and Refugee Programs on Poorer Hosts. *International Migration Review*, 20 (2): 245- 263
- Chmura Economics and Analytics. (2013). *Economic Impact of Refugees in the Cleveland Area: Calendar Year 2012*. Prepared for Refugee Services Collaborative of Greater Cleveland. Richmond, VA: Chmura Economics and Analytics.
- Codjoe, S., Ardey, N., Quartey, P., Tagoe, C. and Reed, H.E. (2013). Perceptions of the Impact of Refugees on Host Communities: The Case of Liberian Refugees in Ghana. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 14 (3), 439–456.
- Cohen, R. (1996). Introduction, in Cohen, R. (ed.) *Theories of Migration*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, xi-xvii.
- Dryden-Peterson, S. and Hovil, L. (2004). A Remaining Hope for Durable Solutions: Local Integration of Refugees and Their Hosts in the Case of Uganda. *Refuge* 22 (1): 26–38.
- Dzimhiri, L. B. (1993). Political and Economic Impacts of Refugees: Some Observations on Mozambican Refugees in Malawi. *Refuge*, 13 (6), 4–6.
- European Commission. (2016). An Economic Take on the Refugee Crisis: A Macroeconomic Assessment for the EU.” Institutional Paper 033, July. Brussels,

Belgium: Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs.

Fakiolas, R. (2003). Regularising Undocumented Immigrants in Greece: Procedures and Effects.

Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 29(3): 535-561.

Gavlack, D. (2014). "Zaatari Syrian refugee camp fertile ground for small businesses." BBC

News, July 30.

Gheasi, M. & Nijkamp, P. (2017) A Brief Overview of International Migration

Motives and Impacts, with Specific Reference to FDI. *Economies*, 5, 31

Gomez, M. P. and Christensen, A. (2010). "The Impacts of Refugees on Neighboring Countries:

A Development Challenge." World Development Report 2011 Background Note, July

29.

Gussin, R. (2013). *Push or Pull Factors in Migration*.

Hamza, B. (2006). *A Report on the Somali Remittance Sector in Somalia*. Nathanson Centre

for the Study of Organized Crime and Corruption. York University. Canada.

Harrell-Bond, B. (1986). *Imposing Aid: Emergency Assistance to Refugees*. Oxford, UK: Oxford

University Press.

Harrell-Bond, B. (2002). Can Humanitarian Work with Refugees Be Humane? *Human Rights*

Quarterly, 24 (1): 51-85.

Horst, C., and N. Van Hear (2002). 'Counting the Cost: Refugees, Remittances and the

Horst, C., and Van Hear, N. (2002). Counting the Cost: Refugees, Remittances and the War

Against Terrorism. *Forced Migration Review*, 14.

Hovil, L. (2007). Self-settled Refugees in Uganda: An Alternative Approach to Displacement?

Journal of Refugee Studies, 20 (4), 599–620.

Jacobsen, K. (1997). *Refugee's Environmental Impact: the Effect of Patterns of Settlement*.

Department of Political Science. Oxford University Press. United Kingdom.

Jacobsen, K. (2001). The forgotten solution: local integration for refugees in developing

countries. *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working

Jacobsen, K. (2002). Can refugees benefit the state? Refugee resources and African state

building. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 40(4), 577– 596.

Jacobsen, K. and Fratzke, S. (2016). Building Livelihood Opportunities for Refugee Populations:

Lessons from Past Practice. *Migration Policy Institute*,

Kaith, S. G. (2009). Push and Pull Factors of Migration; A Case Study of Brick Kiln Industry

of Punjab State. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Social Sciences*, 1, 84-85

Kallick, D. D. and Mathema, S. (2016). *Refugee Integration in the United States*. Center for

American Progress.

Karakas, C. (2015). Economic challenges and prospects of the refugee influx. European

Parliamentary Research Service Briefing (PE 572.809), December.

King, R. (2012). Geography and Migration Studies: *Retrospect and Prospect*, *Population,*

Space and Place, 18(2): 134-153

Kreibaum, M. (2015). Their Suffering, Our Burden? How Congolese Refugees Affect the

Ugandan Population. *World Development*, 78, 262-287.

- Krui, P. and Mwaruvie, J. (2012). *The Dilemma of Hosting Refugees: A Focus on the Insecurity in North-Eastern Kenya*. Karatina University College.
- Landau, L. B. (2002). Challenge without transformation: refugees, aid and trade in western Tanzania. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 42(1), 31-59.
- Landau, L. B. (2008). *The Humanitarian Hangover: Displacement, Aid and Transformation in Western Tanzania*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Wits University Press.
- Legrain, P. (2016). Refugees Work: A Humanitarian Investment That Yields Economic Dividends. Tent Foundation, May
- Long, K. (2013). Back to where you once belonged: UNHCR and ‘voluntary’ repatriation.” PDES/2013/14, September. Geneva, Switzerland: Policy Development and Evaluation Service, UNHCR
- Macchiavello, M. (2003). “Forced migrants as an under-utilized asset: refugee skills, livelihoods, and achievements in Kampala, Uganda.” *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 95, October. Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit.
- Marlowe, F. W. (2007). Hunting and gathering: the human sexual division of foraging labor. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 41(2), 170-195
- Maystadt, J. and Philip Verwimp, P. . 2009. Winners and Losers among a Refugee-Hosting Population. International Association for Research and Teaching, ECORE, Belgium.

Maystadt, J., and Verwimp, P. (2009). Winners and losers among a refugee-hosting population. CORE Discussion paper. May

Maystadt, J.-F. & Duranton, G. (2014). The Development Push of Refugees: Evidence from Tanzania. Economics Working Paper Series 2014/019. The Department of Economics, Lancaster University Management School

Maystadt, J.-F. & Verwimp, P. (2014). Winners and Losers among a Refugee-Hosting Population. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 63(4), 769-809.

Miller, S. D. (2017). *UNHCR as a Surrogate State: Protracted Refugee Situations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Miller, S. D. (2018). Assessing the Impacts of Hosting Refugees. World Refugee Council Research Paper No. 4 — August 2018

Miller, Sarah Deardorff 2016. When Norms Are Not Enough: Understanding the Principle and Practice of Burden and Responsibility Sharing for Refugees. Global Leadership and Cooperation for Refugees Series Paper No. 2, December. Waterloo, ON: CIGI.

Milner, J. (2009). *Refugees, the State and the Politics of Asylum in Africa*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Morris, T. (2010). Urban Refugees in Yemen. *Forced Migration Review*, 34, 36- 37.

New American Economy and Knight Foundation. (2016). “Welcome to Akron: How Immigrants and Refugees are Contributing to Akron’s Economic Growth.

Nobel, P. (ed), *Refugees and Development in Africa*, Uppsala, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies — Seminar proceedings No. 19,1987

Opoku-Asare, N. A. A. (2018). *Pull and push factors that influence senior high school teachers in rural Ghana to stay or transfer to urban schools.*

Polzer, T. (2004). *We are All South Africans Now: The Integration of Mozambican Refugees in Rural South Africa*. Forced Migration Working Paper Series #8. Forced Migration Studies Programme, University of the Witwatersrand.

Refugee Council USA. (2017). “Refugee Integration and Economic Contributions to the United States.” Refugee Council USA Backgrounder, May.

Rubin, E. (2017). Statistics Show Syrian Refugees Help Host Country Economies. *Non-profit Quarterly*, 12.

Ruiz, I. & Vargas-Silva, C. (2016). The Labor Market Consequences of Hosting Refugees. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 16(3), 667-694

Sales, R. (2007). *Understanding Immigration and Refugee Policy. Contradictions and Continuities*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Sanghi, Apurva, Harun Onder and Varalakshmi Vermuru. 2016. “Yes” In My Backyard? The Economics of Refugees and Their Social Dynamics in Kakuma, Kenya. Report No. AUS14056. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.

Tatah L, Delbiso TD, Rodriguez-Llanes JM, Gil Cuesta J, Guha-Sapir D (2016) Impact of Refugees on Local Health Systems: A Difference-in-Differences Analysis in Cameroon. *PLoS ONE* 11(12): e0168820

Taylor J. E., Filipiski, M. J., Alloush, M., Gupta, A., Rojas Valdes, R. I. & Gonzalez-Estrada, E. (2016). Economic Impact of Refugees. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS), 113(27), 7449-7453.

Taylor, J. Edward, Mateusz J. Filipiski, Mohamad Alloush, Anubhab Gupta, Ruben Irvin Rojas

Tumen, S. (2016). The Economic Impact of Syrian Refugees on Host Countries: Quasi Experimental Evidence from Turkey. American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings, 106(5), 456-460.

United Nations Environmental Program. Population Displacement and the Environment. Sudan, Post-Conflict Environmental Assessment

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (1998). *Economic and Social Impacts of Massive Refugee Populations on Host Developing Countries, as well as other Countries*. Standing Committee. UNHCR, EC/47/SC/CRP.40

US Together, Community Refugee and Immigration Services, World Relief Columbus and the City of Columbus. (2015). Impact of Refugees in Central Ohio.

Valdes and Ernesto Gonzalez-Estrada. 2016. "Economic Impact of Refugees." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 113 (27): 7449–53.

Wallerstein, I.W. (1965). *Social Change: The Colonial Situation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

War Against Terrorism'. Forced Migration Review, 14 (September)

Whitaker, B. E. (1999). Changing opportunities: refugee and host communities in western Tanzania. Working Paper No. 11. New Issues in Refugee Research, UNHCR

Whitaker, E. B. (1999). Changing Opportunities: Refugees and Host Communities in Western Tanzania. New Issues in Refugee Research. Working Paper 11. University of North Carolina, USA.

APPENDIX

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

QUESTIONNAIRE

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT OF IVORIAN REFUGEES ON THE FETENTAA HOST
COMMUNITY

Dear Respondent,

I am a Master of Arts (Migration Studies) Student at the University of Ghana. As part of my studies, I am required to undertake a study on the socio-economic impact of Ivorian refugees on the Fetentaa host community

You have been selected as one of the persons to help me complete the study. You are assured of your utmost confidentiality. This questionnaire is designed to collect data to be used purely for an academic purpose. I wish to assure you that all responses to these questions will be strictly confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation and time.

PART ONE: RESPONDENT PROFILE

1. Please what is your sex? (*Tick where appropriate*)

Male Female

2. Please select your age group

below 20 yrs. 20 – 29 yrs. 30 – 39 yrs. 40 – 49 yrs. 50 yrs. and above

3. What is your highest academic qualification?

WASSCE Diploma HND Bachelor’s degree Post Graduate Degree Professional qualification others, please specify
.....

4. How long have you lived in Fetentaa?

Less than 5 years 5 – 10 years 11 – 15 years
 16 – 20 years Above 20 years

PART TWO

Instructions:

SECTION ONE:

ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF REFUGEES ON THE HOST COMMUNITY

The following statements are to determine the Economic benefits of refugees on the host communities. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements using the following scale. [5 = Strongly Disagree at all; 4=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 2=Agree; 1= Strongly agree]. Please tick (✓) in the space provided.

	STATEMENT	1	2	3	4	5
5	Refugees stimulate local commerce					
6	Refugees attract international organisations who bring in resources					
7	Refugees bring in entrepreneurial skills which benefits the host communities					
8	The presence of refugees lead to improve fiscal sustainability					
9	Refugees help create jobs in the host community					
10	Refugees help improve productivity in the host community					
11	Remittances received by refugees boost income					
12	Refugees that are in employment provide important goods and services to the host communities					
13	Refugees pay taxes which brings income to the host community					

SECTION TWO

SOCIAL BENEFITS OF REFUGEES ON THE HOST COMMUNITY

The following statements are made to assess the social benefits of refugees on the host community. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements using the following scale. [5 = Strongly Disagree at all; 4=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 2=Agree; 1= Strongly agree]. Please tick (√) in the space provided.

	STATEMENT	1	2	3	4	5
14	Refugees add on to peaceful coexistence and integration in the host community					
15	Refugee presence leads to the construction of important amenities for the host community					
16	Refugees bring improved social services to the host community					

17	Refugees bring about improved health services in the host community					
18	Refugees bring improved educational facilities to the host community					
19	Refugees increase human security in the host community					

SECTION THREE

CHALLENGES REFUGEES POSE TO HOST COMMUNITIES

The following statements are made to identify the challenges refugees pose to host communities. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements using the following scale. [5 = Strongly Disagree at all; 4=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 2=Agree; 1= Strongly agree]. Please tick (√) in the space provided.

	STATEMENT	1	2	3	4	5
20	Refugees cause social tensions in the host community					
21	Refugees bring about social problems such as gambling and prostitution					
22	Refugees add to security problems such as crime theft and murder					
23	Refugees can be a source of negative public health					
24	Refugees contribute to the spread of diseases such as HIV, Malaria, diarrhoea and other infectious diseases					
25	Refugees contribute to long term mental health issues					
26	Refugees contribute to deteriorating standard					

	of living in the host community					
27	Refugees degrade the environment in the host community					
28	Refugees put a strain on resources					
29	Refugees overwhelm health facilities and schools					
30	Refugees strain infrastructure such as roads, bridges, warehousing facilities and the availability of land;					
31	Refugees place a burden on social and administrative services					
32	Refugees take jobs from nationals, and drive up the cost of housing, goods and other services.					
33	The presence of refugees lead to inflation in the host community					