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A MESSAGE
FROM THE CHAIR

I was a buoyant 20 year old who had just completed the first year of his undergraduate degree when I read the words "Our independence is meaningless unless it is linked up with the total liberation of Africa". This powerful statement is an extract from Ghana’s first President’s - Dr Kwame Nkrumah - Independence Day speech, a speech that still resonates with me today. Something clicked when reading that statement and those words became the catalyst that made me reflect on my own personal identity as a second-generation British born Ghanaian and how I could contribute to Ghana. It was those same words that led to the founding of Me Firi Ghana in 2008.

2008 was the first time I visited Ghana independent of my parents. The seed of a new sense of patriotism for Ghana was beginning to cultivate but how to express and identify with this was an issue; hence the creation of the Me Firi Ghana clothing line. The clothing line ushered in a new sense of patriotism amongst second generation Ghanaians living in London. However, it quickly expanded beyond London, spreading across the UK, into other parts of Europe, North America and as far as Australia. As the audience grew, we diversified our offering, using digital and physical platforms to unite Ghanaian youth, celebrities, professionals, entrepreneurs, political leaders and the Ghanaian diaspora community at large. A movement was born.

Moving forward 10 years, society has evolved and our organisation - Future of Ghana – has spent the best part of a year researching, unearthing and documenting the second-generation British Ghanaian experience. The result has culminated in this important report and expresses some of the unspoken thoughts, desires and priorities of a vital segment of Ghana’s emerging population, the second-generation.

We believe the second-generation are important for a number of reasons. For instance, in 2015, the official global remittances to low-income countries amounted to $431.6 billion, $35.2 billion to Sub-Saharan Africa and $2.2 billion to Ghana, according to the World Bank. Total remittance figures are commonly thought to be double the official stated figures as unofficial forms of remittances are often unaccounted for. We can therefore deduce that financial remittances are significantly more than the value of aid Ghana receives. But the question we should ask ourselves is, what will happen in 5 to 10 years when the majority of those remitting, namely first-generation Ghanaians, either retire or move back to Ghana? Their sizeable contribution is one that we cannot ignore. With the burgeoning youth population in Ghana and Africa as a whole, how can we all join hands and harness our collective skills, talents and resources to move towards Ghana fulfilling its potential?

This report is of significant importance, as it discusses these very issues and seeks to build an evidence-based discussion around this. I strongly believe that for the vision of a Ghana beyond aid to exist, young Ghanaians both at home and abroad must come together, united by a common vision and work together for a more prosperous and self-sustaining Ghana.

Arnold Sarfo-Kantanka
Chair, Future of Ghana
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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report is a pilot study in an upcoming country study series on second-generation Ghanaian diaspora groups. The purpose of this study is to provide insights to support diaspora organisations, international organisations, governments and related agencies in understanding the remittance practices of second-generation British-Ghanaians. By gathering the practices, views and opinions of second-generation British-Ghanaians, this study aims to provide a starting point for relevant stakeholders and researchers to understand the background, motivation and intentions of second-generation British-Ghanaians to remit, its potential long-term implications for diaspora relations and engagement, policy formulation and the socio-economic development of Ghana.

This study recognises the increasing attention given to diaspora agendas and contributions to their country of origin and wishes to contribute to an evidence-based dialogue on this. The aim of this report is to:

- Review literature and draw on ideas and observations from existing research
- Begin to build a profile of second-generation British-Ghanaians
- Identify the ways in which second-generation British-Ghanaians engage/wish to engage with Ghana as well as opportunities and challenges for engagement
- Recommend ways in which diaspora organisations, international organisations, the Ghanaian government and other development partners can help facilitate this desire to engage.

The study employed mixed methods design and took place from July 2017-November 2017. The four phases of the study were a desk-based literature review, online survey, focus group discussions and key informant interviews. 493 respondents participated in the online survey. Five focus group discussions (FGD) took place and consisted of 25 participants in total. For key informant interviews, eight participants took part.

**KEY FINDINGS**

The dominant form of engagement among second-generation British-Ghanaians is social remittance, however, a significant proportion also remit financially.

Close to half of our survey respondents remit socially. Examples varied from blogs, tourism websites, teacher training and running advocacy-focused organisations. Interestingly, almost a third of second-generation British-Ghanaians remit financially but are more driven by investments and reciprocal returns as opposed to their parents who may remit out of duty, community and obligation. The average amount remitted is £101-£300 on a monthly basis (or every other month) though some participants remit £1000+ on a monthly basis. Age, gender and salary bear no impact on the amount people remit i.e. those in lower income brackets are as likely to remit as those in higher salary brackets, but identity does have an impact. Those who self-identify as British are least likely to remit. Those who identify as British-Ghanaian are most likely to remit.

Identity is the most powerful determinant of how second-generation British-Ghanaians engage or do not engage with Ghana.

Identity is complex and manifests as such in predicting behaviour and engagement practices. Our data shows that how participants self-identify strongly correlates with their proclivity to remit financially. Language fluency and a strong sense of cultural identity are the strongest predictors of sending social remittances and those who do not speak a Ghanaian language are significantly less likely to engage in social remittances. Beyond these observable relationships, the issue of identity found in this study extends to situational identity, language, upbringing and social conditioning, the wider notion of Pan-Africanism and African diasporas as collective, the experience of mixed-heritage Ghanaians and integration into British society in comparison to first-generation Ghanaians. Whilst this was beyond the scope of the report, the prominence of this theme throughout each stage of the study necessitates further research. After identity, lack of available information, contacts and pathways to engage represented the biggest obstacle to engagement. Less than 10% of respondents stated that they had no desire to engage with Ghana.

Profile of who is most likely to remit

According to our data, in terms of financial remittances, she is female, identifies as British-Ghanaian, is between 25 - 34 years old and earns between £31,000 – £40,000. She speaks at least one Ghanaian language and works in the corporate world, namely business consulting and management. She does not belong to any diaspora group and remits socially also but only half of the time.

In terms of social remittances, statistically speaking, she is female, identifies as British-Ghanaian, is between 18-24 years old and is a full-time student. She speaks at least one Ghanaian language and belongs to a diaspora group. She engages mainly through cultural activities and also remits financially but only half of the time.
For the purposes of this study:

- Remittances are defined as financial, socio-cultural and skills/knowledge transfer\(^1\).  
- First-generation British-Ghanaian is defined as Ghanaian born naturalised citizens or legal residents of the UK\(^2\).  
- Second-generation British-Ghanaian is defined as the UK born children of at least one naturalised UK citizen from Ghana (or legal resident) or Ghanaian born children of at least one Ghanaian parent who has emigrated to the UK at around primary school starting age (5 years).
African governments have created numerous strategies in an attempt to harness the power of the African Diaspora to promote socio-economic development, regional development and (re)integration through brain gain, knowledge sharing, remittances and poverty reduction. The Ghanaian government in particular has demonstrated a sustained interest in the financial, political and human capital of its diaspora through diverse forms of engagement. Some examples include the establishment of government departments and ministries focused on diaspora relations e.g. the Diaspora Relations Office under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs/ the Ministry of Tourism and Diaspora Relations (now under the President’s Office), the ratification of the Representation of People (Amendment) Act 699 – which gave Ghanaians abroad the right to vote, and the Diaspora Homecoming Summit, with the most recent summit taking place in July 2017. As a result of new transport and communications technologies it has become increasingly easy for migrants and diasporas to maintain long-term economic, social, cultural and political links across borders. As such, diaspora groups are becoming increasingly important as social and economic actors.

Several studies have addressed Ghanaian national level and international policy mechanisms designed to facilitate diaspora engagement but few have engaged with the diaspora beyond interactions with key informants from diaspora organisations and smaller scale qualitative studies. Where studies have focused on the Ghanaian diaspora, the trend tends to be centred on financial remittances. Some older studies as well as more recent studies have highlighted and corroborated that the first-generation Ghanaian diaspora primarily engages with Ghana through the following channels:

- private financial remittances (the most sizeable and tangible form of diaspora contribution)
- investments in stocks
- treasury bills and other government debt instruments
- local development efforts through hometown associations, churches and/or professional networks
- housing and real estate
- political engagement and other informal modalities

In terms of financial remittance inflows, estimates vary widely due to the inconsistent monitoring of remittances and the informal nature of many transactions. One estimate of financial remittances from Ghanaians abroad is $2.1 billion, (accounting for approximately 5.5% of Ghanaian GDP) and another estimate of received private remittance inflows suggests a figure towards $4.9 billion (accounting for approximately 13% of Ghanaian GDP). Others suggest that financial remittances are double the size of aid inflows. Notwithstanding these variations, the potential of these inflows and the diaspora to contribute to the development of their home country is no longer debated.

Despite this consensus, the emergent rhetoric and policy debate around mobilising the Ghanaian diaspora for the nation’s development tends to homogenise, particularly among transnational and generational lines. Consequently, there is a dearth of literature exploring the experience and contribution of the British-Ghanaian diaspora as a specific group. Furthermore, where studies have addressed this group, the focus tends to be on first-generation Ghanaians and few, if any studies exist on second-generation Ghanaians in the UK. Diaspora engagement is highly specific to individual diaspora communities and their interests, aspirations, institutions and sources of identities. Such factors can influence if and how diaspora communities engage in development in their home country. This is particularly important for second-generation diaspora groups whose ties to ‘home’ may be less established than that of their parents. Diaspora mapping exercises are essential tools in generating data on the composition and heterogeneity of diaspora populations, and for gaining insight into how diaspora communities are structured and mobilised. Such information is key in order to utilise the unique strengths and competencies of a diaspora group. This is true of both countries of origin and destination, as both require nuanced understandings of who the diaspora is before crafting any suitable policies and initiatives.
This chapter will provide a short overview of emigration trends of Ghanaians to the UK and Ireland and discuss the conceptualisation of diaspora and identity formation in diaspora populations. It will then address the different modes of engagement by diaspora groups and discuss the varying types of remittances. Lastly, a brief overview of some of the Ghanaian government’s diaspora initiatives will be presented before concluding with a brief summary. This analysis of literature served as a basis for constructing and analysing both the quantitative and qualitative data obtained for this research.

**OVERVIEW OF GHANAIANS IN THE UK AND IRELAND**

Though migration from Ghana pre-dates the colonial era, large-scale emigration from Ghana occurred progressively in the post-independence period, specifically from 1965 onwards. Sizeable numbers of Ghanaians emigrated primarily to neighbouring African nations such as Nigeria, Cote d’Ivoire and Togo but this movement also extended to the wider African continent as well as Europe and North America. The most recent phase of Ghanaian emigration, termed ‘diasporisation’ is said to have begun in the 1980s and is attributed to periods of economic decline and political unrest throughout the 70s and early 80s. Other reasons for emigration include education, training and economic opportunities. As a result of this ‘diasporisation’, large numbers of Ghanaians have settled in cities such as Amsterdam, New York, Hamburg and London. The number of arrivals of Ghanaian-born residents in the UK between 1981-1990 account for 18 per cent of the current Ghanaian born UK population, with a peak in 1991-2000 of 22 per cent. According to Anarfi et al. (2003), the UK Home Office stated that Ghana was among the top ten sending countries to the UK in 1996, and between 1990–2001 an estimated 21,485 Ghanaians entered the UK.

The most recent UK (England and Wales) census, conducted in 2011 states that in terms of the largest size of African born nationals in the UK, Ghana is the sixth country after Nigeria, South Africa, Kenya, Zimbabwe and Somalia. Whilst the ethnic breakdown within these African nationalities varies greatly, Ghana and Nigeria have the highest proportion of Black/Black British African born residents, representing 89% in total. Regarding growth trends of the Ghanaian population in the UK, the 2001 census recorded approximately 57,000 Ghanaian born UK residents while the 2011 census estimates the number of Ghanaians in the UK at 94,000, accounting for 1.3% of all non-UK born residents and 7.1% of all non-UK born Africans in the UK. In Scotland, the total amount of Ghanaian born residents is approximately 1,658, accounting for 0.03% of the total Scottish population, 3.5% of the African population in Scotland and 11.5% of the Central & West Africans in Scotland. The number of Ghanaians with dual nationality and identifying as Scottish and Ghanaian is 114, those identifying as Ghanaian only are 957 and those identifying as another UK identity and Ghanaian is 47.

In the Republic of Ireland, Black Irish and Black Africans account for 57,850 or 1.23% of the total population. The most recent Irish Census data estimates Ghanaians living in Ireland between 201-1000. The UK and Irish Ghanaian population is heavily concentrated in England with significant numbers represented in South and South-East England particularly in London and other urban centres.

It must be noted that the figures above are treated with caution. Firstly, due to the nature of migration patterns and practices it is difficult to differentiate and document between legal and illegal migrants, and thus the gaps concerning the number of Ghanaians in the UK (and abroad generally) persist. For example, migration statistics of Ghanaians abroad in Europe, USA and Canada from Ghana’s Foreign Ministry suggest figures around 500,000 whereas figures from the EU, the World Bank and other agencies put this figure between 1.5-3 million. Secondly, the figures above almost exclusively refer to first-generation Ghanaians and there is currently no comprehensive national measure for second or third generation groups. Some authors have suggested using other forms of data to formulate a representative figure e.g. pupil survey data (where parents may indicate a child’s home language and therefore country of origin) however such survey data is unreliable and inconsistently collected and reported on. Furthermore, a lack of awareness of the purpose and use of such data may lead to parents’ apprehension in sharing this kind of information. Consequently, there is no definite figure of the second-generation British-Ghanaian population and many other second-generation diaspora groups. For this reason, available statistics do not provide comprehensive figures or permit demographic and socio-structural analysis of the Ghanaian diaspora.
The conceptualisation of diaspora is highly contested and definitions vary greatly depending on the group of reference. Early studies around diaspora groups generally focused on migrants’ ‘survival’ in their new host country. Since the mid-1990s, however, there is a growing interest in transnational migrant activities commonly highlighted as a third dimension: their bridging function with origin countries. Whilst some authors use more fixed parameters to define a diaspora group e.g. groups of migrants from one country settling in another, others employ a more fluid understanding encompassing more dynamic factors. Where definitions of diaspora are linked to experiences of migration, how can the experience and contribution of the children and grandchildren of said migrants be understood? How can members of second or third generation diasporas also belong to this wider group?

According to Cohen’s framework for classifying diaspora, some characteristics of a diaspora include the imagining of ‘home’, strong ethnic or national group consciousness and the maintenance of material links with countries of origin. On the other hand, others have argued that identity and belonging revolves around emotional investments and desire for attachments and define belonging as the ways in which, ‘social place has resonances with stability of the self, or with feelings of being part of a larger whole and with the emotional and social bonds that are related to such places’. Feelings of belonging may be prominent or subtle, straightforward or complex but they are indisputably not confined or understood by a set of rules or characteristics of citizenship or group membership. For example, a British-Ghanaian woman may be perceived to automatically belong or subscribe to her identity as an African woman in the UK. However, she may or may not feel like she belongs to this wider group/identity based on the intersectionality of class, age, ethnicity, sexuality and other identity classifications.

According to some analysis, Ghanaian migrants living abroad are often obliged to maintain ties to relatives, friends and social institutions. They may also feel obliged to invest at home, in order to obtain recognition and identity independent of their uncertain social status abroad. Associations and religious organisations continue to serve as institutions that provide migrants with social, financial and psychological support in a sometimes hostile host society.

One of the key questions in understanding diasporas, particularly second and third generation groups, is that of identity. The term diaspora implies some level of ‘shared consciousness and of deterritorialised ‘belonging’ which in turn generates and facilitates common political, cultural or economic activities. Despite this, there is evidence that suggests that such conceptual or cultural frameworks are not always in sync with lived in realities of diaspora groups. The supposed ‘ties’ that connect this group may be much weaker and more transient than the notion of diaspora suggests. Though some form of common identity does occur, it may not be as concrete or long-term as that found in first-generation diasporas.

According to Cohen’s framework for classifying diaspora, some characteristics of a diaspora include the imagining of ‘home’, strong ethnic or national group consciousness and the maintenance of material links with countries of origin. On the other hand, others have argued that identity and belonging revolves around emotional investments and desire for attachments and define belonging as the ways in which, ‘social place has resonances with stability of the self, or with feelings of being part of a larger whole and with the emotional and social bonds that are related to such places’. Feelings of belonging may be prominent or subtle, straightforward or complex but they are indisputably not confined or understood by a set of rules or characteristics of citizenship or group membership. For example, a British-Ghanaian woman may be perceived to automatically belong or subscribe to her identity as an African woman in the UK. However, she may or may not feel like she belongs to this wider group/identity based on the intersectionality of class, age, ethnicity, sexuality and other identity classifications.

One of the key questions in understanding diasporas, particularly second and third generation groups, is that of identity. The term diaspora implies some level of ‘shared consciousness and of deterritorialised ‘belonging’ which in turn generates and facilitates common political, cultural or economic activities. Despite this, there is evidence that suggests that such conceptual or cultural frameworks are not always in sync with lived in realities of diaspora groups. The supposed ‘ties’ that connect this group may be much weaker and more transient than the notion of diaspora suggests. Though some form of common identity does occur, it may not be as concrete or long-term as that found in first-generation diasporas.

Whilst this may be the case for the first-generation Ghanaian diasporas, second-generation Ghanaian diasporas might not identify with this experience as they may not face the same obligations their parents face nor have material ties or obligations to Ghana. Additionally, being born in the UK (or elsewhere), means the second-generation diaspora experience integration into British society in a different way than their parents. This may weaken their sense of a national group consciousness and individual sense of belonging to their wider diaspora group. For this reason, second-generation diasporas have different relations to ‘home’ and return. In the case of Ghana, for example, some may see Ghana in idealistic terms as their familiar but distant ‘home’ or ‘motherland’. Others see ‘home’ in multidimensional ways which continue to change and evolve such that it is meaningless to think of an authentic ‘home’ to return to. Many second-generation diasporas feel a strong sense of belonging and attachment to their ancestral home, as well as actively maintaining connections to the other transnational ‘multi-local lifeworlds’ with which they also identify. Peggy Levitt argues that this is a result of second-generation children being heavily influenced by the culture of their parents, even if they have not been to their parents’ home country. Waite and Cooke argue that this could also be a consequence of a sense of alienation from a national sense of belonging in their country of birth. In the case of this study - the wider notion of Britishness. As a result, second-generation diaspora commonly adopt multiple identities which change and adapt to the socio-cultural context in which they are in.
MODES OF ENGAGEMENT IN/FOR DIASPORA GROUPS

FRAMEWORKS OF DIASPORA ENGAGEMENT

This study found Mohan’s typology and the African Foundation for Development’s (AFFORD) 3Rs as key models useful in framing different forms of diaspora engagement. Mohan’s typology of diaspora engagement consists of 3 key strands which are said to be interdependent. They are as follows:

1. ‘Development in place’ - Development in the diaspora: ‘how people within diasporic communities use their localized diasporic connections to secure economic and social well-being and, as a by-product, contribute to the development of their locality’. One focus here has been the role of ethnic businesses in countries hosting migrant communities.

2. ‘Development through space’ - Development through the diaspora: ‘how diasporic communities utilize their diffuse global connections beyond the locality to facilitate economic and social well-being.’ Prominent examples include the transcontinental trade through Chinese, Indian and Lebanese diaspora groups.

3. ‘Development across space’ - Development by the diaspora: ‘How diasporic flows and continued connections ‘back home’ facilitate the development -- and sometimes the creation – of these homelands’. This includes ‘flows of ideas, money and political support to the migrants’ home country, be it an existing home(land) or one which nationalists would like to see come into being.’

This study is particularly interested in development across space and how second-generation British-Ghanaians channel their ‘diasporic flows’ to contribute to development in Ghana.

AFFORD’s ‘3Rs’ (remittances, return and retrieval) highlights that diaspora members may engage in a range of interconnected activities. For example, a professional network of education professionals may financially remit, support the training of teachers in their home country or help buy school supplies and share their expertise during recurring visits back home (retrieval), all of which may create a pathway for a permanent return to work in the homeland. Considering this, different groups employ and deploy diverse forms of capital whether financial, human, social, intellectual, political or cultural at different times, in different ways. As diaspora groups feel more settled as a community, their collective interests (as opposed to their individual motivations) turn to their home regions, so the orientation will broaden from the UK to the UK plus the homeland. Examples include the Sierra Leonean and Zimbabwean communities in the UK. A third model introduces an alternative angle and examines the distinction between the capacity and the desire to engage in activities which influence development at home. Capacity, among other things, refers to the resources and assets that diasporas may have at their disposal, and their ability to deploy them. The desire to engage is shaped by a variety of conditions, including secure legal, residential and employment status in the host country.
Four established theories are said to motivate diasporas to remit financially:

1. **Altruistic theory** - Altruistic theory posits that migrants may feel obligated to remit due to the love and affection shared for their family and friends. This is particularly prevalent if the person in question has come from a lower socio-economic background.

2. **Self-interest theory** - Self-interest theory asserts that migrants may focus on wealth accumulation and remit home for investment projects – purchase of land, property or investments in the money market where interest rates are commonly higher.

3. **Implicit family contract I (loan repayment)** - Implicit family contract theory suggests that family members of the migrant either wholly or partially sponsored his/her cost of emigration or schooling abroad, hence the obligation for the migrant to pay this back over time. The migrant therefore has a 'contract' with the family which he pays when he settles gradually. The amount to remit will depend on the migrant's financial situation abroad.

4. **Implicit family contract II (co-insurance)** - Implicit family contract II (co-insurance) theory is premised on principles of diversification. The underpinning assumption is that the destination country will have superior or relatively improved economic conditions. Thus, the family 'sponsors' a member to go and settle abroad such that if there is an economic downturn in the home country, the migrant will remit home to support the family. In the opposite scenario, the family will also serve as a form of 'insurance' to the migrant in terms of bad times for the migrant.

The above theories address first-generation diasporas and there are few concrete theories exploring the desire or intentions of second-generation diasporas to remit. One study which examined the link between transnational behaviour and integration of second-generation diasporas in Europe and the United States found that significant transnational engagement (remitting, visiting and viewing media from their homeland) is infrequent. In the Somali community in the UK however, second generation British-Somalis were said to frequently remit financially with pure altruism as the greatest remittance determinant.

Numerous studies have established different forms of remittance for diasporas. The most sizeable and tangible form of remittance is financial and many studies address this phenomenon both in African diaspora groups as well as other global diasporas though literature on second-generation remittances is scant. An empirical study which examined the relationship between citizenship and remitting behaviour in first-generation Ghanaian immigrants in the US, UK, Germany and the Netherlands found that Ghanaians who become citizens of their host nations send roughly nine per cent fewer monetary transfers than Ghanaians who do not naturalise.

If this trend is more pronounced amongst second-generation Ghanaians, this may have 'profound economic, social and political implications for nations that have long relied on migrants to send remittances and otherwise retain their involvement with the 'homeland'. Another study reported that second-generation Ghanaians in the United States are unlikely to remit financially unless they have a strong emotional connection to people (i.e. family or unrelated individuals) in Ghana. However, they were very open to sending social remittances.

**Social Remittances**

It has been asserted that ‘if we only focus on money at the expense of the people, objects, skills, and ideas that circulate within transnational social fields, our analysis of the migration – development nexus remains incomplete. As a result, other forms of remittances are increasingly being explored, including social remittances and skills transfer. Social remittances are both cultural and social, are sent continuously and tend to be repetitive. One definition defines social remittances as ‘knowledge exchanges, ideas and practices that are deemed ‘good’, such as human rights, gender equality, community empowerment, volunteer work and charity initiatives. This can be either individual or collective in nature however social remittances should not be conflated with the social impact of financial/economic remittances with the latter referring to the welfare benefits of financial remittances.
CHALLENGES WITH REMITTANCES

As identified earlier in this report, the monitoring and reporting of financial remittances is inconsistent but nonetheless represents an important component of Ghana’s GDP. In many cases, however, remittances are a function of relatively well-off migrants and thus only benefit direct recipients of the remittances, namely, family and/or their wider social circles. Subsequently, resources are not evenly distributed, creating tension between the remittances migrants send and the wider economic impact of this inflow. Despite this, though showing weak causality, remittances do promote economic growth, specifically so in the case of Ghana. One study found that financial remittances from the Ghanaian diaspora leads to marginal economic growth but has a stronger effect on promoting individual household welfare and health. Furthermore, it has been argued that financial remittances have a similar relationship to aid, and that migration can heighten economic dependency on external inflows, create an unsustainable source of income and exacerbate income inequalities.

Regarding social remittances, a pertinent question is: are social remittances concerned with transferring the ‘right attitudes’ to ‘less developed’ countries? According to some authors, the notion that the transfer of western attitudes and forms of behaviour from developed to less-developed countries would bring about positive change, without the active engagement and collaboration with the home population can be likened to cultural imperialism. Levitt argues, that the likelihood of a social remittance being accepted increases if the remittance is similar to social norms in the home country. As such, it is crucial to create cross-sectional collaborative efforts between the diaspora and home country nationals to forge a more effective and consultative partnership for cohesive long-term socioeconomic development.

GHANA DIASPORA ENGAGEMENT POLICIES AND INITIATIVES

Successive Ghanaian governments have initiated well publicised diaspora engagement policies and initiatives that serve as a more prominent example of diaspora engagement within the African continent. Examples include the establishment of ministries and government departments with a focus on diaspora relations, the establishment of legislation allowing Ghanaians abroad to vote, ‘homecoming’ policies engaging the repatriation of African-Americans to the country, the Diaspora Homecoming Summit convened in 2001 by the Kufuor administration and meetings with diaspora community representatives as an integral part of every foreign visit.

This sustained engagement has been said to have encouraged the consolidation of numerous associations under umbrella organisations, for example the Ghana Union in the UK. Yet, few initiatives from the Ghanaian government address second-generation Ghanaians and the unique ways in which they contribute to and wish to contribute to Ghana.

Studies suggest that the commitment to migration and development exhibited by the Ghanaian government in public discourse is not succeeded by the implementation of concrete national policies that support the Ghanaian diaspora. This is further exacerbated by the proliferation of agencies and departments dealing with the diaspora. With regards to the Diaspora Homecoming Summit for example, there has not been any systematic follow-up i.e. information regarding practical actions on the key outcomes, documentation and policy decisions. Likewise, rather than introducing any concrete policy to encourage the involvement of non-resident Ghanaians in various sectors of Ghanaian affairs, ad hoc initiatives are introduced seemingly without any policy coherence or coordination. The existing modes of engagement between the Ghanaian diaspora and Ghana tends to be informal and ad hoc in nature, leveraging personal networks and function through more informal structures in partnership with trusted local leaders and these initiatives have exhibited success.

This presents a considerable challenge for second-generation Ghanaians who may not have any trusted networks in Ghana. Notwithstanding, a more favourable and enabling environment would bolster these efforts further and necessitates a more coherent, targeted, evidence-based strategy to mainstream appropriate diaspora related policy efforts in the development process.
Available literature and data provides some insights into the profile and remittance practices of diasporas, namely first-generation Ghanaians in the UK. A number of theories suggest rationales for their remittance practices but these are centred on the strong emotional and material ties of first-generation Ghanaians. What is unclear is if second-generation Ghanaians remit, how they remit and why/why not. It is suggested by some studies that identity may be a more prominent factor for second-generation diasporas whose ties to Ghana may not be as established or strong as that of their parents.

Other studies argue that second-generation diasporas are highly influenced by their parents and may engage irrespective of perceived weaker emotional and material ties. Our study aims to explore this idea further and address how material and emotional ties to Ghana impact engagement with Ghana. The remainder of this report aims to build a profile of second generation British-Ghanaians, provide insights on how they engage and wish to engage with Ghana and how this relates to literature. The following section explains the methodology and basis for the empirical portion of this study.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This study employed an exploratory mixed methods approach and consisted of in-depth data collection using multiple sources of information including desk based literature reviews, surveys, focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews. A mixed methods approach was chosen as it allows for the triangulation of data and was best equipped to explore the nuances related to the research focus. The participants of this study were second-generation British-Ghanaians, as defined in the beginning of this report. The data collection phases took place between July and November 2017.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Question framing the study:
• To what extent do second-generation British-Ghanaians utilise various channels to remit?

Sub questions:
• What are the ways in which second-generation British-Ghanaians interact with Ghana?
• How do second-generation remittance patterns differ from first-generation remittance patterns?
• What are the determinants that encourage/discourage remittance inflows from second-generation British-Ghanaians?
• If second-generation British-Ghanaians wish to engage in local development efforts in Ghana, how do they wish to engage (and why)? What are their priorities?
• Are there any correlations between characteristics and the intention to remit? (E.g. identity, affinity for Ghana, cultural ties, parental influence, no. of visits per annum etc)

RESEARCH METHODS

Desk based literature review
The desk-based literature review involved an extensive literature search using a range of sources namely academic journals, grey literature, Google Scholar, secondary data as well as databases with publicly available statistics. Search items included second-generation, diaspora, Ghana, UK, British-Ghanaian and Africa. Topic areas included the migration history of Ghanaians globally and within the UK, diaspora identity formation, remittance practices – both financial and social, Ghanaian government diaspora initiatives and policies.

Quantitative Stage: Online survey
The first phase of the empirical component of the study involved the collection of quantitative data. Over a two-month period from the end of July 2017 to September 2017, an online survey (using open and closed questions) was used to build a profile as well as identify factors that contribute to the practice and intention of second-generation Ghanaians to remit financially, socially, culturally or via skills transfer. The online survey was designed using Survey Monkey, piloted, and shared primarily through electronic and social media platforms before officially launched. In addition to these channels, we employed the use of professional and student networks as well as social media influencers and key figures in the British-Ghanaian community to promote the research study. Furthermore, the survey was publicised via traditional offline channels e.g. Ghana/Africa focused events. Survey questions can be found in Appendix A.

Sampling
In the absence of published, verifiable statistics on the second-generation British-Ghanaian population, the study intended to use multi-stage clustering which involves identifying groups/clusters/organisations, obtaining the names of individuals within that cluster and then sampling within that group. The initial key source of potential participant data was the Me Firi Ghana (MFG)/Future of Ghana (FOG) member database. In order to process the database and refine it for the uses of this study a pre-survey was conducted. The purpose of this initial step was to stratify the dataset in order to ensure representation of key demographic characteristics namely: gender, age, location and occupation. The pre-survey was also promoted via social media. However due to a low response rate from the database and higher than expected positive responses to the pre-survey outside the database, sampling then became self-selecting and it was decided that we extend the main/full survey to wider networks, social media and other channels. As such the pre-survey data was not used for the findings in this study.
Qualitative Stage 1: Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)
The second phase of the empirical component involved the collection of in-depth qualitative data. This phase of the study was conducted as a follow up to the online survey and used to help explain survey results and explore the data at an additional level of detail. The study conducted five focus group discussions with a total of 25 participants. Question themes emerged from the survey analysis and included cultural identity, engagement, repatriation and priorities relating to Ghana. The FGD question guide can be found in Appendix C. Both the FGDs and interviews took place in October and November 2017.

Qualitative Stage 2: Semi-Structured Interviews
The final stage of the data collection involved semi-structured interviews with eight key informants - completed by phone and Skype and lasting approximately 45 minutes each – on average. Question themes focused on changes in the diaspora landscape, identity, the role of the government and other related organisations. The key informant interview guide can be found in Appendix C. Both the FGDs and interviews took place in October and November 2017.

Sampling
Qualitative stage: Participants of the focus group discussions were chosen after conducting the initial online survey and indicating that they would be willing to further elaborate on their responses in a focus group. From the responses given, maximum variation purposeful sampling was used to ensure that these focus groups were not skewed towards any particular gender, age group, occupation or level of engagement with Ghana. However, lower than required response rates meant we extended the focus group invitation to all participants who expressed interest. In the end, there were five focus group discussions with a total of 25 participants.

For the semi-structured key informant interviews – this involved identifying persons based on the following criteria and used convenience/purposeful sampling:

- Age
- Gender
- Demonstrable interest and engagement with Ghana, preferably as community or diaspora leaders
- Ability and experience to speak with authority to each of our research questions

Additional criteria for key informants included choosing individuals representing different industries/sectors to add a distinctive perspective. These industries/sectors included: technology, government, health, finance, media and broadcasting, education, social work, community engagement and social enterprise.

Analysis

Quantitative analysis
For the online survey, we identified 10 questions as most relevant (in a qualitative sense) in assessing whether the participants had either established a relationship/engagement with Ghana or were planning to do so for comparison and analysis. Further, we also identified questions as being clearly measurable in a directional way e.g. the higher the engagement or relationship, the higher the values indicated by the participants. Other questions not considered were either binary in nature (required yes or no responses) or required more nuanced qualitative responses.

Using those 10 questions as our independent variables, single and multiple regression analysis were conducted to measure how individually and collectively those variables explain the differences in the responses. In other words, we wanted to test whether the questions we had created (on a stand-alone basis and combined) were measuring exactly what we wanted them to in terms of level of engagement.

We identified low statistical significance for the individual questions, and hence focused on the below questions which had the highest statistical significance.

- On average, how much money do you send?
- Do you regularly send money to Ghana i.e. financial remittances?
- How often do you engage with Ghana in this way?

In addition to exploring the relationship to remittances (both financial and social) the quantitative analysis also looked at correlational analysis with other factors such as age, gender, salary bracket and so on. The key findings resulting from this analysis can be found in the following chapter.

Qualitative analysis
FGDs and key informant interviews were transcribed via audio recordings, verbatim with grammatical and syntactical errors (on the part of the interviewer and interviewee) remaining in the text. Transcriptions were analysed based on a thematic approach and involved critically examining individual responses to questions, categorising the responses and finally deriving themes from these responses. Themes were identified first through audio-recording and preliminary analysis and shorthand notes were made. Once all interview transcripts were examined thoroughly, this was followed by the development of codes. Descriptive and in-vivo coding were used manually in Excel in order to easily identify the most common codes, the interviews in which they were found and examining whether sub-groups could be formed from these codes. These themes and codes will be explored more thoroughly in the next chapter.

A technical appendix with the detailed quantitative methodology can be provided upon request. Please contact us at research@futureofghana.com for more information.
ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS & LIMITATIONS

To ensure complete confidentiality, names of individuals and some organisations were anonymised and pseudonyms used. Participants of the online survey were directed to an information sheet on the FOG website as informed consent (Appendix D). For the FGDs, participants were given an information sheet (see Appendix E) to give an overview of the study, followed by a conversation to clarify the parameters of the research and answer any questions. Participants then signed a consent form (see Appendix G) in the presence of one of the researchers. For the semi-structured interviews, participants were emailed participant information sheets (Appendix F) and consent forms (see Appendix H) and asked to email their digitally signed forms confirming they had read the consent form and were happy to proceed with the interview. No participants under the age of 18 years of age were involved in the study.

Concerning the research design, the structure of the survey was created with a focus on qualitative research methods due to the exploratory nature of the study. As such, the main limitation in the quantitative aspect of our methodology lies in the ex-post formation of the independent variables, and hence the factors we believe are directly measuring the interaction of the participants with Ghana. We attempted to mitigate this by using relatively high confidence levels (99%) in all of our statistical tests.

This nonetheless does not eliminate our quantitative results from being influenced by statistical biases unaware to the authors. To mitigate this further, where possible, we have triangulated the quantitative analysis with our qualitative data and literature to make any conclusions.

Due to the lack of available statistics on second-generation British-Ghanaians, the population size is effectively unknown and therefore creating an effective sampling strategy for the quantitative stage of the study was challenging. Due to this fundamental issue, the study does not claim to be representative of the second-generation British-Ghanaian community. Furthermore, due to the timing of the study and capacity of the research team, we were unable to attend more offline events and in different parts of the UK. As such, the offline efforts were London centric. Though this is in line with Ghanaian migration patterns in the UK, it would have been interesting to explore other urban centres and areas of the UK as this may have yielded different results.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

ONLINE SURVEY

The online survey consisted of 47 total questions and collected information from a variety of individuals in terms of demographics and interaction with our research questions. Respondents were asked to complete questions around the following themes: background information/demographics; engagement with Ghana; remittance practices and other information such as engagement with Government of Ghana (GoG) diaspora initiatives and membership of diaspora networks. Not all questions were compulsory and were dependent on skip logic based on respondents’ answers. A total of 493 respondents took part. The following section presents the findings from the online survey, categorised into question themes along with some quantitative analysis of these results.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/DEMOGRAPHICS

The first eight questions of the survey asked for a range of demographic information including: gender, age, marital status, current level of education, occupation and nationality. Of the 493 respondents, 62% were female and 38% male. The majority of respondents fell in the 25–34 years’ age bracket (54%), followed by 18–24 year olds (29%) and lastly those aged 35 years and above (17%). Almost 90% of all respondents were based in South-East England with almost three quarters based in London. In terms of education and qualifications, 78% of all respondents had a minimum of an undergraduate degree with a quarter of this group also having a postgraduate qualification (e.g. a master’s) or higher. A range of occupations were represented by the respondents with the highest concentrations in full time education (12%), healthcare (8%) and accountancy, banking and finance (8%). With regards to citizenship, 61% of all respondents were British citizens and 39% hold dual citizenship i.e. British and Ghanaian citizenship.
Under the theme of identity, we asked respondents how they self-identify (as opposed to their citizenship), their region of origin as well as fluency in any Ghanaians languages (see Figures 1, 2 and 3). How these three factors interact and influence remittance practices are addressed in the Financial and Social Remittances section on pages 31-34.

**Figure 1: How respondents self-identify**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above/depends where I am</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British-Ghanaian</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents had the option of choosing a maximum of two regions. There was no representation from Upper East and Upper West Regions.

**Figure 2: Region of origin**

- **Ashanti**: 44%
- **Central**: 10%
- **Eastern**: 15%
- **Greater Accra**: 18%
- **Volta**: 6%
- **Western**: 3%
- **Brong Ahafo**: 3%
- **Northern**: 1%

Note: Respondents had the option of choosing a maximum of two regions. There was no representation from Upper East and Upper West Regions.
Figure 3: Ghanaian languages respondents are fluent in

41% Ashanti Twi
31% None

6% Akuapem Twi
9% Fante
8% Ga

2% Other
1% Dangme
1% Ewe
1% Nzema

Note: Respondents had the option of choosing as many options as relevant.
‘Other’ included Hausa and Buem.
ENGAGEMENT WITH GHANA

Respondents were asked to rank three personal areas of interest pertaining to Ghana. The areas which ranked highest were: education, entrepreneurship/starting a business and health. Other prominent areas include repatriation and youth development. Only seven respondents ranked financial remittances first.

Figure 4: Most important areas of interest for respondents with relation to Ghana

Frequency of visits to Ghana, length of visit, purpose and general experience of Ghana

The following figures (5-7) show the frequency, length and purpose of respondents’ visits to Ghana.

Figure 5: Frequency of travel to Ghana
The main purpose of visits was to visit family and/or friends, though tourism, work/business and investments were also cited. Overall, just over three quarters of respondents had a positive or very positive experience of Ghana, 22% as fair/neutral and less than 5% rated their general experience as negative or very negative.
Maintaining contact with family and friends in Ghana, how and where they reside
Almost all of our respondents regularly keep in contact with family members and/or friends in Ghana (93%). Of this group, the majority keep in touch with uncles and aunts and friends, followed by grandparents and parents. Most respondents’ contacts in Ghana reside in the Greater Accra and Ashanti regions (over 80% in total) with smaller representation in the remaining eight regions (bar the Upper East and Upper West regions where there was no representation in our sample). Most respondents keep in contact through social media - Whatsapp and Facebook as well as via telephone.

Figure 8: Persons frequently contacted in Ghana

Number of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No (Spouse)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Parent)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Siblings)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Children)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Grandparents)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Aunties, Uncles, cousins and other relatives)</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Friends)</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have respondents ever lived in Ghana, length of stay and reason for relocating
40% of respondents have lived in Ghana at some point. Figures 9 and 10 show how long respondents lived in Ghana and reasons for relocating outside Ghana.

Figure 9: How long respondents have lived in Ghana
‘Other’ reasons for respondents relocating included fear of losing their British citizenship after staying in Ghana for too long, living in Ghana for schooling during primary or secondary school and wanting to ‘experience Ghana first hand’ then returning ‘home’ to the UK.

Repatriation
Our respondents expressed a strong desire to move to Ghana (84%). Many said they were unsure when they would relocate, however almost 40% stated that they planned to relocate within the next two to ten years (See Figure 11 below). In terms of influence to move to Ghana, the following reasons were stated as priorities: wanting to give back, starting a business, investment and employment opportunities and family and/or friends. Other reasons included ‘peace of mind’, ‘environment, food, weather and freedom’, to learn a language, ‘frustration’ with living in the UK and wanting to contribute to Ghana’s growth.
Financial remittances
Though only seven respondents ranked financial remittances as number 1 in terms of their area of interest relating to Ghana (see Figure 4), 140 respondents regularly send financial remittances to Ghana. Money is generally sent on an ad hoc basis though just over half of this group send money every month or every other month. The most popular amount to send was between £101 and £200 though some respondents were remitting £1000+ to Ghana on a monthly basis. Family support, housing and its related costs and investments form the primary rationale for remittances though education and business also featured to a lesser extent.

Figure 12: Frequency of financial remittances

Figure 13: Average amount of financial remittances sent
Remittances are sent through a variety of channels including Western Union, Money Gram and other money transfer services as well as through bank transfers and through friends/family who travel to and from Ghana. Other channels included Unity Link, World Remit, Azimo and pre-paid cards.

**Figure 14: Financial remittance channels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through family or friends</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through another money transfer company/agency</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoneyGram</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Union</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank transfer</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents had the opportunity to choose more than one option.

In terms of longevity, 96% of those who send remittances stated that they will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. For the 72% who do not send financial remittances at all, reasons cited included not having anyone to send money to, insufficient finances, parents sending remittances on behalf of the whole family, no expectation to and not believing it is the most efficient way to help.

**How does identity, salary and occupation relate to financial remittances?**
Below are the most prominent relationships discovered within our data with regards to financial remittances.

**How old are those most likely to remit?**
The large majority of those that remit (97 out of 104) were in the 25 – 45 year old age bracket. This is expected given that this age group makes up more than 80% of the total sample of respondents of this study. What was surprising however was that younger cohorts were also remitting larger amounts when compared to their older counterparts.

**Which identity category remits the most?**
British-Ghanaians were most likely to remit money overall, (except for the £401 - £500 and £501 - £600 bracket), followed by those who self-identify as Ghanaian. Those who self-identify as Ghanaian are most likely to remit in the (£501-£600) bracket on a regular basis. Those who consider themselves British are the least likely to remit money in most spending brackets, with only 1 respondent remitting money in the lowest and highest bracket.

**Do those in the high salary bracket remit the highest amount?**
Our analysis found that the salary bracket does not make a significant difference on the amount remitted although it should be noted that the sample included less high earners versus low to medium earners. As such, there is no clear relationship between these two factors in determining the amount remitted. Interestingly, respondents in low earnings brackets are almost just as likely as medium to higher earners to remit any amount. This finding lends to the implicit family contract theories (see Chapter 2 – Literature Review) which suggest a sense of duty to financially remit irrespective of other factors.

**What is the occupation of those that remit financially?**
10 respondents indicated that they work within business, consulting, and management. 8 in IT and Technology and 7 in Accounting, Banking and Finance. Overall, 42 respondents indicated sectors which could be classed as corporate versus 15 respondents indicated sectors which are more aligned with social/human impact sector e.g. educators, social workers etc.
Social remittances

In terms of social remittances, 55% of respondents do not engage in any of the activities stated above. Of the 45% that do, cultural activities, skills transfer and development initiatives were the most common though there was some level of engagement with each category. The majority engage continuously or remotely with frequent visits to Ghana on a monthly or annual basis. Motivations for engaging included: wanting to give back, personal interest in Ghana, family and friends and new opportunities. 41% of all respondents who remit do so both financially and socially.

Note: Respondents were allowed to choose a maximum of 3 responses for this question.
For those who do not engage in social remittances, in addition to
the reasons in Figure 16 above, respondents mentioned a range
of challenges discouraging their interaction with Ghana. These
included but were not limited to: language barriers and cultural
differences, trust, bureaucracy and inefficiency, corruption,
nepotism, hostility, working culture/ethics, politics, no processes
to help diasporans integrate, lack of personal/professional networks
and infrastructure. In terms of language, our analysis found that
language plays a significant role in determining the level of social
remittances.

For those who are not fluent in any Ghanaian language they are
significantly less likely to engage in any kind of social remittance.
437 respondents who speak at least one Ghanaian language engage
in some kind of social remittance activity versus 12 respondents
who are not fluent in any Ghanaian language. The remaining
challenges are explored in more detail in the qualitative analysis.

Membership of diaspora networks/groups
62% of respondents do not belong to any diaspora organisation or
network. The impact of this on remittance practices shows mixed
results. Of those that do remit financially, 42% of them belong to
a diaspora group or network. Of those that remit socially, 62% of
them belong to a diaspora group or network.

As such, membership of diaspora groups/organisations relates
more strongly to engagement in social remittances. This doesn't
negate the initiatives and remittances sent by those who do not
belong to diaspora groups however. Non-membership of a diaspora
group or network and sending financial or social remittances are
not mutually exclusive. 42% and 32% of respondents who do not
belong to a diaspora organisation or network still remit financially
and socially, respectively.

So, who is most likely to remit?

Figure 17: Profile of those most likely to remit

For financial remittances:
- She is female
- Identifies as British-Ghanaian
- Is between 25 - 34 years old
- Earns between £31,000 and £40,000
- Speaks at least one Ghanaian language
- Works in the corporate world, namely - business consulting and management
- Does not belong to any diaspora group
- Remits socially also but only half of the time

For social remittances:
- She is female
- Identifies as British-Ghanaian
- Is between 18-24 years old
- Is a full-time student
- Speaks at least one Ghanaian language
- Belongs to a diaspora group
- Engages mainly through cultural activities and also remits financially but only half of the time

Government of Ghana (GoG) initiatives
Regarding GoG diaspora efforts, 83% of our sample have had no engagement with any GoG initiatives including townhall meetings,
public lectures and summits (or other). For those who have engaged in these initiatives, many highlighted the importance of such an
interaction with the diaspora but lamented the lack of action and tangible impact following these meetings and its lack of targeting to
second-generation groups. Nonetheless, some did note that the events are good for patriotism's sake.
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS (FGDS)

The subsequent stage of the study involved five focus groups with a total of 25 participants. The focus group discussion (FGD) questions built upon some of the findings in the survey and were designed around the subjects of how second-generation British-Ghanaians engage with Ghana, cultural identity, financial and social remittance practices as well as attitudes towards moving back to Ghana. The following themes emerged from the analysis.

“ENGAGING IS ALMOST BY DEFAULT... I'M ALWAYS IN TOUCH”

In the discussion on engagement, the majority of participants in the FGDs expressed engaging with Ghana in two different ways - social interaction and social remittance. For most respondents, engagement occurred through everyday activities such as communicating with family and friends living in Ghana, eating Ghanaian food, attending cultural events such as weddings and funerals, listening to Ghanaian music as well as keeping themselves informed through the use of social media. For these participants, feeling connected to Ghana was based on a series of actions embedded into their everyday lives, providing them with a sense of belonging to their homeland.

A handful of participants explained that their engagement with Ghana centred on using their skills and hobbies to contribute to Ghana. This included a special educational needs programme, mentoring students in universities and teacher training. One participant recalled meeting an autistic boy during her placement year in university in the UK. The young boy had been sent to Ghana by his family in the hope that his condition would improve. By reading through his storyboards, she discovered that he had faced abuse during his time in Ghana. After consulting with her parents, she decided to set up a special educational needs charity in Ghana to tackle the stigmas attached to disability there. Other examples included two participants explaining how their passion for writing led them to create blogs and social media platforms which features content about their experiences in Ghana. One participant explained that she uses her blog as a tool for retelling the stories of Ghana in the hopes that it will encourage people across the world to view Ghana as an ideal tourist destination, which in turn would boost the economy.

“So for me I would like to retell the stories of Ghana to people who do not live there. So how can I make Ghana look better to people that live in Germany or Brazil or people that live in Poland or people that live in France? That is what I can do and if I can do that well, that's going to increase tourism in Ghana.”

“FINDING YOUR ROOTS”

Regarding the factors that drive engagement, a key theme that emerged was the desire to keep in touch or to discover more about their cultural identity. A few participants explained that when growing up, their parents made it a point to teach them to be proud of their culture, by regularly visiting Ghana and learning their native language. For these individuals, frequent interaction with Ghana stemmed from the desire to keep a hold onto their cultural identity. In contrast, several participants shared that their parents made little to no attempt to teach them about their culture, specifically language. Some concluded that this was most likely due to their parents’ busy work schedule, lack of knowledge and/or pressure to conform to British cultural values. In support, one participant explained that her mother avoided teaching her her native language in fear that it will hold her back in school.

“My mum never sat me down and said this is my culture. My dad never, you know…we basically heard all the negatives…That's why now I really want to learn as much as I can so I can pass it on.”

In light of this, many participants recall growing up feeling very confused and disconnected to their Ghanaian identity, with one participant comparing it to being adopted. Despite these negative feelings, participants expressed a strong sense of pride and love for being Ghanaian. For this group of people, it became apparent that as they grew older they were determined to reclaim their Ghanaian identity through their various social interactions, in hope of filling in the missing gaps.

“...You probably want to identify more with your family that's there...you really want to get into your roots and also understand how they live as well.”

“...in my 30's...I'm determined now to be more culturally identified as a Ghanaian, as an Ewe.”
Language was a recurring theme throughout the FGDs and two schools of thoughts emerged. There were a group of individuals who strongly believed that being able to speak their native language was an integral part of identifying as a Ghanaian. For those who didn’t speak or understand their mother tongue, it was perceived to be an obstacle. For many, language was a crucial factor in engagement with Ghana, explaining that it would help bridge the gap, giving them an insight into the local context. For example, one participant took a trip to her village to learn how to speak Ewe to help her communicate effectively with the local farmers she came into contact with. Some participants recall visiting Ghana or attending family functions and attempting to speak their native language. They experienced being teased for their pronunciation or accent, but rather than dwelling on others’ reaction, participants explained it made them more determined to learn the language, with one participant forcing all of her cousins to only speak to her in Ga when on holiday in Ghana.

On the other hand, some participants did not feel it was necessary to speak their native language. In fact, many explained that in recent years, they had noticed that Ghana has become increasingly westernised and being able to only speak English was acceptable. To elaborate, a participant who frequently visited Ghana to work, explained that despite not being able to speak any of the local languages, she had not faced any issues with engaging. She explained that it was common to meet people who had lived in Ghana their whole lives and were unable to speak their language, calling for second-generation British-Ghanaians to feel proud of their dual heritage, rather than being hard on themselves for not being able to speak their language.

“So I think being Ghanaian is about traditions, customs and language - and language being the big factor. As much as I can say I feel Ghanaian in a sense, there still a resistance there… because I speak brofo Twi.”

As mentioned in the survey results, education, entrepreneurship and health ranked as the three most popular areas of interest for survey respondents and we sought to probe further. Initially, FGD participants explained that if they planned to move to Ghana, it was important that these areas were of a high standard to avoid having to travel back to the UK or elsewhere for these services. However, as the conversation developed, participants revealed that interest within these areas also stemmed from a more overarching concern. In terms of education, some participants were aware that Ghana had recently announced the free senior high school policy (Free SHS), and it appeared that most felt this happened ‘a little too late’ for a country with such ‘huge potential’. Participants acknowledged that education played an integral role in developing a country, as it was the key to overcoming issues within health and poverty. Even with a free education, participants expressed concern about the content of the curriculum being taught, particularly its relevance to students in rural areas. Some participants also questioned if Ghanaian students were being taught the skills they need to provide for themselves, their families and to actively participate economically in society in the future.

Similarly, participants also held strong views about the health services in Ghana. In their opinion, it was unfair that there is such a stark difference between the health services afforded to those from low income backgrounds relative to the wealthy, calling for the system to be reviewed. Some stated that they had heard stories of people going to hospital for minor injuries and dying because families were unable to pay the hospital bills. The quality of health services was also raised with many respondents reporting the experiences of family members living in Ghana. One participant explained that although her father lives in Ghana, he leaves every six months to visit the UK for check-ups as he did not feel confident about the level of service he would receive in Ghana. Additionally, participants noted that if individuals within the government were travelling abroad for healthcare, it further highlights that there are severe issues that must be solved.

“Like, if ministers are having to travel out to have healthcare, then what message are you sending to the people who have to use those services [in Ghana]?”

In response to entrepreneurship, most participants agreed that this was an area they could see themselves engaging with the most. Participants felt that in lieu of government support, it was important to empower Ghanaians with more entrepreneurial skills, encouraging them to set up their own profitable businesses and earn a sustainable income, which in turn would give them the opportunity to access quality health services and education. Overall, whilst most participants were vocal about the issues they believed Ghana faced within these areas, it is important to note that many of these opinions were based on the anecdotes they had heard from family or friends, rather than personal experience. Participants agreed that whilst they were passionate about helping to develop these areas, they were also aware that it required a high level of expertise, particularly in health and education. It was also noted that these problems could not be solved through their engagement alone, as to some extent the issues were beyond them. One participant concluded by explaining that whilst you can try to educate people about the importance of clean water, mosquito nets or a balanced diet they cannot be implemented by people who have little to no income, emphasising that these issues are underpinned by poverty, an issue that can only be dealt with by the government.

“So I think in terms of those three, I think the starting point has to be government and until that is fixed, there is nothing you can implement. It has to be implemented at policy level…”

70 ‘Brofo’ = Twi/Akan word for ‘English’
Although participants were eager to give solutions on how to solve issues in the area of health and education, it was interesting to observe that others were quite cautious about ‘crossing the line’ in fear of imposing their western ideals. Participants explained that as a result of growing up in the West, the second-generation have the tendency to adopt a Eurocentric mind-set under the guise of trying to fix a problem, with some participants comparing this approach to the ‘behaviour of colonisers’. One participant explained that it appeared to be a part of British culture to try and fix everything in other countries. They gave the example of the International Citizens Service (ICS) sending students who have just graduated to volunteer in developing nations, to teach locals how to write a business plan despite never owning a business. Some participants called for mutual respect between the Ghanaian diaspora and Ghanaian nationals moving forward. Although some second-generation British-Ghanaians possessed the skills to engage with Ghana, it was important to some participants to tread carefully and seek to work collaboratively, stating that Ghana is a relatively new state and it is important that it finds its own identity and the local context is taken into consideration first.

“We should just respect the culture. We can advise, but respect where people are coming from. Don’t try and change it because that is what people did to us.”

Financial remittance is a practice primarily associated with first-generation Ghanaians. However, during the FGDs it was interesting to discover that a few participants were regularly sending money back to Ghana to support family with school fees, daily upkeep or even towards a church building fund. Like their parents, participants explained that they sent money home out of moral obligation, acknowledging their contribution in some cases played a significant role in the upkeep of their family.

“Usually it’s the parents sending money back home but now it’s seen as something that we should be doing; our generation are actually looking after their parents now.”

Some participants who send money back regularly and those who hoped to do so in the future, explained that they preferred for any remittance sent to be used as a form of an investment, creating a stream of income for their family to provide for themselves. This group of people expressed concern with family relying on them for monthly upkeep, fearing that it was not a sustainable long-term plan. Some participants explained that it was important that their relatives understood that financial remittance was not ‘a gift’, but an opportunity for them to achieve their goals, for example by gaining qualifications and setting up a profitable business. To illustrate, one participant explained that before sending money ‘back home,’ she insisted that a business plan be presented to her. Once satisfied, she was more than happy to send money. In this case, participants viewed financial remittance as a way of creating opportunities, rather than a form of maintenance.

“If somebody has died yes, you can make a contribution and manage it. But otherwise, for me it’s an investment. It can be a £100 to £1 million. Like an investment, you must have a return.”

Most participants who had never sent money to Ghana and planned not to do so in the future held very negative attitudes towards this practice. For most, they had witnessed their parents regularly sending money to Ghana and the funds being misused by trusted family members. One participant explained that her mum was sending money to her brother for him to build a property on her behalf, but the house still had not been built. He then recently acquired a property which raised suspicion amongst the family. Throughout the FGDs participants repeatedly expressed a lack of trust for some family members in Ghana as they were convinced that money remitted was not being used for the intended purpose. Participants were also frustrated with the misconception that people living in the West were well off and do not have their own significant financial obligations. In their opinion, it was unfair that some individuals back home felt a sense of entitlement to their salary and this further affirmed their decision to not consider any form of financial remittance in the near future.

“What I’ve seen is my mum spend hundreds of thousands of pounds helping people and it’s just…you know scams or this or that…it’s misused.”
We also sought to explore the relationship between cultural identity and engagement, unpacking how identity as a British-Ghanaian shaped participants' level of engagement. The majority of participants revealed that they felt confused about their identity as a second-generation British-Ghanaian. Although they were proud to be Ghanaian, they were still struggling to find a middle ground between being British and Ghanaian, with one participant describing it as an uncomfortable relationship. Participants continuously expressed feeling alienated both in the UK and Ghana, arguing that as a result of their skin colour they did not look or feel very British. However, even when they visited Ghana they still felt like outsiders, as they were constantly being labelled an ‘obroni’ made even worse if they could not speak their language. To expand, a participant explained that being British-born you naturally adopt the cultural norms of the UK, which in turn makes it difficult to relate to your Ghanaian identity. In support, another participant who had never visited Ghana was worried that she may not be accepted when she visits Ghana, due to her British traits.

Overall, the issue of identity is a complex one for second-generation British-Ghanaians, particularly for those who have grown up in an environment where their Ghanaian culture or traditions were not embedded in their everyday lives. Despite their love for Ghana, these individuals continue to struggle with feeling accepted by the Ghanaian community and feeling at home in the UK, creating a sense of displacement.

“I’m Ghanaian, but outside, I’m British...so it’s like two wolves that are constantly fighting.”

On the other hand, the FGDs revealed that some participants had a strong desire to move to Ghana because they felt it was their second home, particularly if most of their family still lived there. For others, the thought of raising their children in the UK did not appeal to them, fearing that their kids would grow up and experience an identity crisis similar to themselves. In their opinion, raising their family in Ghana was ideal, as it ensured that their children would be immersed in the Ghanaian culture. Some participants also explained that the UK did not really feel like home, stating that they struggle to feel a part of the British community, despite being born in the UK. To expand, one participant spoke of her internal struggle of feeling like she did not belong anywhere after years of living across Europe. She revealed that it was not until she landed in Ghana, that the feeling subsided and she finally felt at home. Despite her family's objections to her move, she is determined to move to Ghana within the next year.

“I feel like I have passed my expiry date in this country [UK] and there is nothing I can do here anymore.”

Participants who did not see themselves relocating to Ghana in the near future due to family commitments, relationships or no ties to family in Ghana, were confident that engaging with Ghana remotely was just as effective. Participants continuously highlighted that the rise of social media had made it much easier for them to interact with Ghana. To illustrate, a participant explained that although she lives in the UK, she worked with a brand called “This is Accra”. The brand crowdsources images from people who have taken a trip to Ghana and repost these images on their Instagram page, aiming to dispel myths about Africa and to portray Accra in a positive light. In addition to this, some participants also argued that second-generation British-Ghanaians needed to focus their efforts on trying to find out how they can support local businesses in Ghana or joining a UK based organisation, rather than trying to set up their own organisations. In fact, quite a few participants felt that second-generation British-Ghanaians tend to ‘miss the mark’ when they try to move to Ghana to set up a business as some lack any deep understanding of the Ghanaian context. Therefore, contributing remotely was seen as an appropriate step to take to engage, giving individuals the opportunity to build relationships and gain knowledge about Ghana, before making the commitment to move there.

“...contributing remotely, I think it’s important because in a sense, little drops in a water make an ocean.”
For most participants, moving to Ghana seemed to be part of their future plans, however once the discussion developed, the reality of moving to Ghana appeared to be quite daunting. A trend begun to emerge throughout the FGDs where participants would state their interest in moving back to Ghana, but quickly talk themselves out of it. Some of these reasons included differences in salary, transportation and cultural norms. The owner of a special educational needs programme explained that the success of her organisation relied on her eventually moving to Ghana, however she explained that after years of working towards her degree in the UK, she was worried that she would not earn enough to support herself or her business. Some participants acknowledged that whilst Ghana appeared to be the ideal destination to live, after years of living in the UK they worried about how they would fit in. A participant, who had spent nearly three years in Ghana working in journalism, explained that when she initially started her role she found it quite hard to adjust. She discovered that in some professional spaces in Ghana, it was a sign of respect to refer to your manager as ‘Ma’ or ‘Da’ and your senior colleagues as Auntie and Uncle, which she found quite perplexing. In another FGD, one participant also found himself quite frustrated with the timekeeping and laissez faire attitude of some Ghanaians, stating that it was quite common for people to be over an hour late to a meeting without apology.

It appeared that most participants envisioned Ghana to be an ideal place to live, however once you delved deeper into discussing the challenges they could possibly face, they quickly realised that there were vast differences between going on holiday to Ghana and setting up home there. Some participants had grown accustomed to their lifestyle in the UK and this led them to question if they could handle living in Ghana.

"Me giving back requires me to live there, it requires me to actually engage with people there and that stuff…there are certain things in Ghana that I couldn't handle if I lived there."
The final stage of this study involved interviewing key informants in the Ghanaian diaspora in the UK. The informants were selected based on their level of engagement and experience with Ghana and the British-Ghanaian community. Four women and four men were interviewed. Their ages ranged from mid 20s to mid 40s. The interview questions for key informants were grounded in the research focus, built upon the trends identified in the online survey and were designed around the areas of generational differences in engagement, remittance sending practices, changes in the Ghanaian diaspora and diaspora organisations and government relations. The following themes emerged.

“GHANAIANS ARE NOT ALWAYS SENSITIVE TO IDENTITY ISSUES”

Similar to the FGDs, identity was the most discussed topic in the key informant interviews and was seen as the most influential factor in second-generation British-Ghanaians’ engagement with Ghana. The majority of the key informants noted that second-generation British-Ghanaians generally have more pride in their Ghanaian identity now than in previous years citing examples from school where identifying as Caribbean/West Indian was more desirable than identifying as a Ghanaian or African. The success of the Ghana Blackstars, the rise of Afrobeats, and music artists such as Stormzy and Fuse ODG were referenced as examples that have contributed to this new sense of pride. On the other hand, lack of language was commonly referenced as creating a feeling of loss of familiarity and recognition with Ghana.

In contrast to the FGDs, the identity of mixed-heritage second-generation British-Ghanaians and their potential feelings of alienation from the wider British-Ghanaian community was discussed by some key informants. It was suggested that in comparison to second-generation British-Ghanaians with two Ghanaian parents, mixed-heritage Ghanaians may have less of a ‘strong Ghanaian conditioning’ and may not follow Ghanaian traditions and customs as often due to their dual-heritage. It was noted by key informants that due to attitudes and perceptions of who is a ‘real’ Ghanaian, Ghanaians in the diaspora as well as in Ghana may unintentionally alienate mixed heritage Ghanaians from feeling that they can access their Ghanaian heritage.

“I’ve been called obroni all my life.”
“I when I tried to learn Twi people laughed at me.”

It was also raised that mixed-heritage British-Ghanaians may not have access to events that are organised by Ghanaian diaspora organisations or by the UK Ghana High Commission as they may not live in predominantly Ghanaian communities and are less likely to receive information about such events. Irrespective of parentage, it was noted that the second-generation British-Ghanaian experience on the whole can be a polarising. As second-generation British-Ghanaians are mostly born and raised outside of Ghana, the key informants believed that they have to work harder to maintain and appreciate their Ghanaian identity. This challenge causes some second-generation British-Ghanaians to strive to cultivate and maintain connections to Ghana and hold onto this identity fervently whilst others decide not to. The key informants believed that most second-generation Ghanaians fall in one of the two groups and that there are very few who exist in-between.

“You kind of feel like you have to choose. It [Ghanaian heritage] doesn’t just belong in the background. If you’re second-gen it’s either you embrace it or it kind of starts to disappear.”

Pan-African identity featured heavily in key informant interviews. A strong sense of importance was attached to identifying as an African and with other African communities both in the diaspora and on the continent. Some key informants stated that it was their identity as Africans, not specifically as Ghanaians, that influenced their decision to pursue their career paths, activism, membership of Africa focused associations and other endeavours. They believed this sentiment is prevalent for second-generation British-Ghanaians who have been brought up around and regularly interact with other Africans diasporas in the UK. One informant specifically spoke of how her Ghanaian identity (including language skills) advanced her career with frequent travel to the continent and building strong relationships whilst doing so. More generally, it was expressed that for many second-generation British-Ghanaians, pride in their Ghanaian identity inspires them to centre their professional ambitions around Ghana. For this reason, the rise in the number of second-generation returnees was viewed by the key informants as a way for second-generation Ghanaians to reclaim their identity.

“The whole returnee thing is one way to try to address that and try to find a wholeness in their identity and a sense of belonging.”

Key informants also highlighted that a common experience among returnees is the realisation of ‘how British they are’ and of the practical and logistical challenges of relocation which leaves many in a ‘grey space’ where they feel they do not completely fit in either the UK or Ghana.
Diaspora identity and perceptions also featured as a strong theme raised by the key informants. This included discussions around the term 'diaspora' and how it is defined, who is considered a part of the diaspora, and the relationship between the diaspora and Ghana. Some key informants argued that one must play an active role in the diaspora to be considered a 'diasporan'. For them, simply being a person of Ghanaian heritage was not enough to be considered a part of the diaspora and maintaining a connection to Ghana was viewed as key. However, others also provided examples of individuals who did not necessarily identify as being a part of the Ghanaian diaspora but were still engaging with Ghana (and other African nations) outside of the diaspora construct. Building on this, key informants also noted that joining a diaspora organisation does not necessarily increase a person's engagement with Ghana as individuals may join diaspora organisations for a variety of reasons, including connecting with other British-Ghanaians and others with a shared experience in the UK rather than engaging directly with Ghana. It was highlighted that the relationship between Ghanaians in the diaspora and Ghanaians in Ghana can be contentious at times. This was attributed to the perceptions each group may have about the other. One perception the key informants discussed was the ‘saviour mentality’ of some diasporans – both first and second generation.

“...the way it was expressed to me was...when things started to get tough for Ghana, the diasporans were the ones that ran away. And now that things are getting better for Ghana, they want to come back and enjoy. And actually, we don't really want them.”

Adding to the contention is the observation that Ghanaians in the diaspora may not truly understand Ghana’s needs. Some key informants agreed with this observation and stated that diasporans at times suggest ideas and solutions rooted in their own experience which may be ill-fitting for the Ghanaian context. It was suggested that it is important for second-generation British-Ghanaians who are interested in engaging to ‘solve the right kind of problems’, meaning the problems that are having an impact on Ghana’s progress, not the problems they believed needed to be solved. To mitigate this, the key informants encouraged second-generation British-Ghanaians to experience Ghana outside of familial visits and find ways to learn about sustainable ways to support, before making any attempts to get involved in Ghana’s development.

“Start by understanding what Ghana needs. Not going, “Oh, I want to build a school!” Maybe, they don't need a school. Maybe there's a perfectly good school there and what they need is roads...teacher training...a technology lab.”

“And I see loads of people collecting books for libraries and stuff like that. It’s like, ‘Is that what they actually need?’ Has anybody actually gone and asked what they really need?”

By failing to analyse Ghana’s needs properly and utilising their skills accordingly, the key informants believed second-generation British-Ghanaians (as well as other diasporas) were contributing to the perception of the ‘saviour mentality’ which is harmful for diaspora-homeland relations. On the other hand, it was also asserted that there are preconceived notions about diasporans held by some Africans on the continent which also contribute to the contentious relationship.

To illustrate, one key informant who was raised in Ghana before moving to the UK and fluently speaks a Ghanaian language spoke about being met with scepticism by Africans on the continent when traveling to different African countries for work.

“I worked in Kenya for a few months...and my identity played a key role there as they were unsure of whether to put me in an African box or to put me in a British box. This also mean that I understood some of the nuances and some of the ways in which they initially related to me as they were very sceptical of me and whether to treat me as a complete ‘Mzungu’ or not.”

In spite of this, the key informant highlighted the need for greater understanding between Ghanaians in the diaspora and in Ghana and extended this to Africans in the diaspora as a whole.

---

72 Returnee - A person who was born abroad or has moved abroad (and lived there for an extended amount of time) and relocates to their country of heritage/origin
73 Mzungu - Swahili word which refers to people of European descent
Several differences between first and second-generation Ghanaians in the UK were mentioned, particularly in their respective connections to Ghana and attitudes towards engaging with Ghana. First-generation Ghanaians were seen as more connected to Ghana due to the networks they have from boarding schools, religious institutions and their families. Second-generation British-Ghanaians were seen as having weaker ties but still having a strong interest in engaging with Ghana. First-generation Ghanaians are also considered to be more connected to their hometowns while second-generation British-Ghanaians are more connected to Ghana as a nation and the wider African continent.

“The first generation is more likely to be connected to their hometowns, the second generation less so. It’s more of an emotional inheritance, so they’re more connected to the country and in some cases even other African countries.”

Regarding attitudes towards engaging, key informants believed that first-generation Ghanaians send remittances and engage with Ghana out of a sense of community, duty and a personal satisfaction knowing that they have fulfilled that obligation. This sense of community and duty was seen to be somewhat diluted in each subsequent generation and second-generation British-Ghanaians were viewed as wanting a mutual return for their giving/investment particularly regarding financial remittances. Unlike first-generation Ghanaians, key informants also stated that second-generation British-Ghanaians have a more vested interest in engaging with Ghana as a way for them to connect with their cultural heritage. In the same vein, second-generation British-Ghanaians were seen as being more likely to use social media to engage with people in Ghana and within the diaspora to build networks, learn more about Ghana and to advertise diaspora events and opportunities for engagement.

Differences in racial identity were seen to be the most notable generational difference. The key informants believed that first-generation Ghanaians felt more pressure to integrate into British culture in order to succeed personally and professionally. Key informants referenced marital choices and workplace conduct as examples.

“I think there’s something about first generation Africans in general who in a way it’s like there’s a complacency in their heritage. It’s so unequivocal. Like if I talk to my mum, she’s so clearly Ghanaian she doesn’t feel like she needs to make a point of it and I think it’s easier for her to be susceptible to messaging of white approval and minimising difference...”

Echoing some narratives from the FGDs, some first-generation Ghanaians were said to have underestimated the importance of identity to their children resulting in their children finding their own means to connect with Ghana. Through this journey second-generation British-Ghanaians were considered less likely to integrate into mainstream British culture in the same way resulting in more confidence in their Ghanaian identity. The key informants felt that the pride second-generation Ghanaians feel in their heritage is rooted in the fact that they have had to work harder to maintain their cultural identity as they were not born in Ghana.

“It’s something that we’ve had to work harder to appreciate and own and are therefore less willing to give up.”

“EMOTIONAL INHERITANCE”

In the discussion on remittances, the interdependent relationship between social and financial remittances was the most prevalent theme. Both types of remittances were viewed as serving a unique purpose and ‘insufficient’ on their own. In terms of rationale, some key informants stated that interpersonal connections were more important for sending financial remittances while maintaining a cultural connection was more important for sending social remittances which supports our survey findings. Other key informants echoed this sentiment as they felt the interpersonal connections they had and maintained with family and friends in Ghana were the driving force behind their decisions to remit financially.

“I met my cousins and family for the first time and I built that bond with them, then I felt like I wanted to give back.”

The key informants believed that both social and financial remittances were necessary to advance Ghana’s development. More informants felt that financial remittances make a more significant impact as they are associated with economic stability and meeting the recipient’s immediate needs, such as food, clothing, and education fees. Others argued that social remittances have a more lasting impact. Although the key informants generally believed that financial remittances have a greater impact, they were concerned about creating a cycle of dependency. One key informant noted that the impact of remittances is mainly felt by direct recipients and argued that diasporans should assist individuals both inside and outside of their families to evenly disperse financial and social support for a more collective impact of remittances.

“YOU CAN’T REALLY HAVE ONE WITHOUT THE OTHER”
Key informants agreed that more support from the Government of Ghana (GoG) would increase second-generation diaspora engagement with Ghana. The key informants’ most serious concern was the lack of a coherent vision and policy for diaspora engagement. Furthermore, the key informants felt that the GoG was not effectively using the diaspora to support Ghana’s development, particularly in comparison to other nations citing examples such as Mexico and the Philippines.

“I think…look at things like they do in the Philippines and places like that…diasporans will collect money to build dams in the country. I mean they do serious things…at a serious level, which is something I don’t see many African communities do. And I think that’s partly because the governments don’t know how to harness the diaspora.”

The critiques of the GoG’s diaspora engagement plans were not geared toward any specific administration but towards the collective GoG’s diaspora approach. In light of this, the key informants provided some recommendations. The first was to increase the number of diaspora initiatives. Aside from the Ghana Diaspora Homecoming Summit which took place in July 2017, most of the key informants could not name any other government led diaspora engagement initiatives. The key informants believed that having more targeted diaspora engagement initiatives would increase engagement opportunities particularly for second-generation Ghanaians. Another suggestion was to properly fund diaspora initiatives and ensure messaging and promotion is targeted and effective for both first and second-generation. The key informants also suggested partnering with diaspora organisations to gain support in understanding diaspora needs, design initiatives and enhance communications. Other suggestions included making the returnee process less bureaucratic, weeding out corruption and reaching out to mixed-heritage Ghanaians who may not feel that they can access events hosted by the GoG. While the majority of the key informants provided suggestions for GoG, some key informants noted that the onus should not be on the government alone as the government can only provide a certain amount of support due to other government priorities. They highlighted examples of diasporans engaging remotely and in-country, relocating to Ghana irrespective of the challenges and asserted that with these challenges, diasporans should continue to be ‘creative’ in understanding and experiencing Ghana in order to engage effectively.

“It’s true that now we don’t really have proper structure to engage in the way that we would like to. However, it is two ways…I think they just need to be a little more creative…and make their own initial interventions.”

In addition to the support from the Government of Ghana, the importance of support from international organisations in increasing second-generation engagement was mentioned. The International Organisation for Migration (IOM), DFID, and the World Bank were mentioned as organisations that can provide support to the Government of Ghana and diaspora organisations to increase engagement. It was mentioned that some international organisations have done some ‘tokenistic work on a small scale’ with the Ghanaian diaspora and that there are general migration figures on Ghanaian migrants to the UK and elsewhere. However, it was highlighted that there are few available statistics on the number of returnees moving to Ghana and key informants believed collecting this kind of information would be beneficial.

The role of the British government was also highlighted as a potential support mechanism for second-generation British-Ghanaians due to the strong relationship between the two nations. According to one key informant, the British government has not effectively leveraged the relationship that exists between the two nations to encourage British-Ghanaians to become involved in Ghana’s development.

“I don’t understand why the British government has such strong links with Ghana and has a big high commission in Ghana but hasn’t done anything to recognise that there are many people with dual citizenship as well as dual heritage.”
Finally, diaspora organisations and their effectiveness was another main theme throughout key informant interviews. In general, key informants spoke of key changes that have occurred in the diaspora landscape that have helped diaspora engagement. One key informant noted that whilst there is ‘still a long way to go’, there has been a significant change in the diaspora sector over the past 20 years with increased support and diaspora agendas coming to the forefront. They credited the World Bank remittance report as a key factor which increased interest in diaspora-homeland contributions which spurred interest in homeland interventions and how diaspora organisations have and can contribute to that. The increased attention to irregular migration and job creation on the continent was highlighted as another factor that has caused the diaspora sector to become more visible.

“Generally, the whole agenda around migration and development has meant that there have been a lot more funds available for the type of work that the diaspora are involved in.”

Despite this visibility, the low level of membership of diaspora organisations or networks from our survey drew mixed responses from key informants. Some were alarmed by this information and felt a lack of involvement in diaspora organisations would create a disunited, ineffective diaspora that would not be able to make a positive contribution to Ghana. Other key informants were unconcerned by this statistic and argued that second-generation British-Ghanaians would engage with Ghana irrespective of membership of a formal diaspora organisation. Nonetheless, most key informants asserted that diaspora organisations can help by providing structured pathways for engagement (both remote and in-country) and offering financial and technical support for projects run by diasporans. Key informants explained that there is currently a lack of structured pathways for second-generation British-Ghanaians to engage with Ghana, information is scarce and the pathways that do exist are not well advertised. They noted that second-generation British-Ghanaians largely receive information on Ghana from first-generation Ghanaians and from familial visits to Ghana. This creates a limited understanding of Ghana as they do not have the opportunity to explore Ghana through a different lens. The key informants believed that diaspora organisations can create initiatives such as an alternative gap-year programme.

Key informants also mentioned associations such as the Ghanaian Doctors and Dentists Association UK, GUBA, and She Leads Africa as networks that can work with diaspora organisations to build structured pathways for engagement. Social media was also cited as a conduit for second-generation British-Ghanaians to maintain connections with their families in Ghana, share updates on projects in Ghana, as well as build solidarity and intradiaspora networks.

The African Foundation for Development (AFFORD) and Comic Relief were highlighted as key diaspora stakeholders that have been influential in the diaspora sector in terms of funding, advocacy and provision of financial and technical support to diasporans who are interested in engaging with Ghana and Africa on the whole. This includes work experience opportunities in Ghana and seeder programmes for example. However, key informants felt that even with this support diaspora organisations face a number of challenges that impact their overall effectiveness. For example, many diaspora organisations tend to have a small number of staff and limited budgets. Additionally, there are few formal Ghanaian diaspora organisations particularly geared at second-generation Ghanaians in the UK. The key informants also raised the issue that limited number of resources and structures can result in unsustainable programmes. Monitoring and evaluation of diaspora organisation programmes was mentioned as a challenge and a further threat to the sustainability of diaspora initiatives. The key informants believed that while diaspora organisations can create programmes to increase diaspora engagement, the impact of the programmes is not always assessed and learnings built upon.

“I think the thing maybe that we’re lacking is some way of monitoring and evaluating these sort of schemes. Like we send these people to Ghana to set up these business, how many people do they actually employ? How many businesses are still running? Where did we go right? Where did we go wrong? How do we learn? How do we do it differently?”

Large international organisations such as the World Bank and DFID were given as examples of organisations that can provide support and technical capacity building to diaspora organisations in examining the impact of their programmes.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter compares and contrasts key findings from the three stages of this study. Whilst each stage was designed to explore different aspects of the research focus, there were a number of overlaps in terms of the data collected and in relation to the literature presented. Therefore, in this section, we consider the main messages from the literature review undertaken for this research, and how our research confirms, contradicts and extends previous work in this field.

What are the ways in which second-generation British-Ghanaians interact with Ghana?

Across all three stages of study, participants demonstrated their interaction and engagement with Ghana in a variety of ways. Though some participants did not classify their actions formally as ‘engaging with Ghana’, a series of examples were given ranging from a more informal to formal nature. These ranged from daily social interactions, keeping in touch with family and friends, attending Ghanaian events/functions, cuisine, popular culture and music. Towards the formal end of the spectrum, this involved frequent tourist visits, namely to visit family and very few of our participants had never visited Ghana. This contrasts with previous studies where other second-generation groups infrequently engaged in these ways. As such, second-generation British-Ghanaians generally express an active maintenance of emotional attachments to Ghana. In terms of more structured engagement, close to half of our participants, engage in social remittances and do so in-country regularly as well as through ongoing remote engagement. They are actively creating avenues to start activities, initiatives and programmes relating to Ghana.

Social remittances are the dominant form of engagement among second-generation British-Ghanaians and this varied from websites to blogs, capacity building and training to running organisations in Ghana and more. This is in line with literature which suggested that second-generation American-Ghanaians are very open to social remittances more so than financial. Notwithstanding, similar to the reported practices of other second-generation groups such as British Somalis, and contrary to some trends seen in other studies, a significant proportion of second-generation British-Ghanaians remit financially mimicking practices and embodying the same drivers as their parents. The distinct difference between generations in this instance however is the resultant expectation. Whilst some second-generation British-Ghanaians remit out of a sense of community, duty or obligation similar to their parents (altruism theory), self-interest theory strongly underpins this as second-generation British-Ghanaians often view financial remittance as an investment presenting some form of return and mutual benefit for both parties even when sending to family members. Outside family support, second-generation British-Ghanaians show a proclivity to invest in Ghana – in property and other business ventures. As highlighted in the Findings chapter, some participants displayed particularly strong opinions about how their money is utilised based on negative experiences and narratives of money being misused as well as concerns of facilitating dependency and an unsustainable source of support. It can be argued therefore that some second-generation British-Ghanaians are attempting to tackle this concern by applying conditions and expectations to their remittance sending in a way that their parents may not have. Some participants also suggested that financial remittances should have more of a collective impact where benefits are dispersed more communally rather that individually to direct recipients. Though social remittances were seen as more sustainable generally, the importance attached to both financial and social remittance varied greatly. Some viewed the longer-term sustainability of social remittances as of lesser importance than the immediate needs met by financial remittances. Notwithstanding, one area of consensus throughout the study was the notion that both types of remittance are contingent on each other and either one on its own is of limited impact. The interdependency of this relationship is proven further by the 41% of survey respondents who remit both socially and financially embodying AFFORD’s 3Rs where second-generation British-Ghanaians are deploying their financial, human and social capital in interrelated ways.

Remote engagement presents a viable alternative form of engagement for second-generation British-Ghanaians particularly for those who wish to stagger their level of engagement and learn as much as possible about the Ghanaian context before making more substantial decisions such as investing personal resources and relocation. Through creative channels, many second-generation British-Ghanaians are already using remote engagement to prepare for return in some instances and in many cases to engage on their own terms and straddle both spaces (UK and Ghana). Relocating to Ghana in many ways is the form of engagement requiring the highest level of commitment of time, resources and represents the biggest opportunity cost. Despite its requirements, which appeared daunting to many participants, the overwhelming majority wish to relocate to Ghana and wish to do so in the next decade. Our quantitative analysis also shows that those who travel to Ghana more frequently are more likely to relocate, as one would expect. The key determinants from each stage of the study suggests that wanting to give back, new opportunities, finding a sense of self/belonging, wellbeing and disaffection with the UK drives this strong desire to relocate. What is lacking however are clear pathways to facilitate this desire and ease the transition in moving to Ghana. Many second-generation Ghanaians from the UK and elsewhere in the diaspora have already made the transition and are documenting the process via online platforms, social media and other networks.
The return model has been under-researched and statistical figures of the number of returnees are not readily available and was beyond the scope of this study. Systematic collection of this data to monitor and chart this phenomenon would be key in assessing this new trend and its impact.

If second-generation British-Ghanaians wish to engage in local development efforts in Ghana, how do they wish to engage (and why)? What are their priorities?

As mentioned, second-generation British-Ghanaians are engaging in a range of ways from smaller daily actions and remote engagement to more significant actions such as relocating to Ghana. As explained in previous studies, first-generation Ghanaians already have and utilise material connections due to their lived experiences in Ghana before relocating abroad. For second-generation British-Ghanaians, the use of social media and virtual networks to create more tangible connections to Ghana is central to building their own new networks. In terms of priority, though a wide range of interests were shown, our findings show that education, health and entrepreneurship were the top three areas of interest. The basis for this was rooted in the notion that these three areas can promote development and empowerment as well as improving the quality of life for all. Admittedly, some participants were cognisant of the level of skill and expertise required to contribute to real change in education and health which they may not have in some instances. However, entrepreneurship and job creation are areas to be further explored and harnessed and more favourable conditions created for those who wish to engage in this way. Overall, more coordinated efforts by diasporas, organisations and government are required to translate this interest in these areas into tangible actions. Crucial to its success is partnership with Ghanaians in Ghana, building collaboration, knowledge sharing and working towards shared goals rooted in the local context.

What are the determinants that encourage/discourage remittance inflows from second-generation British-Ghanaians?

Are there any correlations between characteristics and the intention to remit? (E.g. identity, affinity for Ghana, cultural ties, parental influence, no. of visits per annum etc.)

Our quantitative analysis determined that age and salary are not strong predictors of remittance practices and there was no clear relationship observed. Our data showed that younger cohorts as well as those in lower salary brackets were still remitting irrespective of the fact. Likewise, for occupation – that is – those from corporate sectors and non corporate sectors remit with marginal differences between the two. In terms of gender, whilst women are statistically more likely to remit both socially and financially it should be noted that they constituted approximately 60% of the total survey respondents. These trends support the altruism theory and implicit family contract theories which suggest duty and obligation overrides demographic factors. For social remittances, cultural identity and language were strong predictors of engagement. For financial remittances, the strongest determinant is identity and personal relationship, which is discussed in more detail further below. Our survey data and qualitative analysis presented numerous factors that encourage second-generation British-Ghanaians to engage with Ghana. These ranged from opportunity, passion, wanting to give back, a renewed sense of pride in Ghana and Africa as a whole, Ghana as a viable market and finding a sense of wholeness and belonging. Underpinning these factors is altruism and a sense of emotional attachment to Ghana though these two areas are very complex and highly individual in nature. As literature suggests, we found that many second-generation British-Ghanaians have a strong sense of belonging and attachment to Ghana, as well as actively maintaining connections to Ghana, UK and the wider African continent. As highlighted by Levitt and other authors, this is a result of second-generation individuals’ strong “Ghanaian consciousness” due to their upbringing, even if they have not been to Ghana. For participants who had less of a ‘Ghanaian conditioning’ during their childhood, they exhibited less of an emotional attachment and some feel isolated from their Ghanaian heritage. Despite this, some do attempt to fill the gaps and reclaim their sense of belonging to Ghana.

Discouraging factors to engagement range from distrust, bureaucracy, inefficiency, perceived levels of corruption, nepotism and politics. Though contentious issues between Ghanaians in the diaspora and in Ghana were raised, these were not cited as the most prominent barriers to engagement and several anecdotes of second-generation British-Ghanaians overcoming this challenge were shared. The most commonly raised factors discouraging participants to engage were the lack of information, contacts/networks and structured pathways to engage. 85% of survey respondents do not engage for these two reasons alone.

Though participants presented a range of factors that encourage or discourage them to engage, the most powerful determinant for and against engagement is identity and featured prominently through all three stages of the study. Many participants switch between situational identities dependent on the context and our study shows that how an individual self-identifies (as a Ghanaian, British-Ghanaian or British) influenced their interactions with Ghana. In terms of financial remittance and identity, as one would expect, those with lesser emotional, material and relational ties to Ghana are less likely to send money. Our quantitative analysis confirmed this and we conclude that those who self-identify as British (versus British-Ghanaian and Ghanaian) are less likely to remit. This also confirmed assertions from literature. Previous studies have also suggested that one’s cultural identity and affiliation is a crucial factor in how one relates to their home (and host) nations. The literature largely centred around first-generation experiences with little insight into second-generation groups and our findings extend this. Unlike first-generation Ghanaians, second-generation British-Ghanaians are working to reclaim their identity in several ways and for those that do, they share a deep pride and appreciation for it. Language is central to this. Our findings suggest that identity is indeed a complex entity and manifests in a variety of ways among our participants – identifying as a diasporan, Pan African identity, the alienation of mixed-heritage Ghanaians, emotional attachments, integration and alienation from wider Britishness and the importance of language. The prominence of the wider notion of African-ness is somewhat unsurprising due to Ghana’s long history of Pan-African ideals – from Kwame Nkrumah’s philosophies to the ‘right of abode’ laws for anyone with African heritage, which has attracted thousands of African-Americans and Afro-Caribbeans to Ghana over the years. More tangible, those who felt less connected to Ghana in terms of language and cultural identity were far less likely to engage with Ghana at all as shown by our survey. Despite the identity related challenges faced by some participants, there was some shared consciousness of not overstepping or imposing their ideas and ideals –
— cultural imperialism⁹⁰ — and there was acknowledgement of their limited perspective in some areas. The depth and influence of situational identity and race on emotional attachments and thus engagement with Ghana was a key finding and would benefit from more in-depth research and analysis. Overall, there was a genuine desire for participants to know and understand Ghana coupled an eagerness to contribute to solutions to address issues that Ghana faces. Likewise, as highlighted, by FGD participants and key informants matching skills to need is crucial.

Irrespective of determinants whether positive or negative, some participants highlighted that many second-generation diasporans already are and many others need to be creative to carve out their own ways of engaging with Ghana. Whilst this creativity is positive and displays a tenacity in their passion for Ghana, the practical realities of doing so with limited information, contacts and networks require a more concerted effort from a range of parties namely individuals, diaspora organisations, international organisations, government and government agencies. This could greatly enhance the level of engagement already seen.

How can government, diaspora organisations and international organisations support diaspora engagement?

Our findings support previous studies in questioning the efficacy of Government of Ghana (GoG) diaspora initiatives⁹⁰. Frequently cited throughout the study were concerns about a lack of vision and policy coherence for diaspora engagement despite positive public discourse concerning the Ghanaian diaspora. Few examples of initiatives could be named and those who had engaged in GoG initiatives largely deemed them as ineffective, with no subsequent follow up but beneficial for patriotism’s sake nonetheless. In absence of a clear vision and policy, second-generation British-Ghanaians are emulating their parents in their informal and ad hoc ways in engaging with Ghana but this does not negate the need for a sound and coherent policy followed by action and a practical commitment to realising its goals similar to other nations such as Mexico and the Philippines as mentioned by some participants.

In terms of diaspora organisations, few studies exist on their effectiveness and few formal organisations exist in the UK. Notwithstanding, our participants highlighted positive changes in the diaspora sector namely recognition and funding but much of this was attributed to recent data demonstrating the level and potential of financial remittances. In addition to this, the international focus on stemming irregular migration has increased interest in diaspora organisations rather than looking at the diaspora as a bridging function between the UK and Ghana⁹¹. Due to funding challenges, the capacity and reach of diaspora organisations is often restricted. Monitoring, evaluation and learning functions in diaspora organisations require more support to ensure that funding received is used effectively in implementing sustainable initiatives in order to not emulate similar challenges in the aid/development sector. Interestingly, our participants did not advocate for a proliferation of new diaspora organisations but rather the strengthening of current ones and increased partnership with government and other international organisations such as the World Bank, DFID and the IOM to build internal capacity, provide opportunities for funding and contribute to wider global agendas.

Moving forward, alternative pathways that the aforementioned bodies can contribute to include an ‘alternative gap-year’ i.e. a structured programme of 3, 6 or 12 months which allows diasporans to gain work experience in Ghana. Our findings shows that the vast majority of survey respondents visit Ghana frequently and the main reason for this is to visit family. Considering this, for those who wish to engage and learn about the Ghanaian context, learn from Ghanaians in Ghana and gain more experience, a structured experience involving different partners would be beneficial. Additionally, investing in creating quality online spaces with information and opportunities for those who wish to engage remotely is another avenue to explore.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite statistical limitations for analysis, second-generation diaspora groups, including second-generation British-Ghanaians, are creating and defining their own narratives of translocal belonging that comprise both homeland (Ghana) and host country (UK) emotional attachments. For this reason, their interaction with the UK and Ghana bears some resemblance but also many important differences to that of their parents. Whilst numerous push and pull factors affect how this group chooses to engage, many second-generation British-Ghanaians are actively displaying a strong desire and passion to engage with Ghana in a range of ways including a strong propensity to relocate to Ghana. Social remittances are the dominant channel which second-generation British-Ghanaians use to remit to Ghana. Despite this, a significant proportion, perhaps more than anticipated, also remit financially mirroring the patterns of their parents both in practice and drivers for this remittance. Nonetheless, both types of remittance are viewed as important and second-generation British-Ghanaians are attempting to make these inflows more sustainable in their contribution to Ghana. Identity is central to how second-generation British-Ghanaians relate to Ghana and works for and against engagement. To capitalise on the appetite of how second-generation British-Ghanaians to give back to Ghana, government agencies, diaspora organisations and international organisations should collaboratively set agendas and work together to enhance pathways for diasporans to contribute to Ghana.

In this final section, recommendations to enhance diaspora engagement are suggested. We draw on the messages synthesised from the literature review, which echo policy statements put forward by some of our participants as well as the authors.

Clear diaspora policy and approach for engagement and repatriation

Whilst Ghanaian diasporas of all generations have and will continue to engage with Ghana in the absence of more structured channels, undoubtedly there is a need for a clear vision and policy set by the Government of Ghana, in consultation with these groups. Once a collective vision is clearly articulated, coupled with resourcing and practical support, diaspora and international organisations can act on this and thus form their own strategies to work towards a common goal for the benefit of Ghana. Measuring impact and building on lessons learnt is inherent in this recommendation. Genuine partnership with diaspora organisations and other agencies to gain support in understanding diaspora characteristics, design targeted initiatives and effective communications is key. Further practical suggestions include vastly improving the information readily available for those wishing to learn more about Ghana via official government portals or online platforms and making the engagement process less bureaucratic: whether an individual desire to obtain dual citizenship, start a business or relocate to Ghana. Within the UK, targeted initiatives and events should also be well promoted to involve all groups including mixed-heritage Ghanaians.

Enhance the capacity of diaspora organisations

Diaspora organisations need to be strengthened. Whilst the majority of our participants were not members of any diaspora organisation, social remittance strongly correlated with membership and diaspora organisations still serve as a vital forum for second-generation British-Ghanaians to meet, network and build their own avenues to interact with Ghana. Increased funding opportunities as well as clear trajectories to acquire support and work with other international organisations are crucial for their success as well as their reach. Also, crucial to this success is collaboration with Ghana based youth organisations to increase knowledge sharing and partnership.

Targeted initiatives and creation of structured pathways for second-generation diasporans

There is a strong desire for second-generation British-Ghanaians to engage and those who do not attribute this to lack of information, contacts and knowledge of ways in which to do so. There is a need to create a platform for second-generation British-Ghanaians (and perhaps second-generation Ghanaians more widely) to begin learning more about Ghana and opportunities to put this into practice on a short, medium and long-term basis. A programme similar to a gap year or National Service, work experience and other initiatives would be beneficial in this regard. Of equal importance are channels for diasporans to engage remotely. Consultation with relevant parties is key in designing an effective programme that meets demand and need.

Harness the strong interest in education, health and entrepreneurship among second-generation British-Ghanaians

Participants show a strong interest in the areas mentioned above and are engaging in these sectors in-country and remotely. Whilst some did not have the skill set to contribute to health and education, others do and the creation of more networks of health and education professionals working together with government, diaspora and international organisations to provide targeted interventions in Ghana would be beneficial. Entrepreneurship was specifically highlighted as the area that second-generation British-Ghanaians felt they could contribute to the most. Favourable policies to harness this interest and promote a business-friendly environment to encourage job creation would build upon this interest.
Investment opportunities, financial and collective remittances

The propensity for investment among second-generation British Ghanaians via financial remittances is clear and represents an important area to build upon in terms of creating lucrative investment opportunities. Property and business were frequently cited as the areas invested in but other areas may also present lucrative opportunities. The concept of collective remittances - where pooled financial remittances from hometown or other migrant associations are matched by government funds and channelled into financing public or community projects in marginalised communities in Ghana is an area to be explored. The benefits from case studies in Mexico demonstrated improved employment, labour force participation and other benefits in social welfare. Careful consideration of the Ghanaian context, the complexity of collective remittances and the practicalities involved necessitate thorough feasibility studies and more research to avoid economic and political bias in how funds are allocated as well as other pitfalls.

Further research

Our research is necessarily limited to the second-generation British-Ghanaian experience. Further research in other second-generation Ghanaian diasporas might reveal a different set of trends, challenges and opportunities as previous studies with second-generation American-Ghanaians did. As mentioned in the introduction of this report, diaspora engagement is highly individual and this study stresses the need for more nuanced and evidence based interventions. For this reason, it would be beneficial to document the experience in other host nations where there are significant Ghanaian migrant populations such as Germany, the Netherlands, United States and Canada. Considering the significance of identity, this is especially important. In addition to different contexts, as the most prominent theme in this study, the area of identity requires further exploration particularly in relation to pan-African diaspora engagement, mixed heritage Ghanaians and integration. Building upon this is the need to understand and document the ‘returnee’ experience and the return model of engagement more generally. Considering the number of participants who remit financially, another suggestion is for a study focused on financial remittances in the British-Ghanaian community. Lastly, more comparative studies taking an in-depth look at generational differences in Ghanaian diasporas would also be fruitful to form a better understanding of how to better target policies to first-generation (and perhaps, third) Ghanaians also.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Online survey questions

Introduction

Welcome to Future of Ghana’s research study on 2nd generation British-Ghanaians. This survey aims to build a profile of who 2nd generation British-Ghanaians are, how they engage/wish to engage with Ghana and why. Our goal is to ensure that our collective voices are represented, which we hope will add to the diaspora conversation, help shape policy and contribute to Ghana’s diaspora engagement efforts.

How is 2nd generation British-Ghanaian being defined?
For the purposes of this research, 2nd generation British-Ghanaian is being defined as:
• UK born children of at least 1 Ghanaian born parent
• Ghanaian born children of at least 1 Ghanaian parent and emigrated to the UK before primary school age (5 years old)

The survey will take between 7-10 minutes to complete.

Your responses are strictly confidential and will not be shared. Results will be analysed with data from focus groups and one on one interviews. (For more detailed information please refer to our Research Information Sheet).

Thank you for taking part in our study!

Please confirm the following:
✓ I confirm that I am 18 years old or above.
✓ I confirm that I am a 2nd generation British-Ghanaian as defined above.

Section 1: Background information

1. Please select your gender:
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. Please select your age group:
   a. 18-24 years
   b. 25-34 years
   c. 35-44 years
   d. 45-54 years
   e. 55-64 years
   f. 65 years +

3. Which of the following best describes your current marital status?
   a. Single
   b. Married
   c. Separated
   d. Divorced
   e. Widowed

4. Please select the UK city/town in which you are based:
   a. London
   b. Essex
   c. Kent
   d. Milton Keynes
   e. Manchester
   f. Oxford
   g. Nottingham
   h. Hertfordshire
   i. Middlesex
   j. Birmingham
   k. Croydon
   l. Surrey
   m. Other: _______________________________
5. What is your current highest level of education?
   a. Secondary school (GCSE)
   b. Sixth Form (A-Levels, BTEC, NVQ, diploma etc)
   c. Higher Level Course (Foundation level diploma, post-extended diploma, certificate of higher education etc)
   d. Professional qualification (ACCA, CIMA, CFA etc)
   e. University - Foundation degree
   f. University – Bachelor's degree
   g. University – Master’s (MA, MEng, MSc etc)
   h. Postgraduate certificate or diploma e.g. PGCE
   i. PhD
   j. Post-doctorate

6. What is your current occupation? Please select the most appropriate sector/area of work.
   a. Accountancy, banking and finance
   b. Business, consulting, management
   c. Coaching
   d. Creative arts and design
   e. Education (Teaching, Teacher Training, Academia)
   f. Engineering and manufacturing
   g. Environment and agriculture
   h. Healthcare
   i. Hospitality and events management
   j. International development
   k. IT and technology
   l. Law and legal services
   m. Law enforcement and security
   n. Leisure, sports and tourism
   o. Marketing, advertising and PR
   p. Media and journalism
   q. Property, real estate and construction
   r. Public services, public sector and administration
   s. Recruitment and HR
   t. Retail
   u. Science and pharmaceuticals
   v. Social care
   w. Student (Full time)
   x. Third sector, charity or other voluntary work
   y. Transport and logistics
   z. Other: _____________________________________

7. Which of the following best describes your employment status?
   a. Employed
   b. Self employed
   c. Part-time
   d. Student
   e. Job seeking
   f. Unable to work

8. What is your average annual income?
   a. < £10, 000
   b. £10, 000 - 20, 000
   c. £21, 000 – 30, 000
   d. £31, 000 – 40, 000
   e. £41,000 – 50, 000
   f. £51, 000 – 60, 000
   g. £61, 000 – 70, 000
   h. £71, 000 – 80, 000
   i. £81, 000 – 90, 000
   j. £91, 000 – 100, 000
   k. > £100, 000
   l. Prefer not to say
9. What is your nationality?
   a. British
   b. British and Ghanaian i.e. you have a UK and Ghanaian passport (dual citizenship)
   c. Other: ___________________________________

10. How do you self-identify?
   a. British
   b. British-Ghanaian
   c. Ghanaian
   d. Depends where I am

11. What region do you or your family originate from? Please choose a maximum of 2*
   a. Ashanti
   b. Brong Ahafo
   c. Central
   d. Greater Accra
   e. Eastern
   f. Northern
   g. Upper East
   h. Upper West
   i. Volta
   j. Western

12. What Ghanaian languages are you fluent in?
   a. Akuapem Twi
   b. Asante Twi
   c. Brong
   d. Dagaare
   e. Dagbani
   f. Dangme
   g. Ewe
   h. Fante
   i. Ga
   j. Gonja
   k. Guan
   l. Kasem
   m. Krobo
   n. Nzema
   o. Other: _____________________________

Section 2: Engagement with Ghana

13. From the list below please select the 3 areas of most interest to you concerning Ghana and rank your choices from 1-3 with 1 being the most important and 3 the least important.
   a. Advocacy
   b. Agriculture/Agribusiness
   c. Development inc. NGOs, INGOs, charities, volunteering organisations etc.
   d. Education and/or technical vocational skills
   e. Energy and power (inc. oil and gas)
   f. Entrepreneurship/starting a business
   g. Environmental issues e.g. sustainability, climate change, pollution, galamsey
   h. Fashion/Design
   i. Finance - investments, banking, loans, savings
   j. Health
   k. Housing/Real estate
   l. Media and journalism
   m. Philanthropy
   n. Politics and governance
   o. Remittances (Financial) i.e. sending money to Ghana for family, friends or other purposes
   p. Repatriation i.e. moving back to Ghana
   q. Rural development
   r. Skills transfer e.g. technical assistance, volunteering
   s. Social development issues e.g. gender, disability, inclusion
14. On average, how often do you travel to Ghana?
   a. Never been
   b. Once a year
   c. More than once a year
   d. Every 1-2 years
   e. Every 3-4 years
   f. Every 5-7 years
   g. Every 8-9 years
   h. Every 10 years +

15. On average, how long do you stay in Ghana when you visit?
   a. 1-2 weeks
   b. 3 weeks – 1 month
   c. 1-3 months
   d. 4-6 months
   e. 7-9 months
   f. 9-12 months
   g. 12 months +

16. What is/are the main purpose(s) of your visits? Tick as many as apply.
   a. To visit family or friends
   b. Tourism
   c. Work/business
   d. Study/education related activities
   e. Volunteering/charity work
   f. Investment related activities
   g. Other (please specify)

17. How would you describe your general experience of Ghana?
   a. Very positive
   b. Positive
   c. Fair/Neutral
   d. Negative
   e. Very negative

18. Do you have close family that you regularly keep in touch with in Ghana?
   a. No
   b. Yes (Spouse)
   c. Yes (Parents)
   d. Yes (Siblings)
   e. Yes (Children)
   f. Yes (Grandparents)
   g. Yes (Aunties/Uncles/Cousins and other relatives)
   h. Yes (Friends)

19. Which region in Ghana do they reside?
   a. Ashanti
   b. Brong Ahafo
   c. Central
   d. Greater Accra
   e. Eastern
   f. Northern
   g. Upper East
   h. Upper West
   i. Volta
   j. Western
20. How do you maintain contact with family members and/or friends in Ghana?
   a. Telephone
   b. Email
   c. Whatsapp
   d. Facebook
   e. Twitter
   f. Instagram
   g. Skype
   h. Other mobile app e.g. IMO, Rebtel, Viber, Tango etc.
   i. Other: ____________________________________

21. Have you ever lived in Ghana?
   a. Yes
   b. No

22. How long did you live in Ghana?
   a. Less than 1 year
   b. 1 year
   c. 1-2 years
   d. 2-3 years
   e. 3-4 years
   f. 4-5 years
   g. 5-10 years
   h. 10 years +
   i. I currently live in Ghana

23. What was your primary reason for moving out of Ghana?
   a. Education
   b. Jobs/Business
   c. Health
   d. Moved with family
   e. Marriage/relationships
   f. New opportunities/horizons
   g. Other: ____________________________________

24. Would you consider moving to Ghana at any point in the future?
   a. Yes
   b. No

25. When do you plan on relocating to Ghana?
   a. Within the next 6 months
   b. Within the next 6 months – 1 year
   c. In 2-5 years
   d. In 5-10 years
   e. In more than 10 years’ time
   f. Unsure

26. What factors influence(d) your desire to move to Ghana? Choose a maximum of 3.
   a. Employment opportunities
   b. Education opportunities
   c. Family and/or friends
   d. Investment opportunities
   e. Marriage/relationships
   f. Retirement
   g. Starting a business
   h. Wanting to “give back”/return “home”
   i. Other: ____________________________________
Section 3: Remittance Practices

N.B. Remittances refers to funds sent by a person living abroad to their home country/country of origin

27. Do you regularly send money to Ghana i.e. financial remittances?
   a. Yes
   b. No

28. If yes, how often do you send money?
   a. Weekly
   b. Fortnightly
   c. Monthly
   d. Every other month
   e. Bi-annually i.e. every 6 months
   f. Annually
   g. Every now and again i.e. when needed

29. On average, how much money do you send each time?
   a. Less than £100
   b. £101 - £200
   c. £201 - £300
   d. £301 – £400
   e. £401 – 500
   f. £501 - £600
   g. £601 - £700
   h. £701 - £800
   i. £800 - £900
   j. £901 - £1000
   k. £1000+
   l. Prefer not to say

30. For what purpose(s) did/o you send financial remittances?
   a. Investments
   b. Housing and its related costs
   c. Family support
   d. Education related costs
   e. Business
   f. Charity work
   g. Other (please specify)

31. How did you/do you send financial remittances?
   a. Bank transfer
   b. Western Union
   c. MoneyGram
   d. Through another money transfer company/agency
   e. Through family or friends
   f. Other (please specify)

32. Will you continue to send remittances?
   a. Yes
   b. No

33. If yes, for how long?
   a. Under 1 year
   b. 1-5 years
   c. 6-10 years
   d. For the foreseeable future
   e. Unsure
34. If no, what is the main reason why?
   a. Remittance fees
   b. Currency/exchange rate factors
   c. I do not have anyone to send money to/or it is not required of me
   d. Remittances no longer required by recipient
   e. No longer able to send money
   f. Other (please specify)

35. Do you engage in any of the following ways with Ghana directly?
   a. Business/enterprise
   b. Cultural activities
   c. Development initiatives e.g. NGO work, youth development, health etc
   d. Political activities
   e. Social activities e.g. social development issues inc. gender, inclusion, advocacy etc
   f. Skills transfer e.g. consulting, training, coaching, mentoring, professional development
   g. Volunteering or third sector
   h. None of the above
   i. Other (please specify)

36. If you answered ‘none of the above’ to the previous question, what is your primary reason for not doing so?
   a. No desire to engage in this way
   b. Don't know how to get involved in Ghana in this way
   c. No personal contacts or networks to start engaging in this way
   d. Other (please specify)

37. How often do you engage with Ghana in this way?
   a. One off i.e. one time
   b. Monthly
   c. Quarterly
   d. Bi-annually i.e. every 6 months
   e. Annually
   f. Continuously (including engaging remotely)

38. What motivate(s)/motivated you to engage with Ghana in this way?
   a. A desire to ‘give back’ and contribute to Ghana
   b. Family and/or friends
   c. New opportunities to explore in Ghana
   d. Personal interest in Ghana
   e. Ghana represents a viable market/enabling environment
   f. Other (please specify)

39. Have you faced any challenges in engaging with Ghana?
   a. No, it’s been a largely positive experience
   b. Yes (please state why)

Section 4 – Other Information and Next Steps

40. Do you belong to any of the following diaspora networks?
   a. Me Firi Ghana/Future of Ghana
   b. Akwaaba UK
   c. GUBA
   d. Ghana Society
   e. Star 100
   f. NPP UK
   g. NDC UK
   h. No, I do not belong to any diaspora networks
   i. Other (please specify)
41. Have you engaged with any of the following Government of Ghana (GoG) diaspora initiatives?
   a. Public lectures
   b. Townhall meetings
   c. Ghana Diaspora Homecoming Summit
   d. No
   e. Other (please specify)

42. If you answered yes to the previous question, how would you describe the effectiveness of these initiatives?

**Focus Group Discussions**

43. Are you willing to take part in a focus group discussion to further elaborate on your answers in this survey and to shed light on any striking emerging trends in the data? Focus group discussions will involve 6-8 people and last between 45 mins -1 hour. We’d be super grateful for your participation!

   Dates: TBC
   Location: TBC

   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. If yes, please enter your name and email address to receive more information:
      First Name: ________________________________
      Last Name: ________________________________
      Email: ____________________________________

44. Would you be interested in receiving further information about Future of Ghana and other programmes/events for the UK Ghanaian Diaspora?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. If yes, please enter your name and email address to receive more information:
      First Name: ________________________________
      Last Name: ________________________________
      Email: ____________________________________
Appendix B: Focus group discussion questions

Engagement

1) What does engagement mean to you?
   a. What are the factors that drive you to engage with Ghana? / What does giving back mean to you?

2) Education, entrepreneurship and health ranked as the most popular areas of interest, why do you think this is? Do you believe that this the most important/easiest way to engage with Ghana? What influences these choices and do you work/have experience within this sector?

   Cultural Identity

3) How do you think your cultural identity impacts the way in which you engage with Ghana?
   a. What does being British mean to you?
   b. What does being Ghanaian mean to you?

Financial Remittance

4) Do you anticipate sending financial remittance in the future? Why/why not?

5) Do you believe that your financial remittances make a wider impact on the economic growth of Ghana, rather than directly benefiting recipients/your family/friends?
   a. If yes, how?
   b. If no, do you think it should make a wider impact?

Social Remittance

6) What does ‘social remittance’ mean to you?

7) How important do you think social remittances are in comparison to financial remittances and why?

Moving back and giving back

8) How many of you have lived in Ghana? (Ask for a show of hands)
   Over 80% of the survey respondents would like to move back to Ghana, why and what influences you to want to move back? (business, cultural affiliations, family, relationships)
   a. What are your plans and priorities?
   b. What challenges will you face if/when you move back?
   c. How can these challenges be resolved (by government, diaspora organisations etc)?

9) What is your end goal in moving back to Ghana?

10) What are your thoughts on contributing remotely? How do you contribute remotely? Can it be just as effective? Why/why not?
Appendix C: Key informant questions

1. How long have you lived in the UK?
   a. Have you ever lived in Ghana?

2. How often do you visit Ghana?

3. Do you speak any Ghanaian languages?

4. Do you send financial remittances?
   a. If yes, why and to whom?
   b. If no, why not?

5. What does ‘social remittance’ mean to you?

6. How important do you think social remittances are in comparison to financial remittances and why?

7. To what extent do you think cultural identity affects how Ghanaians in the diaspora remit?
   a. How has your cultural background influenced your involvement in diaspora affairs and/or your career?

8. What does diaspora engagement look like in your industry/field of work?

9. How has the Ghanaian diaspora in the UK changed since you began your career/organisation?
   a. in composition (age, gender, education background - basically demographic changes if any)
   b. how they engage (this can include first gen too)

10. In your experience with your work/organization, have you seen any differences in how first and second-generation Ghanaians engage with Ghana?

11. Roughly 62% of our respondents are not involved with a Ghanaian diaspora group. How do you think this will impact the Ghanaian diaspora landscape in the UK in the future?

12. In your opinion, what are the best ways for second-generation Ghanaians to get involved in Ghana’s development and why?

13. In your opinion, what factors encourage second generation British-Ghanaians from getting involved in Ghana’s development?
   a. In your opinion, what factors discourage second generation British-Ghanaians from getting involved in Ghana’s development?

14. 83% of our respondents have not participated in a diaspora initiative led by the Government of Ghana. Do you think more support from the government would increase the number of second-generation Ghanaians who want to get involved in Ghana’s development?
   a. How can the government effectively support?
   b. How can diaspora organisations and international organisations also support this effort?
Appendix D: Research Information Sheet (Informed Consent)

RESEARCH INFORMATION SHEET (INFORMED CONSENT)

Working Research Study Title: 2nd Generation British-Ghanaians, Ghana and Remittances: Motivations, Engagement and Development

Hello and thank you for your time! You are being invited to take part in a research study by Future of Ghana. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please read the following information carefully and feel free to ask any questions on any topic that may need further clarification.

What is the purpose of the study?
The purpose of this study is to explore the ways in which diaspora groups interact with their ‘home’ countries. The focus of this study is 2nd generation Ghanaians in the UK, how they engage with/desire to engage with Ghana (i.e. through social, cultural, economic/financial and skills channels) and its implications for diaspora engagement efforts, policies and development. The study will attempt to understand the underlying factors driving engagement with Ghana, the priorities and patterns of 2nd generation engagement (in comparison to 1st generation) and what, if any, barriers to engagement exist. We are intent on ensuring your collective voices are represented, which we hope will help shape policy, add to the dialogue around the diaspora and contribute to Ghana’s diaspora engagement efforts.

Why have I been invited to participate?
We invite you to take part in this study as you are a 2nd generation British-Ghanaian who resides in the UK.

How is ‘2nd generation British-Ghanaian’ being defined?
For the purposes of this study, 2nd generation British-Ghanaian is being defined as:
× UK born children of at least 1 Ghanaian born parent
× Ghanaian born children of at least 1 Ghanaian parent who emigrated to the UK before primary school age (5 years old) and settled here.

Do I have to take part?
It is entirely up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time.

What will happen if I take part?
If you chose to participate, you will take part in a survey (approx. 10 minutes) about yourself, your interests, contributions or intended contributions to Ghana and experiences engaging with Ghana. The survey will also ask if you are willing to take part in focus group discussions and further information will be sent to you.

What about the pre-survey that I did?
The pre-survey was a separate preliminary activity designed to give a better sense of our potential data and refine our research approach but will not be used as part of the main research findings.

Will what I say in this study be kept confidential?
All information collected in this study will be kept strictly confidential using a secure database only accessible to the research team. Your personal responses will not be identified to you nor will you be identifiable to anyone based on this study.

What should I do if I want to take part?
Before starting the survey, on the first page you will indicate that you have read and understood the information presented in this document and then be taken to the survey to complete. Participants must be 18 years old and above.

What will happen to the results of the research study?
The results of this study will be analysed with data collected from focus group discussions and interviews and used towards a research report to be published by Future of Ghana. The final report will be completed by March 2018, and Future of Ghana will be sharing the report with all participants. It will be formally launched at an event in mid 2018. Information will be shared with you regarding the event closer to the time.

Who is organising the research?
The research being conducted by Future of Ghana and led by Pearl Boateng, Noreen Dove and Kirstie Kwarteng.

Contact for Further Information
Lead Researcher Information
Name: Pearl Boateng
Email: research@futureofghana.com

Thank you for your time and cooperation!
Appendix E: Participant information sheet – Focus Group Discussions

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET - FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Working Research Study Title: 2nd Generation Ghanaians in the UK: Engagement, Remittances and Development

Thank you for your time! You are being invited to take part in a research study by Future of Ghana. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done, and what it will involve. Please read the following information carefully and feel free to ask any questions on any topic that may need further clarification.

What is the purpose of the study?
The purpose of this study is to explore the ways in which diaspora groups interact with their ‘home’ countries. The focus of this study is 2nd generation Ghanaians in the UK, how they engage with/desire to engage with Ghana (i.e. through social, cultural, economic/financial and skills channels) and its implications for diaspora engagement efforts and policies. The study will attempt to understand the underlying factors driving engagement with Ghana, the priorities and patterns of 2nd generation engagement (in comparison to 1st generation) and barriers to engagement.

Why have I been invited to participate?
You have indicated on your online survey that you would be willing to take part in a focus group discussion and share more in-depth insights regarding the research focus.

Do I have to take part?
It is entirely up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason until it no longer becomes practical to do so.

What will happen to me if I take part?
If you chose to participate, you will take part in a 1 hour focus group discussion with other participants-no more than 8 people in a room. The questions are completely non-invasive, and you are not required to answer any question. The discussion will be audio recorded for later use by the researcher for transcription and analysis. On the day, you will be asked to sign the consent form, stating you've understood the information presented in this sheet, and agree to take part and be recorded as part of this study.

Will what I say in this study be kept confidential?
All information collected in this study will be kept strictly confidential using a secure database only accessible to the research team. Your personal responses will not be identified to you, personal information will be anonymised nor will you be identifiable to anyone based on this study.

What will happen to the results of the research study?
The results of the focus group discussions will be analysed with data collected from online surveys and interviews and used towards a research report to be published by Future of Ghana. The final report will be completed by March 2018, and Future of Ghana will be sharing the report with all participants and will be formally launched at an event in mid 2018. Information will be shared with you regarding the event closer to the time.

Who is organising the research?
The research being conducted by Future of Ghana and led by Pearl Boateng, Noreen Dove and Kirstie Kwarteng.

Contact for Further Information
Name: Noreen Dove
Email: research@futureofghana.com
Thank you for your time and cooperation!
Appendix F: Participant information sheet – Key Informant Interviews

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET – INTERVIEWS

Working Research Study Title: 2nd Generation Ghanaians in the UK: Engagement, Remittances and Development

Hello and thank you for your time! You are being invited to take part in a research study by the Future of Ghana. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done, and what it will involve. Please read the following information carefully and feel free to ask any questions on any topic that may need further clarification.

What is the purpose of the study?
The purpose of this study is to explore the ways in which diaspora groups interact with their ‘home’ countries. The focus of this study is 2nd generation Ghanaians in the UK, how they engage with/desire to engage with Ghana (i.e. through social, cultural, economic/financial and skills channels) and its implications for diaspora engagement efforts and policies.

The study will attempt to understand the underlying factors driving engagement with Ghana, the priorities and patterns of 2nd generation engagement (in comparison to 1st generation) and barriers to engagement.

Why have I been invited to participate?
We invite you to take part in this study as you are a 2nd generation British-Ghanaian (i.e. with at least one Ghanaian parent), who resides in the UK and considered a key informant on the issues related to this study.

Do I have to take part?
It is entirely up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason until it no longer becomes practical to do so.

What will happen to me if I take part?
If you chose to participate, you will take part in a 30 - 45 minute interview about remittances, diaspora engagement with Ghana, and your predictions about the future of the Ghanaian diaspora in the UK. The questions are completely non-invasive, and you are not required to answer any question. The interview will be audio recorded for later use by the researcher for transcription and analysis.

Will what I say in this study be kept confidential?
All information collected in this study will be kept strictly confidential using a secure database only accessible to the research team. Your personal responses will not be identified to you, personal information will be anonymised nor will you be identifiable to anyone based on this study.

What should I do if I want to take part?
Please email research@futureofghana.com with a suitable date and time between October 21st-October 31st to conduct the interview either face to face, via Skype or phone. A consent form will be emailed to you to sign and send back.

What will happen to the results of the research study?
The results from the interviews will be analysed with data collected from online surveys and focus group discussions and used towards a research report to be published by Future of Ghana. The final report will be completed by March 2018, and Future of Ghana will be sharing the report with all participants and will be formally launched at an event in mid 2018. Information will be shared with you regarding the event closer to the time.

Who is organising the research?
The research being conducted by Future of Ghana and led by Pearl Boateng, Noreen Dove and Kirstie Kwarteng. The key informant interviews will be conducted by Kwarteng Kirstie, Akyeamaa Akyeampong, and William Takyi.

Contact for Further Information
Email: research@futureofghana.com
Thank you for your time and cooperation!
Appendix G: Focus group discussion consent form

CONSENT FORM FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION PARTICIPANTS

Research Title: 2nd Generation Ghanaians in the UK: Engagement, Remittances and Development

Name of Researcher:  
I agree to take part in the above Future of Ghana research project. I have had the project explained to me and I have read and understood the Information Sheet, which I may keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing to:

• Be interviewed by the researcher as part of a focus group
• Allow the interview to be audio taped
• Make myself available for a further interview should that be required

I understand that my participation is voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way.

I understand that any information I provide is confidential, and that no information that I disclose will lead to the identification of any individual in the reports on the project, either by the researcher or by any other party.

I understand that I am free to ask for any data I have provided to be removed up until the point where it is no longer practical to do so. I understand that my name will not appear in any reports, articles or presentations.

I understand that any information given by me may be used in future reports, articles or presentations by the researcher.

I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes of this research study. I understand that such information will be treated as strictly confidential and handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Name of Participant: _______________________________________________________

Signature: _____________________________________________________________

Date: _________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and cooperation!
Appendix H: Key informant consent form

CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

Research Title: 2nd Generation Ghanaians in the UK: Engagement, Remittances and Development

Name of Researcher:

I agree to take part in the above Future of Ghana research project. I have had the project explained to me and I have read and understood the Information Sheet, which I may keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing to:

• Be interviewed by the researcher
• Allow the interview to be audio taped
• Make myself available for a further interview should that be required

I understand that my participation is voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way.

I understand that any information I provide is confidential, and that no information that I disclose will lead to the identification of any individual in the reports on the project, either by the researcher or by any other party.

I understand that I am free to ask for any data I have provided to be removed up until the point where it is no longer practical to do so. I understand that my name will not appear in any reports, articles or presentations.

I understand that any information given by me may be used in future reports, articles or presentations by the researcher.

I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes of this research study. I understand that such information will be treated as strictly confidential and handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Name of Participant: ________________________________________________

Signature: __________________

Date: ___________

Thank you for your time and cooperation!