

Fortress Ghana? Exploring Marginality and Enterprising Behaviour among Migrants in Kumasi Zongos

George Acheampong

PhD Candidate

University of Ghana

BSU/Growth and Employment Platform

gacheampong@gmail.com/+233 26 7071793

Abstract

The study sought to establish if Ghana was seen as fortress by migrants in zongo communities and the implications for enterprising behaviour among these migrants. The study reviewed the marginality theory, enterprising behaviour and further developed a conceptual framework for testing in the study area. The study collected data quantitative from 212 micro-entrepreneurs in the study area. The data was then analyzed using quantitative data analysis techniques such as frequencies, chi-square and the linear regression. The study found that Ghana is not seen as a fortress by most migrants in the zongo communities. The study found that migrants were not marginalised politically, economically or socially. The study also found that the level of economic and political marginality is positively linked to enterprising behaviour while in terms of reactions to marginality the defiant was the only reaction positively linked to enterprising behaviour. The study suggests that migrants in zongo communities feel a sense of belonging and citizenship to Ghana. However, further studies are needed to see if Ghana should be made a fortress, so migrants can be become very entrepreneurial and contribute significantly to the economic development of the country.

Keywords: Marginality, Migration, Enterprises, Zongo, Ghana

Introduction

Enterprise formation is the outcome of complex balancing of opportunity initiatives, risks and rewards. Enterprise formation as a process by which people pursue opportunities, fulfilling needs and wants through innovations, without regard to the resources they currently control (Alam and Hossan, 2003). However, in most societies, cultures and countries access to economic resources is based on one's position within the social strata. The modern society and globalization has however led to a situation where many people have moved from one society to another in search of opportunities lacking in their own original culture creating a state of marginality in these people (Pilar, 2004). Social life multiplies its complexities in the modern city, with its hustle and bustle, its proliferation of sensory stimulation, to which corresponds the growing anonymity of the individual and the hardening of his exterior shell. These individuals in a state of marginality may not have access to economic opportunities like those that belong to the mainstream culture. This leads to several reactions to the state of marginality like affectedness, emulativeness, withdrawal and balance (Grant and Breese, 1997). These reactions to marginality have implications for enterprise formation as the marginalized person may resort to setting up his/her own enterprise in order to survive economically in the mainstream society due to lack of economic opportunities. Entrepreneurship theory indicates that sociological reasons have a role to play in enterprise formation by entrepreneurs but most often empirical literature seems to mainly focus on psychological reasons for enterprise formation (Islam and Mamun, 2000). This presents a research gap that needs exploration. Again, individuals who are marginalized in society react to this marginality by setting up enterprises as they do not have

opportunities in the formal job market in the dominant culture. The German Jewry of the Wilhelmine era serves as a test case of the general theory of marginality (Weisberger, 1992). Some other scholars (Buame, 2007) also claim that if the model is true, how come that African migrant in the minority in other parts of the world and also marginalized and yet they are not the best example of entrepreneurial group. Also, there are no studies that look at the impact of specific reactions to marginality on the decision to engage in an enterprise or the specific state of reaction to inform the decision to set-up an enterprise. Hill (1970) conducted a study of migrants and marginal situations in the cocoa growing belts of southern Ghana. However, this study fell short of how these marginalized migrants developed enterprising capabilities from their situation. It focused more on the anthropological issues rather than entrepreneurial which is the focus of this current study. This study seeks to fill these research gaps by exploring the reactions to marginality among foreign entrepreneurs in Ghana's Zongo communities. The study will also explore the impact of gender on the kind of reaction to marginality. Finally, it will seek to establish the relationship between the specific state of reaction to marginality, type of marginality and the decision to set-up an enterprise. All these are viewed from the perspective of marginalization arising from migration of people of Burkinabe, Nigerian and Malian descent in Zongo communities in Ghana.

Literature Review

The concept of marginality has a long tradition in sociology. Park (1928) in his seminal work on "Migration and the Marginal Man" believed marginality results when individuals in migrant groups are barred by prejudice from complete acceptance into a dominant culture. He argued that the marginal person, having taken on elements of the dominant culture, also is unable to return unchanged to his or her original group. Thus, the marginal person is caught in a structure of double ambivalence: unable either to leave or to return to the original group; unable either to merge with the new group or to slough it off. According to Grant and Breese (1997) there are six responses to marginality. These are affected, emulative, defiant, emissarial, withdrawn and balanced. Dickie-Clark (1966) also described and improved the discourse on the marginal situation. He notes that the marginal situation is one of unequal ranking in social order that creates dominant and subordinate classes. These classes influence a person's legal status, political rights, economic position, and social acceptability, access to education, health, welfare and recreation. These class differences are sustained through barriers to class mobility. Sometimes however these class barriers may be permeable in which case marginality may be purely psychological. Marginal situations can therefore be defined as those hierarchical situations in which there is any inconsistency in the rankings in any of the matters falling within the scope of the hierarchy whether political, economic and socio-cultural. Migration is one of the main sources of marginalisation (Nukunya, 2003). This concept has had a role to play in enterprise formation behaviour of entrepreneurs (Buame, 2007).

In recent years, the promotion of enterprise formation as a revolution to solving numerous economic and social challenges facing developing countries has attracted significant attention by policy-makers and the academia (Buame et al, 2013). There have been several studies on enterprise formation. These have focused on drivers, benefits, tasks and roles. Buame (2007) mentions that there are several models used to explain the urge to set-up enterprises among individuals but suggests three dominant ones namely; trait theory, psychodynamic theory and social marginality theory. Trait and psychodynamic theories belong to the psychological schools of thought while the social marginality emphasizes the anthropological view. The psychological view sees the decision to set-up an enterprise as consisting of the persons own personality make up (Manev et al., 2005) while the anthropological view sees it at a function of social construction (Moore, 1997). These drives lead the entrepreneur to perform certain tasks and roles in the economy. Entrepreneurial tasks and roles are those which

ultimately have a positive effect on a given business endeavour and therefore contribute to its success. Wickham (2006) mentions that entrepreneurs are recognized by what they do- the tasks they undertake. This aspect he discusses provides an avenue for differentiating entrepreneurs from managers. He mentions that entrepreneurs have a critical role in maintaining and developing economic order; and creating new value. Some of the specific roles and tasks include: bringing innovations to the market, identification of market opportunity, combination of economic factors, providing market efficiency, accepting risk and processing market information (Wickham, 2006; Hisrich and Peters, 2002; Kuratko and Hodgetts, 2001; Kuznetsov et al, 2000). The tasks will lead the enterprise owner to gain certain benefits. Entrepreneurship has three categories of benefits; individual, company and national level benefits. For the purposes of this study only individual level benefits are considered. These individual level benefits discussed by Zimmerer et al (2008) are as follows: create own destiny reap profits, make a difference, creates employment and improves the quality of life.

Considering that social marginality has political, economic and socio-cultural implications, this paper looks at the economic implications of social marginality. Economic marginalization as a process relates to economic structures, in particular, to the structure of markets and their integration. To the extent in the markets that some individuals or groups engage in are segmented from the others in general, these individuals can be said to be marginalized from the rest of the economy. Segmentation and exclusion may, however, have non-economic and non-financial origins, for example in discrimination by gender, caste, or ethnicity. Here, integration takes on a broader meaning. People who are experiencing marginalization are likely to have tenuous involvement in the economy. The sources of their income will vary. These experiences affect men and women differently and vary with age. Poverty and economic marginalization have both direct and indirect impacts on people's health and wellbeing.

Moore (1997) applied this theory to entrepreneurship with the central concepts been marginality, minority and migrants. Individuals who are marginalized in society react to this marginality by setting up enterprises as they do not have opportunities in the formal job market in the dominant culture. The German Jewry of the Wilhelmine era serves as a test case of the general theory of marginality (Weisberger, 1992). The environment and its impact on the potential of generating entrepreneurial activity are ignored and also if the model is true, how come that African migrants are in minority and also marginalized and yet they are not the best example of entrepreneurial group.

Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

From the literature review three issues emerge- type of marginality, reactions to marginality and enterprise behaviour. Three hypothetical situations are also developed. These are that the type of marginality affects enterprise behaviour, reactions to marginality affects enterprise behaviour and type of marginality is related to the kind of reaction to marginality. Three types of marginality are seen from the marginality literature. These are social, economic and political marginality. These have an impact on the enterprise behaviour of migrants in zongo communities in Kumasi. Based on this, three hypotheses are developed.

H1a: Social marginality leads to enterprise behaviour

H1b: Economic marginality leads to enterprise behaviour

H1c: Political marginality leads to enterprise behaviour


The marginality literature again suggests that these types of marginality lead to certain reactions among the marginalised in the zongo communities. Three broad categories of hypotheses are proposed:

H2a: Social marginality leads to affected, emulative, defiant, emissarial, withdrawn and balanced reactions

H2b: Economic marginality leads to affected, emulative, defiant, emissarial, withdrawn and balanced reactions

H2c: Political marginality leads to affected, emulative, defiant, emissarial, withdrawn and balanced reactions

Figure 1: Marginality and Enterprising Behaviour



Source: Authors own conceptualisation

These reactions that emanate from the types of marginality are also seen to lead to enterprise behaviour among migrants living in zongo communities. Six hypotheses are proposed to describe this relationship.

H3a: Affected reactions to marginality leads to enterprising behaviour

H3b: Emulative reactions to marginality lead to enterprising behaviour

H3c: Defiant reactions to marginality lead to enterprising behaviour

H3d: Emissarial reactions to marginality lead to enterprising behaviour

H3e: Withdrawn reactions to marginality leads to enterprising behaviour

H3f: Balanced reactions to marginality leads to enterprising behaviour

Research Methods

Study Settings and Population

The study collected data from zongo communities in the Kumasi Metropolitan Area (KMA) in Ghana. According to Sulley (2010) the zongos during pre-independence time was the arriving point of most Hausa and Muslim traders from other West African Muslim countries. Today, it is a multi-cultural community where people from all walks of life and tribes reside. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that the dominance of these West African migrants in Zongos have not waned. The specific zongos were Ayigyia Zongo, Moshie Zongo, Aboabo No.1 and 2, Sawaba, Asawase and Allah Bar. The average household size is 7; 72% percent of these people have only completed junior high school; most of the people in this area rely on the national health insurance scheme for medical care; 75% of the people living in these zongos own micro-enterprises; majority of these enterprises are in trading/retailing and light manufacturing; 79% of these dwellers live in compound homes (homes that have more than one nuclear family usually three or four); the per capita income is around GHC544.

Study Approach and Sampling

This was a cross-section descriptive study conducted between May 2012 and September 2012 in KMA in Ghana. The study selected the communities based on their being classified as a zongo by KMA and residents of the Kumasi Metropolis using a judgmental approach. In all seven (7) zongo communities were selected for participation in the study. Each zongo was allocated 40 respondents since these suburbs have same characteristics and population. Within the communities systematic sampling was used to selected respondents in these communities. Every fourth micro-entrepreneur in these communities was interviewed. The study sent out a total of 280 questionnaires of which 212 were returned usable representing a 76% response rate.

Measurement and Analysis

The study developed a structured questionnaire after an extensive literature review. The questionnaire measured issues like types of marginality, reactions to marginality and enterprise formation behavior. The questionnaires, which were in English, were translated into Twi and Hausa (local languages) and then back-translated into English. The interviews were conducted in local languages. Pretesting exercises were conducted repeatedly among the field staff and micro-entrepreneurs from selected locations before carrying out the actual survey. The data was analyzed using quantitative data analysis techniques such as frequencies, chi-square and the linear regression.

Analysis and Presentation of Findings

Table I: Sample Distribution

Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	99	46.7
Female	113	53.3
Age of Respondents		
18-25 Years	88	41.5
26-35 Years	83	39.2
46-55 Years	37	17.5
Above 55 Years	4	1.9
Educational Level		
No Education	61	28.8
Non Formal Education	18	8.5
Primary Education	60	28.3
Secondary Education	73	34.4
Current Enterprise		
Trade	97	45.8
Services	95	44.8
Manufacturing	4	1.9
No Response	16	7.5

Table II: Levels of Marginality

Variables	Test Value = 4				
	t	df	Mean	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)
Types of Marginality					
Social Marginality	-25.940	192	2.5121	-1.48791	.000
Economic Marginality	-21.404	211	2.9104	-1.08962	.000
Political Marginality	-26.436	207	2.9183	-1.08173	.000
Reactions to Marginality					
Affected	-37.971	207	2.2091	-1.79087	.000
Emulative	-18.029	207	3.1623	-.83774	.000
Defiant	-21.329	207	2.7368	-1.26322	.000
Emissarial	-25.754	207	2.8779	-1.12212	.000
Withdrawn	-36.597	207	2.2284	-1.77163	.000
Balanced	-8.883	202	3.6342	-.36576	.000

The study investigated the levels of marginality and the reactions to this marginality among the study respondents. The one-sample t-test was used to determine the levels of marginality and its reactions. A test value of 4 was adopted as the hypothesized test mean; to suggest agreement as on the likert scale used for collecting data 4 stood for agree. Table III above shows that all the types of marginality had significant negative mean differences. Social marginality recorded -1.49; economic marginality is -1.09 and political marginality is -1.08. Suggesting that political marginality was the highest experienced by the respondents, followed by economic marginality and the least social marginality. These are however insignificant. This suggests that the respondents are not significantly marginalised in Ghana whether socially, economically or politically. This is clearly corroborated by the reactions to marginality. All the reactions recorded significant negative mean differences. Most respondents agree they are balanced with mean of 3.63 with a mean difference of -0.37. The least mean was recorded for affected of 2.21 with a mean difference of -1.79.

Table III: Relationship between Type of Marginality and Reactions to Marginality

Variables	Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Social Marginality			
Affected	974.272	140	.000
Emulative	735.559	126	.000
Defiant	810.872	140	.000
Emissarial	840.270	140	.000
Withdrawn	922.637	140	.000
Balanced	635.203	104	.000
Economic Marginality			
Affected	651.006	90	.000
Emulative	447.057	81	.000
Defiant	703.215	90	.000

Emissarial	646.337	108	.000
Withdrawn	511.337	90	.000
Balanced	440.525	81	.000
Political Marginality			
Affected	777.672	120	.000
Emulative	587.249	108	.000
Defiant	639.053	120	.000
Emissarial	911.952	144	.000
Withdrawn	799.640	120	.000
Balanced	726.711	108	.000

The study used the bi-variate Pearson Chi-square to check linearly for the relationship that exists between the types of marginality and reactions to marginality. The Table IV above shows that all the types of marginality have a strong relation with the various reactions to marginality as all the association recorded a value with significant asymptotic two-sided p-values less than the 0.05 threshold.

Table IV: Type of Marginality and Enterprising Behaviour

Variables	Std. Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)		13.140	.000		
Social Marginality	-.241	-3.238	.001	.706	1.416
Economic Marginality	.349	4.253	.000	.583	1.716
Political Marginality	.344	4.903	.000	.797	1.255
F=24.957 (Sig.=0.000)			R-Square=0.694		

The study investigated the relationship between the type of marginality and enterprising behaviour among the respondents. The study finds that there is a relationship between the level of marginality and enterprising behaviour. This is seen in the F-statistic of 24.96 with p-value of 0.000. Social marginality is seen to be negatively related to enterprising behaviour with beta value of -0.241 with p-value of 0.001. Economic and political marginality were seen to be positively related to enterprising behaviour. They recorded betas of 0.349 and 0.344 with p-values of 0.000 and 0.000 respectively. The predictive capacity of the model seen in the R-square is 0.694. Multicollinearity was at acceptable levels as shown by tolerance and VIF statistics.

Table V: Reaction to Marginality and Enterprising Behaviour

Variables	Std. Coefficients		t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	Beta				Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)			8.678	.000		
Affected	.003		.046	.963	.861	1.161
Emulative	.129		1.679	.095	.813	1.230
Defiant	.269		3.076	.002	.625	1.601
Emissarial	-.177		-2.193	.030	.732	1.366
Withdrawn	-.026		-.354	.724	.912	1.097
Balanced	-.057		-.776	.439	.889	1.125

F=5.129 (Sig.=0.05) R-Square=0.561

The study also sought to establish the reactions to marginality that results in enterprising behaviour. The study found that the reaction to marginality was related to enterprising behaviour as indicated by an F-statistic of 5.129 with p-value of 0.05. The study found that a defiant reaction to marginality was positively and significantly related to enterprising behaviour with a beta value of 0.269 with p-value of 0.002. The emissarial was also significantly negatively related to enterprising behaviour with a beta value of -0.177 with p-value of 0.030. The affected and emulative were positively related to enterprising behaviour with betas of 0.003 and 0.129 respectively but were not significantly related with p-values of 0.963 and 0.095 respectively. The withdrawn and balanced were also seen to be insignificantly related to enterprising behaviour with betas of -0.026 and -0.057 with p-values of 0.724 and 0.439 respectively. The predictive capacity of the model seen in the R-square is 0.561. Multi-collinearity was at acceptable levels as shown by tolerance and VIF statistics.

Discussion of Findings

The study sought to establish if Ghana was seen as fortress by migrants in zongo communities and the implications for enterprising behaviour among these migrants. The study reviewed the marginality theory, enterprising behaviour and further developed a conceptual framework for testing in the study area. The study collected data quantitative from micro-entrepreneurs in the study area. The data was then analyzed using quantitative data analysis techniques such as frequencies, chi-square and the linear regression. The study found that the micro-entrepreneurs in the Kumasi zongos do not feel marginalised in the country and their communities. Socially, politically and economically they do not feel marginalised. This led to situations where the reactions to these marginal situations were also not significant. This is mainly due to the fact that there are no marginal situations in the estimations of our respondents and hence there is no marginal situation. The study sought to check the reactions emanating out of the three forms of marginality. The study found that all the types of reactions to marginality- affected, emissary, defiant, balanced, withdrawn and emulative; emanate from the types of marginality investigated. This confirms the position of literature that these reactions emanate from marginal situations (Grant and Breese, 1997). The study also sought to establish the relationship between the types of marginality and enterprising behaviour among the respondents. The study found that marginality is related to enterprising behaviour (Moore, 1997; Buame, 2007). The study found that economic marginality and political marginality influenced enterprising behaviour positively by about thirty-four percent of the times. The study also found that there is a negative relationship between social marginality and enterprising behaviour of about twenty-four percent of the times. This finding suggests that economic and political marginality is what leads to enterprising behaviour and not social marginality. This may be due to the fact that when these people are

accepted into the social fibre of the community they gain economic opportunities like everyone else and hence they may not be forced to engage in enterprising behaviour. However, when people face political and economic marginality they lack economic opportunities like anyone else and hence the marginal situation forces these people to engage in enterprising behaviour. Finally, the study sought to explain the particular reactions from the marginal situation types. The study found that only two of the reactions (defiant and emissarial) have a significant relationship with enterprising behaviour. The remaining emulative, balanced, affected and withdrawn did not have a significant relationship to enterprising behaviour. The defiant has a twenty-seven percent relationship with enterprising behaviour. The emissarial had a seventeen percent negative relationship with enterprising behaviour. The findings from these set of hypotheses suggests that when people defy the odds of social marginality to engage in enterprising behaviour. The reverse is true for the emissarial who serves as a go between for the two cultures and hence not encouraged to undertake any enterprising endeavour.

Conclusions and Research Implications

Ghana is not a fortress to these migrants in the Kumasi Zongos operating micro-enterprises. The level of political and economic marginality though not significant is positively related to enterprising behaviour while social marginality is negatively related. The defiant is the only reaction to marginality seen to be eliciting enterprising behaviour among the migrants. The findings of the study raise some policy and research questions. Should policy increase the level of political and economic marginalisation to increase the level of enterprising behaviour among these migrants with hope of gaining higher economic contributions? Will it be ethical considering the cross-border tribal relations in West Africa? What will be its impact on the ECOWAS protocol?

References

- Alam, J and Hossan, M (2003), "Linking Between Franchising Networks For Entrepreneurship And Economical Development- Looking For A New Model" Paper to be presented at the EMNet-Conference on "Economics and Management of Franchising Networks" Vienna, Austria, June 26 – 28, 2003 www.univie.ac.at/EMNET
- Buame, S C K (2007), *Entrepreneurship: A Contextual Perspective*, Sedco Publishing- Accra
- Buame, S., Asempa, N and Acheampong, G (2013), "Exploring the skills, knowledge and attitudes of successful female entrepreneurs in Ghana" *Management Science Letters* Vol 3 Iss 1 (Online First)
- Del Pilar, J. A., and Udasco, J.O. (2004), "Marginality Theory: The Lack of Construct Validity", *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 26 (1), 3-15
- Dickie-Clark, H.F. (1966), "The Marginal Situation: A Contribution to Marginality Theory", *Social Forces*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (Mar., 1966), pp. 363-370
- Grant, G K and Breese, J R (1997), 'Marginality Theory and the African American Student' *American Sociological Association*, Vol. 70, No. 3 (Jul., 1997), pp. 192-205
- Hill, P. (1970), "The occupations of migrants in Ghana", *Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Museum of Anthropology, Anthropological papers*, no. 42

Hisrich, R. and Peters, M. (2002), *Entrepreneurship, Starting, Developing and Managing a New Enterprise*, BPI-Irwin, Homewood, IL

Islam N and Mamun M (2000), *Entrepreneurship Development An Operational Approach*, Published by The University Press Limited, Bangladesh, 2000.

Kuratko, D. and Hodgetts, R. (2001), *Entrepreneurship, a Contemporary Approach*, Dryden Press, Fort Worth, TX.

Kuznetsov, A., McDonald, F. and Kuznetsova O. (2000), *Entrepreneurial Qualities: A Case from Russia*. *Journal of Small Business Management* 38(1): 101-107

Manev, I.M., Gyoshev, B.S., Manolova, T.S. (2005), "The role of human and social capital and entrepreneurial orientation for small business performance in a transitional economy", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, Vol. 5 No.3/4, pp.298

Moore. D. P. (1997), "Women's Organizational Exodus to Entrepreneurship: Self-Reported Motivations and Correlates with Success", Accessed on January, 2011 from www.preflightventures.com/resources

Nukunya, G. K. (2003), "Tradition and change in Ghana: an introduction to sociology" Ghana Universities Press, Accra.

Park, R. E. (1928), "Human Migration and the Marginal Man" *American Journal of Sociology* 33:881-93

Sulley, M. (2010), "Re: Why So Much Poverty in Zongos?" *Ghanaweb.com* Accessed June 2012, <http://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/artikel.php?ID=181883>

Weisberger, B. A. (1992), "Rediscovering the Discoverer. (Christopher Columbus)." *American Heritage*

Wickham, P. (2006), *Strategic Entrepreneurship*, 4th ed., Financial Times Prentice-Hall, London

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

