

Resettlement and Livelihood Sustainability in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Bui Hydro-Power Dam Project, Ghana

Francis Z. Naab, Abraham M. Nunbogu, Romanus D. Dinye, Alfred Dongzagla

Abstract—The study assesses the effectiveness of the Bui Dam resettlement scheme in the Tain and the Bole districts in Ghana. The study adopted a mixed approach in its data collection and analyses. Of the eight communities affected by Bui hydropower project, and thus require resettlement, four were purposively selected for primary data collection. Primary data was gathered through questionnaire administration to 157 heads of resettled households, focus group discussions with men and women and in-depth interviews with key informants. The findings indicated that the affected people had been sufficiently contacted at all levels of their resettlement. In particular, the Ghana Dams Dialogue, which served as a liaison entity between the government and the resettlement communities came up for praise for its usefulness. Many tangible policies were put in place to address the socio-cultural differences of traditional authorities. The Bui Dam Authority also rigorously followed national and international laws and protocols in the design and implementation of the resettlement scheme. In assessing the effectiveness of the resettlement scheme, it was clear that there had been a great appreciation of the compensation regarding infrastructural development, but much more would have to be done to satisfy livelihood empowerment requirements. It was recommended that candid efforts be made to restore the lost identities of the communities resettled, and more dialogue is encouraged among communities living together.

Keywords—Resettlement, livelihood, hydro-power project, Bui Dam, Ghana.

I. INTRODUCTION

SINCE the end of the World War II, development interventions which included the construction of large dams increased steadily [1]. Globally, large dam projects are designed and built for at least one of the following five primary reasons: hydropower generation, irrigation, water supply, inland navigation and flood control. In addition to these primary reasons, large dam projects also generate employment opportunities for the domestic labour market [2]. In Ghana, the creation of such large dams serve all the purposes enumerated to some extent. However, they are mainly for the purpose of generating electricity.

F. Z. Naab is a graduate of the Department of Geography and Environment, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK (e-mail: napata09@gmail.com).

A. M. Nunbogu is with the Department of Planning, University for Development Studies, Wa, Ghana (e-mail: nunbogu@gmail.com).

R. D. Dinye is a Professor and Head of the Institute of Land Management and Development, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

A. Dongzagla is with the Department of Planning, University for Development Studies, Wa, Ghana (e-mail: adongzagla@yahoo.com).

Hitherto 2008, there were two hydropower dams under operation in Ghana. The most important and the first dam was built on the Volta River at Akosombo in the 1960s. Its construction led to the creation of the Volta Lake, the world's largest man-made lake by surface area which covers 8,502 km². Another hydroelectric dam further downstream on the Volta River was completed in 1982 near Kpong [3].

In response to the 2007 power crisis, the Government of Ghana cut a sod for the construction of the Bui hydropower dam. The dam was commissioned in 2008 and is expected to generate 400MW of power daily under full operation [3]. The dam has a height of 108m with a reservoir of 444 km² on the Bui Lake [3].

The construction of the Bui dam came with its associated problems to the communities in its catchment areas [4]. These are Brewohodi, Dam Site, Agbegikuro, Lucene, Bui Village, Bator, Akanyakrom, Dokokyina and Bui Camp. Communities within the Bui catchment area needed to be resettled to give way for the construction of the hydropower dam. With the exception of Bui Camp, all other communities were resettled at the time of data collection.

These resettled communities benefited from many social amenities which hitherto were absent. According to [5], the main content of the Resettlement and Community Support Program (RCSP) include: the development of new resettlement Townships with the following communal facilities; community centre, Nursery, place of worship, boreholes, KVIPs, houses, compensation for loss of economic trees at LVB rates, Grants (\$33 for relocation), \$17 to till new farm, income support (\$33 /month/household for 1 year, and Livelihood enhancement (with economic activities).

Though there are many benefits that may accrue to the communities resettled, discussion on the negative impacts cannot be neglected. The need for resettlement of affected population came with a mind boggling issue of how to resettle them sustainably. The displaced population was weary of loss of livelihood and identities such as loss of fertile farmlands, fishing sites, grazing sites, forest plantations, ancestral homes, places of ancestral worship and traditional grave sites [3].

Dams generally negatively impact on the livelihood of communities in the immediate vicinity of the works and associated impoundment zones. Logically, displaced communities resulting from large-scale infrastructural projects ought to be the first to benefit from such projects, with at least sustainable resettlement packages. However, [6] argues that those people who are forced to leave their traditional

settlement, temporally or permanent because of a resettlement project suffer a loss in the quality of their life. The World Commission on Dams concludes that large dams in general produce benefits that accrue to groups other than those who bear the social and economic costs [1].

With the Bui Dam construction, the obvious issues that come to mind are whether enough thought is given to the issues associated with resettlement as far as the negative impacts are concerned and whether the resettlement packages provided by the Ghana government and its partners to affected communities are adequate. It is also fair to find out the level of community participation in the resettlement process.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical setting of the paper is on Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) model. This model was postulated by [7] in response to the failure of [8, p92] four-stage model of how people and socio-cultural systems respond to resettlement: these include recruitment, transition, potential development, and bending over or incorporation.

Cernea's [7] IRR model is congruent with three fundamental concepts: risk, impoverishment, and reconstruction. Cernea [7] identifies eight fundamental impoverishment risks associated with development-induced and forced displacements if the right structures are not put in place. The risks comprise landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, food insecurity, increased morbidity and mortality, loss of access to common property resources, and community disarticulation. The model was quick to add that all of these risk factors may not necessarily surface in every displacement and resettlement programs [7].

Cernea [7] included a component of risk reversal (reconstruction) into this model, suggesting that preventing or overcoming the pattern of impoverishment requires targeted risk reversal or mitigation. The strategic directions to be pursued should be targeted towards moving the population affected: (a) from landlessness to land-based resettlement; (b) from joblessness to reemployment (c) from homelessness to house reconstruction; (d) from marginalization to social inclusion; (e) from increased morbidity to improved health care; (f) from food insecurity to adequate nutrition; (g) from loss of access to restoration of community assets and services; and (h) from social disarticulation to networks and community rebuilding [4]. The Bui Dam resettlement scheme apparently took note of the IRR model. It recommends that displaced people surely would face the impoverishment risk such as homelessness, marginalization, morbidity, food insecurity and all the other factors indicated in the IRR model.

The BPA [5] indicated that as part of the resettlement package, each household of the affected people was allocated a two-bedroom housing unit with a bathroom and a kitchen attached to it. In addition, a central toilet block, borehole, community center and nursery school have been provided. Each household was also given 2 acres (0.81 ha) of land for farming and \$33, being the first 30% of inconvenience allowance [4]. These risk mitigating measures embarked on by the scheme fit into the second part of the IRR model-

reconstruction, which assesses whether mitigation measures are enough to ensure impoverishment reversal from the risks suffered by the resettled people.

III. CHALLENGES OF RESETTLEMENT

Mulugeta and Woldeesemait [9], [10] indicated that displacement usually results in multidimensional apprehensions, such as physiological, psychological and socio-cultural stresses. The impacts of resettlement are multi-dimensional and affect not only the displaced but also the receiving community and the society as a whole. Thus, they argued that resettlement inevitably results in multifaceted problems if not appropriately planned and implemented.

Notwithstanding these views, [11] also explained that resettlement is a complex experience and involves dealing with the past and moving into the present to make a new habitat [11]. Similarly, regarding the Akosombo Dam resettlement scheme, [12] posited that the psychological burden of being resettled and losing access to resettlers' traditional home resulted in a decline in economic activities and in a general impoverishment. Deteriorating relationships between people belonging to different ethnic groups or tribes put together in the same communities also proved out to be a major problem for the resettlement program [12].

Commenting on the rights of the displaced people, their sense of identity and adaptability to the new settlements [13] lamented that most displaced peoples' journey is a struggle driven by the fundamental human desire for belonging which requires the actual engagement of the individual with the environment to develop an identity. The construction of this new identity is a process in which interaction with the new environment is interpreted, and a new reality is constructed [13]. Alula [14] lamenting on an Ethiopian resettlement scheme's woes blamed the emergency-based technical resettlement implementation approaches for the program's failure. To [14], this approach usually involves mass dislocation, hasty and dehumanized planning and site selection processes, unorganized implementation and lack of clear consensus with the host and potential resettlers. It is also an approach that is economically, socially, and environmentally costly. Hence, [14] therefore recommended a more flexible human-centered interactive resettlement approach in which the resettlers move to the new area opting for better provisions and livelihood formation.

Valeth [15] in an attempt to point out the differences between the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and refugees used the Indian experience to depict a number of challenges associated with displacement, resettlement, and compensations of the affected peoples. It was argued that the payment of adequate compensation to those displaced by development projects is theoretically taken as the disqualifier in their claim to be termed as IDPs. But in countries like India, where the level of compensation for development-induced displaced persons is unjust, there is a valid claim for them to be considered as "IDPs in need" [15]. To [15], what needs to be really examined is whether the promised compensation is really given and/or whether it is adequate.

The reality of rehabilitation packages is a different story altogether as can be seen in the case of the Sardar Sarovar Project in India. More often than not DIDs get caught in [16] spiral of post impoverishment displacement. They are mostly denied the right to information with regard to the real rehabilitation package and also the right to decision making with regard to it. Any such forced resettlement, which is accompanied by inadequate compensation and participation, may not be sustainable [15].

In the case of the Akosombo Dam's resettlement scheme in Ghana, [4] pointed out that there was a serious problem with the livelihood arrangement of the Dam affected people, especially in the area of Agricultural development. It is understood that the ambitious agricultural programs are undertaken to make the peasant farmers switch from simple and small-scale subsistence farming methods to large-scale, mechanized farming failed. This largely was as a result of the absence of post-resettlement program that would have specifically targeted the socio-economic development of the settled communities.

This paper assesses the impact of Ghana's Bui Dam resettlement scheme on the livelihoods of the displaced persons. Specifically, the study among others examined how displaced persons are coping with stresses noted by [9], managing the stress of abandoning their original homes and coping with new habitat as identified by [11] and the struggle to create a new identity in light of the realities of the new unfamiliar environment as put forward by [13].

IV. THE STUDY AREA AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Study Area




Fig. 1 An aerial photograph of the catchment area and re-settled communities

The area of the study (Fig. 1) is made up of eight communities which were affected by the Bui Dam construction and which required to be relocated. These communities comprise of Agbegikuro and Lucene in the Bole District of the Northern Region and the communities of Brewohodi, Dam Site, Bui Village, Bator, Akanyakrom, Dokokyina and Bui Camp, all in the Tain District of the Brong Ahafo Region of Ghana [3], [17].

The ethnic groups in the study area include Akan, Mo, Banda, Gonja, Ewe, and Dargarti. Tain and Bole are rural districts characterized by dispersed settlements with agriculture being the main source of livelihood.

The resettlement scheme of these communities had been carried out in three phases. Namely, A, B and C. Phase A began in May 2008 with four communities (Brewohodi, Agbegikuro, Dam Site and Lucene) relocated to the Gyama Resettlement Township. The total population of these communities was 236 from about 42 households. Phase B began in June 2010 with inhabitants of the Bui Village, Bator Akanyakrom and Dokokyina resettled to a location between Bongase and the Dam Site, about 2.5km from Bongase and 3.5km from the Project Site. The three affected communities have a total population of 899 people and total household of 141. At the time of data collection, preparations were advanced for the commencement of the third phase of resettlement, Phase C [3], [18].

The original settlements from which the communities were (re)moved to the resettlement sites of Gyama and Bongase were predominantly vegetation, comprising of about 50% grassland, 25% savannah woodland and 25% water and river bed gallery forest [17], [19]. Land-use activities inundated by the reservoir include residential, commercial, agriculture, recreational, educational and health. Cultural sites were also lost [3], [19].

The communities are mostly peasant farmers and cultivate mainly yam, cassava, guinea corn, groundnuts, and gourds. They usually sell their produce at the Techiman Market. They also cultivate calabash plants and generally keep livestock in communal kraals with common herdsmen who are paid through individuals' contributions.

B. Research Methodology

Out of the two districts affected, the Tain District was purposively sampled for the study. Of the six communities affected in the Tain district by the resettlement, four were purposively sampled based on the fact that the people of these villages migrated from the Tain District of the Brong Ahafo Region. They are Bui Village, Bator Akanyakuro, Dokokyina and Dam site.

The study adopted a mixed approach which sought to bring synergies of integrating quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis. Data was gathered through the questionnaire, Focus Groups Discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews. Quantitatively, a survey design was adopted in this study. Through the survey design, the questionnaire was administered to all 157 household heads in the four study communities. The survey recorded a 100% response rate. In addition to the survey, FGDs and key informant interviews which are rooted in qualitative approach were also adopted in this study. A total of eight FGDs were conducted with men and women—two FGDs in each community. Furthermore, seven key informant interviews were conducted with chiefs, landlords, women leaders and sectional heads. The key informants were purposively selected because they were involved in decision-making at all levels of

the resettlement scheme and therefore were able to provide all necessary information. Qualitative data gathered through FGDs and key informant interviews were transcribed and analyzed thematically. Important verbal quotations from discussants were highlighted. Qualitative data was corroborated with quantitative data in the analysis and presented using simple percentages.

V. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSIONS OF FINDINGS

A. Demographic Background of Respondents

Gender distribution of the respondents for the quantitative data collection was made up of 85.1% males and 14.9% females. Also, their ages were generally from twenty years and above. It was realized that more than half (61 %) of the respondents were between the ages of 20 years and 39 years. The rest (39%) were 40 years and above.

Respondents' ethnic backgrounds vary with the majority (54.5%) being Mo and the rest (45.5%) Ewe. The presence of only Mo and Ewe in the resettled communities is because they are mostly into fishing along the Volta River. The results on ethnic composition corroborate the findings of [17], [19] that communities in the Bui Dam area are ethnically mixed. The dominant ethnic group in Tain District is Banda. However, the presence of only Mo and Ewe in study communities is because they were resettled from Bole District [17].

B. Occupation of Respondents before and after Their Resettlement

Before and after the resettlement, the heads of resettled households were found to have engaged in varied sources of livelihood. The results show that majority of resettlers before resettlement were into farming (41%), followed by fishing (24%), trading (21%), artisanship (6%), teaching (2%), schooling (2%) and nursing. The rest (3%) were into both trading and farming. Before resettlement, no household head was unemployed.

TABLE I
OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENTS BEFORE AND AFTER RESETTLEMENT

Occupation	Before resettlement		After resettlement	
	Number	%	Number	%
Farming	64	41	55	35
Fishing	38	24	38	24
Trading	33	21	28	18
Artisanship	9	6.0	5	3
Nursing	2	1.0	2	1.0
Schooling	3	2.0	3	2.0
Teaching	3	2.0	3	2.0
Farming & Trading	5	3.0	5	3.0
Jobless	-	-	18	12

The occupations of household heads after the resettlement were not quite different from their previous occupations though they were changes in the proportion of households' heads who engaged in each type of occupation. The proportion of household heads who engaged in farming, trading, and artisanship after the resettlement dropped by 6, 3 and 3

percentage points respectively (Table I). These drops were not absorbed in any of the sectors and thus were reported to be unemployed (Table I).

C. Major Stakeholders Engaged in the Planning and Management of the Resettlement Schemes

The primary stakeholders in the planning and the management of the Bui Resettlement Scheme include the eight affected communities; namely Brewohodi, Dam Site, Agbegikuro, Lucene, Bui Village, Bui Camp, Bator Akanyakrom and Dokokyina. Other key bodies involved in the planning and management of the resettlement scheme are the BPA, Ghana Dams Dialogue, Action Aid Ghana, National Disaster Management Organization (NADMO), Wildlife Department, the Member of Parliament for the area, the District Chief Executive, Forestry and Lands commission, the German Technical Cooperation Agen (GTZ) and Energy Commission.

The BPA is legally mandated to coordinate all activities from discussions to the actual resettlement and beyond. Ghana Dams Dialogue (GDD) was also mandated to build consensus between the affected communities and BPA by organizing regular meetings, workshops, seminars and public discussions to deepen stakeholders understanding of what should befall them once the Bui Dam construction had taken off. One traditional leader, full of praise for the GDD puts it this way:

"the Ghana Dams Dialogue has been of much support to us because they helped us in capacity building and we have also had a lot of interactions with people sharing experiences and that has opened our minds. They have built our confidence and hope that if we cry in times of trouble there is somebody to help us. They started by trying to form something like Ghana Dams Association by the communities affected by the dam" (Bui Village, 07.01.2014).

Action Aid Ghana Action Aid (a Non-Governmental Organization) has been very instrumental in making sure that the compensations are paid and that necessary actions are taken promptly on other promises made to the affected communities. Similarly, the National Disaster Management Organization (KADMO) has been very helpful in managing any situations that occurred during the displacement and the resettlement periods.

D. Level of Involvement of the Affected Communities in Decision-Making

According to [16], resettlement of people may be voluntary or forced (involuntary) in nature. When a group of people or an individual willingly relocates from their place of origin to other places, such relocation may be referred to as voluntary. Thus, voluntary resettlement occurs when the migrants have the power to make informed and free relocation decisions and the willingness to leave their original place. On the other hand, where people are forced out of their original location to relocate and resettle in another place, perhaps against their will, such relocations may be seen as involuntary [16].

In order to ascertain whether or not the affected communities had been involved in the decision-making concerning their displacement and their resettlement, respondents were requested to state if they had been part of such decisions. Emerging themes from the various focus group discussions (FGD) as well as the key informant interviews pointed to a general acceptance and satisfaction among the affected communities' in their involvement in decision-making regarding their resettlement. Some respondents put it this way:

"honestly, if I say they do not involve me in all their activities, I'll be lying, because the involvement has been there" (Traditional Ruler, Jamah community, 06.01.2014).

Another respondent reiterated that:

"if we say we did not have interactions with them, we shall be lying. When they came to us during the interactions, they told us what the government wanted to do, and we also told them what we want the government to do for us, we discussed all that with them ... That was what helped us to be able also to talk such that we were able to bargain as to how we should be treated... We now dialogue until there is understanding and then they do that which we agree on" (FGD, Akanyakrom-Battor community, 05.01.2014).

Similarly, another respondent indicated that:

"the time they said that they will resettle us, we made many interactions and arrangements with them concerning our living conditions and the fact that we are coming to a new land, such that when we come here, we shall not be stranded."

And so it was arranged that officers from the Land Valuation Board should measure our farms and properties that were there. We decided that in terms of these properties when we come here they will pay compensation on them to us, which we can use to continue our activities" (FGD, Dokokyina community, 05.01.2014).

Per [7] views on voluntary and involuntary resettlement, this study identifies a mixture of the two. Thus, even though the affected communities' displacement forcefully occurred as a result of the inundation caused by the lake created by the Bui Dam, their relocation arrangements occurred through a mutual agreement and on their own willingness to relocate. It could be deduced that because the people had been involved in the decision-making processes, they did not resist in their relocation.

E. Basic Services and Social Infrastructure Provided for the Communities

According to [5], the main benefits of the Resettlement and Community Support Program include:

- New resettlement township with following communal facilities; community Centre, Nursery, place of worship, Boreholes, public toilets
- Houses; (room for room + kitchen + bath + living room)
- Compensation for loss of economic tress at LVB rates
- Grant: \$33 for relocation, \$17 to till new farm

- Income support: \$33/month/households for 1 year, and
- Livelihood enhancement program: to restore economic activities and improved living standards in project affected areas.

In order to determine the veracity or otherwise, of these promises, respondents were requested to identify the social and the infrastructural facilities provided for them as per the promised package. The emerging themes from the qualitative data collected portray rather an unclear situation on whether or not all of these facilities had been provided to the affected communities.

BPA [5] position that the compensation package has been fully delivered seems to have been challenged by discussants. Discussants were not happy with the manner in which the compensations had been handled. To most of them, it was only parts of the packages that were delivered while other parts were never realized. For example, one discussant expressed his frustration as follows:

"the compensations that they promised us, there is a variety of them; namely, (1) monthly monetary compensation, (2) crop compensation, (3) buildings compensation and (4) land compensation. Currently, they have given us the building compensation. For this, the government does not owe us. For the land compensation, we have not received anything yet, the crops too, nothing. Currently, looking at farming, the farmers are having problems and same applies to fishermen" (FGD, Akanyakrom-Battor community, 05.01.2014).

Another discussant from Jamah seems to agree with the above lamentation. According to this discussant,

"They have not given us the things that they promised to give us and we are hearing from other places that certain things were brought to us but we have not seen the things. They promised to bring us food in the form of maize, rice, oil and money but since we resettled here we have not seen any of those things" (FGD, Jamah community, 05.01.2014).

One discussant in a FGD summarized the state in the delivery of the compensation package in these words:

"So far, the things they have promised, some they have done and left some undone. They promised to tar the roads and then build a clinic. Now they are still working on the clinic but built a primary school and KG; and community centre. Now what is left is a market, a Lorry Park, a police station, a JHS and a Post office which are not yet provided" (FGD, Bui Resettlement community, 05.01.2014).

Analysis of the key informant interviews and FGDs revealed that the BPA had provided some of the compensation to affected persons. These are as follows; communal facilities (consisting of the community center, KG, primary school), houses, relocation grant, and monthly income support. The compensation packages provided to resettlers as reported in this study largely agreed with the findings of [21], [22].

Outstanding compensations include the following;

- Compensation for loss of economic stress at LVB rates

- Communal facilities yet to be provided are a market, lorry park, police station, Junior High School (JHS) and post office.
- Livelihood Enhancement Program (LEP).

It was unclear to the resettlers, at the time of fieldwork, why the compensation packages were not fully delivered. In the case of the LEP, [20] reported that the BPA has deliberately delayed it so that they could come out with programs that are consistent with the livelihood sources of the resettlers. To the BPA, incorporating LEP at early stages of the resettlement would be costly. Mettle [20] quoted officials of BPA as follows;

“the livelihood enhancement program is going to run for about two years, and that’s why the monthly support was for a year. We believe by the time the livelihood enhancement program the settlers would have obtained a profession to earn some income to support themselves. This is importance because of the change in environment. The LEP programs are in conformity with what the settlers use to do. They will be thought things such as co-operatives, but it’s going to be many different things so whatever one thinks it suits him or her you can go for it. We realized it would be expensive to do the LEP in accordance with the resettlement phases. Hence we have changed the plans, we want to finish the resettlements and then organize the people in groups so they can form cooperatives to be able to access certain benefits such as loans, it is much convenient and less expensive this way” (p.68).

From the key informant interviews and FGDs held with resettlers, they reported of the provision of land, crop, food and tarring of the road as part of the compensation packages yet to be provided by the BPA. However, the compensation packages as listed by [5] do not (explicitly) include the above-mentioned compensations. Presumably, compensation for loss of economic trees was misconstrued as compensation for loss of crops while land and food compensations may be part of the livelihood enhancement program.

Earlier studies reported delivery of some compensation packages that never came up in this study during field data collection. For instance, [4] and [21] reported that the BPA has provided boreholes and farmlands as part of the compensations, but they were never reported by discussants. Similarly, the Ghanaian Chronicle also reported of the provision of solar panels and street lighting system, but they were never reported by resettlers.

Some studies [20], [21] indicated that some of the compensation packages delivered were not adequate. Otu-Tei [22] and [20] reported that resettlers were not happy with the houses built for them because the room sizes were small. Again, reported that the land provided to resettlers was infertile.

F. Minimisation of the Socio-Cultural Disruptions through the Design of the Resettlement Schemes

According to [5], a total population of 1,216 people was affected by the dam and would have to be resettled. Apart from the human beings that must suffer the displacement, the

cultural heritages of displaced persons such as ancestral homes, ancestral worship places, Churches, traditional grave sites and lands bequeathed to these communities were also affected [16], [18]. The Environmental and Social Impact Assessment team clearly affirmed the presence of many significant cultural heritages such as shrines, cemeteries and old settlement sites in the project area. The Resettlement Planning Framework stipulates that sufficient attention must be paid to the effects of resettlement on the loss of culturally valued sites, and to displaced people's reactions [16]. Thus, many socio-cultural activities had to be disrupted in the quest of the displacement and the resettlement in the interest of the nation. How these disruptions are managed to mitigate the effects on the resettlement communities is very crucial for sustainable resettlement.

The BPA [5] has put in place certain positive measures that will help mitigate the effects of loss of cultural identities as part of the resettlement scheme. Each community was to be provided a place of worship and a modern community center. Again, all the traditional leaders were to be maintained as leaders of their own people in the new communities. Where two community or tribes were to dwell together, the Ghana Dams Dialogue had helped in creating committees of traditional leaders to address common concerns and resolve problems in order to avoid any conflict that may ensue.

The measures put in place by the BPA to preserve the cultural identities of resettled communities were found to be in operation. Testimonies from some traditional leaders are as follows;

“traditional systems haven’t changed. The only thing is that the communities are now a bit far apart, but the leadership style has not changed much. Fortunately, on our part, before we moved the Ghana Dam Dialogue created a committee, and I am the chairman, so the three communities meet when there are any problems” (Traditional Ruler, Bui Village, 07.01.2014).

Another traditional ruler also has this to say:

“according to the Ghana Dams Dialogue rules, all traditional leaders and the BPA must hold discussions to jointly take any decision regarding the resettlement” (Traditional Ruler, Jamah community, 07.01.2014).

Despite these measures put in place to mitigate the socio-cultural disruptions in the resettlement communities, there seems to exist some pockets of dissatisfaction with the operations of these measures. Some traditional leaders seem to be disgruntled about disregard for their authorities by other rulers. Also, the issue of the identity of the people has emerged in some cases. Some people feel their unique identities are being "swallowed" by other people's identity. Names of some villages integrated are gradually getting lost. One such disturbed ruler who said he was ignored by the other ruler in decision making and that his people's traditional identity is getting lost lamented as follows:

“we have been resettled here with other people but there are so many things going on without discussions being held with us. For instance, where we have been resettled is not named...also we have been mixed with

other people and it is worrying us. I raised our concerns before the Jamah chief, and he told me that the place would be called Jamah resettlement, and I asked him whether it is the people of Jamah who have been resettled there, and he couldn't answer. I have seen that they want to ignore our ancestral identity, and this is also a problem that we are facing" (Traditional Ruler, Jamah community, 07.01.2014).

Similarly, an old lady averred as follows:

"we all had our separate chiefs and each village was on its own, but we have all been brought together here, and we have only one chief, and we are not happy about it, we want to be under our own chief" (FGD, Dokokyina community, 05.01.2014).

One other strong emerging theme on the socio-cultural disruption apart from chiefs disregarding other chiefs is also the phenomenon of youths disregarding elders and traditional rulers in some communities. Movement from typical traditional systems to modernized communities has brought with it the tendencies of disregard for traditions and traditional authorities. An elder in Akanyakuro intimated as follows;

"our forefathers established rules with which they governed themselves, and there was a chief in charge who had an area of jurisdiction but when we moved here the youth has taken everything for granted, and the chiefs are no more recognized because there is no difference between the chief's residence and that of theirs, and there is nowhere for the elders to meet and deliberate on issues of the community. As a result, concerning rules and order, it leaves much to be desired" (Elder, Akanyakuro, 09.01.2014).

Furthermore, resettled population also reported of loss of traditional graveyard, traditional worship centers and shrines. From the on-going discussion, it can be concluded that not much had been done by the stakeholders to mitigate the

negative effects of socio-cultural disruptions on resettled communities.

These findings partially confirmed the views of [8] cited by [9] that displacement usually results in multiple anxieties, including, physiological, psychological and socio-cultural stresses. As noted by [8], resettlement affects not only the displaced people but also both the community left behind and the receiving community. As a corollary, resettlement brings about a manifold of problems if not appropriately planned and implemented. The findings also agree with the positions of [10] who explained that resettlement is a very complex experience and involves dealing with the past and moving into the present to make a new habitat.

G. An Assessment of the Resettlement Scheme by the Affected Persons

In order to comprehend the full impact of the displacement and the resettlement of the affected people, the study examined access to livelihood components such as potable water supply, the quality of the new houses, job opportunities, livelihood empowerment, educational facilities and arable land availability to resettled population. Respondents were therefore asked to indicate whether the above-mentioned livelihood components have been better or worse than the ones they left in their former settlement; or whether they were simply the same or that it is difficult to tell.

The responses indicate that while there are general satisfaction and appreciation of areas like potable water quality, the new housing schemes, and the educational facilities, there is a strong dissatisfaction with other areas including livelihood empowerment efforts, job opportunities, and arable land availability. Table II displays all the responses regarding the various grades given.

TABLE II
LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH INFRASTRUCTURE IN RESETTLED COMMUNITIES

	Water Quality	Housing Scheme	Livelihood Empowerment	Job Opportunities	Educational Facilities	Land Availability
Better	76.3	85.6	31.4	38.9	81.3	33.9
The Same	10.2	5.9	10.2	20.4	9.4	12.7
Worse	7.6	1.7	54.2	38.2	2.5	51.7
I Can't Tell	5.9	6.8	4.2	2.5	6.8	1.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

From Table II, 76.3%, 85.6%, and 81.3% indicated that their housing facilities, educational facilities, and water quality in the resettled communities are better than their original settlement. On the other hand, many respondents reported that livelihood empowerment (54.2%), land availability (51.7%) and job opportunity (38.2%) in resettled communities were worse compared to their original settlements (Table II).

To further understand the effectiveness of the resettlement scheme on the livelihood of the affected persons, respondents were asked to grade their satisfaction levels regarding the infrastructural development and facilities availability in the resettled communities. This again portrays a positive grade and strong levels of appreciation of the physical infrastructural

development in the communities. There is a general appreciation of the new school buildings, roads, community centers and in some cases clinics which were either very dilapidated or absent at all their previous settlements. The level of their satisfaction is displayed in Table III.

The distribution of these responses is an indication that resettled population is somehow satisfied with infrastructural facilities provided to them. From the survey, 83% of resettled household heads were either satisfied or very satisfied with infrastructure provided. Similarly, emerging themes from the qualitative data also point to the same feeling among respondents. Many interviewees were elated about the physical infrastructural development in the resettled

communities. One discussant in a focus group discussion indicates that:

"I am happy here because, in our former settlement, our children used to walk to school far away in neighboring communities but in this resettled community, we have KG, primary and Junior High Schools" (FGD, Bui Resettlement community, 05.01.2014).

TABLE III
LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH INFRASTRUCTURE IN RESETTLED COMMUNITIES

Level of satisfaction	Number of people	Percentage
Very satisfied	38	24
Satisfied	93	59
Can't tell	4	2.3
Not satisfied	17	10.8
Not at all satisfied	5	3.0

Also, the study reveal that resettled population are dissatisfied with livelihood arrangements in their present location. From the survey, majority (61 %) of respondents said they were not satisfied (at all) with livelihood arrangements in the resettled communities (Table IV). Such display of dissatisfaction on the part of the respondents may be a pointer to the fact that the stakeholders might not have done enough in the area of the livelihood empowerment arrangement.

TABLE IV
LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH LIVELIHOOD ARRANGEMENT IN RESETTLED COMMUNITIES

Level of satisfaction	Number of people	Percentage
Very satisfied	8	5.0
Satisfied	47	31
Can't tell	5	3.0
Not satisfied	25	16
Not at all satisfied	72	45

Emerging themes from the qualitative data show that employment, arable land acquisition for farming and livelihood empowerment arrangements which were promised have not been truly delivered. The rate of unemployment among the people has increased (Table I) while the \$33 promised the people were either considered as too little or were not being received in some cases. Additionally, the farmlands provided were either not fertile enough for growing crops or were too little in cases where these lands were fertile.

Other emerging themes from the qualitative data also clearly demonstrate a strong dissatisfaction with the livelihood empowerment arrangement and their implementations. As already noted while being thankful for the sterling infrastructural development, respondents largely expressed dissatisfaction with the livelihood empowerment arrangements in resettled communities. Here are excerpts from some discussions;

"our people feel that the infrastructure is nice, but the living standard is unbearable...because of the new schools here now, the issue of our children crossing over the river to Jamah has been limited, and they are happy

about that, but our living standards are simply unbearable" (FGD, Jamah community, 05.01.2014).

"Though the buildings are modern buildings, the livelihood of the people, especially, that of my community which has no access to the river is very difficult and just unbearable. They talked about the crop compensation but when is that coming? The social amenities are not of so much concern like the livelihoods" (Traditional Ruler, Akanyakuro, 10.01.2014).

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Ghanaians, like many Africans, are proud of their culture and their ethnic identities. Therefore, anything that may destroy their culture and concealed their identities may be fought with all seriousness and alacrity. The complaint of some chiefs of being side-lined by other chiefs in decision making in the resettlement communities and the perceived loss of identity of some villages in the pseudo-cosmopolitan communities may degenerate into conflict if care is not taken to address these issues. It is therefore recommended that a form of constitution or a regulatory framework be created in collaboration with all the chiefs and opinion leaders in all the resettlement communities on each chief's roles, responsibilities and their limitations in the new communities. To preserve ethnic identities, compound names or names agreed upon by all should be used in referring to the pseudo-cosmopolitan communities to avoid concealing other peoples' unique identity.

The compensation package saw some of the promises fulfilled and other not yet delivered. The affected peoples' acceptance and willingness to be removed and resettled was based on trust and goodwill, which resulted from the compensation package, promised them. If the people feel that they have been deceived into resettling to the new sites, their trust and-goodwill-could be betrayed. It is therefore put forward that all outstanding parts of the compensation package be delivered without any further delay. If the challenge is financing the projects, the government would.

It was realized that the Akosombo Dam resettlement scheme did not work very well partly because there had not been any serious national institution or committee to make follow-ups and supervise the post-resettlement activities of the people. As such, for the Bui Dam resettlement arrangements and its medium to long term plans to see the light of day, it is suggested that GDD and the other salient research agencies continue to monitor and evaluate post-resettlement activities, the living standards and the general wellbeing of the people for some time. This will ensure that all levels of the scheme are carried out as planned and that contingency interventions are carried out if need be.

Finally, in addition to the capacity building for the people and provision of land, fishponds, and improved seed crops, it is recommended that micro-level financial assistance in the form of microcredit facilities be made available to the traders, farmers and the fishermen for them to expand their scope. Identified groups who want to go into co-operating crops and animal farming or fish farming should get access to credit at

very low interest rates to enable them to undertake these ventures. By doing these, the government would have been ameliorating the negative effects of the displacement on the peoples' livelihood. Again, the arrangement should be made with the National Buffer Stock authorities to purchase the produce that will come from these initiatives in order to prevent problems associated with lack of ready markets.

REFERENCES

- [1] World Commission on Dams, "*Dams and Development: A new framework for decision-Making. The Report of the World Commission on Dams*". Earthscan Publications Ltd. London, 2000.
- [2] R. Lata, M.S. Rishi, N. Kochhar, and R. Sharma, "Socio-economic impacts of Sorang hydroelectric power project in District Kinnaur, Himachal Pradesh, India". *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*, 2013, 3(2), 54-61.
- [3] L. Raschid-Sally, E.K. Akoto-Danso, E.A.K. Kalitsi, B.D. Ofori, and R.T. Koranteng, "The Resettlement Experience of Ghana Analyzed Via Case Studies of the Akosombo and Kpong Dams". Paper Presented at the 9th Annual Symposium on Poverty Research in Sri Lanka; *Exploring Experiences of Resettlement*, November 2008.
- [4] P.B. Obuor, K. Owusu, E.A. Agyeman, A. Ahenkan and A.N. Madrid, "The impacts of dams on local livelihoods: a study of the Bui Hydroelectric Project in Ghana". *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 2015, 32(2), 286-300.
- [5] Bui Power Authority, "Resettlement Package", 2011. Available from http://www.buipowerauthority.com/res_package.htm (accessed 20.04.2014).
- [6] C. Bates, "Environmental Refugees? Classifying Human Migrations Caused by Environmental Change", *Population and Environment, Human Science Series*, Inc, 2002, 23(5), 465-477.
- [7] M.M. Cernea, "*The Risks and Reconstruction Model for Resettling Displaced Populations*". World Development, 1997, 25(10), 1569-1587.
- [8] S. Thayer and E. Colson, "From Welfare to Development: A Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of Dislocated People", in *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement*, A. Hansen and A. Oliver-Smith, Eds. CO, Boulder: Westview Press, 1982. pp. 267-287
- [9] M. Mulugeta and B. Woldehaimat, "The Impact of Resettlement Schemes on Land-use/Land-cover Changes in Ethiopia: a case study from Nonno Resettlement Sites, Central Ethiopia". *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*. 2011, 13(2), 1520-5509.
- [10] S. Shami, "The Social Implications of Population Displacement on Resettlement: An overview with a focus on the Arab Middle East. *International Migration Review*, 1993, 27(1), 4-33.
- [11] D. Vaiou and M. Stratigaki, "From 'settlement' to 'integration': informal practices and social services for women migrants in Athens", 6th European Urban and Regional Studies Conference, 21-24 September, Roskilde, Denmark, 2006.
- [12] E.A.K. Kalitsi, "Problems and Prospects for Hydropower Development in Africa". Prepared for the Workshop for African Energy Experts on Operationalizing the NGPAD Energy Initiative 2-4 June 2003, Novotel, Dakar, Senegal. Available from <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/sdissues/energy/op/nepadkalitsi.pdf>. (accessed 02.04.2014)
- [13] Y. Tuan, "*Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*". Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. 1977.
- [14] P. Alula, "Revising Resettlement under Two Regimes in Ethiopia: The 2000s Programme Reviewed in the Light of the 1980s Experience", in *Moving People in Ethiopia, Development Displacement and the State*, Alula Pankhurst and Francois Pigeut, Eds. Eastern Africa Series, Addis Ababa. 2009
- [15] P.M. Valet, "Internal Displacement and Other Forms of Forced Migration: Are Refugees and IDPs So Distinct", in *Researching Internal Displacement: State of the Art*, C. Brun and N.M. Birkeland, Eds. Conference Proceedings, Acta Geographica, Series A, No. 6, NTNU, Trondheim, 2003, pp. 383-403
- [16] M.M. Cernea, "Risks, Safeguards, and Reconstruction: A Model for Population Displacement and Resettlement," in *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees*, M. M. Cernea, and C. McDowell, Eds. Washington, DC: The World Bank, 2000, pp. 11-55.
- [17] Environment and Resource Management, Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of the Bui Hydropower Project, 2007. Available from <http://library.mampam.com> (on 20.04.2014).
- [18] Daily Graphic, "Communities at Bui Dam Project Site Resettled". Appeared in the 15 July, 2008 Edition of The Daily Graphic.
- [19] Environment and Resource Management, "Resettlement Framework for the Bui Hydropower Project", 2007. Available from <http://library.mampam.com>. (accessed 20.04.2014).
- [20] M. Mettle, "Force Resettlement in Ghana: The Dam and the Affected People". Thesis for award of Master of Philosophy in Development Studies. Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) Trondheim, Norway, 2011. Available from <http://www.diva-portal.org>. (accessed 12.5. 2014).
- [21] Ghanaian Chronicle, "Bui Resttlemnt Programme". Appeared in the 7 October, 2010 Edition of The Ghanaian Chronicle. Available from <https://www.modernghana.com>. (on 12.5.2014).
- [22] C. Otu-Tei, "Broken Promises: Ghana's Bui Dam Resettlement", 2014. Available from <http://www.internationalrivers.org>. (accessed 12.6.2014).