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ABSTRACT

PERSPECTIVES ON FOOD SECURITY POLITICS IN GHANA

Chelsea Masse
University of Guelph, 2018

An understanding of the politics of food security resides in the language used by food policy stakeholders in framing affiliated concepts. The study of their perspectives is crucial to food security as these actors govern what constitutes a food security challenge in a food insecure context. With the ‘triple-A’ approach to food security, and a Gramscian theory of power, this thesis analyses the frequency of how stakeholders outlined food security in Ghana. The analysis of publicly-available documents and interview transcripts teases out the contest of ideas in food security. Frequency gives way to the level of importance ‘triple-A’ dimensions of food security have in governance. Availability of food and supply-side solutions are the hegemonic ideologies. This dispossesses the importance of other parts to food security, namely food adequacy. The absence of food adequacy in dialogues ties in with the emergence of assailants to nutritional consumption in Ghana, transnational fast food corporations.
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1 INTRODUCTION

We are what we eat as much as where we eat (Bell & Valentine, 1997). The politics of food extends beyond the physical supply of food. Food security in itself is a contested concept. It is recognized that food security is a complex and multidimensional issue that is affected by a broad range of activities, scales, and involves multiple sectors and policy domains (Behnassi & Yaya, 2011; Candel, 2014; de Schutter, 2013; Drimie & Ruysenaar, 2010; Duncan & Barling, 2012; Makhura, 1998; Maluf, 1998; Margulis, 2013; McKeon, 2011; Pereira & Ruysenaar, 2012). The multidimensional nature of food security creates difficulty in unifying the field on exactly what defines food security. Academics studying food security present numerous interpretations of the term. To some, food security means national or local food self-sufficiency, and for others it is equated with emergency famine relief (Staatz, Boughton, & Donovan, 2009). It can be a question of human rights and poverty where local persons do not go hungry solely because they do not produce enough, but because they do not own enough rights in society to command that an adequate diet be produced (Staatz et al., 2009). Some question if food security will continue to be undermined by the politics of economic liberalisation (Young, 2004). Whatever the conceptualization of food security is, food can be perceived as an extension of particular socio-economic conditions. The end of cheap food globally has insinuated a renaissance in agricultural development and offshore land investments (McMichael, 2012). For academics in food security there is a great focus on the intersection of land grabbing and investments, and food security (Borras, Hall, Scoones, White, & Wolford, 2011; Cotula, Vermeulen, & Toulmin, 2011; Daniel, 2011; Haroon Akram-Lodhi, 2012). However, due to the complexity and multi-dimensional nature of the term itself, land grabs only provide a snapshot of the complete picture of food security (Adam Sneyd & Sneyd, 2014).

Contemporarily, food security has been understood as a multi-dimensional concept (triple-A paradigm) of physical availability, physical and financial accessibility, and nutritional and cultural adequacy (de Schutter, 2013). While this definition provides a comprehensive understanding of food security, the realism of the term is sometimes overlooked. Food security is a live issue affecting the livelihoods and living standards of humanity. It is not a theoretical concept, it is a concrete situation. Although the concept of food security itself is seemingly complex, challenges lie in the contests of differing opinions on food security. Recent food crises have shown that ongoing globalization and the entanglement of world food systems have led to a situation whereby food insecurity drivers increasingly lie outside the scope of national governance (McKeon, 2011). Food security governance is one no longer solely dictated by the state; it is now affected by a wide array of governance regimes that are all constituted by a distinct set of actors and interests where conflicts of interests, visions, and paradigms exists
(Margulis, 2012, 2013; McKeon, 2015). These contests of ideas are enveloped in layers of the power of discourse (Clapp, 2012; Clapp & Fuchs, 2009). Consequently, out of the complexity of food politics, security, and governance arises the question, “how can the analysis of perspectives of food policy stakeholders regarding the ‘triple-A’ paradigm of food security facilitate understanding the politics of food through the analysis of the contest of ideas and power relations in a food insecure context?”

While this thesis works in the food security paradigm, it would like to acknowledge the legitimacy of the counter-discourse of food sovereignty. By definition, food sovereignty is the “right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems” (Campesina, 2007). The concept focuses on the localization of food production reconnecting consumers and producers to place. This practice is a vital component of food sovereignty as a mobilized movement through providing a common ground to build solidarity against biotechnologies, land grabbing, and nutritional impoverishment (Sage, 2014). Food sovereignty has allowed for a holistic approach to the production of food as it encompasses a “bottom-up” approach to food policy originating with the peasant farmers who are food producers. The discourse embodies an assertion of the right to land, the right of rural peoples to produce, and the right to continue to exist as such (Martínez-torres & Rosset, 2010, p.150). Food sovereignty counters the argument that food issues are a direct result of the discrepancy between global demand and global supply. It argues the lack of food in certain contexts is the direct result of decades of destructive economic policies based on the globalization of a neoliberal, industrial, capital-intensive, and corporate-led model of agriculture (Wittman, Desmarais, & Wiebe, 2007, p.2). Food sovereignty essentially is an ideology to combat this dominant mode of capital-intensive profit-oriented global agro-food system which is present today by presenting a more holistic, localized approach to food emphasizing ecologically-sound modes of production to allow for a greater emphasis on the quality of food produced, the area of food produced, and the impact this food has on the livelihood of the producer. While academics argue food sovereignty is an integral part of the food system that guarantees economic, social, and cultural rights (Anderson, 2008), the discourse of policy still resides in food security. Thus, this project acknowledges the legitimacy of food sovereignty as a movement and practice; however, this project engages with food security discourse as it is the discourse of politics.

This thesis hopes to highlight the increasing complexity of food politics in a food insecure context. This thesis will begin with a literature review that encapsulates the interacting forces of the multiple dimensions of food security. It will then explain the methodology of the project in relation to the question. A brief historical overview of the food insecure context will follow the methodology as food security is a case-specific
concept. Empirical and analytical chapters follow the historical overview. These chapters hope to highlight where the contest of ideas exists between stakeholders, and the possible implications this could have on food security policy and governance. The thesis will conclude on the ignorance of certain aspects of food security in governance, and the implications this research can have on understanding food security in Ghana, and broadly West Africa.
2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND INTRODUCTION TO CONCEPTS

Food security is defined as being “achieved at all levels when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life” (FAO, 1996). It is a fundamentally multidimensional concept that can be linked to market volatility, ecological crisis, poorly defined land institutions, and vicious cycles of malnutrition and disease (Clapp, 2012; De Schutter, 2013; Lang & Barling, 2012; Rosamond Naylor, 2011). Food security is a complex, contingent, and case-specific term. Despite the globally agreed upon definition of food security, it lacks a globally agreed upon measurability making it impossible to have a standardized measurement of what constitutes food security. There is considerable academic debate over the national and international policies and practices that can best facilitate the realization of food security. While there is broad international agreement that food security has multiple dimensions including the availability, accessibility, and adequacy of food (“triple-A approach”) (Clapp, 2012; De Schutter, 2013), the perspectives of important food policy stakeholders including governments, businesses, non-governmental organisations, and international institutions—often do not align on the reforms necessary to bolster food security (Adam Sneyd, Legwegoh, & Sneyd, 2015). This thesis applies a similar framework as found in Sneyd et. al (2013) to a West African context to facilitate an atypical understanding of food politics. Sneyd et. al (2013) put forth a framework to analyse the politics of just who is able to characterise what as a food security issue necessitates an intervention, and bolsters this as a meaningful area of inquiry for food politics. In practice, this has meant that differing perspectives on and approaches to attaining food security have contended to influence policy. In the African context, to date, political science research on the contest over ideas and practices has been conducted in a Central African context (Adam Sneyd et al., 2015). However, there has been considerably less focus on applying the analysis of food security politics in other African regions, including West Africa.

The “triple-A” approach stems from U.N. Special Rapporteur Olivier de Schutter’s advancement of the Right to Food framework, encompassing three dimensions of food security as: availability, accessibility, and adequacy. The right to food undertakes the important necessity to ensure adequate diets while acknowledging the necessity of availability and accessibility of food to all (de Schutter, 2013). Availability is approached as the appropriate functioning of markets to ensure that foodstuffs has the ability to efficiently travel from the producers to the markets, and from food-surplus areas to food-deficit areas (de Schutter, 2013); however, in a broader food security context availability is more popularly defined as increasing production of food to create a larger global supply, rather than market functioning. Ultimately, the right to food framework seeks policy implementation which complies with the principles of participation, accountability,
non-discrimination, transparency, human dignity and empowerment, and follows the rule of law- excluding no individual or household without justification (de Schutter, 2013).

Language used in current food security literature frame the solution as largely static primarily focusing only on the availability dimension of food security through an agricultural production-centered approach (Breman & Debrah, 2003; Flora, 2010; Jarosz, 2014). Solely focusing on the availability dimension is problematic as it neglects the ideology of food insecurity as a distributional issue, and overlooks ensuring regular, appropriate, and affordable access to food (Tomlinson, 2013), or in “triple-A” approach terminology, availability discourse disregards the necessity of the accessibility and adequacy of food. Food security has been additionally conceptualized as a consensual framework with three distinctive collective action frames: food security as hunger, food security as a component of a community’s developmental whole, and food security as minimizing risks with respect to an industrialized food system’s vulnerability to “normal and international accidents” (Mooney & Hunt, 2009). In contrast, the Right to Food framework advances the idea that a person’s ability to feed themselves is a human right done by either producing their own food, or through financial accessibility (de Schutter, 2013). The following literature review will adhere to the multi-dimensional framework of the “triple-A” approach as it captures the complexity of food security and the politics of food. The literature reviewed will begin by analysing the availability dimension of food security through three important subcategories of: agricultural intensification, politics of production (smallholder production), and the efficient functioning of markets. Following the availability literature, the accessibility literature will be examined through the subcategories of the politics of trade specifically focusing on import surges, income, urban rural divide, and price volatility. Lastly, the adequacy literature will be reviewed through a lens of nutritional and cultural appropriateness.

2.1 Availability Literature

Olivier de Schutter’s Right to Food normative and analytical food security framework focuses on three dimensions of food security, with the availability dimension focused on the physical availability of food (de Schutter, 2013). Availability discourse in food security literature is arguably the most prominent in the trend of understanding food security. It understands food security as a monolithic concept primarily focused on an issue of disparity in market fundamentals between supply and demand, as global supply is underdeveloped in terms of global demand. The inability of global supply to adhere to increasing global demand is the sole cause of food insecurity, and focus should be on producing more food (Sasson, 2012; Warr, 2014). Global demand has not only been a cause of increase in global population, but more so an increase in global food consumption per capita (with developing countries declining from what was already a very low per capita food consumption level), resulting in supply unable to meet demand (Kearney, 2010). The availability dimension is defined as dominant in food
security literature because it has been normalized as technocratic, neoliberal discourse emphasizing increases in production and measurable supply and demand, aligning itself with transnational agribusiness and institutions of governance at the national and international levels (Jarosz, 2014). This normalized monolithic availability discourse is seen as problematic. Food security becomes problematic when utilized solely from a perspective of inadequate agricultural production (availability) while the other two pillars of accessibility and adequacy are overlooked. Moreover, it is neglecting to acknowledge food security as a distributional issue and of ensuring regular, appropriate, affordable access to food (Tomlinson, 2013).

2.1.1 Agricultural intensification  
Within the availability dimension of food security, there is a heavy emphasis placed on this notion of increasing global food production between 70-100% of current production levels in order to feed the increasing global population, with emphasis on feeding the world in 2050 creating a political paradigm of “new productionism” and this international focus on “to feed the world” (FAO, 2009; Pretty et al., 2010; Tomlinson, 2013; Winter & Lobley, 2009). This new paradigm is a global focus on increasing the global supply of food through increased agricultural output to feed the inevitably increasing global population. It is because of this newly prioritized statistic of increasing food production between 70-100% of current production levels that has played a significant role in the discursive construction of the global food security challenge that is to be resolved “through increasing agricultural production of a limited range of food commodities, mainly cereals, through further intensification, a liberalizing of the global food system, and the use of the latest bio-technologies” (Tomlinson, 2013). Increased global supply, and subsequently intensifying agricultural output has become a renowned global focus through the normalized statistic of 70-100%.

2.1.2 Yield gap and technology adoption  
A sub-section of the 70-100% statistic is this peculiarity of the yield gap, and how to close it. The yield gap is defined as “the difference between realized productivity and the best that can be achieved using current genetic material and available technologies and management” (Godfray, H., Beddington, J., Crute, I., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J., Pretty, J., Robinson, S., Thomas S., Toulmin, 2010). It is argued if this gap is closed, and accompanied by improvements in potential yields, there is a high probability that crop production will increase by 50 percent by 2050 without the need to cultivate additional land (Jaggard, Qi, & Ober, 2010). Without having to cultivate additional land, there is the possibility of environmental sustainability, particularly in developing countries, with lower greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and lower possibility of nitrogen use when coupled with adaptation of higher yielding technologies, global technological improvements, and efficient management practices (Tilman, Balzer, Hill, & Befort, 2011). Sustainable intensification must take into consideration additional factors such as
water scarcity, lack of institutional support and labour shortages in some agricultural contexts (Graaff, Kessler, & Nibbering, 2011). While sustainable intensification may seem an environmentally viable alternative to extensification (or the cultivation of more land), its success is contingent on the following factors: latitude (as a proxy for environment); literacy (as a proxy of human capital); openness (as a general measure of orientation of the macroeconomic policies); political freedom and; is negatively related to collective agriculture, but also to total agricultural production with a non-linear effect (possibly reflecting the smaller scope for spill-ins and technology imports) (Federico, 2005, p.115).

As sustainable intensification does not allow for additional land use, food production then becomes contingent on the increased adoption of technological inputs. They are argued as the key source for crop yield improvement. Intensification supports the idea of the solution to food security in the sake of agriculture’s mitigation potential will require investments in technological innovation and agricultural intensification linked to the increased efficiency of inputs, and creation of incentives that are inclusive of smallholder farmers (Dembélé & Staatz, 2010; Vermeulen et al., 2012). Agricultural technologies represent technologies used in food and agriculture for the genetic improvement of plant varieties and animal populations, characterization and conversation of genetic resources, diagnosis of plant or animal disease, and must be available for farmers in order to increase agricultural output and achieve food security (Ruane & Sonnino, 2010). On seed technology, there is strong support for advancements to genetic breeding as it is believed new technology developed to improve breeding and increasing genetic diversity will being about crop improvement and offer an effective solution to improving food security where developing countries will reap the greatest benefits (Tester & Langridge, 2010). However, the issue is found in the availability to farmers, particularly the smallholder producer. For instance, adoption of new seed technology is directly correlated with assets, income, institutions, vulnerability, awareness, labour, and innovativeness by smallholder producers whereas technologies that require few assets and have a lower risk premium and are less expensive have a greater chance of being adopted by smallholder producers (Mérino, 2008; Muzari, Gatsi, & Muvhunzi, 2012). The contradictory element of smallholder producers adopting higher yielding seed technology is this may result in a higher labour demand (Kennedy & Bouis, 1993). While the dominant discourse argues for a higher rate of technology adoption, there is a call for controlled and effective use of these technologies with a focus on: crop improvement; smarter use of water and fertilizers; new pesticides and their effective management to avoid resistance problems; introduction of novel non-chemical approaches to crop protection; reduction of post-harvest losses; and more sustainable production (Beddington, 2010).
Globally, the availability discourse used in the literature has become normalized and implemented into international policy and initiatives rendering it known as the more important façade. In regards to geographically-specific cases, food security “availability” can have other detriments, including continental-wide initiatives to promote the normative agricultural intensification such as the Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). Academic focus has been placed on sustainable intensification as the solution to increasing crop yield output in Africa (Godfray, H., Beddington, J., Crute, I., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J., Pretty, J., Robinson, S., Thomas S., Toulmin, 2010; Pretty, Toulmin, & Williams, 2011). Despite this call for a continent-wide universal ideology regarding increasing agricultural output, it should be noted that there should be no “general recipe”, and more emphasis should be placed on a country level taking into consideration the opportunities and constraints of each country (Graaff et al., 2011). Increased agricultural output is the normative framework, however it disregards the constraints at each country level including labour shortage, land and soil degradation, drought and water scarcity, and lack of institutional support (Graaff et al., 2011). Climate change at the individual country level has the ability to contribute to further lack of agricultural output, and increasing food insecurity through negative externalities such as water scarcity and climate affecting crop output (Sissoko, Keulen, Verhagen, Tekken, & Battaglini, 2011).

2.1.3 Politics of production: smallholder production

Smallholder availability literature heavily focuses on the ideology of increasing agricultural production as the solution to food insecurity. Increased smallholder production has the potential to improve long-term food security of poor households in both rural and urban areas though increasing the food supply through dramatic increase in the use of agricultural inputs and intensification of cultivated land (Baiphethi & Jacobs, 2009; Jayne, Mather, & Mghenyi, 2010; Wiggins, 2009). In this smallholder body of literature, there exists a set of factors which must be satisfied to allow for smallholder production to intensify their agricultural output. For this to occur, there must exist a favourable investment climate for farming, investment in public goods that support agriculture, and developing economic institutions to allocate and protect property rights, to facilitate trading, reduce risk, and to allow collective action (Wiggins, 2009). Much emphasis is placed on the necessity to implement policies that allow for smallholder farmers to enter efficient markets which would allow for the improvement of food insecurity within the region (Barrett, 2008; Chmielewska & Souza, 2010) which will be touched upon in the next section of this literature review. Ultimately, the ideology behind smallholder production aligns itself with the literature of agricultural intensification on the idea of the necessity to increase agricultural yields as a solution to food insecurity.
In the specific context of sub-Saharan Africa, this paradigm is prevalent. The necessity for smallholders to increase their crop yields is obvious. Globally it has been acknowledged for the continent as a whole, the best way to continental food security is through increasing smallholder agricultural productivity (McIntyre, Herren, Wakhungu, & Watson, 2009). This approach is problematic as it does not capture the true complexity of the problem of food insecurity, and the problems facing smallholder production within the individual countries. Institutional bias against the smallholder farmer in sub-Saharan Africa is one issue touched upon. Until the institutional bias begins to shift and favour the smallholder farmer, there will be no change in agricultural output (Hounkonnou et al., 2012). In conjunction with institutional bias, there is the problem of inaccessibility to the inputs necessary to supply the desirable output. It is argued that while it is known to increase the yields there is a need to supply smallholder farmers in Africa with inputs, the lack of immediate response to increased inputs constitutes a poverty trap for farmers in Africa as they are unable to increase the yields and their own economic growth (Jama & Pizarro, 2008; Tittonell & Giller, 2013). The counter-argument to this is the ideology that sub-Saharan African smallholder farming is not the solution to food insecurity, and rather it is investment in commercialization, the larger commercial farm, and hybrid models in which there is linkage between the large farms and the smallholder through vertically integrated supply chain (Collier & Dercon, 2014).

2.2 Accessibility Literature

2.2.1 Price volatility and income

Physical availability, despite being pursued as the most important component of food security, is not the only component of food security. Accessibility, specifically economic accessibility, is an important factor to those which food insecurity affects. Price volatility is one of the most detrimental factors affecting those suffering from food insecurity. Economic accessibility primarily implicates food prices for consumers and producers, as well as volatility regarding agricultural markets. In regards to price volatility and food security, unexpected food price spikes have the capacity to deepen poverty, hunger, and cause political unrest with the root causes of price volatility being broader than market fundamentals of supply and demand (Clapp, 2009). Factors affecting food price volatility include the value of the US dollar, commodity futures speculation, trade measures, imbalances in international trade rules, food aid policies, and corporate concentration (Clapp, 2009). Price stabilisation and food security policies have been argued to be integrated into a social protection matter as the accessibility of food is also based on the size and seasonal distribution of food production; market infrastructure and market development; the composition of food demand; the extent and depth of poverty at the household level; budget constraints; and political aversion to price fluctuation (Dorosh, 2008). Food commodities hold an importance to consumers
and farmers, and because of this there should be attempts to establish efficiency between price stabilisation and food security policy (Dorosh, 2008).

Food price volatility has evolved to include new linkages between agriculture-energy and agriculture-finance markets (Rosamund Naylor & Falcon, 2010). Price variability impacts poor consumers the greatest, but it is also a major impediment to improve food and trade policies in developing countries. When price shocks are large they can instigate a vicious cycle of rising fragility in response mechanisms that deepen and perpetuate volatility and its negative impacts on food security. The growing exposure of vulnerable countries to bouts of market volatility is a challenge to all, and beckons the question of what policies governments should pursue to cope with an increasingly unpredictable environment, especially in the longer term (Prakash, 2011). To the extent that governments have the ability to prevent sizable price spikes, food security will be enhanced through policy intervention (Rosamund Naylor & Falcon, 2010). Those affected by food insecurity are generally tied to the agricultural sector, but rising food prices do not necessitate a rise in income. Rising production costs, weak infrastructure, and lack of credit do not allow the poor who are food insecure to respond to rising food prices (Clapp & Cohen, 2009; Moseley, 2011). Income is directly related to price volatility. Food shortages and price spikes can easily throw households into a food-insecure state, particularly because most poor households spend 50-60 percent of their income on food, making these households particularly vulnerable to food price volatility and rendering them unable to respond (Rosamund Naylor & Falcon, 2010; Ruel, 2010; von Braun & Getaw, 2012). The direct relationship between income and price volatility is an important relationship to sustain for the possibility of achieving food security in a specific context.

2.2.2 Import surges and trade liberalization

Food security and trade have a longstanding historic contradictory relationship. Trade liberalization, and consequently import surges which follow, have negatively impacted nations’ ability to achieve food security. Excessive reliance on food imports has left people in developing countries increasingly vulnerable to price shocks and food shortages (de Schutter, 2011). Encouraged practices, such as export subsidies, discourage local production in importing countries where food security is normally prevalent which creates a dependency on the international market, which affects prices and the ability to achieve food security (de Schutter, 2009). There has been acknowledgement of what factors could assist local ability to achieve food security, including higher tariffs, temporary import restrictions, state purchase from small-holders, active marketing boards, safety net insurance schemes, and targeted farm subsidies; however international institution policy favors the increase of globalized trade liberalization ignoring food security necessities (de Schutter, 2011). Trade liberalization has particularly impacted developing countries as they have been encouraged to lower
their trade barriers, liberalize their economies, and subsequently experience a rising number of food commodity import surges negatively impacting the domestic markets and food producers (Johnson, 2009). Trade liberalization impacts poor producers whose vulnerable livelihoods may be severely disrupted by market instability and sudden import surges, making it difficult to promote food security and market stability (Matthews, 2011).

2.3 Adequacy Literature

2.3.1 Nutritional adequacy

In the “triple-A” definition of food security, adequacy is further fragmented to be composed of nutritional adequacy, and cultural adequacy (de Schutter, 2013) primarily concerning itself with adequate nutritional content for a scientifically defined healthy diet, as well as the level of cultural appropriateness in context of those consuming. Some bodies of literature have begun to view this dimension of food security through a lens of nutritional security. Nutritional adequacy has been conceptualized as understanding nutrition as biochemical molecular and genetic detail (Lang & Barling, 2013). In simpler terminology, it is the adequate nutrients for the human body to sustain a scientifically defined healthy life. In alignment with food security and nutritional adequacy, considering the level of nutritional deficiency of a population is rendered important (Jones, Ngure, Pelto, & Young, 2013). The problem identified in relation to food security is the integration of public health nutrition and sustainability in how to feed the growing population equitably, healthily, and in ways sustaining the ecosystems on which humanity depends (Lang & Barling, 2013). The modern food security debate between bodies of literature stresses the need for increasing agricultural production to feed populations, but neglects the idea of sustainability and the question of “how” in nutrition (how to eat, modes of production and consumption, how much horticulture, less meat and dairy, more equitable distribution, better skilled consumers, less consumption overall in the developed world) with the necessity of current national and international food security policy to take into consideration nutrition (Lang & Barling, 2013). There exists a secondary prominent gap between availability literature and nutritional adequacy literature in that nutritional adequacy literature acknowledges that the availability literature narrowly focuses on cereal improvements and calorie supply to eradicate food insecurity while ignoring supplementary factors such as the balance of micronutrients, vitamins, and minerals (Hawkesworth et al., 2010). Related to this, it is noted that nutritional quality of agricultural produce may not increase in line with higher yields (Schmidhuber & Tubiello, 2007), which becomes problematic in terms of the dominant availability discourse of food security.

The two bodies of literature are in contradiction regarding crop yield production, and the definition of what constitutes nutritional adequacy. Within the nutritional adequacy literature, it is acknowledged that far too little attention is paid to the
nutritional quality being consumed. In conjunction with this argument, it is put forward that the current food system is not performing its primary function of feeding people effectively as micronutrient deficiency and nutritional deficiency are widely popular (Garnett, 2013). Policy makers must align themselves with developing food provisioning systems to ensure the global expanding population has access to enough of the right kind of food to meet their nutritional needs (Garnett, 2013). Although there is important emphasis placed on nutrient and micronutrient consumption, the definition of nutritional adequacy is contested dependent on who is defining it. The contest resides in the ability of Big Food corporations’ definition of nutritional adequacy. These corporations hold power in the global processed and packaged food markets, and hold the ability to alter the dominant definition of nutritional adequacy, and influence national and international food policy. Big Food Corporations have capitalized on nutritionism (the reduction of food’s nutritional value to individual nutrients), and have exploited this discourse to promote highly processed foods (Clapp & Scrinis, 2016). This is problematic as they have become dominant in the nutrition-focused rule-setting activities in agrifood supply chains, allowing them to influence food policy, and lastly in conjunction with the previously stated concerns, they have shifted the burden of diet-related health outcomes onto the individual rather than the product (Clapp & Scrinis, 2016). Nutritional adequacy literature tends to focus on the importance of the consumption of nutrient and micronutrients, however it disregards the issue of power and corporations influence in this realm of food.

Finally, there is a small section of literature that combines the nutrition literature and the specific availability literature around technological improvements. This literature could be regarded as the beginning of amalgamating perspectives to understand the multi-dimensional nature of food security in a narrow fashion. It is recognized within this literature soil degradation affects human nutrition and health as it adversely affects the quality and quantity of food production which humans consume. Soil degradation is a cause of declining crop yields and agronomic production that cause food insecurity, as well as causing a low concentration of essential micronutrients in the produced yields aggravating malnutrition and hidden hunger (Lal, 2009). It is also noted that the increasing competition for limited cultivable soil and water resources have been linked to malnutrition and basic public health problems (McMichael, Powles, Butler, & Uauy, 2007). This existing relationship between soil degradation and the ability of crops to acquire and utilize soil nutrients has been noted in developing countries where many crops are cultivated by weathered soil in which nutrient deficiencies and ion toxicities are common (Clair & Lynch, 2010). Related to this, it is noted that the nutritional quality of agricultural produce may not increase in line with higher yields (Schmidhuber & Tubiello, 2007), which becomes problematic in terms of the dominant availability discourse on food security. In short, soil degradation direct impacts are attributed to the
reduction in crop yields and decline in their nutritional values (protein, content, micronutrients, etc…) (Lal, 2009).

2.3.2 Cultural adequacy

Adequacy in the “triple-A” approach to food security can be further defined as cultural adequacy. Cultural adequacy is arguably the least developed of the food security literature, and is the least quantifiable and measurable component of food security. The availability and accessibility literature find ways to quantify food security, but cultural adequacy is more difficult to quantify. The cultural adequacy literature hypothesizes that there is a common core to food insecurity experiences that goes beyond insufficient food quantity and transcends into culture, most importantly concerning social acceptability of available food (Coates et al., 2006). Cultural adequacy literature continues to argue that food security measurement scales ignore important social aspects of food such as cultural adequacy, to highlight what they determine to be more important key aspects rendering cultural adequacy difficult to detect (Coates, 2013).
3 METHODOLOGY

First and foremost, the politics of food security was vested in control of food. Politically, food was crucial to state’s grip on control over food supplies for a nation as this drove food and agricultural policy. Moreover, the politics of food security was understood as the decisions and power structures of actors involved in the development of food policy, and their impression left on the production, control, regulation, inspection, distribution, and consumption of food. There was a need to analyse the perspectives of food policy stakeholders in a food insecure context as they are the actors who determined what necessitated a food security challenge. Subsequently, they are the actors who influenced the creation of policy, legislation, laws, and regulations linked to the advancement of food security. This was grounds to explore how they framed and perceived food security challenges to further conceptualization of what constituted food security to the actors predominately involved in policy. Not to mention the beliefs that animated many stakeholders in Africa’s food futures have largely fallen under scholarly and policy radars (A. Sneyd, Legwegoh, & Sneyd, 2015). Furthermore, perspectives shed light on what actors authorized as political issues in food.

The “big-picture divide” in the research question, “how can the analysis of perspectives of food policy stakeholders regarding the ‘triple-A’ paradigm of food security facilitate understanding the politics of food through the analysis of the contest of ideas and power relations in a food insecure context?” necessitated a methodological strategy that incorporated a three-part complementary analysis. The big-picture divide in food security literature resided in the contention between those who asserted the predominant issue in food security was physical supply, and those who asserted global food production was at sufficient levels. The divide underlined those who asserted food production must be increased with modern technologies, and those who disagreed with increased production and focused more on the socio-economic conditions associated with food in a certain context. To fully comprehend where stakeholders were positioned in relation to the distinct sides of the debate, a three-part complementary analysis was rationalized. The three-part complementary analysis was designed to ensure a wide range of diversified perspectives was covered to produce a comprehensive analysis on food issues.

The first phase in the research methodology involved primary data collection that compiled and analysed content and media documents from the stakeholder groupings: bilateral and multilateral institutions; corporations; civil society organisations; government; and media. These stakeholder categories adhered to the original study conducted in Economic Community of Central African States (CEMAC) (A. Sneyd et al., 2015; Adam Sneyd, 2013). The documents were acquired through searches on the online databases of All Africa, Factiva, and Google. Searches were conducted with key words such as: [institution or organisation name + food security], and [institution or
organisation name + agricultural production] amongst other variations (see Appendix B for further information). The collected documents were then coded and analysed with the qualitative analysis software HyperResearch. The coding process used the same list of pre-determined codes as the CEMAC study (see Appendix C for list of codes). The codes on the list were each associated with one of the three dimensions of food security (availability, accessibility, and adequacy). The three dimensions were used in part as the larger categories of coding, and were further conceptualized to include a various list of terms associated with each dimension. For instance, the code production was associated with the larger code group of availability while the code market was associated with the larger code group of accessibility. Correspondingly, the coded documents were analysed in terms of frequency of the three dimensions in relation to the different stakeholder groups. This allowed for an understanding of the status quo perspectives that influenced food policy in publicly accessible documents and reports. The primary data collection analysis allowed for a preliminary comprehensive understanding of the currently situated contest of ideas in food policy. Through the analysis of frequency, the numbers began to identify and discern the power relations between the contested ideas and perspectives in food policy. In theory, the frequency of the terms found discerned the power analysis because pattern in which the way powerful actors speak alludes to the degree of power a certain discourse has in the political space of today.

The second part of the methodology built upon the findings of the preliminary analysis, and continued to situate the contended perspectives in food policy. The secondary analysis involved in-country field work to supplement the preliminary analysis. The fieldwork took place in Accra, Ghana. It lasted 2 months between July and September 2017. Accra was chosen because the project took an institutional approach, and the high-level political actors in question were almost entirely located there (see Appendix A for further information). The in-country field work involved semi-structured interviews with persons and organisations affiliated with the defined stakeholder categories. Interview participants were generally found through the “snowballing technique”. At the conclusion of interviews, some participants gave contact information of other food policy stakeholders they thought would be of interest to the project. Participants were also found through direct contact with their affiliated institutions, ministries, corporations etc… The justification for semi-structured interviews as the fieldwork methodology was two-fold. First, semi-structured interviews allowed for a standard set of questions posed across the board which ensured consistency in what was asked. Second, as the project encompassed discourse analysis with a specific coding technique, it allowed the participant to speak freely without a structured response that allowed for comprehensive answers, and ultimately assisted in a successful discourse analysis. In terms of consistency, the interview transcripts used an identical coding and analysis strategy as the preliminary data collection. After the
Interview data was properly coded and analysed, the convergences and divergences between stakeholder perspectives became apparent. Evidently, this led to an understanding of the present state of the politics of food policy perspectives. The identification of the present state of the politics of food policy perspectives situated the “on-the-ground” outlooks on food. This facilitated an understanding of the actuality of what food policy actors prioritized on food security. This provided set-up for the final analysis to identify the power relations, if any, between stakeholders. Insight on power relations were determined by whether or not perspectives aligned with the productivist dominant discourse, and governmental policy on food security, or if perspectives offered a contest to the model and development of food security. Additionally, it provided a subsequent understanding of the contest of ideas between stakeholders. It situated stakeholder perspectives closely related to the actualities of the “on-the-ground” situation which may have been overlooked, or not prioritized by the publically-available documents.

The interviews conducted represented 19 stakeholders. The interviewees that met with the researcher represented: 2 bilateral/multilateral organisations; 4 corporations; 9 civil society organisations; 2 government officials; and 2 media personnel. Given the short time frame of two months for field work, the amount of respondents the researcher was able to interview was not high. This was a considerable weakness in the methodology. The methodology was lacking a certain level of reliability as it was impossible to make generalizations from a small sample size. However, the research question posed searched for an understanding of food politics in a context rather than a broad-reaching conceptualization applicable to all food politics. While the quantity of interview respondents was lower than expected, the information provided by the interview respondents provided the researcher with a glimpse into the complex nature of food politics in a context. Additionally, the methodology was not primarily dependent on the field research. The motive of the field research was to supplement the findings of the preliminary research. The field research was complimentary to the preliminary research, and provided an impression of the on-the-ground perspectives to compare and contrast with perspectives found in the preliminary research.

The final phase of the project involved triangulating the two sets of analysed data. Triangulation identified if the first-person accounts of stakeholders aligned with the publicly available documents. This allowed for a comprehensive understanding of the current food policy environment. The fundamental objective of the project was to situate the contending perspectives, and assessed these contests of opinions in terms of how food security may advance in a context. Additionally, power relations between perspectives were analysed as to whether or not there was a dominant perspective present, and if this dominant perspective influenced policy. Power was conceptualized as ideological hegemony. Hegemony allowed for power to be understood as consent of
an idea of a ruling class, rather than coercion. The project was concerned with a discourse analysis on perspectives, and therefore was concerned with solely discursive power through ideas put forth by stakeholders. It did not seek to analyse power through a framework that analyses power as a three-dimensional concept found in recent literature such as Lukes (2005) and Clapp & Fuchs (2009). The project was interested in the power of language and idea vis-à-vis the ‘triple-A paradigm’, and thus was appropriate that a Gramscian approach to power and hegemony in discourse was the appropriate framework to analyse the perspectives. Furthermore, the power relations also identified whether or not there was a more influential group of stakeholders on food policy in a specific context. The situation of the power relations facilitated an enhanced understanding of the food politics of the context. By understanding where and how certain food policy stakeholders prioritized components related to food security allowed for a greater understanding of how stakeholders conceptualized food problems in a context. Furthermore, it reasserted the inherent complexity of food security as a concept. It reasserted the potential difficulty in the creation of a comprehensive solution to food issues due to the contention between perspectives, and potential power some stakeholders held over others in policy creation.

The project determined a single-case study was the most appropriate form of study in accordance with the above stated methodology. The single-case was chosen based on a few criteria points. First, it was necessary for the single-case to have lacked research on stakeholder perspectives in food policy. Second, the case needed to have a food security issue. It was previously noted, to date, there has been research on stakeholder perspectives in food policy in the Central African context; however, there existed a gap in the field as there was a lack of research on perspectives in food policy in other areas of the continent such as the West African region. In the West African region, Ghana presented itself as the optimal academic and methodologically practical country case-study for this project. Ghana was faced with a food insecurity issue, particularly in the northern regions of the country (Nyantakyi-Frimpong & Kerr, 2017). Ghana presented itself as a successful liberal democracy and classified as a Middle Income Country (MIC). Food security research framed country-level challenges in light of a “severity index” which tended to overlook MIC-status countries. Despite the progression in economic development, food security persists in MIC-status countries which justified attention to understand food insecurity challenges in contexts that were not categorized as “severe”. Economic stability in Ghana provided the assumption of a significant presence of diverse stakeholders in the country, which was necessary to explore the research question.

Ghana proved suitable as a practical country-case study to begin to answer the question posed above. To answer the question, the methodology was heavily based on discourse analysis which necessitated some form of linguistic practicality. Ghana was
an English-speaking nation which allowed the research to be conducted in the researcher’s native language. It was important for the research to be conducted in English as it effectively captured the true meaning of various statements. If the research was to be conducted in a non-English speaking country, there was a concern of improper translation which would lead to mistranslation which would lead to the loss of the original meaning of the statement which would negatively affect the results of this project. Furthermore, Ghana presented itself as a safe context to conduct research on a politically sensitive topic. At the time of research, there were no travel advisories as per the Government of Canada’s online travel guide. The countries that neighboured Ghana did not present themselves as practical case studies. While these states may have fulfilled the case-study criteria listed above, they did not present a safe and practical research environment for a project on a politically-sensitive topic. For example, Nigeria was in the middle of an economic crisis which was linked to a socio-political crisis (Oladapo & Obamuyi, 2016) where it was considered potentially unsafe to travel. Mali was still in the middle of a civil war (Francis, 2017). Ghana’s eastern neighbour, Togo, was a country run by a long-standing authoritative family dynasty with great military backing where it was unsafe to conduct research on a politically sensitive topic in the area (Ahlin, Dionne, & Roberts, 2015) In contrast, Ghana was a food insecure state where there had been no research conducted on the contending perspectives of food policy stakeholders in the region, and presented itself as a practical region to conduct research on a politically sensitive topic.

The literature on Ghanaian food security provided a research gap. There has not been research on the contending perspectives in food security policy. However, three areas emerged out of Ghanaian food security as prominent. First, there was the trend of increased production in an era of climate change. In relation to increased production, it was argued the development of infrastructure, and adequate post-harvest practices was critical to food security (Dzanku & Sarpong, 2011). The development of sufficient infrastructure and post-harvest techniques was crucial in terms of food security and climate change in the Ghanaian context as the lack of these two elements contributed to ongoing food insecurity, and continued to do so as climate changes became more severe in areas through increased droughts and erratic rainfall patterns (G. Owusu & Codjoe Ardey Nii, 2011; Quaye, 2008). There was a lack of acknowledgement on how policy formulation advanced in this context, with the only acknowledgement of policy would have to encompass a holistic approach (Akudugu, 2012). Second, there was the issue of income and price volatility. In relation of policy, it was additionally recommended policy makers begin to promote non-farm interests as a source of income, and food policies must begin to encompass more than just production, but promote adequate levels of demand through income growth (V. Owusu, Abdulai, & Abdul-rahman, 2011). There was fluid conversation particularly in the climate change and food security body of literature as it perceived food security as contingent on
increased climate change and decreased food loss. What was ignored in this section of literature was the idea of foodstuff price volatility as an implication for food security in Ghana (Kuwornu, Ibrahim, & Bonsu-Mensah, 2011). The last theme prevalent in food security in Ghana literature was the adverse effect of the trend of farmers who participated in cash crop (particularly cacao and oil palm) on food security (Aderman, Remans, Wood, & Defries, 2014). In policy relation to cash crop farms, the land deals that inhibited this mode of agricultural production were established under corporate irresponsibility, and poor regulation that directly impacted Ghanaian food security and income potential (Schoneveld, 2011). Each body of literature stood independent of each other. There was a lack of acknowledgement of the dissimilar bodies of literature that presented a less comprehensive perspective on food policy. Additionally, each body of literature presented a policy recommendation for the government to uptake; however, these policy recommendations ignored the politics behind policy creation and implementation, and how stakeholders who had self-interest in food in the Ghanaian context perceived the issue of food security in dissimilar fashions. While Ghanaian food security literature provided policy recommendations in divergent forms, there was ignorance in the literature of the power relations of the contests of ideas behind comprehensive food policy conceptualization.
4 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE POLITICS OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE IN GHANA

To understand the current politics of food and agriculture in Ghana, the historical aspects of the matter must be explored. Ghana gained independence from British colonizers in 1957. Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, influenced by socialist ideologies, served as the country’s first President of Ghana in the post-colonial period. Nkrumah was officially democratically elected as president in 1960 when the country was declared a republic. Despite the attempts to sustain an established democracy, Ghana endured multiple coup d’états in 1966, 1972, 1979, and 1981 (Abena, 2013; Kirkpatrick, 2012). The most contemporary coup d’états in 1981 resulted in the commencement of the political era of John Jerry Rawlings. While the 1981 coup d’état was considered a success, Rawlings attempted a previous unsuccessful coup d’état in 1979. This attempt resulted in his arrest and sentence to death. While imprisoned, Rawlings delivered a speech that heavily resonated with the majority of the population at the time. Accordingly, this led to the call for his release from prison. Rawlings again executed a coup d’état on December 31, 1981 to overthrow the Affuko administration, this time with success. Subsequently, Rawlings suspended the 1979 Ghanaian constitution, and began his militaristic reign (Adedeji, 2001).

The contemporary history of Ghanaian food politics began during the Rawlings regime of the 1980s and the early 1990s. Rawlings adhered to a unique political identity. Rawlings combined Marxist ideologies with contrasting free market ideologies (“End of an era,” 2000). Prior to the Rawlings administration, agricultural policies were primarily focused on urban unemployment rather than rural poverty. The Convention People’s Party (CPP) from 1950-1966 under the rule of Nkrumah implemented agricultural policies that avoided dependence on independent private farmers whose political philosophy was inconsistent with the ruling party, and policy failed to encourage industrialization based on local raw materials (Dappah, 1995, p.9). Subsequent regimes: the National Liberation Council (NLC 1966-1986), Progress Party (PP 1979-1981), National Redemption Council (NRC 1972-1979), the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC 1979), and the Peoples’ National Party (PNP 1979-1981) favoured large scale, capital intensive production and focused little on industrialization through agricultural surpluses and raw materials (Dappah, 1995, p.9). Despite the unified perspective on agricultural policies, regimes continued to differ on alignment with socialist or capitalist ideology.

Agrarian change was quite evident during the Rawlings era. The government wanted to pursue a path of food self-sufficiency. The government had two options to pursue. The choice was between increased price of farm products, and subsidized costs of farm implements. The Rawlings administration pursued the latter of the two options due to its political attractiveness (Bates, 2005). Agriculture began to shift from
what would be considered a more traditional, or peasant mode of production, to a mode of production increasingly dependent on external technological inputs. The greater dependence on technological inputs warranted less producer sovereignty, and more involvement of global actors in national matters. Ghanaian agriculture in the 1980s began to adopt the increasingly complex technological package comprised of fertilizers, water retention techniques, diguettes and dikes, and labour-saving technologies of animal traction and mechanical ridge tier (Webber, 1996). Crop success rates became contingent on the correct implementation and utilization of the technology package. The package was adopted as a whole. The farmer was not able to select which components to adopt (Webber, 1996). The financial access of technological inputs by the farmer was questionable. Additionally, the introduction of the technological package in Ghanaian agriculture introduced the beginning of inter-farmer competition. It was the beginning of an agrarian transition from peasant modes of production to capitalist modes of production. However, this transition reinforced the cyclical poverty trap of the farmers who could not keep up with technological change. The change in agrarian politics in Ghana at this time created a class divide amongst farmers.

In addition to the change in agrarian politics during the Rawlings era, there was also a shift in the nation’s political climate. Rawlings promised a democratic revolution that would create economic opportunities for the worker, redistribute wealth, eliminate various corrupt practices like overpricing, and end neocolonialist influences (Rothchild & Boadi-Gymiah, 1989, p.222). Rawlings policies drew on neo-Marxist ideas that would have satisfied the working class. Despite the counter-capitalist discourse Rawlings projected, he engaged with multilateral forces such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) to keep Ghana afloat during a time of neoliberal revolution. Rawlings advocacy to end neocolonialist influences in Ghana was questionable at best due to his continued interaction and adoption of economic policies with the World Bank and IMF. Other leaders in the West African region, most notably Thomas Sankara of Burkina Faso, aligned with Rawlings neo-Marxist ideology which created political similarity between Ghana and Burkina Faso.

Thomas Sankara modeled his political revolution in the Republic of Upper Volta off of Rawlings revolution in Ghana (Rothchild & Boadi-Gymiah, 1989, p.222). Upper Volta, a landlocked country, neighboured Ghana to the north. Sankara renamed Upper Volta to Burkina Faso as part of his political revolution to empower the poor, and rid of colonial ties. Sankara focused his revolution on rural transformation with greater emphasis on agrarian change. In comparison, Rawlings’focused more on urban issues including rent, price and transport fare controls while farmers were asked to accept lower prices for their crops. Sankara, on the other hand, emphasized the importance of cutting rural taxes, establishment of farming collectives, and attempted to provide rural social services (Rothchild & Boadi-Gymiah, 1989). Sankara’s revolution was able to
focus more on agrarian change to benefit the producer as Burkina Faso’s economy was not integrated into external market relations as Ghana’s was. This allowed Sankara to implement policy reorientation more easily (Harsch, 2013, p.364). Sankara’s policies provided farmers with more extensive public services, productive inputs, price incentives, marketing assistance, irrigation, environmental protection with 71% of investments in the productive sectors allocated to agriculture (Harsch, 2013). This contrasted with Rawlings policy of lower prices to the producer. Burkina similarly adopted the complex technological package in agriculture as Ghana did. However, the difference between the two was the level of importance placed on a fully developed and productive agricultural sector. Sankara prioritized the producer while Rawlings focused on the concerns of the urban proletariat. The level of state control differed between the two as well. While the Burkina government supplied farmers with productive inputs, Rawlings and the PNDC (Provisional National Defense Council) banned the purchase and use of farm tractors on private farms which only allowed mechanization on cooperative and public farms (Rothchild & Boadi-Gymiah, 1989). The politics of production for both countries was ingrained in the nationalist ideology of food self-sufficiency. The difference was found in the level of power and control both governments placed on domestic production methods. To understand what the politics of the day were in that specific geographic region, it was important to explore the relationship between the two powerful political actors. The conclusion was the politics of the day resided in the language of food self-sufficiency to enhance the level of control of the food supply, and of national sovereignty through ceasing relations with neocolonialist influences.

While both Burkina Faso and Ghana prioritized food self-sufficiency, their contemporary food politics were highly influenced by the original implementation of neoliberal policies and economic liberalisation during the 1980s. Rawlings engaged with external neoliberal influences such as the World Bank and IMF while Sankara advocated total debt repudiation at the African Union (AU). In 1983 Ghana entered an Economic Recovery Plan (ERP) with the World Bank Group, and subsequently shifted to a full Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) in 1985. The objectives of Ghana’s SAP were stereotypical neoliberal objectives. The SAP aimed to: establish an incentive framework that would stimulate growth, encourage saving and investment, and strengthen the balance of payments; and improve resource use, particularly in the public sector and direct resources to key areas of adjustment while ensuring fiscal and monetary stability (The World Bank, 1992). Trade liberalization and a framework that encouraged endless economic growth were additional components of Ghana’s SAP aligned with the political discourse of the 1980s. The SAP identified the agricultural sector as the weakest economic performer with a marginal 1% increase per annum from 1986-1990 (The World Bank, 1992, p.10). This coincided with multilateral and governmental efforts to improved policy environment for encouraged private sector
investment in the food and agriculture sector. This discourse reflected contemporary Ghanaian political discourse. Considerable importance is placed on the creation of a favourable environment for private sector investment in food and agriculture, such as found in the 2017 food security and agricultural development initiative: Planting 4 Food and Jobs (Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2017). In 1991 efforts commenced to create a favourable investment environment and included: lowered corporate tax rate applicable to agriculture to 35%, and raised corporate tax rebates on exports to 60-75% for agriculture (The World Bank, 1992, p.6). While food and agriculture politics was seemingly rooted in nationalistic discourse of self-sufficiency, Rawlings continued interaction with global forces that ultimately forced liberalized Ghanaian agricultural markets.

Consequently, it was questioned if interaction with the global forces had impacted price volatility in domestic agricultural markets. Price variability was assumed to be contingent on policy and environmental shocks during this time from 1978-1993. While the SAP during this time worked to liberalize Ghana’s economy, its influence was detrimental on agricultural foodstuff price variability. During the years Ghana adopted economic reforms (mainly 1983 with the ERP, and 1985 with the full SAP), Ghana saw higher variability in maize prices. That being said, 1983 also coincided with the drought in Ghana (Shively, 1996). Whether the drought, or the economic reform caused the higher variability in price was debatable. Interestingly enough, the northern market of Bolgatanga (Upper East Region) found a reduction in price volatility in the subsequent years of economic reform. Additionally, the switch from a fixed exchange rate regime to a managed float resulted in immediate higher and more volatile prices, but was followed by lower and less volatile prices (Shively, 1996). Both policy and environmental shocks impacted the price variability of crops that directly impacted the food security situation of the country. However, it remained undetermined whether price variability was more severely affected by policy or environmental externalities.

Ghanaian food politics ultimately found itself torn between the contrasting ideologies of liberalized agricultural markets and production for national self-sufficiency. Meanwhile, liberalization negatively affected commodity crop production through increased competition in the agricultural sector. For example, the price of seed cotton fell after liberalization in relation to input costs, and to competition from food crops such as maize and groundnuts. This resulted in a fall in producer commitment to cotton, and a decline in yields (Poulton, 1998). Political revolution was ingrained in patriotic commitment with coercive measures. The same could be said about the agricultural policies of the time. Despite Rawlings’ coercive measures during his rule post-coup d’état, Ghana returned to democratic rule in 1992 and officially elected Rawlings. Rawlings social democrat party, the National Democratic Congress (NDC) won the majority vote as the National Patriotic Party (NPP, a far-right party) won less than 30%
(“J.J. did it,” 1992). This fueled a democratic transition in Ghana, and by 2004 Ghana had achieved a multi-party democratic foundation (Yayoh, 2007). While contemporary Ghanaian politics are rooted in democratic thought, the food and agriculture policies are still found at the crossroads of liberalized agricultural markets and nationalistic self-sufficiency.
5 PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF PUBLICLY-AVAILABLE STAKEHOLDER DOCUMENTS

This chapter presented the results of the content and media analysis of publicly-available stakeholder documents. Publicly-available documents were collected and coded with the qualitative analysis software HyperResearch. Quantitatively, the numbers extrapolated from the analysis provided an empirical basis on the frequency of language used in stakeholders' dialogue on food security in Ghana. The frequency of language relative to the dimensions of food security established what was understood as the "dominant discourse" in stakeholders' perspectives on food security challenges in Ghana. Qualitatively, the analysis unraveled the contest of ideas shrouded in the language used by differently-situated food policy stakeholders. In this, what stakeholders called upon as the order of the day in Ghanaian food security challenges was conceived. Not to mention the analysed perspectives ruminated how differently-situated stakeholders postulated solutions to food insecurity. Taken together, the analysis positioned the debates of the day on Ghanaian food security.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilateral/Multilateral</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Civil Society Organisation</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Number of publicly-available documents coded per stakeholder group

5.1 Bilateral and Multilateral Institution Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Frequency of the appearance of codes associated with the three dimensions of food security.

5.1.1 Availability of food

It was found bilateral and multilateral institutions framed food security challenges in language linked to the availability of food in 576 instances. Of these, institutions tended to discuss food issues most frequently with language linked to the codes production (80), productivity (79), technological inputs (43), and extension (42).

According to the numbers, production was the principal code found in the availability dialogue. Institutions generally aligned on the notion that Ghanaian food security will only continue to advance with increased crop production. Institutions tended to use the language “increased production” in reference to the code production. When
institutions discussed the concept of “increased production” they also used language linked to the availability code technological inputs. Institutions communicated a perspective that increased production will only occur if producers begin to adapt technological inputs in their production methods. United States Agency for International Development (USAID) ADVANCE program conveyed this perspective as, “Immediate interventions to introduce or encourage the use of improved technology include improved seed and basic mechanization aimed at improving productivity” (Dusza & Riley, 2010). While many of the institutions aligned with the perspective of increased food production with the adoption of technological inputs, there were two eminent contentions. A Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) document, and a European Union (EU) document challenged this narrative. These documents expressed an interest in alternative production methods. The FAO stated, “support the production of fruits and vegetables in a safe manner preferable with organic farming methods” (Food and Agriculture Organisation, 2013). The EU supported this perspective through its recognition of the success of different low-input conservation practices applied in certain areas in Ghana (European Commission, 2007). The divide in perspectives presented within the institutions documents reflected the big-picture divide in food security availability literature. One perspective aligned with the dominant discourse of production and technological inputs. The other suggested methods with less reliance on technological inputs.

On technological inputs, all of the institutions generally used language that conveyed “improved farmer access to technological inputs”. Most institutions aligned on the idea that producers needed access to technological inputs to improve the physical supply of food in Ghana to further food security. The AU particularly bolstered this perspective through the statement, “food crop yield increases (2.5% per annum or more) is due to the use of improved seed and agro-chemicals, productivity-enhancing inputs as well as good rainfall pattern and soil fertility” (Egyir, Asare, & Asamoah, 2013). However, some institutions diverged on this idea and presented a counter-perspective. Particularly, the FAO highlighted the issue of corruption with increased access to technological inputs (something not found in other discourses on the topic). The FAO claimed, “even when agricultural inputs of fertilizers and chemicals are supplied, farmers sometimes fall to the temptation of diverting such inputs into other farming ventures or selling to other farmers”(Essegbey, Omari, Fuseini, & Nyamekye, 2013). Additionally, the EU was the only institution to recognize the politics of technological inputs. The EU highlighted the fact that these inputs supplied to producers were “not produced locally”(European Commission, n.d.). While the dominant discourse supported the notion of increased access to technological inputs, some institutions underlined the problematic nature of said technological inputs.
Secondly on technological inputs, it was found institutions under the UN mandate never explicitly used language related to technological inputs in their communications. For instance, the FAO chose broadly worded statements such as “improving techniques” and “appropriate strategies”. These phrases were ambiguous, open to interpretation, and provided no clear insight into the perspective. The FAO used this vague phrasing in statements linked to production such as, “significant increase in rice productivity and production can only be achieved through improvements in production systems, and therefore the production techniques farmers’ use must be enhanced” The techniques that the FAO referenced in this statement were never explained. Furthermore, the World Food Programme (WFP) lacked clarity in their communications linked to technological inputs. The unclear language of “adaptation measures” was found to be linked to technological inputs. This language was found in statements such as, “vulnerable people in general and smallholder farmers in particular, in affected communities require increased investment in adaptation measures that sustain their agricultural production and household resilience during climatic disturbances such as droughts and flooding” (World Food Programme, 2012). The WFP never explained what “adaptation measures” represented or indicated which left the statement vague.

5.1.2 Accessibility of food

Institutions articulated accessibility to food second to availability of food in their communications on food security in Ghana. Of the 469 occurrences found: market (72), income (62), and gender (44) were amongst the most frequent codes.

The perspectives presented on market proved similar. Institutions used similar phrases on market. Generally, the language found included “increased access to markets”, “linkage to markets”, “support for markets”, and “potential for markets” for domestic producers. The phrase “access to markets” was linked to economic growth by the institutions. For instance, the EU linked these two concepts through the statement, “improved access to local and regional markets will make agricultural production a driver for rural and sustainable economic development” (European Commission, 2014). International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) bolstered this perspective, but furthered the idea of increased capacity of the producer as a result of increased access to markets. IFAD stated,

“IfAD aims at increasing the access of small farm and off-farm enterprises to markets and adequate technologies, allowing them to improve their commercial and environmental sustainability in agricultural value chains, and to efficient, sustainable services to strengthen their capacity, skills and financial assets” (Demirag, 2015).

Institutions prioritized increased macroeconomic growth as a result of increased producer access to markets in their communications on food security issues. Food security, in this sense, was approximated to improved market structures in Ghana.
By the same token, institutions conveyed an increase in income was necessary to ensure Ghanaian food security. Institutions communicated assorted suggestions on how to improve incomes, and further financial access to food in Ghana. The EU aligned with this perspective with the suggestion, “promoting sustainable investments in Ghana Savannah Ecological Zones will help rural households to move from subsistence to income generating agriculture and should create decent employment opportunities along the value chains” (European Commission, 2014). Some institutions conveyed similar suggestions on how to increase income. USAID and the United Nations (UN) institutions proposed increased competitiveness in agricultural markets to boost the income producers. USAID fostered this perspective through the ADVANCE program with the statement,

“...the ACDI/VOCA team has put processes in place and has gained a momentum to increase competitiveness of Ghana agricultural sector in domestic and regional markets. This transformation will lead to increased incomes, the emergence of a commercial agriculture class and improved services in rural areas and will ultimately contribute to economic growth and poverty reduction” (Dusza & Riley, 2010).

For some institutions, improved financial accessibility was viable with a formalized agricultural market. Formality was understood as a driver of ameliorated macroeconomic revenue, and bettered income. The catch, however, was this solution put forth was exclusive to producer-households.

Other institutions did not link the issue of income to a formalized market. For instance, the WFP constructed income inequality as a challenge to food security. They communicated,

“differences in income, procurement of food and assets between livelihood groups are key to understanding why, for instance, an unskilled labourer is more food insecure than a trader. Identifying livelihoods (based on households’ sources of income) is important for targeting and designing assistance” (World Food Programme, 2012).

To that end, food security solutions were affixed in assessment of income inequality relative to prior to implementation of institutional projects.

On top of this, the WFP exclusively recognized the challenge at the intersection of gender, income, and food security. The WFP recognized this obstacle as, “women in northern Ghana do not have the same opportunities to earn income as men and this makes gender an important dimension of poverty” (World Food Programme, 2012). It highlighted the issue of gender-income disparity in financial accessibility to food as, “about 62% of female headed households fall into the two poorest wealth quintiles compared with 39% of male headed households. Similarly, only 11% of female headed households reach the wealthiest quintile in comparison with 21% of male headed households” (World Food Programme, 2012). This was noteworthy as they were the sole
institution that applied a gender lens to income, purchasing power, and financial accessibility. Therein, gender could produce an impediment to food access for a large portion of the population.

5.1.3 Adequacy of food

Institutions did not engage with the adequacy dimension as frequently as the other two dimensions. In fact, the analysis showed only 167 occurrences of language linked to food adequacy. When institutions did engage with language associated with the adequacy dimension, they corresponded with the codes nutrition (38), malnutrition (34), and staple (23). On nutrition, institutions provided similar perspectives. Institutions saw eye to eye on improved nutrition as crucial to food adequacy in Ghana. Yet, two difference of opinion arose out of the conversation on nutrition. Up front, institutions neglected to specifically define how they conceptualized adequate nutrition. This was precarious as it begets ambiguity in interpretation. Some institutions, such as the EU, bestowed language like “appropria

te nutrition” and “nutritional resilience” in their dialogue. Without a concrete definition of nutrition, there was incertitude in the communication. Likewise, some communications on food adequacy were not linked to the usual approach of personal health and livelihood. Distinctly, USAID and the UN, recognized nutrition improvements as probable by way of modernised agriculture. The UN articulated their implementation of a Food Security and Emergency Preparedness Programme in Ghana would, “reduce nutrition insecurity through modernised agriculture” (United Nations, 2015). USAID furthered this perspective through the Agriculture Technology Transfer (ATT) project. This project advanced, “increase effective demand for quality seed and other technology packages in targeted value chains with a potential for high impact on incomes, food security and nutrition” (USAID, n.d.). To these institutions, a transition to modernised production methods could potentially positively impact food security.

As on nutrition, institutions contested on how to frame malnutrition challenges. Institutions framed malnutrition as an impediment to economic development, or as a health and development indicator. On the former, institutions perceived malnutrition as a negative force on the national economy and labour force productivity. Notably, the Cost of Hunger in Africa (COHA) communicated statistical evidence to support this perspective. COHA disseminated, “that in 2012, an estimated GH¢4.6 billion (or US$2.6 billion at the time) was lost to the economy as a result of child undernutrition” (Cost of Hunger in Africa, 2012). COHA additionally provided supplementary statistics in regards to the impact on the Ghanaian labour force productivity as, “an estimated 1,077,906 working hours were lost in 2012 due to workforce absenteeism as a result of incremental undernutrition-related child mortality” (Cost of Hunger in Africa, 2012). This perspective diverged from the alternative perspective institutions took which focused on the individual health impacts (primarily stunting and wasting) without reference to socio-
economic impacts. Essentially, the dialogue on malnutrition was constructed around either the potential impact on economic productivity, or the health of an individual. The link between the two perspectives was obvious. The call of the day was improved health of the population may lead to greater efficiency of the labour force.
5.2 Business Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 Frequency of the appearance of codes associated with the three dimensions of food security.

It was notable that agribusiness was quite underdeveloped in Ghana. While there are many global corporations with operations in Ghana, it was noted that the majority of these corporations were not concerned with food issues in their corporate social responsibility reports (CSR). Rather, corporations tended to focus their efforts on health, education, water, and sanitation issues. For example, Ghana Oil and Gas Company (GOIL) Ghana’s largest oil and gas company did not mention food issues, but rather focused on water and sanitation in their CSR report. What was inferred from this particular finding was perhaps food issues were not at the forefront of social responsibility initiatives in Ghana for undetermined reasons.

5.2.1 Availability of food

Business communications used language associated with the availability dimension of food 56 times. Corporations articulated food availability with language linked to the codes production (15), domestic production (7), and sustainability (4).

In many instances, language found in the documents associated with production was descriptive in tone. Particularly, agri-business described the type of agricultural production their particular corporation was engaged in. They shed light on what type of production they commended as appropriate to further Ghanaian food security. For one, Africa Atlantic Holdings Ltd (a subsidiary of Atlantic Holdings), indicated they wanted to engage in additional large-scale operations. Agro-Mindset supported this solution as they communicated current the Ghanaian agricultural model as ineffective desired increased private-sector involvement in domestic production. On the other hand, some corporations proved progressive in their solutions. Aloha ECOWAS Development Corporation embraced progressive thought as it promoted a production model that conserved agricultural waste, and applied it to mushroom and tilapia production. On that note, corporations presented dissimilar production models that would advance food security in Ghana.

Comparatively, corporations provided similar perspectives on domestic production. Some corporations bolstered language that was aligned with food sovereignty, rather than the political discourse of food security. Agro-Mindset harmonized this with a discussion on Conservation Agriculture (CA), “a better pathway
could be to farm CA way. Adoption and scaling up of CA has significant potential to increase smallholder livelihoods, agricultural productivity and food security and consequently reduce environmental degradation in Ghana" (Agro-Mindset). Undertones of producer sovereignty were evident. On the same note, Antwi Farms attuned consumer sovereignty and local consumption as, "the opportunity will be given to every Ghanaian to be able to buy meat cheaply for his consumption" (Antwi Farms, n.d.). Some corporations provided perspectives that underlined the importance of consumer and producer sovereignty in the supply-side of the Ghanaian food system.

5.2.2 Accessibility of food

Language associated with accessibility codes frequented the documents 56 times. Of this frequency, corporations articulated with the codes income (11), market (9), and trade (4).

Corporate documents communicated anomalous perspectives on income. Provision of assistance to smallholder households to improve income was one perspective. To do so, one corporation suggested a farm-to-table food system in Kumasi, Ghana. They speculated if a farm-to-table system was implemented then, “rural communities will have incomes to support the goods and services needed for a higher quality of life; and more eager to develop their communities” (Asare Asiamah, 2017). This idea disseminated into the big-picture idea of community development. The second perspective found articulated the business-as-usual approach of increased incomes to allow for greater access to food. However, one unique corporation communicated an innovative business model that smallholder producers could adopt for increased income. The model was based off a quick return on capital, and was forwarded as, “the total time from planting to first harvest for mushroom crops is approximately 21 days, so the farmers will see an economic return almost immediately, which will fuel the people’s passion for involvement in this new industry in Ghana” (Aloha ECOWAS Development Corporation, 2012). Language linked to income was also found in some CSR reports. Notably, Ashanti Gold briefly linked income and food security. Ashanti Gold found itself responsible to support those who were directly affected by their corporate operations. With this, they recognized the importance of financial accessibility of food and livelihood as in their CSR report it was stated, “in 2015 we plan to focus our efforts on the creation of alternative livelihoods for resettled communities, including support for long-term access to food and sustainable income streams”(AngloGold Ashanti, 2014). While corporations presented a variety of dissimilar ways for increased income, it was evident they aligned on the basic assumption of increased income in Ghanaian households for greater access to food.
5.2.3 Adequacy of food

Corporations discussed food issues in the adequacy dimension 11 times. Of those occurrences, food qualitative dimension (6) and food safety (3) were the codes of interest. The two codes were used by the corporations as an assurance they have followed standards to assure production of safe and qualitatively appealing food products. These codes provided no insight into corporations’ perspectives on cultural or nutritionally adequate food consumption.

5.3 Civil Society Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Frequency of the appearance of codes associated with the three dimensions of food security.

5.3.1 Availability of Food

From the numbers, civil society organisations were the least documented stakeholder group in the preliminary analysis. There were various explanations for this. For one, many civil society organisations in Ghana were local and small-scale. Resources, such as the internet, perhaps were not as accessible to local and limited-funded organisations comparative to larger scale non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Withal, civil society communications on food security framed food challenges in the availability dimension in Ghana 40 times. Of these, production (8), productivity (4), and sustainability (4) were the most frequent codes found.

On production, some civil society organisations presented a united front in their publicly available documents. These organisations considered increased and diversified agricultural production as a solution to food insecurity in the country. Case in point, SEND Ghana highlighted the importance of increased food production as the “centre of their mandate” (SEND Ghana, 2015). In the same manner, Association of Church Development Projects (ACDEP) communicated increased and diversified production as the end to food insecurity. They stated,

“…maximising existing opportunities around food production, food security and incomes as well as looking new opportunities in these areas. This may vary from introducing new crops like soya as a cash crop to introducing newly developed varieties of existing crops” (ACDEP, 2017).
On the whole, this language let on that food security would get under way in Ghana with increased agricultural production levels.

Solutions capped in language related to the code sustainability articulated there was call for food production to become better aware of the long-term commitment to sustainability in various ways. In the words of Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), “Chicks, goats, or lambs from an animal bank, as well as seeds and agricultural training, play a part in our disaster risk reduction programs and can set a household or farm up for success that can last generations” (ADRA, n.d.). The term “generations” hinted toward long-term thought, and time-commitment. Ecological conservation emerged as a theme interwoven with sustainability in the communiqués of some civil society organisations. TRAX Ghana outlined the solutions to current ecological impediments that hindered potential in domestic agricultural production as,

“While the natural, environmental features of Northern Ghana mean agroecological practices are particularly important in this region, Trax also recognises that agroecology is often perceived in relation to food sovereignty and is understood to include social elements of connecting communities to the land and the production of food. This is particularly pertinent in Northern Ghana where communities and social ties are integral to daily life. That is why we always work with farmer groups and aim to building the capacity of farmer groups to govern their shared natural resources collectively” (TRAX Ghana, n.d.).

This suggested solutions of agroecological applications rather than standard agrochemical solutions to production constraints. As such, this particular discourse made sense of food sovereignty elements in statements on food security in Ghana.

5.3.2. Accessibility of food

Language associated with the accessibility of food was found in 34 instances. Of these times, organisations had ideas associated with the codes gender (5) and water (4).

Some civil society organisations put forth congruent ideas. These ideas assumed gender-specific barriers were critical to food security. To illustrate, one organisation buttoned down a gender analysis on income inequality and their role in improved food security. They determined, “women in particular feel the effects of entering a marketplace previously closed to them, providing dependable income and self-reliance” (ADRA, n.d.). The term dependable income linked back to the larger reciprocal idea of food security achieved through financial empowerment of women. The solutions enacted by CARE Ghana empowered women micro-entrepreneurs by way of engagement in value chains for increased income, and improved food security to boot. (CARE, n.d.). Likewise, SEND Ghana applied a gender-equity lens to food security solutions. A SEND Ghana document testified, “level playing ground for both women and men to actively engage in productive activities that could possibly increase food
security” (SEND Ghana, 2015). Keep in mind, the phrase “possibly increase” indicated a correlation to food security, but not a definite causation. Taken together, the gendered solutions to food security challenges in Ghana were framed in a variety of respects with no consensus on the tie between gender and food accessibility.

5.3.3 Adequacy of food

Language associated with the adequacy dimension of food security was seldom found in the civil society organisation documents collected. There were 12 instances of words or phrases affiliated with the adequacy of food in a food system. Of this count, nutrition (5) was the only repeated code. The nutrition-specific aspects put forward by organisations provided no insight into their exact perspective on food adequacy. Rather, the term “nutrition” was broadly associated as “food security and nutrition”. As a result, organisations took no notice to adequacy of food as a dimension of food security.

5.4 Government Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 Frequency of the appearance of codes associated with the three dimensions of food security.

5.4.1 Availability of food

Language used in government documents signaled the availability of food 455 times. Of these, productivity (64), production (53), and technology (42) were of utmost importance.

Government documents communicated similar themes relative to the availability code productivity. Many phrases found dictated “increased” or “enhanced” crop productivity levels. Government contended the adoption of modernized technology for increased crop output for the market. The Food Security and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (FASDEP) was developed in accordance with this theme. The central vision in this document was, "a modernised food and agriculture in which productivity and production improvements are based on science and technology” (Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2007). On the same note, the Medium Term Agricultural Sector Investment Plan (METASIP) upheld the view that “sustainable modernisation of the food and agriculture sector can only occur when productivity and production improvements are based on strategic thinking, science and technology” (Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2010). Other documents, such as the contentious Plant Breeders Bill, echoed increased productivity by way of adoption of improved quality of seeds. The bill articulated improvements in production as, “the provision of
better seeds to farmers would result in increased yields on the same piece of land which will thereby enhance the economic development of the country” (Appiah-Opong, 2013). The point of view of government documents assumed improvements in the availability of food by means of adoption of modernised technology and production methods vis-à-vis agrochemicals.

Language associated with the availability code *production* similarly acknowledged the theme of the necessity of increased crop output as way of improved food security conditions. Some documents contained solutions inclusive of improvement of environmental conditions in the production environment. It was assumed increased crop output would accompany these conditions. The National Development Planning Commission grounded this with the words “the various soil and crop improvement programmes implemented by government with support from development partners can also make significant contribution to improving soil condition for staple food production” (National Development Planning Commission, 2014). The same document linked the likely impression increased production would have on the country’s macroeconomic status. The ideas in this document indicated increased production would result in the emergence of investment opportunities along the agricultural value-chain. This was validated as,

“Increased production also has the potential of opening up public and private sector investments in post-harvest management operations along the agriculture value-chain, including food haulage and transportation, storage, processing and preservation and marketing. Emphasis must be placed on rice and maize for support along the value chain” (National Development Planning Commission, 2014).

Broader conceptions affiliated with the availability of food were derived from the language in the documents. To a great degree it was understood the language appropriated by the government documents perceived food as a commodity first. Food security solutions related to increased production output of food crops as way of accumulating national revenue further commodified the idea of food.

### 5.3.2 Accessibility of food

Government documents framed food issues in Ghana with language linked to the accessibility of food 366 times. Of these occurrences, government frequently articulated language linked to the codes *market* (52), *income* (46), and *gender* (39).

Many a time the government documents framed food challenges relative to the code *market*. The order of the day for greater accessibility of food was to integrate informal markets into the formal economy. To an extension, this perceived food security solutions as parallel to market-oriented development in the agricultural sector. Yet, the term “food security” was never explicitly used relative to agricultural markets. FASDEP perpetuated agro-economic formality as “increased competitiveness and enhanced
integration into domestic and international markets” (Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2007). The Shared Growth and Development Plan (SGDP) rehashed agro-economic formality as “the agriculture sector continues to face significant challenges which need to be addressed in order to enhance its competitiveness and integration into both domestic and international markets” (National Development Planning Commission, 2014). To encourage competitiveness and agro-economic formality in Ghana’s agricultural markets was to encourage further trade of food produced in Ghana. This language further commodified the idea of food. And to broader point, it encouraged a deeper ecological footprint of food vis-à-vis carbon levels associated with long-distance trade routes. Likewise, language linked to the code market signified the impacts of market fundamental fluctuation inflicted on consumers’ ability to access food. Some documents contended this through query of “price, distribution, and diversification of food” in agricultural markets. The METASIP document laboured the point “a priority objective of the government was to provide regular market information to improve distribution of food stuffs. To use market and price information for stock management and price stabilisation” (Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2010). The elements of price and distribution of food were understood as critical to the access of food by consumers. The ways in which price and distribution of food solutions were framed in governmental policy had serious implications for the improvement of consumer purchasing power in agricultural markets, and financial accessibility of food to boot.

The theory of improvement of purchasing power was further explored in language connected to the codes income and gender. And on a larger note, these codes linked back to the bigger-picture conversation on poverty and development in Ghana. Food insecurity was frequently articulated as found at the intersection of household income levels and poverty status. Some government documents perceived the government’s role in the food system as responsible for sufficient income and ensured access to food. As such, METASIP deliberated, “groups most vulnerable to food insecurity will also be supported with income diversification opportunities to enable them to cope better with adverse food supply situations, production risks, and enhance their incomes for better access to food” (Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2010). The details lacked in METASIP’s proposed accessibility solution avoided critical details. Far-reaching questions, such as how would income diversification realize in Ghana, remained unanswered. The degree to which these vague solutions were political promises was questioned as well. In like manner, government documents related the productive power of the labour force to food accessibility. For instance, individual worker health problems like “HIV or tuberculosis infection, limit capacity to earn income and access food resources” (Government of Ghana, 2013). One document applied a gender-lens to household income barriers, and applied it to rural Ghanaian contexts. It brought to mind that “gender was also an important dimension of poverty, and prompted as sharp divide of the differences in income-accumulation between men and women”
(Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2007). The long and short of it was government documents acknowledged solutions of improved income levels to comprehensively facilitate food security conditions for the better part of the population without a detailed course of action.

5.4.3 Adequacy of food

In fellowship with the trend in frequency, government documents framed food security challenges relative to the adequacy of food in the least frequent manner. Of the 143 times adequacy was found in the documents, government engaged with the codes *nutrition* (32), *malnutrition* (23), and *staple* (15).

Government documents postulated solutions to the macroeconomic impediments cooked up by inadequate nutrition of the labour force. Some documents established increased nutritional indicators of the workers would accumulate greater formal revenue, and further macroeconomic development. The National Nutrition Policy (NNP) symbolized economic development by way of human development by the agency of improved nutrition of its citizens, particularly women and children (Government of Ghana, 2013). The METASIP document mirrored this idea in the name of food consumption for adequate nutrition to result in higher economic productivity, and reproduction (Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2010). Here the government documents progressed macroeconomic development with improved national labour force productivity by means of adequate food consumption, and improved overall individual health.

One government document applied a human-rights lens to conceptualizing nutrition in Ghana. The NNP maintained nutrition as a human right as, “All people living in Ghana must have a right to access safe and nutritious diets. This right shall be observed in accordance with the fundamental basic right of all persons to be free from malnutrition and related disorders” (Government of Ghana, 2013). The sharpness of this language regarded nutrition as a human right rather than as a channel of improved labour productivity. The language characterized the worker as a human in lieu of their labour power.

With conviction, government documents employed language associated with the adequacy codes *malnutrition* and *staple* in a purely descriptive style. *Malnutrition* was marked with quantified indicators and statistical levels of nutrition present in Ghana. In a similar manner, the code *staple* was not applicable to food adequacy challenges. Alternatively, government documents communicated challenges with staple crops in Ghana to the level of crop production output. Once more, the government commodified the concept of food with language akin to output volume.
5.5 Media Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 Frequency of the appearance of codes associated with the three dimensions of food security.

5.5.1 Availability of food

Media utilized language linked to the availability dimension of food repeatedly in their publications. Of the 1248 occurrences, media articulated food issues in Ghana with the codes *production* (219), *seeds* (197), *imports* (136), and *technology* (122).

Media frequently reported on food security challenges in Ghana with language linked to the code *production*. Media perspectives put forth varied based on the ownership of the outlet. For instance, the Ghanaian Times was a state-owned newspaper. They supported the ambitions of the government, and articulated to their reader “one of the numerous government initiatives rolled out in the agricultural sector to boost production for food security and poverty alleviation” (The Ghanaian Times, 2016b). The particular article in question painted the policy in a positive and supportive manner. Under private-ownership, media outlets were less restricted in their critiques. Reports, such as those from the Business and Financial Times (BFT), provided constructive critiques to government’s food security initiatives. Many of the statements produced by BFT advanced policy suggestions they perceived as the solutions to food security challenges. The same news outlet surely notes the priority of private sector investments in domestic agricultural production. For instance, one BFT article recommended government policy, “should remove all excise/import duties on all agricultural machinery, fertilizers, and pest-control to motivate the private sector into investing more in machinery and other inputs to boost crop production and harvests” (Otoo, 2018a). The same article glorified private investment as a provision to unprecedented food production, job-creation, and revenue generation for economic growth and development (Otoo, 2018). The difference in ownership between media outlets in Ghana provided dissimilar perspectives on the approval of government agricultural production and food security policy.

It was found that media outlets spoke much of the same relative to the code *seeds*. Many a time the code *seeds* were coupled with terms like “improved” or “subsidized”. For one, a BFT article narrated improvements to supply and production of food as unachievable without the use of improved or enhanced seeds and agro-chemical application (Business and Financial Times, 2018b). Media perspectives contributed opinions to the big-picture debate between types of seeds employed in
agricultural production. Specifically, media outlets expressed the current debates in Ghanaian society between proponents for genetically-modified (GM) seeds and traditional breeding techniques. GM seeds held a controversial and politically-sensitive status in Ghanaian food production. The current political administration passed legislation loosely associated with GM seed introduction, and a media outlet reported on it as,

“Ghana has passed a seed law that aims to increase the availability of improved seed varieties to farmers by providing more opportunities to the private sector. However, there is still a chronic lack of varietal diversity, indicating that governance challenges in the seed system remain despite the reform efforts” (Investment Weekly News, 2018).

While it was noted this legislation was idealistic, the seed law was not without its political weakness with governance challenges. A commonplace perspective emerged from discussions associated with the code technology. Generally, media outlets discerned adoption of modernised agro-chemicals and technologies as solvent to food availability drawbacks. And private-sector investment would supply these provisions to producers. The BFT published an article that recommended solutions that amalgamated local practices and technology as, “government should collaborate with international partners and educational institution/universities for the exchange and transfer of expertise, technology and new production trends to blend with local practices” (Otoo, 2018a). This perspective embodied a holistic approach to agricultural production in respect to traditional practices, and to an extension respect of culture. Some media outlets dared to critique bio-technologies. The BFT quoted a prominent Ghanaian scientist who stated, “if we don’t do anything about the current situation in this country, and allow people’s fears and uncertainties about biotechnology to stop us from adopting it, we will lose our foods and soils…and ground-water will be reduced” (Otoo, 2017). Technology generated a debate on the proper technological approach to production barriers in Ghanaian food supply.

5.5.2 Accessibility of food

Media framed food issues in language affiliated to the accessibility of food 889 times. Of these times, media used language connected to the codes gender (199), market (155), and water (77).

Many of the media communications coupled the code gender with terms like “equality” and “inclusiveness”. And in many of these occurrences of gender, media framed accessibility barriers pertinent to female-led production households. Food accessibility in this perspective was understood as improved crop output for female-led production households. Media outlets alluded to “strengthening the capacity” of gender-specific production roles. One media article found it meaningful to report on a development project that “aimed for improvement in economic security of poor women
smallholder farmers and their households in Northern Ghana to increase productivity and accessibility to inputs and markets” (Azanduna, 2018). The content media reports on was important as it pointed to what outlets apprehended as food accessibility solutions in Ghana. Likewise, media outlets paid heed to gender-specific limitations in agricultural production. For instance, a media outlet drew connections between gender and accessibility to extension information. This report noted “limitations against female farmers can be overcome if extension package delivery is gender responsive” (Ghana News Agency, 2018). Gender-equity was the final notable advancement to food security documented in media reports. A report illustrated macro-economic policies as a catalyst to gender-equitable accessibility to food. It specifically stated, “macroeconomic policies that would support smallholder agricultural production, food security, nutrition, and ensure secured incomes of rural women and girls, and their communities, to mitigate the negative impact on international investment and trade rules” (Addo, 2018). Gender and accessibility of food, in the perspective of the media, pointed to improvements in production constraints for female-led production households.

Media reports provided first-class information pertinent to the reality of Ghanaian agricultural markets. A particular article made clear of the powerful role of the “middlemen” in agricultural and food market structures. It brought to light that middlemen went to the communities by foot and on bicycles to purchase farm produce for cheap and to resell at the market at exorbitant prices, and thereby make a large profit.” (The Ghanaian Times, 2016a). Media reports blew the lid off the covert informality in Ghana foodstuff pricing structures. The power of price resided in the hands of the middlemen traders. Producer-market relationships were forwarded as impediments to accessibility to food in Ghana. One report pegged marketing as a top priority for smallholder producer’s success in Ghana (Business and Financial Times, 2018a). And marketing improvements by smallholder producers were essential to sustained food security, income, and economic growth (Otoo, 2018b). One media outlet pushed for farmer cooperatives to handle marketing challenges, and gain bargaining power in the food system (Otoo, 2018b). Many of the perspectives put forth by differently-situated media outlets knit together the marketing challenges associated with the current price system in place.

5.4.3. Adequacy of food

In line with prior findings, media sporadically framed food security challenges in Ghana in food adequacy language. Of the 240 occurrences, nutrition (68), rice (64), and malnutrition (34) were of interest.

The codes nutrition and malnutrition were dressed in complementary language. Nutrition was often coupled with the terms “improved” or “inadequate”. It was made clear with this language that Ghana’s nutritional status was inadequate, and food security solutions must operate for improved nutrition indicators. Perspectives
Presented in media reports made clear of the relationship between public health and nutrition. One perspective exposed the challenges in the health sector as front-line public health staff viewed nutritional activities as supplementary work as opposed to a priority (Kuorsoh, 2018). These perspectives trickled into the different barriers that hindered nutritional improvements in Ghana. Some articulated solutions they placed confidence in to improved human nutrition. One outlet applauded USAID’s development project of orange-fleshed sweet potato (OFSP) production for improved micronutrient consumption. As stated, it would lead to nutrition improvements for the nutritionally-vulnerable populations of women of reproductive age and children under five years (Futukpor, 2017). Some perspectives believed bio-technology in production methods, such as GM technology, would yield higher nutritional values for food supplies (Otoo, 2017). Media perspectives bolstered solutions to improved nutrition in Ghana that were independent of one another.

Perspectives on malnutrition lessened nutritionally inadequate consumption patterns to the economic losses that accompanied. Loss in labour force productivity was thought as caused, in part, by the prevalence of worker malnutrition. Some noted large economic losses of up to GH¢4.6 billion which was equivalent to 6.4 per cent gross domestic product (GDP) annually to hunger (The Ghanaian Times, 2017). Jeune Afrique harmonized malnutrition as an issue pertinent to economic development and public health (2016). Based on the numbers, rice was a popular code found in the media communications. However, media articulated food challenges relative to rice production, not consumption. Therefore, the code rice was not understood as a component to food adequacy in Ghana, but rather the elements that contributed to its successful production. The Daily Graphic bolstered ideas the government should undertake to overtake the boundaries of rice production (Ngrenbe, 2017). As such, challenges of adequate food consumption in Ghana were woven in economic development and public health impediments.

5.6 Discussion

The analysis above maintained food security was a contested concept in Ghana. The medley of food security perspectives was unlaced after the revision of publicly available documents. By the numbers, it was established differently-situated stakeholders framed food security challenges and solutions relative to the availability of food. Stakeholders appropriated priority to supply-side improvements for advanced food security. As such, this softened the interest in other central elements of food security like the adequacy of food. The numbers empirically established stakeholders generally held supply-side solutions as cardinal to advanced food security in Ghana. Yet, the way in which these stakeholders made solutions and challenges known differed greatly.
For the most part, stakeholders acquainted the availability of food with either the code production or productivity. Increased output of food produced was to foster food security in Ghana. Thoughts were divided on the appropriate method to produce greater quantities of food. Some suggested elevated food supplies with big-time agro-chemical applications. Others took the opportunity to divorce language linked to the agro-petro-chemical-biotech-pharmaceutical complex of the day, and proposed solutions that embodied agroecological production methods. Many civil society organisations supported agroecological production principles, but some supported the route of agro-chemical applications. The cause to disagree between the two sects was influenced by large external donor funds. Donor funds commanded authority in how international development projects take shape. Case in point, the civil society organisation SEND Ghana approached food security solutions by way of increased production with agro-chemical technologies. Likewise, SEND Ghana was recipient to donor funds from external donors notable EU and USAID. Parent-donor organisations attach their development ideologies to donated funds. By that, it was evident civil society organisations who received external donor funds embodied parent-donor ideologies in project development. The schism in civil society organisation perspectives perpetuated the global debate on agricultural production between patrons for agro-chemical application, and proponents of agroecological methods.

Ideas on the availability code technological inputs warranted careful speculation by institutions. Institutions affiliated with the UN captured food security solutions with agro-technologies in an exceptional manner. The UN used language that alluded to application of agro-technologies in production. Yet, the shortage in detail and ambiguity in language provided no clear insight into their position on the type of agro-technologies applied to production. The UN had notoriety in food security dialogues due to its powerful geopolitical position. The position taken by the UN had potential implications for the materialization of future food security solutions. The absence of a firm position on technologies was a politically neutral one as agro-technologies were of a highly political nature.

Many of the stakeholders recognized the accessibility challenges to food in Ghana as linked to the code market. Many times institutions, government, and corporations articulated accessibility issues as “producer access to markets”. The shortage of defined measures that represented setback to accessibility of markets clouded the perspective. On the contrary, perspectives found in media reports circumscribed detailed observations specific to the Ghanaian context. Among them were accounts of disparities in control and power in the guise of “middle-men”. Middle-men were market actors who bridged the gap between the producer, and the market sellers (known as “market-queens” in Ghana). By and large the price of food was batted down through the economic transactions of the middle-men. The price the
producer sold food at was calculated solely by middle-men. In this vein, the middle-men were the lone food supplier to market-queens. One more, the middle-men were the only actors in the food system who determined what a food commodity was valued at. And so, middle-men controlled financial accessibility of food by way of economic transactions along the various agricultural commodity supply chains. The bottom-line reality of financial accessibility to food in Ghana was chock-full of complex socio-political structures. Some perspectives, such as those above, glossed over the hard-facts presented by Ghanaian agricultural market processes. Evidently, there was a far-cry between globally positioned actors conceptualization of market, and media outlets rooted in Ghana.

The numbers provided evidence that all stakeholders framed food security challenges least frequently as food adequacy challenges. Stakeholders lost sight of food adequacy as a food security constituent. Outside of this, publicly available documents presented a wide array of stakeholder perspectives linked to the codes nutrition and malnutrition. Some institutional and governmental documents made sense of nutrition and malnutrition indices as impediments to maximum economic productivity. Other institutional and media reports suggested improved varieties produced (such as the encouraged production of OFSP) would result in improved nutritional consumption. On account of the three dimensions of food security, there was no singular solution to food security advanced in any of the stakeholder perspectives. And even where consensus was presented, there was continual contest. It was made known that many stakeholders assumed increased supply of food gave rise to food security. Even so, contentions on the best method of increased domestic production lingered. To this end, food security ideologies were fueled by a medley of differently-situated conceptualizations of food availability, accessibility, and adequacy.
6 ANALYSIS OF ON-THE-GROUND PERSPECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilateral/Multilateral</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Civil Society Organisation</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 Count of key-informant respondents by stakeholder group

6.1 Bilateral and Multilateral Institution Respondents

6.1.1 Availability of food

The bilateral and multilateral respondents used language linked food security and the faults in domestic production. For instance, when asked bilateral and multilateral institutions used language that connected to the code production most frequently. A high level of importance was placed on the issue of production in Ghana linked to food security. When asked what the largest barrier in food security in Ghana was, the FAO stated, “Definitely it is food production, like I said it is raining well, the land is there, and the different actors that are supporting the agricultural sector they are highly qualified and Ghana is producing enough. Still Ghana is depending on imports of some food stuff, okay but in terms of meeting the basic food security needs.” (FAO August 31, 2017).

In alignment with production, a second bilateral institution idealized the concept of production through extended mechanization services. They pledged Brazil should begin to support Ghanaian smallholder farmers through provision of mechanization services to smallholder and some commercial operations (Bilateral August 7, 2017). The politics of production was found in the agreed upon idea that Ghana needs increased food production. However, the contention between the two was there was no overlap in production language used by either institution. One prioritized the impact imports have on domestic production while the other prioritized the necessity of increased production through improved access to mechanization. Additionally, one institution vocalized that domestic production in conjunction with imported foods allowed for basic food security needs. The other contended production needed to increase without reference to if basic food security needs are met. Neither agreed on whether basic needs were met with current production levels.

6.1.2 Accessibility to food

Bilateral and multilateral institutions did not frequently use language that linked to the accessibility dimension of food security. When they did communicate with accessibility language, they discussed a variety of codes. Most notably, they aligned
with preliminary stakeholder groups on the idea of market. Bilateral and multilateral institutions used the language “access to markets” when asked to identify a barrier to food security in Ghana. This converged with other stakeholders in the preliminary analysis, particularly bilateral and multilateral documents on the idea of market. Additionally, a multilateral institution advanced the idea of “big farmer linking to small-farmer for access to markets” (FAO August 31, 2017). This idea was additionally presented in the business perspective on accessibility. In relation to the market, one institution acknowledged in their perspective it was the distribution of food that hindered the accessibility of food in Ghana (Bilateral August 7, 2017). This related directly to the producer’s access to markets. Institutions generally aligned on the broad idea that food accessibility issues stemmed from producer access to markets.

### 6.1.3 Adequacy of food

Language linked to the adequacy dimension of food security was seldom used by the bilateral and multilateral institutions. Adequacy language that was found within institutions’ dialogue did not highlight the nutritional dimension of adequacy. Rather, it highlighted the rural-urban dichotomy of food adequacy. Stakeholders communicated there was a gap in terms of nutritional security. The FAO communicated this gap as, “But if you look understand food security as including nutrition, then both in town and in the rural area there are some gaps. In towns they have the opportunity, they have more access to kind of jobs that can give them more means to access maybe the compliment and supplement in terms of medical or whatever nutrition issues, while in the rural areas they have to rely on the natural sources of let’s say nutriment, but the trend is not only in Ghana but if you look at all African countries all sub-Saharan African countries the discrepancy is there” (FAO August 31, 2017).

While the institutions did not communicate food issues through language linked to the adequacy dimension frequently, they did communicate there was a discrepancy between urban and rural access to nutritious foods. The language used was not directly linked to consumer consumption, but rather highlighted how geographic disparities hindered accessibility to nutritious foods. The lack of communication through the adequacy dimension provided evidence that adequacy was not a priority of institutions in relation to food security.

### 6.2 Business Respondents

### 6.2.1 Availability of food

The perspectives provided by business were the least developed of the stakeholder group. Business primarily discussed food issues in Ghana through the availability dimension. Corporations provided a similar perspective in the availability dimension. Corporations conveyed the message that “producers need to begin to see farming as a business” (Agribusiness August 7, 2017). Some dismayed the government’s subsidized technological input for the smallholder producer. They called
for the end of “support to the small farmers. Subsidies are lessening their commitment” (Agribusiness August 7, 2017). In addition to this, corporations advocated for the coordination between large and small farms for machinery and inputs. Essentially, the perspective wished for the government to wash its hands of involvement in the production side of the sector, and allow for the private sector to emerge. Lastly, an interesting perspective was presented by a particular corporation. This corporation advised that perhaps since cash crops grow well in Ghana, production should be focused on cash crops rather than food crops. Corporations essentially felt it was time for the government to heed involvement in the production sector, and allow for the private sector to emerge through connecting large scale farms to small scale farms. Corporations were aligned on the broad idea that production in Ghana needed to be increased. For this to occur, corporations believed there needed to be a perspective-shift by the producers to understand agricultural production as a profitable business that required capital input for output. Ultimately, the discourse “farming as a business” looked to maximize profit and output driven by private sector engagement.

6.2.2 Accessibility to food

The accessibility dimension was discussed less frequently than the availability dimension. However, two corporations provided similar perspectives on accessibility issues. The corporations aligned on the issue of food processors. Corporations advocated for increased development to agro-processing to create value addition in the sector. One noted there was too much food waste in Ghana, and stated food processing and the value it added could combat this issue and support the domestic farmer. A second corporation furthered this perspective and underlined the impact the development on this sector could have on income through job creation. Overall, corporations were concerned with job creation and value addition through the development of agro-processing in Ghana. To these corporations, food accessibility could be improved through an improvement in income and value-addition to raw product. An improvement in income can be conceptualized as increased financial accessibility to food for the consumer; however, the discourse on value-addition was understood as a way for the market to accumulate more capital. These two perspectives presented a misaligned view on what defined accessibility issues in Ghana.

6.3.3 Adequacy of food

The corporations that were contacted did not communicate food issues through the adequacy dimension of food security.
6.3 Civil Society Respondents

6.3.3 Availability of food
In terms of the numbers, civil society respondents frequently used language related to the codes *production*, *seeds*, and *fertilizer*.

On production, civil society presented dissimilar perspectives. Civil society differed on the question of does Ghanaian food security need increased food production. Organisations that aligned with the perspective that Ghana’s food production needed to increase for food security provided an additional perspective. Some organisations went beyond increased food production, and indicated that for production to truly increase, smallholder farmers must begin to approach agriculture as a business. Some civil society organisations were concerned with what implications government policy would have on production in Ghana, and subsequently food security in the region. Additionally, some conveyed a concern on how the market dictated what should be produced, rather than the opposite. The largest contention in perspectives was found between those that conveyed increased production was necessary, and those that thought otherwise. For instance, SEND Ghana indicated the challenge in Ghanaian food security was solely production. However, the Peasant Farmers Association of Ghana (PFAG-Peasant Farmers of Ghana Association August 29, 2017) contested this perspective and argued, “if right now you are to a survey of farmers to ask them what their challenge is, they will not tell you they want to increase production, I think the challenge is market” (Peasant Farmers of Ghana Association August 29, 2017).

Civil society perspectives presented a second divergence on production. The contention was found on who should lead production in Ghana. Some organisations conveyed “production should be led by the private sector”. The alternative perspective, presented by organisations such as ESCARID, noted it should be government supported production. It underlined the idea that production should be motivated by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture rather than the private sector. This perspective was understood through the statement,

“What I think is that it is the state that sets the policy, so policy wise yes it should be the government. But the private sector should lead the production. The government should wash its hands of direct production, no no no that is not good. It would be worse. They would create more troubles because they would produce at the loss and people would go in, but how to motivate the farmers to produce that should be the concern of MOFA.” (ESCARID August 8, 2017).

On seeds, civil society respondents presented three dissimilar perspectives. The majority of civil society organisations were not concerned with where the seeds producers are supplied with originate from. However, PFAG was the only stakeholder
out of all the categories to acknowledge government-provided seeds in the government flagship program Planting for Food and Jobs (P4FAJ) were in fact not locally curated seeds, but rather they were imported. They noted in their interview,

“You know about the government program Planting 4 Food and Jobs, one aspect of the areas is to provide seeds for farmers, and what we thought was the seed would be cured locally, the seeds are actually imported, that is why a nation is not able to supply to its farmers, there are other nationals that are supplying the seeds, that is the general rule.” (Peasant Farmers of Ghana Association August 29, 2017).

Relatedly, one civil society organisation raised the issue of control and power in seeds provided to producers. They questioned producer accessibility to seeds sold by large corporations,

“Farmers do not have the resources, they do not have the finances, so if there are a number of things they need to spend money on, then they don’t have the money, and it is difficult to access those things. But what are these inputs? And where are they coming from? And who is controlling them?” (General Agricultural Workers Union August 1, 2017).

The same civil society organisation questioned the normative perspective on quality seed and increased production. The organisation questioned whether if access to new seed varieties would even result in increased production, or if it would be another financial burden to the smallholder producer,

“The financial challenge in agriculture, everything that we have said comes with a financial challenge, when farmers are not getting enough they do not have the funds to invest in the seeds, the agrochemicals, the fertilizer, but when you do get enough money, and you do get a lot of yield, the returns are poor” (General Agricultural Workers Union August 1, 2017).

Lastly, civil society organisations presented dissimilar perspectives on different types of seeds in Ghanaian agriculture. Organisations were divided on whether to support or oppose GM seeds. One perspective presented underlined the problem of corporate control and power in GM seeds and the loss of producer sovereignty. The second perspective highlighted the potential GM seeds could have on agricultural production in Ghana, and disregarded the discourse of corporate power. For instance, one organisation supported GM for pest control through their statement, “Oh we are working on it (GM) now. Because we can do research on it, we are doing research on it. We have the Fall Army Worm in the system. We could use GM to introduce the gene for resistance” (CSIR August 17, 2017). The contention was found on whether to support the introduction of GM seeds in Ghanaian agriculture.
On fertilizer, civil society organisations presented four different perspectives. First, some civil society organisations perceived “improved access to fertilizer for smallholder producers” as necessary to increased production in Ghana. Some civil society organisations contended this perspective. They acknowledged the environmental trade-offs of fertilizer use was detrimental on long-term sustainable agricultural production. One civil society organisations communicated this perspective through, “fertilizer is imported and too expensive. Pesticide and herbicide use are destroying the environment especially with soil effects. Roundup, glyphosate, negative effects on rural areas” (Civil Society Interview August 2, 2017). Civil society organisations presented a perspective that perceived fertilizer use should not simply exist as a “one-size-fits-all” solution. Two civil society organisations established subsidized fertilizer in Ghana was a “blanket solution”. One organisation communicated the importance of ecological diversity in fertilizer application, “We try to do that with the adoption of the subsidy program, where we want farmers to boost the soil, but the challenge is that the soils that you know Ghana we have different ecological zones, each soil has its own nutritional deficiency, so you don’t just do a blanket application for the soils, to show that soils this is the nutritional content of the soil, we are getting the fertilizer, we have a blanket application, so it doesn’t bring the yields it effects” (Peasant Farmers of Ghana Association August 29, 2017).

A second civil society organisation bolstered this perspective through the statement, “They don’t bring the fertilizer the program you know and then agronomic practices and then use of pesticides we need extension services the farmers may not know how to grow this or use the fertilizer and you give them the fertilizer and they apply it any how I also think our research people should be up and doing because they just come and say this is the fertilizer and apply 50-50-50 but us maybe the soil does not need nitrogen, but the fellow goes and applies nitrogen and it does not need it.” (ESCARID August 8, 2017).

It was understood from these two perspectives that ecological diversity was considerable in Ghana. Organisations did not see the provision of the same fertilizer to each ecological zone as a feasible solution to production constraints.

6.3.2 Accessibility to food

Organisations discussed accessibility issues in Ghana frequently with language linked to price. Civil society organisations shed light on the fundamentals of the informal agricultural markets, and its impacts on price fluctuation. Two important perspectives were advanced by civil society organisations. First, many organisations communicated the problem of “the middle-man”. The organisations reported the problematic price structure the middle-men constructed in the agricultural markets. First, PFAG communicated the problem of “submitting crops to the prices of the market queens or
the middle-men” (Peasant Farmers of Ghana Association August 29, 2017). It was understood the middle-men and market-queens controlled the prices of food with no power to the producer. The issue of price control was understood as,

“Market queens and fuel play a key role in moderating the price before it goes to the retail before it goes to the consumer. Prices are not government control; prices are in control of the middle class who operate between the farm-gate and the consumer” (Civil Society Interview August 2, 2017).

Lastly, one perspective highlighted the power struggle on price between producer and middle-men as,

“Because there is no cooperative. You sell whatever price you want. I sell mine for 10 cedi and you sell yours for 5 cedi and the middleman will come and buy and the other issue it is the middle men who determine the price of the commodity. It is not the farmer. This is not good. The farmer says I sell3 yam for 20 cedi and the middleman says no that is too expensive so no I buy for 15 cedi or 10 cedi and he say no I cannot sell it, and then he go stand far away, and then the sun goes down and the farmer wants to get something from the market so he is forced to sell it at that price but he knows” (ESCARID August 8, 2017).

Civil society organisations presented perspectives that underlined the lack of regulation in price structure in Ghana, and its impact on financial accessibility to food for the consumer and producer.

Organisations presented similar perspectives on the code storage. Organisations generally aligned on the idea there should be greater focus on the creation of storage mechanisms for advanced food security. Organisations aligned on the fact that storage in its current state was inadequate to support increased agricultural production, and subsequently food security. For instance, one organisation representative stated,

“for me the focus should not be production, production is not really the issue, how ensuring when farmers produce it is easy market for them, able to store what they produce so the lean periods are not to the market, once we do that we can cry for more, but that is the issue” (Peasant Farmers of Ghana Association August 29, 2017).

An additional civil society perspective furthered the notion that increased access to storage for producers could result in better controlled prices. They noted, “market information, storage facilities, small technologies that can help farmers add value to their product and store, and bargain for better prices” (SEND Ghana July 31, 2017).

Lastly, civil society organisations presented similar perspectives on post-harvest loss. Organisations generally agreed that post-harvest loss negatively impacted a consumer’s physical accessibility to food. Many stated the severity of post-harvest loss.
For instance, one organisation specified, “30-40% post-harvest loss. We don’t even grow so much and for a fellow to lose 20-30% is a great loss” (ESCARID August 8, 2017). One organisation furthered this perspective. They communicated there needed to be greater emphasis on post-harvest loss, and less emphasis on increased production.

“…on trying policy dialogue on how to reduce post-harvest loss. A lot of statistics show that more than half of the food Ghana makes does not make it to the consumer. It is not processed, even the farm is harvesting, on timely harvesting, and bad harvesting, and even to transport it to the storage facility is a challenge” (Peasant Farmers of Ghana Association August 29, 2017).

Overall, civil society conceptualized accessibility issues in Ghana through language linked to a diverse set of accessibility codes. It was noted that language found within each code did not correspond to other civil society codes. Civil society did, however, present an incredibly realistic and accurate perspective in regards to the market functions in Ghana, an importance that was ignored in other stakeholder perspectives on accessibility.

6.3.3 Adequacy of food

Civil society organisations presented similar perspectives on nutrition (12). The organisations understood there needed to be a greater emphasis on nutrition as an element of food security. Organisations presented dissimilar views on the ways in which this could be achieved. One civil society organisations understood “improved nutrition” as a consumer behavioural change. They advanced the notion that cheap food was prioritized over nutritious food in the urban context, and this would only be changed through a shift in consumer perspective,

“A lot of people in the urban areas eat rice almost on a daily basis, and that is because again rice was brought in and dumped. Now, well, if you look at the last 10 years, there has not been much emphasis on eating lots of vegetables, which is done in the rural areas especially. But um now people are becoming very health conscious and I think they are going back to eating vegetables. But the other thing is so eating vegetables is still a problem, fruits are expensive so you cannot eat a lot of fruits, we eat one kind of food which is the cheap food” (Peasant Farmers of Ghana Association August 29, 2017).
A second civil society organisation reiterated the problem of the consumption of unhealthy foods as an accessibility issue,

“the food has to have the requisite carbohydrates, the requisite protein, the requisite all of the basic uh nutrients that you need. So you can have a lot of food available but it is all carbohydrates, but that is the problem with most people in Ghana. They have one type of food, they don’t have all the components, or they don’t have the trace elements, they don’t have enough iron...nutrition is at the call it is not just accessibility but what are you accessing” (SEND July 31, 2017).

One organisation extended the nutrition perspective beyond the problem of what was consumed, and the nutritional value. This organisation understood lack of nutrition because of the perception of certain foods. They noted traditional foods are considered quite healthy, but Ghanaians perceived traditional foods as “poor-person food”. Rather, people consumed unhealthy foods because they were considered “rich-person food”. This perspective understood nutrition as a classist problem.

Now people are running away from cocoyam. It is very good and very nutritious. People are running away from our leafy vegetables and going in for cabbage even though I told that it is not as nutritious. We are not doing a good service to what God has given to us. There was a research institute that compared the nutritional values in the leafy vegetables and they found them to be very nutritious. Each ecological zone has their own leafy vegetable, so we should encourage to go in for these leafy vegetables to make our soup and sauce. So we should like I said eat what we grow, and grow what we eat. The cocoyam, the plantain. You also realize most of our local dishes are becoming extinct because people are running away from it. You go to the village and people are thinking about fried rice. You bring fufu here you see people run for the fried rice because we have this notion that it is a European man and if you eat the fufu you are a local man” (ESCARID August 8, 2017).

A second organisation underlined the issue of nutrition and class perception. This organisation presented the idea that urban Ghanaians began to adopt a less-nutritious diet to belong to what they believed to be a “Western-class”. This organisation stated,

“And that is because life in the urban areas is fast. But, for me, a change in lifestyle, people again are also looking at the influence, foreign influence, people like to go eat the fried rice, you know, takeaway as they describe it, greasy and oily and all that. And they think that is tastier, you know, and they also think it is a kind of I will even say a kind of prestige. A prestige. Fried rice, or pizza you think you belong to this class. But in the rural areas it is not like that. In fact, rural areas do not like greasy foods. They like to eat very simple foods. But for me, I still think it is a cultural influence. After all, now we have KFC. KFC. Why do we need to have KFC in Ghana?” (Peasant Farmers of Ghana Association August 29, 2017).

The politics of food adequacy were crucial in the perspective presented by civil society organisations. Arguably, civil society organisations were the stakeholder who perceived
adequacy as a crucial dimension of food security. They conceptualized food as more than just sustenance, but as something that defined class. The commodification of food has persisted in Ghana as food now has the ability to define a status of wealth. Moreover, this perspective highlighted the power classist ideals can have on consumer food choices, particularly concerned with multi-national fast food corporations.

6.4 Government Respondents

6.4.1 Availability of food

On availability, government conveyed food issues through productivity (8), and seeds (4). Government in Ghana has a predominately productivist perspective of food security and agriculture in Ghana. They perceived increased productivity as a deterrent to other barriers in food security. Government respondents argued,

“right now the new government decided that the main focus would be productivity so we provide subsidized seeds and fertilizer, because if you increase productivity your agric costs come down and if you have guaranteed market for your produce you increase incomes because most of the yields we are having now are below the potential that you should have” (Government August 9, 2017).

This perspective highlighted the importance placed on the physical supply of food accumulated within the country. The language government officials used around the idea of productivity provided a trivial at best insight into the details of their perspective. While they consistently conveyed the notion of “increased productivity”, the language lacked detail as to how increased productivity would directly impact food security. It also lacked the evidence this is what the food system needed for food security. Government presented a diverged perspective on increased agricultural productivity, and an agricultural transformation in general to impact food security. While the above statement clearly conveyed a message that placed importance on increased productivity, another official indicated perhaps this perspective was not as cohesive as governmental documents suggested. The governmental official stated, “agricultural problems are structured in nature. Solutions cannot be quick” (Government August 7, 2017). This official suggested a perspective that insisted agricultural transformation was one not only of changes to modes of production, but one that additionally advanced a comprehensive behavioural change.

The contradictory perspective to a behavioural change was one that technological inputs would allow for increased productivity. This aligned with the governmental policy and was conveyed by a governmental official interview who stated, “if you are applying the right fertilizers to the rights soils and you are applying the right seeds you should be getting 8t/ha, but right now we are getting like 2t/ha” (Government August 9, 2017). This was justification for the provision of input (seed and fertilizer)
subsides. While one governmental official aligned their perspective strictly to that of the official governmental policy, the other acknowledged that “government struggled to meet the seed requirement for subsidies” (Government August 7, 2017). Lastly, governmental officials tended to diverge on another concept. While most agreed on the subsidized fertilizer and seed program enacted by the government, they furthered the perspective of business in agriculture. One stated, “if fertilizer is free, they won’t begin to see farming as a business” (Government August 7, 2017). Another advanced this statement as, “Improving their skills. And to do agriculture as a business not just anything” (Government August 9, 2017).

Overall, government respondents presented a mostly unified perspective on availability issues in Ghana. Here, it was noted the politics of production were understood as the transformation of the agricultural sector from a small-scale and sustenance-based mode of production to one that maximized profit and output through the discourse of “farming as a business”. This placed onus on the producer to begin the sector’s transformation as much of the government discourse highlighted the perspective of the producer to shift to a business-oriented mindset. This perspective additionally furthered the ideology of food as a commodity as maximized output perceived food as something to be traded on the domestic and global markets.

6.4.2 Accessibility to food

The numbers showed income and price were the two most frequent codes found within the dialogue. On income, language was found to discuss income associated to the level of unemployment in the country. Government respondents underlined the barrier unemployment (and subsequent lack of income) had on financial accessibility to food. It was understood youth unemployment and lack of youth interested in agriculture negatively impacted the financial accessibility of food in Ghana. First, one government official noted that while the GDP may grow, unemployment in agriculture was still a big problem (Government August 7, 2017). A second government official reiterated this perspective when asked what the largest barrier to food security in Ghana was, “the barrier is just low incomes because um unemployment is so high, we have many vulnerable groups in society, they cannot afford inputs, improved seeds and fertilizers to enhance their productivity and sometimes when the increase their productivity and prices collapse they cannot recover the cost of their investment and leaves them in a situation where there is income loss and or job loss therefore they cannot afford it” (Government August 9, 2017).

The primary barrier, in the perspective of the government, was low incomes. However, this particular statement interestingly linked low income to on-farm production methods rather than financial accessibility to food.
On price, government respondents underlined the relationship between consumer, price, and food security. Government respondents conveyed a perspective that highlighted the impact lack of income in a producer household could have on food security. The issue, in the perspective of the government respondents, was price variability in different seasons. Where price may be accessible in the rainy season, it was not accessible in the season before the harvest,

“The prices may be high and farmer’s income will not be able to afford what they can eat, it just won’t be fiscally accessible. And because for whatever reason, okay rainy season, but now a days it is not that it is mainly about before the next harvest season where prices are higher that people suffer from food insecurity or enough income to buy the food because the price has gone up” (Government August 9, 2017).

Essentially, the government respondents understood the barrier to financial accessibility to food in Ghana as lack of income, and price fluctuations due to seasonality.

6.4.3 Adequacy of food

There was seldom use of any language related to the adequacy dimension of food security utilized by government respondents in Ghana. The only occurrence that adequacy was discussed was when an official gave what their definition of food security would be. The definition was stated as followed, “Well food security is uh having access to quality, nutritious foods all year round. That will enable health in life. Access, physical and financial access” (Government August 9, 2017). When asked if they have observed a change in food consumption trends amongst Ghanaians, government simply stated, “I have observed no trends” (Government August 9, 2017). They followed this answer with the description of government programs that are focused on value addition activities and a brief mention of a national nutrition policy. What was evident from the lack of discourse related to the adequacy dimension was that adequacy was not considered as important as the other two dimensions of food security. This perspective was problematic with respect to adequacy.

6.5 Media Respondents

6.5.1 Availability of food

Media respondents presented similar perspectives on the availability of food. The perspectives recognized food production in Ghana was insufficient. One media respondent understood food security solely from a productivist perspective as they defined food security as, “having enough food produced for the market, enough to serve the population, and enough to export to other countries, so the household indicators in place” (Media Interview July 28, 2017). Another media outlet understood problems in the availability of food as lack of regulation on imports. They stated, “We just have problems with policymakers. It is with the policymakers. I don’t understand why we are
importing rice” (Media Interview August 15, 2017). The perspective on imports impact on domestic food production was bolstered by another media outlet as, “Ghana’s current food situation, um for now we are to produce to feed the whole population but it is highly insufficient, so we still have to rely on a lot of imports to compliment the local production” (Media Interview July 28, 2017). The two perspectives understood production in Ghana to be insufficient to properly nourish the population which resulted in reliance on imported food. Lastly, this perspective was expanded on. One media outlet understood the inefficiency of domestic production as lack of investment,

“The largest barrier of obtaining food security in Ghana. Very limited investment in crop production, there is limited financial incentive for farmers to actually invest in food production, so and there is the tendency going to produce on large scale cash crops not necessarily food crops” (Media Interview July 28, 2017).

Overall, media respondents understood the availability of food in Ghana as insufficient. The perspectives aligned on the common theme that food production in Ghana needed to increase to achieve food security.

6.5.2 Accessibility to food

Media respondents conveyed accessibility issues primarily through the codes storage and income. Media understood the barrier income, or lack thereof, had on food security for the population. They underlined the impact increased expenditure on food could have on the vulnerable populations (those who lack income),

“having a food secure population means that families and households can focus on developing other sectors of their livelihoods such as health, education, improving their social lives, yeah so right now most households invest a lot in food and getting food okay, because as we are not producing to meet the population requirement we have to import from production outside, rice especially rice, we import a lot of it, if households very financial insecure household is using the resources that they have to meet their food requirement, it is not very good and it is even a trick to our social and political fabric. So, I believe there is a need for more food production, and it should be encouraged, the government should come out with policies, for integration and development actors to kind of improve the environment of food security because we are under producing and it is not good for especially for the vulnerable population” (Media Interview July 28, 2017).

A second media respondent perceived the accessibility problem as a storage problem rather than an income problem. They perceived increased access to storage as an element of advanced food security for Ghana.

“There are a lot of issues that would hinder people from getting food in Ghana. Looking at our lands, looking at our farmers okay it is not much of a problem owning food in Ghana. The problem I would say would be storage. We don’t have warehouses. We don’t have promising storage. And once you can store something it is more secure and
people are able to get it. What happens largely is people can plant and harvest but we lost all that because we do not have the storage. Basically our major issue I think is storage. If we are able to store grains and process seeds, we won’t have a problem. I travel a lot; I don’t see us going hungry because we don’t have the land. But if they have the machineries in place, but Ghana our problem is storage. We have a lot of farmers, but the storage aspect is what we lack” (Media Interview August 15, 2017).

Media respondents presented dissimilar views on accessibility to food in Ghana. One presented it as solely an income problem. The other presented it as solely a storage issue. Food politics continued to complicate itself through the dissimilar perspectives. Media respondents took narrow-outlooks on accessibility issues as they conceptualized them as a one-element problem.

6.5.3 Adequacy of food

The language used in the adequacy dimension of food security underlined the urban-rural dichotomy of consumption habits. They highlighted the increased unhealthy consumption habits adopted by the urban population, and the increased problem of micronutrient deficiencies.

“Food consumption among Ghanaians is mainly two categories, there is a difference between the urban, the urban and rural pool. If you are in the urban communicates you are more likely to consume a lot of highly processed foods, yeah. Most likely to buy food that is produced by vendors. But if you are in the rural communicates you are more likely to harvest from your farm and create it for your family because you don’t have the financial ability to buy food from an institution. Yes, so but of course, Ghana food consumption pattern is generally on average is quite okay. We do consume a lot of carbohydrates, and there is a need for public education on consuming a lot more vegetables. Currently in Ghana, we do not consume a lot of vegetables even though health wise it should be encouraged by nutritionists. So aside the fact they consume a lot of carbohydrates, we also consume a lot of fatty foods, which is not very healthy, so there is a lot of incidents where there is a lot of incidents of fat food consumption which affects the health of the population. So the need to have a highly balanced food consumption pattern is placed is actually prime, and our education system is nutritionists who provide advisory on how to actually prepare and consume healthy and balanced foods” (Media Interview July 28, 2017).

The perspective highlighted an influx of processed food consumption in the urban context. This was perceived as problematic as processed foods bring about health-concerns, as well as concerns of corporate power over consumer behaviour.

6.6 Discussion

These perspectives reiterated the complexity of food governance in Ghana previously found in the preliminary analysis. There was no single consensus amongst the stakeholders on how to advance food security in Ghana. Three notable trends were presented in the on-the-ground perspectives. First, while all stakeholders presented perspectives on food security, civil society respondents presented crucial information.
Civil society respondents provided a perspective closely related to the reality of the situation on-the-ground. It provided insight that proved it was connected closely to the domestic producers and consumers. It provided grounds to question if other stakeholders were disconnected from the actualities of the food situation in Ghana. Civil society respondents highlighted both nutritional and cultural adequacy issues that had previously been overlooked. It noted the disappearance of culturally adequate dishes with a subsequent shift in dietary behaviour. This provided insight that perhaps adequacy issues, while ignored by other stakeholder groups, were prioritized by a marginalized voice. Lastly, civil society respondents presented not only a dissimilar perspective to other stakeholder groups, but organisations within the group contended with each other. This further complicated food politics in Ghana as organisations within civil society could not present a united front on the matter.

Secondly, some stakeholder groups underlined the importance of producer behavioural change in agricultural production. Government and corporations aligned on this matter. Both government respondents and corporations used the language “farming as a business” to denote their perspective on availability. Corporations furthered the perspective of “farming as a business” to incorporate the potential role the private sector could have on the shift to “farming as a business”. Government respondents provided no insight on the role the private sector would play in the transition to “farming as a business”. This perspective communicated the idea that producers were not productive enough. The discourse of “producers must begin to see farming as a business, and not just anything” was a negative connotation. It was perceived as if corporations and government believed producers did not take their agricultural production livelihoods as a serious manner. It placed the onus of unsuccessful production strictly on the producer, and not on externalities such as the efficiency of government policy.

Lastly, the discourse used to communicate the adequacy dimension of food security provided important insights that were not found in the preliminary analysis. Stakeholders who discussed food in the adequacy dimension generally aligned on this as a class issue. This was communicated in two ways. It was communicated through the rural-urban dichotomy of consumption. Stakeholders highlighted the difference in access to nutritious food year-round between the urban and rural contexts, which was expected. What was not expected was the alternative perception of industrial diet foods (high fat, high carb, and high sugar) as a status of wealth. It provided insight to the level of power a Western-diet had on consumer consumption patterns. The falsified notions of wealth and class being associated with the consumption of pseudo-foods were concerns in some stakeholder perspectives (most notably civil society respondents). The perspectives provided insight into the dietary shift in Ghana which directly affected cultural and nutritional adequacy of consumption. While perhaps the consumption of these foods may have allowed a person to adhere to an adequate daily caloric intake,
the nutritional adequacy continued to be questionable at best. This questions whether or not a person who consumed these types of foods could be considered food secure.

6.6.1 Alignments and Divides between Perspectives Presented in Preliminary Documents and Field Work Interviews

The preliminary and field work analyses presented a discussion where stakeholders aligned and converged on various food security discourses. The analysis will now go further to identify the alignments and diverges between preliminary and field work stakeholder perspectives. This will identify if there are discrepancies between publically-available documents and on-the-ground perspectives on food security in Ghana to further position the perspectives of differently-situated stakeholders.

6.6.1.1 Bilateral and Multilateral

Bilateral and multilateral institutions generally showed alignment between the publically available documents perspective and the on-the-ground perspectives. On availability, both sets of data quantitatively focused on the term production. On the issue of qualitative alignment, both sets of data aligned on the idea of production. That being said, both sets of data conveyed an opinion that production in Ghana needed to increase to advance food security. The two perspectives differed on the factors that impacted production in Ghana. Preliminary documents focused on the adaptation of technological inputs in modes of production. On-the-ground perspectives recognized the problem of imports in Ghana, and the impact imports had on the success of domestic production. On accessibility, the two sets of data aligned on the concept of market. Qualitatively speaking, the two sets of data used the same language that conveyed the idea that producers needed to be linked to the market. Neither sets of data specified if they referred to the formal market or the largely informal market that existed in Ghana. The fieldwork perspectives offered additional insight as it conveyed the idea to link small producers with large-scale producers for increased access to the formal market. Lastly, on adequacy the two sets of data aligned in one sense, and diverged in another. The two sets of data aligned on the quantitative fact they happened to discuss the code nutrition frequently. Preliminary documents conveyed a message of “improve nutrition” that hinted nutrition in Ghana was inadequate. On-the-ground perspectives rather highlighted the dichotomy between urban and rural nutrition. Neither perspective highlighted the issue of over-nutrition in either the urban or rural context.

6.6.1.2 Government

The governmental perspectives presented in both the publically available documents and the on-the-ground perspectives generally aligned. This was not a surprise as government should present a united front on political issues. A divided government would further hinder a cohesive policy environment. On availability, government generally aligned. In both quantitative and qualitative terms, the code productivity was prevalent. Both perspectives communicated the desire to increase
productivity in the country to further food security. One notable divergence was presented by a governmental official on-the-ground who communicated that agricultural change was not a quick process, but a long-term goal. They hinted it was more of a behavioural change, and drastic change in productivity should not be expected quickly. On accessibility, both sets of data quantitatively used language that was linked to the term income. Both sets of data used language around income to emphasize the growing issue of unemployment (lack of income) and financial accessibility of food. Lastly, on adequacy, there was a divergence in perspective. The divergence was not on idea, but rather it was lack of acknowledgement. The two sets of data aligned qualitatively as language related to the adequacy dimension was seldom used in the food security communications. In terms of qualitative evidence, there was a divergence. Preliminary documents used nutrition to highlight the impact lack of proper nutrition had on the nation’s labour force productivity, and subsequent accumulation of formal economic revenue. The on-the-ground perspective did not highlight any adequacy issues related to food except to briefly mention there was a national nutrition policy in place.

6.6.1.3 Civil Society

Civil society did not present a unified perspective between the two sets of data. On availability, both sets of data frequently used the term production. The nature in which the sets of data used this term was dissimilar as there was a big-picture divide as highlighted in the previous chapters. Some organisations, such as SEND Ghana, aligned their perspectives in both sets of data. Both their on-the-ground perspective and their preliminary document highlighted they perceived advanced food security in Ghana as provisory to increased production. On accessibility, the two sets of data frequently used language linked to different codes. The preliminary analysis quantitatively showed discussion centralized around the code gender. Preliminary documents used language related to gender to highlight gender-based barriers that prevented accessibility to food. The field work data set communicated a different story. This data set did not discuss gender-based barriers, but rather centralized discussion around price. Generally the discussion focused on the structural issues in market pricing in Ghana. This shows the two sets of data prioritized dissimilar factors in accessibility of food. On adequacy, the two sets of data aligned quantitatively on the use of the code nutrition. Preliminary documents, however, provided no insight from the language associated with the code into the adequacy perspective. In terms of qualitative, in the field work documents nutrition was used alongside language that highlighted nutrition as a class struggle along with the a decline in nutrition in Ghana.

The analysis of perspectives on food security provided evidence there continued to be a disconnected understanding on what constituted food security, and the best methods to achieve advanced food security in Ghana. These perspectives provided further evidence that food security did not warrant a linear solution, but rather it was a
complex web of conflicted and contrasted ideas on the three dimensions of food security. On *availability*, stakeholders were divided on the proper method to production of food to achieve food security in Ghana. Bilateral/multilateral institutions, government, and corporations emphasized a productivist perspective. These stakeholders emphasized matters on production as crucial to food security. Generally, these stakeholders used similar discourse in their perspectives such as “increased production”, “increased productivity with modernised technology”, and “farming as a business”. Civil society organisations stressed long-term sustainability and ecological conservation in production as imperative to food security. On *accessibility*, stakeholders emphasized the role markets played in food security, but in dissimilar fashion. Institutions and government understood “access to markets for consumers and producers” and “increased competitiveness in markets” as potential aid to food security issues in Ghana. Institutions and government assumed markets as formal markets. Civil society organisations contradicted this perspective, and indicated the functionality of the informal agricultural markets (price setters, middle-men, market queens etc…) as the deterrents to food security. This was the only stakeholder group to fully acknowledge the informality of agricultural markets in Ghana.

On *adequacy*, there was an ignorance of adequacy as a dimension of food security. Institutions and corporations hardly scratched the surface on adequacy issues in food security. Institutions acknowledged the need for “improved nutrition”, while corporations did not adequately acknowledge the dimension. Civil society organisations and government presented dissimilar perspectives on adequacy. Civil society organisations understood food as an extension of class relations in Ghana. Meanwhile, government underlined the intersection of nutrition and labour force productivity as the main issue of adequacy in food security. The absence of cohesion between stakeholder perspectives on the three dimensions of food security reiterated the complex web of ideas where food security solutions reside. The complexity of variously situated perspectives impacted the understanding of food security in Ghana, and the power relations amongst these perspectives continued to impact a comprehensive understanding of food security in Ghana. These power relations between stakeholders and their perspectives will be touched upon in the next chapter.
7 POWER AND POLITICS OF GHANAIAN FOOD SECURITY

To facilitate a greater understanding of the power of Ghana’s food policy stakeholder perspectives, there will be an analysis on the two sets of data compared to the current government food security and agricultural development flagship policy Planting for Food and Jobs (P4FAJ). By comparing perspectives to recent Ghanaian food security policy, it will become clear which actors align or divide on government policy. This will begin to situate the power structures in relation to the action plan to combat food insecurity issues. Although government is no longer sovereign in the sense their perspective is the sole determinant of policy, governmental policy is still the end-of-the-line for the power to advance food security. It is still policy that determines the success or failure in attaining food security. Thus, it is important to situate where power resides in relation to government food policy, and how these power relationships can impact the success or failure of Ghanaian food security. To facilitate a deeper understanding of the power of language, a brief analysis of the theoretical basis of the concept of hegemony will follow.

7.1 Power, Hegemony, and Discourse

There is no theory of food security. It is a case-specific concept that makes it nearly impossible to have a universal theory attached to it. Simply, persons are still lacking a sufficient amount of food. Each context presents distinct reason as to why food insecurity continues to exist. While food security itself is not theoretical, the power relations which exist within the complex web of interactions influencing food security and food security policy can be situated theoretically. Power can be broadly defined as “the chance of a man or a number of men to realize their own will in communal action even against the resistance of others who are participating in the same action” (Weber, 1946). Power is linked to the various resources available to and the degree of organisation achieved by different classes in society. Class is understood as “relationships of groupings of individuals to the ownership of private property in the means of production” (Giddens, 1971, p.38). Class relations are dichotomous built around a line of division between two antagonistic classes: the dominant, and the subordinate (Giddens, 1971, p.38). Classes impose and maintain their power over society (or attempt to achieve ends in society) through creating and maintaining a hegemony.

Hegemony is not power diffused through force or coercion, but rather is power diffused through consent. Hegemony is an “organizing principle” (or world view, or combination of world views) that is diffused onto society by classes who hold a form of societal power into every aspect of life. Hegemony is dualistic in nature as it functions “as ‘a general conception of life’ for the masses and as a scholastic programme or set of principles which is advanced by a sector of the organic intellectuals of the ruling class (Boggs, 1976, p.39). Organic intellectuals are representative of both the dominant class,
and the subordinate class. The subordinate classes, notably the working class in modern industrial capitalism, have intellectuals “organically” linked to it which represent its interests as opposed to those of the dominant class. This provides insight to the subtle, yet pervasive forms of ideological control and manipulation that served to perpetuate all repressive structures (Boggs, 1976, p.38). It is through ideas and norms that the masses of society conform to the control of those who have power in society. Hegemony is created by the consent of the majority through the dominant discourse of the classes with power. The ruling classes create dominant discourses to create consensus in society. When the majority of society accepts the dominant discourse as correct, then the dominant discourse becomes legitimate. When there exists a challenge or opposition to this tool of power then a counter-hegemony can be said to exist. In other words, a counter-hegemony exists when there is a class or societal group that challenges the dominant discourse with a counter-discourse.

The concepts of hegemony, and dominant discourse provide a framework to analyse the power relations between stakeholder groups in food politics in Ghana. This will provide further insight on understanding the complexity of food politics, and the impact power relations can have on advancing food security in Ghana. Hegemony was particularly found in the Availability dimension of food security. The dominant discourse was found to be linked to the code *production*. The discourse was highly correlated to private sector interests, and was mentioned by the majority of other stakeholder categories. Language that highlighted the interests of production, in particular, over other factors that impacted food security were found within the dialogue and documents of Business and Government stakeholder categories. The dominant discourse highlighted the importance these stakeholders placed on increased agricultural production, and modernized agricultural production (specifically an increased number of external inputs employed in production) to advance food security in Ghana. The dominant discourses emphasis on production was accepted and diffused into food politics by more than one stakeholder category.

There are two exceptions to this dominant discourse emphasis on *production* and its influence on food politics in Ghana. First, the civil society stakeholder category countered the dominant discourse through emphasizing other credible factors impacting food security in Ghana. Civil society’s unacceptance of the dominant discourse in their dialogue and publically-available documents on food security was important for two reasons. First, it allowed for counter-hegemony to exist and challenge the status-quo of food security. Second, it provided insight to the perspective of those closer or directly related to the production of food in Ghana. The other stakeholder categories could be seen as “distant” or “less connected” to the actualities of production, and the needs of the producer. Second, the hegemonic discourse has proven to be deceptive by a number of academics. This discourse pursued by private sector interests promised
more, cheaper, and better food along with an end to the drudgery of farm work to justify the myriad upheavals wrought by capitalist agriculture, and its inequalities (Weis, 2010, p.316). The productivist policies legitimated by the hegemonic discourse in fact provided the opposite result. It has been argued food production at current levels can feed the population (McMichael, 2009). The world produces more than 1.5 times enough food to feed the population (FAO, 2015; Food and Agriculture Organisation, 2009; Giménez, Shattuck, Altieri, Herren, & Gliessman, 2012). The cause of hunger is not due to the lack of production, but rather the lack of equitable distribution in society. However, due to this language that has been accepted as the norm by stakeholders the negative consequences due to the emphasis on production still reside. The inequalities that result from this are due to:

1. industrial and bio-engineered agricultures systematically displacing farmers who supply food for the poor;
2. the fact that markets respond to people with incomes, not people as such;
3. and agro-exporting, a structural imperative of the state system, exacerbates these tendencies (McMichael, 2009, p.171).

The first point noted above draws attention, in particular, to the idea of increased inputs in production. It was questionable why any stakeholder would choose to advance a narrative that would systematically displace those who supplied the majority of Ghana with food. Stakeholders should have been well aware that the Ghanaian agricultural system was dominated by small-holder producers unable to absorb technological inputs, with very few industrial sized production units. Despite the evident flaws in the dominant discourse, it was still pursued by the majority of stakeholder categories, and only civil society presented a counter-discourse.

7.1.1 Power Dimensions between Stakeholder Perspectives and Implemented Government Policy
Now that power has been defined, and an example of dominant discourse has been provided, the power of stakeholder perspectives with interests in Ghanaian food security must be understood in contrast to government policy. The influence stakeholder perspectives have on implemented government policy defined their power in shaping the politics of Ghanaian food security. To assess policy in comparison to the perspectives found in the study, government food policy must first be understood on its own.

In recent times the Nana Akufo-Addo administration has pursued the policy program Planting for Food and Jobs. This program was considered both an agricultural development plan, as well as a food security initiative. The prime initiative of the program read as follows,
“The Government of Ghana (GoG) is fully committed to increasing the productivity and thereby catalyzing a structural transformation in the economy through increased farm incomes and job creation. To contribute to this goal, the GoG has initiated a flagship Planting for Food and Jobs (P4FAJ) Campaign that will motivate the farmers to adopt certified seeds and fertilizers through a private sector led marketing framework, by raising the incentives and complimentary service provisions on the usage of inputs, good agronomic practices, marketing of outputs over an E-Agriculture platform” (Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2017).

The policy advanced the idea of food self-sufficiency in Ghana and conceptualized food security in Ghana as,

“Ghana recognizes food security as a complex condition requiring a holistic approach and involving a series of complementary actions targeting the access dimension of productivity (inputs), incomes of small-scale food producers, resilience of food production systems and the sustainable use of biodiversity and genetic resources” (Ministry of Food and Agriculture, 2017).

Overall, the Government of Ghana perceived the answer to food security though a food self-sufficiency policy for increased domestic productivity. It was a productivist-centered ideology reliant on the adoption of the technological package of agriculture. What was concerning about this perspective was the reliance on the technological package. This raised the question of sovereignty and financial accessibility to the domestic producer.

After the analysis of both preliminary and field work perspectives, it was evident there were considerable alignments and divides amongst stakeholder perspectives in relation to government policy. Generally, bilateral and multilateral institutions aligned with the governmental perspective on productivity. Bilateral and multilateral institutions communicated the perspective that Ghana’s agricultural sector needed increased productivity. However, the institutions were divided on the appropriate approach to increased productivity. The governmental policy approached productivity with increased access to technological inputs such as fertilizers and improved seeds. Institutions, however, were split on this approach. Some institutions, such as IFAD, the World Bank, and USAID aligned with the perspective advocating use of technological inputs for increased productivity. However, UN institutions (such as the FAO) did not engage with language that explicitly stated there should be an increased use of technological inputs in Ghanaian production methods, alternatively known as the dominant discourse. In the preliminary analysis, the FAO used language such as “good agricultural practices, and increased irrigation” (Food and Agriculture Organisation, 2013) in conjunction with the phrase increased productivity. Additionally, the UN questioned “how to increase agricultural productivity sustainably while maintaining biodiversity” (United Nations, 2017). The lack of explicit language related to technological inputs continued in the fieldwork documents. For example, the FAO never used language related to the code...
technological inputs. Rather, on productivity, the FAO conveyed that "it is raining well…Ghana is producing enough" (FAO August 31, 2017). The contest of ideas between the government perspective and the institution’s perspective was not found on productivity, but rather the approach taken to increased productivity. The UN institutions took a weak stand on the code technological inputs. The absence of powerful language used by the UN institutions in their Availability perspective was problematic. UN institutions hold a high level of power in global politics, and the lack of engagement (or dismissal) of the dominant discourse was a missed opportunity for greater influence on the direction of Ghanaian food politics.

The most critical contention between stakeholder perspective and governmental policy was found within the civil society perspective. This was not a surprise as it was previously noted civil society organisations challenged the dominant discourse in their perspectives on food politics, and presented a counter-hegemonic perspective. Theoretically civil society was heterogeneous, and was an area for contests over the development and realization of models of society (Hirsch, 2003). Civil society organisations in Ghana can be large (and possibly the recipient of big donor aid), or grassroots. They can be distinguished as non-governmental organisations (NGOs), or grassroots organisations (GROs). Some civil society organisations, particularly NGOs, did not conform to the theory of contested ideas on society. Notably in the fieldwork documents, there was a significant difference in perspective if the organisation was an NGO or a GRO. If the organisation was a NGO, the organisation tended to align with the perspective presented in government policy. For instance, Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) noted in their interview,

“Most of our work that we do in AGRA, we have been more or less involved in food policy but more in the production area. Where we really provide the planting materials, and that has been the role of AGRA. How do we get technology to the doorstep of farmer to improve productivity? We have been involved in the seed system. We have been involved in the fertilizer system” (AGRA August 11, 2017).

Much of the language conveyed by AGRA was associated with the code technological inputs. Their projects and involvement in the agricultural sector in Ghana highly focused on the improvement of access to technological inputs. Through the priority placed on the provision of materials to producers, it was clear AGRA aligned itself with the objectives of the current government of increased productivity with increased use of technological inputs in production. Contrastingly, GROs presented an entirely dissimilar perspective. For instance, one GRO questioned the legitimacy of the subsidized fertilizer that the government promoted,

“I think one of the objectives of the subsidy program was to increase application of the fertilizer, so that improvement in yield. A study was done by one agency that showed the
fertilizer application has not changed production. You understand. And when you go down, that is what the farmers need, you understand, because if you tell the farmer to produce, and he produces, and there is no one to buy, what is the point?” (Peasant Farmer Association of Ghana August 29, 2017).

Another GRO questioned the legitimacy of government’s actions to tackle the contentious yield gap,

“The yield gap, when they address it, they address it in a rather linear manner. It is not nothing. Nothing innovative to increase yield simply increase improved varieties, apply more fertilizers, apply more agrochemicals, practice better cultural practices, harvest well and deal with post-harvest losses. That is how they want us to address the yield gap. If that is all, that in my view is not enough. The all those things have been ticking aboard, in the contest where farmers have skewed access to land, otherwise the farmers who are farming are not going to derive much the full benefits of their effort in applying those technologies that are sneaking to address the yield gap. If a sharecropper has spent money on the technologies, and I get much 2-3 times the yield, therefore we are creating a yield gap, at the end of the day I surrender 1/3 to the land owner. It is not motivating enough. That is one example of addressing one of the elements that need to be addressed. Alone without addressing the land question is problematic. The input marketing challenges is a whole baggage. Farmers do not have the resources, they do not have the finances, so if there are a number of things they need to spend money on, then they don’t have the money, and it is difficult to access those things. But what are these inputs? And where are they coming from? And who is controlling them? Is it Monsanto? You know Monsanto.” (General Agricultural Workers Union of Ghana August 1, 2017).

These two examples provided empirical evidence of the schism in civil society organisations’ perspectives in relation to enacted government policy. GROs critically questioned the legitimacy of the approach government policy took on food security and agricultural production. GROs engaged with a counter-discourse that challenged the legitimacy and status-quo of the dominant discourse. NGOs, however, found themselves more or less aligned with the approach government policy took, and in consent with the dominant discourse

The disparity of power between the NGOs and GROs of civil society resided in capital. For example, AGRA engaged with a plethora of large donors (for example: USAID, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the Rockfeller Foundation). Naturally, AGRA engaged with the discourse of the donors who hold power as AGRA would want to continue to receive funding for continued operations. AGRA prioritized private-sector interests over the interests of the domestic producer. This was not the first documented case of AGRA to prioritize private sector interests. AGRA has had several controversial issues inclusive of the appropriation of genetic wealth, and dispossession of sovereignty (Thompson, 2012, 2014). Appropriation of wealth and
dispossession of the farmer aided private-sector interests to increased capital accumulation. Conversely, the PFAG and General Agricultural Workers Union (GAWU) were two “worker-based” organisations. The PFAG and GAWU were organized on the basis of the needs of the worker (or farmer). They received less or no amounts of external funding. In other words, the discourse they engaged in, or perspective they conveyed was not controlled by external donor power.

This trend held true in other NGOs who received large external donor funding such as SEND Ghana. Upon closer inspection, SEND Ghana received funding from large institutions such as the EU, the World Bank, and USAID. SEND Ghana noted their projects provided impact as,

“We have made a lot of impact and we think that we first of all we have been able to contribute to food security: production, we just finished a project that we worked with 4000 households, to increase their, 4000 households, to increase their food production” (SEND Ghana July 31, 2017).

SEND Ghana communicated two important issues on power in this statement. First, SEND Ghana engaged with the dominant discourse of increased production. SEND Ghana has bought into this discourse due to its engagement with large, private-sector interest donors. They articulated, “we don’t have our own resources, we mobilize resources from donors” (SEND Ghana July 31, 2017). These donors have an agenda and capital, and used organisations such as SEND Ghana for agenda-setting through capital provision. Second, SEND Ghana highlighted the quantified impact their organisation contributed to food security in Ghana. The larger the impact the more it can result in secured funding. SEND Ghana provided no challenge to the dominant discourse, and potentially adopted it due to the power of external donors and their capital.

As previously stated, governance has now incorporated a variety of actors beyond the state. Contemporary governance “is multi-layered and includes important local, substate-regional, suprastate-regional, and transworld operations alongside and intertwined with national arrangements” (Scholte, 2002, p.288). While the definition of contemporary governance should theoretically bolster a greater level of democracy in decision making, it was clear that in the big-picture divides in perspectives amongst food policy stakeholders in Ghana this did not hold true. The power structures in society were still determinative on the level of the influence stakeholder perspectives had in the policy creation and implementation process. The contests over development and models of Ghanaian food security remained between the NGO and GRO organizations within the civil society stakeholder group. The major difference between the two sets of organisations was found in the sources of funding.
The impact official donor funding can have on official perspectives taken by an organisation are substantial. It has been theorized that increased amounts of donor funding can:

1. Weaken the legitimacy of NGOs and GROs as independent actors in society;
2. Distort the accountability of NGOs and GROs away from grassroots and internal constituencies, and overemphasizes short-term, quantitative outputs (Edwards & Hulme, 1998, p.3).

NGOs that accepted large external donor funding adopted the dominant discourse promoted by the private-sector donor interests. They prioritized quantifiable impact, and did not provide a challenge to the norms of society. They consented to the ideologies of those who held power.

GROs presented perspectives that challenged the dominant discourse of food politics. However, GROs did not hold power in food governance in Ghana as their perspectives did not influence governmental policy. Rather, official policy aligned with the dominant discourse of increased production with increased use of technological inputs. In theory, multi-stakeholder governance was to bolster greater democratic decision making. However, the power structures in society allowed the dominant discourse continued prosperity. The politics of the matter resided in the class power of private-sector interests. Perspectives, such as GRO perspectives, continued to be marginalized in the policy creation space due to lack of power. While GROs challenged the dominant discourse, their lack of power continued to marginalize their perspective.

7.2 Political Disregard for Food Adequacy as Food Security

Arguably one of the more important findings of this research was the lack of acknowledgement of nutritional and cultural adequacy in the stakeholder’s perspectives. The Right to Food Framework advanced that food security was a three-dimensional concept inclusive of nutritional and cultural adequacy. Both in the preliminary analysis and supplementary field research, adequacy was the least frequent dimension in the communications. For Ghana, this was problematic. Nutritional inadequacy remained a problem in Ghana. According to the numbers, the micronutrient indicators indicated a 56.4% rate of anemia in women between the ages of 15-49, and under 5 stunting is at 18.8% (Scaling Up Nutrition, 2017). The numbers showed that nutritional insecurity still existed in Ghana. The only stakeholder group that acknowledged the importance of nutrition issues in Ghana in a semi-adequate manner was civil society. This perspective shed light not only on the severity of the nutritional insecurity, but how nutrition was impacted by urbanization.
One main theme underlined by civil society was the rural-urban consumption dichotomy. Urbanization impacted nutritional adequacy of diets. Within the urban context of adequacy, two main issues were highlighted from the civil society perspective. The first issue was food as an identifier of social class. Food classism in Ghana was understood as an extension of both cultural and nutritional adequacy. Civil society highlighted there was an increased demand for rice because rice was perceived as a "rich man's food". Traditional meals, such as fufu or kenkey, were perceived by the urban elites as a "poor man's food", despite the years of rich cultural significance attached to these dishes. This was problematic because food furthered the class divide between elite and poor based on type of food consumed. Food became an extension of wealth. The type of food consumed defined a specific class situation, and relegated those who consumed it to the same class.

The second issue highlighted from the civil society perspective on nutrition was the expansion of the industrial diet in urban Ghana. The process of urbanization facilitated the dissemination of the industrial diet due to its emphasis on convenience and fast service (Winson, 2013). This held true in Ghana as the reason behind an increased consumption of ‘fast-foods’ was due to demanding work schedules and lack of time to prepare meals. The focus was on the consumption of ‘energy-dense’ (generally high-fat, high-sugar, and high-carbohydrate) quick foods rather than what would be considered healthy eating. What was truly of concern was the quick expansion of transnational fast-food corporations in the capital of Accra. YUM Food Brands had expanded into Accra with Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) and Pizza Hut present. KFC alone has 13 stores in Ghana with hopes to expand in the future outside of the capital region (Searcey & Richtel, 2017). The perspective communicated by civil society on the transnational fast-food corporations was one of deep concern. One civil society participant noted younger Ghanaians eat at KFC and upload photos of them at KFC to social media websites including Instagram (Peasant Farmers Association of Ghana August 11, 2017). When asked why, they stated that it was because they believed this was what Western persons eat, and they wanted to resemble Western persons (Peasant Farmers Association of Ghana August 11, 2017).

The power of the transnational fast-food corporations in Ghana was of concern. KFC looked to transcend KFC into a daily brand (Searcey & Richtel, 2017). From this, it was already quite evident the power KFC holds over Ghanaian consumer choices. Additionally, Ghanaian over-nutrition statistics were alarming. A study conducted noted the health indicators as the following:
1. prevalence for overweight for the entire nation is 25.4% with the prevalence of obesity at 17.1%

2. for the urban population, statistics show prevalence for being overweight is 27.2% with obesity higher at 20.6%

3. these statistics are higher for women than men

4. 55.2% of the residents of the Greater Accra region are either overweight or obese (Ofori-Asenso, Agyeman, Laar, & Boateng, 2016).

From these perspectives, it was evident KFC (and other trans-national fast food corporations) held power in the Ghanaian food system. YUM Brands brings tremendous economic resources, and therefore power, to bear in pushing its brand. KFC exploited Ghanaian consumers through creating a false sense of identity to the Western world. KFC was perceived as what Western persons ate. That statement in itself, at best, was an over-generalization. However, consumers bought into this discourse. The false sense of identity with another culture has influenced the way consumers make food choices. A consumer perceived themselves to be of a higher societal status in Ghana if they consumed foods from Western fast food corporations. KFC, and other trans-national fast food corporations, hold power over its consumers and their choices.

The civil society perspectives presented in the field research data highlighted the potential consequences the inevitable expansion of the industrial diet into urban Ghanaian lifestyle could have. The perspectives understood the expansion of the industrial diet perpetuated food consumption as an extension of class position. The problematic expansion of transnational fast-food corporations and over-nutrition was ignored by other stakeholders. Most importantly, the perspective highlighted the detrimental influence and power the industrial diet has on traditional diets. The industrial diet, in urban Ghana, seemingly did not exist in parallel to the traditional diet, but slowly replaced it.
8 CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE AREAS OF STUDY

8.1 Concluding Thoughts

Sneyd et. al (2015) concluded food politics in CEMAC was incredibly complex, and there was no singular solution to advanced food security communicated by stakeholders. This thesis concluded in a similar degree. The question of “how can the analysis of perspectives of food policy stakeholders regarding the ‘triple-A’ paradigm of food security facilitate an understanding of the politics of food through the analysis of the contest of ideas and power relations in a food insecure context?” situated the wide array of food security thought. The analysis of publicly-available documents, and key-informant interview transcripts defined the attractive topics of the day in food security. Stakeholders were a good bit divided in their perspectives on food security issues. Not to mention similarly-situated actors talked past each other in their communications. The web of ideas that governed Ghanaian food security narratives was muddled. The diverse array of ideologies, however, challenged the influence of the dominant discourse. Persistent critique of the dominant class, and their associated beliefs on food security solutions will motion change to food politics.

From this, it was evident coherent policy may never exist for Ghanaian food security. Power structures in multi-stakeholder governance hindered the adoption of a universal thought. The vernacular of the stakeholders alluded to the degree of influence they held in food politics. The dominant perspective amongst high-level political actors marginalized the less powerful ideas. The dominant ideology was cloaked in productivist discourse upheld by private-sector and government interests. In these dialogues, the perspectives of the smallholder producer were overlooked in exchange for capital-generating opportunities in food production. Perspectives that contest the productivist discourse will necessitate policy better reflective of the realities in smallholder domestic production. The voices of those who produced food for domestic consumption were continually marginalized. Domestic smallholder producers must become an institutional component of multi-stakeholder governance for improved food security and policy.

The politics of food security resided in language used by food policy stakeholders as they were the political actors who determined what constituted a food security challenge. As a result, the frequency in phraseology chosen by stakeholders indicated a certain level of political importance. Frequency gave way to the degree of significance each dimension of food security held in multi-stakeholder governance. Out of the analysis, availability of food and supply-side solutions were the order of the day. Solutions to improved availability of food were coupled with agro-chemical application in domestic production. Prolonged comprehension of agro-chemical applications as food security solutions continued to legitimize, and normalize this approach to agricultural development. Precariously, this grasp on food security perpetuated capitalist modes of
agricultural production married to the agro-petro-chemical-biotech-pharmaceutical complex of the day. And it further legitimized the development agenda of the corporate class as agro-corporations emerged into untainted agricultural markets in developing contexts.

The politics of food knit availability of supply together with the omission of nutritional and cultural apt in food security narratives. The disregard of adequacy as a dimension of food security was imperative to the socio-economic structures of the food system. Documented statistics showed over-nutrition indicators were the call for concern in urban Ghanaian food security. Political inattention to rise in over-nutrition together with markets historically subjected to neoliberal conditions of structural adjustment programs encouraged the emergence of transnational fast food corporations in Ghana. The shortage of high-level political talk coupled with falsified societal perspectives of nutrient-poor edible products anchored the successful operations of transnational fast food corporations. Food insecurity was now subjected to the role of transnational fast food corporations in the Ghanaian food system. The lingual hegemony fabricated by actors on supply-side food solutions muffled food adequacy as part of these solutions. Absence of counteraction to transnational fast food corporations allowed corporations to permeate the supply of food with their nutrient-poor edible products. These products now altered the type of food available, the type of food purchased, and the type of food preferred in Ghana. Transnational fast food corporations are now on the food security governance agenda in Ghana. In this regard, it was not the nature of the perspective that was imperative, but rather the absence of food adequacy in stakeholder narratives on food security that perpetuated corporate power in the Ghanaian food system.

There is a need for further research on food adequacy as part of food security. With the continued global expansion of the industrial diet, research must explore what it means to be food secure in light of this. The global distribution of nutrient-poor edible products associated with the industrial diet will render food adequacy as imperative to food security solutions. Research should further explore the contest of ideas in multi-stakeholder food security governance in other food insecure contexts. This may lead to a wider thought on what forms food security. This may also provide further insight to a coherent idea of what global food security means.

8.2 Contributions to International Development Politics

This thesis empirically, conceptually, and theoretically contributed to the literature on international development politics. This thesis established a quantitative basis that assessed the frequency in which differently situated stakeholders framed food security challenges and solutions relative to the three-dimensions of food security. By way of the numbers, this thesis quantitatively established what the dominant discourse in
Ghanaian food security politics was. The dominant discourse was a blend of productivist language. Furthermore, the thesis revealed that even when stakeholders discuss food security solutions in the same dimension, they held dissimilar perspectives on what this dimension means to advanced food security.

This thesis linked to the bigger-picture debate on what actually constituted food security as it held food security was a contested concept amongst differently situated actors. While institutionalized definitions were inclusive of nutritional and cultural adequacy as part of food security, it was evident that stakeholders most active in the food policy environment thought otherwise. It became apparent that food adequacy was not at the forefront of governance thought despite its inclusion in official definitions. Food security was a contested concept between food policy stakeholders, and with this the analysis of perspectives questioned the legitimacy of normalized global food security definitions.

Finally, this thesis applied neo-Marxist theory to the study of food security politics. The thesis understood power structures in a Gramscian school of thought. This analysis brought to light how and in what ways hegemony manifested itself in food security politics. Food security framed as physical supply improvements was the hegemonic ideology that many stakeholders gave consent to. Proponents of the hegemonic ideology influenced the advancement, or lack thereof, of food security in a food insecure context. Gramscian thought additionally teased out potential hypothesis as to why stakeholders consented to the language of the dominant discourse.
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APPENDIX A
Supplementary Information on Key-Informant Interviews

A1: Interview Questions (with probes potentially used)

Part 1: Food environment and food security in Ghana

1. How do you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) define food security?
   a. Possible probe: As you defined food security as (insert a shortened version of how they defined food security), how would you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) then define food insecurity?
   b. Possible probe: How would you categorize Ghana’s current food situation?

2. What do you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) think is the largest barrier in attaining food security in Ghana?
   a. Possible probe: What do you think needs to change in Ghana to overcome this barrier (specify barrier) in attaining food security?
   b. Possible probe: How can this improvement be attained?

3. What do you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) think is a possible facilitator to attaining food security in Ghana?
   a. Possible probe: How do you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) believe this can be achieved?
      i. Through what mechanisms can this be achieved?

4. How do you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) view food production in Ghana?
   a. Possible probe: Do you find food production to be sufficient? Why or why not?
   b. Possible probe: Do you think increasing food production is important in attaining food security? Why or why not?
c. Possible probe: What problems do you think Ghana faces in terms of efficient food production?

d. Possible probe: What strengths do you think Ghana holds in terms of efficient food production?

5. How do you view the trends of food consumption in Ghana?

a. Possible probe: Have you noticed a dietary change in consumption patterns? What is the change you have noticed?

b. Possible probe: Are there more prominently consumed food in Ghana?

c. Possible probe: What factor do processed foods and imports play on food consumption trends of Ghanaians?

d. Possible probe: Do you find there is still an importance on traditional foods?
   
   i. If yes, what factors of traditional foods are still important in Ghana’s food environment?
   
   ii. If no, why do you think traditional foods are no longer important? What do you think is causing a change in the importance of traditional foods?

Part 2: Food governance and food policy environment in Ghana

1. What experience have you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) had in the food policy environment? [For example: have you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) been involved in the dialogue during the creation and development of food policy?]

   a. Possible probes:
      
      i. Have you found your involvement in the food policy environment to be effective? Why or why not?

      1. What do you believe needs to be done to make your involvement more effective?

   2. What resources have you mobilized to make your voice heard in the food policy conversation in Ghana?
3. How do you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) think current government food policy focus is moving Ghana toward the direction of attaining food security?
   a. Possible probe: Where do you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) believe there needs to be change and/or improvement in food policy?
      i. Possible probe: How do you think this change should be realized? Alternatively, through what outlet do you think this change would be effectively realized?
      ii. Possible probe: What conflicts do you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) believe can arise from change in food policy?

4. What impact do you (or your affiliated organisation/business/ministry) think you can make on the food security situation in Ghana?
   a. Possible probe: How can this impact become realized?
## A2: Key-Informant Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Category</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral/Multilateral Institutions</td>
<td>• Food and Agriculture Association of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brazil-Ghana Bilateral Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>• OLAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anyako Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Koffi Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barclays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
<td>• SEND Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General Agricultural Workers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Independent activist with local socialist movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ESCARID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Food 4 All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council for Scientific and Industrial Research- Food Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council for Scientific and Industrial Research- Crop Science Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peasant Farmers Association of Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>• Office of the Deputy Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ministry of Food and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>• Independent Journalist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Key Search Terms in Preliminary Document and Media Analysis

The approach to collecting publicly available stakeholder documents and media reports was:

- Generated a comprehensive list of bilateral/multilateral institutions, agri-business, governmental ministries, civil society organisations, and media outlets who participated in food security dialogues in Ghana.

- Used Google for a general search of institutional documents with search terms (see chart below for examples), and conducted a deeper search as documents came to light.

- Used Factiva and All Africa to search for media reports on agri-business, food security, and development in Ghana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Category</th>
<th>Search Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral/Multilateral Institutions</td>
<td>“FAO Ghana”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Government of Ghana and FAO CPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o FAO Agribusiness PPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“UN and Ghana”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COHA and Ghana (came from New Partnership from Africa Development seeing they discussed the study on their site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPAD and Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAADP and Ghana documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU and Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o EPA and Ghana documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African Development Bank and Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD and Ghana and AFDB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO and Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Click on Agriculture at the bottom of the WTO and Ghana page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana and WHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Nutrition landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP and Ghana documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR and Ghana agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Development Bank of Accra annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benso Oil Palm Plantation documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa Processing Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa Processing Company annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro Africa Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro MindSet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agribusiness in Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM in Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promasider Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfricaAtlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate farms in Ghana/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Civil Society Organisations | - NGO in Ghana food security  
| - TRAX Ghana  
| - Technoserve Ghana  
| - Savanna Agricultural Research Institute  
| - Yendi E.P. Church Agricultural Station  
| - Permaculture Network Ghana  
| - Agricultural Rural Development Network Ghana  
| - Agriculture NGO Ghana  
| - AGRA Ghana  
| - Bioversity International  
  - Strategy report |

| Government | - Government of Ghana agricultural policy  
| - Ministry of Food and Agriculture food security policy  
| - Ministry of Foreign Affairs Ghana documents  
| - Gender in agriculture Ghana  
| - Women in agricultural doctorate  
| - Ghana’s Shared Growth and Development Agenda (GSGDA II) |
| Media                  | Google News: “food security” “Ghana”  
|                       | “food security”  
|                       | o Daily Graphic  
|                       | o The Ghanaian Times  
|                       | o Business and Financial Times Ghana  
|                       | o Daily Guide  
|                       | o The Ghanaian Chronicle  
|                       | o The Insight Newspaper  
|                       | o The Ghana Star  
|                       | “sécurité alimentaire”  
|                       | o Jeune Afrique- Ghana  
|                       | “food security” “sécurité alimentaire”  
|                       | o Factiva- Ghana, English and French |
APPENDIX C
HyperResearch Coding List

Availability (group: production/supply-side)

- Production/supply-side
- Biofuels
- Domestic production
- Drought
- Efficiency
- Fertilizer
- Flooding
- Food aid
- Harvest
- Herbicide
- Deficits ex. Palm oil deficit
- Insecticide
- Pesticide
- Production
- Production volume
- Productivity
- Seasonality
- Seeds
- Supply
- Sustainability
- Technological innovation
• Technological inputs
• Technology
• Tools
• Tractor
• Weather

Accessibility (group: marketing, buy’em, sell’em, demand)
• Marketing/buy-em sell-em/demand
• Breweries (maize)
• Charcoal
• Cold chain
• Cooking gas
• Coping strategies
• Cost
• Cross-border
• Customs
• Electricity
• Energy
• Entitlement
• Food processors
• Fuel
• Gender
• Hold-ups
• Import substitution
• Imports price cost
• Income
• Inequality
• Inflation
• Market
• Marketing
• Oil subsidies
• Police
• Ports
• Post-harvest loss
• Price
• Price fluctuation
• Purchasing power
• Refrigeration
• Resources
• Roads
• Sellers
• Storage
• Stoves
• Tariffs
• Tariff escalation
• Trade
• Transport
• Water

Adequacy (group: consumption/eating/living/reproducing)
- Culture
- Dietary diversity
- Food qualitative dimension
- Food safety
- Health
- Malnutrition
- Micro-nutrient deficiencies
- Nutraceutical
- Nutrients
- Nutrition knowledge
- Nutritious
- Over-nutrition
- Rice
- Safe
- Safety
- Staple
- Supplements
- Traditional food
- Vitamins