



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

*Digital Comprehensive Summaries of Uppsala Dissertations
from the Faculty of Social Sciences 182*

Statebuilding through diaspora recruitment?

*The role of capacity, norms and representation for
legitimacy in Somaliland and Liberia*

ANNA IDA R. ROCK



ACTA
UNIVERSITATIS
UPSALIENSIS
UPPSALA
2021

ISSN 1652-9030
ISBN 978-91-513-1118-0
urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-431663

Dissertation presented at Uppsala University to be publicly examined in Brusewitzsalen, Östra Ågatan 19, Uppsala, Friday, 5 March 2021 at 13:15 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The examination will be conducted in Swedish. Faculty examiner: Professor Isabell Schierenbeck (School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg).

Abstract

Rock, A. I. R. 2021. Statebuilding through diaspora recruitment? The role of capacity, norms and representation for legitimacy in Somaliland and Liberia. *Digital Comprehensive Summaries of Uppsala Dissertations from the Faculty of Social Sciences* 182. 120 pp. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. ISBN 978-91-513-1118-0.

How do the local elites and the wider population perceive returnees in post-war governments and what shapes these returnees' legitimacy? Overall, while acknowledging some benefits, local elites in Somaliland and Liberia highlight challenges connected to returnees' presence in governments and question their legitimacy. These challenges are mirrored in the perceptions of the Liberian population, who see returnees as less legitimate in government positions than stayees. The legitimacy of these returnees is mainly shaped by notions of capacity, democratic norms and practices as well as by how well they represent the local population. This thesis provides several pioneering studies of how diaspora returnees are perceived domestically. These issues are examined through three essays that rely on a wide array of novel data from Somaliland and Liberia. In essay I, I discuss under which conditions returnees in the Somaliland government are seen as legitimate. In essay II, I demonstrate how Liberian elite perceptions and experiences of returnee ministers only slightly correspond to the expectations held in international and national policy circles. In essays I and II, I mainly rely on elite interviews. However, in essay III, I investigate the research question from the perspective of the general Liberian population. Using a survey experiment, I demonstrate how a high presence of returnee ministers negatively affects cabinet legitimacy. This effect, however, is attenuated when returnees indicate that they will give up their ties to their host country. In this way, this thesis problematizes expectations of diaspora returnees by showing how they seldom constitute ideal interlocutors in statebuilding activities and their engagement often implies difficult trade-offs between central peacebuilding and statebuilding objectives. Dominance by returnees in the government excludes local actors and signals that qualifications acquired in the Global North are valued over domestic knowledge. This thesis concludes that in these contexts diaspora recruitment is highly political.

Keywords: Statebuilding, Peacebuilding, Liberia, Somaliland, Diaspora, Legitimacy

Anna Ida R. Rock, Department of Government, Box 514, Uppsala University, SE-75120 Uppsala, Sweden.

© Anna Ida R. Rock 2021

ISSN 1652-9030

ISBN 978-91-513-1118-0

urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-431663 (<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-431663>)

To Rakel and Cleo,

List of Papers

This thesis is based on the following essays, which are referred to in the text by their Roman numerals.

- I Rock, Anna Ida R. (2017). 'Perceptions of Returnees in Somaliland Politics: The Grounds for Legitimacy', *International Migration*, 55(5), 205-216.
- II Rock, Anna Ida R. Do diaspora returnees meet expectations? Technocratic skills and outsidersness in Liberian post-war cabinets (unpublished).
- III Rock, Anna Ida R. How legitimate are diaspora ministers among citizens? Findings from a survey experiment in Liberia (unpublished)

Reprints were made with permission from the respective publishers.

Acknowledgements

The final sections of this book were composed during the strangest of times. In early spring 2020, I spent too long at a hospital abroad with my oldest daughter, while pregnant with her little sister. During those weeks, Covid-19 began to top headlines all over the world. Though many have fared much worse over the last year, it has not been an ideal time to complete a dissertation. Notwithstanding its challenges, however, this year resulted in great deal of reflection and made me even more appreciative of the great people in my life. Without them, neither beginning nor completing this book would have been possible.

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge and thank my supervisors: Anna Jarstad, Johanna Söderström and Maria Eriksson Baaz. Their help and support extends far beyond simply helping me develop and write this book. I am filled with gratitude for the privilege of these three wise and generous scholars having guided me through this journey. Anna: you and your scholarship have inspired me immensely. I am so fortunate to have had the opportunity to be part of your project “Democracy from the Outside?” Thank you for believing in me then and for continuing to believe in me since. I am grateful for all your encouragement and great advice, for the conversations about research, field work, career and family life, but also for encouraging me to rest and set work aside when I needed it most. Johanna: you have always gone above and beyond to help me. Your unwavering support has given me the confidence to try new things, such as carrying out a survey experiment. Your feedback (e.g., your reminders about the length of my paragraphs, your many suggestions on my graphs, and your notes when what I have written does not make much sense), always made me improve. You have always offered advice and company when I needed it the most. Thank you for being a mentor and friend. Maria: I am incredibly grateful that you joined my team of supervisors during the last years. You came in and led me in the right direction when I got stuck, and you have continued to provide perceptive feedback whenever I have felt lost. Thank you for helping me sharpen my thinking and uplifting my work to a higher level.

I would also like to extend my deepest thanks to PerOla Öberg and Anders Sjögren, who read the entire manuscript and whose insightful comments greatly improved the final product. I am also deeply indebted to Jesper Bjarnesen, Emma Elfversson, Johan Wejryd and Luise Bendfeldt. This book is much better thanks to their constructive advice during the manuscript conference. Elin Bjarnegård and Gina Gustavsson, thank you for your guidance throughout the first year, but also for continuing to offer invaluable advice and wonderful discussions.

I am also indebted to Peter Haldén, who I worked for as a research assistant and who in many ways gave me the courage to apply to the PhD position. Thanks also to Mats Utas, Ken Menkhaus, Michael Walls, Matthias Basedau, Neophytos Loizides and Sten Widmalm who all have provided helpful feedback on my project at various points over the years. A big thank you also to Anna Wistus and Jeasmin Akter who regularly answered my questions about travel insurance, parental leave and everything else connected to my employment with patience and kindness.

I am lucky to have completed my PhD in a department with so many people who generously shared their time and expertise. I wish to thank all of my colleagues at the Department of Government for their support and encouragement, as well as for providing such an open, interesting and fun place to spend the past six years. A special thanks to Pär Nyman, Rafael Ahlskog and Johan Wejryd for patiently explaining different steps of carrying out a survey experiment. I could not have written Essay III without your help. Many thanks also to Tove Hellkvist who kindly assisted me with the cover of this book. I am also grateful for the amazing PhD community at the Department. A special mention goes to Johanna Nilsson, Per Ekman, Michal Smrek, Camille Pellerin, Malin Holm, Sandra Håkansson, Maria Nordbrandt Bergström, Marcus Österman, Oskar Hultin Bäckersten, Johanna Pettersson, Lutz Gschwind, Lauri Peterson and Linda Moberg, who in different ways have improved my texts, supported me when I was nervous about teaching or simply made the PhD time much more fun. My cohort played a decisive role in the writing of this book: Darrel Robinson, Kristoffer Jutvik, Zohreh Khoban and Sofia Helander. Thank you for always sharing clever thoughts, humor and support. You are one of the main reasons I have enjoyed the last few years so much. I am very grateful to have had you as colleagues and for the tremendous friendships we formed along the way.

Teresa Norling, I cannot thank you enough for your help during this time. Your advice has improved my writing and raised my confidence about sharing my work. If more people were as kind-hearted as you, the world would be a much better place. Nazita Lajevardi also requires a very

special thanks. Thank you for your sharp eye in proofreading, but an even bigger thank you for being a source of support and inspiration, as well as for your friendship. A special thanks also to Ariel Young. I am glad I have had you by my side through the whole PhD journey and for all the fun we have had over the last twelve years. Thank you for being such a great friend. I truly wish Hawaii was closer.

I am also indebted to numerous foundations and institutions that have made this work possible. I thank *the Swedish Research Council* [VR 2013-06334] for funding my PhD student position, and *J Håkansson's stipendiestiftelse*, *Forskraftstiftelsen Theodor Adelswårds minne fstam*, *Gålöstiftelsen* and *Erik Borbos Hanssons stipendiefond* for generously funding my field work and participation at International conferences.

The support of my friends and family outside of academia has been instrumental to writing this book. A big thank you to Herbert Rock, Anna Lantz, Urban Adolfsson, Maria Wiotti, Hanna Vestin, Andrea Samosir Josephson, Annika Stenekas, Erik Stenekas, Hanna Nelson, Petter Eriksson, Cecilia Imbro, Lennie Imbro, Sozan Barzanje, Åsa Höijer, Nouran Briki, Nathalie Sahlin, Rebecca Eriksson and Emmie Grut Jonsson, for your encouragement, for asking interested questions and for providing an often needed distraction from research. Particularly helpful to me during this time has been the support of my mother-in-law, Ingegerd Adolfsson. Thank you for always helping out with Rakel and Cleo and for always expressing interest and support in what I am doing. And, Emily. Thank you for being my person. For always lending an ear and reminding me to trust the process, but also to trust myself. I owe you so much.

Det största av tack till min pappa Erik Norén, den mest allmänbildade och varmhjärtade person jag någonsin träffat. Trots att du inte längre finns hos oss så hjälper du mig varje dag. Din medmänsklighet, ditt intresse för omvärlden och din tro på mig finns kvar hos mig. The completion of this book would definitely not have been possible without my mother, Stephanie Norén. Thank you for everything, but especially for the countless hours of babysitting, which enabled me to continue to focus and write even though I have young children. Your love and support have been more important than I can translate into words.

Finally, Pär, without your optimism and encouragement, I would never have had the idea to apply to the PhD program. Thank you for being my life partner and for always thinking too highly of me. I am incredible grateful that we are going through this circus of combining family life and our diverse careers together. Rakel and Cleo, thank you for making the dissertation work so much harder, but life so much better. I love you more than I can ever explain.

Contents

Introductory Chapter.....	15
Introduction	15
Theoretical points of departure and contributions.....	19
What is post-war statebuilding?.....	19
Efficiency, capacity, and technocracy	21
Local legitimacy and representativeness	27
Diaspora returnees as bearers of particular norms and practices ...	37
Studying perceptions of diaspora recruitments in post-war settings ..	42
A multi-methods design to develop and test theory	42
Case selection and context.....	44
Research design, method, and findings in essay I: Elite Interviews and Perceptions of Returnees in Somaliland.....	57
Research design, method, and findings in essay II: Elite experiences and perceptions in Liberia.....	65
Research design, method, and findings in essay III: Survey experiment with the general population in Liberia	68
Fieldwork: ethical issues and positionality	74
Conclusions	81
Capacity	84
Norms and practices	85
Representativeness.....	87
References	94
Appendix	108

Abbreviations

LECBS	<i>Liberia Emergency Capacity Building Support Project</i>
LGP	<i>Local Governance Programme</i>
LURD	<i>Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy</i>
MIDA	<i>Migration for Development in Africa</i>
MODEL	<i>Movement for Democracy in Liberia</i>
RQN	<i>Return of Qualified Nationals Programme</i>
SES	<i>Senior Executive Service</i>
SNM	<i>Somali National Movement</i>
TOKTEN	<i>Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals</i>
TRQN	<i>Temporary Return of Qualified Nationals Programme</i>
UN	<i>United Nations</i>
UNDP	<i>United Nations Development Programme</i>
UNMIL	<i>United Nations Mission in Liberia</i>

Introductory Chapter

Introduction

Moreover, we call upon our colleagues of all political persuasions now in the Diaspora to return home and join us in meeting this exciting challenge of national renewal. [. . .] I re-echo my appeal to all of you to please come home!! Please make the sacrifice, for your country needs you and needs you now!!!

- Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Inaugural Address.¹

Only by being a diaspora, you know about the world outside [. . .] You have seen England and want to bring it here. You have seen like how MPs campaign and how the house debates issues! And we have to show them what we know!

- Member of Somaliland Parliament, Hargeisa (Interview 1 2015).

Many post-war cabinets and parliaments are dominated by diaspora returnees. Long internal wars often lead to collapse of education systems and many qualified citizens seeking refuge and opportunities in other countries. As a result, post-war countries often lack the human resources and capacities to deal with societal challenges (Turner 2008; Reilly 2017). To (re)build state institutions, lay the foundation for democratic governance, and (re)form the social contract between states and citizens (Addison and Mansoob 2001), governments need to engage highly skilled individuals who are knowledgeable about the domestic circumstances in post-war governments (Chesterman, Ignatieff and Thakur 2004). As many of the most educated and experienced nationals are located abroad, newly-formed post-war governments often recruit from the diaspora. It may serve as a straight-forward solution to turn to the diaspora for such recruitments. But are *diaspora governments* seen as legitimate?

International agencies, foreign and national governments, as well as diaspora groups themselves often portray the diaspora as a vital part of the

¹ For full inaugural address see Carrie Chapman Catt Center (2017).

post-war resource pool. As noted in the introductory quotations, post-war governments often call for the returning diaspora to share what they have learned abroad.

Within peacebuilding and statebuilding research it is claimed that the poor record of many peacebuilding and statebuilding operations largely stems from a lack of local ownership, translating into a lack of local² legitimacy of these processes (e.g., Pietz 2007; Donais 2009; Richmond 2012). At the same time, international donors generally promote liberal democratic ideals and require that (re)constructed state institutions live up to Western³ standards of government (Moe 2011). Therefore, from the perspective of international agencies, recruits from the diaspora seem to be ‘ideal interlocutors in reconstruction activities; they speak both “Western” and local languages, and understand both “Western” and local approaches to getting things done’ (Hughes 2011, p. 1506). The return of a well-qualified diaspora can fill gaps in the civil service ‘with greater legitimacy’ than foreign technocrats (Chesterman, Ignatieff and Thakur 2004). That is, the diaspora returnees are assumed, being lauded with the legitimacy of the domestic actors as well as with the qualifications and Western understanding of the internationals (Hughes 2011).

These assumptions are illustrated by cases where invading powers and other international agencies place or support actors from the diaspora in top positions in interim governments, such as in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Liberia. Similarly, international donors have launched a wide range of capacity building return programs to mobilize skilled individuals in the diaspora for the benefit of homeland development.⁴ These include programs to recruit people from the diaspora to fill top positions in the government.⁵

Although diaspora returnees dominate governments and parliaments in many highly sensitive political settings, we know very little about how these returnees are perceived domestically. Specifically, it remains unclear

² Terms such as “local” or “international” are both highly imprecise terms. As I will show later on especially the meaning of “local” is contested both theoretically and empirically. I have still chosen to use them since they are standard terms in the literature I am speaking to and there is a lack of other suitable terms which can capture the phenomenon of interest. I will discuss this more in depth further on in the thesis.

³ Also the term “Western” has been rightfully criticized (see e.g. Apphia 2016). It is however also commonly used in scholarly and policy literature. Equally important it is empirically referred to by respondents in the cases included in this thesis.

⁴ Launched in the 1970s, Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals (TOKTEN) by the UNDP and the IOM Return of Qualified Nationals (RQN) are two such programs. Two other iconic programs are Migration for Development in Africa (MIDA) and Temporary Return of Qualified Nationals (TRQN), established by the IOM in the early 2000s.

⁵ Such as The Liberia Emergency Capacity Building Support (LECBS) project funded by UNDP, the Open Society Initiative and the Government of Liberia.

whether the domestic population views these returnees as competent and legitimate civil servants. A few scholars have problematized the idea that diaspora returnees, both in general and as participants in capacity return programs, will automatically be perceived as part of the national community (e.g., Brinkerhoff 2008; Hughes 2011; Sánchez Villa 2011; Baser 2018; Nyamnjoh 2018). Chesterman, Ignatieff and Thakur 2004 has warned that the local legitimacy of diaspora returnees is ‘not unlimited [...] and the emergence of the diaspora as a new political elite may itself give rise to new political tensions’ (2004, p. 370). Yet, few scholars have empirically investigated if and how these tensions are manifested.

Despite calls for an increased focus on comparing the experience of “stayees”⁶ with those of diaspora returnees (Délano and Gamlen 2014), few studies have examined how stayees view returnees placed in elite political positions such as in the cabinet and the parliament. Nonetheless, political elites play a vital role in these contexts. Often in co-operation with international actors elites are generally in charge sustaining peace, managing resources and external relations, implementing statebuilding initiatives in new political institutions, and guiding the move from war to a supposedly non-violent, democratic society (Hensell and Gerdes 2012).

The scant attention in the scholarly literature of how diaspora returnees in these positions are perceived is surprising since it revolves around subjects close to the heart of political science, such as: who should be considered part of the demos, how elite contestation over political power is conducted, who has the right to represent and govern the national population post war, and how new or rebuilt political institutions gain legitimacy. As returnee ministers and Members of Parliaments (MPs) are appointed to the most powerful positions in key political institutions in places where peace is often fragile and identities are highly politicized, their presence might either reinforce or harm state stability. Hence, more knowledge about how diaspora ministers are perceived is needed.

To this end, the overarching aim of this thesis is to contribute to further knowledge about – and problematize expectations on – returnees from the diaspora in post-war governments. To address this aim, this thesis investigates the following research question: How do the local elites and the wider population perceive returnees in post-war governments and what shapes these returnees’ legitimacy?

⁶ Here “stayees” refers to those who have stayed in the country of origin and therefore are not considered part of the diaspora residing in the Global North. However, as with the term “local”, this term is a simplification of a far more complex reality. In Africa, for instance, movement across borders is essential to many people’s income (Bjarnesen 2013) and in many cases “stayees” have moved internally or have been staying in neighboring countries.

In this thesis, I am studying a certain group of political elites and how they are understood from the perspective of other elites and the wider population. I study the issue of returnees in two branches of the government – cabinets and parliaments – in two contrasting cases, Somaliland and Liberia. These are both small post-war states that have experienced disproportionate influence of diaspora returnees in politics. These cases will be further presented and discussed in the section ‘Case selection and context’.

In addition to this introduction, this thesis is comprised of three essays. The first essay examines the extent to which returnee MPs and cabinet ministers are perceived as legitimate in Somaliland from the perspective of the local elite. The second essay investigates how local Liberian elites’ perceptions of returnee ministers correspond to or deviate from the expectations held in international and national policy circles. The third essay analyses how a large presence of diaspora returnees in post-war cabinets affects the way the local population perceives the legitimacy of the cabinet.

This thesis makes several unique empirical and theoretical contributions. It provides rich novel empirical data stemming both from elite interviews and a survey in an area of research, as well as a geographical area, where available empirical data about political elites are scarce. This thesis also offers methodological insights from data collection and gives examples of opportunities and challenges associated with both elite interviews and survey experiments in Somaliland and Liberia. Moreover, by combining an inductive and deductive approach, I develop and test new theoretical insights and hypotheses within a research and policy area with limited previous theorizing – i.e., diaspora returnees in post-war cabinets and parliaments. This will be further elaborated on below.

The rest of this introduction is divided into four parts. The next section describes how this thesis is positioned in relation to related research fields such as research about statebuilding, return migration, and diaspora studies and literature about cabinets and representation. In addition, I will explain in which ways the thesis contributes to the knowledge within these fields and present the theoretical departure points for this thesis. In the second part, I present my research design, methods, and findings in the three essays. I discuss the cases and how my cases were selected, Somaliland’s and Liberia’s conflict history and role of their diasporas, as well as the methodological lessons from the studies. In the third part I discuss ethics and reflexivity connected to my studies. In the fourth and final part, I discuss my conclusions and how they relate to each other. I then provide

my take on how we should understand local perceptions of diaspora returnees in post-war governments. Finally, I identify limitations of this study as well as prospects for future work within this area.

Theoretical points of departure and contributions

What is post-war statebuilding?

This thesis mainly positions itself within the literature of international statebuilding. This is an extensive field of research focusing on contemporary statebuilding efforts after civil war, and definitions and lessons from this literature are applicable to this study.

Opinions vary regarding what the core functions of a state consist of as well as how statebuilding should be defined. However, there is general agreement that the following areas are essential functions of the state and therefore included in statebuilding, the provision of security, the rule of law (police and justice system), delivery of basic services (such as health care and emergency relief), capability to develop and implement budget plans (e.g., Paris and Sisk 2009), functioning foreign relations, tax collection and mechanism for managing international aid (e.g., Balthasar 2012, p. 229), management of public finances, definition of citizenship and duties (Ghani et al. 2006), and coordinating collective efforts such as infrastructure development (e.g., Chandler and Sisk 2013). From these different elements, this thesis views statebuilding as a process following intra-state war in order to create or recover ‘the authoritative, legitimate, and capable governance institutions that can provide for security and the necessary rule-of-law conditions for economic and social development’ (Sisk 2013, p. 1).

Although this thesis has its departure within the statebuilding field, one key assumption is that statebuilding and peacebuilding are closely intertwined: to create legitimate state institutions is often a core aspect of peacebuilding (King and Matthews 2012, p. 277; Mac Ginty 2014). Although often connected, these two concepts should not be seen as synonymous. Moreover, they can often be conflicting. For example, support for the creation of new institutions or a new political system can undermine stability and peace in societies polarized after civil wars.

Widely divergent definitions of peacebuilding exist and its meaning is contested by people, organizations, and scholars. Some use it broadly to refer to peacekeeping, peacemaking, and conflict prevention (Wood 2003) or as ‘efforts to implement and consolidate peace agreements’ (Jarstad, 2008, p. 17).

Boutros Boutros-Ghali's widely-cited *Agenda for Peace* views peacebuilding as 'action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict' (1992, para. 21). Many definitions and practices of peacebuilding missions address intrastate wars and engage in political, social, and institutional transformation to enable sustainable peace (Bertram 1995, p. 388), a view of peacebuilding I use in this thesis. Despite being separate concepts and sometimes conflicting phenomena, a key assumption in this thesis is that statebuilding cannot be successful in the long run if peace is not maintained. Thus, efforts to enhance statebuilding from a short time horizon not only endangers the sustainability of peace but also risks the sustainability of the statebuilding process in the long run.

As with the conflict between peacebuilding and statebuilding, the interplay of democratization and peacebuilding often create problems (Jarstad and Sisk 2008). For example, efforts to increase democracy may in many cases undermine peace and vice versa, an outcome that can also be true for statebuilding and democratization. Although international statebuilding efforts generally have included democratizations, these concepts are not synonyms. Statebuilding per se does not require the creation of a western-styled democracy or neoliberal markets (Paris and Sisk 2009). Thus, another essential conceptual distinction is that statebuilding should be separated from democratization.

Another concept closely related to statebuilding and peacebuilding is nationbuilding. Nationbuilding is often used interchangeably with statebuilding, particularly within policy circles and American statebuilding scholarship (e.g., Watson 2004). Although closely connected, these concepts can be seen as two potentially conflicting processes:

[S]tatebuilding focus[es] primarily on public institutions – the machinery of the state, from courts and legislature to laws and bureaucrats – whereas nation-building refers to the strengthening of a national population's collective identity, including its sense of national distinctiveness and unity. (Paris and Sisk, 2009, pp. 14–15)

Importantly, the distinction between these concepts shows that the different goals international and national actors generally hold as important in post-war contexts often are conflicting. Here, I argue that the role of diaspora returnees in governments connects to the trade-offs between different objectives of peacebuilding, statebuilding, democratization, and nationbuilding.

Efficiency, capacity, and technocracy

As expressed above, (re)building efficient state institutions lies at the very core of statebuilding and is often viewed as a solution to many of the problems facing post-war communities:

International actors regard an efficient and capable state as a bulwark against conflict recidivism, as a clearing house for competing demands among citizens, as a provider of social goods and as an organ able to administer the economic and diplomatic responsibilities of statehood on the international stage. According to this logic, if the state is ‘perfected’ then conflict will be unlikely [...]. (Mac Ginty 2012, p. 290).

However, capable and efficient state institutions require qualified officials in top positions, a prerequisite that is often lacking in post-war contexts. Many low income countries have a high outflow of qualified individuals irrespective of societal unrest; moreover, migration of skilled workers often increases during civil war (e.g., Bang and Mitra 2010; Reilly 2017) as elites generally have the resources to leave. Often, elites remaining after war lack necessary qualifications to efficiently lead a statebuilding process or act as top technocrats in the government. For example, in 2004 there were only 30–40 lawyers in all of Southern Sudan (Turner 2008).

As explained above, the diaspora is often viewed as the solution to such brain drains (e.g., Bekele 2017). Therefore, the role of the diaspora in today’s statebuilding discourse is closely connected to their potential capacity and therefore their ability to create and provide efficient and capable government institutions. Many from the diaspora return and engage in homeland government institutions without assistance from international agencies or foreign governments (Rock 2017), yet many qualified diaspora returnees are affiliated to a donor capacity program. There are many such return programs that focus on a wide range of sectors but with the common aim to transfer diaspora knowledge to homeland institutions and actors (Shindo 2012; Mueller 2019).⁷

To the best of my knowledge, there are no empirical studies on returnee cabinet ministers or MPs per se. Although the majority of capacity return programs does not focus on recruitment of absolute top officials, such as cabinet ministers, some insights from these programs relate to the subject of this thesis. Therefore, examples from policy evaluations as well as aca-

⁷ Early on, the RQN programs were generally seen as permanent. This has changed in recent years. Today, MIDA, RQN, TOKTEN, and TRQN are generally seen as facilitating temporary results (Shindo 2012; IOM 2019).

ademic works focusing on different return capacity programs to government institutions are useful to present here. This is especially the case since they demonstrate different opportunities and pitfalls connected to recruitment from the diaspora to capacity building initiatives and because these programs give examples of different expectations around the added value of being from the diaspora, which I believe must be further problematized.

For example, in a study of the USAID-funded Local Governance Programme (LGP) in Iraq, Brinkerhoff and Tadesse give positive reports of diaspora professionals' (DPIs) contributions to capacity building. According to the authors, these individuals provide technical expertise, as well as knowledge about the local culture, language, and context, and were imperative to the rapid launch of different parts of the project. Importantly, Brinkerhoff and Tadesse also report some friction between these diaspora professionals and Iraqis who had not left during the war. Thus, they recognize that employing diasporas might lead to social divisions, which are difficult for international agencies to predict (2008, pp. 84-85).

However, Brinkerhoff and Tadesse's main conclusion addresses the positive contribution of diaspora returnees. They also point out that employment of diaspora professionals carry some additional benefits compared to working only with locals. The authors, for example, claim that diasporas bring with them certain democratic values from their adopted country that are 'an asset to the kinds of democratizing reforms that accompany postconflict reconstruction' (ibid, pp. 85-86). Similarly, they argue that diaspora professionals can translate the local context to project management:

In post-conflict situations, external interveners often have limited local knowledge and become dependent upon individuals who speak Western European language and are familiar with donor procedures and needs. While many of these individuals are well meaning and are sincerely interested in assisting in reconstruction, others seek to influence reconstruction efforts to advance their own interests. For the LGP the DIPs helped program decision makers to interpret what they were told by Iraqi counterparts and identify hidden and/or conflicting agendas. (Brinkerhoff and Tadesse 2008, p. 85)

Interestingly, this argument suggests that diaspora professionals are neutral compared to Iraqi counterparts and therefore can give international staff the true picture. At the same time, they also highlight that these individuals have personal networks and contacts in Iraq that should indicate that diaspora professionals as well might have their own interest in affecting the process in one way or another. While recognizing the value of having people who can explain local relationships and events to international

agencies, I believe it is questionable to which extent diaspora professionals (or any other actor) should be considered neutral or non-political in this sense.

Hughes has also discussed the participation of diaspora returnees in capacity-building by providing an analysis of return capacity programs in Cambodia and Timor-Leste. By comparing the experiences of these programs, Hughes suggests that international knowledge has implicitly been prioritized above local knowledge (2011, p. 1514) and claims that these programs 'have a political significance which is noted and contested locally' (ibid, p. 1493). Thus, in these cases different domestic actors do not seem to view recruitments of diaspora returnees as unbiased and unproblematic.

Hughes, however, does not provide a systematic study of how these are contested locally and discussions of methods and materials are relatively scarce. Her analysis is based on a historic overview, a few quotations from speeches and news interviews, and a few references to interviews conducted by the author herself. It offers interesting theoretical arguments about how capacity return programs can 'represent attempts to smuggle "Western" hierarchies of knowledge into post-conflict reconstruction efforts' (2011, p. 1493). Yet, it gives only limited new empirical knowledge about capacity transfer or how stayees view returnees.

Evaluations from other programs provide mixed evidence of diaspora returnees' contributions to capacity building. In a policy report of the result of the Temporary Return of Qualified Nationals' (TRQN) project in Afghanistan, Kuschminder concludes that the program successfully transferred knowledge and capacity building. Her interviews with both participants and colleagues indicate that the TRQN project was highly appreciated by 'participants, host institutions, and colleagues' (2011, p. 22). Thus, the program is generally described in positive terms.

Contrary to findings by Kuschminder as well as Brinkerhoff and Tadesse, other studies have shown that the transformative power of the returnees has been limited. Many participants in return programs report that they met several obstacles when trying to influence governmental and administrative processes. Returnees, for example, often report that they had difficulties dealing with the administrative culture in the new environment and therefore could not work effectively in the positions in their countries of origin. An evaluation of The Afghanistan Expatriate Program (AEP) and the Palestinian Expatriate Professional Project (PEPP) showed that these programs had problems 'translating individual inputs into institutional capacity building' (World Bank 2006, p. 1).

Evaluations of this kind most often take the perspective of diaspora returnees and it is interpreted through the lens of international agencies' objectives. However, there are a few exceptions (besides Hughes) where more attention has been paid to the experiences of local counterparts. For example, some stayees in a study in Liberia believed returnees had agendas or political motives that were not in the best interest of the country. However, stayees often viewed international personnel as neutral, so their engagement in the project was seen as less problematic (De Carvalho and Nagelhus Schia 2011, p. 20).

Sánchez Villa discusses returnees in statebuilding more broadly and gives examples from evaluations of return capacity programs as evidence that the belief that Western ideas and capacity can be transferred on the basis of ethnic bonds is faulty. For instance, she claims that skilled returnees generally are hindered to enable long-term capacity building since they lack links 'based on lived experiences on the ground as well as a deep understanding of local dynamics and needs' (2011, p. 36). Overall, she points out that aspects other than only formal qualifications are needed to enable transfer of capacity, that international agencies often have overseen other forms of knowledge, and that identities and belonging are important in these contexts. However, her analysis builds solely on secondary sources without using any new empirical data.

While their empirical contributions are somewhat limited, both Hughes and Sánchez Villa problematize the recruitment from the diaspora to the public service in post-war contexts. Although recognizing the necessity of having qualified individuals in top positions in order for states to function efficiently and statebuilding to be sustainable, I argue that notions of capacity and qualifications are politically loaded. I agree with Hughes and Sánchez Villa that common ideas within policy circles, and even among scholars, of what constitutes useful background knowledge often are based on a narrow understanding of the contexts diaspora returnees are supposed to work in and stems from a Western understanding of suitable qualifications. By framing capacity or qualifications in meritocratic terms, international agencies and others involved may attempt to de-politicize statebuilding.

Others have pointed out that a 'technocratic turn' has taken place within the peacebuilding field (Mac Ginty 2014), and technocracy is today a central element in peacebuilding and statebuilding interventions.⁸ Having the

⁸ Technocracy in this context refers to "the systems and behaviours that prioritize bureaucratic rationality. In an ideal type, it is directed from above, pursues the imposition of a single policy paradigm and is immune to social context" (MacGinty 2014, p. 289).

right technocratic system in place is commonly seen as the solution to political disorder (Jackson 2014, pp. 82-83). International agencies and governments from the Global North claiming to strive for liberal democracy have accordingly been criticized for favouring technocrats ‘without a political base’ to actors who are viewed as politicians with ‘a popular constituency’ (Nzongola-Ntalaja 2006, p. 83). In contrast to politics, which is viewed to be corrupt and ineffective, technocracy is assumed to provide a de-politicized, non-biased, and value-free mechanism to make decisions (Centeno 1993, pp. 311-312; Mac Ginty 2014, p. 291).

However, wars, states, and politics are connected. Like Mac Ginty, I do not criticize technocracy as such: a technocratic approach can undoubtedly provide results and, in its ideal form, fairness. However, Mac Ginty aptly critiques the assumption that technocracy, as it is adopted in contemporary peacebuilding and statebuilding, is inherently neutral and efficient. In fact, this technocratic turn largely defines the design of post-war processes and actors (2014, p. 288). These are undoubtedly political processes as it is a question of what policies should be enacted and who has a say over them.

Experts are seldom neutral as they typically represent ‘special interest groups whose perspectives and self-interests render them non-representative of the demos as a whole’ (Shapiro 2005, p. 343). Technocratic elites depend on a system that supports and protects their positions often created by international peacebuilding and statebuilding programs (Mac Ginty 2014). Technocratic approaches also often build on a Western rationale as pointed (Hughes 2011) and potential local alternatives are seen as invalid (Mac Ginty 2014, p. 292; Donais 2009, p. 8). As technocracy often stands in contrast to participation, in its most extreme form ‘participation is sacrificed to efficiency’ so technocratic systems can be both ‘intolerant’ and ‘exclusive’ (Mac Ginty 2014, p. 292).

Although Mac Ginty does not connect this technocratic turn specifically to recruitment from the diaspora, I view this discussion as highly relevant for this thesis since diasporas to a higher degree than stayees commonly are deemed as suitable technocrats in post-war environments. As discussed above, this is partly because many individuals with necessary qualifications often leave during wars. As I show in my essays and as will be discussed further below, returnee cabinet ministers are often recruited because they are deemed the most competent technocrats. However, this is also connected to the argument raised by Hughes that Western knowledge has higher status than other forms of knowledge, such as about the domestic context. This is not only true in connection to capacity return programmes, but this is also something many domestic leaders are aware of. Since aid and loans are fundamental to many post-war economies,

many heads of states likely consider the objectives of international agencies when recruiting returnees to their governments. This approach leaves important questions about what kind of knowledge these individuals bring with them, to which degree they exclude other groups from political power, and to which extent they are fit to represent the domestic population.

I believe that different aspects of statebuilding play an important role in nationbuilding. For example, I argue that top public officials, such as cabinet ministers, have a high symbolic value and both represent the population and the state at the international level. Thus the appointment of cabinet ministers and how they are perceived cannot be completely detached from nationbuilding. In this sense, I argue that statebuilding and nationbuilding also may create a dilemma: statebuilding generally requires qualified technocrats to be successful, at the same time, individuals holding the necessary qualifications are often foreigners or diaspora returnees, people who might not always function as national symbols. Thus, one important departure point is a claim brought forward by Hughes. That is, programs that help qualified expatriates return are far from only of technical as suggested by many policy makers as both programs and recruitment to top positions outside of such programs are inherently political.

This thesis builds on important arguments brought forward by, for example, Hughes and Sánchez Villa, but it takes this discussion further by studying these issues empirically with novel data. In contrast to these previous studies presented above, which discuss diaspora more broadly, this thesis takes a more narrow focus on returnees in the cabinet and parliament. Many aspects in terms of how diaspora returnees in these positions are perceived are likely to be similar to those in lower public service positions. However, due to the political importance of cabinet and parliament positions, many aspects are also likely to be heightened or relevant only to returnees taking on these positions. Furthermore, because these are more important political positions, they are also worthy of attention in themselves. Since some capacity return programs focus on recruitment to the cabinet, such as the LECBS in Liberia, a greater focus on how returnees in these positions are perceived is relevant also to those interested in understanding the consequences of donor-funded capacity return programs. Moreover, many evaluations focus mostly on the experience of the participants themselves. Limited focus is devoted to colleagues of diaspora returnees, and these evaluations do not investigate how returnees in these programs are perceived by the wider population. This thesis aims to shed new light on these broad aspects.

Local legitimacy and representativeness

The research field of international statebuilding is massive. A large extent of this body of research tries to explain why the most prevalent Western, liberal peace, and state building frameworks (Moe 2011) have failed to produce legitimate state institutions, sustainable peace, and economic and social development (e.g., Chandler 2006; Jahn 2007; Mac Ginty and Richmond 2007; Mac Ginty 2008; Moe 2011; Richmond 2013).

As pointed out earlier, among a myriad of suggested explanations, the lack of local ownership of these processes stands out. Thus, the importance of ownership by domestic actors for the capacity and stability of the state has been emphasized in a large part of the more influential statebuilding literature (e.g., Lake 2007; Kaplan 2008; Sending 2009; Chandler 2011; Richmond 2012; Clements 2014). Local ownership in this context refers to the extent to which domestic actors are in control over the design and implementation of political processes and is fundamental to the legitimacy and sustainability of post-war reconstruction (Donais 2009, p. 3). In this sense, local ownership can be defined as

the process and final outcome of the gradual transfer to legitimate representatives of the local society, of assessment, planning and decision-making functions, the practical management and implementation of these functions, and the evaluation and control of all phases of statebuilding programs, with the aim of making external peace and statebuilding assistance redundant (Narten 2009, p. 254).

International interveners and researchers now often recognize that no matter how well-designed a statebuilding effort is it will not succeed if the domestic population does not recognize it as legitimate (Talentino 2007 p. 153). That is, it has been claimed that ‘the complex relationship between insiders and outsiders’ is a fundamental part of post-war reconstruction efforts (Donais 2009, p. 3). A connected problem is that there generally are

considerable tensions between international fixed standards of state legitimacy and ‘good governance’, on the one hand, and local experiences and perceptions of what constitutes efficient and legitimate governance on the other hand (Moe 2011, p. 142).

Hence, legitimacy is a multifaceted concept. Similarly, who is considered to be local often depends on who is asked. Therefore, transferring political power to legitimate local representatives is considerably more complex than international agencies and scholars often assume.

Legitimacy is arguably one of the most contested concepts within political science: '[legitimacy] is not merely an important topic, but the central issue in social and political theory' (Beetham 1991, p. 41). Opinions collide in terms of whether legitimacy is a useful concept, how it should be defined, and if or how it should be measured empirically (e.g., Huntington 1991, p. 46; Gilley 2006; Weatherford 1992). A detailed examination of these discussions would require much more space than this thesis offers. Instead, I will provide a brief discussion of how legitimacy is conceptualized⁹, especially with reference to post-war contexts, before I present the definition of legitimacy guiding this thesis.

Political legitimacy most commonly refers to legitimacy of states or regimes. Although not indispensable for states or regimes, legitimacy provides great efficiency advantages (Hurd 1999, p. 388). Because states or regimes can seldom afford to attain order only on the basis of coercion, political stability must also refer to some normative ground (Hechter 2009, p. 280). Thus, political legitimacy is a prerequisite for political authority and it makes up the foundation for rule by non-coercive methods. Legitimacy details how power can be used in ways that those subjected to it wilfully accept (Gilley 2006, p. 499). Legitimacy has been pointed out as crucial to political order, stable peace, and development since it 'lies at the heart of all political discourse and determines much political competition in both developed and less developed societies' (Clements 2014, p. 13).

If those subject to it perceive the ruling power as illegitimate, it means that the state's authority is weakened. Therefore, legitimate governance is seen as key to avoid state fragility (OECD 2010, p. 15). In addition to being a sign of a lack of support in itself, states or regimes that lack legitimacy must allocate considerable resources to uphold compliance and have less means to devote to public goods, which will further reduce public support. Therefore, lack of legitimacy may increase the risk of a government being overthrown or state failure (Gilley 2006, p. 499).

Moreover, uncertainties about legitimacy within the ruling elite undercut confidence, and such uncertainties are likely to generate conflicts that can further reinforce a course of state collapse. Central to the Western notion of statehood is a clear separation between public and private spheres and that political competition takes place in a system with formal rules and

⁹ Max Weber's conceptualization of legitimacy is perhaps the most well-known within political science. Weber is often seen as laying the foundation for empirical legitimacy research by arguing that both the claims of rulers to be legitimate and the legitimacy beliefs of citizens are important to study. He also made a separation between three different ideal types of legitimacy: traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal legitimacy (Weber 1978). However, to understand the legitimacy of returnees from the diaspora in post-war, "non-Western" contexts, I consider other conceptualizations more useful.

impersonal relationships (OECD 2010, p. 7). However, in most post-war states, the public and private spheres are interwoven and personal ties are a central feature of state-society relations. In states where public and private spheres are blurred, some citizens may perceive that the morally right action is for patrons to provide client networks with different resources, such as jobs. Therefore, as emphasized by Moe (2011), perceptions in these settings of what constitute legitimate political authority often differ fundamentally from the understanding of the concept in formal, rule-based Western states (e.g., OECD 2010, p. 17; Robins 2013).

Rather, in these contexts, it is essential to gain legitimacy from different sources. Legitimacy can sometimes be connected to the identity and culture of rulers, and legitimacy enjoyed by, for example, traditional leaders, is of great relevance (Clements 2014, p. 14). In post-war contexts, rebel leaders or freedom fighters may claim and gain legitimacy due to their role in the conflict or crafting of the nation. Such aspects may overshadow other sources of legitimacy such as delivery of development. This does not mean that democratic and public interests are not important for legitimacy. The point is that to understand what is perceived as legitimate in different contexts, we cannot depart from a legal-formal model based on a state that has not experienced war in many decades.

Paris and Sisk claim that 'legitimate government institutions in war-torn countries rely on a limited foundation of knowledge' (2009), a situation that remains true today even though a lot of work has been conducted since Paris and Sisk's study. Nevertheless, several scholars have developed frameworks to understand the origins of legitimacy in states that do not conform to the Weberian legal-formal ideal (e.g., Berg 2013; Boege 2014; Pegg and Kolstö 2014).

A division is often made between input-oriented and output-oriented legitimacy (Scharpf 1999, ch 1). Input legitimacy generally refers to participation in democratic processes, whereas output legitimacy refers to effectiveness and accountability of political actors or institutions (Hurrelman, Schneider and Steffek 2007, p. 4). Berg has used the input-oriented and output-oriented separation, but in *de facto* states. Here, Berg suggests that input-oriented legitimacy is based on a sense of identity and community rather than procedures, and output-oriented legitimacy is based on the state's or government's capacity to solve problems. What this output oriented legitimacy means is often very different in war-torn unrecognized countries compared to recognized states in the Global North (2013). Others have also pointed out the relevance of processes or procedures believed to constitute the right to govern. However, these do not necessarily correspond to liberal democratic processes (Boege, 2014, p. 238).

Some scholars have divided legitimacy into domestic (e.g., Khan 2009) and international (or external) legitimacy (e.g., Holsti 1996; OECD 2010; Pegg and Kolstö 2014). This literature refers to a division between the legitimacy beliefs of domestic subjects, such as the domestic population, and international actors, such as foreign governments or international agencies. In this literature, domestic legitimacy is similar to local legitimacy, which is a central concept within peacebuilding and statebuilding literature. This literature presents local legitimacy as closely related to local ownership of the peacebuilding and statebuilding process. It is argued that local ownership is fundamental to legitimizing these processes, the new government, as well as international actors in post-war settings.

The majority of the work focusing on legitimacy in post-war situations discusses the legitimacy of the state but not the legitimacy of institutions, individual actors, or groups within the government. Some scholars have argued that ‘citizens in democratic countries make a clear separation between their views of the state and their views of politicians, parties and governments’ (e.g., Muller et al. 1982; Lillbacka 1999 p. 203, quoted in Gilley 2006, p. 591). Thus, the legitimacy of the state itself, certain regimes, and certain actors might differ.

However, in other contexts such as in authoritarian, unstable, and post-war states, this separation is less clear. In some places, it may be difficult to distinguish the state from the regime. Often political power is not assigned to state institutions but vested in elites running the state (Mulbah 2016). In post-war contexts, especially when extensive statebuilding is taking place, rulers and their cabinets are largely in charge of the development and direction of the state. If the state as well as the regime is new, people may have very few or bad previous experiences with the state. In these cases, the government’s legitimacy may largely be based on the population’s perception of the state.

With reference to the connection between legitimacy of individuals and institutions, studies from the Global North have demonstrated that the identity of members of a decision-making institution can influence the legitimacy of that institution (e.g., Tate 2003; Scherer and Curry 2010; Banducci, Todd Donovan, and Karp 2004; Arnesen and Peters 2017; Clayton, O’Brien and Piscopo 2018). I believe this is likely to be true to a higher extent in post-war and neo-patrimonial contexts, where identities often are even more politicized.

Based on this discussion, successful and sustainable statebuilding require that a large share of citizens and elites accept the state and its institutions as legitimate. Moreover, I suggest that an important aspect is that individuals occupying positions at the highest level of the state, such as

the cabinet, are accepted and perceived as legitimate by both citizens and other elites. Thus, one assumption in this thesis is that cabinet and government legitimacy is connected to state legitimacy in these contexts to a higher degree than what is the case in many states in the Global North. This is also likely to be true with reference to “external” actors – i.e., international agencies, foreign governments, and multilateral cooperation’s deem the state and its representatives as legitimate. Thus, how state representatives are perceived by external actors is likely to influence how legitimate these external actors perceive the regime and by extension the state.

Importantly, the people who view the state, regime, or cabinet as legitimate should be disaggregated (Stel and Ndayiragije 2014). Elites, non-elites, people from different ethnic groups, or geographical groups may have different ideas of what constitute a legitimate institution (or political actor). In many post-war settings, a small group of influential elites generally view the sitting regime as highly legitimate (OECD 2010). This view is often connected to their own interests since their personal wealth is closely connected to the present political system. At the same time, this reveals very little about whether the wider population views the regime as legitimate (OECD 2010, p. 32). Thus, to understand the legitimacy of a regime, institution, or actor, it is important to include both the perspectives of other elites and that of the population at large and disaggregate what voices are heard. This is what I am trying to do in this thesis.

Clearly, no state or regime acquires legitimacy from a single source. If people have a great distrust towards the government due to previous violent actions, providing security will not by itself provide legitimacy (OECD 2010, p. 9). To understand the sources of legitimacy in post-war states, we must examine what actors believe to be legitimate governance in these contexts (Robins 2013).

Therefore, in this thesis, rather than adopting a universal or norm-based approach to legitimacy, I focus on perceptions of legitimacy. I have used an iterative process between data and theory throughout the work to understand how legitimacy should be understood in these contexts. In essay I, I used an emic approach to investigate legitimacy. Thus, I focused on ‘the belief of people in certain actors’ right to govern, to build peace, [and] to take and implement political decisions’ (Boege 2014, p. 239). In essay II, I do not address the concept of legitimacy per se, but I focus on elite perceptions of returnees and how they are framed. In essay III, I examine several of these factors with respect to cabinet legitimacy. Thus, in essay III, to carry out the survey experiment, I employed a deductive approach to legitimacy based on what I learned from the previous two essays in

combination with insights from existing theories related to government legitimacy. I return to how legitimacy is operationalized in essay III in connection to the discussion of method and research design, but this is also presented in the essay itself.

This thesis contributes to and makes use of many insights from the research field of statebuilding. However, the general statebuilding literature does not discuss diaspora returnees as insiders or outsiders explicitly and only provides limited guidance about how these actors should be understood. Therefore, this thesis contributes with valuable insights to explain the position of diaspora returnees in cabinets and parliaments during statebuilding, the importance of institutions and processes grounded in the local community, and the connection to the legitimacy of the cabinet. In this way, this thesis contributes to a deeper understanding of key concepts within the research field of international statebuilding, such as local ownership and local legitimacy, and their related characteristics and prerequisites.

To connect the discussion of local ownership and legitimacy to the previous discussion of diaspora returnees in statebuilding, it has often been assumed that returnees are more capable of providing local ownership (and therefore more legitimacy in the eyes of domestic actors) than other international staff (Hughes 2011). However, as pointed out by Sánchez Villa (2011) and Nymanjoh (2008), it is unclear to which extent diaspora returnees can actually function as legitimate representatives of the domestic community.

The diaspora is a form of a transnational actor located between domestic and interstate politics (Turner 2008). Thus, with reference to the diaspora, it becomes highly germane to define what is meant by local (Nymanjoh 2018). In many post-war contexts, one's role in the struggle often trumps one's ethnic affiliation, and returnees can be accused of not understanding the meaning of 'local sacrifices' (Hughes 2007, p. 1507).

This critique of diaspora returnees as local representatives has received support by an emerging number of studies that have looked at the experiences of returnees and the relationship between returnees and stayees generally (e.g., Stefansson 2004; Gmelch 2004; Heggli Sagmo 2015). These studies have revealed the often complicated link between returnees and stayees. It has been demonstrated how returnees from the United States in the early twentieth century were often met with suspicion or jealousy in Europe (Wyman 1993). In Bosnia and Herzegovina, returning refugees are often seen as traitors who left the home county in a time of crisis and who failed to defend their home (Al-Ali 2004; Stefansson 2004). Similarly, returnees from the Czech diaspora experienced discrimination and hatred

upon their return to the Czech Republic after 1989 (Hron 2007, p. 48). Tensions also occurred between returnees and stayees in Guatemala, partly because returnees were seen as having escaped the hardships of the military regime (Taylor 1998).

The studies presented above focus on returnee migrants in general and not returnees taking on public positions; however, these studies found that returnees are not always welcomed back home. There has been a limited focus on the return of elites and returnees who serve in top public positions upon their return. Moreover, although several studies have looked at the returnee-stayee relationships, few have examined the experiences of stayees. Knowledge is also limited as to why some heads of states would encourage the return of elites or recruitment from the diaspora to public service as well as how this is received by elites or the general population.

With reference to the African context, common descriptions of African migration demonstrates a “receiving country bias”; moreover, research has generally ignored African states (Flahaux and De Haas 2016, p. 5). Thus, this thesis contributes to the knowledge within the research fields of diasporas returnees and return migration, which have mainly focused on non-elite returnees, by studying a specific group of elite returnees commonly framed as having qualifications essential to the development of the state.

Although far from ideal, this thesis uses different terms to describe the social reality – e.g., local, external, international, and domestic. Accordingly, especially the common use of the term local has been criticized. Scholars have criticized that donors often define local as ‘actors and institutions within the recipient country, often apparently conceived to be united in goals and purpose’ (Bendix and Stanely 2008, p. 24). Thus, to hold such a homogenizing perception of how the local community is constituted fails to recognize the diversity of local actors and their interests (Ebo 2007, p. 83). The notion of the local has also been problematized by a number of scholars (e.g., Hughes, Öjendal and Schierenbeck 2015; Mac Ginty 2015; Hameiri and Lee Jones 2017; Van Leeuwen et al. 2019) and its meaning is contested both theoretically and empirically. The meanings of concepts such as local or international are far more complex, often overlapping, than have been recognized both by donors and academics. Often there are no clear guidelines as to who would be considered local or foreign or international, but empirically this depends on who is asked. Diasporas further exemplify the blurriness of these concepts, since they ‘offer a challenge to the traditional ‘inside/outside’ conception of social life whereby socio-political activities are defined as either purely ‘domestic’ or purely ‘international’ (Al-Ali and Koser 2002).

I use these terms in this thesis because of a lack of more appropriate terms and the need to connect my arguments to the statebuilding literature as well as to how these are empirically used in the cases included. However, I agree that notions of locals and internationals must be problematized and are highly simplified, and sometimes faulty, ideas of social divisions. My thesis supports this critique by further demonstrating the blurriness and fluidity of social divisions. In this thesis, I also show how different actors might try to be framed as insiders or portray themselves or others as outsiders, depending on where it is most beneficial to be positioned. Thus, the idea of being an insider or local representative has a clear value in these contexts. As I will discuss in more depth below, elite actors may have many different incentives to enhance their own position and undermine that of other elites, and the insider/outsider division can be used as a tool to achieve this.

Elite relations after civil war are important for the sustainability of peacebuilding and statebuilding processes. Elite exclusion or inclusion is closely connected to state legitimacy (Call 2012). Many states recovering from intrastate war have fragile domestic political structures and state institutions (Hensell and Gerdes 2012, p. 155). Who is part of the elite in these contexts is highly sensitive since changes in power balances between elites often are both the cause and consequence of civil war (ibid). A large share of intrastate wars revolve around grievance and government power and therefore who should be in charge of state resources (Call 2012). Referring to Pierre Bourdieu, Hensell and Gerdes argue that post-war contexts often consist of ‘an open social space’, providing opportunities for new elites to form, former elites to lose power, or existing elites to further enhance their position (2012, p. 155).

Political elites losing power in a post-war context have a lot to lose on a personal level. Often, it can be difficult for former political elites to find well-paid employment as they are regularly banned by new political elites. If former elites used their previous political power for nepotism, it may mean that not only they themselves are losing important income from the state, but also that many of their family members or friends find themselves in the same situation.

In addition to economic loss, political elites excluded from government power may risk facing juridical consequences, such as being subject to war crime trials or being held accountable for mismanagement. In many cases, they may fear for their life if new political elites perceive them as a political threat to their newly gained power or due to the risk of retribution of former oppressed groups.

Call has demonstrated that political exclusion is one of the main causes of civil war recurrence. Thus, peacebuilding is likely to fail when the post-war political reality is exclusionary in terms of distribution of political power. Conversely, political inclusion, such as through access to state offices, is central to state legitimacy (Call 2012, p. 4).

In many post-war situations, for an individual to get a top position in the government or win a seat in the parliament or senate means that government resources can be re-distributed to this person's ethnic group or other networks (Arriola 2009). Extended networks of political elites also have great motivation to defend their elite position and react if they risk losing influence. Thus, elites have incentives to secure their political position, both from a personal perspective and to live up to pressures from the own ethnic group or other kind of networks. Therefore, if they are excluded from political power, they may take action or try to undermine elites in power or the political institutions themselves. The ultimate consequence may be a breakdown of peaceful elite relations and a mobilization of their networks, leading to the reoccurrence of violence (Call 2012).

Many heads of states have recognized that political exclusion of other groups might be harmful for sitting elites. In sub-Saharan Africa, it is common to use the cabinet to build coalitions. African political parties are generally not reliable mobilizers of popular support over time (Kuenzi and Lambright 2001; Mozaffar and Scarritt 2005). Therefore, in the African context, coalitions are built with ethnic patrons rather than political parties (Arriola and Johnson 2014, p. 496). Cabinet positions are frequently given to different ethnic patrons to meet 'redistributive demands of politicized ethnic groups' (Lemarchand 1972; Bayart 1993). In Africa, a cabinet minister is considered:

“a kind of superrepresentative” (Zolberg, 1969, p. 283) who is expected to speak for the interests of co-ethnics, as well as channel resources to them. Ministers not only have a hand in deciding where to allocate public resources, presumably in their home districts, but are also in positions to supplement their personal incomes by offering contracts and jobs in exchange for other favors (Arriola, 2009).

Thus, to manage elite relations (and elite's networks) is one of the main objectives of ministerial appointment by African chief executives. In this way, African leaders can co-opt so called “Big Men” – important political figures who have large patron-client networks and thereby can secure supporters and votes (Bratton and van de Walle 1997). To include people with different ethnic identities in the cabinet is a way for the chief executive to reach wide public support and keep oppressed elites from conspiring

against the ruling government (Arriola 2009). Historical evidence has shown that African leaders who have used patronage to include different ethnic groups in the cabinet have created more stable regimes (e.g., Bayart 1993). This shows that the inclusion of elites in government is important for much more than their potential qualifications – i.e., elites’ identities matter.¹⁰

Furthermore, I argue that the diaspora identity is of great relevance in many of these contexts, but it is a form of identity that has been underexplored. The diaspora identity generally overlaps with other forms of identities such as ethnicity, gender, regional heritage, or political affiliation. Yet, in many places, the diaspora might form a new type of upper class and might dominate the political sphere (Chesterman, Ignatieff and Thakur 2004). In this way, their diaspora identity separates them from stayees – even if stayees come from the same ethnic group – and becomes an identity of great political importance. This is likely to create resentment from domestic elites who are not from the diaspora since they might already be excluded from power or fear that they might be so in the future. Thus, antipathy towards diaspora returnees in top positions may be based on aspects relating to lack of legitimacy, such as juridical prohibition of dual citizenship, but it may also be connected to personal interests of other elites and their networks. If the diaspora position has been used as a basis to gain political power and to exclude stayees, this likely provides incentives to undermine the credibility of diaspora returnees based on the same premises.

One contribution worth emphasizing connected to this discussion is that the essays included in this thesis provide novel data about perceptions of cabinet ministers in Liberia and Somaliland. Research about cabinet ministers in the Global South is limited and especially so in sub-Saharan Africa. To the best of my knowledge, there is no comprehensive dataset of African cabinet ministers that includes biographic information, and generally very little information is available about ministers’ backgrounds, characteristics, and how different ministers are perceived either by other elites or the wider population.¹¹

¹⁰ In this thesis elites refers to ‘a small group of leaders [...] occupying formal or informal positions of authority and power in public and private organizations or sectors and who take or influence key economic, political, social and administrative decisions’ (Leftwich 2010, pp. 103-104).

¹¹ One example of minister data from a few countries is the *Conjonctures de l’Afrique centrale* from the Great Lakes of Africa Center offers biographical information such as political party, ethnicity, and region of origin for cabinet ministers in Rwanda and Burundi (See Ansoms 2018). Also, Arriola and Johnson (2013) provide a dataset of cabinet composition from 34 African countries including the number of female ministers in each cabinet, and a

The Afrobarometer, a pan-African non-partisan research network, uses surveys, for example, to determine how citizens view the chief executives, government systems, or government as a whole, but these surveys do not include specific questions about cabinet ministers (Afrobarometer 2019). The academic work that has been done on cabinet ministers in this region has mostly focused on the appointment of female ministers (e.g., Bauer and Okpotor 2013; Arriola and Johnson 2014; Adams et al. 2016) and the issues of clientelism, nepotism, and personal rule in African politics (e.g., Lemarchand 1972; Bayart 1993; Bratton and van de Walle 1997; van de Walle 2003; Diamond 2008; Arriola 2009; Gerdes 2012). In this sense, this thesis makes a substantial empirical contribution to existing knowledge about cabinet ministers in these contexts.

Diaspora returnees as bearers of particular norms and practices

Above, I presented some previous research (and theorizing) about diasporas engagement in statebuilding and provided a few examples of research about experiences of returnees. However, this thesis addresses the more general fields of diaspora research and return migration and definitions of key concepts such as diaspora and returnee are therefore needed.

When focusing on issues of diaspora returnees and their impact of countries of origin, the research fields of diaspora research and return migration are not always easy to separate. The research field of diasporas in general have a long history, originally focusing on the experience of dispersed Jews (Faist 2010, p. 12) and later on expanding to include Armenians, Palestinians, Kurds, Chinese, Koreans, Eritreans, Tamils, and Mexicans (Bercovitch 2007, p. 18). There is also a vast body of literature focusing on African diasporas (e.g., Bowles 2015; Garbin and Godin 2015; Pires 2015; Mangala 2017; Okpewho and Nzegwu 2009). Today, common research about diasporas include all sorts of groups ‘which ha[ve] originated in a land other than which [they] currently reside, and whose social, economic and political networks cross the borders of nation-states or, indeed, span the globe’ (Vertovec 1999, p. 1).¹²

recent global dataset of cabinet ministers by Nyrup and Bramwell (n.d.) includes information about gender, birthdate, and party affiliation. However, to the best of my knowledge, there are no available datasets covering information such as educational level, diaspora experience, working experience, conflict experience, or similar kinds of biographical information of relevance to this thesis.

¹² For a more extensive discussion of definitions of diaspora, see Sheffer 2003.

It lies beyond the scope of this thesis to try to capture this extensive research field. Most relevant for this thesis is that a large share of this literature has focused on the experiences of members of the diaspora and more limited focus is paid to the relationship between diasporas, countries of origin, and populations in the countries of origin. Yet, there is common agreement among scholars interested in diasporas that ‘homeland’ or ‘countries of origin’ has an essential role in the consciousness of diasporas (Cohen 1997) and that the notion of return is central for many members of diasporas (Safran 1991).

Peace and conflict scholars have more recently begun to recognize the importance of diasporas and returnees. It has become a popular term in policy circles and interest has particularly been turned towards the potential of diasporas or returnees as development actors and peacemakers (Pirkkalainen and Abdile 2009, p. 7). However, some researchers have emphasized diasporas’ negative impact on security, both in the host country and the country of origin. Diasporas have, for example, been described as ‘long-distant nationalists’ who are inescapably careless and unaccountable (e.g., Anderson 1993, p. 12). Furthermore, some have declared that it is ‘easier to hate from a distance’ (Ignatieff 2001) and that diasporas can be ‘regressive globalisers’ who use transnational spaces to support nationalism rather than cosmopolitanism (Kaldor, Anheier and Glasius 2003). Since diaspora members are not directly affected by the consequences of continued warfare, it has been suggested that they may hold a more extreme position than people more directly affected by the war (e.g., Demmers 2002; Lyons and Mandaville 2012, p. 18; Lyons 2012; Orjuela 2012). Moreover, diasporas dispersed by conflict, or ‘conflict generated diasporas’ (Lyons 2004, p. 6), have been pointed out as the least willing to compromise (Al-Ali 2007, p. 41; Lyons 2007; Lyons and Mandaville 2012).

The more recent “peacemakers or peacebreakers” discourse emphasizes that diasporas can contribute to both war and peace at different phases of the conflict or even at the same time (e.g., Lyons 2004; Koser 2007, p. 241; Smith and Stares 2007; Turner 2008; Lyons 2012). Some have demonstrated cases, such as Northern Ireland, where diasporas have transformed themselves from promoters of violent means to essential partners in peacebuilding (e.g., Cochrane 2012). Moreover, some have argued that diasporas can, and usually do, play a critical economic role in the post-war phase (Adamson 2002, p.156). It has also been suggested that since locals are more likely to listen to advice from diasporas than from unknown foreigners, diasporas can in this phase play an important socio-cultural role by promoting justice, truth, and reconciliation (Bercovitch 2007, p. 35).

Generally, this literature treats diasporas only as actors from a distance. Thus, it deals with how diasporas positioned in host countries affect countries of origin, but it does not deal with diaspora returnees taking on official positions or their direct engagement in statebuilding in these countries. Following from this is that peace and conflict scholars focusing on diasporas have generally not investigated how stayees view diaspora returnees. In this way, this thesis offers an important contribution.

The scholarly interest in the impact of migration on countries of origin is far from new and there is a significant amount of research focusing on the migration-development nexus (e.g., Demissie 2015; Mangala 2017). Thus, many scholars have investigated the effect of economic remittances and migrants' engagement in homeland development (e.g., Mohan and Zack-Williams 2002; Brinkerhoff 2008; Catrinescu et al. 2009). There is also a growing research field of social and political remittances that investigate how the migrants' own norms and ideas are transformed after entering the new country and how norms and ideas are transferred between host and home communities (e.g., Levitt 1998; Fargues 2006; Rother 2009; Spilimbergo 2009; Levitt and Lamba-Nieves 2011; Lodigiani and Salomone 2012). Scholars have also focused on the economic effect and causes of return migration and on the reasons as to why migrants make the decision to return to their countries of origin (e.g., Massey and Espinosa. 1997; Black et al. 2009; Tsuda 2009).

As touched upon above, from the perspective of policy makers, diasporas and/or return migrants are often portrayed as potential 'agents of democratization' or 'agents of development' (Turner and Kleist 2013; Sinatti and Horst 2015) since they have been socialized in Western democratic countries (e.g., Shain, 1999; Koinova 2009, p. 2). Return migrants are believed to bring capacity, economic and social capital, as well as Western norms that they supposedly have gained during their time in the Global North.

Rother demonstrates that in the Philippines migration could have both a positive and negative effect on an individual's support for democratic principles, depending on which country the migrant was working (2009, p. 245). In a study focusing on Mali, Chauvet and Mercier investigated the effect of migration on political outcome in the country of origin. Their result shows that the stock of migration has a positive impact on participation rates and electoral competitiveness, which is mainly due to the returnees from European countries. Their result also demonstrates that the impact of returnees on election turnout not only holds for the returnees themselves, but also increases participation overall in the area where they

live (2014, p. 630). In addition, individuals who have attained foreign education in a democratic country tend to support democracy in their home countries (Spilimbergo 2009), and there is a positive relationship between migration and share of women in parliament in the sending country if the host country has a higher degree of female empowerment (Lodigiani and Salomone 2012).

As discussed in essay II, a number of scholars have also pointed out expectations that returnees are expected to act as brokers between the domestic community and international agencies (Turner and Kleist 2013; Åkesson and Eriksson Baaz 2015, p. 5). In the African context, the idea that individuals exposed to ‘Western rationalities’ may act as brokers or go-betweeners goes back to colonial times. At that time, brokers were supposed to act as mediators between domestic communities and colonialists and be role models for “the natives” (Turner and Kleist 2013, p. 197). This connects to the rationality behind the argument raised by Brinkerhoff and Tadesse that diasporas can function as translators of the local context for international agencies. However, scholars have criticized this notion of returnees as agents of development or their ability to function as brokers (e.g., Turner and Keilst 2013; Sinatti and Horst 2014) and claimed that it builds on a faulty belief that social and cultural capital gained during migration experiences are ‘universally applicable’ (Åkesson and Eriksson Baaz 2015). Countries of origin are not blank slates to which returnees can come and apply their supposed knowledge. Moreover, as pointed out above, returnees are not always welcomed back by the domestic population.

Many overlapping terms are used within the literature discussed above such as return migrants, circular migrants, transnational actors, and diasporas. However, I believe that diaspora returnee comes closest to capturing the phenomenon of interest in this thesis and this is the term I will mainly use. My understanding of diasporas is similar to scholars who have emphasized the hybridity and fluidity of diaspora communities and diaspora identities (Hall 1990; Clifford 1994; Galipo 2019). With reference to the discussion earlier about being framed as an insider or outsider, I agree with Turner and Kleist that a diaspora identity is ‘a position that is [...] constantly performed by those who claim to be diaspora’ and it is thus not a real-world fact (2013, p. 195). I focus on the diaspora as a form of political identity and I believe the diaspora term is most useful when we are trying to understand how it is empirically used. Thus, I agree with Brubaker who proposes that we should

think of diasporas not in substantialist terms as a bounded entity, but rather as an idiom, a stance, a claim, as a category of practice [...] used to make

claims, to articulate projects, to formulate expectations, to mobilise energies, to appeal to loyalties. It is often a category with a strong normative change. It does not so much describe the world as seek to remake it (2005, p. 12).

When I use the term diaspora returnees, I generally refer to individuals born in or have parents born in or hold present or previous citizenship or have parents who are or have been citizens in the post-war state in question who have lived abroad, generally in the Global North (if it is not explicitly stated that they have lived somewhere else)¹³ and then returned, temporarily or more permanently, to the post-war state in question for a more extensive purpose than a vacation.

The reason that this term generally refers to individuals returning from the Global North is because this corresponds to the empirical understanding of returnees from the diaspora in these contexts. For example, in Liberia those returning from the diaspora are often called re-pats, a term generally referring to those who have lived in the Global North before their return (Clark-Barol, McHugh and Norum 2015, p. 188). Similarly, the Somali word for diaspora (*qurbajoog*) generally refers to someone who has lived in the Global North for a considerable time (Galipo 2019). In Somaliland, it is also commonly used about individuals returning to Somaliland from the Global North. Thus, people are making use of this concept in everyday life and are giving it a meaning, which might digress from strictly academic conceptualization of diaspora (Ibrahim 2009, p. 19; Galipo 2019). It should be noted that the connotation of these terms is not static and that return in these cases seldom refers to permanent return or that returnees are completely cutting their ties to the diaspora country abroad.¹⁴

¹³ Thus, they have been abroad longer than a temporary visit. Temporary visit can for example be for studying for a short amount of time or shorter holidays or visiting relatives.

¹⁴ In this sense, “diaspora returnees” can be understood also as “transnational actors”, belonging to the transnational paradigm which have informed much of the more recent migration literature (Goldring 1996; Levitt and Glick Shiller 2004; Faist 2010; Galipo 2017). Instead of viewing return migration in binary terms where someone exit one country and return to another, return should be seen as more fluid (Galipo 2017, p. 7). Return must not be permanent, but migrants often circle between different geographical locations (Hansen 2007). Moreover, both during the time in the diaspora and after return, migrants generally keep transnational ties and continues exchanges with their familial, religious, political, political or organizational networks (Mangala 2017, p. 6).

Studying perceptions of diaspora recruitments in post-war settings

A multi-methods design to develop and test theory

None of the three essays mix quantitative and qualitative methods, yet the thesis as a whole has a multi-methods design. Thus, I make use of different methods in the different essays to provide a better understanding of the overarching research objective. I considered this approach most suitable to enhance our knowledge and theorize how returnees in top public positions are perceived by different parts of the local community and how this perception affects the view of the institutions they are part of.

Essay I uses an inductive approach and relies mainly on elite interviews, essay II uses interviews with elites and media material in a more theory-driven approach, and essay III uses a deductive approach through a survey experiment. Essay III tests hypotheses generated from previous research and the findings in the first two essays. These three essays are relevant in their own right, but they are also closely intertwined and follow the chronology of the development of the theoretical framework. Getting a deeper understanding of how returnees are perceived by their fellow elites was necessary in order to investigate how perceptions of returnee members of an institution affect public perceptions of that institution as a whole. While there exists a wealth of excellent previous research on related questions, I needed more insight into which factors were likely to affect perceptions of returnees in politics, how these factors might play out in different contexts, and how returnees in politics are portrayed by elites and media in these contexts before developing testable hypotheses. All these factors are likely to influence the public perception of these returnees.

In the theoretical section presented above, I provide examples of literature discussing different aspects of diaspora returnees' engagement in countries of origin. These literatures are points of departure to different degrees for the three essays. Nevertheless, it should again be noted that none of the included studies have empirically investigated local perceptions of diaspora returnees in the cabinet or parliament. Studies of, for example, engagements in return capacity programs and relationships between returnees and stayees in general can give some guidance, but are not sufficient to tell us how we can understand perceptions of returnees in the government. There are likely to be aspects of perceptions of returnees in the government that are not captured in these literatures and therefore dif-

difficult to predict. Moreover, there is a lack of available data covering returnees in governments. The significance of field research and in-depth and informed accounts from those experiencing this phenomena in the early stages of this thesis cannot be underestimated.

Therefore, my research design was at first inductive and open-ended. As suggested by Heimer (2006, p. 59) and O'Brien (2006), I considered the design of the study to be an ongoing process and emphasized discovery before verification. Before entering the field, I engaged with literature and theories that might be applicable to the study, but they were not sufficient to account for what could be expected from the political involvement of the returnees in the cases at hand.

At an early stage in the process, I tried to keep the research design open to unforeseen ideas that I might come across in the field. Thus, when doing fieldwork, it is common to realize that expectations are not at all applicable or have made us imagine problems or opportunities that do not exist (O'Brien 2006, p. 28). This may sound like unguided intellectual wandering to some political scientists who emphasize the primacy of deductive reasoning and a strictly linear research process. However, iteration is essential to conducting field research of topics where we have limited knowledge. Kapiszewski et al. capture the importance of going back and forth between theory and empirics when doing this kind of study:

Fieldwork often involves exploring what is poorly understood and confronting new, complex realities; as such, induction and iteration are unavoidable if valid inferences are to be drawn and interpretations developed. Indeed, the repeated discovery that fieldwork entails is one of its strengths as a research technique (2015, pp. 24-25).

Hence this approach was used to gain a deeper understanding of the topics investigated in the first essay.

The design of this thesis as a whole demonstrates how a research subject can be investigated at various levels by combining methods that are most suitable for the more specific research questions at hand as well as how studies using different methods can inform each other. As I will show in the concluding section of this introductory essay, the combination of these three essays enabled me to better theorize about the perceptions and legitimacy diaspora returnees in top positions in the public service in post-war states.

Practical conditions always have an influence on research design and implementation of a study. Both when planning the research and when plans turn out to be unfeasible (or things never imagined from the home department turn out to be possible) once in the field, adaptations must be

made. Such issues often influence both choice of method and the data, but are not always brought up in the methods sections. I agree with Heimer that this is regrettable since it ‘prevents us from not only discussing difficulties encountered in fieldwork but also from learning about available coping strategies and their methodological advantages’ (2006, p. 59).

Instead of reinventing the wheel every time a researcher encounters challenges in the field, there is much to be learned from how others have handled similar issues. Therefore, practical issues connected to choices of method as well as the ability to carry out the study have a natural place in this text.

Next, I will explain my selection of cases and provide some contextual knowledge before I go on to describe each of the methods applied in the essays and lift some of the lessons learned from these experiences. To openly lay out the research process and the development of the three essays, I will also briefly present the findings of each essay. By including this in connection to the method discussion, I demonstrate how the result from each essay informed the design and theoretical departure points of the following essay. In the conclusion of the introduction, I will more thoroughly link the findings from the three essay to each other and to the wider research field.

Case selection and context

The research question is investigated in two cases: in essay I it is examined in the context of post-war Somaliland and in essays II and III it is examined in the context of post-war Liberia. Both Somaliland and Liberia have experienced extensive and devastating wars, resulting in a need for diaspora investments and qualified individuals to return. These countries have large diasporas situated in the Global North that have been encouraged to return. To investigate the manifestation of diaspora returnees is particularly relevant in small post-war states where the diaspora has a disproportionate presence in politics (Ferme 2015, p. 100). In 2018, Somaliland had a population of approximately 3.8 million (SCSD 2019) and Liberia had a population of approximately 4.8 million (UNMIL 2018). Since this is a novel study, I decided to focus on smaller states where much of the political power is vested in the national government compared to other state institutions. Thus, the relationship between the state and the public in small post-war states, with overlapping private and public relations, is generally ‘qualitatively different to that which might be observed in larger,

more developed states' (Mulbah 2016). Thus, I included cases where government positions are of greatest importance both to other elites and to the public.

Moreover, in both these cases, returnees from the diaspora make up a considerable share of the political elite class.¹⁵ It would not be very useful to investigate how diaspora returnees in the government are perceived in places that have not experienced or have highly limited experience of diaspora returnees in the government. Thus, I examine perception of diaspora returnees in places where their presence is an empirical actuality and it makes sense for people to talk about them.

To provide a list of possible cases is difficult since, as I have pointed out earlier, there are no comparable data available across cases about returnees from the diaspora in post-war governments.¹⁶ From the perspective of the aim of this thesis, Somaliland is considered more of a favourable case for diaspora returnee legitimacy, but Liberia is considered a more paradigmatic case.¹⁷ This distinction will be further explained below. Because a myriad of factors might affect legitimacy or elite perceptions and because we have limited previous knowledge about perceptions of returnees in the government, it is difficult to argue that any case is an ideal favourable or paradigmatic case. However, despite this and the fact that the selection of the two cases are based on a somewhat different logic, I believe that the two cases included in this thesis can help us understand the phenomenon of interest beyond the context of the individual cases.

Somaliland, a de facto state officially located in northern Somalia, is (alongside Somalia) the most ethnically homogenous state of sub-Saharan Africa in terms of culture, language, and religion¹⁸ (Brown 1997, p. 7). Unlike many countries, diaspora returnees in the Somaliland government have not been placed in their positions by foreign powers. Moreover, the

¹⁵ When discussing case selection, it is worth pointing out that diasporas can have many different compositions, wars can have very different characters and the role of the diaspora during conflict can vary. Due to practical and economical limitations, it is not possible to investigate all forms of diaspora in this thesis. In most cases, the diaspora are of course engaged in the war in one way or another and some groups might be forced to flee to a larger extent to others. Yet, cases included in this thesis is for example, likely to differ from cases where, due to the character of the war, one of the warring (or affected) parties, or one ethnic group, to a large extent had to live in exile and the image of those returning from abroad closely overlaps with one party in the war.

¹⁶ In the Appendix I give examples of a few cabinets with a considerable share of ministers who have background abroad. To put together this data was very time consuming since biographical information about individual ministers often are difficult to find, therefore only a few cases are included.

¹⁷ See Flyvbjerg 2006 for a more detailed description paradigmatic cases.

¹⁸ As in the rest of Somalia, the majority of Somalilanders belong to the Sunni branch of Islam and the state adhere to the Shafi'ite rite of shari'a law (Walls 2014, p. 60)

Somaliland diaspora is generally considered to have suffered during the war so they are not seen as traitors, a common perception in other post-war countries. Therefore, it has been suggested that the Somali diaspora may have the ‘moral authority’ to represent the local community (Horst et al.2010, p. 14). Somaliland, due to its contested status, depends on the diaspora even more than most other states. The diasporas’ ability to lobby foreign governments for recognition is essential (Kleist and Hansen 2005). In addition, since the international involvement in Somaliland statebuilding has been limited, Somaliland depends on diaspora investments. Hargeisa, the capital of Somaliland, has practically been rebuilt by investments from the diaspora or by diaspora returnees. Taken together, these conditions imply that Somaliland constitutes a favourable case for diaspora returnees to be perceived as legitimate in government positions. Thus, if returnees are not perceived as legitimate in this context, returnees in governments might have even greater problems regarding legitimacy in most other cases.

Liberia, in contrast, is considered a paradigmatic case both from a theoretical and from a policy perspective. As I will describe in further detail below, Liberia is of great policy relevance and due to its high presence of diaspora returnees in the government, enabled by donor support, and given the time that has passed since the first post-war government, Liberia allows me to study the key mechanisms at play.

Unlike Somaliland, Liberia is a recognized state. Moreover, Liberia is Africa’s oldest republic and international presence has been extensive in Liberia since the end of the second civil war in 2003. This is, for example, demonstrated by the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), a peacekeeping force stationed in Liberia between 2003 and 2018 with up to 15,000 military and police personnel deployed at the same time (UNMIL 2019). Liberia depends on foreign aid and international donors are present in most parts of the political and economic spheres.¹⁹ Liberia has often been seen as the poster child of statebuilding support; President Johnson Sirleaf received the Nobel Peace Prize in 2011 (Mulbah 2018) and has often been described as the darling of the international donor community (e.g., Cooper 2010; Walraven, Melber and Mehler 2012, p. 123). Above all, several capacity return programs have been implemented in Liberia.²⁰ For example, the LECBS project recruited 40 Liberians from the

¹⁹ For example, the Net official development assistance (ODA) to Liberia in 2006 was USD 269 million (OECD 2008, p. 29) and 1,098 billion USD in 2015 (World Bank 2019b).

²⁰ For example TOKTEN.

diaspora, including 16 cabinet ministers and the head of the Liberia National Police (Friedman 2012) and this project has been referred to as a flagship capacity initiative (UNDP 2011).

Moreover, top positions in the government and political parties has historically had (Starr 1913), and continues to have, a great value in Liberia (Mulbah 2018). As with many other post-war cases, Liberia is a neo-patrimonial society where government positions are generally seen as a way to redistribute government resources to the own network (Liebenow 1969; Mulbah 2018). This makes the identity of those in the political elite class highly relevant both to other elites and the general population. Therefore, Liberia provides a useful case to improve our understanding of key aspects of how diaspora returnees in governments are perceived locally. I will return more to the generalizability of findings in the three essays in the concluding section.

Somaliland – brief conflict history and diaspora

To better understand the discussion of the three studies, it is necessary to provide some basic understanding of the Somaliland and Liberian context and the relationship between these states and their diasporas.

Somaliland, a former British protectorate called British Somaliland, joined a union with Italian Somaliland after gaining its independence in 1960, creating what is today known as the United Republic of Somalia (Kaplan 2008, p. 146).²¹ After a bloodless coup in 1969, General Siad Barre established military rule and a socialist political system. The authoritarianism and dominance of Barres' own southern-based Marehan clan lead to the formation of armed resistance by other clans in the 1980s. This resulted in the Somali Civil War at the end of the decade. One of the most prominent rebel groups in the north of Somalia were Hargeisa-based Somali National Movement (SNM), which was formed in 1981 (Kaplan 2008, p. 148; UCDP 2016a). The Isaaq makes up approximately 70% of the Somaliland population,²² and accordingly the SNM was mainly formed and supported by members of the Isaaq clan. After the Barre regime was overthrown in January 1991, SNM leaders declared Somaliland's independence from Somalia on 18 May 1991 (Lewis 2008, pp. 68-70).

The first decade after the declaration of independence was characterized by violent clan conflicts in Somaliland. They came to an end after

²¹ Somaliland did however enjoy sovereignty for a few days before it entered the union with Somalia. This reference to that Somaliland has been an independent state is a central argument for the claim for recognition (Walls 2014, p. 29).

²² The remaining 30 percent of the population generally belong to one of four other main clans: the Dhulbahante, Gadabursi, Iise and Warsengeli (Bradbury 2008).

extensive efforts by clan leaders and a large number of peace conferences held during the 1990s (Kaplan 2008, p. 148). These efforts resulted in a referendum of the constitution in 2001 and since then six comparatively peaceful and fair elections have been held. When losing the presidential election in 2010, incumbent president Kahin accepted the defeat and peacefully transferred power to the winning candidate, Ahmed Mohamed Mohamoud “Silanyo” of the Kulmyie party (Hammond 2012, p. 157). Peaceful presidential elections also took place in 2017 resulting in Kulmyie’s candidate Muse Bihi Abdi being elected president, since President Silanyo did not run for a second term (Olad 2017). As these are rare events in post-war countries, Somaliland is often highlighted as an exceptional case of successful peacebuilding and a stable process of post-war political reconstruction (e.g., Kaplan 2008; Debiel et al. 2009; Richards 2015).²³

In most other post-war societies, peace processes and new political systems are either developed with direct involvement by the international community or more indirectly through ultimatums presented to receive aid. Partly due to its contested status, the statebuilding process in Somaliland has largely been locally owned with limited international involvement. Both peace and political reconstruction efforts have been led by local actors and this lack of international engagement is frequently highlighted when explaining Somaliland’s stability (e.g., Pegg and Kolstö 2014). This international engagement has enabled local actors to combine Western forms of democratic institutions with traditional²⁴ elements in the new state, resulting in an hybrid political order (HPO). Most evident is the inclusion of clan elders into the upper chamber of the parliament or the House of Elders (the *Guurti*). Thus, it is argued that the absence of external actors made the inclusion of traditional elements possible and gave the process as well as the new state high levels of legitimacy (e.g., Moe 2011; Pegg and Kolstö 2014).

It is difficult to find data regarding Somaliland causalities, displaced persons, or emigrants since Somaliland is officially part of Somalia. However, as a consequence of the war, a large majority of the population in

²³ If it should be seen as “successful” can of course be criticized. Especially since elections to the parliament have been repeatedly postponed since they were originally supposed to be held in 2005 (Mahmood 2019). However, such statements are given refer to Somaliland in comparison to other cases of post-war democratization, and especially with regard to the situation in its neighbor to the South, Somalia.

²⁴ I am aware that the use of the term “traditional” can be problematic. As, in today’s world “traditions are themselves constantly reinvented and deeply influenced by Western ideas” (OECD 2010, p. 21). However, this is the phrase used in the literature of HPOs and statebuilding, and it is also frequently used to refer to the system in Somaliland by Somalilanders.

Somaliland was internally or externally displaced (Omaar 2004). A majority resided in refugee camps or in neighbouring countries, but many Somalilanders also fled to the UK, U.S., and Scandinavian countries.²⁵

Migration from Somaliland also occurred between the 1880s and 1960. Many of these early migrants were traders and commercial seamen who left for cities nearby such as Aden or Sanaa. Later migrants began to establish themselves in the UK, Gulf States, or other places. Later waves of migrants from Somaliland consisted of prominent students selected to study at British schools (Hammond 2015, p. 47). Thus, many Somalilanders living in and returning from the diaspora were already living and working abroad before the civil war (Hansen 2013, p. 144).

The Somaliland diaspora played an essential role both during the war and in the post-war phase. The Somali National Movement (SNM) was founded by Somalis living in exile in London in 1981 (Lewis 2002, p. 252), and the struggle against Said Barres regime by the SNM was largely funded by the diaspora. Therefore, in Somaliland there is a widespread notion that the declaration of independence of Somaliland in 1991 would not have taken place without the actions and support of the diaspora (Rock 2017). Members of the SNM were also heavily influential in the peacebuilding and statebuilding process and the chairman of SNM, Abdirahman Ahmed Ali Tuur, became Somaliland's first president in 1991 (Walls 2009, p. 380).

To attain stability, as many as 39 peace conferences and meetings were held between 1990 and 1997 (APD and Interpeace 2008, pp. 14-16). These events took place without financial support from the international community. Instead, with the exception of the Hargeisa conference in 1997 financed by the Somaliland government, these events were largely funded by Somalilanders within the country or in the diaspora (*ibid*, p. 26). Thus, the nature of the conflict and role of the diaspora during the conflict and peacebuilding process meant that the diaspora had close connections to and to some extent even composed of the leadership of Somaliland after the conflict. These connections contributed to placing returnees in prominent positions in Somaliland politics.²⁶

²⁵ Due to the merge of immigrants from Somaliland and Somalia in official records there are, to the best of my knowledge, no official numbers of how many persons with background in Somaliland that left to or are still residing in any of these countries. However, a large percentage of the population are known to reside abroad and the largest share of Somalilanders are located in the UK (Hammond 2015).

²⁶ It should be noted that the involvement by the diaspora was not always positive. For example, different branches of the diaspora fueled clan conflicts by providing support to different clan militias in the early 1990s (Ibrahim 2010).

The conflict against the Barre regime and following violent clan conflict during the 1990s devastated Somaliland. At the end of the war and the following clan conflicts (1994-95), Hargeisa and Burco were basically ruined and all formal structures in Somaliland were destroyed (Omaar 2004; Eubank 2010; Ibrahim 2010). Only one percent of Hargeisa's post-war population still lived in the city at the end of the war (Hansen 2007). Dowden, who visited Somaliland in 1991, made the following observation 'Throughout Africa and the Middle East I have never seen more devastation. The capital of the north, Hargeisa, resembled Berlin or Hiroshima at the end of the Second World War' (2008, p. 94).

This meant that schools, hospitals, roads, and political institutions had to be built or re-built. Since most elites left Somaliland (or Somalia) before or during the conflict, it was difficult to find the necessary capacity and investments for such extensive reconstruction projects locally (Rock 2017). The extent of the devastation after the war led to a need for external investments and support in Somaliland. Due to the contested status of Somaliland, such support did not generally come from international donors but from the diaspora and other private investors (Ibrahim 2010). More than 25 years into the statebuilding process, Somaliland still depends on remittances and the diaspora sends about 500 million U.S. dollars to Somaliland every year (Menkhaus 2015, p. 56). In 2016, the annual budget of the Somaliland government was only 295 million U.S. dollars (*The Economist* 2015).

Since the call for independence, returnees from the diaspora have dominated Somaliland politics. Approximately two-thirds of the MPs and half of the ministers in the 2016 cabinet were returnees from European countries (Ismail 2011; Rock 2017). Former president "Silanyoo", who used to live in the UK, is believed to have UK citizenship. In addition, the founders and chairmen of the two opposition parties, WADANI and UCID, are returnees from Finland (Rock 2017).

Somaliland law allows dual citizenship and the Somaliland citizenship law from 2002 states that Somalilanders who are Somaliland citizens by birth are allowed to acquire foreign citizenships without losing their Somaliland citizenship. Holders of dual citizenships are allowed to hold any position in Somaliland, including in the executive, with the exception of the position as president or vice president (2001 Somaliland constitution, Article 82).²⁷ Therefore, there are no legal restrictions for returnees to assume government positions (except becoming president or vice-president).

²⁷ The eligibility for being appointed minister or deputy minister is regulated by Article 41 in the 2001 Somaliland constitution. It states: "1. He must be a Muslim and must behave in

The economic dependence on the diaspora seems to affect the allocation of returnees in politics. This is perhaps most evident when it comes to the financing of political parties and political campaigns. The three political parties as well as individual candidates depend on funds from the diaspora (Ibrahim 2010). In a study of campaign funding by Aly Verjee et al., the national registered parties²⁸ – Kulmiye, UCID, and Waddani – all stated that they depended on contributions from the diaspora. Although they all report that they get some funding from the government, they have expressed that these contributions are insignificant. For example, Waddani claims that these contributions cover less than 15% of their administrative costs. Instead, the most important funding source for these parties is donations from party members within Somaliland or from the diaspora (ibid). It has been shown that the diaspora are of greater relevance for these parties than for the political associations that did not succeed to become an official party in the 2012 elections (Aly Verjee et al. 2015, p. 37).

In my study, interviewees noted that the involvement of diaspora in national politics has increased since the last election as the ruling political party, Kulmiye, has strong bonds with the diaspora. Several interviewees explained that Kulmiye received a great deal of funding from the diaspora during the 2012 election campaign and that the party was obliged to give something back. Therefore, after winning the presidential election, Siyanyoo felt obliged to offer his diaspora supporters positions in government (Interview 2 2016).

Irro, the founder and leader of the Waddani party in 2015, emphasized in an interview with me the importance of having well-organized fundraisers in the diaspora. He explained that there are official Waddani representatives who are responsible for gathering financial support in the UK and

accordance with the Islamic religion. 2. He must be a citizen who is not younger than 35 (thirty five) years. 3. He must be physically and mentally able to fulfil his duties. 4. He must be educated to, at least, secondary school level or equivalent. 5. He must not have been subject of a final sentence for a criminal offence by a court within the preceding five years. 6. He must be a responsible person with appropriate character and behaviour. 7. No employee of the state shall be eligible for candidacy unless he has tendered his resignation from office prior to a period determined by law. Such resignation shall be accepted.” The article that regulates appointment of cabinet ministers is in fact Article 84:5, which states that: ”no person who cannot fulfil the conditions necessary for eligibility for election to the House of Representatives shall be appointed as Minister or Deputy Minister”. The eligibility for candidacy to the House of Representatives is regulated by Article 41 (2001 Somaliland constitution). Despite referring only to male candidates, women are allowed to be cabinet ministers and MPs.

²⁸ Only three national parties are allowed in Somaliland.

in Stockholm (Interview 3 2015). In a similar vein, regarding the organization of the national parties in the diaspora, a Kulmyie representative told Aly Verjee et al. the following:

Kulmiye is well organized as far as funders and supporters abroad are concerned. For example, in [the] UK we have, in London, a chairman, executive committee and branches of the committee in each major city. These branches meet to discuss party issues. The branches are also useful during fundraising. They provided 60 per cent of Kulmiye's budget during the presidential elections and during other elections to provide candidates 50 per cent of what they spend. The same was true for other European countries like Sweden, Norway, the U.S. and Canada (Aly Verjee et al. 2015, p. 40).

Similar relations not only revolve around economic dependence but also around personal relations and responsibilities towards friends, acquaintances, and clan members, who may expect to benefit from having friends in high places. Since all three leaders of the national political parties have returned from the diaspora and have families still living outside of Somaliland, they all have extensive personal networks in the diaspora (Rock 2017). Below I will provide a similar account of the Liberian context and the historic and present involvement of the diaspora in Liberia.

Liberia – brief conflict history and diaspora

Liberia was established in 1822 by the American Colonization Society (ASC) with the objective to become the home for freed black slaves from the Americas. ASC was founded as a response to a growing concern among Americans and plantation owners in the Caribbean that freed slaves could cause unrest or uprisings among the still enslaved (Liebenow 1969). In 1847, the settlers declared independence from the ASC and established the Liberian Republic (Levitt 2005, p. 3).

In 1822, Liberia was already inhabited by different indigenous groups, which were severely affected by the arrival of the new settlers. Including the new settlers, there were (and still are) 16 major ethnic groups in Liberia (Levitt 2005, p. 17).²⁹ These indigenous groups were marginalized and not included in the running of the state. Although the new settlers, Americo-Liberians, made up only five percent of the population, they came to dominate the elite positions and the politics of Liberia (Söderström 2015, p. 31). These inequalities resulted in tensions between different ethnic groups (UCDP 2016b). Liberia experienced a 'de-facto one-party rule' of the

²⁹ Besides the settlers, these are: Kpelle, Bassa, Gio, Kru, Grebo, Mano, Loma, Krahn, Gola, Kissi, Mandingo, Vai, Gbandi, Belle, Dei, and Mende (Liebenow 1969, p. 37).

Americo-Liberian True Whig Party (TWP) from 1878 to 1980 (Gerdes 2013).

Recently, Liberia has experienced two civil wars: 1989–1996 and 2000–2003. The 2000–2003 civil war can largely be seen as a continuation of the first, but with new coalitions and names of the groups involved.³⁰ Samuel Doe, who overthrew the elected Liberian government in a coup in 1980, was the first Liberian ruler to belong to an indigenous group. Although many thought Doe would improve the lives of all Liberians, he established harsh military rule. All political parties were forbidden, the constitution was suspended, and Doe filled elite positions within the military and security sector with members from his own Krahn ethnic group (UCDP 2016b). By the end of the 1980s, the Liberian elite primarily consisted of Krahn and Americo-Liberians, who controlled most of Liberia's resources. By the end of 1989, the National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL), led by a former minister in the Doe government, Charles Taylor, started an uprising against the Doe regime (Gerdes 2013, pp. 31-33). NPFL consisted largely of members of the Gio and Mano groups, although Taylor was an Americo-Liberian. In September 1990, Doe was killed and the regime was overthrown. Armed conflict continued between different armed groups until a final peace agreement was signed in 1996 and in 1997 Taylor was elected president of Liberia (UCDP 2016b).

In 1999, a rebel group called Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) emerged in northern Liberia and initiated the second Liberian civil war in 2000 (UCDP 2016b). In 2003, a fraction of LURD created the Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL) and joined the struggle against Taylor (Gerdes 2013, p. 165). Monrovia was soon controlled by the rebel groups and negotiations begun. Charles Taylor stepped down as president in August 2003 and left for exile in Nigeria. Vice-President Moses Blah signed a peace agreement with LURD and MODEL and the parties agreed to request an international peacekeeping force to keep the peace (UCDP 2016b).³¹ A transitional government remained in power until 2006, when Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf was sworn in as President (Gerdes 2013).

From the founding of the republic in 1847 through the 1950s, migration in and out of Liberia was mainly characterized by immigration from the U.S. to Liberia. During the 1950s, a small number of Liberian students

³⁰ Therefore, the whole period 1989-2003 is sometimes also referred to as the *Great War* (Söderström 2015, p. 19)

³¹ Data regarding war casualties are unreliable and often vary depending on the source. The civil wars in Liberia is however estimated to have claimed the lives of 150 000 – 270 000 Liberians (Söderström 2015, p. 30).

started to travel to the U.S. and some other countries for higher education (Reilly 2017, pp. 181-183). The coup by Doe in 1980 initiated the first larger involuntary emigration from Liberia (Aghoa 2017, p. 62). Until this point, Liberia's net migration had always been positive; that is, immigration had been higher than emigration. Net migration was zero from 1980 until a failed coup by General Quiwonkpa in 1985 (Reilly 2017, p. 187). This coup attempt marked the start of massive emigration from Liberia, which continued through the First and Second Liberian Civil Wars, peaking in 1996 when it was estimated that over 780,000 Liberians fled across an international border (UNHCR 2007). The majority of these left for neighbouring countries, but many left for the U.S. As with Somaliland, there are no official figures of the size, dispositions, or location of the Liberian diaspora. However, most Liberians living in the diaspora outside of West Africa reside in the United States.³² Estimates of the size of the diaspora in the U.S. range between 73,000 and 300,000 (Reilly 2017, p. 177).³³

As in post-war Somaliland, at the end of 14 years of intrastate war in Liberia, the country's political and physical infrastructure were to a large extent devastated. In 2003, almost half of the pre-war 2.2 million population had fled their homes (Friedman 2012). The flight of human capacity in combination with a lack of resources resulted in almost all government institutions ceasing to function (UNDP 2006, p. 35). A high outflow of skilled Liberians had begun already in 1980 and continued in the 2000s. In 2000, about 45% of Liberians who held a tertiary degree had emigrated (Reilly 2017, p. 187).

Between 1989 and 2003, Liberia's domestic education system had been terminated, resulting in illiteracy rates between 70 and 80% in 2006 (UNDP 2006, p. 2). When Ellen Johnson Sirleaf won the presidential election and assumed office in early 2006, she not only faced problems with a fragile post-war situation and an economy, but also faced difficulties finding competent individuals to form a functioning government, a problem reflected in her inauguration speech where she calls for the diaspora to return.

At this point, appointing cabinet ministers and other high positions 'was an immediate priority' to strengthen Liberia's economic situation and avoid a relapse into conflict (Friedman 2012, p. 2). However, the approach

³² There are also Liberian diaspora organizations in The Netherlands, France, Luxemburg, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, Poland, Norway, The UK, Belgium, Italy, The Republic or Ireland and Denmark. But there are no reliable estimates of the number of people in Europe with Liberian origin and ancestry (Reilly 2017, p. 178).

³³ The UN Special Representative in Liberia, Paul Klein, claimed in an interview in 2004 that there were 450,000 Liberians residing in the U.S. and Canada (World Chronicle 2004, p. 10).

by the Liberian government to engage potential civil servants from the diaspora was very different from the approach in Somaliland. To recruit qualified people to public service, Johnson Sirleaf reached out to the UNDP and an NGO called the Open Society Institute (OSI) for funding. As a result, the Emergency Capacity Building Support (LECBS) project was launched in April 2006. One of its main objectives was to offer funding to ‘attract competent Liberians to join the public sector in pivotal leadership positions, utilizing the project to supplement the salaries of these Liberians’ (Republic of Liberia 2008, p. 69). With the 3.25 million U.S. dollars funding from the LECBS, Johnson Sirleaf’s administration recruited 40 Liberians from the diaspora and 16 were appointed as cabinet ministers (Friedman 2012, p. 6).

As Gerdes has put it, Johnson Sirleaf ‘exemplifies the ambiguities of Liberia’s elite in general and of the notion of Americo-Liberian in quite typical ways’ (2012, p. 30). Early on, she was often seen as an historical elite Americo-Liberian. However, during her presidential campaign in 2005, she repeatedly emphasized her indigenous origin.³⁴ Johnson Sirleaf has vast professional experience. She had served as Liberia’s Minister of Finance in 1979–80 in the Tolbert administration, had worked for the World Bank in Washington DC, and had held top positions at Citibank and UNDP (Johnson Sirleaf 2009). Like president Silanyoo, who was also part of the Somaliland diaspora in the UK, Johnson Sirleaf was part of and engaged in the Liberian diaspora in the U.S. The relations she built during this time have had great influence on the formation of the present political elite in Liberia (Gerdes 2011).

Gerdes claims that three different groups of ministers can be distinguished in the first Johnson Sirleaf cabinet: those who used their general elite connections; those who used their personal connections with Johnson Sirleaf; and those recruited because of their prominence in Liberian society. General elite connections include both ministers who formed these relations in an international setting and ministers who mainly were connected to national elite networks (Gerdes 2011, p. 43). However, as pointed out above, a large share of these individuals were recruited from the U.S.

Johnson Sirleaf also won the 2011 presidential election and remained President of Liberia until her term ended in 2018. In her second term, the majority of Johnson Sirleaf’s cabinet also consisted of ministers recruited

³⁴ She is the daughter of J. Carney Johnson who had indigenous origin and Martha Dunbar. Dunbar had an indigenous mother and a German father. Dunbar was however raised in the elite Dunbar family and Johnson was similarly adopted by an eminent elite family by the name McGrity (Gerdes 2012, p. 31).

from the diaspora.³⁵ These recruitments have not been without criticism and some newspapers have claimed that Johnson Sirleaf's use of diaspora cabinet members seems to have done 'more to enrich members of the diaspora than it has done to improve the quality of life for ordinary Liberians' (Mungai 2015). She has been extensively accused of filling the government with her friends from the U.S. rather than individuals from Liberia and that most of the appointees have roots in the America-Liberian elite (Gerdes 2011).

The current President of Liberia, George Weah, was elected in 2017. Weah has a very different profile compared to Johnson Sirleaf. As a former soccer star, Weah is particularly popular among Liberia's urban youth (Gerdes 2013, p. 202). He ran as a presidential candidate in 2005 and 2011, but lost to Johnson Sirleaf. During these presidential campaigns, much focus was devoted to personal traits rather than ideological issues. For Weah, it was particularly important to put forward that he came from a poor background and has not been part of the established Liberian elite. In this way, he symbolized indigenous success and the end of Americo-Liberian dominance (Gerdes 2013, p. 202). However, his earned wealth as a soccer star was also emphasized to demonstrate his ability. Weah's lack of higher education has been a frequent topic of discussion in Liberia.³⁶ During his presidential campaigns, he has put much effort into delegitimizing education as an important qualification of a leader and has emphasized that 'formerly, well-educated leaders had either been ineffectual or merely self-serving' (Gerdes 2013, p. 202).³⁷ Consequently, his basis for appointments to the cabinet after being elected president seems to differ considerably to Johnson Sirleaf. Some Liberian media have been claimed that '[u]nlike the Sirleaf government, most of Weah's cabinet is home-based Liberians that are not from overseas' (Nyanfore II 2018). This is also consistent with information I was given during interviews in Liberia both with persons supporting and opposing Johnson Sirleaf (and Weah) (Interview 4 and 5 2018).

In Liberia, cabinet nominations by the president must have the consent of the Senate (1986 Liberia Constitution: Article 54). It should be noted that dual citizenship is banned in Liberia by the Aliens and Nationality Law. This law, however, is heavily debated in Liberia and several political

³⁵ See the Appendix for list of ministers and their diaspora background.

³⁶ In 2011, Weah got his high school degree at the age of 40 and earned a college diploma from Devry University at the age of 44 (Butty 2011).

³⁷ It has been claimed that a majority of those in the Liberian diaspora, as well as governments from Western countries and the West-African region favoured Johnson Sirleaf as president over Weah in the 2005 elections due to Weah's lack of professional experience and leadership training (Antwi-Boateng 2011, p. 15).

attempts have been made for dual citizenship and citizenship for persons of non-black origin. The Liberian diaspora in the U.S. has been particularly active in trying to change this law.

The Liberian diaspora is generally seen as playing an important part in Liberia's politics and development. Liberians regularly refer to the diaspora as the country's sixteenth county (besides the 15 counties that are geographically located in Liberia) (Reilly 2017, p. 188). The Liberian diaspora has also been engaged in Liberian politics both during the wars and the post-war period. The U.S. diaspora supported armed resistance against both the Doe and Taylor regime and it has lobbied host governments for peace-building support and aid. The Liberian diaspora was also highly active during the presidential campaigns and mobilized financial and moral resources (Antwi-Boateng 2011).

In addition to returning for political positions, the diaspora contributes to financing campaigns and influences the voting of Liberians back home (Reilly 2017, p. 188). This is illustrated by the fact that Johnson Sirleaf also campaigned in the U.S. during the 2005 and 2010 presidential elections (ibid 175, p. 188). The diaspora has been and still is a fundamental source for economic capital. For example, in 2015 personal remittances made up over 20% of Liberia's GDP (World Bank 2019). Thus, as with Somaliland, the diaspora is an important source for political and economic support. In this sense, Liberia and Somaliland (as with many other post-war states) can be seen as transnational states as they have a large share of their populations living abroad, their migration communities have played a fundamental financial and political role in (re)constructing and developing these states, and much of the economic resources come from the outside (Bradbury 2008, p. 7).

Next, I will describe the research design, method, and key findings in the three essays independently, beginning with the study of Somaliland.

Research design, method, and findings in essay I: Elite Interviews and Perceptions of Returnees in Somaliland

The research objective of the first essay is to investigate the extent to which and when returnee Members of Parliament (MPs) and the cabinet are perceived as legitimate in Somaliland from the perspective of the local elites. Fieldwork for this essay was also the first data collection step for this thesis. The analysis builds on elite interviews conducted during two field trips to Hargeisa, the capital of Somaliland, in April 2015 and February 2016. Overall, I spent a little over four weeks in Hargeisa. In total, I

conducted 34 face-to-face interviews with former and current cabinet ministers, members of parliament, public servants in the parliament and ministries, opposition leaders, other party officials, researchers, journalists, civil society activists, and business entrepreneurs. Respondents had diverse backgrounds: some had experience with the diaspora; some did not; some belonged to different clans; and some were members of one of the three national political parties.

A combination of a lack of financial resources and limited previous knowledge about the relationship between the Somaliland population and its politicians and top public officials lay the ground for the decision to focus this study primarily on the accounts of elites. This approach also entailed some limitations, and it must be emphasized that views expressed in interviews are the opinions of elites and not the wider population. However, this provides an important elite perspective from a broad range of elite actors in Somaliland, some with experience working in government institutions and some from other sectors. This approach allowed for a deeper understanding of the meaning of key concepts – e.g., diaspora, returnee, and legitimacy – in the Somaliland context as well as getting a better understanding of the scope of the diaspora involvement in Somaliland politics.

To get hold of respondents, individuals from the diaspora in Sweden were contacted before my first field trip to Somaliland. Sam Dualeh assisted me numerous times and provided both knowledge about Somaliland as well valuable information about whom I should meet. He also put me into contact with relevant people in Hargeisa. In addition to these connections, I also reached out to researchers at the Hargeisa University and different research institutes before my trips. Ahmed M. Musa among other researchers at these places not only provided me with important information about the Somaliland context, but also these initial interviews served an additional purpose – i.e., to work as a bridge to appropriate respondents. This form of snowballing procedure was considered as the most appropriate for this study and it proved to be fruitful as it gave me access to individuals holding official positions in Somaliland.

The gate-keepers or brokers who made this research possible, clearly and unavoidably so, also shaped the research result. Nevertheless, without them, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to get in contact with suitable participants. Also, in an effort to avoid bias, several access points were used to reach respondents. Moreover, I also actively tried to reach persons outside of the closest sphere of the ones helping me and asked, for example, when suitable, if they knew individuals from other clans or political parties.

However, some biases became evident during the study (although I recognize that there might be more that I am not aware of). First, there is a gender bias since only four of the respondents were women. This largely mirrors the fact that women hold few elite positions in Somaliland. For example, only one of the 164 MPs is a woman (Walls 2014, p. 309) and very few civil servants are women. However, there are several female ministers in the government and women are also active in CSOs and participate as candidates in elections. Regrettably, despite active efforts, it proved difficult to reach more female respondents. Another bias is the one of language, since all respondents in this study speak English. Regarding researchers, CSO leaders, and ministers, this is probably not a problem since most belonging to these groups in Somaliland speak English. However, it would have been beneficial to include the accounts of politicians who do not speak English. The risk of this bias is primarily that negative accounts of the diaspora and returnees will be overlooked as there is a possibility that the relationships between English-speaking elites and returnees are better. However, as is evident in the essay, since the respondents expressed and recognized negative accounts of returnees, the risk that this bias affected the result is estimated to be low.

Interviews were semi-structured and were carried out with the help of an interview guide with thematic issues reflecting the purpose of the study. This was considered the most appropriate way to reveal what is missing in existing theory and implied some degree of flexibility depending on the answers given. Interviews were around 30–60 minutes and were conducted in English. They took place in various locations in Hargeisa, such as the Ambassador Hotel, Maan-soor Hotel, and the parliament.

Since respondents indicated that they were not comfortable being recorded, interviews were not taped. Instead, I took extensive notes and re-wrote notes as soon as possible after the interviews ended. Furthermore, to protect the integrity of respondents, their names are not used in the essay. When relevant, respondents agreed to the fact that their identity could be disclosed when referring to their background or current position.

I attempt to be transparent with challenges I encountered while conducting these studies. These occurred especially during my first field trip before I had developed appropriate coping strategies. When conducting interviews, I started by telling respondents about myself and asked them to introduce themselves. After these introductions, I had planned to ask my open-ended questions. However, in the first interviews I did not get the possibility to tell many respondents what I was interested in. Instead, respondents, after presenting themselves, started talking about issues they considered interesting connected to my research. Often there was little

space for me to interrupt and ask questions. When I tried to ask a question, I was often ignored. Descriptions of different events could go on for almost 30 minutes despite repeated attempts from me to interrupt or change the course of the discussion.

This can be interpreted as an expression of social status and especially respondents' older age. At this point, it did not pose a problem to my research since people talked about the issues I was interested in without any need of direction from me, and they did so at length. Sometimes people veered off and discussed topics outside of the scope of my research. This could, of course, be annoying as it was very difficult to interrupt such digressions, but I realized that if I were patient, they usually came back to issues of interest to me. However, I realized that I had to adopt coping strategies to direct the interviews and to devote more time for each interview than I first planned. I learned to be even more precise about my research when I introduced myself and clearly explained that I had a set of questions I wanted to ask.

The ability to control where interviews were to be conducted also needs some explanation. Method literature often recommends interviews be conducted in an isolated place where other people cannot listen or interrupt (e.g., Söderström 2011). This is, of course, the ideal setting to assure that people are not afraid to speak their mind. However, the perfect method advice does not always work in practice. In the field, you often need to take the interview when it is offered. Flexibility and openness to changing circumstances are usually very important to conduct the necessary interviews. In the field, you have to be prepared that people may have a different sense of time and accept that interviews can be cancelled or rescheduled with short notice.

Despite having access to an office at another location during my study in Somaliland, people often called and told me that they were in the reception area of my hotel and that they wished to meet right away. Even at times when we had decided to meet somewhere else, people often showed up when I was working in the lobby and asked if we could talk there and then instead. Since most of the people I met with expressed that they had a tight schedule, I had to agree to do the interviews when they had time to meet. When I got the opportunity to meet political leaders or the speaker of the parliament, I could not refuse to do so because the time or place was not ideal. If we were in a crowded place, I asked if we could move to a more isolated table or go out to the garden. It is, of course, important to crucially analyse the effect this can have on the information provided. I did not consider it to be a problem for the objective of this study as respondents chose the location themselves and did not seem to hold back

critique towards either the system or individuals. If my topics had been of a more sensitive nature, this would have created a more significant obstacle.

An inductive approach was then applied to systemizing the material collected. In this essay, I used previous literature investigating returnees in general and the scarce previous research existing about returnees in politics to better make sense of the findings and to contrast them to other cases. Before turning to the results of the study, I will discuss what additional insights about methods this study produced.

Available data and information

A central aspect when discussing the method applied in the first essay is that Somaliland is comparatively little researched and its unrecognized status provides hindrances for research. There is limited data available regarding most aspects of society and there are few previous studies to rely on. Due to Somaliland's contested status it was, for example, until recently even difficult to find any form of reliable estimates of Somaliland's GDP or size of its population.³⁸ The Somali society is traditionally oral and there are limited written protocols from different parts of the peacebuilding and statebuilding process as well as few reliable media sources to get information from. Since I do not speak Somali, sources accessible to me without an interpreter are even fewer.

Some ground-breaking work on Somaliland history, statebuilding, and political development has been done in recent years (e.g., Lewis 2008; Walls 2009; Walls 2014; Renders 2012; Musa and Horst 2019). Local research institutes, such as the Academy For Peace and Development (APD) and the Horizon Institute, also provide important publications of Somaliland politics. Yet compared with many other settings, especially recognized states, the available published information about Somaliland's history and current situation remains scarce.

These conditions limit method and research design options and make Somaliland challenging to compare to other cases and to some extent complicates the description of what kind of case Somaliland is. It also makes the effort to access even basic information demanding and to get to the starting points of interviews is generally considerably more difficult than in many other contexts where data are more easily accessible. This part of researchers' efforts are often not visible in final papers, which I believe is regrettable. To not recognize the amount of work behind these studies or neglect to discuss connected challenges creates an even more significant

³⁸ The World Bank provided Somaliland's first GDP and poverty estimates in January 2014 (World Bank 2014).

bias towards continuing to conduct research in more easily accessible places and further hindering the possibility to learn from others.

In Somaliland, this difficulty meant that it took considerable time and energy to get hold of a basic list of the members of the parliament and cabinet ministers. It was also often impossible to find written information online about respondents in top positions or subjects raised in interviews. These limitations place more weight on the researchers in such contexts, to address issues of triangulation, and fact checking, but ultimately such research is more valuable. It also requires the researcher to adopt strategies and methods other than what might have been the case in other contexts.

For me, this meant that I had to learn as I went on to a much higher degree than I did, for example, during my elite study in Liberia. The Somaliland contexts required me to be more flexible and more alert because I had to write down all information I got right away since I could often not look things or names up later. These circumstances also made me much more dependent on my Somaliland contacts.³⁹

As for so many other aspects of conducting research in Somaliland, besides getting help to get in contact with respondents, it proved invaluable to have informed contacts who could guide me through different parts of the Somaliland system help me put together diverse strands of information and explain how different elite actors in Somaliland are related. But it also made my research more vulnerable since I was to a higher degree dependent on others. One of the coping strategies I used to reduce this vulnerability was to strive for a broad range of different contacts with the Somaliland diaspora, Somaliland researchers, and local Somaliland actors.

While recognizing these challenges, I would also like to emphasize advantages related to doing research in a setting where few(er) previous studies have been conducted. One of the greatest benefits was that people in general were willing to assist and talk to me and they were not tired of researchers as may be the case in many other places suffering from research fatigue (e.g., Clark 2008; Sukarieh and Tannock 2013). This enabled me to access different levels of society and book meetings with elites on short notice. Somaliland's unrecognized status and the wish for wider

³⁹ Connected to this is for example the lack of accessible information about how to get a visa. To access Somaliland it is necessary to obtain a Somaliland visa and I was informed that it must be acquired before entering the Somaliland airport or border. From my initial contacts in Somaliland I was advised to go to the Somaliland consulate in London in person. I contacted the consulate to confirm an appointment and booked a two day trip to London for the visa interview. However, when I arrived at the consulate, no one was there. Instead, I was informed over the phone that everyone responsible for visas had left the UK for several days to come and my prospect to get a visa in the near future was really bad. In the end, right before my planned first field trip, I instead got a visa through contacts in the Somaliland diaspora in Sweden.

attention from the international community (which I probably was considered a part of) are also likely to have made government officials and opposition leaders prone to talk to me. It was, for example, possible to arrange a meeting with the speaker of the parliament only two days after I had received his contact information from another informant. A majority of potential respondents in Liberia were also willing to be interviewed. However, compared to Somaliland I experienced it more difficult in Liberia to get respondents still holding official positions.

Findings in essay I

Findings from the study in Somaliland informed the points of departure for the following two essays; therefore, it is essential to present the results of this study before discussing the design and method of essay II.

In addition to general grounds for legitimacy, applying both to returnees and stayees in top political positions, this essay proposes that two central dimensions, Expectations and Commitment, influence returnees' perceived legitimacy in Somaliland. Findings from interviews suggested that Somalilanders generally viewed diaspora returnees positively in the first phase of the statebuilding process since expectations on them were high. When returnees in the parliament or the cabinet did not live up to these expectations, support for them declined. It was argued that returnees should be able to bring certain things due to their time in the diaspora. Thus, returnees, compared to stayees, have different expectations they must live up to in order to be seen as legitimate in their positions. These expectations revolve mainly around their expected capacity, democratic quality, and ability to deliver development. Failure to live up to these expectations is likely to negatively influence the legitimacy of returnees in politics and government.

Since returnees lived abroad where there are more opportunities, they were expected to be more educated and experienced than stayees. However, many interviewees argued that many returnees in Somaliland lacked the necessary qualifications for their jobs. It was pointed out as a fundamental problem that Somaliland does not attract those who succeeded in the diaspora, but that the "wrong" people return to serve as MPs or in the government. Thus, many returnees perceived right to serve in these positions requires being more qualified than stayees.

Similarly, it was expected that returnees should be able to bring with them democratic practices from the places where they have been residing. The interviews revealed that returnees were expected to break habits of clan corruption and be bearers of good governance. Due to the common belief that returnees in the parliament and government did not manage to

live up to these expectations, this negatively influenced the perception of returnees in these positions.

The third expectation, which is closely connected to the other two, was that returnees were assumed to translate their capacity and norms and contribute to Somaliland's development to a higher degree than stayees. As such, the returnees were expected to lobby for recognition since they have more extensive international contacts. Failure to secure recognition was a common critique raised during the interviews.

However, respondents also raised prominent examples of returnee ministers who had lived up to expectations; these actors were seen as highly educated and experienced people who had resisted clan corruption and contributed to Somaliland development. In addition to satisfying expectations, returnees' legitimacy also depends on the extent they are perceived as committed to Somaliland. This notion of commitment is connected to conflict history if returnees possess foreign passports and returnee MPs' or ministers' presence (or absence) in Somaliland.

Interviewees mentioned conflict history and if people left during times of hardship could have negative influence on perceptions of returnees in some places. Thus, respondents pointed out that the fact that people flee during war may be a relevant ground for questioning their commitment; however, this is seldom the case in Somaliland due to the specific conflict history and the role played by the diaspora during the war.

Returnees' possession of foreign passports was seen as far more damaging for their perceived commitment to Somaliland. It was claimed that most returnees in the parliament and government are dual citizens. This was partly perceived as positive since they have greater opportunities to lobby foreign governments for recognition. But this was mostly seen as having a negative influence on returnees' legitimacy since their use of their foreign passport, instead of their Somaliland passport, was interpreted as disrespectful to the Somaliland nation and might harm the independence struggle.

Overall, their keeping of a foreign passport was sometimes interpreted as a sign that they are not true nationalists and distanced them from the local population. Connected to this was the issue of returnees' presence or absence in Somaliland. It was claimed that returnee MPs and ministers spend the majority of their time in the other country where they have citizenship. Frequent travels were highlighted as an indication of disloyalty. It was also pointed out that their absence has practical consequences since it hinders the work of the parliament.

Many interviewees connected the returnees' ability to leave and keep families abroad as indicators that the returnees might be reckless with respect to Somaliland politics as they have less to lose if something goes wrong. Respondents also claimed that this made returnees more detached from the local reality and that they did not understand the needs of the local population.

All these marks of commitment may influence perceptions of returnees in these positions. However, it should be noted that findings in this essay also demonstrated that the perception of returnees in Somaliland largely rests on pragmatism. If returnees are able to provide development and show that they are not engaging in corrupt practices, this is likely to outweigh other flaws such as holding a foreign passport or spending time abroad. This may not always be the case in other contexts, where, for example, the diaspora played a different role during the war.

In addition to giving valuable insights about this issue in Somaliland, this study also provides important lessons for other cases. If interpretations of commitment are relevant in the Somaliland case, where it has been theoretically argued that the diaspora holds more moral authority to represent the local community than many other conflict-generated diasporas (Horst et al. 2010, p. 14), this is likely to hold true for many other less favourable cases.

Above all, this essay constitutes an important point of departure and illustrates the relevance of further studies on returnee politicians in post-war settings in Somaliland and in contrasting cases. Below, I illustrate how findings from this study informed my second and third essay.

Research design, method, and findings in essay II: Elite experiences and perceptions in Liberia

The first essay demonstrated different expectations on returnees in politics in Somaliland. In the second essay, by using literature about policy maker expectations on returnees in general to develop a theoretical framework, I investigate how Liberian elite perceptions of returnee ministers correspond to or deviate from the expectations held in international and national policy circles.

This essay provides a unique insider perspective since it makes use of elite interviews in Liberia with current and former ministers and deputy ministers of the Liberian government, opposition leaders, presidential candidates, members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and researchers. These interviews are combined with a systematic study of news

material, debate articles, and policy documents to assess whether arguments raised extend beyond the elite group included in the interviews. Similar to the study in Somaliland, these interviews were semi-structured and were intended to capture to what extent respondents believe returnee ministers contribute to or hamper an efficient, democratic, and local cabinet.

Interviews for this study were conducted in Monrovia and Gbarnga in Liberia during two weeks in August 2018. In total, 16 face-to-face interviews were conducted. Interviews were 30–60 minutes long, recorded, and conducted in English. All interviews were carried out and transcribed by me. Purposive sampling (see Kutlay 2016) was used to select respondents, who were of mixed age and diverse backgrounds: some respondents had experience with the diaspora, some had been beneficiaries of the LECBS projects whereas most had not, about half had been part of Johnson Sirleaf’s cabinets, and some had opposed Johnson Sirleaf’s party (Unity Party). Again, I tried to access respondents through several channels and domestic contacts. I contacted several of the respondents directly through email, social media, or telephone before going to Monrovia. Two of my Liberian contacts, Fofana Abraham and Abraham Matthews, were also both essential to this study as they shared their knowledge about Liberian politics and put me in contact with potential respondents.

I was prepared to go back to Liberia to conduct more interviews. However, after conducting approximately half of the interviews, I realized that the accounts I gathered were generally very consistent and largely corresponded to what I found when studying discussions of returnees in written Liberian media. New respondents repeated arguments that I had previously heard, indicating that I reached a satisfying level of theoretical saturation.

Unfortunately, as in Somaliland, it proved difficult to reach and convince female participants. Despite extensive efforts from both me and my research assistant, only one of the elites interviewed is female. As in Somaliland, in Liberia more men than women are political elites. However, there are several female representatives in the Senate and House of Representatives and a large share of President Johnson Sirleaf’s cabinets were female. Thus, absence of women in politics does not fully explain this bias. One additional reason might be that previous female ministers to a larger extent than their male counterparts have left Liberia. There is, however, no available data to substantiate this claim.

Findings in essay II

Findings in this study reveal a number of mismatches between expectations on returnees in statebuilding from domestic and international policy makers and how Liberian political elites view returnees' presence in the cabinet. The essay is structured around a number of specific expectations extracted from literature about policy maker expectations as well as policy documents. In accordance with expectations of policy circles, Liberian elites view returnee ministers as having the potential to bring two main benefits: their qualifications and potential relationship with international institutions. Liberian elites recognized that returnee ministers might have valuable qualifications and social networks from their diaspora experience. However, only a very specific kind of network was brought forward as valuable for returnee ministers' in the material – a network of international donors or other development partners. Also, only a few returnees are perceived as having these qualifications and social networks and they are not seen as a given benefit of having lived in the diaspora.

The material showed some ambiguity as not all Liberian elites expressed the same perceptions of returnee ministers. However, findings demonstrate how Liberian elite perceptions generally digressed from expectations from policy circles regarding returnee minister's ability to provide good governance, embeddedness in the local society, and possibility to provide benefits connected to their qualifications, social networks, democratic values, and local knowledge and connections during a temporary return.

Most shortcomings and dangers associated with returnee ministers centred on their perceived outsidersness and how they are seen as a separate category from ministers recruited from Liberia. For example, returnee ministers' patriotism was questioned and they were referred to as 'technocrat missionaries' who returned to Liberia to 'do a job' for a limited time before returning to their home abroad. To some Liberian elites, this clearly demonstrated returnee ministers detachment to Liberia and its population. An ensuing argument was that returnee ministers are unaware of local needs and therefore are not part of the local community. Moreover, connected to their belonging in Liberia, it was argued that returnee ministers generally are not part of domestic neo-patrimonial (or Big Man network) structures. It was claimed that people cannot reach out to returnees when in need since they do not know them the same way they know homegrown actors.

However, the most frequently used argument against returnee ministers' presence was the difficulty of holding these ministers accountable if they engage in corruption or in some other way misbehave. Experiences

of returnee government officials who left for the U.S. when accused of corruption have strongly informed the common narrative about returnees in public top positions. This argument, in combination with the claim that most returnee ministers possess dual citizenship, was central for a recurrent notion of returnees in these positions as harmful for Liberia.

Connected to the issue of accountability, it was repeatedly claimed that returnee ministers' diaspora connection make them more prone to corruption as returnees have a dual family challenge: they have to finance their life in Liberia as well as their families' lives in another country.

Finally, Liberian elites also problematized the dominance of returnee ministers in the cabinet since the end of the war and called for a balance between recruitment from abroad and from Liberia. In this way, findings in this study demonstrate how recruitments from the diaspora are inherently political, since it implies exclusion or inclusion of different social groups.

This essay not only takes on an important elite perspective, but also demonstrates a need to study this issue from a bottom-up perspective to capture how returnee ministers are perceived by the population. Thus, there is a need for more knowledge of how these returnees are viewed by the general population and to which extent these perceptions correspond to perceptions by elites presented in this essay.

Research design, method, and findings in essay III: Survey experiment with the general population in Liberia

The third essay begins where the second essay ends: it investigates the overarching topic of this thesis from the perspective of the general population. In this essay, I use a survey experiment to answer how a large presence of diaspora returnees in post-war cabinets affect the way the local population perceives the legitimacy of the cabinet.

The study tests six hypotheses generated from various research fields, such as research about migration, political representation, and political corruption in combination with findings from the two other essays. The first five hypotheses focused on the negative effect of a high presence of returnee ministers on cabinet legitimacy by investigating the following variables: direct support, efficiency, corruption, accountability, and representativeness.

In addition to these and to better grasp which circumstances returnees' presence in a cabinet impacts institutional legitimacy and therefore the different variables presented above, a sixth hypothesis was included. This hypothesis captures recent qualitative evidence that suggests that a key

mediating factor of returnee ministers' presence on cabinet legitimacy is the perceived enduring relationship returnee ministers keep with their host country.

To test these hypotheses, I carried out a vignette survey experiment with 1038 respondents in Monrovia in May 2019. A pre-analysis plan, including a draft of hypotheses and an outline of the research, was registered at the Evidence in Governance and Politics (EGAP) website before the final data collection was initiated.

Researches within social science are often confronted with questions of the internal validity of causal claims. The popularity of experimental designs during the last decade comes from the fact that they are considered to provide a potential remedy to these problems. Briefly, a survey experiment manipulates the form or order of items or descriptions included. In the survey experiment, respondents are randomly assigned to which manipulation or treatment they will receive (Gaines, Kuklinski and Quirk 2007). In a vignette survey experiment, a short description of a scenario is presented to respondents. This can, for example, be a description of a political grouping or a political decision. The experimental part consists of different characteristics in the vignette that might be varied for different treatment groups or there might be a control group (i.e., a group that does not receive a vignette). To capture the causal effects of interest, the decisions, answers, or behaviours of respondents belonging to different treatment groups are compared. The logic behind the experiment is that if assignment to treatment is random, average difference between treatment groups cannot have been affected by any extraneous variable but by the difference in the treatments.

Importantly, random assignment of treatment differs from random sampling. While random sampling has to do with the procedure by which respondents are chosen, random assignment does not mean that respondents must be drawn randomly from a larger population; however, it requires that the procedure that determines which treatment respondents receive is random (Druckman et al. 2011, p. 23).

In this essay, the vignettes presented to respondents entailed a description of a hypothetical presidential candidate and which ministers this presidential candidate would appoint if elected. The experimental treatment consisted of three descriptions of these ministers' backgrounds and actions. These descriptions consisted of a variation of where they were recruited from (the U.S. or Liberia) and if the ministers recruited from the U.S. would permanently leave their U.S. homes and bring their families to Liberia or if they would keep their houses and families in the U.S. (these

referred to as the Local, Weak ties, and Strong ties treatments, respectively).⁴⁰ The following survey consisted of questions about standard demographics, followed by different questions about respondents perceptions of the cabinet described to them.

Unlike in the first two essays, essay III uses a deductive approach to examine legitimacy. Within empirical legitimacy research ‘subjective legitimacy’ is referred to as a latent concept as it ‘cannot be measured directly’ (Gilley 2006, p. 503). Consequently, subjective legitimacy has to be empirically captured through ‘cause variables’ (Bollen and Lennox 1991) or ‘antecedent conditions’ (Levi, Sacks and Tyler 2009). In this way, legitimacy is measured with the use of empirically accessible variables theorized to lie close to the meaning of legitimacy. As a reflection of the hypotheses above, to empirically capture legitimacy in this study, I asked several questions about direct support and perceptions of cabinet performance, accountability, corruption, and representativeness.

The survey was conducted with the use of tablets. I programmed the survey in the *dobloo SurveyToGo* (STG) software. This software has several benefits such as possibility to program random assignment of treatment, to choose respondents within households, and to access different quality control features.

Due to financial and practical reasons, only respondents from 50 randomly selected Enumeration Areas (EAs) in Central Monrovia were included in the study. These EAs included varying socio-economic and ethnic compositions. Households as well as respondents were randomly selected within these EAs.

In addition to the practical advantages, Monrovia provided several other advantages as the focus of the data collection. Approximately half of Liberia’s population lives in urban areas and one-third lives in Monrovia or its surroundings (CIA 2019). Monrovia also has great diversity; its population includes all ethnic groups, religions, geographic areas, and socio-economic status in Liberia.

However, this sampling has some limitations compared to a nationwide random sample. As the main hypothesis proposes that a high share of returnees in the cabinet will have a negative effect on cabinet legitimacy, Monrovia, which is more cosmopolitan, theoretically constitutes a more

⁴⁰ Thus, the three treatment groups are: The reference group (“Local” treatment) receiving a description of cabinet where a majority of ministers are recruited from Liberia, the group receiving a description of a majority of ministers recruited from the U.S. which will bring their families with them to Liberia and quit houses in the U.S (“Weak ties” treatment) and the group receiving a description of a majority of ministers recruited from the U.S. which will keep their families and second homes in the U.S. (“Strong ties” treatment). Full vignettes and survey questions can be found in essay III.

difficult test for this hypothesis than other areas in Liberia. It is reasonable to believe that Liberians living in rural areas or other smaller urban areas are more detached from the diaspora and therefore more negatively inclined towards diaspora returnees in the government.

The survey experiment was carried out with the use of a local research firm, The Khana Group (TKG). I chose TKG as my partner since they have extensive experience conducting large surveys in Liberia. For example, TKG carried out the latest round of the Afrobarometer and have been partnered with Gallup. Having a reliable partner such as TKG helped offset my financial and practical (i.e., travel to and from Liberia) limitations. These national experts helped me select the enumeration areas, formulate the surveys and represented me in the ethical approval interview with the ethical board for research at the University of Liberia Institutional Review Board (UL-IRB).

I provided training to all enumerators and I was present in Monrovia for the pilot study and most of the data collection process. Being present during these steps was essential to a successful outcome of the study. Several changes were made in the survey after the pilot study and discussions with the local team of how to best formulate questions. In addition, this approach detected problems with the data collection process early in the process. These issues will be further discussed below.

Lessons learned from the survey experiment

The use of survey experiments is widespread in political science research in the Global North. In this context, survey experiments are often self-administered and conducted online. To study politics with the use of survey experiments is, however, less established in the Global South, especially so in sub-Saharan Africa.⁴¹ When conducting a survey in this context, many insights can be used from the well-developed body of survey experiment literature from the Global North, but this literature does not cover everything.

In many cases, no reliable census data exist (in the case of Liberia the census data are out of date), certain topics may be politically sensitive, different domestic norms may exist that make cross-gender interviews problematic, ethnic tensions might influence which enumerators to choose, and respondents may be unfamiliar or sceptical towards surveys

⁴¹ There are some recent exceptions, such as studies investigating if voters in Benin favor co-ethnics (Adida 2015), the relationship between information about elite tax evasion and political participation (Kolstad and Wiig 2019), single party hegemony in Tanzania (Croke 2017) and why voters support corrupt political candidates in South Africa (Bøttkjer and Justesen 2018).

(e.g., Lupu and Michelitch 2018). Moreover, although surveys in general are more common, they are much less used and often encounter problems not found in the Global North. Critiques have been raised that existing surveys conducted in the Global South lack transparency, for example, in terms of implementation and response rates (Lupu and Michelitch 2018).

Fabricated interviews in enumerator-administered surveys is a well-known problem, especially in surveys conducted in the Global South. Enumerators are generally compensated per conducted interview and some areas they work in might be high crime areas, making their incentives to quickly leave these areas greater. These issues can lead to enumerators skipping certain questions, making up responses, or fabricating the whole interview (Lupu and Michelitch 2018, p. 201). For my study, it proved extremely valuable to have carried out the survey on tablets with the *SurveyToGo* software as this software includes several quality control features designed to detect fabrication or mistakes. These features included registration of GPS signals, start and end times of interviews, time passed between interviews, and time stamps of each survey question. The software also records whether the GPS on the tablets has been turned off or if interviews were conducted faster than the pre-programmed time. During training, all enumerators were informed about these quality control measures and that improperly conducted interviews would be excluded from the study.

These measures revealed irregularities in several interviews conducted by one enumerator. Many of this enumerator's interviews were carried out in just a few minutes, leaving just one or a few seconds for both asking and answering the questions; all these interviews were excluded from the analysis. I also manually went through all the remaining interviews conducted by this enumerator to make sure that GPS positions were accurate and that the time stamp for every question seemed reasonable. Although it is impossible to completely avoid incidents like this or human error, many of these issues were detected by the software's quality control features.

Regrettably, this software does not solve the problem with monitoring the selection of households nor make sure that enumerators record the right number of persons living in a household. Enumerators were carefully instructed on how they should choose households. The software was programmed to ask for the number of respondents in the households, their names, and randomly select one respondent in each household; however, the enumerators had the responsibility to record the number and names. Enumerators were also supposed to manually write down the number of respondents who were unavailable or declined to participate as well as the reason why these people were not included in the study. Thus, the response

rate may be inaccurate and external validity might be compromised if enumerators do not follow the instructions.

My survey experiment suggests a problem as the response rate was 99.1%; that is, only ten original respondents were unavailable or declined to participate, an unrealistic number. Thus, this high response rate indicates that some enumerators failed to report respondent's refusal and non-compliance.

In the Afrobarometer round 7 in 2018, the response rate was reported to be 96% and in round 6 in 2015, 94%. Thus, the response rate is higher in this study. However, response rates from the Afrobarometer refer to a nationwide sample, whereas this study was conducted in Monrovia only. This survey is also considerably shorter than the Afrobarometer survey. Furthermore, this survey took place in a time of high political mobilization in Monrovia, which in this context may have made people more willing to participate and may have made it more likely that response rates are slightly higher in this study. Despite the probable failures to report response rates accurately, the response rates are probably at least as high as in the Afrobarometer rounds, which should still be considered as a high response rate. In addition, the sample included in this study, despite its flaws, probably comprises a composition more similar to the Monrovia population compared to internet-based survey experiments.

Moreover, failure of enumerators to follow instructions for selection of respondents affects the external validity negatively, but it does not threaten the internal validity of the experiment since allocation of treatment was still randomized. This also demonstrates the great importance of letting the software randomize treatments rather than enumerators.

Findings in essay III

Results from this study fail to reject the proposed hypotheses. Instead, the results suggest that high presence of ministers recruited from the diaspora negatively affects the population's view of the cabinet as legitimate. This holds for all variables. Results also indicate that the effect of a high share of returnee ministers on cabinet legitimacy is significantly stronger when recruited returnees keep strong ties to their former host country, in this case the U.S., compared to if they signal they will loosen their ties to the former host country. Thus, these results provide support for that remaining close ties to the host country is mediating the effect a high share of returnee ministers has on cabinet legitimacy.

Results also indicate that this mediating effect is particularly evident for perceived cabinet corruption and accountability. For these two variables, all treatment group means were diverse. However, the difference is

considerably smaller for the group receiving the Local treatment and the Weak ties treatment; the confidence interval for these groups overlap and therefore the difference of means between these two groups is not statistically significant. Respondents receiving the Strong ties treatment on average viewed the likelihood for the described cabinet to be corrupt significantly higher and the possibilities to hold the cabinet accountable significantly lower compared to respondents receiving the other two treatments. These differences of means are statistically significant.

This indicates that the notion that returnee ministers keep strong ties to the former host country are seen as more relevant for their risk of being corrupt and chances of being held accountable than solely the circumstance that they are recruited from the former host country. This finding resembles the elite's statements in essays I and II that returnees are more prone to be corrupt and difficult to hold accountable since they can leave if being accused of corruption.

Fieldwork: ethical issues and positionality

In relation to the discussion above about research design and method, several additional aspects of research ethics and positionality must also be emphasized. The number one priority throughout all my three studies has been the safety and integrity of all respondents, research assistants, and myself.

Recently, important post-colonial critique has been raised towards how researchers (mainly based in the Global North) often exploit 'research brokers' or 'fixers' while conducting field work in the Global South (Adedi Dunia et al. 2019; Eriksson Baaz and Utas 2019). This critique revolves around several aspects of the power imbalance between contracting researchers and research assistants. While these brokers often play a fundamental role, they seldom receive official credit or are included as co-authors. Moreover, when safety issues are discussed, these generally deal with respondents and the researchers themselves, often neglecting the situation for domestic research brokers even though these people are at the greatest risk as they will also suffer from long term consequences (Eriksson Baaz and Utas 2019, p. 173).

In hindsight, I believe that I could have considered this more when conducting these studies. Due to the desire to get foreign government to recognize Somaliland, the risk that I, a Swedish researcher, would experience serious trouble from domestic authorities seemed low. However, it is more

difficult to assess the potential long-term consequences for those who assisted me. They are all well-informed and well-connected in Somaliland and ensured me that this subject of study did not imply any risks. However, I should have considered the power balance between me and the assistants and the potential risks they faced more carefully.

In both Somaliland and Liberia, I relied on several people, so each one of them did not spend a lot of time assisting me. Moreover, several helped me with interviews as part of their job in different government institutions. I financially compensated those who devoted more time to help me and made sure that they did not have to privately cover any expenses connected to these studies. Yet, taking into account the critique presented above, I should probably have developed an even more thought through method to credit and compensate those who assisted me.

For all three studies, I did a thorough risk assessment, including how sensitive this subject is and if it put participants at risk. To discuss returnees from the diaspora in politics or government did not seem to be particularly sensitive since it is repeatedly discussed at both official political meetings and in the media. This also corresponded to what my domestic contacts and respondents in interviews told me. Moreover, during elite interviews, respondents were also more informed than I was about both the security situation and the possible sensitivity of the subject.

While collecting data for the Somaliland essay, I became aware how safety issues, and especially one's sense of safety, when carrying out field studies have gained remarkably little attention in qualitative research (some notable exceptions are Felbaba Brown 2014; Goldstein 2014 and Grimm et al. 2020). This is problematic since it often influences the design as well as the result of a study even though researchers might not want to recognize this. It is challenging to carry out a qualitative study in any setting, but even more so in places where there are obvious threats towards the researchers and/or participants. Moreover, common problems conducting field studies are often deepened when both the researcher and national population feel insecure and fear violence or government reprisals.

However, what struck me in Somaliland was how potential contextual threats may affect both the researcher and the study. I learned how difficult it may be to assess one's safety in general and how torn one may be between recognizing feelings of unsafety and other aspects of being a junior researcher. To know all factual circumstances is often difficult, if not impossible, and even more difficult in a place with limited information and media coverage and where one does not speak the language.

The Swedish Foreign Ministry advises against travelling to any parts of Somalia, including Somaliland. During my first travel, the Swedish government recommended that Swedish citizens in Somaliland, including Hargeisa, leave. However, after consulting with diaspora in Sweden and researchers who have been in Somaliland, I was informed that travelling there did not imply more of a security risk than going to many other more well-visited places. I was repeatedly told that Hargeisa is among the safest cities in Africa.

This also corresponds to my experience that threats towards my personal security, such as the risk of getting robbed or getting caught in violent clashes, was lower in Hargeisa than in many other places I have visited.⁴² For example, in Hargeisa, moneychangers leave piles of cash on the streets in the centre of the city without any weapons or guards. Moreover, the city has been practically free of armed violence since the peace process began, and the risk for clans taking up arms and conflict is considered low.⁴³

Although research brokers often are put in a more vulnerable position than researchers themselves (Eriksson Baaz and Utas 2019), I believe that it is important to recognize that one's sense of safety likely places limits on a study. For me, this combined with other practical circumstances lead to the decision to limit interviews to Hargeisa. This is where a large majority of the pool of respondents reside. However, from the beginning, I considered including respondents from other cities and even to compare Somaliland and Puntland. Once in the field, I realized that this was not a sustainable option. I realized my own limitations, but this also made me even more confident in not putting any participant in the study at risk.

One of the benefits of this experience is that this made me very aware of security issues, so I constantly assessed the risks my research assistants, my respondents, and myself could encounter. It may have made me exaggerate some risks, but I consider this preferable to being over-confident. Reflecting on such issues might also help researchers better recognize their own misconceptions and their own position in a different setting. Despite efforts to avoid it, it became clear that I came to Somaliland with many

⁴² However, the Easternmost parts of Somaliland has experiences violence due to an ongoing conflict with Puntland (Menkhaus 2015).

⁴³ However, the risk of terrorist attacks, especially from al-Shabab, is still present. The latest attack was in 2008, when 30 people were killed by five car bombs in Hargeisa and Puntland. Despite being assured by various contacts that Hargeisa is safe, during my first trip I was repeatedly told that "Al-shabaab will strike there sooner or later, everyone knows that. I would never go there", about the hotel I stayed at. The day I arrived to Hargeisa also coincided with the horrific attack by al-Shabab in North-eastern Kenya killing 147 students at the Garissa Univeristy (BBC 2015), making this a frequently discussed topic.

misconceptions and had been influenced by the narrative often told in media. To realize this helped me scrutinize myself so these notions would not influence my research.

Importantly, my experience was very different during my second visit to Hargeisa. At this point, I was much more familiar with Somaliland and had time to reflect on my first experience. This made me feel considerably safer even though the factual circumstances had not changed. The second time around I also had a much more extensive network in Hargeisa and had people to confide in. This also meant that I had someone to reach out to if I needed assistance. This experience gave me a deeper appreciation of conducting a pilot study when possible, for reasons I had not fully understood previously. It is important not only to get a sense of the accessible data, but also to better assess feasible methods from a security perspective. Moreover, a pilot study gives the researcher the opportunity to reflect over his or her own position.

In essay II, I did a similar risk assessment as conducted for Somaliland. Information about the Liberian situation is much more accessible and Sweden has an embassy in Monrovia, where I got assistance and information. Therefore, I felt that I had a better grasp of the situation in Monrovia at the point of my first visit compared to what I had in Somaliland.

Following up on the discussion about potential risks from my experience in Hargeisa, risk assessments also have a connected gendered dimension, which forced me to postpone and adjust my initial research plan. Between conducting my study in Somaliland and the first study in Liberia, I had become pregnant. Although being a very welcomed addition in my personal life, this created obstacles for my planned research in Liberia. It has been shown how having children often negatively affects women's careers in academia (Kyvik and Teigen 1996; Hunter and Leahey 2010). However, it is seldom discussed how childbearing and having small children restricts researchers doing field work in settings where one might be hesitant to go during pregnancy or with infants.

A combination of lack of access to high quality health care, insurance issues, and physical restrictions connected to the pregnancy made it impossible to conduct my first study in Liberia during the course of the pregnancy. This was challenging since I could not move the research project forward without collecting data from the field. I also realized that even after my daughter was born, I could not go to Liberia for as long as I had initially planned since I was hesitant to bring her with me.

This forced me to plan my time in Liberia in much more detail. Ideally, I believe that it is best to plan a maximum two interviews per day in the field and leave plenty of room to transcribe, prepare for interviews, and

process what has been said in interviews. Due to the limited amount of time I had in Liberia, this was not realistic for this study. I often had four interviews in one day, in different locations, sometimes as far away as Gbarnga (a three-hour drive from Monrovia). This led to really long working days, often ranging from 4 am to 8 pm.

The time limit was not ideal. But it was what the circumstances allowed me to do. Since I knew this well in advance, I also had plenty of time to prepare. I reached out to scholars who have written about Liberian politics both in Sweden and abroad. I also established contacts at the Swedish embassy in Monrovia and with several Liberian researchers. In addition to reading everything I could access about Liberian history and politics, I also read about potential respondents to be prepared if I succeeded to get an interview with them. I also closely followed Liberian news and held Skype interviews with researchers and other contacts in Liberia to be as informed as possible before the fieldwork.

For many research topics, this would still not have been a useful way to carry out a study. It might take considerable time to understand the context, to get a way in to communities of interest, or to build rapport with respondents. But due to the nature of my research question and my interest in the accounts of elites, this approach, despite its disadvantages, proved to be fruitful. Since potential respondents were elites who often had contact information online, I contacted several potential respondents myself before I arrived in Monrovia. I also had invaluable assistance from contacts in Liberia to arrange interviews and to obtain information about potential respondents.

For the survey experiment, the safety assessment was slightly different. Compared to the two previous elite studies, respondents in this study were mainly non-elite citizens. Moreover, when carrying out this study, I did not interact with respondents myself, but the enumerators played a much larger role. In addition to going through dual ethical approvals (in Sweden and in Liberia), the research team and I carefully went through the initial information and statement of consent presented to respondents in the survey interviews.

An additional risk that occurred was the political situation, which became more sensitive in Monrovia right before the survey was implemented. The survey was conducted in mid-May 2019; on June 7, large protests were planned in Monrovia. Obviously, I had to consider and assess the risks, which I did in consultation with the domestic research team. The issue of the study was not closely connected to the protests and at the time of the survey there was no political unrest in Monrovia. However, this increased the importance that the vignette presented in the survey did

not too closely resemble the real political actors and that enumerators could clearly present themselves and the purpose of the study. Indeed, I also had to carefully monitor the situation from day to day.

The risk for me and for respondents answering the survey was assessed to be rather low, rather, the enumerators were at greatest risk. They were going to different areas in Monrovia with varying socio-economic status and were sometimes entering people's homes. Some of the areas included are known for being more unsafe and enumerators were carrying tablets, which might be considered valuable. For these reasons, issues of security were carefully discussed at the training session with the enumerators. They were, for example, informed that they should not carry out any interviews after dark, should always work in teams reporting to each other, and always leave if they felt that the situation was unsafe. This was also one of the main reasons that I contracted a well-established research firm familiar with carrying out research in all areas of Monrovia and which has an existing security protocol. The domestic research coordinator reported to me daily and no incidents were reported during the study.

Earlier, I presented how I experienced some problems during elite interviews in Somaliland, where respondents did not fully listen to my questions and engaged in long monologues. Such problems are not unfamiliar for most field researchers, and it demonstrates the importance of trying to predict and understand social relations in the field. To have an understanding of how one is 'positioned in the social world' (Gouldner 1970, p. 489) is essential to carrying out successful fieldwork. During interviews, researchers' and respondents' identities are embedded in power structures (MacLean 2013). These power structures should be recognized by the researcher, both for ethical reasons and for understanding how answers might be biased.

Before going to Somaliland and Liberia, I tried to anticipate how people would perceive me as a young female researcher from Sweden. While in the field, I had to continue to develop my understanding of how the relationship between the interviewees and myself was entangled with systems of social power based on factors such as gender, class, ethnicity, and age. The social hierarchies are not always easy to detect.

While there are some who point out that female researchers can encounter specific problems due to their gender when doing field studies in contexts with high levels of gender inequality (Felbaba Brown 2014, p. 11), I did not experience any obvious barriers connected to my gender during my research. It was obvious that the elites I met with had higher status than myself, which was also reflected in the interviews. But as discussed

earlier, this was probably more connected to my age and their elite position than my gender.

In Somaliland, respondents often wanted to tell the outside world about their situation and, of course, to get recognition. This affected how people engaged with me, since I was seen as a tool to get closer to these aims. I tend to agree with Schwedler (2006): female researchers from the Global South are often seen as a ‘third gender’ when conducting field research. This can in itself be challenging since one’s privileged position over local women may become obvious (this should, however, be true for both male and female researchers), but it enables female researchers to conduct research in contexts with great gender inequalities. In Somaliland, my understanding is that people primarily saw me as a *cadaan* (white), secondarily as young, and thirdly as a woman.

Similarly, in Liberia my status as an outsider was obviously the strongest mark of my identity. Also, I interviewed elites, many of who have more political and economic power than I do. Yet, Sweden is one of the largest providers of aid to Liberia, which probably influenced respondents’ perceptions of me as well as their willingness of taking their time to meet with me. Therefore, it was necessary to assess to which extent this could bias their answers in the interviews. During the course of interviews, the respondents often offered their opinion of what they believed donors should focus on. However, I did not notice that this influenced their answers when discussing the topics of interest for these studies.

For the survey experiment, I did not meet respondents myself, but I had to consider the power relation between enumerators and respondents as well as the influence of that the survey was conducted by the Uppsala University in Sweden. I had to understand how this risked giving respondents certain hopes or impressions, both of the study and their participation. To avoid misleading respondents, I and the domestic research team carefully worked through how enumerators should present the study and ask for informed consent. During the training session, it was also repeatedly emphasized that respondents’ participation should be completely voluntarily and that enumerators should point out that respondents could end the survey whenever they wanted to.

The survey also included a question at the end asking who they thought was behind the survey. To include this question is relevant since it has been shown that respondents participating in surveys in the Global South frequently believe that the surveys are backed by the government or other political actors (Lupu and Michelitch 2018). The majority of respondents (62%) in this survey answered correctly that TKG/Uppsala University were behind the survey. Although a large share of the respondents did not

pick the right answer, a low number (6%) of respondents replied that the government was behind it.⁴⁴ Since this was a survey experiment with random assignment of treatment, misconceptions about who sponsored the study do not affect the results of the study.

However, from an ethical perspective it is worrisome that many respondents do not apprehend who is behind the survey or mistrust the information given. For this study, respondents were also given a written note with information about the study and contact information for me and others responsible for the study. This information specified that Uppsala University was the entity principally responsible for the research and that The Khana Group was the Liberian partner. Yet, to better assess answers given in surveys in general in these contexts, future studies should more thoroughly probe the fact that many respondents do not know or are of the impression that organizations other than those stated in the information are behind surveys.

Conclusions

In this thesis, the following research question has been investigated: How do the local elites and the wider population perceive returnees in post-war governments and what shapes these returnees' legitimacy? Overall, while acknowledging some benefits, local elites in Somaliland and Liberia highlight challenges connected to returnees' presence in governments and question their legitimacy. These challenges are mirrored in the perceptions of the Liberian population, who see returnees as less legitimate in government positions than stayees. This thesis shows how notions of capacity, democratic norms and practices as well as representation are not only central peacebuilding and statebuilding objectives, but that the legitimacy of returnees in government is largely shaped by these principles. In this way, findings in this thesis are of great relevance for future peace- and statebuilding efforts.

In this introduction, I have explained how the three essays in this thesis are connected. Although they largely build on the same body of research, they investigate the issue at hand from different angles. I have also presented how the essays build on each other and how findings from essays I

⁴⁴ Of the remaining, the answers were divided as follows: 19 % "do not know", 6 % "No one", 2% "Non-governmental or religious organization", 2% "International organization or another country", 1% "Other" and less than 1% answered "God", "Research company/University/Organization", "Private company", "Media", "Political party or politician" respectively.

and II are used to develop the hypotheses tested in essay III. Despite the fact that these studies have been conducted in different contexts and have focused on different populations, the key findings point in similar directions. Above all, it is demonstrated that in post-war societies the diaspora background of ministers are politically important; it is associated with capacity, norms of good governance, and the role the broker plays representing both the local population and international donors. Thus, the identity of having background in the diaspora has a political meaning and shapes the legitimacy of returnees in post-war governments. Furthermore, I show how these essays constitute a theoretical contribution to the larger statebuilding research field by demonstrating how the use of these concepts (capacity, norms and practices, representativeness) vary between contexts and how the aspects of these concepts that hold greatest importance vary depending on the actor. In this way, it increases our understanding of how legitimacy operates.

A central issue in these studies is: Who is considered part of the diaspora (i.e., who is a returnee)? The first two studies take on this question from an empirical perspective by focusing on how the respondents or stayees viewed the diaspora (i.e., returnees). This was done by interpreting respondent's answers and by studying media material and previous research on diaspora (e.g., Ibrahim 2010). Moreover, at the end of the interviews, I also asked more specifically who respondents considered to be from the diaspora. The responses were similar in both Somaliland and Liberia. Although respondents recognized that nationals living in neighbouring countries theoretically should be considered as diaspora, they made it clear that these are not the groups that are referred to when discussing this issue. In the case of Somaliland, it was also pointed out that diaspora in the Gulf States or Asian countries are generally not considered part of the diaspora. As explained above, the word for diaspora in Somalia (*qurba-joog*) mainly refers to the diaspora from the Global North (Ibrahim 2010, p. 9). When discussing solely the presence of diaspora and returnees in politics, it was pointed out that in Somaliland these individuals mainly come from European countries, whereas in Liberia they mainly come from the U.S. This empirical reality is also the main reason why the third essay refers to returnees as being recruited from the U.S.

As emphasized above, I do not claim that diasporas or returnees are homogenous groups and perceived in the same way in all contexts. Moreover, returnees are not all seen in the same way by nationals. For returnees, their diaspora identity overlaps with their other identities, such as gender, ethnicity, and political affiliation. Nevertheless, in Somaliland and Liberia there are certain narratives, often negative, about returnees in government

at a group level even though there might be examples of individual returnees who deviate from this narrative. Thus, findings in these essays show how the diaspora identity is politicized and can be used as a political tool against returnees in top positions. Therefore, they connect to central questions within political science such as who has the right to govern, where are the boundaries of the nation, and who can act as legitimate representatives of the national population.

There are some noteworthy limitations to this study in addition to those already noted. For example, the study has limited guidance on actual perceptions of returnee officials in large states with limited experience of returnees' presence. Also, in spite of some theorizing, this study does not investigate how returnees are perceived in cases where the diaspora is largely part of the losing party in the war. Thus, there are cases where the findings from this study do not apply. Therefore, future research should investigate how these findings extend to cases of different characteristics and different populations and if they hold over time.

Interestingly, although there are some notable discrepancies, many of the arguments articulated about returnees by elites are similar in Liberia and Somaliland in essay I and II, a finding also supported by essay III. While there are some resemblances across these contexts, these two cases also contrast in several important aspects, such as being or not being a recognized state, having experienced extensive statebuilding lead by international agencies or not, having (ethnically) homogenous or heterogeneous diasporas, as well as the role of the diaspora during the war. Thus, many aspects raised are likely to extend to a larger universe of cases than those studied here, especially to other small post-war states where the composition of those in the diaspora does not mirror losing parties in the conflict. Resentment towards returnees in politics is likely to be even more widespread in places experiencing (unwanted) military interventions, and where many returnees are connected to the invading power. Assumptions that returnees will attain local legitimacy in such settings, oversee domestic actors trying to secure political power, and exaggerate the perceived value of originating from the same physical place. If cabinet legitimacy is affected negatively by returnees' dominance in Liberia, as is shown in essay III, this is even more likely in these places where there is widespread resentment towards common diaspora countries in general.

The three essays included in this thesis demonstrate in different ways the relevance of notions of capacity, democratic norms, and practices as well as by how well they represent the local population in governments. Below, I specify how these concepts are central to how we should understand perceptions of diaspora returnees in post-war governments.

Capacity

Locals' notions of capacity and by extension provision of efficiency and development are central in all three essays.

First, in both Somaliland and Liberia, the elites expressed a need for outsiders to supply capacity. The brain drain after the war was central to discussions about development and government efficiency. The interviews in essays I and II provide prominent examples of returnee ministers who were perceived as being extremely skilled and largely successful in delivering what was expected of them. In both contexts, elites' expectations of capacity revolved around education, working experience, and politics or government agency experience. However, according to Somaliland and Liberian elites, a central component of returnees' capacities is their potential networks abroad, particularly with international agencies and foreign governments. The Somaliland respondents claimed that returnees were in a considerably better position to lobby foreign governments and international organizations for Somaliland's recognition than stayees. Due to Somaliland's contested status, Somalilanders without foreign passports might even have difficulties travelling abroad. Therefore, the role of returnees as external representatives is likely to be of even greater importance in such settings. In Liberia, elites emphasized returnees with experience from international agencies and the ensuing potential to secure vital aid and loans through their networks and experiences from these organizations.

Second, in both Somaliland and Liberia, the prominent examples mentioned above were commonly used to contrast returnees who were accused of not living up to these expectations. Rather, it was argued, returnees were in general failing to deliver on these expectations and returnees assumed qualifications were questioned in essays I and II. In Somaliland, it was pointed out that the wrong and less successful persons in the diaspora were returning. Liberian elites emphasized that some returnees might have qualifications from the Global North, but they lacked experience with the domestic system as well as sufficient understanding of domestic circumstances to do their jobs well. To come directly from abroad to serve as a cabinet minister could harm cabinet efficiency in several ways – e.g., through cooperation issues within ministries or committees or in deficient policies since policy makers are not up-to-date with the domestic reality. This narrative is common, yet it is important to recognize that domestic elites also might have personal incentives, such as securing their own positions by de-emphasizing the skills and contributions of returnees. However, in essay III, it is demonstrated that the non-elite Liberians also believe that a cabinet with many returnee ministers are likely to perform

worse than a cabinet with mostly locally-recruited ministers. This thesis does, however, not investigate to which extent perceptions of returnees in governments among citizens in general are formed by perspectives articulated by elites or which other factors influence citizens' perceptions, a topic for future studies to examine further.

Third, findings from both Somaliland and Liberia indicate how returnee's legitimacy to be in the cabinet or parliament is highly conditioned on expectations from domestic elites that they should provide more efficiency and development than their domestic counterparts due to their assumed qualifications. In both cases, it is claimed that if returnees performed better in terms of development, formulating policies, and dealing with corruption, their presence would be less controversial to locals. In some cases, legitimacy stemming from efficiency – i.e., output legitimacy – might be of greater relevance to evaluations of returnees than to domestic actors, since, as is shown in the essays and as discussed below, returnees' legitimacy based on representing the domestic population is restricted.

Furthermore, this thesis demonstrates how capacity in the eyes of locals refers to a wide range of aspects such as education, work, political experience, social networks abroad, and experience with international agencies or governments and is manifested by, for example, providing development, securing aid or loans, as well as lobbying for recognition or securing attention for domestic affairs abroad. However, capacity also deals with particular local knowledge and experiences as well as ability to understand local needs. As Hughes notes, both return capacity programs and many heads of states turning to the diaspora use a meritocratic argument for their recruitment. However, merit in these cases refers only to 'Western ideas of 'professionalism' and is not viewed in terms of local knowledge' (2011, p. 1507). Local elites in essays I and II repeatedly noted that diaspora returnees in general lack necessary knowledge of domestic conditions and of the domestic system he or she is supposed to work in. Thus, this shows how policy makers' narrow notion of merit often differs to domestic actors' understanding of capacity or skills necessary to efficiently run the government.

Norms and practices

Essays in this thesis have also probed and problematized expectations of returnees to bring particular norms and practices from the Global North.

First, Somaliland elites expected that returnees in government would provide good governance and democratic practices due to their experience

living in a Western democracy (essay I). Returnees were, however, generally seen as failing to deliver on this expectation. In Liberia, elites did not expect returnees to bring certain norms or practices due to their time abroad, rather, as discussed below, returnees were in general seen as more likely to be corrupt than their local counterparts (essay II). Both Somaliland and Liberian elites questioned whether returnees in general could provide good governance. Evident in both these essays was that misconduct (e.g., corruption) by individual returnees was used as an argument to delegitimize returnees in the government as a group.

Second, corruption was central in all three essays, although in different ways. In addition, the discussions around corruption among Somaliland and Liberian elites differed in some central ways. In Somaliland, disappointment commonly concerned returnees' inability to dismantle the widespread clan corruption. In Liberia, although not referring to this issue as corruption per se, some elites criticized returnees for not being part of the neopatrimonial structure and that people in general cannot reach out to returnees to get funding or other support the same way as they can with stayees. However, these essays do not examine how non-elite populations in Somaliland and Liberia view issues of clan corruption or neopatrimonial redistribution or how returnees in the government are expected to deal with these issues, another important avenue for future research.

Yet, essay III shows that cabinet with a majority of returnee ministers are perceived as more likely to be corrupt than a cabinet with a majority of locally-recruited ministers. This is in accordance with elite accounts from Liberia presented in essay II. Liberian elites expressed that returnees with dual citizenship are inclined to be corrupt due to their connection to the diaspora and the great financial burden connected to keeping families and homes abroad. This can also be contrasted with accounts from Sierra Leone presented earlier, where returnees initially were argued to be less likely to be corrupt since they had sufficient resources abroad. In this way, as with hopes that returnees would stop clan corruption in Somaliland, returnees' outsidersness seemed to be considered a potential asset in Sierra Leone at that time. However, in the case of Liberia, outsidersness was claimed to make returnees more prone toward corruption due to their need to support two households – one in Liberia and one in their host country.

Third, a central theme for all three essays, also connected to corruption, was accountability of returnees in government, although in somewhat different ways in the both cases. Dual citizenship was central to elite perceptions of returnees in governments in both Somaliland and Liberia, as this was seen as enabling returnee ministers to avoid accountability. One important aspect raised in the case of Somaliland is that returnees might be

more reckless since they have a way out if something goes wrong, and the consequences of their actions in the government or parliament generally do not affect their children and grandchildren since they reside abroad. Simply put, they have much less to lose in the long run compared to stayees if they, for example, implement poor policies or create conflicts within institutions; that is, they will not have to live with the consequences of their misdeeds. In Liberia, lacking accountability was mainly connected to government officials' possibility to embezzle government resources and flee to a safe haven using a foreign passport. This is also mirrored in essay III: non-elite Liberians believed holding a cabinet of mainly returnees accountable was more difficult than holding a cabinet of mainly stayees accountable.

This thesis thus shows how judgements of corruption and accountability with reference to returnees might differ between different cases and actors. Notably, these essays do not further examine local meanings of corruption and accountability and to which degree neopatriotism is interpreted negatively or perceived as a form of corruption by citizens in general. In addition, these essays do not investigate how these perceptions differ between groups in society or with reference to stayee or returnee actors. Since corruption of government officials risks delegitimizing the political system and its actors (e.g., Seligson 2002; Anderson and Tverdova 2003), especially in post-war contexts (Dix, Hussmann, and Walton 2012), this is a relevant avenue for future studies to examine.

Representativeness

In all three essays, the ability of returnees in governments to represent local populations were discussed and problematized. Also regarding representativeness, there were certain aspects raised which overlap whereas others diverge between the different cases and essays.

First, in both essay I and II, elites critically noted that returnees crowd out local actors in the government. This view is explained by one Somaliland respondent:

It has been almost like a requirement to be from the diaspora to be in politics. It defines how far you get in politics. If you are diaspora you are most likely to succeed (Interview 6, 2015).

Data from Liberia illustrate a similar situation in Liberia, where the cabinet and broader government has largely been dominated by diaspora returnees and elites are calling for a balance (essay II). Perceptions that returnees are dominating the political sphere might be especially sensitive in places

recovering from violent conflicts over government power. If returnees dominate the cabinet, broader government, and parliament, it means that other groups are probably excluded from these institutions. As political exclusion is a driving cause for civil war recurrence (Call 2012), this should be taken seriously. Since diaspora/stayee identities overlap with many other identities, they might not have the same mobilizing power as identities associated with ethnicity or religion. However, findings in these essays support Chesterman's warning that diasporas as a new political elite might be the root of new political tensions in post-war settings (2004, p. 8). In both Somaliland and Liberia, the diaspora returnees are perceived as an upper class group who generally exclude non-diaspora from political power. If other elites as well as the general population feel excluded by returnees in the government for long periods, this might have consequences for the legitimacy of the state, and ultimately for statebuilding as well as peacebuilding. To examine if this is the case among elites and general population, as well as the potential consequences, are also important avenues for future research.

Second, both essay I and II demonstrate how returnees in the government are evaluated for their ability to represent the inside of the state (i.e., the population or certain parts of the population) or the outside (i.e., foreign agencies, companies, or governments). In Liberia, returnees were seen as important brokers between the Liberian government and international agencies such as the IMF or the World Bank (essay II). The respondents believed the diaspora has a better chance than local actors of demonstrating to these organizations that Liberia is a competent, reliable partner. In this sense, returnees are described as essential representatives of Liberia. As noted above, similar arguments were raised in Somaliland, but with the focus of returnees' ability to lobby for recognition. That is, cabinet ministers are seen as national symbols rather than mere technocrats or bureaucrats. Their perceived loyalty and commitment are used as a key argument when discussing whether to place returnees in these positions. In addition to their efficiency, their behaviour and actions are interpreted from the perspective of their roles as representatives of the national population and the nation. In post-war settings, there might be a great need for external acceptance since aid and investments are fundamental for the state's development. But what is shown in these studies is that this might come at the cost of representing the domestic population.

Third, different forms of outsidersness of returnees are highlighted in a negative sense by both Somaliland and Liberian elites through arguments about returnees' non-commitment, disloyalty, lack of understanding of local circumstances, and lack of integration with the local community. In

Somaliland, it was argued that even if it might enable lobbying of foreign organizations, the use of foreign passports by returnees in official positions undermines Somaliland's struggle for recognition. Returnee ministers' dual citizenship or close connection to the diaspora country were problematized by Liberian elites as well. Besides the issue of accountability, returnees' reference to the U.S. as their "home" and the fact that they are keeping homes and families abroad, are interpreted as central signals that they are not part of the national community or are committed enough to the national development. As is demonstrated in essay III, some of these narratives, often articulated by elites or media, seem to have resonance among the non-elite population since cabinets with a high share of returnee ministers are considered less likely to represent the local population compared to a cabinet with a high share of ministers recruited from within Liberia. Importantly, results from this essay also support the idea that the returnee's inability to represent the local population is connected to whether their families and homes are abroad or in Liberia. Furthermore, Liberian elites claimed that returnees' close connections abroad severely hindered returnees' understanding of local needs and the local system. Therefore, elites questioned the extent the returnees could represent the national population. Returnees' ability to fully act as legitimate representatives of the domestic society and thereby their capacity to provide local ownership in the settings investigated in these studies is limited. This contribution is highly relevant from a policy perspective since returnees often are seen as a way to ensure local ownership by policy makers.

As discussed above and since categories overlap, Liberian returnees position within (or outside of) neopatrimonial networks were also discussed. In this sense, returnees were seen as representing (and redistributing to) locals to a much lesser degree than ministers who had stayed in Liberia, thereby increasing their perceived outsidership. The extent to which this is negative depends on the lens with which one interprets the matter. If heads of states or donors aim at breaking neo-patrimonial or the Big Men network practices, returnees' potential position outside of these structures might be seen as partly beneficial to these actors. There might, however, be a risk, which is not investigated in this study, that returnees also function as patrons or Big Men with their clients or networks located in the diaspora rather than in the state. If so, their positions might be even more problematic since this means that state resources might be redistributed outside the state or their policies cater to those living outside the country. Thus, returnee government officials are likely to create or be part of networks that often differ from the stayees' networks. Which network gains access to state resources depends on who wins the presidential or

parliamentary elections. This points to the struggle between different kinds of networks, where some seem to be more integrated locally and others more located abroad or at least less evident. Therefore, future studies should examine these networks, possibly through network analysis, to reveal how different (or similar) the returnees' networks are to the stayees' networks.

Fourth, several contextual aspects might influence the relationship between nationals and the diaspora. For example, in post-war states with limited experience of returnees in government or politics, the returnee identity might be less significant to nationals since returnees as a group do not threaten the political power of national actors. However, findings in this thesis are important for cases that have not yet experienced high presence of returnees but might do so in the future. Given that Liberia is a paradigmatic case, it shows that there is a considerable risk that when returnees are perceived as excluding national actors from positions of power or when the national population feels alienated from returnees in power, the outsidership of returnees is likely to be articulated and used against them. Similarly, since this is problematized in a favourable case of diaspora legitimacy as Somaliland, this risk is even greater in contexts where the diaspora is seen as holding less moral authority to take part in the government, for example, in cases where the diaspora's role during the war is questioned or where the ethnic, religious, or political composition of those in the diaspora do not mirror the national population or elites.

As is demonstrated here, this thesis shows how, and how well, returnees represent is multifaceted. Different forms of representation might be contradictory such as local populations believing returnees can represent the country to international agencies while also believing they might not understand local needs. These contradictory beliefs both negatively and positively influence the legitimacy of returnees in governments.

As I demonstrate in the three preceding sections, this thesis shows how notions of capacity, norms, and practices as well as representation are central to perceptions of diaspora returnees in the government and in different ways shape their legitimacy.

Essays I and II also indicate that the elites' perceptions of the returnees' role in statebuilding seemed to become more negative as time passed from the end of wars. For example, in both Somaliland and Liberia, domestic elites believed after the end of the wars the returnees' capabilities were needed as the countries did not have qualified people to run the country. Therefore, the elites rarely questioned why returnees were living in the

diaspora since the situation on the ground was not stable. Therefore, to live abroad at this time was perhaps not considered as a sign of disloyalty as it might be at a later time. In Somaliland and Liberia, domestic elites eventually had bad experiences with returnees in government partly because of the returnees' exclusion of domestic actors and partly because of their dissatisfaction with the state's development as well as the belief that returnees were corrupt or disloyal.

These three essays show that returnees in the government are treated as an important and distinct category or identity from homegrown actors. In this way, actions by one or several members of this group are used to make arguments about the group in a more general sense, as a kind of symbolic representation (Pitkin 1972). However, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to study how returnee ministers and MPs actually perform in terms of, for example, efficiency or corruption, but this is an important path of inquiry for future studies.

These essays, in particular results in essay III, also provide insights for those interested in institutional legitimacy more generally. It adds to studies from the Global North (e.g., Sherer and Curry 2009; Arnesen and Peters 2017; Clayton, O'Brien and Piscopo 2018) that have investigated the relationship between identities of members of an institution and the legitimacy of that institution. Few studies have previously looked at this in contexts in the Global South or focused on the cabinet nor have they investigated the link between diaspora identity of officials and institutional legitimacy. In essay III, I reveal a significant relationship between diaspora identities (i.e., being recruited from abroad) of ministers and a number of variables capturing cabinet legitimacy. To which extent this extends to other forms of identities and other contexts is an important path for future studies of institutional legitimacy, especially in sub-Saharan African or post-war contexts.

Although essay III shows how a returnee cabinet is rated differently (and worse) than a stayee cabinet when it comes to aspects such as delivering development, being corrupt, being held accountable, and representing the local population, due to the method deployed it does not investigate different arguments around returnees in governments as is done in essays I and II. Therefore, an additional important avenue for future research is to qualitatively dig deeper into how local non-elite populations perceive these aspects and to which degree they value a government official's close connections with donors or foreign governments.

The influence of diaspora returnees in post-war settings is likely to persist. Regrettably, armed conflicts continue to cause people to leave their countries of origin at the same time as the world is getting more and more

globalized. This study does not take a normative stance or argue that there is no need for skilled returnees. Rather, in many post-war settings qualified returnees might be essential (Turner 2008). In such settings, transfer of capacity is necessary to build sustainable state institutions. However, this thesis demonstrates that while these recruitments might be necessary, there are no silver bullets. Instead, they illustrate a difficult trade-off between different important objectives of peacebuilding and statebuilding. Viewing returnees as ideal interlocutors between the international and the domestic seldom holds true in post-war governments. While potentially providing skills and networks abroad, in the eyes of the domestic population, returnees are limited in their ability to translate these skills to the domestic context as well as provide local legitimacy, good governance, or democratic norms. Additionally, this thesis has pointed to the shortcomings of post-war states' ability to hold returnee government officials accountable as well as the importance of finding ways to do so. To hold government officials accountable overall might be difficult in these (as well as other) contexts, however, dual citizenship provides an additional practical barrier. Thus, returnee government officials with dual citizenship are inherently especially difficult to hold accountable, which should be included in the equation when such recruitments take place.

The discussion in this concluding section mainly addresses returnees recruited from abroad or who keep an essential part of their life abroad – such as a home or their family. To keep homes and families abroad generally signal that these returnees possess dual citizenship and these are generally the group of returnees the respondents in Somaliland and Liberia referenced. Although this distinction is not always clear in my three essays, reference is also made to returnees who have returned long before being recruited and it is pointed out that those belonging to this group are perceived as considerably less problematic. This is also supported by findings in essay III, which shows that the negative effect on legitimacy of returnees' presence in cabinets are attenuated if returnees signal they are giving up their dual citizenship or their life abroad.

Thus, as is demonstrated in essay III, there might be ways for returnees to increase their insidership or perceived commitment, such as giving up close ties to their host country by bringing their family back or giving up their home abroad. These sacrifices might be too costly to make for many highly skilled returnees and this can be out of their hands, since spouses or children might not want to move. However, it is important for national heads of states, donors, and returnees to understand how this is interpreted by domestic elites and populations. There can also be other more limited

and less demanding ways through which returnees can signal their commitment, for example, by being present or being further engaged in different domestic initiatives and with the domestic population.

Moreover, donors, scholars, and heads of states must recognize how the technocratic turn within peacebuilding and statebuilding in combination with an over-reliance on the benefits of a diaspora experience risks over-emphasizing the relevance of returnee's competence compared to other forms or domestic knowledge. "Technocrat missionaries" are far from neutral or from being de-politicized, but they embody politics in several ways since they exclude other domestic actors by taking a job in government and their presence manifests the norms and qualifications highly valued by donors and heads of states. While recognizing the importance of a meritocratic base for recruitment, I believe it is essential to open up the meaning of merit in these contexts and to understand what form of biases and exclusions a narrow focus only on Western qualifications implies.

In sum, this thesis addresses the question how national elites and the wider population perceive returnees in post-war government. It shows how the capacity, norms, and representativeness ascribed to such diaspora returnees shape the legitimacy of these actors as well as the government. It gives guidance to how we can better understand the division between insiders and outsiders as well as the foundation of local legitimacy in post-war contexts. It also helps us understand elite relations as well as the relationship between returnees and stayees in these settings. It provides indications of how returnees may contribute to the emergence of a new class system and gives insights into how post-war settings are divided and which sections of society benefit from different appointments. It also enhances our understanding of the relationship between the legitimacy of a member of an institution and the institution as a whole. In addition, it provides rare first-hand data about cabinet ministers and public perceptions of them in sub-Saharan Africa. Therefore, this study provides important insights into several research fields, but these are also of relevance for heads of states and practitioners engaged in statebuilding.

References

- Adams, M., J. Scherpereel and S. Jacob (2016). 'The Representation of Women in African Legislatures and Cabinets: An Examination with Reference to Ghana', *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 37(2), 145-167.
- Adamson, F. B. (2002). "Mobilizing for the transformation of home: politicized identities and transnational practices". In Al-Ali, N. and K. Khalid (eds.). *New approaches to migration?: transnational communities and the transformation of home*. London: Routledge.
- Addison, T., Murshed, M. (2001). *From conflict to reconstruction: Reviving the social contract*. WIDER Discussion Paper, No. 2001/48, The United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER), Helsinki.
- Adedi Dunia, O., S. Bisimwa, E. Cirhuza, M. Eriksson Baaz, J. Ferekani, P. Imili, E. Kambale, J. Mapatano, L. Mulimbi, B. Mukungilwa, L. Mukingi, D. Mwambari, S. Parashar, D. Rukanyaga Assumani, W. Sinzaher, M. Utas and J. Vincent (2019). 'Moving out of the backstage: How can we decolonize research?' *The disorder of things*, October 22, 2019. Available at: <https://thedisorderofthings.com/2019/10/22/moving-out-of-the-backstage-how-can-we-decolonize-research/>.
- Adida, C. L. (2015). 'Do African Voters Favor Coethnics? Evidence from a Survey Experiment in Benin', *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 2 (1), 1-11.
- Afrobarometer (2019). *Questionnaires*. Afrobarometer. Available at: <https://www.afrobarometer.org/surveys-and-methods/questionnaires>. Cited: 15 January, 2020.
- Aghoa, C. (2017). "The making of the Liberian Diaspora and the challenges of postwar reconstruction". In Falola, T. and A. Oyeade (Eds.) *The new African diaspora in the United States*. London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Åkesson, L. and M. Eriksson Baaz (2015). "Introduction". In Åkesson, L. and M. Eriksson Baaz (Eds.). *Africa's return migrants: the new developers?* London: Zed Books.
- Al-Ali, N. (2007). "Gender, diaspora and post-Cold War conflict". In Smith, H. and P. Stares (eds.). *Diasporas in conflict – Peace-makers or Peace-wreckers?* Tokyo: United Nations University.
- Al-Ali, N. and K. Koser (eds.) (2002). *New approaches to migration? Transnational communities and the transformation of home*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Aly Verjee, A. Y., H. A. Y. Abokor, A. M. Warsame, M. A. Farah and M. F. Hersi (2015). *The Economics of Elections in Somaliland - The financing of political parties and candidates*. Rift valley institute research paper 3, London: Rift Valley Institute (RVI).
- Anderson, B. (1993). 'The new world disorder', *New Left Review*, 193, 2–13.
- Anderson, C., & Tverdova, Y. (2003). 'Corruption, Political Allegiances, and Attitudes toward Government in Contemporary Democracies', *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(1), 91-109.
- Ansoms, A. (2018). *Conjonctures de l'Afrique centrale 2018*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Antwi-Boateng, O. (2011). 'The Political Participation of the U.S.-Based Liberian Diaspora and Its Implication for Peace Building', *Africa Today*, 58 (1), 2011, 2-26.

- APD and Interpeace (2008). *THE SEARCH FOR PEACE, Peace in Somaliland: An Indigenous Approach to State-Building*. Hargeisa: Academy for Peace and Development.
- Apphia, K. A. (2016). 'There is no such thing as a western civilisation', *The Guardian*, 9 November, 2016.
- Arnesen, S., & Peters, Y. (2018). 'The Legitimacy of Representation: How Descriptive, Formal, and Responsiveness Representation Affect the Acceptability of Political Decisions', *Comparative Political Studies*, 51(7), 868–899.
- Arriola, L. R. (2009). 'Patronage and political stability in Africa', *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(10), 1339-1362.
- Arriola, L. R. and M. C. Johnson (2014). 'Ethnic Politics and Women's Empowerment in Africa: Ministerial Appointments to Executive Cabinets', *American Journal of Political Science*, 58 (2), 495-510.
- Balthasar, D. (2012). *STATE-MAKING IN SOMALIA AND SOMALILAND Understanding War, Nationalism and State Trajectories as Processes of Institutional and Socio-Cognitive Standardization*. PhD Thesis, The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE).
- Banducci, S. A., T. Donovan, and J. A. Karp. (2004). 'Minority Representation, Empowerment, and Participation', *Journal of Politics*, 66(2): 534–56.
- Bang, J. T. and A. Mitra (2010). *Civil War, Ethnicity, and the Migration of Skilled Labor*. MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE ECONOMICS DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 10-34.
- Baser, B. (2018). 'Engaging Diasporas in Development and State-Building: The Role of the Kurdish Diaspora and Returnees in Rebuilding the Kurdistan Region of Iraq', *Ethnopolitics*, 18(1), 76-91.
- Bauer, G., and F. Okpotor (2013). 'Her Excellency": An Exploratory Overview of Women Cabinet Ministers in Africa', *Africa Today*, 60(1), 77-97.
- Bayart, J. F. (1993). *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly*. New York: Longman.
- BBC (2015). 'Kenya attack: 147 dead in Garissa University assault', *BBC* April 3, 2015. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-32169080>. Cited: 15 January, 2020.
- Beetham, D. (1991). *The legitimation of power*. London: Macmillan.
- Bendix, D. and R. Stanley (2008). 'Deconstructing local ownership of security sector reform: A review of the literature', *African Security Review*, 17(2), 93-104.
- Bekele, G. W. (2017). "Revisiting Africa's brain drain and the Diaspora option". In Falola, T. and A. Oyebade (eds.). *The new African diaspora in the United States*. London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Bercovitch, J. (2007). 'A neglected relationship: Diasporas and conflict resolution'. In Smith, H. and P. Stares (eds.). *Diasporas in conflict – Peace-makers or Peace-wreckers?* Tokyo: United Nations University.
- Berg, E. (2013). 'Merging Together or Drifting Apart? Revisiting Political Legitimacy Issues in Cyprus, Moldova, and Bosnia and Herzegovina', *Geopolitics*, 18(2), 467-492.
- Bertram, E. (1995). 'Reinventing Governments: The Promise and Perils of United Nations Peace Building', *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 39(3), 387-418.

- Bjarnesen, J. (2013). Diaspora at Home? Wartime Mobilities in the Burkina Faso-Côte d'Ivoire Transnational Space. *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Uppsala Studies in Cultural Anthropology*, 53. Uppsala.
- Black, R., K. Koser, K. Munk, G. Atfield, L. Donofrio and R. Tiemoko (2004). *Understanding voluntary return*. Home Office Online Report, 50/04: Home Office, London.
- Bollen, K.A. and R. Lennox (1991). 'Conventional wisdom on measurement: A structural equation perspective', *Psychological Bulletin* 110(2), 305–314.
- Butty, J. (2011). 'Liberian Politician George Weah Graduates With U.S. College Degree', *Vocie Of America news*, June 30 2011.
- Boege, V. (2014). 'Vying for legitimacy in post-conflict situations: the Bougainville case', *Peacebuilding*, 2(3), 237-252.
- Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992). *An agenda for peace: Preventive diplomacy and other matters*, United Nations, New York.
- Bowles, L. K. (2015). "Transnational mobility, social capital, and cosmopolitan women traders in Ghana". In Demissie, Fassil (ed.). *Africans on the move: migration, diaspora and development nexus*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Bøttkjær, L. T., and M. K. Justesen (2018). *Why Do Voters Support Corrupt Politicians? Experimental Evidence from South Africa*. Paper presented at The 8th Annual Conference of the European Political Science Association, Vienna, Austria.
- Bratton, M., and N. Van de Walle (1997). *Democratic experiments in Africa: Regime transitions in comparative perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brinkerhodd, D.W. and S. Tadesse (2008). "Recruiting from the Diaspora: The Local Governance Program in Iraq". In Brinkerhoff, J. (ed.). *Diasporas and Development: Exploring the Potential*, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Brinkerhoff, J. (ed.) (2008). *Diasporas and Development: Exploring the Potential*, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Brown, M. E. (ed.) (1997). *Nationalism and ethnic conflict: an international security reader*. Cambridge: MIT.
- Brubaker, R. (2005). 'The 'diaspora' diaspora', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1), 1-19.
- Carrie Chapman Catt Center (2017). *Inaugural Address - January 16, 2006*. Carrie Chapman Catt Center for Women and Politics, Iowa State University, 9 March, 2017. Available at: <https://awpc.cattcenter.iastate.edu/2017/03/09/inaugural-address-jan-16-2006/>.
- Call, C. (2012). *Why Peace Fails: The Causes and Prevention of Civil War Recurrence*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Catrinescu, N., M. Leon-Ledesma, M. Piracha and B. Quillin (2009). 'Remittances, Institutions, and Economic Growth', *World Development*, 37(1), 81-92.
- Centeno, M. A. (1993). 'The new leviathan: The dynamics and limits of technocracy', *Theory and Society* 22(3): 307–335.
- Chandler, D. (2011). "The liberal peace: statebuilding, democracy and local ownership". In Tadjbakhsh, S. (ed.). *Rethinking the liberal peace: external models and local alternatives*. London: Routledge.

- Chandler, D. (2006). *Empire in Denial: The Politics of Statebuilding*. London: Pluto Press.
- Chandler, D. and T. D. Sisk (eds.) (2013). *Routledge handbook of international statebuilding*. London: Routledge.
- Chauvet, L. and M. Mercier (2014). 'Do return migrants transfer political norms to their origin country? Evidence from Mali', *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 42(3), 630-651.
- Chesterman, S., M. Ignatieff, and R. Thakur. (2004). '*Making States Work: From State Failure to State-Building*'. New York: International Peace Academy and United Nations University.
- CIA (2019). 'AFRICA::LIBERIA' *Central Intelligence Agency*. Available at: https://www.cia.gov/LIBRARY/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/print_li.html. Cited: 6 June, 2019.
- Clark-Barol, M., C. McHugh and R. Norum (2015). "Small Items for Sale; Moral High-horse I'm Trying to Get Rid Of": Online Listserv Rhetoric in Expatria". In Torkington, K., D. Inães and J. Sardinha (eds.) (2015). *Practising the good life: lifestyle migration in practices*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Clayton, A., D. Z. O'Brien and J. M. Piscopo (2019). 'All Male Panels? Representation and Democratic Legitimacy', *American Journal of Political Science*, 63(1), 113-129.
- Clements, K. P. (2014). "What is legitimacy and why does it matter for peace?". In Ramsbotham, A. and A. Wennmann (Ed.) *Legitimacy and peace processes - From coercion to consent*, Accord issue 25, London: Conciliation Resources.
- Clifford, J. (1994). 'Diasporas', *Cultural Anthropology*, 9(3), 302-338.
- Cochrane, F. (2012). "Mediating the Diaspora Space: Charting the Changing Nature of Irish-America in the Global Age". In Lyons, T. and Mandaville, P. G. (Eds.). *Politics from afar: transnational diasporas and networks*. London: Hurst.
- Cohen, R. (1997). *Global Diasporas*. London: UCL Press Ltd..
- Cooper, H. (2010). IRON LADY: The Promise of Liberia's Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. *World Affairs*, 173(4), 43-50.
- Croke, K. (2017). 'Tools of single party hegemony in Tanzania: evidence from surveys and survey experiments', *Democratization*, 24(2), 189-208.
- Debiel, T., R. Glassner, C. Schetter and U. Terlinden (2009). 'Local State Building in Afghanistan and Somaliland', *Peace Review*, 21(1), 38-44.
- de Carvalho, B and N. N. Schia (2011). *Local and National Ownership in Post-Conflict Liberia. Foreign and Domestic Inside Out?* Oslo: NUPI.
- Déllano, A., and A. Gamlen (2014). 'Comparing and theorizing state-diaspora relations', *Political Geography*, 41, 43-53.
- Demissie, F. (ed.) (2015). *Africans on the move: migration, diaspora and development nexus*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Demmers, J. (2002). 'Diaspora and Conflict: Locality, Long-distance Nationalism, and Delocalisation of Conflict Dynamics', *The Public-Javnost*, vol. 9(1), 85-96.
- Diamond, L. (2008). 'The rule of law versus the Big Man', *Journal of Democracy*, 19(2), 138-149.

- Dix, S., Hussmann, K. and G. Walton (2012). *Risks of Corruption to State Legitimacy and Stability in Fragile Situations*. U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, Tiri and The UK Department for International Development.
- Donais, T. (2009). 'Empowerment or Imposition? Dilemmas of Local Ownership in Post-Conflict Peacebuilding Processes', *Peace and Change*, 34(1), 3-26.
- Dowden, R. (2008). *Africa: altered states, ordinary miracles*. London: Portobello.
- Druckman, J. N., D. P. Green, J. H. Kuklinski and A. Lupi (2011). "Experiments: An Introduction to Core Concepts". In Druckman, J. N. (ed.) (2011). *Cambridge handbook of experimental political science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ebo, A. (2007). "Liberia case study: outsourcing SSR to foreign companies". In Nathan, L. *No ownership, no commitment. A guide to local ownership of security sector reform*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Eriksson Baaz, M. and M. Utas (2019). 'Exploring the Backstage: Methodological and Ethical Issues Surrounding the Role of Research Brokers in Insecure Zones', *Civil Wars*, 21(2), 157-178.
- Faist, T. (2010). "Diaspora and transnationalism: What kind of dance partners?". In Bauböck, R. and T. Faist (eds.) (2010). *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Fargues, P. (2006). 'The demographic benefit of international migration: hypothesis and application to Middle Eastern and North African contexts', *Policy Research Working Papers*, vol. 4050, Washington DC: World Bank.
- Felbaba Brown, V. (2014). *Security considerations for conducting fieldwork in highly dangerous places or on highly dangerous subjects*. Drugs, Security and Democracy program, DSD Working Papers on Research Security, no 3.
- Ferne, M. C. (2015). 'Diasporic State'. In Mustapha, M. and J. Bangura (eds). *Democratization and human security in postwar Sierra Leone*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Flahaux, M., and H. De Haas (2016). 'African migration: trends, patterns, drivers', *Comparative Migration Studies*, 4(1).
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). 'Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Friedman, J. (2012). *Building Civil Service Capacity: Post-Conflict Liberia 2006-2011*. New Jersey: Princeton University: Innovations for Successful Societies.
- Gaines, B. J., J. H. Kuklinski, and P. J. Quirk (2007). 'The Logic of the Survey Experiment Reexamined', *Political Analysis* 15: 1-20.
- Galipo, A. (2019). *Return migration and nation building in Africa: reframing the Somali diaspora*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Garbin, D. and M. Godin (2015). "'Saving the Congo': transnational social fields and politics of home in the Congolese diaspora". In Demissie, F. (ed.) (2015). *Africans on the move: migration, diaspora and development nexus*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Gerdes, F. (2011). *Liberia's Post-War Elite: A New Era of Inclusive Ownership or Old Wine in New Bottles?*, Arbeitspapier Nr. 1/2011 der Forschungsstelle Kriege, Rüstung und Entwicklung, Universität Hamburg, Hamburg.
- Gerdes, F. (2013). *Civil war and state formation: the political economy of war and peace in Liberia*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

- Ghani, A., M. Carnahan and C. Lockhart (2006). *Stability, State-Building, and Development Assistance: An Outside Perspective*. Working Paper Princeton Project on National Security, Princeton.
- Gmelch, G. (2004). "West Indian Migrants and Their Rediscovery of Barbados". In Long, L. D. and Oxfeld, E. (eds.) (2004). *Coming home?: refugees, migrants and those who stayed behind*. Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goldring, L. (1996). "Blurring Borders: Constructing Transnational Community in the Process of Mexico-US Migration". In Chekki, D. A. (ed.). *Research in Community Sociology: New Communities in a Changing World Vol 6 (Research in Community Sociology)*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Goldstein, D. (2014). *Qualitative research in dangerous places: becoming and "ethnographer" of violence and personal safety*. Drugs, Security and Democracy program, *DSD Working Papers on Research Security*, no 1.
- Grimm, J. J., K. Koehler, E. Lust, I. Saliba and I. Schierenbeck (2020). *Safer field research in the social sciences: a guide to human and digital security in hostile environments*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Hall S. (1990). "Cultural Identity and Diaspora". In Rutherford, J. (ed.). *Identity: community, culture, difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hameiri, S. and L. Jones (2017). 'Beyond Hybridity to the Politics of Scale: International Intervention and 'Local' Politics', *Development and Change*, 48(1), 54-77.
- Hammond, L. (2015). "Diaspora returnees to Somaliland: heroes of development or job-stealing scoundrels?". In Åkesson, L. and Eriksson Baaz, M. (eds.). *Africa's return migrants: the new developers?*. London: Zed Books.
- Hansen, P. (2007). "Revolving Returnees in Somaliland". In *Living Across Worlds: Diaspora, Development and Transnational Engagement*. Geneva: IOM International Organization for Migration.
- Hansen, P. (2013). 'Khat, Governance and Political Identity among Diaspora Returnees to Somaliland', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(1), 143-159.
- Hechter, M. (2009). 'Legitimacy in the Modern World', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(3), 279-288.
- Heggli Sagmo, T. (2015). "The role of social capital in post-conflict business development: perspectives from returning migrants in Burundi". In Åkesson, L. and Eriksson Baaz, M. (eds.). *Africa's return migrants: the new developers?*. London: Zed Books.
- Heimer, M. (2006), "Field Sites, Research Design and Type Findings". In Heimer, M. and S. Thøgersen (eds.). *Doing Fieldwork in China*. København: NIAS Press.
- Hensell, S. and F. Gerdes (2012). 'Elites and International Actors in Post-War Societies: The Limits of Intervention', *International Peacekeeping*, 19(2), 154-169.
- Holsti, K. (1996). *The State, War, and the State of War* (Cambridge Studies in International Relations). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horst C., R. Ezzati, M. Guglielmo, P. Mezzetti, P. Päivi, V. Saggiomo, G. Sinatti, and A. Warnecke (2010). *Participation of Diasporas in Peacebuilding and Development: A Handbook for Practitioners and Policymakers*. PRIO Report, 2. Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO).

- Hron, M. (2007). 'The Czech Émigré Experience of Return after 1989', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 85(1), 47-78.
- Hughes, C. (2011). 'The politics of knowledge: ethnicity, capacity and return in post-war reconstruction policy', *Review of International Studies*, 37(4), 1493-1514.
- Hughes, C., J. Öjendal and I. Schierenbeck (2015). 'The struggle versus the song – the local turn in peacebuilding: an introduction', *Third World Quarterly*, 36(5), 817-82.
- Hunter, L. A., and E. Leahey, (2010). 'Parenting and research productivity: New evidence and methods', *Social Studies of Science*, 40(3), 433–451.
- Huntington, S. (1991). *The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hurd, I. (1999). 'Legitimacy and Authority in International Politics', *International Organization*, 53(2), 379-408.
- Hurrelmann, A., S. Schneider and J. Steffek (2007). "Introduction: Legitimacy in an Age of Global Politics". In Hurrelmann, A. S. Schneider and J. Steffek (eds.). *Legitimacy in an age of global politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ibrahim, M.H. (2010). *Somaliland's Investment in Peace: Analysing the Diaspora's Economic Engagement in Peace Building*. DIASPEACE Working Paper, no 4.
- Ignatieff, M. (2001). 'The Hate Stops Here', *Globe and Mail*, October 25, 2001.
- Interview 1, Member of Parliament Somaliland, interview conducted by the author in Hargeisa, 2015.
- Interview 2, Member of the Parliament Somaliland, interview conducted by the author in Hargeisa, 2016.
- Interview 3, "Irro"- founder and leader of the Waddani party, interview conducted by the author in Hargeisa, 2015.
- Interview 4, Current deputy Minister in Liberian cabinet, interview conducted by the author in Monrovia, 2018.
- Interview 5, Current Senator in Liberia, interview conducted by the author in Monrovia, 2018.
- Interview 6, Researcher, interview conducted by the author in Hargeisa, 2015.
- IOM (2013). *MIGRATION FOR DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA (OVERALL MIDA)*. International Organization for Migration (IOM), August 2013. Available at: <https://www.iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/Country/docs/IOM-Somalia-MIDA.pdf>. Cited: 5 October, 2019.
- IOM (2015). *Migration for Development in Africa (MIDA)*. International Organization for Migration (IOM). Available at: <https://www.iom.int/mida>. Cited: 7 September, 2015.
- IOM (2019). *IOM and Migration and Development*. International Organization for Migration (IOM). Available at: https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iom_migration_and_development.pdf. Cited: 3 December, 2019.
- Jackson C. (2014). "Government in a Box? Counter-insurgency, State Building, and the Technocratic Conceit". In Gventer, C.W., D.M. Jones and M.L.R. Smith (eds.). *The New Counter-insurgency Era in Critical Perspective. Rethinking Political Violence series*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

- Jahn, B. (2007). 'The tragedy of liberal diplomacy: democratization, intervention and statebuilding', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 1(2), 87–106.
- Jarstad, A. (2008). "Dilemmas of war-to-democracy-transitions: theories and concepts". In Jarstad, A. and T. D. Sisk (eds.) (2008). *From war to democracy: dilemmas of peacebuilding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jarstad, A. and T. D. Sisk (2008). "Introduction". In Jarstad, A. and T. D. Sisk (red.) (2008). *From war to democracy: dilemmas of peacebuilding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson Sirleaf, E. (2009). *This child will be great: memoir of a remarkable life by Africa's first woman president*. 1st ed. New York: Harper.
- Kaldor, M., H. Anheier and M. Glasius (2003). "Global Civil City in an Era of Regressive Globalisation". In Kaldor, M., H. Anheier and M. Glasius, *Global Civil Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kapiszewski, D., L. MacLean and B. L. Read (2015). *Field research in political science: practices and principles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaplan, S. (2008). 'The remarkably story of Somaliland', *Journal of Democracy* 19(3), 143-157.
- Khan, W. A. (2009). 'DOMESTIC LEGITIMACY AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT', *International Journal on World Peace*, 26(3), 7–38.
- King, E., and R. Matthews (2012). 'A new agenda for peace: 20 years later', *International Journal*, 67(2), 275-293.
- King, C. and N.J. Melvin. (1999/2000). 'Diaspora Politics: Ethnic Linkages, Foreign Policy, and Security in Eurasia', *International Security*, 24(3), 108–38.
- Kleist, N. and P. Hansen (2005). *The Big Demonstration: A Study of Transborder Political Mobilisation*. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, Academy for Migration Studies in Denmark, AMID Working Paper No. 42.
- Koinova, M. (2009). 'Diasporas and democratization in the post-communist world', *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 42(1), 41-64.
- Kolstad, I. and A. Wiig (2019). 'How Does Information About Elite Tax Evasion Affect Political Participation: Experimental Evidence from Tanzania', *The Journal of Development Studies*, 55(4), 509-526.
- Koser, K. (2007). "African diasporas and post-war reconstruction: An Eritrean case study". In Smith, H. and P. Stares (Eds.), *Diasporas in conflict – Peacemakers or Peace-wreckers?* Tokyo: United Nations University.
- Kuenzi, M. and G. Lambright (2001). 'Party system institutionalization in 30 African countries', *Party Politics*, 7(4), 437-468.
- Kuschminder, K. (2011). *The Role of the Diaspora in Knowledge Transfer and Capacity Building in Post-war Settings: The Temporary Return Uof Qualified Nationals to Afghanistan*. IS Academy Migration Policy Report, No. 1, December 2011.
- Kutlay, M. (2016). 'Turks of Bulgaria: An 'Outlier Case' of Forced Migration and Voluntary Return', *International Migration*, 55(5).
- Kyvik, S. and M. Teigen (1996). 'Child Care, Research Collaboration, and Gender Differences in Scientific Productivity', *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 21(1), 54-71.
- Lake, D. A. (2007). *Building Legitimate States After Civil Wars: Order, Authority, and International Trusteeship*. Unpublished manuscript. Available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1004425>.

- Leftwich, A. (2010). 'Beyond Institutions: Rethinking the Role of Leaders, Elites and Coalitions in the Institutional Formation of Developmental States and Strategies', *Forum for Development Studies*, 37(1), 93-111.
- Lemarchand, R. (1972). 'Political clientelism and ethnicity in tropical Africa: Competing solidarities in nation-building', *American political science review*, 66(01), 68-90.
- Levi, M., A. Sacks and T Tyler (2009). 'Conceptualizing Legitimacy, Measuring Legitimizing Beliefs', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(3), 354-375.
- Levitt, J. I. (2004). *The evolution of deadly conflict in Liberia: from "paternalitarianism" to state collapse*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- Levitt, P. (1998). 'Social remittances: migration-driven local-level forms of cultural diffusion', *International Migration Review*, 32(4), 926-948.
- Levitt, P. and D. Lamba-Nieves (2011). 'Social Remittances Revisited', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(1), 1-22.
- Levitt, P. and N. Glick Schiller (2004). 'Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society', *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 1002-1039.
- Lewis, I.M. (2002). *A Modern History of the Somali: Revised, Updated, & Expanded*. 4th Ed. London: James Curry, Ltd.
- Lewis, I. M. (2008). *Understanding Somalia and Somaliland: culture, history, society*. London: Hurst.
- Liebenow, J. Gus (1969). *Liberia: the evolution of privilege*. Ithaca.
- Lillbacka, R. (1999). *The legitimacy of the political system: the case of Finland*. Dissertation, Åbo:Åkad.
- Lodigiani, E. and S. Salomone (2012). *Migration-induced Transfers of Norms. The case of Female Political Empowerment*. IRES Discussion Papers, 2012-1.
- Lupu, N. and K. Michelitch (2018). 'Advances in Survey Methods for the Developing World', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21, 195-214.
- Lyons, T. (2012). "Transnational Politics in Ethiopia: Diaspora Mobilization and Contentious Politics". In Lyons, T. and P. G. Mandaville (eds.) (2012). *Politics from afar: transnational diasporas and networks*. London: Hurst.
- Lyons, T. and P. G. Mandaville (2012). "Introduction – Politics from afar: Transnational diasporas and networks". In Lyons, T. and P. G. Mandaville (eds.) (2012). *Politics from afar: transnational diasporas and networks*. London: Hurst.
- Mac Ginty, R (2008). 'Indigenous peace-making versus the liberal peace', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 43(2), 139-163.
- Mac Ginty, R. and O. P. Richmond (eds.) (2007). 'Myth or reality: the liberal peace and post-conflict reconstruction', *Global Society*, 21(4), 491-497.
- Mahmood, O. (2019). 'Somaliland's fragile democracy faces more election delays', *Reliefweb*, March 19, 2019. Available at: <https://reliefweb.int/report/somalia/somaliland-s-fragile-democracy-faces-more-election-delays>. Cited: January 15, 2020.
- Mac Ginty, R. (2012). 'Routine peace: Technocracy and peacebuilding', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47(3), 287-308.
- Mac Ginty, R. (2015). 'Where is the local? Critical localism and peacebuilding', *Third World Quarterly*, 36(5), 840-856.

- MacLean, L.M. (2013). "The Power of the Interviewer". In Mosley, L. (ed.). *Interview Research in Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Manning, C. (2006). 'Political Elites and Democratic State-building Efforts in Bosnia and Iraq', *Democratization*, 13(5), 724-738.
- Massey, D.S. and K. E. Espinosa (1997). 'What's Driving Mexico-U.S. Migration? A Theoretical, Empirical, and Policy Analysis', *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(4), 939-999.
- Menkhaus, K. (2015). *Conflict Assessment / 2014 Northern Kenya and Somaliland*. DANISH DEMINING GROUP, Nairobi, 2015, 03. Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2589109. Cited: January 15, 2020.
- Moe, W. L. (2011). 'Hybrid and 'Everyday' Political Ordering: Constructing and Contesting legitimacy in Somaliland', *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 43(63), 143-177.
- Mohan, G. and A. B. Zack-Williams (2002). 'Globalisation from below: conceptualizing the role of the African diaspora in Africa's development', *Review of African Political Economy*, 29(92), 211-236.
- Moran, M. H. (2006). *Liberia: the violence of democracy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mozaffar, S., and J. R. Scarritt. (2005). 'The puzzle of African party systems', *Party Politics*, 11(4), 399-421.
- Mueller, C. (2019). 'Research on Diaspora Knowledge Transfer within a Temporary Return Program', *Migrant Knowledge*, October 16, 2019. Available at: <https://migrantknowledge.org/2019/10/16/research-on-diaspora-knowledge-transfer-within-a-temporary-return-program/>. Cited: January 15, 2020.
- Muller, E.N., T.O. Jukam and M. A. Seligson (1982). 'Diffuse political support and antisystem political behavior: A comparative analysis', *American Journal of Political Science*, 26(2), 240-265.
- Mulbah, S. (2016). *State-building Interventions in Post-Conflict Liberia*. [Electronic copy] Routledge.
- Musa, A. M. and C. Horst (2019). 'State formation and economic development in post-war Somaliland: the impact of the private sector in an unrecognised state', *Conflict, Security & Development*, 19(1), 35-53.
- Narten J. (2009). "Dilemmas of promoting "local ownership" The case of postwar Kosovo". In Paris, R. and T. D. Sisk (eds.) (2009). *The dilemmas of statebuilding confronting the contradictions of postwar peace operations* [Electronic copy]. London: Routledge.
- Nyamnjoh, A. (2018). Does local ownership enhance legitimacy and democratic governance in peacebuilding? The case of diasporas, *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 25(3), 323-340.
- Nyrup, J. and S. Bramwell (n.d.). *Who governs? A new global dataset on members of cabinets*. Available at: https://www.dropbox.com/s/ophg2i81kyjqzyi/Authoritarian_Ministers_Dataset.pdf?dl=0. Cited: January 15, 2020.
- Nzongola-Ntalaja, G. (2006). 'Challenges to state building in Africa', *African Identities*, 4(1), 71-88.
- O'Brien, K. J. (2006). "Discovery Research (Re)design, and Theory Building". In Heimer, M. and S. Thogersen (eds.). *Doing Fieldwork in China*. København: NIAS Press.

- OECD (2008). '29 LIBERIA' IN 2008 SURVEY ON MONITORING THE PARIS DECLARATION: MAKING AID MORE EFFECTIVE BY 2010. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/countries/liberia/42243397.pdf>.
- OECD (2010). *The State's Legitimacy in Fragile Situations - Un-packing Complexity*. OECD Series: Conflict and Fragility, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Okpewho, I. and N. Nzegwu (eds.) (2009). *The new African diaspora*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Olad, M. (2017). 'Somaliland Ruling Party Candidate Bihi Wins Election', *Voice of America*, November 21, 2017.
- Omaar, R. (2004). 'Peace-Building and Democracy – Lessons of Somalia and Somaliland', *Whitehall Papers*, 62(1), 83-92.
- Orjuela, C. (2012). "Diaspora Identities and Homeland Politics: Lessons from the Sri Lankan/Tamil Eelam Case". In Lyons, T. and P. G. Mandaville (eds.). *Politics from afar: transnational diasporas and networks*. London: Hurst.
- Paris, R. and Sisk, T. (eds.) (2009). *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding*. London: Routledge.
- Pegg, S. and P. Kolstö (2014). 'Somaliland: Dynamics of international legitimacy and (lack of) external sovereignty', *Geoforum*, 66, 193-202.
- Pietz, T. (2007). "Local Ownership – Applicable Concept or Policy Ideal?". In Pietz, T. and L. von Carlowitz. *Local Ownership in Peacebuilding Processes in Failed States Approaches, Experiences, and Prerequisites for Success*. Workshop Report, Expert Meeting, 20 – 21 April 2007, Center for International Peace Operations (ZIF), Berlin. Available at: file:///C:/Users/annno460/iCloudDrive/Avhandling/KAPPA/Local_Ownership_Workshop_Report_Dezember_07%20expert%20meeting%20def%20of%20LOCAL%20OWNERSHIP.pdf.
- Pires, S. (2015). "Guinea-Bissau immigrant transnationalism in Portugal: a substitute for a failed state?". In Demissie, F. (ed.) (2015). *Africans on the move: migration, diaspora and development nexus*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Pirkkalainen, P. and M. Abdile (2009). *The diaspora–conflict–peace nexus: a literature review*. DIASPEACE Working Paper 1, University of Jyväskylä.
- Renders, M. (2012). *Consider Somaliland: state-building with traditional leaders and institutions*. Leiden: Brill.
- Republic of Liberia and the UNDP (2008). *Mid-term Independent Evaluations of the Liberia Emergency Capacity Building Support (LECBS) and TOKTEN Projects*. Republic of Liberia, UNDP and USAID, July 2008, Monrovia.
- Reilly, J. (2017). "Reaching out to the Diaspora: The Liberian State's Formulation of a Diaspora Engagement Policy". In Mangala, J. (ed.). *Africa and its global diaspora: the policy and politics of emigration*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Richards, R. (2015). 'Bringing the Outside In: Somaliland, Statebuilding and Dual Hybridity', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 9(1), 4-25.
- Richmond, O. P. (2012). 'Beyond Local Ownership in the Architecture of International Peacebuilding', *Ethnopolitics*, 11(4), 354-375.
- Richmond, O. P. (2013). 'Failed statebuilding versus peace formation', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 48(3), 378-400.
- Robins, S. (2013). 'An Empirical Approach to Post-conflict Legitimacy: Victims' Needs and the Everyday', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 7(1), 45-64.

- Rock, Anna Ida R. (2017). 'Perceptions of Returnees in Somaliland Politics: The Grounds for Legitimacy', *International Migration*, 55(5), 205-216.
- Rother, S. (2009). 'Changed in migration? Philippine return migrants and (un) democratic remittances' *European journal of East Asian studies*, 8(2), 245-274.
- Safran, W. (1991). 'Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return', *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1), 83-99.
- Sánchez Villa, S. (2011). 'In- or Outsiders? The Return of Qualified Diaspora Members and Their Role in Rebuilding Post-war Governance', *The BSIS Journal of International Studies*, 8.
- SCSD (2019). *Latest Statistics*. Somaliland Central Statistics Department 2019 (SCSD). Available at: <http://www.somalilandcsd.org/>. Cited: January 15, 2020.
- Seligson, M. (2002). 'The Impact of Corruption on Regime Legitimacy: A Comparative Study of Four Latin American Countries', *The Journal of Politics*, 64(2), 408-433.
- Sending, O. J. (2009). *Why Peacebuilders Fail to Secure Ownership and Be Sensitive to Context*. Security in Practice Working Paper Series 1. Oslo: NUPI.
- Scharpf, F. W. (1999). *Governing in Europe. Effective and democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scherer N. and B. Curry (2010). 'Does Descriptive Race Representation Enhance Institutional Legitimacy? The Case of the U.S. Courts', *The Journal of Politics*, 72(1), 90-104.
- Schwedler, J. (2006). 'The Third Gender: Western Female Researchers in the Middle East', *Political Science & Politics*, 39(3), 425-428.
- Shain, Y. (1999). *Marketing the American creed abroad: diasporas in the US and their homelands*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shain, Y. and A. Barth. (2003). 'Diasporas and International Relations Theory', *International Organization*, 57(3), 449-479.
- Shapiro, M. (2005). 'Deliberative', 'independent' technocracy v. democratic politics; Will the global echo the EU?', *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 68(3/4), 341-356.
- Sheffer, G. (2003). *Diaspora politics: at home abroad*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shindo, R. (2012). 'The Hidden Effect of Diaspora Return to Post-conflict Countries: the case of policy and temporary return to Rwanda', *Third World Quarterly*, 33(9), 1685-1702.
- Sinatti, G. and C. Horst (2015). 'Migrants as agents of development: Diaspora engagement discourse and practice in Europe', *Ethnicities*, 15(1), 134-152.
- Sisk, T. D. (2013). *Statebuilding*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Smith, H. and P. Stares (eds.) (2007). *Diasporas in conflict – Peace-makers or Peace-wreckers?* Tokyo: United Nations University.
- Spilimbergo, A. (2009). 'Democracy and foreign education', *American Economic Review*, 99(1), 528-543.
- Starr, F. (1913). *Liberia: description, history, problems*. Chicago.
- Stefansson, A. (2004). "Refugee Returns to Sarajevo and Their Challenge to Contemporary Narratives of Mobility". In Long, L. D. and E. Oxfeld (eds.) (2004). *Coming home?: refugees, migrants and those who stayed behind*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Stel, N. and R. Ndayiragije (2014). 'The Eye of the Beholder: Service Provision and State Legitimacy in Burundi', *Africa Spectrum*, 49(3), 3-28.

- Sukarieh, M. and S. Tannock (2013). 'On the problem of over-researched communities: The case of the Shatila Palestinian Refugee Camp in Lebanon', *Sociology*, 47(3), 494-508.
- Söderström, J. (2011). "Focus Groups: Safety in Numbers?". In Höglund, K. and M. Öberg (eds.). *Understanding Peace Research: Methods and Challenges*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Söderström, J. (2015). *Peacebuilding and ex-combatants: political reintegration in Liberia*. New York: Routledge.
- Talentino, A. K. (2007). 'Perceptions of Peacebuilding: The Dynamic of Imposer and Imposed Upon', *International Studies Perspectives* 8(2), 152-171.
- Tate, K. (2003). *Black Faces in the Mirror: African Americans and their Representatives in the U.S. Congress*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1998). *Reweaving the Torn: Return of Guatemala's Refugees*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- The Economist (2015). 'Somaliland sets 2016 budget', *The Economist*, December 17, 2015. Available at: https://country.eiu.com/article.aspx?articleid=1173782501&Country=Somalia&topic=Economy&subtopic=_5. Cited: January 15, 2020.
- Tsuda, T. (2009). "Why Does the Diaspora Return Home? The Causes of Ethnic Return Migration". In Tsuda, T. (ed.). *Diasporic Homecomings. Ethnic Return Migration in Comparative Perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Turner, M. (2008). *Three Discourses on Diasporas and Peacebuilding*. Paper for WISC 2008, Ljubljana, 23-26 July, 2008.
- Turner, S. and N. Kleist (2013). 'Introduction: agents of change? Staging and governing diasporas and the African state', *African Studies* 72(2): 192-206.
- UCDP (2016)a. *Somalia*. Uppsala Conflict data program (UCPD). Available at: <http://ucdp.uu.se/#country/520>. Cited: 15 November, 2016.
- UCDP(2016)b. *Liberia*. Uppsala Conflict data program (UCPD). Available at: <http://ucdp.uu.se/#country/450>. Cited: 15 November, 2016.
- UNDP (2006). *MOBILIZING CAPACITY FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT - National Human Development Report 2006, LIBERIA*. UNDP. Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/liberia_2006_en.pdf.
- UNDP (2011). *United Nations Development Programme National Capacity Development Programme (NCD) Annual Project Progress Report –January-December 2011*. UNDP Liberia. Available at: <https://www.undp.org/content/dam/liberia/docs/Annual%20Report%20National%20Capacity%20Development%20January-December%20%202011.pdf>.
- UNHCR (2007). *2005 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Statistical Yearbook: Liberia*. UNHCR, 5 August, 2007. Available at: <https://www.unhcr.org/statistics/STATISTICS/4641be64d.pdf>.
- UNMIL (2018). *LIBERIA FACTS*. UNMIL, 23 April, 2018. Available at: <https://unmil.unmissions.org/liberia-facts>. Cited: 5 June, 2019.
- UNMIL (2019). *UNMIL –United Nations Mission in Liberia*. UNMIL, 2019. Available at: <https://unmil.unmissions.org/>. Cited: 5 May, 2019.
- van de Walle, N. (2003). 'Presidentialism and Clientelism in Africa's Emerging Party Systems', *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 41(2), 297-321.
- Van Leeuwen, M., J. Nindorera, J. Kambale Nzweve and C. Corbijn (2019). 'The 'local turn' and notions of conflict and peacebuilding – Reflections on local peace committees in Burundi and eastern DR Congo', *Peacebuilding*, 8(3), 1-21.

- Van Walraven, K. , H. Melber and A. Mehler (2012). *Africa Yearbook Volume 8*, Leiden: Brill.
- Vertovec, S. (1999). 'Three meanings of 'diaspora', exemplified among South Asian religions', *Diaspora*, 6(3), 277-330.
- Vigne, R. (1987). 'SWAPO of Namibia: A Movement in Exile', *Third World Quarterly*, 9(1), 85-107.
- Walls, M. (2014). *A Somali nation-state: history, culture and Somaliland's political transition*. Hargeisa: Ponte Invisible.
- Walls, M. (2009). 'The Emergence of a Somali State: Building Peace from Civil War in Somaliland', *African Affairs*, 108(432),. 371–389.
- Watson, C. A. (2004). *Nation-building: a reference handbook*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.
- Weatherford, M. S. (1992). 'Measuring Political Legitimacy', *American Political Science Review* 86(1), 149-166.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Wood, E. (2003). 'REVIEW ESSAY: Civil Wars: What We Don't Know', *Global Governance*, 9(2), 247-260.
- World Bank (2014). *New World Bank GDP and Poverty Estimates for Somaliland*. World Bank Press release, January 29, 2014. Available at:<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press--release/2014/01/29/new--world--bank--gdp--and--poverty--estimates>.
- World Bank (2006). *What Role for Diaspora Expertise in Post-Conflict Reconstruction? Lessons from Afghanistan, and West Bank and Gaza*. Social Development Notes, No. 25. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (2019a). *Personal remittances, received (% of GDP) – Liberia*. The World Bank. Available at: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/BX.TRF.PWKR.DT.GD.ZS?end=2018&locations=LR&start=2004&view=chart&year_high_desc=true. Cited: 20 January, 2020.
- World Bank (2019b). *Net official development assistance and official aid received (constant 2015 US\$) – Liberia*. The World Bank. Available at: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/DT.ODA.ALLD.KD?end=2017&locations=LR&most_recent_value_desc=false&start=1960&view=chart . Cited: 20 January, 2020.
- World Chronicle (2004). 'Liberia: Can it emerge from the Ashes?', *World Chronicle*, 924, 14 January, 2004. Available at: 20 January, 2020.
- Wyman, M. (1993). *Round-Trip to America: The Immigrants Return to Europe, 1880–1930*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Appendix

Examples of post-war cabinets in sub-Saharan Africa in 2016: Liberia, Sierra Leone and Rwanda.

The tables below are meant to provide brief examples of the compositions of cabinets in these three cases. It should be noted that it is generally difficult and highly time consuming to find bibliographical information about cabinet ministers in these cases. Therefore, this information below comes from a myriad of sources such as news articles, official webpages of governments and ministries, LinkedIn, scholarly articles and other literature such as Johnson Sirleaf's memoir "This child will be great" (2009). As far as possible I have tried to control all information to different sources.

Table 1. Liberian cabinet 2016

Name	Position	Year	Experience abroad	Gender	Born	Education	Profession
Ellen Johnson Sirleaf	President	2006-2016	Studied, worked and lived in the U.S. for many years.	Female	Monrovia	Bachelor from Madison Business College, Wisconsin. Masters degree from Harvard University.	Politician, economist. Worked for the World Bank, Citibank, UN etc.
Joseph Boakai	Vice President	2006-2016	Studied and lived in Sierra Leone. Studied in the U.S. in the 1970s.	Male	Lofa County	Bachelor from College of West Africa, Liberia. Degree from Kansas State University.	Agriculturist, businessman.
Augustine Kpehe Ngafuan	Minister of Foreign Affairs	2012-2015 (October 2015)	Studied in the U.S. while working in Liberia.	Male	Monrovia	Masters degree from Rochester University. Certificate	Finance. Worked at Central Bank of Liberia.

						from Harvard University.	
Edward Jr. Mclain	Minister of State for Presidential Affairs	2008-2016 (deceased in August 2016)	Studied in France. Worked in Cote d'Ivoire. Wife lives in Atlanta, Georgia.	Male	Monrovia	College of West Africa. Cuttington College. Doctor of Psychiatry University of Besançon, France.	Psychiatrist
Amara Mohamed Konneh	Minister of Finance	2012-2016	Lived in the U.S. for many years. Also worked in Guinea.	Male	Gbama District, Gbarpolu County	Masters degree. Studied at Drexel, Penn state and Harvard University.	Economist
Benedict Sannoh	Minister of Justice	2014-2016	Lived in the U.S. for many years.	Male	Bomi, Grand Cape Mount County	Masters degree. Studied at Columbia University Law School of New York.	Lawyer. 2003-2010 UN missions in Sudan and Sierra Leone. He was a managing partner at the Liberia Law Services of Washington, DC, from August 2010 - 2011
Brownie J. Samukai	Minister of National Defense	2006-2016	East Timor, Tanzania	Male	Lofa county	Bachelors degree.	Military. From 1999 to c.2004/05 he served as a security officer with the

							UN, initially with UNTAET in East Timor, and then from 2000 with UNHCR and the UN Department of Safety and Security in Tanzania.
George Werner	Minister of Education	2015-2016	Studied and Lived in the U.S. for several years.	Male	Grand Cess, Grand Kru County	Masters degree. Studied at University of Pennsylvania and at St. Joseph University in Philadelphia. Studied a shorter amount of time at University of South Africa (UNISA), Pretoria.	Public servant. Previously the Director-General of the Civil Service Agency and Chair of the Government of Liberia's Inter-ministerial Scholarships Committee.
Frederick Norkeh	Minister of Posts and Telecommunications	2010-2016	Lived in the U.S. for many (probable 20+) years.	Male	-	PhD. Doctorate Degree from Hamline University, St. Paul, Minnesota in Public Administration in 2006.	-
William Gyude Moore	Minister of Public Works	2015-2016	Lived in the U.S. for many years.	Male	Maryland, Liberia.	Masters degree. Studied at Berea College, Kentucky	Public servant. Was Deputy Chief of Staff/Head

			Also lived in refugee camp in Côte d'Ivoire.			and Georgetown University.	of the Program Delivery Unit in the Executive Office of the President.
Moses M. Zin-nah	Minister of Agriculture	2015-2016	Studied, worked and lived in the U.S. for several years.	Male	-	PhD from University of Wisconsin-Madison.	Has worked as a lecturer in for example University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Cape Coast and Kwadaso Agriculture College in Ghana.
Bernice Dahn	Minister of Health and Social Welfare	2015-2016	Studied in the U.S. for one year.	Female	Maryland, Liberia.	Medical doctor. Master's of Public Health from the University of Washington.	Medical doctor. Worked for University of Liberia.
Lewis G. Brown	Minister of Information, Culture, and Tourism	2012-2016	-	Male	-	Studied at University of Liberia, unknown degree.	Served as Foreign Minister of Liberia under Charles Taylor. Former NPFL rebel
Patrick Sendolo	Minister of Lands, Mines, and Energy	2012-2016	Lived in the U.S. for many years.	Male	-	Holds a Juris Doctor (J.D.), honors, from the University of Georgia.	Attorney. Worked at a lawfirm in Florida, before joining the Liberian government in 2008.
Axel Marcel Addy	Minister of Commerce	2013-2016	Studied in the U.S. for	Male	-	Masters of Arts from the University of	Been deputy minister

	and Industry		around 4 years.			California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and a BA from California State University, Long Beach (CSULB).	for commerce and industry.
Julia Duncan-Cassell	Minister of Gender, Children and Social Protection	2012-2016	Lived in the U.S. for many (around 20) years.	Female	-	Bachelors degree from University of Phoenix.	Been President of the Liberian Unity Party's California branch and of the North California branch of the Liberian Community Association. Was Superintendent of Grand Bassa County for six consecutive years.
Neto Zarzar Lighe	Minister of Labor	2014-2016	-	Male	-	-	-
Eugene Nagbe	Minister of Youth and Sport	2013-2016	None known.	Male	Maryland, Liberia.	Bachelor from University of Liberia.	Been minister several times. Worked under Charles Taylor. Was Secretary general for CDC until 2011.
Angela Cassell Bush	Minister of Transport	2014-2016	Have studied in France	Female	-	Bachelor from the Schiller International	Been Deputy Minister for Expenditure and Debt

			and the U.S.			University, Paris; two Masters from the Goldey Beacom College, Wilmington, Delaware.	Management.
--	--	--	--------------	--	--	--	-------------

Table 2. Sierra Leone cabinet 2016

Name	Position	Year	Experience abroad	Gender	Born	Education	Profession
Ernest Bai Koroma	President	2007 - 2016	No known diaspora experience, wife and daughters have studied in the UK.	Male	Make li, Bombali District	Bachelor degree. Graduated in 1976 from Fourah Bay College, University of Sierra Leone.	Insurance broker. Worked at Sierra Leone National Insurance Company in 1978.
Ambassador Victor Bockarie Foh	Vice President	2015 - 2016	Been Ambassador in China.	Male	Bo district	Fourah Bay College	Diplomat, politician
Samura Mathew Kamara	Minister of Foreign Affairs and International cooperation	2012 - 2016	Studied in Wales for many years. Worked for the World Bank in Washington DC.	Male	Bombali district	Bachelor degree from Fourah Bay College. Master and PhD from University College of North Wales.	Economist
Kaifala Marah	Minister of Finance	2012 - 2016	Lived abroad for several	Male	Kono district	Bachelor degree from Fourah Bay	Accountant. Worked as legislative

			years. Studied and worked in the U.S. Was recruited when he worked for the Commonwealth office in London.			College. Masters degree from State University of New York and PhD from Hull university.	aide for U.S. Senate. Worked in commonwealth office in the UK.
Franklyn Bai Kargbo	Attorney General and Minister of Justice	2010 - 2016	Probably studied in the UK and lived in Gambia, Ethiopia and Eritrea for a while.	Male	Bombali district	-	Lawyer
Alpha Kanu	Minister of Information and Communication	2013 - 2016	Studied in the UK.	Male	Port Loco district	Studied at St Francis secondary School and Fourah Bay College. MPhil from University of Nottingham.	Mining engineer. APC's official spokesperson.
Minkailu Mansaray	Minister of Mines and Minerals Resources	2010 - 2016	Studied in Gambia. No further information found.	Male	-	-	-
Usman Boie Kamara	Minister of Trade	2013 - 2016	Studied and lived in the UK	Male	Free-town	Prince of Wales Secondary school in	Ran for president in 2012 election.

	and Industry		for several years.			Freetown. Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine in London.	
Henry Olufumi Ma-cauley	Minister of Energy	2014 - 2016	Lived in Denmark, France, the U.S., Nigeria.	Male	Freetown	-	Business man. Worked for oil companies in France and the U.S. Was high commissioner to Nigeria 2008-2014.
Abu Bakarr Fofanah	Minister of Health and Sanitation	2014 - 2016	Lived in the UK for many years. Studied in Germany.	Male	-	Bachelors and Masters degree from College of Medicine and Allied Health Science. Advanced diploma from Institute of Tropical Medicine in Berlin.	Physician (Licensed to practice medicine in the UK and Sierra Leone).
Musa Tarawally	Minister of Lands and Country Planning	2013 - 2016	-	Male	Moyamba	-	-
Leonard Balogun Koroma	Minister of Transportation and	2013 - 2016	Lived in the UK and U.S. for many years	Male	Freetown	-	Politician/public servant. Worked for example to set up APC

	Aviation		(after the coup in 1992).				chapter in New Jersey.
Minkailu Bah	Minister of Education	2007 - 2016	-	Male	Tonkolili district	-	Was acting head of Electrical and Electronics department Fourah Bay College University
Alfred Paolo Conteh	Minister of Defense	2007 - 2016	Lived in the UK for many years in the 1980s and 1990s.	Male	Freetown	Masters degree.	Major. Attorney.
Mojueh Kaikai	Minister of Social Welfare, Gender and Children's Affairs	2013 - 2016	None known.	Male	Pujehun district	Graduate from Fourah Bay College	Previously served as the resident Minister of the Southern Province, and Deputy Minister of Labour.
Sam Sesay	Minister of Agriculture	2007 - 2016	Have experience of studying and living in Russia, the Neatherlands, Liberia	Male	Kambai district	PhD.	-
Matthew Teambo	Minister of Labor	2013 - 2016	Lived and worked in the U.S. for many years.	Male	Tonkolili district	PhD.	Was a lecturer and Professor at Golden Gate University, San Francisco. Former MP.

Momodou Alieu Pat-Sowe	Minister of Marine Resources and Fisheries	2013 - 2016	-	Male	-	-	-
Diana Konoman	Minister of Local Government and Rural Development	2012 - 2016	-	Female	Kono district	Fourah Bay College.	Politician. E.g. Previously served as the All People's Congress chairwoman of the Eastern Province region
Peter Bayuku Konte	Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs	2012 - 2016	-	Male	-	-	-
Abdul B. Barrie	Act. Minister of Works, Housing & Infrastructural Development	2012 - 2016	Lived and worked in the UK for at least 8 years.	Male	Kabala Koinadugu District	Bachelors degree.	Worked for British Gas in London and America Insurance Group (AIG).
Momodou Maligi	Minister of Water resources	2013 - 2016	Studied and worked in the U.S. for many years.	Male	Bonthe district	Masters degree. Studied at Lawrence University and Valparaiso University.	Senior Manager at the Sierra Leone's National Social Security and the Head of Corporate Global Banking of

							the Standard Chartered Bank in Freetown
Ibrahim Kemoh Sesay	Minister of Political and Public Affairs	2013 - 2016	Not known.	Male	Port Loko district	Fourah Bay College.	Been MP and minister of Transport and Aviation.
Pauk Kamara	Minister of Sports	2010 - 2016	Lived in the UK in 1996 after being shot in Sierra Leone.	Male	Kambia district.	Bachelors degree.	Journalist
Alimamy A. Kamaria	Minister of Youth Affairs	-	-	Male	-	Bachelors degree.	-

Table 3. Rwanda cabinet 2016

Name	Position	Year	Experience from abroad	Gender	Born	Education
Paul Kagame	President	2000-2016	Grew up and lived in Uganda (for 30+ years)	Male	Ruanda-Urundi	-
Anastase Murekezi	Prime Minister	2014-2016	Lived in Belgium.	Male	Gikongoro	Bachelors degree.
Geraldine Mukeshimana	Minister of Agriculture & Animal Resources	2014-2016	Lived in the U.S. Worked in Kenya.	Female	Huye District	PhD.
Stella Ford Mugabo	Minister of Cabinet Affairs	2013-2016	Grew up and lived in Uganda for 20 years. Spent 1 year in the UK.	Female	Uganda	Masters degree.

James General Kabarebe	Minister of Defence and national security	2010-2016	Lived in Uganda for many years.	Male	-	Bachelors degree.
Seraphine Mukantabana	Minister of Disaster Management & Refugee Affairs	2013-2016	Have lived in Congo-Brazzaville for many years.	Female	Cyangugu	Bachelors degree.
Valentine Sendanyoye Rugwabiza	Minister of East African Community	2013-2016	Have lived in Switzerland.	Female	-	-
Papias Malimba Musafiri	Minister of Education	2015-2016	Have studied in India.	Male	-	PhD.
Oda Gasinzigwa	Minister of Family and Gender	2013-2016	Born in Tanzania and lived there for many years.	Female	Tanzania	Masters degree.
Claver Gatete	Minister of Finance and Economic Planning	2013-2016	Born in Uganda and lived there for many years.	Male	Uganda	Masters degree.
Louise Mushikiwabo	Minister of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	2009-2016	Lived in the U.S. for 23 years, returned when appointed minister.	Female	Kigali	Masters degree.
Agnes Binagwaho	Minister of health	2011-2016	Lived and studied in Belgium.	Female	Rwanda	PhD, medical doctor.
James Musoni	Minister of infrastructure	2014-2016	Born in Uganda and lived there for many years.	Male	Uganda	Masters degree.

Sheikh Musa Fazil Hare-rimana	Minister of Internal Security	2006-2016	Studied in Saudi Arabia.	Male	Gisenyi, Nyamirambo	Bachelors degree.
Busingye Johnston	Minister of Justice	2013-2016	Born in Uganda and lived there for many years.	Male	Uganda	Masters degree.
Francis Kaboneka	Minister of Local government	2014-2016	Studied in Ireland.	Male	-	Masters degree.
Vincent Biruta	Minister of Natural resources	2014-2016	Studied in Belgium.	Male	Shyorongi, Kibungo	PhD.
Judith Uwiz-eye	Minister of Public Service and Labour	2014-2016	Studied for two years in the Netherlands.	Female	Rwanda	Masters degree.
Julienne Uwacu	Minister of Sports and Culture	2015-2016	No information about time abroad.	Female	Rubavu District	Masters degree.
François Kanimba	Minister of Trade and Industry	2011-2016	Studied in France for 5 years in the 1970s-80s.	Male	Gikongoro	Masters degree.
Jean Philbert Nsengimana	Minister of Youth & Information & Communications Technology	2012-2016	Studied in Dubai for one year.	Male	Kibuye	Masters degree.
Venantia Tugireyezu,	Minister in the Office of the President	-2016	-	Female	-	-

Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis

*Digital Comprehensive Summaries of Uppsala Dissertations
from the Faculty of Social Sciences 182*

Editor: The Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences

A doctoral dissertation from the Faculty of Social Sciences, Uppsala University, is usually a summary of a number of papers. A few copies of the complete dissertation are kept at major Swedish research libraries, while the summary alone is distributed internationally through the series Digital Comprehensive Summaries of Uppsala Dissertations from the Faculty of Social Sciences. (Prior to January, 2005, the series was published under the title “Comprehensive Summaries of Uppsala Dissertations from the Faculty of Social Sciences”.)

Distribution: publications.uu.se
urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-431663



ACTA
UNIVERSITATIS
UPSALIENSIS
UPPSALA
2021