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Abstract

From the cottage industry that it was in colonial times, Ghana’s tourism has grown to become the country’s fourth highest foreign exchange earner, generating $2billion and employing about 350000 people annually. Though there have been many studies on the sector, those that focus on the country’s tourism growth trajectory and its inherent patterns are few and far between. But it is imperative to understand what type of developments have occurred, how this growth has evolved, and, perhaps, most importantly, the extent to which these changes have reflected different philosophical leanings of successive governments. To this end, the paper, using secondary data employs a fusion of Tourism Area Lifecycle Curve with a Political Economy approach to analyse existing demand and supply trends over the 1985-2014 period. The results suggest that the country’s tourism has evolved through 5 distinct stages so far, namely, the colonial era, early expansion, the first decline, renaissance and the current slowed growth. Each of these stages is marked by a unique combination of market indicators and governmentality. The findings suggest the possible existence of an association between government’s philosophical orientation (and by extension, intervention) and sector performance. It found, for example that tourism experienced higher growth in the era where the government adopted a hybrid philosophical approach which saw government being directly involved in product creation aside its regulatory and facilitative functions. It is recommended that the first step towards reviving the ailing fortunes of the tourism sector is to change the philosophical paradigm from the present laissez fairist approach towards the hybrid philosophical paradigm which encourages government to combine its entrepreneurial, facilitative and regulatory roles.

Introduction

Over the last 30 years there have been noticeable shifts in tourist patronage from the conventional tourist spots towards newer destinations (United Nations World Tourism Organisation, 2015). These shifts have been occasioned mainly by both demand and supply factors. On the demand side, there have been changes in tourist consumption...
patterns, marked by a departure from the traditional 4S (sun, sea, sand and sex) towards one of greater engagement with the host community and the environment. On the supply side, there has been an exponential growth in new destinations which offer a greater variety of tourist experiences. The mushrooming of new destinations is, perhaps, more evident in the developing world (Okech, 2010) and is often innately for economic rewards (Mill & Morrison, 2009). Tourism has often been touted (e.g. Honey & Gilpin, 2009; United Nations World Tourism Organisation, 2012) as an important vehicle through which pathways to development (e.g. enhanced foreign exchange earnings, the creation of jobs, enhanced revenue to the government and stimulation of local economic growth) can be delivered. These attributes of tourism have led to its widespread endorsement by national governments and multinational aid agencies. Clearly tourism has in contemporary times evolved into a trillion-dollar economic activity and the world’s fourth largest industry (UNWTO, 2015).

The growth in supply of destinations has implied stiffer competition and a more pressing need for individual countries to pay closer attention to their internal operational structures. It is therefore imperative that countries that seek to benefit from tourism commit to carefully monitoring their destinations (Inskeep, 1991). Such an exercise carries the benefit of providing a clear view of where and how the destination has evolved and, (based on the trends noticed), outlines a scientific basis for decision making towards sustainable management of the destination, and by extension a country’s tourism. Understanding destination growth and its politico-economic dynamics is, therefore, particularly germane at a period where tourism’s recognition as a pathway for economic transformation has been institutionalized in the developing world (Pleumarom, 2012).

Destination evolution (and its driving factors) has always been a subject of intense academic enquiry and Butler (1980)’s Tourism Area Lifecycle Model is one of the most popular models for assessing destination evolution. Butler (1980) its main proponent, argues that destinations rise and fall and outlines five hypothetical stages that every destination grows through. The TALC employs a combination of variables such as number of visitors, number and quality of receptive facilities, and the nature of the host-guest interaction to outline the various stages of development. Butler further posits that policy interventions can be crafted for each stage of a destination. From the viewpoint of assessing a destination’s evolution the TALC raises issues of the dynamics of tourism growth (in terms of demand and supply), the philosophy, nature and extent of government involvement in tourism and the relationship between these constructs over time.

The afore-raised issues can be adequately analysed within a Political Economy (PE) framework. PE’s original purpose (e.g. Arrow, 1951) was to study production procedures, as well as the distribution of the attendant wealth from these processes. In contemporary times, however the frontiers of PE thinking have expanded to include the issues such as governmentality and economic performance (Merlo, 2005). Generally, PE thinking posits a relationship between governmentality and economic performance (Mo-sedale, 2011), thus using such an approach
provides the opportunity to relate the economic activity to its attendant government interventions (governmentality) and vice-versa. In the view of Nunkoo, Ramkissoon and Gursoy (2012), the PE approaches provide a useful basis for understanding government’s involvement in tourism. Of all the academic disciplines, tourism in particular must be understood from such a perspective for four reasons: its variegated nature, its complex production processes, its highly nuanced production and distribution processes (Picard & Wood, 1997) as well as its socio-politico and economic ramifications in host destinations (Holden, 2005; Nelson, 2012).

The study is set in Ghana, a lower middle income West African country which has over the last 30 years become a key destination in the sub-region. Though its relationship with tourism started at independence, it was only after 1985 that sustained efforts at tourism development began. When applied to the current discourse, a combination of the PE approach and the TALC guides the thought process through posing the following questions that set out the outline of this paper: what have been the demand and supply trends over the years in Ghana’s tourism? Do the demand and supply trends mark out any distinct eras? And if so, what governance indicators (philosophy and related activity) have characterised these periods; And, finally, how has the relationship between economic activity and governmentality evolved over time?

While there have been some studies on the country’s tourism experience (e.g Akyeampong, 2009; Asiedu, 2002; Boakye, Otibo and Frempong, 2013; Konadu-Agyeman, 1991) the attendant discussions have barely focused on exploring the interactions between governmentality and economic performance for the particular eras. The closest to the scope of this study has been that of Akyeampong, (2009) which explores governments’ philosophical orientations and their subsequent interventions in tourism but does not link them to industry performance. Again, in terms of data, this study covers a longer period than Akyeampong’s which mainly covers the period up to 2005 only. Notably, as Akyeampong’s (2009) work notices, the post 2005 era has been marked by some slowed growth- a fact which, as will be seen later in this paper, changes the narrative when included in the analysis. Thirdly, whereas Akyeampong’s discussion appears to focus the implications for the private sector (particularly business travel), this paper explores the issue from a wider perspective of destination governance.

Nevertheless, the present study relies heavily on Akyeampong’s work to provide the historical perspectives to the timelines marked out. The findings contribute to the existing knowledge (e.g. Teye, 1988; Asiedu, 2002; Akyeampong, 2009; Sonne, 2011; Koutra and Edwards, 2012; Boakye, Otibo and Frempong, 2013) on the political economy of the country’s tourism and the factors that have (or continue to) shape the growth of the sector. The paper therefore primarily attempts to analyse the evolutionary patterns of Ghana’s tourism, using an adapted version of Butler’s Tourism Lifecycle Framework which juxtaposes governance (governmentality) and economic performance. It uses demand and supply trends to mark out the distinct phases of Ghana’s tourism evolution and explores the dynamics of governmentality existing at those particular eras.
The rest of the paper outlines the literature, methods and findings. The literature review section discusses the concepts of governmentality both theoretically and empirically and from there the methodological issue are addressed. The final section considers and discusses the findings and fleeces out some issues for consideration in the management of Ghana as a destination.

**Literature review**

Tourism is patently an outcome of policy (Hall & Jenkins, 1995; Nelson, 2012) and, policy, the outcome of government’s philosophical orientation (Akyeampong, 2009). As Akyeampong (2009) poignantly puts it, government policy is the most dominant influence on tourism development. Either way, government policies and actions (or inactions) play a major role in shaping not only the fortunes of the tourist trade but also the developmental outcomes for both government itself and its citizens (Hall & Jenkins, 1995). While this truism about government’s central role in tourism is not in doubt, the debate in the literature has often played around the following themes: (a) the appropriate philosophical orientation governments of developing countries should adopt towards the tourism trade, (b) the appropriate role of governments in tourism (c) the optimum combination of government interventions and industry performance.

A considerable amount of literature has been devoted to destination management around varied themes such as competitiveness (Dwyer & Kim, 2003; Ritchie & Crouch, 2003), or and its related concepts of attractiveness (Pompurova & Simockova, 2014), sustainability (Buckley, 2012) and promotion (Bieger, 1998). The two concepts, governmentality and economic performance have individually and severally been the subject of much academic inquiry within the broad sphere of macroeconomics. Governmentality as’ first used by Foucault (1978) connotes an idea of superintending a state through an array of tools and mechanisms. This paper adopts the general view espoused in the literature e.g. Burchell, 1996; Casterneder & Burner, 2010) which views governmentality as comprising both the philosophies and resultant interventions in the sector by government. Hence, governmentality in tourism is operationalized to include both the philosophy and the related activities that governments undertake in tourism. Both dimensions have been the subject of an intense polemic debate with the discourse normally being centred on the acceptable extent of government’s role in economic production. The two extremes of literature generated from the discussion can be appropriately labelled the supportive and critical views of neoliberalism. On the one side are the proponents of the supportive view whose argument (e.g. Harvey, 2005) and, to an extent, Duffy and Moore (2010) can be summed up in the mantra that prohibits government from engaging in direct business operations. This view has been expressed through the various Structural Adjustment Programmes proposed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank (Akyeampong, 2009; Lacey & Ilcan, 2015). To such supporters of the neoliberal orientation, the interplay of market forces can be employed to adequately match demand with supply or, better still, ensure efficiency.
Consequently neo-liberals frown on state interventionist policies such as state entrepreneurship, price controls, trade restrictions, and state subsidies to economic activities and argue strongly for divestiture of state control in enterprises. In the Ghanaian context, it is worth mentioning that the neo-liberalist philosophy has shaped many of the interventions made by Bretton Woods Institutions in Ghana and other developing countries. In Ghana for example, the neo-liberalist-inspired Structural Adjustment Programme culminated in the state divesting itself of almost all its tourism supply units such as hotels (Akyeampong, 2009). Similar examples have been reported of India (Venkatesh, 2014) and the Czech Republic and Slovakia (Williams & Balaz, 2000).

The counter argument is presented by adherents of the critical view (e.g. Brohman, 1996; Griffith, 2006; Mosdale, 2016; Wearing, 2002) who argue essentially that neoliberalism is more harmful than good. For the critical authors, neo-liberalism is inherently bad and fails to consider the social context within which economic production occurs and thus, has made the African continent poorer than it was before the introduction of such liberalism-driven interventions. To the critics, the overemphasis on the market tends to skew the production processes towards the highest bidder, in the process creating vulnerable marginal groups which ultimately increase the social cost for government. Critics of the neoliberal approach point to the failures of the Bretton-Woods interventions in Africa and argue that in spite of more than 30 years of so-called reform, African economies have remained essentially the same in structure. They further point to removal of subsidies in agriculture and the damaging effects it has on the social life of the large numbers of unskilled persons who are rendered jobless on account of these withdrawals (Doogan, 2013). Indeed a more recent riposte published by the IMF itself delivers an even more damning verdict of the outcome of its neoliberalist philosophy (Ostry, Loungani and Furceri, 2016).

The same debate finds expression in the tourism literature between what Akyeampong (2009) refers to as the state activism and the laissez-fairist perspective. The argument in favour of the neo-liberal thinking is summed up by the maxim “tourism is private sector led”. Akyeampong (2009) for example argues that Ghana’s tourism (demand and supply) grew rapidly during what he terms the ‘laissez-faire’ era of tourism development where the state was no longer an entrepreneur but a facilitator. Opponents of the neoliberal proposition point to the fact that unbridled liberalisation especially in tourism leads to loss of sovereignty, ownership and control of a country’s tourism industry (Adu-Febiri, 1994; Akama, 2004, Britton, 1981; Konadu-Agyemang, 2001; Wearing, 2002).

While the neo-liberal argument appears palatable and laudable particularly when considering the convenience of allowing the market to allocate resources versus the inefficiencies (and related costs) of the state operations, its proponents often overlook the contextual realities. A neo-liberal approach works best under certain conditions: an economy of equal access, capacities and vulnerabilities; ability of all players to understand their roles; capacity of all the actors to perform efficiently; and a facilitating environment
that provides free access to factors of production among others. Again, the issue of market failures, namely, externalities, public goods and the case of the monopolist should serve as reminders of how the forces of demand and supply are not always the most efficient allocator of resources. Though written some 35 years ago, Jenkins and Henry (1982) are very much contemporary in their argument that governments of developing countries must be actively involved in tourism essentially to compensate for the absence of a strong and tourism-experienced private sector. Perhaps by being a service provider itself, the state could understand the private sector better and react accordingly to create a more conducive environment for operating in the tourism service provision business. As Akama (2002:1) aptly puts it: “it is usually the government that has the required social and political capacity and legitimacy to bring together and co-ordinate the activities of diverse and different interest groups which are involved in the development of tourism and, also, establish the required level playing field”.

Economic performance, the second key concept in this paper, is often operationalized in the tourism context within the confines of demand and supply perspectives. Demand can therefore be equated to tourist arrivals (both inbound and domestic) and supply would refer to the amalgamation of industries that cater for the varied needs of tourists. Demand for tourism has grown exponentially over the last 60 years. According to the UNWTO (2015), international arrivals have grown from 25 million in 1950 to 1.13 billion in 2014 and are expected to reach 1.8 billion in 2030. Demand for tourism is very sensitive and has been found to be shaped by incomes (Gee, Mackens and Choy, 1997); lifestyles (Crompton, 1979); availability of crude oil (Becken, 2006) and most importantly, security (Boakye, 2010; Pizam & Mansfeld, 2006).

Tourism supply constitutes the amalgamation of all those businesses that meet the direct needs (e.g. accommodation, food, beverage, transport and entertainment/attractions) of the tourists. The performance of the tourism supply system has also been found to be affected by a myriad of challenges which are both internal and external. In Ghana, internal factors include unskilled labour (Adu-Febiri, 1994; Mensah-Asah, 2014); poor service (Boakye & Boohene, 2010; Teye, 2000) and weak managerial capacities (Mensah-Asah, 2014). On the external front, tourism supply in Ghana is faced with an unfriendly fiscal environment (Acquaye, 2011); difficult access to credit (Akyeampong, 2007); and a weak supporting infrastructure by way of roads, and particularly utilities.

Destination Growth Analysis Models

Tourist destinations like any other entity go through various changes of growth with time and in the view of some leading authors (e.g. Butler, 2011; Prideaux, 2000) destinations grow and decline in popularity over time. To buttress the point, the traditional seaside resorts of many European countries are no longer as popular as they used to be. Similarly, Las Vegas was fast losing its popularity as a destination until it was revived through the introduction of gambling. For some intriguing reason, most of the models on destination evolution have been framed around a
hypothetical small coastal town which ultimately progresses into a beach resort. Perhaps it may be fair to assume that these models were postulated during an era where mass beach-based tourism was the prevalent form of tourism. Three of the most frequently referenced growth models are discussed in turn.

The first of them, Miossec’s model, uses a complex interaction of four key variables: growth in time, space, the provision of resort and transportation facilities and attitudinal changes among key stakeholders to identify five stages of development. The model postulates that tourism development goes through five stages, ranging from isolation which is no development to the creation of a fully-fledged pioneer resort with the necessary transportation. These changes also come with their attendant evolution of host acceptance or rejection of tourism (Pearce, 1989). The key critique of Miossec’s work lies in its inability to “factor the existing socioeconomic structure where some form of urban hierarchy and some transport networks are already found” (Pearce, 1989, p.18).

Another destination growth model is Prideaux (2000)’s Resort Development Spectrum. This model is also stage-based but, unlike the first, treats the coastal resort destination as an entire unit. The Resort Development Spectrum identifies several stages of a destination’s development starting from the least developed stage, the local to region to national to international and ultimately stagnation, rejuvenation and or decline. According to Prideaux, the drivers of growth are essentially economic and include: - The destination’s ability to tap new markets - Ability to attract new economic market segments willing to pay higher rates for better amenities - Availability and continued development of transportation-related infrastructure and has been used in relatively fewer studies (Hsueh, 2012) to trace the interface between transportation and the economic development of destinations.

The third is Butler’s Tourism Area Life Cycle Model (TALC)-1980 and by far, remains the most frequently used and criticized destination growth model (Butler, 2011). According to Butler’s (1980) original thinking, a resort or destination grows and ultimately declines after passing through six hypothetical stages namely, exploration involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, rejuvenation and decline. In Butler’s thinking, six variables namely time, number and type of tourists, number of tourist facilities, degree of professionalism by service providers and the level of formality of host-guest relationships combine to shape the growth or otherwise of a destination.

The earliest stage, exploration, is characterized by an isolated settlement with some unique attractions that only the locals and a few non-institutionalized tourists know about and use. There is a lack of access and tourist-related facilities and the few ones offered unstandardized and crude services and are not created for the tourist market. Host guest relationships at this juncture are highly informal and cordial. With time the destination grows in popularity and evolves into the involvement stage in where the unspoilt nature of the destination begins to appeal to the them mass tourism market. At this stage the first standardized tourist receptive facilities are built, host guest relations are getting
more formal and tourism impacts are becoming larger. Tourism becomes one of the economic activities in the area.

The second stage, development, witnesses a substantial increase in the number of tourists and there is now a clear delineation of a tourist season during whose peak period visitors outnumber the local population. The number of tourist facilities booms and more tourism jobs are created. The locals, though not so welcoming of tourists, tolerate the tourism trade because of its obvious benefits. Building of tourism—related infrastructure is booming and their designs as well as service delivery are becoming more westernized to cater for the institutionalized tourists who now dominate the destination. Local control of tourism and its facilities is ceded rapidly to outsiders who come in the form of Multi-National Corporations (MNCs).

At Butler’s consolidation stage, there is a reduction in available space for tourism development. Tourist arrivals reach their highest peak though the rate of increase declines and by this time the non-institutionalized tourists are long gone and destination has become a popular mass tourism spot. Host-guest relationships are mutually suspicious, and indeed locals are excluded from certain tourist areas, spawning an anti-tourism sentiment. There is an oversupply of tourist receptive facilities leading to the destination having very cheap prices. Professionalism is at its peak and the destination is predominantly owned and operated by foreign interests.

With these conditions, stagnation (the next stage) quickly sets in and the destination begins to witness a decline in the rate of increase of tourist arrivals. The destination is now very popular implying congestion and a loss of appeal as a mass tourism enclave. At this stage many of the MNEs leave the destination and thus ownership of property reverts to local owners. Host-guest relationships are strained and with the former being openly antagonistic (Doxey, 1975) and blame the latter for pollution and corruption of moral values.

The last two stages, namely, rejuvenation and decline are presented by Butler as possible outcomes of destination’s reaction to the stagnation stage. Hence both post-stagnation stages are outcomes of managerial decisions. The first - rejuvenation occurs where the destination tries to repackaged itself by introducing more attractions or, the second, decline where the interventions are unsuccessful and the destination dies out completely. In such an instance, the destination may be still operational but not a major feature on the tourism circuit.

Choosing an Appropriate Framework for Analysing Ghana’s Evolution

Miossec’s (1977) and Prideaux’s (2000) models, though very useful in their own right as stage analytical tools, are not ideal for the present study due to their emphasis and variables for study. Miossec’s model for example is focused mainly on a spatio-temporal perspective whose variables fall outside the purview of the study. Prideaux’s (2000) model on the other hand, places emphasis on the economic environment (both macro and micro) without taking cognizance of the political (or governmentality) dimensions which shape it, and or the interface between again rendering it inappropriate for this study. Butler’s TALC also has some shortcomings, and key amongst them, is the fact
that its stages are vaguely defined and that it is premised on a flawed assumption of unimpeded linear growth (e.g., Gale, 2005; Haywood, 1986). But its most stinging critique concerns the restructuration processes (Garay & Canoves, 2011) and questions have been raised (e.g., Agarwal, 2006; Butler, 2010) about the ability of the TALC model to aptly capture the post-stagnation dynamics of a destination. This has led to several suggested modifications. Agarwal (2006) for example, calls for a ‘reorientation’ stage after the destination reaches stagnation and argues that destinations do make some efforts in that regard when they reach stagnation. Baum (1998) has also suggested the need to make provision for both a complete reinvention in which the destination ‘starts over again’ and a total exit from tourism where the community’s resources are used for some other economic activity.

These shortcomings notwithstanding, TALC remains the most frequently used framework to trace destination growth and its utility in (1) identifying the fact that destinations do go through some evolution and (2) understanding the socio-economic indicators of different stages through which destinations evolve is yet to be disputed. As Berry (2001) has cogently argued, deviations from the model do not detract from its usefulness. Thus, for the present study the TALC is adopted for the reasons of:

- Creating a framework for tracing the changing scenes of Ghana’s tourism since independence
- Providing space for observing from a longitudinal perspective, a combination of diverse variables
- Helping to identify Ghana at a particular stage and to prescribe some suggested solutions on how to avoid attaining the next stage

To cater for the weakness of being unable to capture the post-stagnation dynamics, the study adopts Agarwal’s (2006) modification of the TALC which, in essence, upholds the original thought of a sinusoidal fluctuation but argues for the insertion of a stage between stagnation and decline on the empirical basis that some destinations attempt to (and actually do) prevent decline through a series of interventions generically labelled ‘reorientation.’ Figure 1 captures this modification aptly.

![Figure 1: Modified Tourism Area Life Cycle Model](source: Agarwal, 2006)

**Methodological issues**

The study relied largely on secondary data in the form of existing records secured from the Ghana Tourism Authority. The data covered information on tourism arrivals and number of star rated hotels over a period. Comparative percentages and moving averages were
employed to calculate relative growth rates for both arrivals and the number of receptive facilities while the seasonal moving averages technique was employed to highlight changes over time.

It is worth noting that while there are other indicators of supply (e.g. restaurants, attractions, etc.) and even within the accommodation subsector a wide variety of forms, restrictions imposed by lack of continuous data limited the study to only that available for the licensed star rated hotels. The obvious limitation of representativeness notwithstanding, using star-rated hotels as a proxy for gauging tourism supply is not new and has been employed in other studies (e.g. Akyeampong, 2009, Boakye, Otibo & Frimpong, 2013).

The various eras were thus marked out using a combination of the demand and supply trends on the one hand and, the prevailing government philosophy and its attendant activities on the other. The paper employed a modified form of Butler’s Tourism Area Life Cycle, and in its analytical process makes, copious references to earlier comprehensive studies by Akyeampong (2007; 2009), Asiedu (2008) and Teye (1991, 2000).

**Results and discussion**

Based on combinations of economic performance and governmentality five distinct stages are identified in Ghana’s tourism evolution (Table 1). These are the Colonial Era (which is similar to exploration stage), the Early expansion (synonymous with the involvement/development stage); the First decline; the Renaissance; and, the era of Slowed Growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Government Orientation/ philosophy</th>
<th>Government Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonial</td>
<td>*low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>none, no policy on tourism</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early expansion</td>
<td>*high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>hybrid: State as an entrepreneur, regulator and facilitator</td>
<td>* infrastructural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First decline</td>
<td>*low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>The State mainly as a regulator</td>
<td>* administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>hybrid: State as an entrepreneur, regulator and facilitator</td>
<td>* Product creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Administrative structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* awareness creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slowed growth</td>
<td>slowed growth</td>
<td>slowed growth</td>
<td>laissez- faire – State as a facilitator and more as a regulator.</td>
<td>* legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* administrative structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presumed based on the fact of no figures but the prevailing description and the normally expected market reactions to changes in demand or supply. These are discussed in turn. In each era, a report is made on the demand and supply trends as well as issues relating to governmentality (both philosophy and action).

The Colonial Era: Colonialism up to 1956

The first era identified is the colonial era which is synonymous with Butler’s exploration stage and covers that period of time which marks the formal British rule in Ghana till independence. Practically, it may range from the period when The Gold Coast was officially a British colony till 1957 when it became independent and assumed the name Ghana. Tourism development in the colonial era can best be described as inadvertent (Akyeampong, 2009). The colonial era is thus characterized by low visitor numbers and an equally low stock of tourism supply (Table 1). There were only six licensed hotels in the country during this period (Akyeampong, 2009) and the tourism demand consisted of leisure and holidaying activities of European civil servants who were administering the colony on behalf of the Queen (Akyeampong, 2009). Equally governmentality was virtually non-existent as there was no explicit government philosophy, policy or direction.

Towards the end of colonial era, however, a slight paradigm shift was observed where, for the first time in the county’s history, elaborate investments were made in tourism accommodation-specifically the construction of the 110-room Ambassador hotel in 1956 which was aimed primarily at accommodating dignitaries who would be participating in the country’s independence celebration a year later. This construction marks the first large scale commercial accommodation enterprise.

Early expansion: 1957 to 1977

The second clear period can be termed the era of early expansion and it spans the period lasting up to two decades after Ghana’s independence in 1957. It is characterized by a growth in supply and demand (Table 1). This period, coincides with Akyeampong’s (2009) era of state activism and the involvement stage of Butler’s curve. On the supply side there was a marked growth in tourist supply receptive facilities. The State Hotels Company was the dominant force in accommodation and owned facilities in almost all the regions of Ghana (Akyeampong 2009). From the demand side, an absence of data for the period in question leaves little options apart from a presumptive conjecture based on known growth of tourism receptive facilities. It would not be out of place to assume that the creation of so many tourism receptive facilities (including transportation and a travel and tour company) would be done in reaction to the growing numbers of tourists. Another possibility has to do with the socialist leanings of the then government whose investments would be driven more by altruism than market considerations. In terms of governmentality, the Government’s philosophy was, essentially socialist as shown in the state’s approach of being actively involved in both the provision and management of tourism-related facilities. The era witnessed the government being a very
active investor and manager of tourism-related facilities. This is not very surprising as the government of Kwame Nkrumah that took over from the departing colonial administration had strong socialist inclinations (Akyeampong, 2009:10). In addition, governmentality in this era took an administrative form through the creation of bureaucracies to manage various aspects of tourism (Asiedu, 2008): These included the creation of the State Hotel and Tourist Corporation which was later split with the other wing, the Ghana Tourist Corporation becoming the eventual precursor of the present day, Ghana Tourism Authority. A third trait of governmentality during the era was the commissioning of major studies largely focused on the viability of the tourism trade (Teye, 2000). The first of them was the Obuam Committee (1972) which is generally thought (e.g. Teye, 1988) to pass for the country’s first ever tourism development plan. Other studies included those undertaken by UNDP, USAID in 1973; Ghosh and Kotey’s Tourism multiplier effect and one in 1975 by the United States International Executive Service Corps. Suffice to say this was an era in which both governmentality and economic activity were high (Table 1).

The first decline: 1978-1983

The era of the first decline is marked by low levels of both demand and supply (Table 1). On the supply side there is no evidence of additional facilities being added during this period and based on the link drawn by Becken (2012) it would be safe to assume that the general economic downturn and the global oil crises could have reduced tourist inflows. In terms of governmentality, apart from the renaming of the Ghana Tourism Board (now authority) in 1977, not much can be found in the literature about the country’s tourism over these five years. The answer for this hiatus perhaps lies in (1) the economic decline and (2) political instability. Concerning economic decline, it has been noted that a positive relationship exists between a country’s level of economic development and its tourism sector (Akyeampong, 2009). The period in question (especially 1979) marks one of the country’s worst in terms of low productivity and shortage of essential commodities among others (Nuggent, 2000). By then, many of the newly-independent African states, including Ghana had become poor and heavily indebted (Konadu-Agyemang, 2001; Nugent, 2000) and this decline in economic fortunes reflected in the tourism front also.

But the political instability (and the attendant insecurity) offers another plausible explanation for the decline. The literature is replete (e.g. Mawby, Boakye & Jones, 2014; Pizam & Mansfeld, 2006) with evidence of destination unpopularity as a result of insecurity. Concerning instability, Teye (1986, 1988) has established an organic link between the stability of a nation and the growth of tourism. These six short years were, perhaps the most unstable in the country’s history, witnessing five well-documented coup d’états and a host of abortive ones which made the country very volatile and unsafe to visit. In terms of economic activity, the security challenges, general decline and economic malaise translated into dwindling activity on both demand and supply fronts (Teye, 1988).
The era of the renaissance: 1984-2001

Ghana’s renaissance era appears synonymous with Butler’s rejuvenation stage. It is marked by increases in tourism demand and supply as well as increased government interventions (Tables 1, 2 and 3). Between 1986 and 2001 tourist accommodation grew from 420 to 1053 units representing a 150.7 percent increase. The period was characterized by a sustained growth in earnings from tourism. Computations from the Ghana Tourism Authority figures suggest the tourist trade earned the country a total of approximately US$3.2billion during the period. On the average, tourism receipts grew by 11 percent and the sector’s contribution to GDP almost tripled from 1.45 percent in 1986 to 3.9 percent in 2000. Over the same period, tourist arrivals grew by more than 300 percent. The era also witnessed the creation and or revival of tourism trade associations. New trade associations of car rentals, chefs, tour guides, and tour operators, forex bureaux operators, drinking bars, indigenous traditional caterers, restaurants and night clubs were formed in this period while old ones such as the hotels’ association were revived. On the strength of all of these, it is little wonder it coincides with much of the period that Akyeampong (2009) labels ‘the golden era’ of tourism in Ghana.

In terms of governmentality, the era is credited with the implementation of many singular yet unprecedented governmentality activities that were to permanently revolutionize the country’s tourism landscape. First, was a perceptible change in philosophy and mode of intervention (Table 1). In keeping with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank economic reforms, government’s philosophy changed radically to adopt a more neo-liberal stance of ceding its entrepreneurial functions and focusing more on regulation and planning. Government interventions were, now more focused on administration and product creation, (Table 1). The administrative interventions began with the creation of legal backing for tourism (through the passage of PNDC law 116 of 1985) to be recognised as one of the key pillars around which the country’s socio-economic transformation was to be organized. The state also promoted tourism through various awareness creation and training initiatives. Within two years of this designation the first ever tourism awareness fair- ‘Intertourism 89’ was organized by the then Ghana Tourist Board.

Regarding training, two important schools were established. The first, the Hotel Catering and Tourism Training Institute had the mandate to equip entry and low level frontline staff such as waiters, cooks, front desk operators, tour guides with the necessary operative skills for their respective areas. The second was the tourism programme at the University of Cape Coast which was to produce middle level supervisory personnel at both the undergraduate and postgraduate degree levels—again for the sector. While the former started in 1991, the latter admitted its first batch of students (both levels) in 1996. Another administrative intervention came in the form of the establishment of the Ministry of Tourism, which represented the highest ever level of authority granted to tourism. On its heels was the crafting of the country’s second major tourism development plan which covered the period (1996-2010).
Together, these three events contributed towards firming up the administration and more importantly, organization of tourism and placing Ghana on the international tourism map. A notable introduction to governmentality was the creation of tourism products. For the first time in the country’s tourism history, government created three tourism attractions – the Kakum National Park, the Cape Coast Castle and the Elmina Castle. This intervention was made possible through funding from the United States Agency for International Development (US-AID), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and was delivered under the Natural Resource Conservation and Historic Preservation Project (NRCHP). This landmark project was the result of a government initiative, specifically, the then Central Regional administration which sought to use tourism as the lead sector around which development of the region would be pursued. In addition, government was actively involved in creating landmark festivals such as the Pan African Festival (PANAFEST). Together with the park and castles, the festival boosted the tourist inflows.

The era of slowed growth: 2002-to date

The economic performance data suggests that tourism has since the 2001 entered a period of stagnation, or at best, slowed growth. This is an era which has been characterised by declines in growth in demand and supply. As will be noted from Table 2, growth was two percentage points higher in the renaissance era (11%) than has been in the stagnation phase (9%). Hence, though in absolute terms the numbers keep increasing, the marginal growth rate is declining.

The reasons for Ghana’s slowed growth are complex and multifaceted and the literature has variously unearthed a myriad of factors that collectively constitute constraining influences on the growth of the sector. These have included: poor service quality (Mensah & Amissah, 2009), poor and inadequate infrastructure (Adu-Febiri, 1994; Teye, 2001), an ineffective governance structure (Boakye, Otibo & Frempong, 2013) inadequate funding (Holden et al., 2011), an unfavourable operating environment (Akyeampong, 2007) and insecurity (Boakye, 2008; Teye, 1988). But perhaps, the single most limiting factor to the country’s tourism growth is the nature of the tourism product itself. Ghana offers very little variety to tourists. Tourists have been known to complain (e.g. Boakye & Boohene, 2010) about limited options that the country offers them as a destination. The country’s attraction stock has remained virtually unchanged over the last two decades. Many of its potential attractions remain underdeveloped those being used have seen very little modifications and remain in their raw state. Again, the major events such as PANAFEST and Emancipation day that really helped to create the tourism euphoria during the renaissance are currently pale shadows of themselves. Governmentality in this era has been driven by a laissez faire policy and has focused on legislation, regulation, and a stronger participation of the private sector. There is also the increased activity of non-state actors (NGOs) in the tourism sector.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>arrivals</th>
<th>percentage change</th>
<th>average growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Renaissance</td>
<td>125162</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>145780</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>172464</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>213316</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>256680</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td>271310</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>286000</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>304860</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>326438</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>347953</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>372653</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>399000</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>438833</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>slowed growth</td>
<td>482643</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>530827</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>538821</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>428533</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>497129</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>586612</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>698069</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>802779</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>931224</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>1080220</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,263,857</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>993600</td>
<td>-21.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>1093000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s computations from GTA figures

A similar pattern emerges on the supply scene. Though the number of licenced facilities increased on the whole from 198 to 610 during the period the growth was twice faster over the pre 2001 period than after (Table 3). However the rate of increase has been half slower in the post renaissance era.
### Table 3: Comparative supply trends for licensed star-rated hotels)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>No of licensed star</th>
<th>percentage change</th>
<th>average growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996*</td>
<td>Renaissance</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>253</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>369</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>399</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009*</td>
<td>slowed growth</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>417</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>497</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>438</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>531</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>610</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the previous years there were 168 licensed hotels in 1995 and 379 for 2008

### Legal/policy framework

Interestingly, though, the stagnation/slowed growth era can be described as, perhaps, the most vibrant in terms of the creation of a legal/policy infrastructure for tourism. The passage of, perhaps, the most important tourism-related law yet: Act 817 of 2011 with its attendant creation of a tourism development fund occurred in this era. Prior to this landmark law, there was also the creation of L.I 1817 which offered a very generous package for a wider array of tourism-related businesses but was abolished within the same period after 5 years. Another notable event has been the review of the old 15-year plan and the creation of another 15 year document to span 2013-2027. Also worth mentioning were various important policy documents/strategic plans such as: the Five year Tourism Action Plan (2003-2007); National Tourism Policy (2005); Tourism Sector Medium Term Development Plan (2010-2013); National Tourism Marketing strategy (2009-2012), and; National Tourism Development Plan (2013-2027). The neo-liberal thinking is manifest in the creation of an environment which has witnessed a plethora of activity by non-state actors in providing technical assistance. Some noticeable organizations have included: Ricerca e Cooperazione RC (Italy); USAID (USA) Department for International Development, (UK) Danish International Development Agency (Denmark); the then German Technical Cooperation (Germany); The Japanese International Cooperation Agency (Japan) and; Stichting Nederlandse Vrijwilligers(SNV or, Netherlands Development
Organization) of the Netherlands. Their activities have largely tended to centre on building the capacity of the tourism public institutions in their regulative function. There have also been instances of support for the creation of some small scale community-based tourism attractions and management.

Paradoxically, at the height of government’s regulation and legal/policy frameworks, the business operating environment has, over the past decade, appeared to be quite unfriendly. The slowed growth era has been characterized by complaints of industry players about the quality of their operating environment. Akyeampong (2007) as well as Acquaye (2011), Boakye et.al (2013) have all enumerated several complaints by service providers about high taxes, difficult access to credit and stifling utility bills. At the time writing this paper, new utility tariffs have been introduced which are so high that they exceed even payroll costs. According to a television interview granted by the president of the Ghana Hotels Association in June 2016, the hotel business is being stifled through a poor operating environment and many of them are on the verge of closing down.

Conclusions and policy implications

In conclusion, Ghana’s tourism has evolved through changing phases which have been largely shaped by different combinations of government philosophy and interventions. The TALC has generally, again proved useful in assessing a destination’s evolution. Nevertheless, the Ghanaian case highlights the TALC’s shortcoming in the impracticability of its assumption of unimpeded continuous growth up until the saturation point. The Ghana situation has suggested the presence of some internal fluctuations even before the development stage. Unlike the TALC’s proposition, Ghana’s tourism growth experienced an early decline after expansion, but ‘rejuvenated’ and peaked before entering into the current slowed growth situation. The paper ends by drawing a few policy implications from the findings.

Firstly, the results suggest that Ghana needs to revisit its tourism development strategy. The fluctuating fortunes observed in the market (Tables 2 and 3) are not necessarily new as they reflect the generally cyclical nature of tourism. On the global scene for example, tourism is in its fifth year of a rebound following an earlier depression, however, the 10-year period of slowed growth in the Ghana case needs examination.

Again, the findings highlight the need to re-examine notion that the state must not engage directly in business as often expressed in the mantra ‘government has no business in businesses’. Notably, the evidence from the data on the Ghanaian situation rather suggests the reverse: the laissez-faire philosophy has been coterminous with periods of slowed growth while the epochs of strong sector performance appear to coincide with government’s adoption of a hybrid philosophy. Governments of developing countries must be encouraged to invest in and own tourism-businesses. Alternatively they should partner with the private sector within the PPP frameworks to engage in business. The success models of fully state owned and operated agencies like Graphic Communications Group (a media outlet), State Insurance Company and the Ghana Oil Company should be studied and replicated in the tourism
arena. Leaving the conduct of business to the private sector without creating the appropriate environment for it to operate has a deleterious effect on the growth of the industry and ultimately its ability to act as a vehicle for development.

Finally, the finding about the different economic fortunes being associated with alternating forms of governmentality highlights the fact that the type of government intervention is an equally important variable to be considered when planning tourism. The difference in fortunes observed across the eras may be attributable to the changing nature of government interventions. The product creation and facilitative activities outlined under the renaissance appeared to yield better economic outcomes than the strict adherence to the laissez-faire or neo-liberal orientation. Capacities of Government and its agencies (particularly the Local Authorities) must be built to enable them create and operate tourism attractions and evolve policies that will create strong forward linkages between tourism and other local sectors.
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