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Historical trajectories of tourism development policies and planning in Ghana, 1957 – 2017

Abstract

Historical research on tourism development policies and planning is generally limited, with scant attention on destinations in the Global South. This paper traces the historical trajectories of the development of tourism policy and planning in Ghana using the analytic framework of ‘Development First’ and ‘Tourism First’. The analysis builds on a 3-year research project and using the framework approach to qualitative analysis provides a detailed contextual analysis of key national economic development plans and national tourism development policies and plans. Four broad political eras of tourism development and planning are identified - i) 1957 – 1966: post-independence era of Development First; ii) 1966 – 1981: political instability era of Tourism First; iii) 1981 – 2000: structural adjustment era of mixed Tourism First-Development First and; iv) 2000 – 2017: democratic consolidation era of Development First. The analysis highlights how the distinct historical contexts of state involvement shape the present and future characteristics of tourism development. The implications of this paper suggest the need for more detailed exploration of the historical processes of tourism development in Global South destinations. Such exploration provide important insights into the critical role of the state in the development and implementation of tourism policies and the effects on the sustainability of tourism development.
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Introduction

Tourism development is inherently a political activity and as such there is always a contention between different actors and interests. Consequently, the state through public sector agencies tend to wield considerable power in shaping the direction and pace of tourism development (Adu-Ampong, 2017b; Jeffries, 2001). On a global level, tourism represents about 7% of the world’s export in goods and services and generates 1 in every 10 jobs globally (United Nations World Tourism Organisation [UNWTO], 2017). Thus, in many destination, governments at national, regional and local levels are taking a keen interest in tourism development on the premise of the sector’s potential for catalysing economic development and poverty reduction.

In contrast to the general recognition of the political nature of the tourism development and planning process, there has been less engagement with the historical nature and context of tourism development policies and planning (Saarinen, Rogerson and Hall, 2017; Walton, 1997). In the above context, this paper traces the historical trajectories of tourism development policy and planning in Ghana. This paper responds to the call to take seriously the historical nature and context of tourism development and planning (Butler, 2015; Buzinde & Manuel-Navarrete, 2013; Saarinen et al., 2017; Walton, 2005, 2009). The historical processes of tourism development in a destination can offer insights into the sustainability of current tourism development processes. The aim of this paper is therefore to provide a detailed examination of the historical developments of tourism policies and plans in Ghana. This is necessarily detailed because of scant research that examines the historical trajectories of tourism development policies and planning in Ghana specifically and in Sub-Saharan African countries more generally. The analysis uses the ‘Development First’ and ‘Tourism First’ framework as developed by Burns (1999) as a heuristic framework in order to show the shifting emphasis in how tourism planning is approached within each historical period.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows; after this introduction, there is a review of the literature on the need for a historical exploration of the tourism-development nexus. The next section offers a contemporary overview of tourism in
Ghana and methodological approach. The fourth section provides a detailed examination of the tourism development policy and planning process in Ghana from independence in 1957 to 2017. The timeframes used for the analysis reflects key political events in Ghana’s history. The discussion and conclusion section highlight how the historical antecedents of tourism development explains the shifts and continuity in the challenges facing tourism development policy and planning in Ghana.

### Historical research, tourism-development nexus and tourism policy and planning

There is limited historical research within tourism studies (Walton, 2005; 2009) and what little there is tend to be mainly focused on North America and Western Europe (Rogerson, 2011). Research on the historical development of tourism in the Global South tend to be scant (Pandy and Rogerson, 2013; Rogerson, 2011). As Walton (2005:6) aptly noted, "A problem in tourism studies has been a prevailing present-mindedness and superficiality, refusing deep, grounded or sustained historical analysis even when dealing with essentially historical processes...” In order to overcome this present-mindedness it is important to engage in a historical analysis of contemporary tourism development and planning issues. A serious investigation of the past can help to inform our understanding of how tourism destinations are being transformed and are likely to be transformed in the future. For instance, in a historical study of the changing hotel industry in South Africa, Rogerson (2011) shows how the transformation of the hotel sector ‘from liquor to leisure’ in the period of 1928-1968 laid the foundation for the development of an internationally competitive South African hotel industry. Pandy and Rogerson (2013) also offer a historically nuanced assessment of how the international sanctions imposed on tourism during the apartheid era in the late 1970s and early 1980s served as the catalyst for the establishment and subsequent evolution of the timeshare economy in South Africa. These studies shows the advantages of a historical approach to tourism policy research.

It is on this basis that this research proceed in exploring the historical process of tourism development and planning in Ghana. This research responds to the call set out by Saarinen et al (2017:312) that “[t]he historical dimension of tourism development and planning cries out for further geographical excavation”. The application of a historical perspective on the tourism development and planning process in Ghana can
offer important insights and enrich geographical research on the ongoing relationship between tourism planning and economic development.

The perceived positive relationship between tourism and economic development has a storied history. Although the idea of development seems to defy definition, on the most basic level a basic “development means making a better life for everyone” (Peet and Hartwick, 2009:1). From the changing paradigms of modernization to dependency to economic neoliberalism, alternative development to post-development, human development to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and then the current Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the idea of development has evolved beyond simple economic criteria to include other measures such as sustainability, cultural and human development. Within this changing context, the perceived role of tourism in development has also evolved with an impact on government approach to tourism planning. A detailed analysis of the evolution of development paradigms vis-à-vis tourism planning is beyond the scope of this paper (see Sharpley and Telfer, 2015, Telfer, 2015, 2002). Nonetheless, it is worth stating that whether in descriptive and/or normative terms, development characterises the socio-economic condition of a given society and tourism is has been perceived to have the potential to contribute to this goal.

The post WW II period with the development of the jumbo jet, growing affluence of Western countries and rise of charter tours marked the beginning of the optimist view of tourism’s role in economic development (Steiner, 2006). For newly decolonising countries, the rise in travel and tourism provided an opportunity for gaining needed foreign exchange, generate employment and generally stimulate economic development with a view to poverty reduction (Harrison, 2001). From the 1950s through to the early 1980s, tourism development planning hinged on the tenets of modernization theory with the expectation that tourism would result in a greater multiplier effect that would create jobs, conserve the environment and generally stimulate local economic development. However, low multiplier effects, high rates of leakages and perceived widening of inequalities in tourism communities (Lea, 1988; Sinclair and Tsegaye, 1990; Pleumaron, 1994; Mowforth and Munt, 2009) led to the questioning of the economic case for tourism.
From the late 1960s through to the early 1980s, much of the research on the tourism-development nexus and the resulting “discussion of tourism [was] typically divorced from the historical and political processes that determine development” (Britton, 1982:332; see also de Kadt, 1979). de Kadt (1979) had earlier argued that the state needs to play a critical role in the planning and design of the tourism sector in order to minimise the potential negative impacts while encouraging the positive impacts. This was similarly echoed by Britton (1982) who noted the importance of governments in developing countries taking a deliberately central redistributive role in the planning and organization of the tourism industry and the benefits accruing thereof.

In the 1980s and early 1990s, studies began to focus on how the implementation of the IMF and World Bank backed Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) affected tourism development in developing countries. For instance, Dieke (1995) shows that the liberalisation of the economy through the SAPs made way for local private sector and foreign investment in the tourism sector. The impact of the SAPs was to consign the role of the state to that of an enabler rather than an operator for the tourism sector. In the case of Ghana, Konadu-Agyemang (2000, 2001) contends that the implementation of SAPs opened up the tourism sector but led to higher leakages of tourism revenues due to increased rates of foreign and private sector involvement. Tourism development under the SAPs focused on areas in the south of the country that had the potential for a quick return on investment at the expense of areas with sufficient tourist attractions but lacking needed infrastructure. This resulted in increased and entrenched socio-economic and spatial disparities some of which persist to date.

At the turn of the new millennium, the debate on the tourism-development nexus moved to a more direct focus on tourism’s role in poverty reduction. The emergence of the ‘pro poor tourism’ concept (Bennett et al., 1999; Ashley et al., 2000) highlighted the need to make tourism development work for the poor (Schilcher, 2007; Scheyvens, 2007; Harrison, 2008; Goodwin, 2008). In contemporary times, research focuses on the dynamic relationship between tourism and the general development processes in a country. The SDGs for example have three of the seventeen goals making explicit reference to tourism (goal 8: economic growth and employment, goal 12: sustainable consumption and production, and goal 14: conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development). Consequently, tourism is
considered as “a powerful social force that needs to be better understood in order to connect it more effectively to development agendas that go beyond purely economic considerations” (Spenceley and Meyer, 2012:301). Thus, it is imperative to trace the historical trajectories of tourism development policy and planning in a destination in order to understand how tourism can contribute to development efforts.

**Overview of tourism in Ghana and methodological approach**

The tourism sector in Ghana is currently one of the fastest growing sector of the economy and is the fourth highest foreign exchange earner for the country (Adu-Ampong, 2017b). It has been estimated that in the year ending 2013, a direct contribution of US $1.3 billion and a total contribution of US $ 3.0 billion to GDP was made by the tourism and travel sector in Ghana. This accounted for 3.0% of total GDP and 7.2% of total GDP respectively (World Travel & Tourism Council [WTTC], 2014). The composition of international tourists arriving in Ghana is concentrated in a few key markets with the top 8 countries making up 60% of all foreign arrivals in 2011 for instance. The key source markets in 2011 were Nigeria (19%), the USA (13%), UK (9%), Cote d’Ivoire (5%), India (3%), Germany (3%), South Africa (3%) and the Netherlands (3%). The motivations of international tourists to Ghana are varied. Nonetheless, a 2009 report of the Ghana Tourism Authority (GTA) shows that the main purposes of visits for 40% of arrivals are professionally related travel – businesses, conferences, study and/or training. Visiting friends and relatives (VFR) is the second most important travel motivation (25% of arrivals) with leisure holiday travel coming in as a third main purpose with 19% of arrivals. In recent times, there are increasing efforts at developing and encouraging the domestic tourism market (Cobbinah and Darkwah, 2016).

This article is based on a three year research project which adopted a mainly qualitative research approach involving interviews, document analysis and observations. The research project examined the relationship between tourism governance and the role of tourism in local economic development and poverty reduction (Adu-Ampong, 2016). In tracing the historical trajectories of tourism development policies and planning in Ghana, this particular article draws upon a detailed contextual analysis of key national economic and national tourism development policies and plans (see table 1). In
addition, the analysis also draws on published research focusing on different aspects of tourism and national development in Ghana.

The framework approach for qualitative analysis as developed by Ritchie and Spencer (1994) is used to analyse the documents through the five-step process of familiarization, identifying a thematic framework, indexing, charting, and mapping and interpretation. The familiarisation stage involved immersion in the data through detailed reading of policy documents in order to get an overview of the range and diversity of the data gathered. The next stage involved devising an index of descriptive key issues which were then used for refining themes at the charting phase. At the mapping and interpretation stage, the central concern was to provide a coherent analysis of all gathered data. In achieving this aim of analytic coherence, Yin’s (2009) analytic techniques of pattern matching and explanation building helped to complement the framework approach to data analysis utilised. Both techniques allowed data to be analysed in a way that built up an explanation about the causal links and mechanisms [the ‘how’ and ‘why’] between key historical issues on tourism policies and planning. The analytic framework and emerging themes drove the data analysis process. Data analysis remained an iterative process through which data was scrutinised for meaning, salience and connections.

Although the methodological approach used here allowed the research to meet its aims, there are some limitations to the approach taken. Firstly, this study focused mainly on key national economic development plans and national tourism development policies and plans that were easily accessible (see table 1). Thus, there might be some plans not considered for this study. Furthermore, without a survey of the writers and users of these documents, the analysis presented here may not offer a comprehensive overview of the changing trajectories of how these tourism policies and plans are implemented. In addition, the operationalization of the Tourism First and Development First analytic framework is liable to the charge of not having clear-cut boundaries. Nonetheless, as a heuristic tool, the framework provide a basis for a arriving at a broad overview of the
Tourism development planning and policy-making in Ghana: Tourism First vs. Development First

The analytic framework used in the assessment and analysis of the historical trajectories of tourism development policies and planning in Ghana rest on the bipolarity of ‘Tourism First’ vs ‘Development First’ developed by Burns (1999). These are two ends of a continuum of tourism planning. On one hand, a Tourism First approach is concerned primarily with economic growth through tourism multiplier effects centred on increased tourist arrivals. Key characteristics of this approach include seeing tourism simply as a business industry and the commoditisation of resources through the identification of attraction sites for resort and hotel development. From this perspective, development – in the sense of improving the local livelihoods – tends to be subsumed or diverted in the belief that direct benefits from tourism development arrive through multiplier effects.

On the other hand, a Development First approach to tourism development planning starts from the central consideration of how tourism relates to its environs. Thus, tourism development is weighed in terms of is net benefits vis-à-vis the related social, cultural and environmental costs. A Development First approach sees “tourism as a means of, or a tool for, achieving national social and economic goals” (Burns, 1999:332). A key characteristic of this approach is that it provides a holistic conceptualisation of tourism-as-system where the starting point is the identification of the specific development goals of a given destination. Tourism development planning focuses on the local level and the benefits accruing from tourism as part of a set of policies aimed at improving the alternative economic livelihood options in order to eliminate poverty, create productive employment and the general betterment of women in society (Burns, 1999).
A Tourism First vs. Development First framework enables a reflection on the historical patterns of tourism development planning and the most dominant approach taken within a given destination and across time. While most tourism development plans might have a mix of both approaches, it is likely that on a balance either a Tourism First or a Development First approach will be more dominant. Thus, this framework is used heuristically in analysing the historical trajectory of tourism development policy and planning in Ghana.

The rest of this section revolves around four key eras in Ghana’s political history since independence. These periods are identified on the basis of politically significant events that took place at that time. Within each identified era, specific emphasis and analysis focuses on key long-term tourism development plans developed during that period. The identified eras are:

1. 1957 – 1966: post-independence era of Development First approach
2. 1966 – 1981: political instability era of Tourism First approach

The post-independence era of Development First approach: 1957 – 1966

Up to the time of independence on 6th March, 1957 there was no effective tourist demand for accommodation nor did Ghanaians have any inclination of leisure travel. While Ghanaians did travel during this period, when they did travel it was in the household of family relatives that they lodged. The little demand for overnight accommodation came from foreign seafarers and sea-bound travelers and for this group accommodation facilities were provided in major coastal towns by local entrepreneurs (Akyeampong, 2006). The period of 1957-1966 witnessed the first active involvement and investment of the state in the tourism sector. This started when in 1956 the Ambassador Hotel was commissioned as the first international class hotel to be built in Ghana. This was to serve as accommodation for dignitaries coming to attend the planned independence celebrations of Ghana in March, 1957. It can thus be argued that
this first state investment was not necessarily bore out of an effective tourist or market
demand but was bore out of a Development First approach.

Based on a Development First approach, tourism development planning within this
period was holistically conceptualised as a tool for overall socio-economic development
of the country based on socialist principles. Importantly the development of tourism in
this period served political purposes of highlighting and impressing upon the world the
great socio-economic progress that made in the newly independent country.
Consequently, although the government was well aware of the foreign exchange from
international tourism, the development of the sector was not left simply to only
economic considerations.

This period of 1957-1966 witnessed an active role of the state as an investor and
entrepreneur in tourism development. Indeed given that the political economy of Ghana
at this time was based on a strong socialist inclinations – ideology of ‘African’ or
’scientific’ socialism – the state’s role in overall national development was near total
(Nkrumah, 1970; McCain, 1979). During this period, the government of Dr. Kwame
Nkrumah engaged in hosting Pan-African conferences and other international meetings,
summits and conferences (Akyeampong, 2006). This created the initial demand for
appropriate international hotels and conference facilities in Ghana. The ideology of
African socialism meant that a mixed approach of strong state involvement and
indigenous private sector involvement was encouraged in tourism development.

Within this era institutions and structures which later came to be the foundation of
public sector tourism governance were developed. For instance, the Ghana Museums
and Monuments Board (GMMB) and the State Hotels and Tourist Corporation (SHTC)
were set up in 1957 and 1962 respectively. In 1958 Ghana Airways was established as
the national carrier to connect to as many newly independent African countries as
possible on the basis of public service and national prestige. In 1965, the SHTC was split
up into the Ghana Tourist Corporation (GTC) and the State Hotels Corporation (SHC). In
the absence of a substantive ministry, the GTC was assigned the responsibility for
tourism policy and planning, and to develop, promote and regulate the tourism sector.
The SHC on the other hand was tasked with expanding the accommodation capacity in
the country and engaged in building a number of state hotels, guest houses and catering rest houses around the country.

In the absence of a separate tourism development plan, the directions for developing the tourism sector were discussed within national economic development plans. National economic development plans provide a way to assess the shifts in thoughts regarding tourism’s perceived role in economic development (Adu-Ampong, 2018). Thus the Second 5-year Development Plan, 1959 – 1964 for instance discusses the potential of developing the tourism industry in Ghana and notes that the “first requirement is more hotel and boarding house accommodation” which the government was investing in given the lack of private investment (Government of Ghana, 1958, p. 24). There was a perception that international tourism was a form of neo-colonialism that reinforces dependency relations. This was seen as incompatible with and against the very tenets of the African socialism that was being practiced by the government leading to an ambivalence in making tourism a priority in national development planning. The consequence was that the government did not push for increased international tourist arrivals during this period (Asiedu, 1997).

**The political instability era of Tourism First approach: 1966 – 1981**
The period of 1966-1981 is considered as the lost decades for Ghana as well as many other African countries (Aryeetey & Kanbur, 2007). This era was characterised by the high frequency of successful and abortive coups d’état. The resultant economic meltdown and political instabilities had a negative impact on tourism development in Ghana (Teye, 1988). The political instabilities experienced during this period partly resulted in a Tourism First approach to tourism development with a semi-passive involvement of the state in the tourism sector.

Notwithstanding the high number of changing military and ‘democratic’ regimes during this period, a number of tourism development and impact studies were undertaken in the country (see table 2 below). This period also witnessed a number of institutional tinkering in the tourism sector. In 1973, the Ghana Tourist Corporation (GTC) was split up into the Ghana Tourist Control Board (GTCB) and the Ghana Tourist Development
Company Limited (GTDC) by the National Redemption Council Decree 224. In 1977 the GTCB was renamed as the Ghana Tourist Board (GTB) and remained so until 2013 when it became the Ghana Tourism Authority through the Tourism Act 817. This era was therefore the start of a more systematic approach to tourism development planning mainly as a business industry in line with a Tourism First approach.

**INSERT TABLE 2 HERE**

In terms of tourism policy and planning, the 1972 tourism resource inventory study carried out by the Obuam Committee was an important first attempt at cataloguing and classifying the tourism potential of the country. This led to a government White Paper on tourism and a five-year tourism development plan for 1972-1976 which sought to encourage foreign investment through concessions and tax incentives (Teye, 1999). Subsequent studies were also important in driving forward tourism planning and development in the country but because of the short-lived nature of governments over this period, tourism development did not go beyond the passing of legislations and commissioning of new studies (Akyeampong, 2006). The insights gained from the earlier studies did however serve as the basis for the first major comprehensive nationwide tourism master plan in Ghana. The 15-year Tourism Development Plan 1975-1990 (also known as the Tourism Master Plan) was carried out by a Danish consultancy firm – Hoff and Overgaard – with financial and technical assistance provided by the Danish government.

The Tourism Master Plan was based on field studies in all of the nine regions of the country at that time. The consultants made use of aeroplane, helicopter or boat to reach less accessible areas (Teye, 1988, 1999). The outcome was a comprehensive plan that assessed Ghana’s tourist assets and facilities, assessed human resource development needs, undertook market segmentation analysis of tourism products and how to market these as well as evaluate the potentials for developing the physical, cultural and historical resources of the country vis-à-vis the general and tourism-specific infrastructural needs. The Tourism Master Plan delineated the country into three tourism development zones – the coastal zone starting from the beachline of the
Togolese border on the East through to the Cape Coast/Elmina area in the Central Region; the Western zone and then the Northern zone from the Ashanti Region up north (see figure 1 below). Initial development was to be concentrated in the coastal zone especially the Cape Coast/Elmina area which already had general and tourism-specific infrastructure fairly developed. The Western zone was to be developed next contingent on an expansion of the existing airport in Takoradi or a development of a new international airport to receive direct flights from abroad. The Northern zone was to be the final area to be developed.

The 1975-1990 Tourism Master Plan was a classic example of a Tourism First approach to tourism planning and development. The focus was primarily on economic growth through increased tourist arrivals. A number of projections were made in terms of tourist arrivals and receipts which served as the basis for undertaking tourism development projects. A 12.5% average annual growth rate was envisaged for the 15 years of the plan with arrivals projected to increase from 64,000 in 1975 to 357,000 a year by 1990. Between 1975 and 1990 a projected total of 35,700 additional direct and indirect jobs were to be created while foreign exchange earnings were expected to reach $57 million a year by 1990 (Teye, 1988; Asiedu, 2008). In consonance with a Tourism First approach relying on the identification and commoditization of attraction sites, beach resort developments in eight selected coastal communities were to be the nucleus of primary tourism development projects along with the development of various resorts on Dodi Island in the Volta Lake. Beach resort developments were to be combined with cultural tourism as all eight selected sites had at least one of the many forts and castles that currently serve as the “bricks and mortar” of Ghana’s tourist attraction (Addo, 2011). The Master plan also focused on the development of game parks with the acknowledgement that “no part of West Africa offers any strong competition to East Africa when it comes to animal life and watching game, but Ghana seems to have more and better possibilities than other West African countries for
developing at least a couple of game reserves of touristic interest in a foreseeable future” (Hoff and Overgaard, 1974:9 as cited in Teye, 1988:339).

Notwithstanding the comprehensive nature of the Tourism Master Plan, its implementation encountered serious difficulties as projected arrivals failed to materialise. In 1979 for instance there were a total of 38,000 arrivals majority of them Ghanaian nationals returning home for various purposes. Actual international foreign arrivals was only 16,000 (Teye, 1988). In summary, over this period of Tourism First approach to tourism development policy and planning, internal political conditions meant that implementation did not happen. The many coup d’états and constant regime changes created an unstable political and economic environment that was neither conducive for short-term nor long-term tourism investment and development.

**The structural adjustment era of mixed Tourism First-Development First approaches: 1981 – 2000**

The 1981-2000 period was a significant one not only in terms of the tourism sector but importantly in terms of overall national economic development planning strategy. Following the last successful military takeover in 1981 and at the behest of the World Bank and IMF, the military regime of the Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) embarked upon the liberalisation of the national economy and institutioned a free market system. The implementation of the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) which began in 1983 sought to deregulate the economy and free it from state controls and perceived market distortions as well as promote a private-sector-led trade and investment environment (Konadu-Agyemang, 2000). It is within this context of government deregulation and diversification of the national economy that led to the transformation of the tourism sector initially from a Tourism First approach.

As foreign aid and international development assistance flowed in, so did the international tourist traffic. From the low growth rates of the 1966-1981 period, the tourism sector began to see high growth rates in both international arrivals and receipts. Massive foreign direct investments started to pour into the country’s tourism sector leading to a tripling of registered hotels from 273 in 1989 to 766 in 1997.
Under the remit of the SAPs, PNDC Law 116 of 1985 declared the tourism sector as a priority sector for government investment. The Ghana Tourist Development Company (GTDC) in 1987 had its mission reoriented around tourism promotion and the mobilisation of investment resources.

A first substantive Ministry of Tourism was established in 1993, which played a key role in tourism promotion leading to a 5-year Tourism Development Action Programme in 1996. A proposal for a Tourism Development Scheme for the Central Region in the early 1990s received funding from United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The resulting Natural Resource Conservation and Historic Preservation Project (NRCHP) enabled the restoration of the Cape Coast Castle, the Elmina Castle and the construction of a visitor reception centre and a canopy walkway in the nearby Kakum National Park in a bid to diversify the tourism offering (Adu-Ampong, 2016). These tripartite attractions receives the highest visitor numbers and continues to be the key fulcrum of tourism development in the country. Emancipation Day celebrations were introduced into the Ghanaian tourism calendar in 1998 after the then President's visit to the Caribbean the previous year to witness their celebration. Emancipation Day in combination with PANAFEST (Pan African Historical Theatre Festival) served as a draw card for a large number of Africans in the diaspora in addition to other international tourists to flock to Ghana in the late 1990s as tourism enjoyed a boom.

As part of a broader national economic development plan – Ghana Vision 2020 – a new 15-year National Tourism Development Plan 1996-2010 (GNTDP 1996-2010) was prepared with financial support from UNDP and technical assistance from the World Tourism Organisation (Teye, 1999). The GNTDP 1996-2010 was a comprehensive master plan that set out to provide an inventory and evaluation of tourism resources in the country as well as an economic analysis of the impacts of (projected) tourism development. Poised on a fine balance of a Development First and a Tourism First approach, the plan was framed up on the basis that there was opportunity to plan for tourism development in ways that generates benefits and not problems, and that tourism development becomes indefinitely sustainable. The plan included recommendations on how to enhance economic benefits, on improving access to the
country and improving internal infrastructures, on avoiding undesirable socio-cultural and environmental impacts and finally recommendations on how best to implement the plan.

Although there are elements of a Development First approach to it, there is a largely Tourism First approach underpinning the GNTDP 1996-2010. In line with overall economic development policy of the SAPs, the plan conceptualised tourism development mainly in terms of the tourism sector’s contribution to economic growth. Thus the major objectives for developing the tourism sector of Ghana was to among other things “bring socio-economic benefits to the country including generating income, employment, foreign exchange earnings and government revenues, serving as a catalyst to expansion of other economic sectors, and strengthening both the urban and rural economies” (Government of Ghana, 1996, p. 28). The projection was to increase overall tourist arrivals from 286,000 in 1995 to 638,000 by 2005 and then to 1,062,000 in 2010 with corresponding tourist receipts growing from $237 million in 1995 to $1.6 billion by 2010. This Tourism First approach reflected the nascent state of the tourism sector and hence the need to make a strong case about the economic viability of developing the tourism sector in order to secure the commitment of both public and private sector investors.

Some have argued that this structural adjustments era can be seen as “a watershed in the development of tourism in Ghana and the period 1985-2007 can be considered as the ‘golden age’ of Ghana's tourism development” (Akyeampong, 2006, p. 17). The mix of Tourism First and Development First approaches in tourism planning highlighted the important role the tourism sector was to play in overall national economic development strategies. Institutional mandate of public sector tourism institutions and agencies was regularly reoriented and realigned to meet strategic national interests. For instance the Ministry of Tourism’s mandate was in 2003 expanded and christened as the Ministry of Tourism and the Modernisation of the Capital City (MOTMCC). With a view to the golden jubilee independence celebrations in 2007, the tourism ministry became the Ministry of Tourism and Diaspora Relations (MOTDR) in 2006. This was in part geared towards attracting African Americans, Afro-Caribbean and other diasporan groups of African descent to travel to Ghana as a form of root tourism. Thus although the economy was
liberalised and deregulated the state still maintained a strong shaping role in setting the priorities of tourism development through the realignment of tourism institutions.

*The democratic consolidation era of Development First approach: 2000 – 2017*

The era of democratic consolidation is characterised by a double turnover of political power amidst a stable socio-economic and political landscape. The two main dominant political parties of the National Democratic Congress (NDC) and the New Patriotic Party (NPP) while alternating in government have brought about a number of significant developments in terms of tourism planning and development in Ghana from a Development First approach. The NPP government that was in power between 2001 and 2009 ruled under the umbrella of the “golden age for business”. Private sector investment in the tourism sector was a major priority and this was reflected in the first national economic development plan of this period – the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy 2006-2009. Tourism planning within this period was strategically tied to overall national development ambitions (Adu-Ampong, 2018). Coming up to the 50th Independence celebrations of Ghana in 2007, the newly realigned Ministry of Tourism and Diaspora Relations (MOTDR) launched the Joseph Project to position Ghana not only as a tourist destination but as a Homeland destination for Africans in the Diaspora in search of their roots (Yankholmes, 2013).

During this era, the National Tourism Policy was developed up to a 7th draft in August, 2006 with the support of the Netherlands International Development Organisation (SNV). While this remains a draft policy document, it provided important direction for tourism planning during this era. The tinkering and constant realignment of the mandates of the tourism ministry meant that towards the end, the GNTDP 1996 – 2010 had lost some relevance. When the NDC government took over power in 2009 for instance, the portfolio of the tourism ministry was streamlined and reverted back to become the Ministry of Tourism. When the GNTDP 1996-2010 elapsed in 2010, there was a lack of capacity within the tourism ministry to prepare a new long-term tourism development plan (Adu-Ampong, 2016). In order to be captured in the national Medium Term National Development Policy Framework 2010-2013, the ministry prepared a Tourism Sector Medium Term Development Plan (TSMTDP) for 2010-2013. The main
goal of the TSMTDP 2010-2013 was to “develop Ghana as an internationally competitive and high quality destination where the tourism industry, besides producing macroeconomic benefits, explicitly contributes to poverty reduction and conservation of the country's cultural, historical and environmental heritage” (Government of Ghana, 2010: p. vii). The TSMTDP 2010-2013 tended towards a Development First approach to tourism planning. This plan is succeeded by the new 15-year Ghana National Tourism Development Plan (GNTDP) 2013-2027.

In terms of conceptualising tourism’s role in development, the GNTDP 2013-2027 presents a very clear outline from a deeply Development First approach to tourism policy and planning. This is evidenced in how throughout the plan the emphasis is on identifying the opportunities that can enhance the sector as well as identifying the obstacles and constraints. The main guiding goal of the plan is to “ensure that tourism in Ghana achieves its full potential in a sustainable and responsible manner and that it contributes to the country's GDP, reduces poverty, ensures that its operation is not detrimental to the environment and the culture and traditions of the Ghanaians and attracts a wide range of markets” (Government of Ghana, 2013, p. 9 emphasis added). In contrast to the earlier plan, the GNTDP 2013-2027 has a central focus on the tourism-development nexus and seeks to utilise tourism not only for general economic growth but also specifically for poverty reduction.

Within the Development First approach taken in the GNTDP 2013-2027 there is an acknowledgment that although important, increased economic growth through tourism should not be pursued for its own sake. There is an awareness that the traditional ‘trickle down’ effect that was inherent in the 1996-2010 plan had failed to materialise and so deliberate steps need to be taken if tourism is to have an impact on poverty reduction. The plan conceptualises a nexus between economic growth, tourism sectorial linkages and poverty reduction. The argument is that for tourism to contribute to a broad based growth agenda there has to be increased linkages between tourism and other sectors of the economy. Such linkages could lead to a structural transformation of the economy thus enabling tourism to make significant contributions to economic development and poverty reduction. In line with a Development First approach, the
focus is on the local level with tourism seen as part of a set of policies that can improve the alternative socio-economic livelihood options of local people.

The democratic consolidation era has seen the state reactivate its steering role in tourism planning and development in Ghana. In 2011, the Tourism Act 817 was passed by Parliament to transform the Ghana Tourism Board (GTB) into the Ghana Tourism Authority (GTA) in order to provide the needed institutional framework for tourism development. The Act also granted additional powers to the GTA in terms of direct tourism investment thereby expanding the functions of the GTA to include regulation of attraction sites and tourism product development. The establishment of the GTA also came with the establishment of the Tourism Development Fund (TDF) to be financed through government seed capital and a 1% levy on tourist accommodation. The TDF is aimed at solving the perennial financial constraints facing the tourism sector and is to be used for tourism product development and other infrastructural development projects that can contribute to the competitiveness of the sector. The portfolio of the Ministry of Tourism was in 2013 expanded and further realigned into the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Creative Arts (MOTCCA). The new mandate of MOTCCA is to develop tourism with culture and the creative arts serving as the fulcrum for an accelerated national development (Adu-Ampong, 2016).

**Discussion and Conclusion**

This paper has offered a detailed examination of the historical developments of tourism policies and plans in Ghana. Using the analytic framework of Development First and Tourism First approaches to tourism planning, the paper provides insights into the changing emphasis placed on tourism development within the larger national political and governance context. The analysis have shown how the shifts and continuities in tourism development policy and planning in Ghana tend to link to the wider policy and research context of the changing paradigms of perceived role of tourism in economic development and poverty reduction. These shifts and continuities, especially in relation to institutional structures, have shaped the pace of the sustainability of tourism development planning.
With the exception of first historical era, the overall trajectory of tourism development policy and planning in Ghana has followed that of the literature on the tourism-development nexus. At the time of independence in 1957, a mainly Development First approach to tourism development was pursued by a socialist government that saw beyond the trappings of a trickle down multiplier effect promised by modernization theory. The government therefore took an active steering role as both an investor and entrepreneur in tourism development. This was counter to the then prevailing notion that newly developing countries should simply open up their tourism sectors to the vagaries of private sector investment. With the country falling into a period of political instability from the late 1960s and the start of Structural Adjustment Programmes from the early 1980s, tourism development policy and planning began to take a more Tourism First approach. The need for developing countries to diversify their economies however played a significant role in catalyzing the transformation of the tourism sector in Ghana and opening it up to international investment. As tourist arrivals and investment increased, the expected benefits did not fully materialise leading to calls for new approaches to tourism development planning. These changes to an extent reflected changing development paradigms within international policy circles. The move towards the Millennium Development Goals in the 2000s and more recently the Sustainable Development Goals have underlined the move towards a more Development First approach to tourism policy and planning in Ghana. The state is (re)taking an active steering role in developing and distributing tourism benefits.

The findings presented in this paper shows how contemporary tourism development policies and planning tend to reflect historical antecedents. The analysis highlights the value of heeding the increasing calls for a critical engagement with the historical nature of tourism development and planning (Butler, 2015; Buzinde & Manuel-Navarrete, 2013; Rogerson, 2011; Saarinen et al., 2017; Walton, 2005, 2009). There are a number of important insights to be gained from such an approach as evidenced by the case of Ghana. Such an approach makes it possible to trace current tourism development to historically contingent episodes. This makes it possible to better understand and explain current geographies of tourism development. Thus the contemporary concentration of tourism development in the Coastal/Central zone of Ghana at the expense of other areas can be historically traced to the first Tourism Master Plan.
development in 1975. The plan identified this area as the most viable for initial development. The related plan to extend tourism investment and development into other parts of the country however continues to experience a slow uptake due to limited government investment to open up new areas of the country for tourism development. Consequently private investment have been slow to follow with much of private investment going into the already developed tourism areas in the Central Region which is considered as the tourism hub of the country (Adu-Ampong, 2017a). Thus, the elements of a Tourism First approach from the 1975 plan continues to shape contemporary geographies of tourism development and investment across the country.

The approach taken here shows that the present and future characteristics of tourism in Ghana have been shaped by historically contingent processes. As many developing countries open up to the promise of tourism, the lessons from the case of Ghana can serve as guide. The use of the analytic framework of Tourism First and Development First makes it possible to understand fully how countries approach tourism development policies and planning at a general level. While both approaches are found in any such tourism development plan, it is possible to identify in which direction the scales tend to tip. The challenges of developing and effectively implementing tourism development policies and plans are not unique to Ghana but tend to be common in many developing countries. There is a challenge of securing the long-term sustainability of tourism development in these countries.

To address some of the challenges of tourism development, a Development First approach to tourism policy and planning is essential to ensure that there is a holistic approach to development through tourism that is set against the context of social, cultural and environment costs. This is in line with contemporary understanding of development as seen in the new Sustainable Development Goals and the new understandings of the relationship between tourism and economic development (Sharpley and Telfer, 2015; Spenceley and Meyer, 2012; Telfer and Sharpley, 2008). Current insights shows that tourism as a social force can be directed towards wider development and poverty reduction efforts when there is a better understanding of its characteristics. A historical approach like the one taken within this research helps to identify and situate the challenges of tourism development policies and planning in
destinations in order to propose corresponding recommendations. This research therefore contributes to the limited literature on the historical nature of current geographies of tourism development and planning in destinations in the Global South.
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