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1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.1. Introduction

Personal safety is one of the most critical human needs in life. So, the perceived and actual risk associated with travel and tourism has made safety and security essential factor in tourism considerations in the world of travel and holiday. As a result of the sharp rise in the interest in tourism activities, safety and security matters have also become one of the forces causing uncertainties in the tourism industry in the world. The success or otherwise of a tourist destination hangs on being able to offer a safe and secure environment for tourists who are also the customers. This study employed a type of “Tripartite Approach into Tourist Safety Assessment”.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

In Ghana, in July 2015 an accident occurred at Bunso Canopy Walkway in the Eastern Region leading to the injury of about 20 school children who had gone to have fun in the Bunso Arboretum. In March 2017 another accident occurred at the Kintampo Water Falls where 17 revellers including students from two institutions were feared dead while many others sustained various degree of injury when trees fell on them at the site in the Brong Ahafo Region of Ghana. It was only after this fatal accident at Kintampo that the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Creative Arts ordered tourist safety audit at some selected tourist destinations including Kakum National Park (KNP). Hence, there is a need to explore the tourists’ safety in the tourism hub in Ghana.

1.3. Aims of the Research Work

The general objective of the study was to examine the safety and security conditions and assess the role of safety in the tourism industry at Cape Coast Castle, Elmina Castle and KNP in the Central Region of Ghana.

However, the specific objectives of the study were to:
• Identify the security facilities found at the selected tourist attractions.
• Identify the types of institutions supporting the safety of tourists in the destination.
• Identify tourists’ sources of information about attractions in the Central Region.
• Examine tourists’ purpose for travelling.
• Ascertain tourists’ perceptions of safety at the selected tourist attractions.
• Examine the impressions of destination workers about tourists’ safety.
• Examine the impressions of GTA about tourists’ safety.
• Analyse the plans for tourists’ safety at the destination.
• Identify safety and security collaboration by destination management for better safety practices.

1.4. Hypotheses

Based on these objectives, the following hypotheses were proposed:

• Firstly, H₀: Inbound tourists do not have more tourism safety knowledge than domestic
• Secondly, H₀: Tourists’ overall assessment of safety at the destination is not influenced by the safety of road transport and when walking by the roadside.
• Thirdly, H₀: Tourists’ purpose of visit does not influence the perception of safety at the attraction sites.
• Finally, H₀: Tourists’ decision to repeat a visit is not influenced by the safety at the attraction sites.
2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. The Case Study Area

The focus of this study was limited to only Cape Coast-Elmina-Kakum destination in the Central Region because it houses the three World Heritage Sites in Ghana, namely Elmina and Cape Coast Castles and Fort St Jago. Figure 1.1 below shows the map of the Central Region and the selected case study facilities; Elmina Castle, Cape Coast Castle and Kakum National Park. The two castles are located on the coast, the Gulf of Guinea and KNP is located in the rain forest close to the Atlantic coast.

![Figure 1.1. The map of the study area - Cape Coast, Elmina and Kakum](image)

2.2. Sampling and Survey Instruments

Random sampling responses of 515 tourists were surveyed for the study. Mostly only international tourists do visit the trio of facilities selected within the period of visit before going back to their origin; hence the most significant percentage (97%) of the respondents being non-Ghanaians. Random sampling technique was employed because there was no reliable data on tourists to construct a sampling frame. Purposive sampling technique was used for the destination workers to sample their views. The sampling instruments used were interview guide and self-administered questionnaire. The surveys were administered to tourists who had visited these three facilities during the tourism peak season in the Central Region, between June and September 2018. Field assistants were employed in the questionnaire administration. The survey questions that formed core constructs in the questionnaire included: What were the precautionary measures did tourists undertake before travelling and during their stay at the destination? What were the security facilities the tourists find at the attraction sites visited? And what were the general impressions of tourists about safety at the destination? The research assistants used the tool of observation to verify the security facilities identified by the tourists. Before the data collection permission was sought from the managers and heads of the selected attraction sites and facilities. The data were analysed with the use of IBM Statistical Product for Social Science (SPSS) software version 20. Descriptive statistical presentations which included pie charts, bar charts, cross-tabulations and frequencies were run to represent various background characteristics of respondents, their perceptions of safety, among others. Inferential statistical measures like Chi-Square Test of Independence were employed to test for relationships between background characteristics of tourists and their perceptions of safety and security at the destination, purpose of travel and overall impressions and assessment of safety. Maps of the destination area and photos of the three main sites under study were presented.
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Interview Results of Facility Management Staff (Destination workers)

In all 55 workers were sampled for the study. In Elmina and Cape Coast Castles, the responses indicated that tourists were not allowed to carry any offensive weapon into the Castle. Jamaicans and Afro-Americans were not allowed to join the white natives to go for a tour in the Castle. For KNP, the workers have fire training sessions. Tour guides always gave safety talk before tourists would go onto the canopy walkway for sightseeing. One can say that safety measures at Kakum National Park are reliable and regular and the reason could be that because there was a collaboration between Ghana Heritage Conservation Trust (GHCT) and USAID. In the case of Elmina and Cape Coast Castles, oversight of safety measures and gadgets are controlled by the government of Ghana, and therefore the monitoring was weak. It was observed that the sole government-monitored facilities have weak and inadequate safety measures. There was no safety policy in the three tourist facilities. For Cape Coast and Elmina Castles, there was no collaboration on safety practices with any tourism-related agency. For Kakum National Park, there was a collaboration with GHCT and USAID, the sponsors of the canopy walkway and this development ensured proper tourist safety measures at the park. GTA organises unannounced inspections of sites within the year, at least twice. The general impressions of GTA about tourist safety in the Central Region were that the region was one of the violent-free areas in Ghana and thus safe for recreation and tourism.

3.2. Types of Institutions Supporting the Safety of Tourists

The types of institutions and related agencies promoting the safety of tourists in the Central Region of Ghana are grouped into three. The Government agencies made of Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Creative Art, Ghana Tourism Authority, Ghana Fire Service, Ghana Police Service, Ghana Immigration, Ghana Prison Service, District and Municipal Assemblies etc. The quasi-governmental
agencies consisting of Ghana Tourist Development Company, Hotel, Catering and Tourism Training Centre (HOTCATT). Under the private tourism sector enterprises, we have Tour Operators Association of Ghana (TOAGHA), Ghana Hotels Association, Ghana Restaurants Association, USAID etc.

3.3. Results of the Questionnaire with the Tourists

A little more than half of the respondents (58.8%) were females whiles approximately two out of five of them (41.2%) were males. Female tourist number was higher than the male tourists, and it might mean that women are now travelling more as compared to the previous decades of travels. It might mean that more women are far more financially empowered in the current global economy. Close to two-thirds of the respondents (63.1%) were between the ages of 18 - 33 years. About one out of every ten of the respondents (10.6%) was either 50 years or more; this indicates that the tourists who visited the attraction sites at the time of the study were predominantly the youth of not more than 41 years of age. This observation might mean that the youthful population now has a desire for travelling and adventures. Almost all of the respondents (97.1%) were non-Ghanaians, with only 2.9% of them being Ghanaians.

3.4. Security Facilities at the Sites and Purpose of Travel

In addition to the three main selected sites, the tourists visited other four ancillary attractions at the destination namely: Hanson’s Cottage, Monkey Forest Resort, Stingless Bee Centre and Elmina Lagoon. The security facilities identified by tourists were security guards, directional signs installed, safety signs, CCTV cameras, the alarm system at the sites, safety deposit boxes and others. What was not too sure was whether the CCTV cameras and the safety deposit boxes were serviced periodically or not. It was observed that safety installations in these facilities were either not working or non-existent and that there was no active supervision for repairs.
In all 496 tourists volunteered responded to the question of the purpose of visit on the questionnaire. Some tourists (45.6%) indicated that the purpose of their visit was to be on vacation. About one out of every ten tourists (12.3%) reported that they were at the destination to attend either a business meeting, seminar or a conference. Other tourists (25.4%) indicated that they visited their friends and families. These showed that most of the tourists visited the tourist destination sites in the Central Region of Ghana to expend their holidays as well as visit their friends and families.

3.5. Tourists’ Safety Precautionary Measures

Before travelling tourists undertook some precautionary measures. Some acquired comprehensive travellers’ health insurance (20.5%); others assessed the health risks associated with travelling to the destination (18.9%); some also assembled suitable medical/first-aid kits and toilet items for the duration of the visit (16.1%) and others consulted a travel medical clinic or a practitioner (14.9%) before travelling to the destination. A little over one-third of the respondents vaccinated themselves before going to the destination. Some tourists travelled with bottled water/drinks (7.0%) and prescribed medicines (5.9%).

At the destination, at least, four out of every five of the respondents ate only foods that were well-cooked or well-packed (31.3%) and as well bought first-aid kits and toilet items (30.7%) whiles living at the destination. Some slept under treated mosquito nets (16.3%) and drank only well-sealed bottled water or drinks from certified producers (11.6%). Furthermore, one out of every ten of the respondents (4.2%) indicated that they boiled their drinking water before using if they doubted its safety.

3.6. Tourists’ Perception of Safety at the Destination

Almost all of the tourists found the tourist attraction sites in the Central Region of Ghana as safe. Only 25 out of the 481 (representing 5.2%) tourists had
concerns about the safety of the attraction sites. Only 2 of the respondents rated the Kakum National Park as unsafe. However, more than 90% of the entire respondents rated the various tourist attraction sites in the region as safe.

3.7. Tourists’ Perceived Safety before Travelling

From Table 3.1 below, there was a mean value of 1.82 for the respondents’ responses on “What is your overall perception of tourists’ safety at this destination?”; this indicated that on the overall, most of the tourists found the destination as safe.

Table 3.1. Perceptions of tourists on safety at the destination and their perceived safety before travelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourists’ overall perception of safety at destination</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists’ perception of safety at the destination before their visit</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-1.49 = Highly safe; 1.5-2.49 = Safe; 2.5-3.49 = Slightly safe; 3.5-4.49 = Not safe; 4.5-5 = Highly unsafe

Source: FIELDWORK, IMBEAH (2018)

In Table 3.1 there was a relatively strong positive relationship between the tourists’ safety expectations of the destination and their actual overall perception of safety at the place (with a Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient of 0.370 and a corresponding \( p \)-value of 0.000). Since \( p = 0.00 < 0.05 \), it could be said that there was enough statistical evidence to infer that as the level of the tourists’ safety satisfaction increased their safety expectations also increased possibly for future visits.
3.8. Tourists’ Return Visit and Recommendation to others

The percentage of the tourists who were satisfied with the level of safety encountered at the destination was slightly less than that of their expectation of the destination’s safety level before they embarked on their journeys (with a mean difference of -0.099 and a standard deviation of 0.702). With \( t_{(466)} = -3.033 \) and a corresponding \( p \)-value of 0.003 < 0.05, the result of the t-test for Paired Samples indicated that the observed differences in the mean values for the variables were highly significant though it looked quite small. It implied that the tourists’ overall perception of safety at the destination did not meet their safety expectations of the place before they embarked on their journeys. Nine out of every ten of the tourists (408 out of 451) indicated that they would revisit destination in future with only a few of them (43 out of 451) indicating that they would not return to the destination. Of the tourists who were willing to return to the destination, 91.4% reported that they would recommend the destination to other tourists or travellers whiles a little over one-third (34.9%) of those who indicated that they would not return said they would also not recommend the destination to other tourists or travellers. It implied that 15 out of the 451 respondents were not satisfied with the level of safety at the destination. They would neither visit the destination in future nor recommend it to others.

3.9. Testing of Hypotheses

3.9.1. Hypothesis One

For testing hypothesis one (Inbound tourists do not have more tourism safety knowledge than domestic tourists), the study used the precautionary measures (variables) that the tourists adopted to assess their level of knowledge on tourism safety; thus independent samples test on tourists’ knowledge of tourism safety was conducted. The t-test for Equality of Means was conducted on variables with the assumption of unequal variances whiles those for the rest were done with the premise of equal variances. Regarding the assessment of the differences in the
tourists’ understanding of tourism safety, the result of the t-test for Independent Samples showed that – with \( p \)-values of approximately 0.000 which was significantly less than 0.05 – there was statistically significant evidence that the knowledge base of the two groups of tourists (Ghanaian and non-Ghanaian) on tourism safety differed significantly. With individual mean differences of 0.551, 0.532 and 0.211, that while inbound tourists assembled suitable medical/first-aid kits and toiletries for the duration of their visit, consulted travel medical clinic or practitioner before travelling, and obtained prescribed medicine according to the length of the stay, the domestic tourists generally did not. On the other hand, the local tourists usually did see the need to acquire comprehensive travellers’ health insurance more than the foreign tourists – with a mean difference of -0.283. Similarly, the rest of the variables measuring the understanding of the tourists on tourism safety recorded \( p \)-values more than the 5% significance level (assessed the health risks associated with travelling to the destination, 0.728; took some vaccinations before travelling, 0.093; brought bottled water/drinks for the duration of stay, 0.228; sought information on the health risks of destination from tour operators, travel agents, airlines, 0.555; and requested information on traffic, animals and sports-related accidents, 0.416). Therefore, there was not enough statistical evidence to deduce that foreign tourists have more tourist safety knowledge than their domestic counterparts.

The tourists’ measures of using boiled water if they doubted its safety and always disinfecting their hands after every handshake or touching something as part of their means of safeguarding themselves whiles at the destination violated the assumption of the Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances (with \( p \)-values of 0.003 and 0.005 respectively). These values were less than 0.05, and so, the t-test for Equality of Means was conducted on these variables with the assumption of unequal variances for the Ghanaian and non-Ghanaian tourists. The t-test for the test was done with the assumption of equal variances. Regarding the assessment of the differences in the tourists’ understanding of tourism safety, the result of
the t-test for Independent Samples showed that – with $p$-values of approximately 0.001 which was significantly less than 0.05 – there was statistically significant evidence that the knowledge base of the foreign and domestic tourists on consuming only well-sealed bottled water or drinks from certified producers differs significantly. With a recorded negative mean difference of 0.507, more of the domestic tourists took in well-sealed bottled water or drunk drinks produced by certified producers only than the foreign tourists. However, the $p$-values for the rest of the variables were significantly more than 0.05, indicating a lack of differences in the tourists’ understanding of the current issues. These results suggested that the knowledge of both the foreign and local tourists on the safety measures to ensure tourism safety whiles at the destination was not significantly different.

It could be concluded that there was not enough statistical evidence to imply that foreign tourists have more tourist safety knowledge than their domestic counterparts. Hypothesis one could not be wholly accepted after testing since the numbers of Ghanaian tourist-respondents were small. Therefore, hypothesis one is partially accepted. It implies that this statement can be described as a proposition which can further be tested with more significant tourist-respondents input.

3.9.2. Hypothesis Two

For testing hypothesis two (Tourists’ overall assessment of safety at the destination is not influenced by their perception of road transport safety and when walking by the roadside), the study used a statistical test to run for descriptive statistics on-road or transportation safety for the tourists while at the destination as shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3.
Table 3.2. Descriptive statistics on-road or transportation safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your overall perception of tourists’ safety at this destination?</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Transportation</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel safe when you walk by the roadside in this destination?</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, Imbeah (2018)

In Table 3.2 that, with a mean of 1.81, most of the respondents rated their overall perception of tourists’ safety at the destination as, at least, safe. Similarly, the majority of them indicated that they somehow felt safe (with a mean of 1.55) when they walked by the roadside of the destination. Again, some of the respondents reported that they neither perceived the destination as safe nor unsafe (with a mean of 3.05).

It could be observed from Table 3.3 below that the correlation coefficient for the relationship between tourists’ overall perception of their safety at the destination and their perception of transportation safety at the destination was -0.073 indicating a very weak inverse relationship between the variables.
**Table 3.3. Correlations between overall perception, transportation safety and roadside safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>The overall perception of the destination’s safety</th>
<th>Transportation Safety</th>
<th>Safety in walking by the roadside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho The overall perception of the</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destination’s safety</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.193**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Safety</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety in walking by the roadside</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: FIELDWORK, IMBEAH (2018)

This relationship suggested that as the tourists’ overall perception of safety at the destination increased their understanding of transportation safety of the place decreased and vice versa. Moreover, with a p-value of 0.0119, Table 3.3 above showed that the observed relationship between the two variables was too weak to be significant. Thus, the tourists’ assessment of safety at the destination was not influenced by the safety of road transport. Similarly, with a Correlation Coefficient of 0.193, Table 3.3 indicated that there was a relatively weak positive relationship between the tourists’ overall perception of their safety at the destination and their safety when they walked by the roadside within the destination. It is observed from the table that though the exhibited relationship between the two variables seemed slightly weak, it was statistically significant at even 0.01 significance level. It indicated that as the tourists’ overall perception
of their safety at the destination increased, they felt very safe or confident to walk by the roadside of the destination at any point in time. Thus, it could be said that there was enough statistical evidence to infer that the tourists’ assessment of the destination’s safety was influenced by their perception of their safety when walking by the roadside. Furthermore, Table 3.3 showed that there was a weak negative relationship between the safety of transportation at the destination and tourists feeling safe when they walked by the roadside in this destination - with a Correlation Coefficient of -0.129. However, it could also be observed from Table 3.3 that though the relationship between the variables was weak, it was still significant at even 1% significance level ($p = 0.005 < 0.05$) indicating that as the transportation or road safety at the destination increased their perception of safety in walking by the roadside decreased. This finding could be since the tourists mostly commuted the roads of the destination in hired cars and not public vehicles and thus, had little confidence in either the commercial vehicles in the streets or the driving capabilities of the drivers at the destination.

3.9.3. Hypothesis Three

For testing hypothesis three (Tourists’ purpose of visit does not influence their perception of safety at the attraction sites), another statistical test was run for correlations coefficient between tourists’ purpose of visit and safety at attraction sites, as shown in Table 3.4 below. It could be observed from the table that - with a Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient of -0.213 - there existed a slightly weak negative relationship between the tourist attraction sites’ safety and the purpose of the tourists’ visits. It indicated that as the safety of the tourist attraction sites increased the purpose for which the tourists visited the attraction sites moved from informal to formal (that is, from familial visits and vacations to education and business purposes). Thus, it could be concluded that there was enough evidence to infer that the purpose of the tourists’ visits was influenced by the safety level of the tourist attraction site.
Table 3.4. Correlations between purpose of visit and safety at attraction sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Safety at Attraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of visit Correlation</td>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of visit Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety at Attraction Site</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.213**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety at Attraction Site</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: FIELDWORK, IMBEAH (2018)

3.9.4. Hypothesis Four

For testing hypothesis four (Tourists’ decision to repeat a visit is not influenced by their perception of safety at the attraction sites), a statistical test was run for correlations coefficient between tourists’ assessment of safety at attraction sites and tourists’ decision to repeat visit, as shown in Table 3.5 below.
Table 3.5. Correlations between safety at attraction sites and the decision to repeat visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Safety at attraction sites</th>
<th>The decision to repeat the visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decision to repeat visit</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>0.136**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: FIELDWORK, IMBEAH (2018)

With a Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient of 0.136, Table 3.5 showed a weak positive relationship between the tourists’ perception of safety at the attraction sites and their willingness to return to the destinations in future. The observed correlation between the variables indicated that as the tourists’ perception of safety about the destination increased their tendencies for a repeat visit to the destination increased. Furthermore, it was be observed as shown in Table 3.5 the p-value for the test is 0.004 indicating that though the existing relationship between the tourists’ perception of safety at the attraction sites and their willingness to return to the destinations in future seemed weak, it was statistically significant at 5% significance level. It implied that there was enough statistical evidence to infer that the tourists’ decision to repeat a visit was influenced by the safety at the attraction sites. Finally, the summary of the testing of hypotheses is shown in Table 3.6 below.
### Table 3.6. Summary status of the results of hypotheses tested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Partially Accepted</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√ (Partially Accepted)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$</td>
<td>√ (Accepted)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√ (Rejected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√ (Rejected)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Summary of Findings

It was revealed that there were weak safety and security measures in Elmina and Cape Coast Castles, but KNP has reliable safety measures. There was no tourist safety policy in the Central Region of Ghana. There were no collaborations with any tourism-related agencies to help monitor safety issues. Over three-quarters of the respondents (80.6%) reported that the tourist attraction sites they visited had safety and security measures. Almost all of the tourists found the tourist attraction sites in the destination as safe; about 456 out of 481 (representing 94.8%) responded in this affirmative. Concerning accommodation, a clear majority (94.5%) of the total respondents perceived the accommodation facilities at the destination to be safe. As regards perceived transport safety, about half of the respondents (76.6%) had used tourist buses and hired vehicles as their means of transportation during their stay at the destination and had not encountered any road accident upon visiting the destination. All the tourists took some pre-trip precautionary measures. The result of the t-test for Paired Samples indicated that the tourists’ overall perception of safety at the destination did not meet their safety expectations of the place before they embarked on their journeys. However, of the tourists who were willing to return to the destination, 91.4% indicated that they would recommend the destination to other tourists whiles a little over one-third (34.9%) of those who indicated that they would not return said they would also not recommend the destination to other tourists. It implied that 15 out of the 451 respondents were utterly not satisfied with the level of safety at the destination and so would neither visit the destination in future nor recommend it to others. Despite this, it could be inferred that the tourists generally perceived tourism at the destination as at least safe.
4.2. Recommendations

Some of the recommendations are:

- Application of SMART devices as part of emergency call lines in and around tourism facilities can be helpful. For example, locally developed “App” in Ghana called “ROADTOP” can be used. This “App” gives the tourist the power to be part of ensuring their safety and security when they are in vehicles and provide the ability to report crimes and emergency cases when the tourist is caught up in a problem.
- It is strongly recommended that a team of tourism experts be formed as a supervisory body to help monitor the tourists’ safety and security in tourist facilities and destination. This team will offer “Tripartite Tourism Safety Solutions” (TTSS) for the industry.
- The tourism training institutes in the Central Region of Ghana should review their curriculum to include tourism safety and health issues in their training of students.
- Ghana Tourism Authority (GTA) should task all sites to install CCTV cameras, safety deposit boxes, alarm systems etc.
- GTA and the TSAA should collaborate to work on the promulgation of tourism policy for the region and the entire country as early as possible.

4.3. New scientific results

The following new scientific results were explored:

1. Implementation of effective and efficient policy measures to increase higher inbound tourist arrivals in the Central Region of Ghana: For example, there is no tourist safety policy in the Central Region of Ghana, and this problem will be solved by this implementation.
2. Incorporation of responses of tourists’ safety in the local tourism planning, for example in the tour operators’ planning and tour
packages elements of tourists’ opinions, should be used as guides and basis for tour packaging in the Central Region of Ghana.

3. Installations of safety gadgets in tourism facilities where there are none and to repair/improve the spoilt appliances: Technical inspection of safety installations will be added to the GTA’s annual routine checks of tourist facilities to maintain constant supervision of safety installations.

4. Establishment of “Tourist Safety Audit Agency” in the Central Region of Ghana: This will stop the ongoing individual tourist facilities doing their unsupervised safety checks and planning. This safety problem will be addressed immediately. The head of this agency will be independently appointed to give more room for the implementation of safety audit report and observations.

5. Establishment of collaboration with local or international safety agency/group to help monitor safety measures in these facilities: GTA and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Creative Art will champion this collaboration link with Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with any reputable tourism safety agency.

6. Formation of a team of tourism experts to act as a supervisory body to help monitor the tourists’ safety and security in tourist facilities and destination. This team will offer “Tripartite Tourism Safety Solutions” (TTSS) for the industry. The team will consist of three expert sub-bodies, namely: (i) Tour Operators Union of Ghana (TOUGHA), Car Rentals Association of Ghana, Ghana Hotels Association, (ii) Hotel, Catering and Tourism Training Centre (HOTCAT), Ghana Institute of Safety and Environmental Professionals (GHiSEP), Tourism Training Institutes in Central Region, (iii) Ghana Tourism Authority, Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture, Central Region Development Commission (CEDECOM),
Museum and Monuments Board, Ghana Police Service and Ghana Fire Service.

7. Review of the tourism training curriculum to include tourism safety will be immediate: The tourism training institutes in the Central Region of Ghana, for example, the Tourism Departments in Cape Coast University and Cape Coast Technical University will review their curriculum to include tourism safety issues from the first year to the final year, topics such as “Hygiene, Health and Safety, Administration of First Aid, Safety Management and Practices” etc. Destination workers will be mandated to undergo in-service training in tourism safety from time to time. This review of the curriculum and instructions of workers stems from the fact that if the tourism destination workers are not themselves safe, the customers (the tourists) cannot be assured of safety at the destination.
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