
UAEU-CBE-Working Paper Series

**Title: Testing for the Tourism Led Economic Growth
Hypothesis in Sweden with Structural Breaks**

Authors: Abdalnasser Hatemi-J and Per-Ola Maneschiold

Department: Accounting and Finance

No. 2019-03

Series Founding and Acting Editor: Prof. Dr. Abdalnasser Hatemi-J

Copyright © 2010 by the UAE University. All rights reserved. No part of this paper may be reproduced in any form, or stored in a retrieval system, without prior permission of the authors.

The views and conclusions expressed in this working paper are strictly those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent, and should not be reported as, those of the FBE/UAEU. The FBE and the editor take no responsibility for any errors, omissions in, or for the correctness of, the information contained in this working paper.

Testing for the Tourism Led Economic Growth Hypothesis in Sweden with Structural Breaks

Abdulnasser Hatemi-J, UAE University

Email: AHatemi@uaeu.ac.ae

and

Per-Ola Maneschiöld, Karlstad University, Sweden

Email: Per-Ola.Maneschiold@kau.se

Abstract

Many emerging as well as frontier markets have promoted tourism for achieving economic growth. This paper investigates empirically the impact of tourism receipts on the economic performance in Sweden. The results of tests for cointegration reveal that there is a long run relationship between the underlying variables if the effect of two unknown structural breaks are accounted for. The elasticity of the GDP with regard to revenue from tourism is around 0.99, which decreases during 1973 – 1977 but increases during 1978 – 2017. The result from the bootstrap causality test also shows that the tourism-led growth hypothesis is empirically supported in the case of Sweden.

Keywords: Tourism Receipts, Economic Growth, Sweden, Structural Breaks, Bootstrap Causality Test

JEL Classifications: F43, E01; C32

1. Introduction

The tourism sector is a large and growing sector in the global economy. The demand for tourism services is growing as a consequence of growing world income together with an increased economic integration and general deregulations such as visa free travelling combined with relatively cheaper travelling costs. The increased economic wellbeing generates an increased possibility for a larger amount of the world population to consume leisure activities including leisure travel. This also generates an increased possibility to shift from what is often regarded as local domestic inferior leisure travel to internationally luxury leisure travel. As more countries reach the stage of development where consumption of leisure activities become affordable, then it can be expected that demand for tourism services will continue to grow in the future. The increased demand for leisure travel and goods and services generated in the destination-country economically benefits the country in general and their local tourism-regions in particular generating job-opportunities and influx of much-needed foreign currency. In fact, policy makers in both frontier and emerging markets have systematically been trying to promote inbound tourism.

Tourism is for many economies a significant sector and it is for many small economies the most important sector of the economy. This significant importance of tourism might necessarily not only be beneficial to a country as tourism is highly volatile where preferences or international economic income can change swiftly in the short-run making a tourism-dependent economy vulnerable in a similar case as an oil- and gas-dependent economy related to e.g. the Dutch disease problem. The global economic crises as well as local military conflicts illustrates the potential economic consequences of a negative shock to a country over-dependent on tourism.

Besides generating job-opportunities and influx of foreign currency, there are different channels through which tourism can generate a positive effect on economic growth. The different channels are e.g. increased personal income, taxes, revenues and employment opportunities as discussed in Lee and Chang (2008), increased earnings of foreign exchange yielding accumulation of capital goods contributing to the balance of payments as discussed in McKinnon (1964) and the stimulation of investments in new infrastructure, human capital and technology as discussed in Eugenio-Martín et al. (2004), Sakai (2009), Blake et al. (2006), Feng and Morrison (2007) and Lemmetyinen and Go (2009). Besides the direct effects in the tourism sector itself, tourism stimulates indirectly and by induced effects other related

industries causing positive economics to scale and scope as discussed in Syriopoulos (1995), Andriotis (2002) and Weng and Wang (2004) and Spurr (2009).

The positive contribution to growth by tourism-related consumption in the destination-country needs not necessarily only to be permanent in nature but can be temporary. As discussed in e.g. Cerina (2007), Giannoni and Maupertuis (2007) and Lozano et al. (2008), this argument is related to proposition that increase over time of the exploitation of the tourism-dependent natural resources become greater than their natural rate of reproduction which in turn might cease to affect the long-run growth. Furthermore, disadvantages from tourism dependence can also be related to costs incurred from the provision and maintenance of tourism-related infrastructure and resources devoted to specialized education as discussed in Sinclair (1998), increased pollution, congestion or despoliation of the environment as discussed in Pearce (1985), Jenner and Smith (1992) and Gursoy and Rutherford (2004) and potential increases of crime and violence as discussed in Dunn and Dunn (2002). However, by aggregating the potential economic, social, cultural, environmental and political benefits and costs to a country specializing in tourism development, the general consensus is that the tourism sector may significantly contribute to economic growth as discussed in Brida and Pulina (2010), Brida et al. (2016a) and Gwenthure and Odhiambo (2017) and especially of an importance to developing countries endowed with tourism-related natural resources as discussed in Candela and Cellini (1997) and Lanza and Pigliaru (2000).

Lanza and Pigliaru (1995) made one of the first theoretical contributions investigating the link between economic growth and a specialization in tourism. Their main findings are that countries with a relative large tourism sector also generally being small economies exhibit higher than average rates of growth. Hence, a country with a relative abundance of natural resources demanded in tourism services specializing in the tourism sector will enter a faster growth path where developing countries often are more endowed with tourism-dependent natural resources as argued in Sinclair (1998). A country with a large endowment of natural resources suitable for tourism-services specializing in tourism will generate a significant positive contribution to economic growth as discussed by Lanza and Pigliaru (2000). Candela and Cellini (1997) show that the smaller the economy the easier to benefit from a specialization into tourism in terms of an increase in economic growth.

The tourism-industry is generally characterized by a low entry-threshold as well as a low exit-threshold making a tourism-dependent economy vulnerable to competitors and potential

competitors. This is the case due to the notion that the industry is generally characterized by low levels of technology and low labor skills. This in turn implies that low-skilled labor-abundant countries with tourism-required natural resources relatively easy can develop a competitive tourism-sector exploiting its comparative advantage. For a more developed capital-abundant country with a higher marginal revenue product to stay competitive in the tourism-sector, there is a need to develop its tourism-service into a segment with less demand for low-skilled labor focused on tourists with a higher willingness to pay. This segment is related to a supply of a combined service with a high marginal utility for the consumer. This service can e.g. be related to a luxury service above the level of its low-skilled labor competitors or a scarce unique natural resource much demanded but open to a few and absent in many competing nations such as tranquility in the wild-life with a high marginal utility to people living in over-populated countries and urban areas.

The competitive edge need to be generated from the service supplied to the market where the service in itself generally is made up of accommodation, food, transportation, entertainment and life-experiences. For developing low-skilled labor countries, the competitive edge are generally linked to low prices with a basic overall level of quality in the service while developed high-skilled labor countries need to develop its service into segments demanding a high-quality service meeting their expectations related to a high willingness to pay. The possibility to develop the tourism-service supplied to the market is central for a country developing from a low-skilled low-wage country to a high-skilled high-wage country to stay competitive not losing its competitive edge in this industry characterized by a low entry-threshold, low levels of technology and low-skilled labor. If this development does not occur, it seems reasonable to expect that diminishing returns will eventually set in putting a limit to the extent that the tourism sector can contribute to a country's wellbeing.

This argument relies on the assumption that a progress and development is generated from an increasing tourism-sector in turn generating an increased labor-demand with increasing wages and economic wellbeing in the country. The increase in wages will spillover into higher prices in the labor-intensive tourism-sector and a need to make production less labor-intense and/or develop the service into a segment with higher marginal utility and willingness to pay for the service. The question is if this is a possibility for a developed high-skilled high-wage country to develop its service to stay competitive. This is not analyzed to the same extent in the literature as is the case for developing countries.

This paper will make a contribution to fill that gap in the literature by analyzing whether or not there is a link between tourism-services and economic growth in Sweden. To the best knowledge, this issue has not been investigated for Sweden. We investigate the long run relationship between tourism receipts and economic performance in Sweden by conducting tests for cointegration with unknown structural breaks. We also test the tourism led growth hypothesis via the bootstrap causality test, which is robust to non-normality and time varying volatility of the underlying data.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains a brief literature review, section 3 discuss the methodology and section 4 discuss the empirical findings. Section 5 concludes the paper with final remarks.

2. Brief Literature Review

The first attempt to investigate empirically the impact of tourism on economic growth was made by Ghali (1976), to the best knowledge. The paper by Balaguer and Cantavella-Jordá (2002) referred formally to the tourism-led growth hypothesis offering a theoretical and empirical link between inbound tourism and economic growth. The tourism-led growth hypothesis was in the paper by Balaguer and Cantavella-Jordá (2002) derived from the export-led growth hypothesis linking growth to expanding exports in turn developed by McKinnon (1964), Balassa (1978), Krueger (1980) and Helpman and Krugman (1985). Balaguer and Cantavella-Jorda (2002) find that Spanish economic growth is sensible to persistent expansion of international tourism.

Since the paper by Balaguer and Cantavella-Jordá (2002), several studies has appeared trying to understand the temporal relationship between tourism and economic growth whether developments in the tourism sector contributes to economic growth or not as indicated by the tourism-led growth hypothesis. The empirical evidence on the impact of the tourism sector on economic growth is to some degree mixed. Lee and Chang (2008) points out that the inconclusiveness are related to a lack of homogeneity and comparability in terms of sample data, time periods, geographical locations and use of methodologies. However and as pointed out in Brida et al. (2016a), the empirical findings with a few exceptions suggest that overall international tourism drives economic growth.

Brau et al. (2007) investigate 143 countries were their results indicate that tourism countries grow significantly faster than all other sub-groups considered in their analysis. Di Liberto

(2013) analyze a panel of 72 countries during 1980 – 2005 finding a positive and significant impact on growth from the tourism sector. Furthermore, they also show that increased education contributes to growth and that the role of the tourism sector is significantly larger in countries with higher aggregate levels of human capital. Overall, the results suggest that an increase in human capital endowments is always beneficial to growth even when the development strategy focuses on expansion of an unskilled sector. Ekanayake and Long (2012) using a panel of developing countries finds evidence that tourism revenues makes a positive contribution to economic growth.

Nikolaos (2004) investigates the impact of tourism on long- run economic growth in Greece under a multivariate framework finding evidence supporting the tourism- led growth hypothesis. Gunduz and Hatemi-J (2005) using a leveraged bootstrap causality test found evidence that the tourism-led growth hypothesis is supported empirically in the case of Turkey. The same result was found in the paper by Ertugrul and Mangir (2015) validating the tourism- led growth hypothesis for Turkey. In the paper by Cortés-Jiménez (2008) focusing on both regional as well as international tourism in Spain and Italy, evidence indicate that domestic tourism is a relevant factor for Spanish growth whereas international tourism is more important for Italian economic growth.

Carrera et al. (2008) find evidence of the validity of the tourism- led growth hypothesis in Mexico using a linear cointegration analysis. Eugenio-Martín et al. (2004) focus on Latin American countries where the empirical evidence indicate that tourism growth is associated with higher economic growth in low and medium income countries but not in high income countries. Phiri (2015) finds evidence supporting the tourism- led growth hypothesis for South Africa under the linear cointegration analysis.

Lee and Hung (2010) find that tourism imposes a positive impact on Singapore's economic development in the long-run. Tang (2011) find that international tourism arrivals and economic growth exhibit a long- run relationship for Malaysia in all 12 different disaggregated tourism markets of the country. Untong (2014) examine the validity of the tourism- led growth hypothesis for Thailand and finds that it is valid during 1980 – 2012 but not valid during 1960 – 1979. Hence, the level of tourism specialization seems to play an important part in the tourism- growth nexus in Thailand. Similarly, Ahad (2016) find evidence of the tourism-led growth hypothesis in Pakistan. Schubert, Brida and Risso (2010) conclude that small islands highly specialized in tourism activity rank as top 10 nations according to the contribution of tourism activity to gross domestic product.

Figini and Vici (2010) find some evidence linking tourism specialization with economic growth for the 1980 – 1990 period but not for the 1990 – 2005 period with the general conclusion that tourism-based countries have not grown at a higher rate than non-tourism-based countries. However, they conclude that the data for the period are not fully reliable such that there is no robust evidence on the link between tourism specialization and higher growth rates. Hence and unlike most of the previous empirical literature, they conclude that there is no significant independent relationship between tourism specialization and economic growth. Sequeira and Campos (2007) find no evidence linking tourism specialization with higher growth rates while Sequeira and Nunes (2008) find empirical evidence linking tourism specialization with higher growth rates both in a broad sample of countries and in a sample of poor countries. Hatemi-J (2016) provides empirical evidence in support of the export led growth hypothesis for the UAE, a country that relies heavily on tourism in order to diversify its economy. Furthermore, Oh (2005) finds that the tourism- led growth hypothesis does not hold for South Korea and Brida et al. (2016b) finds that the tourism- led growth hypothesis holds only in the case of Brazil under a nonlinear cointegration model analysis but does not hold for Argentina.¹

3. Methodology

In order to find out whether or not there is a long run relationship between economic growth and tourism receipts in Sweden we conduct tests for cointegration in the presence of two unknown structural breaks. Accounting for potential breaks can increase the power of the underlying tests. For these purpose, three tests that are developed by Hatemi-J (2008) are used. These tests are described as the following. Let Y_t be the log of GDP and X_t be the log of tourism receipts. The following regression can be used in order to investigate the long run relationship between the two underlying variables:

$$Y_t = a_0 + a_1D_{1t} + a_2D_{2t} + b_0X_t + b_1D_{1t}X_t + b_2D_{2t}X_t + e_t \quad (1)$$

Where a_0 is the intercept and a_1 and a_2 are changes in the intercept. The slope is defined by b_0 and b_1 and b_2 are changes in the slope. Since the variables are expressed in logarithmic form, the slope represents the elasticity. The last term in equation (1) represents the error term. D_{1t}

¹ For a recent study on the relationship between sustainable development and tourism see Isik (2018).

and D_{2t} are the two unknown indicator variables that allow for potential breaks, which are defined as the following:

$$D_{1t} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \leq [n\tau_1] \\ 1 & \text{if } t > [n\tau_1] \end{cases}$$

and

$$D_{2t} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \geq [n\tau_2] \\ 1 & \text{if } t < [n\tau_2] \end{cases}$$

The relative timing of each underlying break is $\tau_1 \in (0.15, 0.70)$ and $\tau_2 \in (\tau_1 + 0.15, 0.85)$. Note that $n = \frac{t}{T}$, where $t = 1, \dots, T$. To test for cointegration, three test statistics are used. The first one is the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test, which is calculated by the corresponding t-test value for the slope of e_{t-1} in a regression of Δe_{t-1} on $e_{t-1}, \Delta e_{t-1}, \dots, \Delta e_{t-k}$. The optimal lag order k is determined by minimizing an information criterion. On the other hand, the Z_α and Z_t test statistics are calculated by using the bias-corrected first-order serial correlation coefficient estimate, ρ^* , which is defined as the following:²

$$\rho^* = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n-1} (\hat{e}_t \hat{e}_{t-1} - \sum_{j=1}^B w(j/B) \hat{\gamma}(j))}{\sum_{t=1}^{n-1} (\hat{e}_t^2)}$$

Note that the function $w(\cdot)$ provides kernel weights that fulfill standard conditions for spectral density estimators. B is the bandwidth number and $\hat{\gamma}(j)$ the estimated covariance function, which is defined as the following:

$$\hat{\gamma}(j) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=j+1}^T (\hat{e}_{t-j} - \hat{\rho} \hat{e}_{t-j-1})(\hat{e}_t - \hat{\rho} \hat{e}_{t-1})$$

Note that $\hat{\rho}$ is the OLS estimator of the effect of $\hat{e}_{t-1}$ on $\hat{e}_t$. The Z_α and Z_t test statistics for testing the null hypothesis on no cointegration in the presence of two unknown structural breaks are the following:

$$Z_\alpha = n(\hat{\rho}^* - 1)$$

And

$$Z_t = \frac{\hat{\rho}^* - 1}{\hat{\gamma}(0) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^B w(j/B) \hat{\gamma}(j) / \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} (\hat{e}_t^2)}$$

² Note that the Z_α and Z_t test statistics were introduced by Phillips (1987). Gregory and Hansen (1996) showed how these two tests can be used when there is one unknown structural break. Hatemi-J (2008) extended these test for testing for cointegration when there are two unknown structural breaks. The distribution of the underlying test are not similar and have been generated via the simulation methods.

It should be mentioned the $\hat{\gamma}(0) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^B w(j/B) \hat{\gamma}(j) / \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} (\hat{e}_t^2)$ represents the estimated value of the long-run variance of the residuals in regression that has $\hat{e}_t$ as the dependent variable and $\hat{e}_{t-1}$ is the independent one. The distribution of these three tests are nonstandard and they have been produced by Hatemi-J (2008) via the simulation methods. The test values that are used are the lowest values of these tests through all values for τ_1 and τ_2 , with $\tau_1 \in T_1 = (0.15, 0.70)$ and $\tau_2 \in T_2 = (0.15+\tau_1, 0.85)$. The reason for choosing the lowest value for each test statistic is that the lowest value characterizes the empirical evidence against the null hypothesis of no cointegration. Thus, we used the following values:

$$ADF^* = \inf_{(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in T} ADF(\tau_1, \tau_2) \quad (2)$$

$$Z_t^* = \inf_{(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in T} Z_t(\tau_1, \tau_2) \quad (3)$$

$$Z_\alpha^* = \inf_{(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in T} Z_\alpha(\tau_1, \tau_2) \quad (4)$$

These tests are implemented by using an algorithm produced in Gauss by Hatemi-J (2009).

4. Empirical Findings

The results of the cointegration tests with two unknown breaks are presented in Table 1. Based on these results, it can be seen that the Z_t^* test statistic suggests that there is cointegration at the 5% significance level, while the other two test statistics suggest that there is cointegration at the 10% level. The most significant breaks are found to be as the following. The first break is in year 1974 and the second break is in year 1978. It should also be mentioned that tests for unit roots, not presented here, showed that the variables have a unit root with drift and intercept.

Table 1: The Results of the Tests for Cointegration with Two Unknown Structural Breaks.

Test Statistic	Estimated test value	1% Critical Value	5% Critical Value	10% Critical Value
ADF*	-5.702	-6.503	-6.015	-5.653
Z_t^*	-6.861	-6.503	-6.015	-5.653
Z_α^*	-55.005	-90.794	-76.003	-52.232

Notes: the tests are implemented via a statistical software component produced in Gauss by Hatemi-J (2009).

The estimated cointegrating vector is presented in Table 2. Based on these estimates we can note the following. The elasticity of the GDP with regard to the tourism revenue is 0.99 in Sweden. This elasticity has decreased by the amount of 0.495 during the first break and it has increased by the amount of 0.186 in the second break period.

Table 2: The Estimated Values of the Parameters.

	α_0	α_1	α_2	β_0	β_1	β_2
Estimated parameter values	5.385	3.526	1.455	0.990	-0.495	0.186
<i>t</i> -values	28.968	3.928	-1.631	32.817	-4.308	1.657

In addition, the causality test was performed using the leveraged bootstrap simulation method. The result of this test is presented in Table 3. Based on this empirical finding one can infer that the null hypothesis of the tourism revenue not causing the GDP can be rejected at the five percent significance level since the test value is higher than the critical value at that given significance level.

Table 3: The Result of Bootstrap Causality Test.

H_0	Estimated test value	1% Bootstrap Critical Value	5% Bootstrap Critical Value	10% Bootstrap Critical Value
Tourism does not cause GDP	9.824	12.916	8.866	6.868

Notes: The bootstrap causality test with leverage adjustments was implemented by using a statistical software component written in Gauss by Hacker and Hatemi-J (2010).

5. Conclusions

Many countries have attempted systematically to promote inbound tourism in order to achieve the positive impact of this variable in terms of higher economic growth rates. In the existing literature, the relationship between tourism and economic performance has been investigated for many countries both for the developing as well as the developed ones. To the best knowledge, this issue has not been investigated for Sweden. The aim of the current paper is to fill this gap in the literature. We test for the long run relationship between these two important

macro aggregates by conducting tests for cointegration with two unknown structural breaks. The results show that there is a long run relationship between tourism receipts and the GDP in Sweden. The elasticity is around 0.99, which decreases during the oil shocks in the 1970s. In addition, the null hypothesis that tourism revenue does not cause the GDP can be rejected at the conventional significance level using the bootstrap causality test. Thus, the tourism led growth hypothesis is supported empirically in Sweden. This Scandinavian country offers tremendous opportunities to foreigners that are interested in winter sports during colder periods. Swedish long summer's days have also a lot to offer to tourists, for not mentioning the beautiful forests and natural scenery that the country possess all around the year. The well-known friendly and peaceful nature of the Swedish people also appears to pay off in economic terms via the tourism channel.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The authors declare that there are no conflict of interests.

References

- Ahad, M., (2016), Does tourism-led growth hypothesis exist in Pakistan? A freshlook from combine cointegration and causality approach with structural breaks, *International Journal of Economics and Empirical Research* 4(2), 94-111.
- Andriotis, K. (2002). Scale of hospitality firms and local economic development – evidence from Crete, *Tourism Management* 23(4), 333–341.
- Balaguer, J. and Cantavella-Jorda, M. (2002) Tourism as a Long-run Economic Growth Factor: the Spanish Case, *Applied Economics* 34, 877–884.
- Balassa, B. (1978), Exports and economic growth: Further evidence, *Journal of Development Economics* 5, 181-189.
- Blake, A., Sinclair, T. M., and Campos Soria, J. A. (2006). Tourism productivity. Evidence from the United Kingdom, *Annals of Tourism Research* 33(4), 1099–1120.
- Brau, R., Lanza, A., and Pigliaru, F. (2007). How fast are small tourism countries growing? Evidence from the data for 1980–2003, *Tourism Economics* 13(4), 603–613.

Brida J. G. and Pulina M. (2010) A literature review on the tourism-led-growth hypothesis," Working Paper CRENoS 201017, Centre for North South Economic Research, University of Cagliari and Sassari, Sardinia.

Brida J. G., Cortes-Jimenez I. and Pulina M. (2016a) Has the tourism-led growth hypothesis been validated? A literature review, *Current Issues in Tourism* 19(5), 394-430.

Brida, J. G., Lanzilotta, B. and Pizzolon, F., (2016b). Dynamic relationship between tourism and economic growth in MERCOSUR countries: a nonlinear approach based on asymmetric time series models, *Economics Bulletin* 36(2), 879- 894.

Candela, G. and Cellini, R. (1997). Countries' size, consumers' preferences and specialisation in tourism: a note, *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali* 44, 451–457.

Carrera, E. J. S., Risso, W. A. and Brida, J. G., (2008). Tourism's impact on long- run Mexican economic growth, *Economics Bulletin* 3(21), 1- 8.

Cerina, F. (2007). Tourism specialisation and environmental sustainability in a dynamic economy, *Tourism Economics* 13, 553–582.

Cortés-Jiménez, I. (2008). Which type of tourism matters to the regional economic growth? The cases of Spain and Italy, *International Journal of Tourism Research* 10(2), 127–139.

Di Liberto, A., (2013), High skills, high growth: Is tourism an exception?, *The Journal of International Trade and Economic Development* 22(5), 749-785.

Dunn, H. and Dunn, L. (2002). People and tourism: Issues and attitudes in the Jamaican hospitality industry, Kingston, Arawak Publications.

Ekanayake, E. M. and Long, A. E., (2012), Tourism development and economic growth in developing countries, *The International Journal of Business and Finance Research* 6(1), 51-63.

Ertugrul, H. M. and Mangir, F., 2015. The tourism- led growth hypothesis: empirical evidence for Turkey, *Current Issues in Tourism* 18(7), 633- 646.

Eugenio-Martín, J. L., Morales, N. M. and Scarpa, R. (2004), Tourism and economic growth in Latin American countries: A panel data approach, FEEM Working Paper No. 26.2004.

Feng, R., and Morrison, A. M. (2007). Quality and value network, *Marketing travel clubs. Annals of Tourism Research* 34(3), 588–609.

Figini, P., and Vici, L. (2010). Tourism and growth in a cross section of countries, *Tourism Economics*, 16(4), 789–805.

Ghali, M.A. (1976). Tourism and Economic Growth: an empirical study. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. 24(3), 527-538.

Giannoni, S. and Maupertuis, M. A. (2007). Environmental quality and optimal investment in tourism infrastructures: a small island perspective, *Tourism Economics* 13, 499–513.

Gregory, A. W. and Hansen, B. E. (1996) Residual-based tests for cointegration in models with regime shifts, *Journal of Econometrics* 70, 99–126.

Gunduz, L. and Hatemi-J, A., (2005). Is the tourism-led growth hypothesis valid for Turkey?, *Applied Economics Letters* 12, 499–504.

Gursoy, D. and Rutherford, D. G. R. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model, *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(3), 495–516.

Gwenhure, Y. and Odhiambo, N. M. (2017). Tourism and economic growth: A review of international literature, *Tourism* 65(1), 33-44.

Hacker, R.S. and Hatemi-J, A., (2006). Tests for causality between integrated variables using asymptotic and bootstrap distributions: Theory and Application, *Applied Economics* 38(13), 1489–1500.

Hacker, R.S. and Hatemi-J, A., (2010). HHcte: GAUSS module to Apply a Bootstrap Test for Causality with Endogenous Lag Order, Statistical Software Components G00012, Boston College Department of Economics. Available online.

Hacker, R.S. and Hatemi-J, A., (2012). A bootstrap test for causality with endogenous lag length choice: theory and application in finance, *Journal of Economic Studies* 39(2), 144-160.

Hatemi-J, A., (2003). A new method to choose optimal lag order in stable and unstable VAR models, *Applied Economics Letters* 10(3), 135-137.

Hatemi-J, A., (2008). Tests for cointegration with two unknown regime shifts with an application to financial market integration, *Empirical Economics*, 35, 497–505.

Hatemi-J, A., (2009). CIttest2b: GAUSS module to implement tests for cointegration with two unknown structural breaks, Statistical Software Components G00006, Boston College Department of Economics. Available online from <https://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/g00007.html> .

Hatemi-J, A., (2016). On the tourism-led growth hypothesis in the UAE: a bootstrap approach with leveraged adjustments, *Applied Economics Letters* 23(6), 424-427.

Helpman, E. and Krugman, P., (1985). Market structure and foreign trade, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Isik N. (2018) Sustainable Development and Tourism in Asia: A Panel Data Analysis. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 59(11), 970-979.

Jenner, P. and Smith, C., (1992). The Tourism industry and the environment, *The Economic Intelligence Unit*, Special Report, 2453, London, UK.

Krueger, A., (1980). Trade Policy as an Input to Development, *American Economic Review* 70, 288–292.

Lanza, A. and Pigliaru, F., (1995). Specialization in tourism: the case of small open economy, in Coccossis, H. and Nijkamp, P. (eds), *Sustainable Tourism Development*, Avebury, Aldershort.

Lanza, A., and Pigliaru, F., (2000). Tourism and economic growth: Does country's size matter?, *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali* 47, 77–85.

Lee, C-C. and Chang, C-P., (2008). Tourism development and economic growth: Closer look to panels, *Tourism Management* 29, 180–192.

Lee, C. G. and Hung, W. T., (2010). Tourism, health and income in Singapore, *International Journal of Tourism Research* 12(4), 335- 359.

Lemmetyinen, A. and Go, F. M., (2009). The key capabilities required for managing tourism business networks, *Tourism Management* 30, 31–40.

Lozano, J., Gomez, C. and Rey-Maqueira, J., (2008). The TALC hypothesis and economic growth theory, *Tourism Economics* 14, 727–749.

McKinnon, R. I., (1964). Foreign exchange constraints in economic development and efficient aid allocation, *Economic Journal* 74, 388–409.

Nikolaos, D., (2004). Tourism as a long- run economic growth factor: an empirical investigation for Greece using causality analysis, *Tourism Economics* 3(1), 305- 316.

Oh, C., (2005). The contribution of tourism development to economic growth in the Korean economy, *Tourism Management* 26(1), 39–44.

Pearce, D. G., (1985). Tourism and environmental research: A review, *International Journal of Environmental Studies* 25, 247–255.

Phillips, P. C. B., (1987). Time series regression with a unit root, *Econometrica* 55, 277–301.

Phiri, A., (2015). Tourism and economic growth in South Africa: evidence from linear and nonlinear cointegration frameworks, MPRA Paper 65000, University Library of Munich, Germany.

Sakai, M., (2009). Public sector investment in tourism infrastructure. In L. Dwyer & P. Forsyth (Eds.), *International handbook on the economics of tourism* (pp. 266–279). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Schubert, F. S., Brida, J. G., and Risso, W. A., (2010). The impacts of international tourism demand on economic growth of small economies dependent of tourism, *Tourism Management* 32(2), 377–385.

Sequeira, T. N. and Campos, C., (2007). International tourism and economic growth: A panel data approach, in A. Matias, P. Nijkamp and P. Neto (eds), *Advances in Modern Tourism Research: Economic Perspectives*, Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg, pp. 153–163.

Sequeira, T. N. and Nunes, P. M., (2008). Does tourism influence economic growth? A Dynamic panel data approach, *Applied Economics* 40(18), 2431–2441.

Sinclair M. T., (1998). Tourism and economic development: A survey, *The Journal of Development Studies* 34, 1-51.

Spurr, R., (2009) Tourism satellite accounts. In L. Dwyer & P. Forsyth (Eds.), *International handbook on the economics of tourism* (pp. 283–299). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Syriopoulos, T. C., (1995). A dynamic model of demand for Mediterranean tourism, *International Review of Applied Economics* 9(3), pp. 318-336.

Tang, C. F., (2011). Is the tourism- led growth hypothesis valid for Malaysia? A view from disaggregated tourism markets, *International Journal of Tourism Research* 13(1), 97-101.

Untong, A., (2014). Examining the tourism- led growth hypothesis: a case study of Thailand, *Applied Economics Journal* 21(2), 30- 51.

Weng, C-C. and Wang, K-K., (2004). Scale and scope economies of international tourist hotels in Taiwan, *Tourism Management* 25, 761–769.