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Theory: The literature on volume of tourism in developing nations, does not provide empirical measures necessary for rigorous hypotheses testing. While there have been ample studies on volume of tourism among developed nations, very little has been done regarding developing nations. Several theories from the dependency school, world systems and modernization offer theoretical explanations, but these explanations have not been adequately translated into empirical models, for studying the volume of tourism.

Hypotheses: To improve the ability to explain volume of tourism and to identify the factors that affect the volume of tourism in developing countries, the study tests four hypotheses based on the theories of Modernization, World System and Push- Pull.

Methodology: The study uses Confirmatory Factor Analysis to examine the factors that are likely to influence the volume of tourism. Shift Share analysis is also used to study regional variations in volume of tourism.

Findings: The study found support for the fact that aspects of modernization are some of the most important determinants of volume of tourism. This finding has policy implications for developing nations trying to encourage tourism as an important economic sector. Shift Share analysis revealed that in the last decade Sub – Saharan Africa, East Asia Pacific and the Middle East have seen an increase in the volume of tourism compared to other developing regions of the world.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“In a restless world, tourism is the only acceptable human form of restlessness”.

Bauman’s statement might appear to some as an exaggeration of the human condition – a romanticized version – of the lifestyle of the leisured class. Perhaps so. And yet it is an apt description of the modern life – where the mind constantly seeks change. This constancy of change is the defining principle of modern tourism. Some might argue that tourism has always existed throughout history, for the need to travel is a universal phenomenon. But sociologists have argued that tourism is essentially a modern phenomenon (Borocz 1996; Cohen 1972, Dumazedier 1967; MacCannell 1976; Urry 1990). This statement does not imply that pre-modern individuals did not travel, only that people in pre-modern times traveled occasionally for pleasure and only some traveled to satisfy their wanderlust. Yet there are several differences between pre-modern travel and modern travel. The differences can be found in attitudes, orientations and conceptions of recreational travel (Wang 2000). The motivation to travel, while an outcome of the modern technology, involves the development of certain modern values about “health, freedom, nature and self-improvement” (Graburn 1984 in Wang 2000). These values are related to modernity, which is associated with change in social order – from traditional forms of social order to a contemporary form of societal order that includes new dimensions of institutions, intellect, time and that of space and time (Wang 2000). The
emergence of these new forms of order are part of the process of the Weberian concept of rationalization, and so to a large extent the rise of tourism can be said to coincide with the rise of modernity.

Another difference between pre-modern and modern travel is that pre-modern travel was an occasional event, modern tourism is now an institution – institutionalized leisure, a consumer activity. As an institution, Tourism has successfully enshrined the changes in values, norms and lifestyles that industrialized societies have undergone since the post World War II years. As a tour de force of social change tourism is also a double-edged sword, where

On the one hand, the spread of tourism in the world economy leads to extroversion, internationalization and deterritorialization. On the other hand, it works toward the retrenchment of identities in a territory, a system of filiation and patrimony, all acting as a fulcrum. There is a constant tug-of-war between mobility, which is motivated by a zest for modernity, and an appeal to identity, which takes for granted the equality of cultures on their own terms (Lanfant et al. 1995:8).

There are two major schools of work that have attempted to make a causal connection between modernity and tourism. According to one body of research, tourism is a reaction to the negative aspects of modernity, wherein tourism is treated as an “escape” from the alienation of modernity (Cohen & Taylor 1992; Rojek 1993) – the “push of modernity”. The second body of research argues that tourism is a “false” necessity, and the demand for tourism is the result of the manipulation of the tourism production system (Britton 1991; Watson & Kopachevsky 1994) – the “pull of modernity”. While both bodies of research contain elements of truth, modern tourism is a “cultural celebration of modernity” (such as the improvement of living standards, and increased discretionary time and
disposable income), appearing as tourism related consumer culture” as well as an escape and a “desire to get away from it” (Wang 1999:15).

Even though tourism existed in pre-modern times, albeit in a different form, it is only under late modernity that it has become a mass phenomenon, and has been referred to as a “social fact” in the Durkheiminan sense, and as an “ international fact” (Lanfant 1995) that merits academic and scholarly attention. Psychological studies on motivations for tourism concentrate on experiential factors, while sociological studies focus on cultural values, social mechanisms, and structural conditions. Of the two forms of study, sociological studies have a wider focus since it focuses on both cultural and structural conditions for the “sociogenesis of tourism” (Wang 2000:13).

Tourism under modernity, especially under late modernity, has been widely accepted as a part of life, and for many it has become a deeply rooted habit. Furthermore, this orientation toward tourism has been increasingly globalized under late modernity. This has transformed tourism into a virtual “necessity”: whereas in the past tourism was a luxury, available only to elite groups, in modernity and late modernity, tourism is for mass consumption (Wang 2000:13).

Modern tourism, thus, involves the interaction between consumers and tourism-oriented capital. The presence of a tourist as a consumer implies the presence of sufficient infrastructure, while the capital needs a tourist market – where there is a desire to consume tourism as a commodity. Furthermore, the emergence of the tourist, argues Wang (2000) has more to do with the “enabling” conditions of modernity – the so-called “love” side of the ambivalence of modernity (the “pull” of modernity).

As part of the process of globalization, international tourism is more than just an extension of travel beyond international boundaries, or just a form of international trade. It acts as a “transmission belt” between "the post-industrial sending societies, and the
developing countries” (Lanfant et al 1995:28) that are unequal in their development.
While the sending societies have been more concerned with the motivations of tourists,
the receiving societies have been more concerned with the changes brought about by the
mass influx of tourists. With the passage of time, international tourism has been brought
within the purview of international markets, giving it an important economic dimension,
and also legitimizing tourism planning practices as well as the conceptualizing of tourism
(Lanfant 1995).

Tourism, as an expression of disenchantment, is reflected in the people’s
motivations to travel and their choice of holiday. While people from developing nations
engage in long-term or permanent migration, people from developed nations migrate to
the “pleasure periphery” of the less developed nations (Turner and Ash 1975). Even
though tourism involves a temporary change in status quo, in reality it reinforces the
status quo.

Thinking he is engaging only in his own pleasure, the tourist is
unconsciously contributing to a “strong society”. Tourism is thus an
institutional practice which assures the tourist’s allegiance to the state
through an activity which discreetly effaces whatever grievances,
discontent or “alienation” that the tourist might have felt in regards to
society. The tourist enslaves himself at the very moment he believes
himself to have attained the greatest liberty. Tourism, to paraphrase Marx,
is the opiate of the (modern) masses (Van den Abbeele 1980:5).

Tourism, especially mass tourism is an indicator of the affluence brought about by
modernity and its associated lifestyles. International tourism has emerged as one of the
most important growth industries due to technological advancement and improvements in
communications. Traditionally world tourism is measured in International Tourist
Arrivals and International Tourist Receipts. According to the World Tourism
Organization (WTO), international arrivals in 1999 worldwide reached an estimated 664 million, an increase of 4.4 per cent over the previous year.

Though Europe (59 percent) and the Americas (19 percent) are the main tourist-receiving regions, Asia/Pacific region was the star of world tourism in 1999, receiving 97.2 million international tourists. Other favorite regions were the Middle East (16.2 percent), Africa (7.8 percent) and South Asia (8.3 percent), according to the WTO (2000). Mediterranean countries, especially Spain (+9.2 percent) and Morocco (18.0 percent) saw an increase in international arrivals. Central America also witnessed a rapid growth in this sector. A number of interesting destinations grew in popularity in terms of tourism arrivals in 2000; Iceland (+13.4 percent), Estonia (+15.2 percent), Georgia (+21.1 percent) and Iran (+16.5 percent). On the other hand Europe and the Americas witnessed a slowdown, with Europe 2.7 percent and the Americas 2.4 percent (WTO Highlights 2000).

According to the World Tourism Organization, Africa was the fastest-growing region for world tourism in 1998. The region showed a growth rate of 7.8 per cent in arrivals in 1999, which is nearly twice the world average. The major destinations in Africa in 1999 were, South Africa (6 percent), Zambia (26 percent), Zimbabwe (11 percent), and Tunisia (3.4 percent). International arrivals to Middle East increased to 16 per cent, and to South Asia to 8.3 per cent. Development plans are currently under way in developing countries such as India, to boost tourism industry. Currently India ranks 46th among the world's top 60 tourism destinations, generating only one percent of the global tourism business. To reverse this trend, current five-year plans have included several measures. Among them are liberalization of India's aviation sector, abolishing entry visa
requirements for the top visitor markets (such as the U.K., other European countries and the U.S.) and issuing visas on arrival for the remaining markets, and development of a world class infrastructure (water supply, transportation and waste disposal).

International tourism has also generated an estimated US$ 455 billion as receipts. International Tourism Receipts for 1999 have been estimated at US$ 455 billion (WTO Highlights 2000). Receipts from international tourism rose to 3.1 per cent in 1999. According to the WTO'S Tourism Economic Report, 1998, tourism is one of the top five export categories earning foreign exchange for 83 per cent of the countries, and the main source of foreign currency for 38 per cent of them. For some time now, newly developing nations have been trying to develop their tourism sector in an effort to boost their economies.

While tourism has become a major economic activity in several nations, “the ability of the national economy to benefit from tourism depends on the availability of investment to develop the necessary infrastructure and on its ability to supply the needs of tourists” (Williams and Shaw 1988:5). There is a general consensus that tourism promotes the development of several sectors of national economy. Tourism:

1. Creates local requirements and fosters new industries and commercial activities
2. Improves employment opportunities in a country
3. Increases urbanization through growth and renovation of tourist facilities, specially in economically depressed areas
4. Increases state earnings of hard currency – which helps in reducing deficits
The growth of international tourism industry has brought about both benefits and losses to developing countries. The sheer size of tourist arrivals, the large variations in the origins of tourists, and an increase in the types of tourists have lead to several undesirable social problems such as increase in regional and economic inequality and increase in drug related crimes.

Tourism's impact on the environment is well known. Unplanned tourism has led to environmental degradation in developing countries. Among the many economic impacts of unplanned tourism, three are well known. First, benefits of tourism have not always accrued to the host country. Substantial amount of foreign exchange generated by the industry often goes back into the countries of tourist origin. Second, tourism has generated severe regional inequalities in developing countries. Unplanned tourism has led to increased urban/ rural polarization as well as the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. The most well known undesirable social impact of unplanned tourism is development of sex tourism. In many developing countries such as Thailand and the Philippines, tourism-generated sex industries have contributed to the rise of HIV in Asian countries.

The World Tourism Organization predicts an upward trend in international tourism as people discover new destinations, and as the travel industry becomes more organized. The new phenomenon, also known as mass tourism, has to be understood within the context of modernization, industrialization and economic development (Mowforth and Munt 1998). Studies analyzing tourism have constantly evoked the concept of "globalization", which has been referred to as an "ever-tightening network of connections that cut across national boundaries, integrating communities in 'space-time'
combinations" (Hall 1992:299; Giddens 1984). While this notion of interconnectedness is not new, in the present context of technological development, it suggests that with capital and commodity, people can also be transported and transferred across the world.

Objectives of the Study

With the growth of tourism, concerns about issues related to sustainable development have surfaced. The concept of sustainable development has been defined and interpreted in various ways. It is a concept that reflects the interests of the individuals involved in the debate on sustainable development (Mowforth and Munt 1998:24). The growth in the sheer number of tourists is seen as a threat to the fragile environments in developing countries. The principle of “carrying capacity” is a central tenet in environmental protection and sustainable tourism development. “It determines the maximum use of any place without causing negative effects on the resources, on the community, economy and culture, or reducing visitor satisfaction” (Wahab and Pigram 1997:281). This principle of carrying capacity implies that there should be a limitation on tourism development that would help in reducing degradation of resources. Such debates have generated a need to investigate the factors that contribute to the variations in tourist volumes in developing societies.

The theoretical importance of tourist volume may be described in terms of the perspective put forward by the sustainable tourism school. Sustainable tourism involves three elements; community, environment, and financial considerations. First, a community must be involved in making tourism as one of its goals. Second, tourism must strive to achieve an ecological balance and conservation of resources. Third, tourism, like
any other business must generate a profit for it to be sustainable. Even a perfunctory appraisal of the sustainable school perspective reveals that all three components of sustainable tourism are integrated with the issue of volume of tourism. Development of community plans for tourism development focuses on the issue of the size or volume of tourists to be accommodated. From an ecological point the volume of tourist arrivals is closely related to carrying capacity of host community resources which attracts tourists. Finally, tourist volume is closely related to economic considerations with respect to the development and improvement of infrastructures necessary to sustain tourism. From a sustainable development perspective it is impossible to focus on the determinants of tourism volume in order to design sustainable tourism strategies.

Current research on international tourism focuses mainly on the issues of management and construction of tourist centers and the importance of developing infrastructure. While these studies have enriched the area, very few studies have been conducted on the importance of the volume of tourism, the number of tourists per 1000 persons in the host population. Studies on tourism volume, at this point suffer from several drawbacks. First, empirical studies on tourism volume are few and far between. A few econometric studies on tourism volume have focused on time series trends and patterns in international tourism volume, and tend to be mostly descriptive in nature. Second, there has been very little effort at specifying empirical models based on existing theoretical views on tourism volume. Several theories from the dependency school, world systems and modernization school offer theoretical explanations, but these explanations have not been adequately translated into empirical models. As a result very few studies
have evaluated the validity of the world systems or modernization explanations as they relate to the volume of tourism.

This study on international tourism has three objectives. First, this study will describe the existing regional variations in international tourism volume in developing countries. Second, I propose a theoretical model of international tourism, taking into account existing theoretical literature on tourism volume. Third, this study will test and evaluate the empirical validity of the proposed model using available cross-national data on proposed social and economic factors related to tourism volume. Finally, the study focuses on developing nations, as there are well known differences in the factors that drive tourism volume in developing and developed countries (Borocz 1996; Wang 2000; Rojek 1996).

The power of the tourism industry, especially in relation to these destination societies, has been referred to as “oligopsony” – a situation when few buyers have the ability to restrict the movement of sellers – due to their access to different tourism markets (Borocz 1996). It is important to note that modern tourism originated in the West (Wang 2000), and the emergence of mass tourism should be understood within the context of industrial capitalism (Borocz 1996:50).

Tourism developed as a consequence of industrialization and modernization processes that first started in the developed nations. The development of wage economy and increase in leisure time among the industrialized nations has led to the development of tourism as a form of leisure. But, the rise of tourism among the developing nations was the result of a response to the demand from developed nations. The historical context in
which tourism took shape as an economic activity differs among the developed and the developing nations.

For destination societies, the high concentration of capital in the intricately interwoven hotel, airline, and tour operator branches may create “classic” situations of foreign trade and direct foreign investment dependency. This is especially so in the case of previously colonized Third World destination societies where institutionalized patterns of international penetration already exist, and in situations where a destination country’s tourist product lacks uniqueness to such an extent that it can be substituted by the multinational companies for some other country with relative ease (Borocz 1996:12).

Industrial capitalism created a need for leisure capital, thereby giving rise to the development of the tourism industry. While advanced industrial nations had the required industrial infrastructure for the tourism industry to take off, developing nations, with their new geographic and territorial boundaries lacked the basic industrial infrastructure. Therefore, developing nations have attempted to use tourism as an engine-of-growth model, governed by outside needs. Conversely, tourism in industrialized nations grew as consequence of needs that emanated from within - surplus capital and a need to relax and travel.

Thus, the development of tourism in developing and developed nations was the result of different needs and motivations of societies. Consequently, at a theoretical level it is appropriate to consider different models of tourism volume to study developed and developing nations.
CHAPTER II

THEORY AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Technological advancement is one of the most important dimensions of modernity. ‘All that is solid melts into air’ wrote Marx about modern technological advances. Technical and cultural diffusion has facilitated the rise of mass tourism. Despite the fact that tourism is now a social phenomenon very few sociological studies have been conducted. While work on the sociology of tourism can be classified into four main areas: tourists, interaction of tourists with locals, the tourism system, and tourism impacts (Cohen 1984) very little effort has been made to integrate theory with method (Dann and Cohen 1996). Some of the theoretical perspectives dealing with this issue are discussed below.

Neo-Durkheiminan Perspectives

Three major Durkheimian themes have been used in tourism research – the concepts of anomie, sacred, and collective representation. Dann (1977) used Veblen’s notion (1925) of status enhancement with anomie to study the motivations of tourists to travel to Barbados. MacCannell (1973, 1976) studied the “The Tourist” as a symbol of the modern individual who seeks new authentic experiences. Here tourism becomes the sacred quest responding to inner desires. This quest combined with Goffman’s (1959) idea of “front-
“back” stage is used to understand the tourist’s need for authentic experiences. Tourism can be a form of modern pilgrimage (Turner 1973; Graburn 1989).

… the pilgrim’s (or tourist’s) goal, [is] not within the spatial or symbolic boundaries of society but rather within the antistructural liminal recesses of the Other; that Center is the repository of society’s most sacred values (in Dann & Cohen 1996:306).

MacCannell also argues that different tourist attractions are a reflection of the differences that exist in society.

Developmental Perspective

Studies on tourism have also emphasized on the importance of industrialization (Hiller 1976) and on its internationalization (Lanfant 1980). In the 1960s the idea that international tourism could benefit the developing countries was advocated by Kurt Krapf (1961). In 1963 the United Nations Conference on Tourism and International Travel in Rome declared that tourism could make an important contribution to the economic development of the developing countries. Between 1969-79, twenty-four World Bank aided projects were launched in 18 countries. Lanfant (1995) argues that international tourism can no longer be considered as an extension of domestic tourism, or even reduce its economic importance by analyzing it only in terms of its contributions to trade. It is not only the developing nations that see international tourism as solving their economic problems, the developed nations also view tourism as beneficial to furthering their economic growth. Tourism can create new jobs as well the multiplier effect ensuing from this advantage can be considered as factor of growth. (Lanfant 1995). Many industrialized nations now see tourism as the economic activity of the future.
While industrialized nations seek to further their economic activity, industrializing nations are now beginning to grapple with some of the issues that have affected their societies with this international exchange. Most studies have tended to focus on the economic impact of tourism in the industrializing nations, thus looking at an issue from a very limited perspective. It is important to analyze the economic impact of tourism within a sociopolitical framework.

The liberal perspective of economic development argues that interdependence and economic linkages of industrialized economies with industrializing economies tend to favor the less developed economies (Gilpin 1987). Trade, international aid, and foreign investment help the industrializing economies acquire export markets, capital, and technology needed for development. Though the world economy can help the development of the peripheral regions through diffusion, liberalism also states that it is the efficient organization of the domestic economy first that is most important. Trade can serve as an "engine of growth" as the industrializing economies gain capital, technology and access to world market (Gilpin 1987).

This theory of economic growth also argues that several factors required for economic development are diffused from the advanced core nations of the world economy to the less developed economies of the periphery. The rate and direction of this diffusion is dependent on a number of factors: the international migration of economic factors (capital, labor, knowledge); the volume, terms, and composition of foreign trade; and the mechanics of the international monetary system (Rostow 1980:360 in Gilpin 1987).
In line with this argument, liberals also argue that when the industrializing nations have failed to transform, it is because of the problems in their domestic social and political systems, and not in the operation of the international market system (Kindleberger 1962). A major flaw in the liberal theory of development is the insufficient attention it pays to the political factors. Economic development cannot be divorced of political factors (Gilpin 1987). For Marxists, this process is fraught with political conflict as nations attempt to find their positions in the international division of labor. And, finally, argue the Marxists, this process will lead to socialism. The Marxist explanation of development has given rise to several theories of underdevelopment.

Conflict Perspective
The tension between the industry and the consumers, between a highly organized establishment and the quality of expected touristic experience is dealt within this perspective. Cohen (1988) argues that this tension is obvious in the notion of “commercialized hospitality”, when social exchange between guests and hosts are the outcome of an economic exchange. Criticism of tourism at the structural level is part of what is known as theories of underdevelopment – mainly dependency and world systems approach. Theories of underdevelopment argue that international capitalist economy operates to systematically “underdevelop” the less developed economies. This is inherent part of the system, and which results in damaging the developing economies. There is, furthermore, an “unequal exchange” (Emmanuel 1972) taking place between the developed and the developing nations – primarily based around terms of trade. The Singer-Prebisch theory or the structuralist theory argues that the world economy is
composed of a core or a center of highly industrialized nations and a large
underdeveloped periphery (Prebisch 1959). Technical advancement has a different
consequence for the industrialized and the least industrialized periphery due to the
international division of labor inherited from the past. Therefore, the structuralists
conclude that the only way for the developing nations to reverse their situation would be
through promotion of international agencies. Agencies like the UNCTAD would be more
likely to promote their interests than others. Rapid industrialization through import
substitution policies was another way out.

But the structuralist argument soon lost its attractiveness, since the methods
advocated by this school did not change things. In response, there arose a very different
interpretation of the situation of the developing nations – the dependency theory. The
dependency theory distinguished between “undeveloped” and “underdeveloped”, by
arguing that poor societies were a part of the underdeveloped world, since they had
experienced the negative consequences of colonialism (Clancy 1999). Thus, the
dependency theory was born. Dependency theory attributed the underdevelopment of
certain regions of the world to imperialism and colonialism. It incorporated Marxist
explanations, where development at the core was at the expense of the periphery (dos
Santos 1970; Frank 1967).

By dependency we mean a situation in which the economy of certain
countries is conditioned by the development and expansion of another
economy to which the former is subjected. The relation of
interdependence between two or more economies, and between these and
world trade, assumes a form of dependence when some countries (the
dominant ones) can expand and be self-sustaining, while other countries
(the dependent ones) can do this only as a reflection of that expansion,
which can have either a positive or a negative effect on their immediate
development (Dos Santos 1970:231).
Components of the dependency theory include (1) the nature and dynamics of the capitalist world system, (2) the relationship between the developed and the less developed nations, and (3) the internal characteristics of the dependent countries themselves (Gilpin 1987).

World Systems Perspective

World systems approach has been defined variously. According to Chase-Dunn (1998), world system can be viewed as ‘intersocietal networks that are systemic’. That is they exhibit patterned structural reproduction and development. The world system is an interactional entity – a self-contained unit, where important social processes that transform social structures are contained within it. Though different theorists within the world systems approach agree that focus on the kinds of interaction is necessary (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1997:12), yet they cannot seem to agree on the importance of the kinds of “interconnectedness”.

According to Fernand Braudel (1975), the major forerunner of the world systems study, commodity trade was the most important type of interconnectedness. For Wallerstein, the world system is composed of multicultural economies, where there is a division of labor in the production of foods and raw materials. It is the networks of production, distribution and consumption of necessary goods that unite the world system. World systems, according to Wallerstein (1974), are of two kinds: world-empires and world-economy. The former displays a division of labor that is encompassed by a ‘single overarching imperial polity’, while the latter displays a division of labor that has been politically organized into an interstate system – the modern world system. Other forms of
interconnectedness, according to Chase-Dunn are exchange of prestige goods (exotic imports that honors the owner), political protection, regularized army conflict, and information exchange networks. Others, like Charles Tilly (1984) focus on political interconnections in defining world systems – that is change in the actions of power holders in one part of the world can affect a people in another part of the world of the world. David Wilkinson focuses on interaction through conflict – especially military competition (1987).

Another approach to the world system study emphasizes the ideological (cultural) diffusion and the cross-cultural marriages among elites in the prestige goods economy (Schortman and Urban 1987). Thus, for these authors, economic trade is only part of the intersocietal interaction. The rise of the world systems approach coincided with the increasing knowledge that the modernization perspective had failed to explain the lack of development in certain areas of the globe. Also known as the developmentalist approach, it rests on the idea that study of social change is “society”, and that the world consists of related but autonomous “societies” each moving along a similar path of development (Hopkins 1982). Though the dependency theory very effectively challenged the modernization approach, its deterministic approach to explaining poverty in parts of Asia, Africa and South America almost condemned these regions into an eternity of servitude and hopelessness.

One of the core concepts of world systems approach revolves around the division of labor. The division of labor, according to Wallerstein (1974) is the result of the interaction between the forces of production of the world economy as a whole. There are five aspects of the division of labor: core and periphery, commodity chains, semi-
periphery, unequal exchange, and capital accumulation. The division of labor is referred to as processes taking place within an existing set of relations (Hopkins 1982). These processes are continually altering the relations of productions. These production relations at the global level create areas as “cores” or “peripheries”. The terms, core and periphery, was first used by Raul Prebisch (1959), when writing about the deteriorating “terms of trade” for agricultural and mineral products in relation to manufactured goods in the area of international trade. The terms referred to two kinds of participants in international commerce: (1) Nations that exported manufactured goods – formed the center, and (2) nations that exported agricultural and extractive products – formed the periphery. The central relation of the world systems perspective is that of core and periphery. These are geographically different regions – that specialize in capital intensive and labor-intensive products. According to Wallerstein, both need each other to exist. Reduced trade barriers, international financial security, U.S. aid to Europe and domestic policies designed to stimulate consumer demands – contributed to the economic growth of the core countries in the 1950s and 60s. In the context of the capitalist mode of economy, core economic organizations increasingly dominated economies through corporations. Though the position of the core nations change within this world system - in response to competition. It is important to note that the change in the position of the core nations is still relative to each other. Even though the location of production may change, it still remains within the core areas. According to Chase-Dunn (1989), capitalist organizations continue to grow into “bureaucratically administered firms”. The size and importance of core state bureaucracies has expanded due to demands of social welfare and have become political
forces in their own right. Yet the policies they follow are in line with the interests of the capitalist class.

The periphery on the other hand has undergone social and political upheaval in their quest to become core-like economies. After 1945 the colonial empires had to relinquish control of their colonies. Most core nations tried to minimize the change by installing governments that would maintain friendly ties, and continue with the existing trade policies. The resulting relationship from this was known as “neo-colonialism”. The new states maintained ties with the core nations. Though the peripheral nations maintained their independence, they have remained subordinate to the demands of the core. Since the periphery lacks the resources to implement their domestic policies, they continue to participate in the world economy, at the terms of the core nations. Raw materials and agricultural exports are still a major aspect of their participation in the world economy. Thus, not only is there limited improvement in the periphery, the class system in the periphery reflects extreme economic inequality.

World-system theorists generally see power over peripheral states as being concentrated in the hands of the various groups that have an interest in maintaining their countries’ participation in the world division of labor. The extreme exploitation that integration into the world-economy creates requires coercion enforced by a state apparatus. Hence, these local groups that benefit from this integration use their resources to dominate a state that pursues policies favorable to them and enforces the system of economic exploitation (Duvall and Freeman 1981, in Shannon 1996:105).

By “unequal exchange” Wallerstein refers to the processes that reproduce the core-periphery division of labor. “Capital accumulation” is a world process and involves changing the peripheral surplus. The repressive nature of the peripheral states adds to the instability of these states (Chase-Dunn 1989). Ethnic and religious affiliations weaken
national identity, and the ability of the core nations to intervene in the political affairs of the peripheral states adds to the instability of these states (Chirot 1977).

The notion of semi-periphery is Wallerstein’s own idea – which includes economic and political dimensions. Semi-peripheral regions form the intermediate link between the core and periphery. The semi-peripheries have economies that are a combination of core and peripheral forms of production. The semi-peripheral states enjoy a greater degree of freedom from the core, than the peripheral states. States in this category have achieved high levels of industrialization, and have shown considerable stability. Most of this industrialization in these regions has been the result of investments undertaken by local capitalists and the state, with capital from private core lenders (Shannon 1996). In the newly developed economies (Taiwan, South Korea, Singapore) a large portion of the capital was generated through domestic accumulation. Furthermore, debt by foreign lenders was also controlled. The rise of these states is an indication that countries can raise their status within the world economy.

Semi-peripheries trade with both regions. All export production does not go the core, a lot of it goes to the periphery and to each other. The urban middle classes are significantly larger in the semi-periphery. Like the periphery, semi-peripheries also exhibit widespread economic inequality. A state can move into and out of the semi-peripheral status from above and below. But upward mobility is usually difficult, and if it does occur, it is at the cost of a downward movement of another. Therefore, semi-peripheral states are relatively stronger and more centralized than the peripheral states. Most of these states use state power to help develop domestic economies.
The structure of the international state system has three aspects – imperialism, hegemony and class struggle. Wallerstein (1979) argues that there is a strong connection between the division of labor and the international state system. Modern political economy is characterized by regular cyclical rhythms – which affect the different zones of the world economy. During periods of stagnation – the peripheral and the older semi-peripheral zones are hardest hit, while the core and new semi-peripheral zones do relatively well. It is the resolution of these periodic crises that furthers the movement of the world system towards the secular trends.

Tourism as Leisure Migration

Another perspective that has attempted to deal with the phenomenon of tourism is the leisure migration approach. Migration has been broadly defined as a permanent or semi permanent change of residence (Lee 1965). There is no limit to the distance that might be involved in the move, nor is there any distinction made between internal and external kinds of migration. According to the theory, there are several factors that aid in the process of migration. Some of these factors are associated with the area of origin. Thus, there may be several factors that might attract an individual, resulting in migration. While some other factors might not attract the individual in their decision to move. For example a good climate may be an attractive factor, while a bad climate might have the opposite effect, according to Lee (1965). Some other factors that are associated with the area of destination, and form intervening obstacles, are personal factors.

Another theory within this perspective of migration argues that the tourist is also a leisure migrant (Borocz 1996). The leisure migration approach, argues Borocz (1996)
provides the study of tourism with aspects of labor migration and refugee flows, and help in the conceptualization of leisure flows.

The main dividing line in debates within the labor migration literature is between push-pull theories – which assume that labor flows are automatic consequences of global inequalities and use the individual as the unit of analysis – and the historical-comparative institutional economic sociology approach (Borocz 1996:8).

International leisure migrations also involve the flow of commodities, money, power and knowledge. The development of leisure migration is based on the availability of the services and infrastructure used for commercial travel. Leisure flows tend to lead to change at the local level (Pi-Sunyer 1977; Meleghy, Preglau and Tafershofer 1985).

Review of the Literature

The notion of tourism is mainly associated with the phenomenon of mass tourism, which is characterized by participation of large numbers of people in tourism, and also to the fact that holidays are standardized, rigidly packaged and inflexible (Vanhove 1997 in Wahab and Pigram 1997). Mass tourism, argue Burkhard and Medlik (1974), "is essentially a quantitative notion, based on the proportion of the population participating in tourism or on the volume of tourist activity." Mass tourism is different from popular and social tourism.

Popular tourism denotes tourist activities, meeting with wide acceptance by people, because of their attractiveness and availability. The acceptance may be due to meeting the needs or tastes of people or more particularly to being available at a low price. Popular tourism is, therefore, essentially a quantitative notion, although by its nature it may give rise to mass tourism (Burkhard and Medlik 1974:43).
Social tourism is concerned more with participation of people in tourist activities with limited means, and includes measures to encourage participation. Mass tourism as a phenomenon started in the 50s and 60s, but was not considered a major economic sector. It was only in 1985, at the Lome III conference of less developed nations, that tourism received adequate attention. There is a general consensus that tourism promotes the development of several sectors of national economy. Tourism:

1. Creates local requirements and fosters new industries and commercial activities
2. Improves employment opportunities in a country
3. Increases urbanization through growth and renovation of tourist facilities, specially in economically depressed areas
4. Increases state earnings of hard currency - which helps in reducing deficits
5. Helps in redistributing capital between developed and developing nations (since a large portion of foreign travel is directed toward developing regions)
6. Activates the economic circuit in a country - and accelerates the multiplier effect (Wahab 1974:15).

Others have argued that many developing nations have rich natural attractions, and development based on these attractions offers the tourism sector some comparative advantage vis-a-vis other economic sectors (Vanhove 1997:66). Vanhove also argues that in addition to the above advantage, tourism has a lower import content compared to other basic economic sectors, and has a high growth rate potential. Furthermore, it has a stabilizing effect on exports, and that it is labor-intensive sector. While tourism has become a major economic activity, "the ability of the national economy to benefit from tourism depends on the availability of investment to develop the necessary infrastructure
and on its ability to supply the needs of tourists" (Williams and Shaw 1988:5). A cost-benefit analysis of mass tourism can be measured at national, regional and local levels.

Incidental costs, according to Frechtling (1994), leads to quality-of-life costs and public or fiscal costs. This affects the local population of a region. Some of the incidental costs of tourism import are listed in Table 1. (All tables follow page 95). Though, Frechtling does add that it is not certain that a specific volume of tourists will produce costs in all the categories listed. In addition to direct incidental costs there are secondary incidental costs, which impose further life-quality and fiscal costs on the region.

Clearly, tourism requires careful planning and building of infrastructure. Tourism is, to a large degree, a resource-based activity, interacting with natural systems and with a capacity to initiate far-reaching changes on the environment (Pigram 1992). Thus, managing environmental issues is of key importance to tourism planning. Unplanned tourism has led to environmental degradation in developing countries. Thus tourist resort planners must give preference to designs where environmental damage is minimized and, where a very basic limitation is related to the carrying capacity of the areas in relation to visitor use and the development of facilities. Conventional forms of tourism development will affect resource quality and tourists will seek other destinations. There have been expressions of outrage by some at the devastation of natural wildlife in developing nations.

Having ruined their own environment, having either used up or destroyed all that is natural, people from advanced consumer societies are compelled to look for natural wildlife, cleaner air, lush greenery and golden beaches elsewhere to consume. Thus armed with their bags, tourists proceed to consume the environment in the countries of the third world - that last "unspoiled corner of earth" (Hong 1985:12)
Though tourism has become a major economic sector, it is still not a very secure growth sector, especially for the developing economies. The developing economies go through seasonal fluctuation in arrivals, in addition to themselves going through economic cycles. Destination nations, among the developing nations do not have the power to control pricing. In addition, most third world tourism destinations are "mutually substitutable" (Crick 1996:22). There are several well-known economic impacts of unplanned tourism. Often, benefits of tourism do not always go to the host country, and large amount of foreign exchange generated by the industry is reportedly funneled back into the countries of tourist origin. The nature of package tours is such that most of the foreign exchange does not even reach the destination nation. Table 2 outlines some of the principles behind sustainable tourist management.

Tourism has also generated severe regional inequalities in developing countries. It affects different classes, increasing inequalities of wealth and stratification. Profits from tourism go to the elites. Small operators in the tourism industry in developing nations face stiff competition from multinational companies. Unplanned tourism has led to increased urban/ rural polarization as well as the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. According to Crick (1996) a developing nation's desire to attach itself with the affluence of Europe or north America is naive, since it is their affluence that produces the underdevelopment of the Third World. "The structural dependencies are visible in the case of tourism" (Crick 1996:24).

Tourist do not go to Third World countries because they are friendly, they go because a holiday there is cheap, and that cheapness is, in part, a matter of the poverty of the people, which derives in some theoretical formulations directly from the affluence of those in the formerly metropolitan centers of the colonial system. That affluence now produces
conditions of work and life such that leisure activity is prized (Crick 1996:25).

According to Britton (1982), economists have been portraying tourism and development incorrectly, because they provide no socio-historical context to explain the economic inequality between tourist–generating, and tourist-destination nations. And that it should be analyzed within the framework of underdevelopment. Therefore, to opt for tourism as a growth strategy is to ask for continued control by overseas forces (Hiller 1976). Britton, therefore argues that the tourism industry is the "opposite of self-reliant development".

Tourism has also had a socio-cultural impact, and Turner and Ash (1975) claim that tourism is the enemy of authenticity and cultural identity. Greenwood (1978) refers to this as "commoditization" - as an example of capitalist development. Most of these impacts can be classified under the following categories:

1. Community involvement in wider frameworks
2. Nature of interpersonal relations
3. Basis of social organization
4. Rhythm of social life
5. Migration
6. Division of labor
7. Stratification
8. Distribution of power
9. Deviance
10. Customs and the arts
The most well known undesirable social impact of unplanned tourism is development of deviance. Some of the tourism-oriented deviant activities are theft, begging (Noronha 1979; Cohen 1983), prostitution (Jones 1978) and fraud. The extreme case of sexualized conduct in tourism is that of prostitution tourism. In many developing countries such as Thailand and the Philippines, tourism has generated thriving sex industries, which in turn have contributed to the HIV pandemic in Asian countries. Sex tourism according to Hall (1994) results from government and foreign interests, and ways in which ruling groups in destination countries support prostitution tourism (Lee 1991). Thus, even though women are important in the tourism sector as producers and consumers, work in tourism conforms to dominant gender norms. Studies using the dual system analysis argue that even though capitalism creates a hierarchical structure in the labor force, it is indifferent as to who occupies the positions within the structure. Since capitalism and patriarchy are separate systems within the dual system analysis (Rojek 1995) access to occupations is in reality determined by patriarchal relations.

**Sustainable Tourism**

The theoretical importance of tourist volume may be described in terms of the perspective put forward by the sustainable tourism school. There is no single acceptable definition of sustainable tourism, though it is a commonly held view that any definition of sustainable tourism should emphasize the importance of environmental, social and economic elements of the tourism system. An ATLAS project funded by the European Union defined sustainable tourism in the following manner:
Sustainable tourism is tourism which develops as quickly as possible, taking account of current accommodation capacity, local population and the environment. The development of tourism and new investment in the tourism sector should not detract from tourism itself. New tourism facilities should be integrated with the environment (Richards in Bramwell 1996).

In 1983 the World Commission on Environment and Development was set up with Gro Harlem Brundtland as its chair, in response to a UN General Assembly resolution. According to the Brundtland report, sustainable development refers to development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs (1987:43).

Most scholars have regarded this definition as extremely ambiguous, since it leaves the concept of sustainability open to contest, and something that has been "socially constructed", thus reflecting the interests of the few who were involved. The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, 1992, also referred to as the Earth Summit of 1992, met to elaborate strategies and measures which would halt and reverse the effects of environmental degradation in the "context of strengthened national and international efforts to promote sustainable and environmentally sound development in all countries." The immediate results of the Rio Declaration fell short of the envisaged aims of the conference. Since the diverse opinions on defining tourism have made it difficult to concretize the concept, theoreticians have evolved a set of principles that underlie the concept. It is important to note that these principles outline the processes and not the outcomes (Swarbrooke 1999:14).

Sustainable tourism, therefore, involves community, environment, and financial considerations. According to the theses evolved by sustainable tourism, there are three important strategies that are part of sustainable tourism. First, the community must be
involved in tourism goal setting. Second, tourism must strive to achieve ecological balance and conserve resources. Third, tourism, like any other business must generate a profit for it to be sustainable. Development of community plans for tourism development focuses on the issue of the size or volume of tourists to be accommodated. From an ecological point of view, the volume of tourist arrivals is closely related to carrying capacity of host community resources that attract tourists. Finally, tourist volume is closely related to economic considerations with respect to the development and improvement of infrastructures necessary to sustain tourism.

According to “Global Code of Ethics for Tourism”, by the World Tourism Organization (WTO), Article 3, tourism is a factor of Sustainable development. The Article is reproduced below.

Article 3 / Tourism, a factor of sustainable development (1994)

1. All the stakeholders in tourism development should safeguard the natural environment with a view to achieving sound, continuous and sustainable economic growth geared to satisfying equitably the needs and aspirations of present and future generations;

2. All forms of tourism development that are conducive to saving rare and precious resources, in particular water and energy, as well as avoiding so far as possible waste production, should be given priority and encouraged by national, regional and local public authorities;

3. The staggering in time and space of tourist and visitor flows, particularly those resulting from paid leave and school holidays, and a more even distribution of holidays should be sought so as to reduce the pressure of tourism activity on the environment and enhance its beneficial impact on the tourism industry and the local economy;

4. Tourism infrastructure should be designed and tourism activities programmed in such a way as to protect the natural heritage composed of ecosystems and bio-diversity and to preserve endangered species of wildlife; the stakeholders in tourism development, and especially professionals, should agree to the imposition of limitations or constraints on their activities when these are exercised in particularly sensitive areas:
desert, polar or high mountain regions, coastal areas, tropical forests or wetlands, propitious to the creation of nature reserves or protected areas;

5. Nature tourism and eco-tourism are recognized as being particularly conducive to enriching and enhancing the standing of tourism, provided they respect the natural heritage and local populations and are in keeping with the carrying capacity of the sites;

The concept of **carrying capacity** includes several elements:

1. Physical carrying capacity – is the level beyond which the available space cannot provide for tourists without a clear deterioration of the tourist experience.

2. Ecological carrying capacity – is the level of visitation beyond which unacceptable ecological impacts will occur either from the tourists or the amenities they require.

3. Cultural carrying capacity represents the number of visitors beyond which the cultural, historical and archaeological resources start to deteriorate in time.

4. Tourist social carrying capacity is the level beyond which visitor satisfaction declines unacceptably because of overcrowding.

5. Host social carrying capacity is the level beyond which growth will be unacceptable in terms of determent to the host community in its traditions, ethics, value system or quality of life (WTO 1994:23–5, 60-2).

**Tourism and its devotees**

Who are these tourists? What are their expectations? What determines the origins of this form of activity? Much of research has focussed on demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of tourists - the frequency, purpose, length, and the type of trip, and the
nature of tourists destinations, and the kinds of activities undertaken during their stay (Burkhart and Medlik 1974). Even though these data aid in studying trends in tourism, they are not of much use sociologically. Since World War II, international tourism has turned into a form of mass activity. Major tourist destinations have been North America and Europe. But, in the recent years this trend has been changing, with tourists opting for other destinations.

Ravenstein’s study (1889) on migration in England was of the opinion that it was the desire to get ahead that had a stronger pull, than the desire to escape an unpleasant situation. It was the pull factor that was more responsible for the migration of people, in 19th century England. But, when we view tourism as a form of temporary migration – the act of leaving an environment seems to stem more from a desire to get out of the current situation for an out-of-the-ordinary experience. Tourists are often seen as "travellers for pleasure" (MacCannell 1976) seeking experiences that might be quasi-religious, or an experience that might be different from the usual hum-drum of life (MacCanell 1976; Cohen 1996). Most of modern tourism is based on the idea of movement away from the core to the periphery. Cohen (1996) develops five modes of touristic experiences: (1) The Recreational Mode, (2) The Diversionary Mode, (3) The Experiential Mode, (4) The Experimental Mode, and (5) The Existential Mode.

The recreational mode is a structural-functional analysis of the touristic experience – as a form of entertainment. But this is an entertainment that rejuvenates and recreates the individual undertaking this form of pleasure. For the recreation-seeking tourist, the people and the landscapes seen and experienced are not part of the tourist’s "real" world. Like other recreational settings, they are "finite provinces of meaning"
separate from reality. Though the tourists or the staff of tourist establishments may not admit this aspect, the distinguishing trait of the tourist situation, however, is that such an admission would spoil the game (Cohen 1996:96). This form of tourism serves as "pressure-valve" for the modern man (Cohen 1996). But, in case the individual overdoes this, it becomes dysfunctional – a form of escapism.

The diversionary mode of tourism, according to Glasser (1975) is the “Therapy School” of the sociology of leisure, where tourism activities act as a “healing balm for the robots” (Cohen 1996:95). While the recreational mode is a movement away from the center, and seeks to recreate and reinforce the importance of the center, the diversionary mode is a form of pure escapism. It works as an escape from the meaninglessness of the ordinary existence. Though it works as a balm it does not try to reinforce the meaning of the center. "It makes alienation endurable" (Cohen 1996:96).

The third form – the experiential mode deals with the man who is aware of his alienation. And in an attempt to renew the meaning in their lives, individuals seek to renew this meaning through experiences outside their own community. This mode reflects "the striving of the people who have lost their own center and are unable to lead an authentic life at home, to recapture meaning by a vicarious, essentially aesthetic experience of the authenticity of the life of others" (MacCannell 1973). MacCannell (1976:156) argues that "authentic experiences are believed to be available only to those moderns who try to break their bonds of their everyday existence and begin to live." The experiential tourist remains a stranger even when living among people who live authentic lives.
The experimental mode of tourism is about people who are willing to try alternative life-styles in seeking a meaning to their existence. This meaning need not be sought out through travel, but through various other forms - drugs, religion, etc. In fact, it is this tourist who comes closest to the pilgrim - in search of the self, even though not sure of the goals. Sometimes this can become a habit, and the pilgrim remains eternally the seeker, never making a commitment (Cohen 1996:100). The existential mode is one where the tourist lives in two worlds - the world of everyday life which lacks any deeply held convictions, and another world created for periodical pilgrimages - to nurture their spiritual life. This is indeed the pilgrim - whose center is not the center of his culture, but one to which he returns and is a believer.

An examination of the typology reveals that it is based on experiences that range from being superficial to those that have a profound influence. The assumption has been that an individual has one "spiritual" center, and if alienated from that center - seeks for the center elsewhere. According to some scholars, tourism should be considered as a process, taking place in several phases. The five-phase framework for recreation comprises; anticipation - travel to destination -on-site behavior - return travel and finally recollection (Fridgen 1984; Clawson and Knetsch 1966). The field of motivational research includes large-scale market research to studies of atypical groups (Pearce 1982). But as that is not the focus of this study, I will not delve into this any further.

Modern Tourism

Tourism in its modern form is an ecological, economic and a political system, which is constantly expanding into new areas. The system works around a group of national and
transnational corporate actors and governmental and non-governmental agencies. International tourism is not merely a form of "geographical extension of a migratory movement, whose initial causes are to be found at the specific point from which it originates" (Lanfant 1995), but a form of "international fact".

It is possible to divide social phenomena into two groups. One kind does not travel well: the other does. On their own account they overflow the boundaries of any given society, boundaries which themselves are often difficult to define (Mauss 1969:243). Lanfant, by using Mauss's definitions of tourism as an international fact, approaches the phenomena in its totality - which has set into motion all society, and its effects can be felt at social, economic, political, geographical, ecological and technological levels.

Tourism in the Peripheral Economies

Tourism industry in the developing economies shows signs of being affected by the international division of labor. Governments in the peripheral regions are dependent on core countries for economic viability, and their own political legitimacy. Financial aid, provision of infrastructure, the orientation of administrative services and licensing, etc, are all in accordance with the requirements of the core sectors (Britton 1996). Tourists arrive in the urban centers of the peripheral regions (most of which have been ex-colonies). These urban centers also have the headquarters of the foreign tourism companies. Britton’s enclave model indicates the dominance of the core nations, and their control over tourist expenditures by controlling tourism movement. Britton also develops
a set of eight propositions. Some of the important propositions are stated below

(1996:167)

Proposition 1: Tourist industry in a peripheral economy will occur either
by demand from overseas tourists or from foreign investments, but not
from demands from within the region.

Proposition 2. Since foreign companies are important in defining what
constitutes a tourist product, tourist services in a peripheral destination are
likely to be owned and provided by these firms.

Proposition 3. Capital accumulation in such an industry will be from petty
producers, to local dominant sector enterprises, and ultimately overseas to
foreign tourism corporations.

Propositions 4. The key processes within the industry is being
concentrated into the hands of metropolitan tourism capital – as evident in
the sphere of airline, cruise ship, travel, hotel and tour operations -
monopolistic organizations.

Proposition 5. Most peripheral destinations were previously integrated into
the international economy to provide supplies of raw material
commodities to colonial powers.

Proposition 6. The inclusion of the third world destinations into the
international tourism industry is associated with spatial patterns of the
transport networks.

Thus, peripheral economies with appropriate networks are most likely to be incorporated
into the international tourism trade. The dominance of foreign owned corporations in the
industry, therefore, imposes a development mode in the developing regions that
reinforces the various aspects of a dependent-development (Britton 1996). Consequently,
most of the economic advantages in these cases go to the local and foreign elites. The
local population only participates through wage labor or petty enterprises. Thus, it is
important to create local linkages to spread the benefits of growth in social, sectoral, and
Brohman argues that when nations focus only on increasing trade or tourism is a concern for broader developmental goals of raising the living standards of the people. In order to determine the effects of the outward-oriented growth on the overall development, Brohman argues that the following could determine the linkages:

1. The extent of linkages to the domestic economy;
2. The creation of employment and value-added;
3. The effect of external accounts and balance of payments;
4. The fostering of genuine and appropriate technology and relocation;
5. The generation of jobs for skilled labor as well as local managers, technicians, and other highly trained personnel;
6. The establishment of favorable wages and working conditions relative to those prevailing in the country (Brohman 1996:52).

In contrast, most tourism sectors in the developed regions are better linked to their local economies and have lower foreign exchange leakage ratios (Harrison 1992; Weaver 1988).

Despite an upward trend in international tourism in the recent years, the developed nations continue to dominate the area. Though tourism figures indicate a rise in international tourism in the developing nations, economic development has been uneven. This uneven development has been attributed to the fact that most tourism-related activities have been the monopoly of a few nations. In addition, tourism studies have also indicated that lower multiplier effects have been associated with the developing nations – where large-scale, tourism complexes are foreign-owned (Pearce 1989).
Furthermore, tourism has reinforced the core-periphery structure of the traditional plantation economy. A study of the spatial organization of tourism in Fiji found that patterns of colonial development were reinforced by the tourism industry.

A discussion of the literature on tourism reveals the near absence of empirical research in the area. The empirical literature on volume of tourism suffers from several shortcomings. First, there are very few empirical studies on volume of tourism such as pollution and social problems associated with tourism in developing countries. Recent studies on tourism volume focus more on the relationship between tourism and sustainability, and pay very little attention to the determinants of tourism in developing nations. Second, very few studies have attempted to examine tourism volume in developing nations using a multivariate framework. A large proportion of the current literature on tourism volume is descriptive and undertakes only univariate analysis of tourism data. Finally, there is little if any attention paid to the development of sociological models of tourism volume in developing countries. Empirical studies on tourism volume have examined the association of a number of selected demographic, economic and political variables but fail to provide a theoretical justification for the variables used in the studies.

Thus, most recent studies on tourism have adopted approaches that have been mainly descriptive, and very few studies have of tourism have adopted approaches that are empirical in nature. Other approaches have emphasized on the “sustainable” tourism aspect as a means of development (Brohman 1996, Smith and Eadington 1992). The political economy approach has tended to use the modernization versus dependency approach to study tourism and development in developing nations. Leheny (1995),
Sinclair, Alizadeh, Antieno and Aononga (1992), and Sinclair and Stabler (1991) have used political economy approaches (Clancey 1999). While there has been a plethora of studies using the dependency approach, hardly any have used the world systems approach to study tourism in developing nations, or even if used, it is used in conjunction with other theories to study tourism in developing nations. Therefore, the present study is an empirical study, to study factors influencing tourism volume.
CHAPTER III

MODELING INTERNATIONAL TOURISM

While mass tourism is a modern phenomenon, and can be growth inducing, haphazard planning has created problems for most nations, it has been especially detrimental for the developing nations. Most research on tourism has tended to focus on the economic aspect of tourism and has not adequately dealt with various theoretical issues. While we might be aware of some of the factors that prompt tourists to choose certain destinations, and avoid others, there have not been many empirical studies to this effect.

Studies on international tourism have indicated several factors that might be responsible for the rise of certain favorite tourist sights, but there have been no studies that have empirically isolated the factors that contribute to the volume of tourists. The volume of tourism, as the literature has indicated, is closely related to economic considerations with respect to the development and improvement of infrastructures necessary to sustain tourism. As the volume of tourism increases, the contact and interactions between the local and tourist populations increase. The contact and interactions between the hosts and tourist populations can generate conflict. From this perspective the volume of tourism can be essentially seen as a process that involves competition for jobs, and scarce environmental resources such as air and water. The world systems approach based on the conflict perspective provides the general
framework for this study. Within this frame, a number of theories such as the core-periphery and modernization provide a general explanation of tourism volume.

World Systems Theory

The world systems approach drawing from the Marxian tradition, argues that within the global economy there exists a division of labor, which divides global regions into a core region of states and a peripheral region of states. The central tenet of the world systems perspective rests on the relationship between the core and the periphery. These are geographically different regions that specialize in capital intensive and labor-intensive production. The terms, core and periphery refer to two kinds of participants in international commerce. First, nations that export manufactured goods form the core. And, second, nations that export agricultural and extractive goods form the periphery. While both groups of nations need each other to exist, peripheral regions are in a more dependent position since they depend on core nations for help.

According to the dependency school, especially Cardoso (1973), who acknowledges the fact the industrialization has taken place within the peripheral regions, argues that peripheral states are in the midst of what he considers as an “associated-dependent development” process. According to Cardoso these new trends in international capitalism are taking place through multinational corporations (MNCs). These MNCs help foster development in the new states, since it is in their best interests, and in that sense they promote development. This is another form of colonialism that of economic imperialism, according to which the basic relationship between a developed capitalist nation and an underdeveloped nation is one of extractive exploitation that perpetuates
stagnation. Merhav (1969) argues that in peripheral capitalism where the developmental process involves the transfer of technology from core to periphery creates structures suitable for growth of commercial monopolies.

Monopolization is the most immediate result of industrial growth, and induces conditions in which price competition, freedom of entry, constant returns to scale, all the fundamental prerequisites for the classical process of continual growth in a private enterprise system, do not exist from the outset (Merhav 1969:6). The endless accumulation of capital, according to the world systems perspective, is carried out through “commodification” (activities that are related to production, exchange, saving, or borrowing - as part of market operations). The on-going commodification process has commodified essential components of production, such as labor. In addition, the endless accumulation of capital has resulted in the formation of commodity chains, the emergence of monopolizing non-specialized capitalists functioning as the anti-markets, and the development of unequal exchange between core and periphery (Wallerstein 1995). Thus the core-periphery exchange is in many ways a spatial phenomenon.

The “unequal exchange” results due to the role of state machinery. The stronger the state machinery, the more it has the ability to distort or capture the international market. It is the political rules that make the transfer of capital across boundaries easier and thus profitable to the core production owners. The peripheral status of developing nations has historical origins in the experience of colonialism. The colonies were connected to the core colonizing nations in such a way that the core imposed on the colonies forms of production, social organization and trading patterns designed to meet the economic and political growth of the core nations (Amin, 1974; Frank, 1978). One of
the consequences of this imposition is that developing nations that constitute the
periphery have only been able to develop capitalist and non-capitalistic forms of
production under the domination of the core nations. These enterprises profit from the
fact that the labor costs in the periphery is very low compared to the labor costs in the
core nations.

The relationship between the core and periphery nations is structured by a well-
designed division of labor in a global system of production and consumption. The core
and periphery can be regarded as specialized "sectors", performing different functions, in
one global system dominated by the developed nations (Wallerstein, 1972: 2). The
dominant position of the core within the structure of production is indicated by the
specialized commodity production under taken by the periphery and in the regulation of
capital, human and technology flows to the periphery from the core nations. This occurs
because of the presence of large multinational companies in the core nations with huge
capital outlays. They are capable of controlling social and economic conditions in the
periphery conducive to the generation and transfer of capital from the periphery. To the
core nations the division of labor in the global system of production is thus unequal and
in favor of the development of the core nations. In the periphery, small groups of elites
manage and control the production process to the satisfaction of the core economies.
These pressure groups, through their close association with dominant local political and
commercial classes, are able to encourage political decisions over economic policy;
commercial practices and labor legislation consistent with their interests (Frank, 1972;
The presence of the core-periphery has implications for the tourism industry. The control, management and organization of the global tourist industry rest with the core nations. The demand for tourist dollars in the periphery nations creates alliances between the tourist organizations in the core and a group of elites in the developing nations who wield social, political and economic power. Consequently, the provision of infrastructure, the orientation of administrative services and the passing of licensing, labor and marketing regulations all proceed in accordance with the mandates from the tourist organizations in the core nations. The organization of productive forces in the periphery in favor of capital accumulation by the core set of nations, restricts the growth of entrepreneurial activities in the periphery. As mentioned earlier, the distortions in the periphery economy leads to the marginalization of local tourism enterprises. This in turn reduces the ability of local entrepreneurs to manager and guide the growth of tourism industry in the periphery. As tourists arrive, a proportion of the tourist dollars spent in developing nations are funneled back to the core economies from where the tourists arrive.

Within the periphery, control over pricing and franchising rights of tourist goods and sold by petty entrepreneurs is owned by tourist corporations in the core. Complete control over tourist activity by the core in the periphery is achieved by setting up hierarchies of tourism organizations. Despite the fact that the core controls the development of the tourism industry in the periphery, coordination between the core and periphery in terms of the management of tourism is likely to increase the flow of tourists argues the world system theory. Thus, as the core-periphery relationship intensifies, the flow of tourists to developing nations is likely to increase.
Therefore, the first hypothesis is as follows;

H1: The greater the influence of the core on the periphery, the greater will be the volume of tourism.

Modernization Theory

Part of the 19th century Enlightenment project was the emphasis on "progress" or evolution of society - from an imperfect, unequal world to a more equal world. The modernization project was in several ways a reflection of this idea. Rostow's "Stages of Economic Growth" (1960) is an expression of this ideology, where societies could develop by going through certain stages of development. The stages that Rostow wrote about were related to Great Britain's stages of development as a modern industrialized nation. The process of modernization has been described as the total transformation of a traditional or pre-modern society into the types of technology and associated social organization that characterize the 'advanced' economically prosperous and relatively politically stable nations of the western world" (Moore 1974:94).

According to theories of social change, flow of goods and services between nations contribute to modernization of societies. Tourism as a phenomenon of temporary movement of people, often from developed to developing nations can be examined from the perspective of the modernization theory. Non-modern or traditional societies are composed of traditional and transitional societies. The traditional and the modern societies are the two ends of a continuum, while transitional societies are referred to, as developing societies are neither modern nor traditional.
Modernization theories suggest a number of differences that are ideological, structural and psychological between modern and non-modern societies (Parsons 1949; Kahl 1968; Sjoberg 1964; Huntington 1968). In the traditional, joint and extended families bear the burden of socialization of the young. The young are socialized into being responsible for the family and the collective unit such as the clan. The social structure of modern societies is based on an extensive network of social, economic and political groups associated with the state. Modern capitalist society generates enormous surpluses through industry, manufacturing and services activities. These accumulated surpluses are often reinvested to generate more capital resulting in high standards of living.

Modernization requires creation of specialized institutions. Modernization theorists claim that this process occurs in phases, through which all societies pass. Modernization considerably influences the transition of developing economies into economy types found in Western Europe. Furthermore, traditional values are replaced by the contemporary values. This process of transition, from traditional to a more contemporary form of social order, is an irreversible process. However, the proponents of modernization believe that modern nations have a crucial role to play in this process of transition. They further suggest that in order to improve the developing economies, the local elite of the developing nations have to be educated and socialized to help in this transformation. The advanced societies would help by advising the local elites on political reforms, technical expertise, and help begin the industrialization process.

Largely as a result of technological progress, the industrialized and the industrializing nations now have large urban populations. Growth of urban centers in developing nations has led to an increase in social and economic problems. The rise of
bureaucracies in urban areas is linked with the modernization process (Weber 1927). As nations change from pre-modern to modern societies, technological advancement will create more rational and efficient organizations. Therefore, among developing nations levels of bureaucratization also indicate levels of the development. Weber argues that increase in education, technological advancement, increased specialization, and a rational approach to life has led to the organization of rational and efficient organizations. Highly developed nations tend to have higher levels of bureaucratization - indicating a more organized society.

The political organization of traditional societies are often dominated by either charismatic leaders or persons chosen by virtue of their high ascriptive roles. By contrast, the political structure of modern societies is governed by ideologies of socialism, democracy and nationalism that stress the value of participation by citizens. Modernization theorists have also identified a number of psychological and behavioral dispositions that characterize the personality of a modern person (Huntington 1968). Therefore, in modern societies the political structure is characterized by the centralization of the administrative organs of the state, and close interaction between the state and the citizens.

The modernization theory also makes several ideological assumptions about the nature of development. Perhaps the most important assumption is related to the fact that transformation from traditional to modern society cannot be achieved without technological and institutional assistance from the already developed societies. The disintegration of the traditional structures is to be followed by the reintegration process into a modern economy. The knowledge acquired by the developed societies is expected
to help transitional societies reduce the cost of unguided transition into a modern society. An essential strategy for this cost reduction is found in the supply of modern social and scientific technical know how. The flow of goods, services, and technical knowledge is believed to be essential for the process of modernization. The flow of tourists is seen as an essential component of the flow of technology from the modern to traditional economies.

As developing societies become more modern, tourists are more likely to plan, and be able to predict the course of events that constitute the tourist experience. Being able to experience and understand other cultures without abandoning the modern values is likely to increase the number of tourist arrivals, especially from developed nations.

In sum, modernization theory suggests that several notable differences exist between modern and traditional societies. These differences are likely to converge over time, due to the on going modernization influences. However, the transition to a modern society is likely to require financial, technological and organizational inputs from the already modernized societies. For this reason, the flow of people and goods from the modern to the traditional is believed to be desirable and needed for the successful transition from traditional to the modern. As societies become more and similar, tourists from modern (developed) nations are more likely to enjoy and interpret the culture and environments of the developing societies within the value framework of the modern societies. Based on the above arguments, the following hypotheses are developed.

H2: The higher the level of modernization of the host nation, the higher will be the volume of tourism.
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Modernization theory focuses on the transition of traditional societies to modern societies. While traditional societies have been associated with values frequently associated with Durkheim’s (1964) description of “mechanical solidarity”, modern societies espouse values that are related to individualism, and other aspects of “organic solidarity”. The intense transaction between the core and the periphery leads to the development of efficient organizations such as education and modern media. These organizations promote the development of social, political and economic institutions that promote the diffusion of modern values and modern ways of living. In general then, as the core – periphery relationships intensify, the process of modernization in the developing nations is hastened.

H3: The greater the influence of the core on the periphery, the higher will be the level of modernization.

Push- Pull Theory

According to the push-pull theory, some people move because they are pushed out of their own location, other move because they are pulled or attracted to another place. Ravenstein (1889) concluded that pull factors were important than push factors. Oppressive laws, high taxes, bad climate and uncomfortable surroundings do induce people to migrate, but the volume of migration which "arises from the inherent desire in most men to better themselves in material aspects" is far greater. Thus factors that might push a person to migrate might be labeled as stress or strain. But, it is rare for people to migrate solely due to stress factors.
Most motivational studies in tourism highlight the fact that the average tourist is seeking an escape from reality. For the recreation-seeking tourist, the people and landscapes that the tourist encounters are not part of tourist’s "real world". Like other recreational settings, they are "finite provinces of meaning" separate from reality (Cohen 1997:95). According to the functionalist view then, recreation tourism is caused by the "pull" factors from the tourist's own society. This recreation has value of reinventing the individual. Some of the most famous tourist sites include the French Polynesian island of Tahiti, Bali, and the Caribbean. Individuals seeking to change their life, albeit only temporarily from reality, have the option of choosing a site that meets their standards, and are attracted towards certain places because of what it has to offer. Thus pull factors are important in determining the destination for a tourist. Traditionally, Europe draws the most crowds, but in the recent years, Middle-East, Africa and the Pacific Rim have been drawing the tourists, due to several unique attractions, that are cultural, physical and social. Based on these suggestions, the following hypothesis is proposed.

H4: The higher the level of pull factors, the higher the volume of tourism.

A model for Volume of Tourism is presented in Figure 1. (All figures follow page 121).
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Several studies on international tourism have analyzed factors that have contributed to the rise of tourism in developing countries. As indicated earlier there has been a steady increase in tourism volume during the last decade. This study examines the determinants of volume of tourism in developing nations. It investigates the role of selected socio-economic variables on the volume of tourism. In general, it is proposed that three social dimensions, modernization, nature of the relationship with the core nations, and pull factors influence the volume of tourism in developing countries. The three proposed social dimensions are latent factors. The model suggested in this study specifies the theoretical linkages between the three proposed independent latent factors and the dependent variable, volume of tourism. The test of the model involves the estimation of the strength and direction of the hypothesized causal paths.

Operationalization of Variables

Cohen (1996) classifies “travelers of pleasure” according to the kind of experience they seek. The “recreational” tourist seeks experiences that have a rejuvenating effect. Modern forms of tourism, especially what has been referred to as mass tourism, caters to Cohen’s “recreational” type tourist. It is this category of tourists that forms the core of this study. The World Tourism Organization (WTO) has defined tourism as travel for reasons other
than obtaining incomes with at least one overnight stay abroad. The WTO has three categories of tourists by purpose of visit (in thousands), in the following groups;

1. Leisure, recreation and holidays
2. Business and professional
3. Other – which includes visiting friends and relatives, health treatment, religion/pilgrimages.

This study uses the first category – that is visitors who have declared their purpose of visit as leisure. The dependent variable of the study is the number of tourist arrivals who belong to the category of leisure and recreation in a given developing country per thousand population. Data for leisure tourism were obtained from World Tourism Organization (1998). The latest data available on volume of tourism are for year 1997. Nations for which data for 1997 were not available, the study used data for the most recent year available, provided that the data were not for any year prior to 1996.

Modernization, World System and Push-Pull theories are used as a framework to analyze the factors affecting the volume of tourism.

To test the first hypothesis, related to the world system theory, the study uses Wallerstein’s definition (1974) of a world system. The world system according to Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) is an intersocietal system marked by a self-contained division of labor, with no overarching world state. The modern capitalist world economy is politically organized as a system of competing and unequally powerful states. Though later theorists have developed different aspects of this theory, this study uses Wallerstein’s definition of the world system.
The core-periphery world order is indicated by several factors. One of them is international trade. The neo-classical theory of export-led growth has shaped the development of policies of the World Bank. According to the World Bank’s 1987 “World Development Report”, “rapid growth and efficient industrialization were usually associated with outward-oriented [export-led growth] policies of trade” (World Bank, 1987:92). The neo-classical/World Bank thesis of growth has been supported by various empirical research (Salvatore & Hatcher 1991; Dollar 1990; Moschos 1989; Ram 1987, 1985; Krueger 1980; Tyler 1981; Kavoussi 1984). All these studies have concluded that exports lead to superior economic performance (Yaghmaian 1994).

Bornschier (1981) argues that with the spread of multinational corporations, the core-periphery thesis has undergone a twist – that there is a new form of hierarchy. While the core specializes in control over capital, technology, innovation processes, the periphery is engaged in standardized and routinized production either for the domestic or the world market. This, according to Bornschier is “dependent-industrialization”. The major link between the core and the periphery, according to Bornschier, are multinational corporations – which are linked to the internal division of labor. Since dependent-industrialization relies on prior income concentration, it tends to intensify earlier inequality. Bornschier (1981) operationalizes this core-periphery relationship using foreign direct investment. While there are different measures that can be used to measure the world system approach, this study has mainly used economic measures, relying on Wallerstein’s definition. The study uses the following indicators to measure world systems; export, net trade and foreign direct investment. It is these indicators that adequately meet the criteria as defined by Wallerstein. Data for these variables were
obtained from the World Bank (1997). Exports of goods and services (percentage of GDP) represent the value of all goods and other market services provided to the rest of the world. They include the value of merchandise, freight, insurance, transport, travel, royalties, license fees, and other services, such as communication, construction, financial, information, business, personal and government services. They exclude labor and property income as well as transfer payments. According to the world systems approach, nations are connected with each other through trade, and what nations export often determines their position in the world economy. Export data for all countries, for the year 1997 were obtained from the World Bank.

Net trade in goods and services (BoP) is derived by offsetting imports of goods and services against exports of goods and services. Exports and imports of goods and services comprise all transactions involving a change of ownership of goods and services between residents of one country and the rest of the world. As nations trade with each other, nations in the periphery are more likely to incur higher costs by way of import, than exports. Nations in the periphery are more likely to import technical know-how, while exporting mainly agricultural goods. Data for the variable, for the year 1997, were obtained from the World Bank.

Foreign Direct Investment is defined as net flows as percentage of GDP: Foreign direct investment is net flows of investment to acquire a lasting management interest (10 percent or more voting stock) in an enterprise operating in an economy other than of the investor. It is the sum of equity capital, reinvestment of earnings, other long-term capital, and short-term capital as shown in the balance of payments. Studies have shown that
foreign direct investment leads to the development of the economy in the periphery, as well as transfer of technical knowledge.

The second and the third hypotheses are related to the Modernization theory. Modernization, according to Huntington is a multifaceted process that involves changes in “all aspects of human thought and activity” (1968:32). The principal aspects of modernization, “urbanization, industrialization, secularization, democratization, education, media participation do not occur in haphazard and unrelated fashion” (Lerner 1958:438 in Huntington 1968). Over time the level of economic well-being increases and economic inequalities decrease. The emergence of tourism is also related to societal changes that herald its onset. These changes are also related to increased welfare and social programs aimed at uplift of society in general. Using this definition as the starting point for analyzing the effects of modernization, the indicators used to measure modernization are human development index, urbanization, people employed in the service sector and gross domestic product (Pillai & Wang 1999).

Urbanization is the midyear population of areas defined as urban in each country and reported to the United Nations. It is measured here as a percentage of the total population. As societies modernize, there is an increase in urban areas – which become centers of education and change. Data for urbanization, for 1997 were obtained from the World Bank (World Development Indicators).

Service sector is measured by percentage of the population employed in the service sector. People employed in the service sector, is also an indication of the development of bureaucratic organizations. One of the key issues involved in transition of societies from traditional to more contemporary forms of social order is the presence
of bureaucratic organizations and the people employed in this economic sector. Data for this variable were gathered from the Central Intelligence Agency Fact book, 1998.

The Human Development Index developed by the United Nations is a new measure of development – by combining indicators of longevity, knowledge and standard of living into a composite human development index. Longevity is measured by life expectancy, Knowledge is measured by a combination of adult literacy (2/3 weight) and mean years of schooling. Standard of living is measured by purchasing power, based on real GDP per capita adjusted for the local cost of living (purchasing power parity). The HDI sets a minimum and maximum for each dimension and shows where each country stands in relation to these scales – that is expressed as a value between 0 and 1. A high index indicates a high level of development. Increased technical knowledge has led to an increase in life expectancy and associated standard of living, which is again an indicator of modernization. This indicator also takes into consideration the social aspects of development. The index for the year 1997 was used.

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita based on purchasing power parity (PPP). GDP PPP is gross domestic product converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the U.S. dollar in the United States. GDP measures the total output of goods and services for final use occurring within the domestic territory of a given country, regardless of the allocation to domestic and foreign claims. Gross domestic product at purchaser prices is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for
depletion and degradation of natural resources. The residency of an institution is determined on the basis of economic interest in the territory for more than a year. Tourism receipts are considered as a component of the GDP. However, these receipts are often less than ten percent of a nation’s GDP. Data for this variable for the year 1997 was obtained from the World Bank.

The fourth hypothesis is related to the push-pull theory. Tourism can also be defined as a form of leisure of migration. While most studies on tourism have focussed on the consequences, leisure migration affects social life by “exerting influence on those groups of the society which participate in it, by transforming the societies which it penetrates, and by sustaining the tourism industry, the institutional channel of leisure flows” (Borocz 1996:9). The pull factors are related to social and economic incentives found in any given country that has a tourism sector. The development of a tourism industry is closely related to the infrastructure development and the ability to accommodate a large volume of leisure and commercial travelers (Wang 2000). One of the most important aspects of capitalism is productivity- which facilitates flow of commodities, people and capital. Transport, communication, and travel are important elements of this system. Therefore, for increased production and exchange, it becomes important to develop facilities and infrastructure for tourism to develop. The indicators used to measure the pull factors are heritage, language, number of rooms and the consumer price index. A number of studies have used factors such as heritage, language, number of rooms and consumer price index as pull factors with regard to tourism in developing nations.
Consumer price index reflects changes in the cost to the average consumer of acquiring a fixed basket of goods and services that may be fixed or changed at specified yearly intervals. Tourists from developed nations are more likely to visit developing nations, due to the exchange rate. A good exchange rate is likely to give a better value for their money, and would be an attractor.

Heritage is one of the variables used to measure pull factor. The World Heritage Commission, of the UNESCO, defines a heritage site as “a cultural monument could be a masterpiece of creative genius, or have exerted great architectural influence, or be associated with ideas or beliefs of universal significance, or it may be an outstanding example of a traditional way of life that represents a certain culture.” A natural site may exemplify major stages of the earth's history, or represent ongoing ecological and biological processes, or contain the natural habitats of endangered animals, or it may be a scene of exceptional beauty. According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Heritage Convention, "cultural heritage" is a monument, group of buildings or site of historical, aesthetic, archaeological, scientific, ethnological or anthropological value. "Natural heritage" designates outstanding physical, biological, and geological features; habitats of threatened plants or animal species and areas of value on scientific or aesthetic grounds or from the point of view of conservation. Nations that have been included on this list have been coded one, others have been coded as zero. Data for the year 1997 were obtained from UNESCO’s World Heritage site.

Language is used to measure pull factors. Since the study is examining the flow of tourists from core countries to peripheral regions, the language spoken in the host country is an added attraction. Therefore, host nations that use English or French are more likely
to have a higher volume of tourists as compared to host nations where these languages are not spoken. Therefore, countries where English and French are spoken have been coded as one, while others have been coded as zero. Data were obtained from the CIA fact book for the year 1998.

Accommodation forms an important part of pull factors. For the study, data on accommodation was collected from the World Tourism Organization (1998), and is an index of hotel rooms available and the number of bed-places. According to the WTO, the number of rooms refers to the total capacity in rooms of establishments offering accommodation available during peak period of the tourist season. Data refer to the entire country. The number of bed-places, refers to the total capacity in bed-places of establishments offering accommodation available during peak period of the tourist season, and data refer to the entire country. Absence or presence of adequate accommodation facilities would definitely attract people to certain destinations.

Sources of data
To test the hypotheses presented in this study, data from a number of national and international organizations are collected. Data for the study pertain to years 1995-1998. A list of all the sources for each of the variables in this study is presented in Table 3. The focus of this study is on volume of tourism in developing countries. World Bank’s (1998) definition of the term ‘developing countries’ is used in this study. The countries chosen are based on the World Bank definition of low and middle-income economies. Low and middle-income economies are defined as those in which 1997 GNP per capita was $9,360 or less. The World Bank lists 156 economies, but American Samoa, Isle of
Man and Mayotte are dependencies, and so were not included in the list for analysis. Grenada was not included due to the fact that values for the dependant and independent variables were missing. Table 4 lists the low and middle-income countries used in this research.

Cross-national data often suffer from lack of data on a number of key variables. In this study, it is crucial to have data on the dependent variable, the "annual volume of tourism in developing countries". Out of the 151 developing countries considered in this study, data on the dependent variable were not available for 42 countries. A list of countries for which data are not available for the dependent variable, is presented in Table 5.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Missing Data Analysis.

Of the 151 countries, 42 countries had missing information. Countries with missing information on the ‘volume of tourism’ have been grouped into three categories:

(a) War-torn countries: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bosnia, Croatia, Lebanon, Liberia, Mozambique, Rwanda, Slovakia, Sudan, West Bank, Yugoslavia, Eritrea

(b) New Republics: Belarus, Czech Republic, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan; African Nations: Benin, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Djibouti

(c) Other: Argentina, Cape Verde, Ecuador, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Macedonia, Micronesia, Malta, Yemen

Nearly fifty percent of the countries for which no data on volume of tourism was reported were either war torn countries or new republics. Among the 109 countries for which data are available for the dependent variables, there was no data available for a number of independent variables.

Missing data present a number of problems. In dealing with missing data, two properties, the extent of data missing, and the causal factors associated with missing data, are considered. Cross-national studies in general do not consider missing data on less than twenty percent of the cases for an independent variable as serious. This is the case especially when the sample of countries considered is greater than 100 (Pillai and Wang
If data are missing for less than twenty percent of the cases for a variable, the missing data will be declared missing during data analysis. Of the twelve selected variables in the proposed model, five variables had more than 20 percent missing cases.

When data are not available due to systematic characteristics associated with the countries for which data are missing, the estimates derived from countries for which data are available are likely to suffer from bias. In addition, when data are missing for a large proportion of case, the distributional properties of the variable such as skewness and kurtosis are also affected. A number of independent variables considered in this study had more than 20 percent of the cases missing. Little and Rubin (1987) propose a procedure now known as Hot Decking to deal with missing data. This method is used in this study to impute data for variables with more than 20 percent of cases missing.

The Hot Decking procedure involves two types of variables. The first type is the Hot Decked variable, the variable being imputed. The second type consists of either a variable or a combination of variables (predictor variables) strongly associated with the hot decked variable. The predictor variables are often chosen on the basis of either theories that suggest strong substantive relationships, or on the basis of strong bivariate correlations with the hot-decked variable. Secondly, the predictor variables should have far fewer missing values than the hot decked variable. The five hot decked variables are Foreign Direct Investment, Gross Domestic Product, Export, Consumer Price Index and Accommodation.

In this study, the predictor variables were chosen on the basis of strong correlations with the hot decked variables. Hot Decking was accomplished using the well known Little-Reuben missing value imputation methods implemented by SOLAS, a
software widely used for missing data analysis. In order to ensure that values being imputed are reasonable and probable, the following methods were developed. First, I dropped randomly from the Hot Decked variable at least six known cases. Using the selected predictor variable(s), Hot Decking was implemented. The predicted values for six cases dropped were compared with the actual values. A combination of predictor variables that produced the smallest residuals were selected for Hot Decking. Following are the list of predictor variables chosen for the Hot Decked variables.

For the Hot Decked variable TSROOMS: Predictor Variables used are Population, Net Trade, Tourists (by Business), number of Bed-Places and index of Number of Rooms and Number of Bed-Places.

For the Hot Decked variable Foreign Direct Investment: Predictor variables used were Imports, Heritage, Foreign direct investment (percentage of gross capital formation).

For the Hot Decked variable Gross domestic Product: Predictor variables used were Human development Index, Percentage in Service Sector and Percentage of Urban Population.

For the Hot Decked variable Export: Predictor variables used were Trade, Import and Human Development Index.

For the Hot Decked variable Consumer Price Index: Predictor variables used were Foreign Direct Investment (percentage of gross capital form) and Human Development Index.

Data on all variables in the model are available for 89 countries. There are 20 countries with missing data. Data for these missing countries are imputed using the Hot
Decking procedure. As described earlier, it is found that Hot Decking procedure predicted accurate point estimates for missing values in the variables associated with 60 percent of the cases. Thus, it is suggested that the imputed values for the 20 countries are reliable in 60 percent of the cases (12 countries). In sum, I had full information on variables for 89 countries and reliable information for 12 additional countries. This produces reliable values for 101 countries (89+12) out of the 109 countries. The results of the Hot Decking procedure are presented in Tables 6A-6J. The dataset, thus, has 109 cases (nations) with the volume of tourism as the dependent variable and several independent variables.

Analysis

The model estimation is done in several stages. First, all the proposed indicators of the latent factors are described. Descriptive statistics, such as mean and median are used to describe the indicators. Structural modeling (EQS) is used to evaluate the empirical support for the proposed model. In order to assess the impact of Hot Decking on the distributional properties of the independent variables considered in this study, it is necessary to examine the distributional properties of all the variables before and after the implementation of Hot Decking. Data analyses are conducted using variables that have been imputed with estimated values using the Little and Rubin (1987) method.

The first stage of the analysis will focus on description of volume of international tourism, that of leisure tourism (different from business tourism). Descriptive statistics such as the mean, median, mode and coefficient of variation will be presented to describe the aggregate properties as well as the extent of variation in each of the international
tourism in developing countries. The objective of the descriptive analysis is to determine the aggregate levels of the correlates of volume of tourism in the developing countries. The aggregate properties of the variables are examined using frequency distribution, histograms, descriptive statistics, normality and scatter plot. The developing countries will be categorized into geographical regions such as Asia and Africa. Measures of central tendencies for volume of tourism for each of the regions is also estimated. The variations in these regional measures for central tendency for all developing countries as a whole will provide preliminary indication of regional disparities that exist in the volume of tourism.

In the second stage of analysis, a number of steps are taken to assess the distributional properties of each of the indicator variables in the model. These distributional properties can be assessed using simple histograms for each of the variables as well by examining the frequency distribution of each indicator variable. The aggregate properties of the variables are examined using frequency distribution, histograms, descriptive statistics, normality and scatter plots.

Histograms and box plots: Histograms use bars to represent the frequency, proportion, or percentage of cases associated with each outcome or interval of outcomes of a variable. They also identify the properties of frequency distribution. Box plots identify the median of the distribution. If the median is not in the center of the box, the observed values are skewed. If the median is closer to the bottom of the box than the top, data are positively skewed. If the median is closer to the top than the bottom, data are negatively skewed. The length of the box indicates the extent of the spread or variability of the observations. The degree of normality of distribution of a given variable is
assessed by determining the degree of conformity to an ideally distributed variable. In a normally distributed variable about 68.27 percent of the cases are included between one standard deviation on each side of the mean; 95.45 percent of the cases are included between two standard deviations on either side of the mean.

If the variable is found to be skewed, appropriate measures will be taken to remove the skewness. This is often done using any of a number of transformations such as square root and logarithm transformations. Yet another method is to obtain an ordinal level measure of the skewed variable using percentile ranking. The distributional properties of the variables after the transformation will be presented.

Correlation matrix of all the indicator variables will be examined to assess the strength of association among variables. If there are variables strongly associated these variables will be replaced by appropriate proxy variables for which data are available. If no proxy variables are available, one of the variables will be dropped.

A third approach toward describing the disparities in volume of tourism across regions and over time involves the use of Shift Share analysis techniques. One of the objectives of this study is to describe regional variations in international tourism. Shift Share analysis has been widely used as a technique to describe regional variations in socioeconomic phenomena. This technique partializes the change in volume of tourism over time into three components. Here, the change in leisure volume over a period of time is a function of base growth effect, compositional effect and relative share effect.

Total change overtime (1990-1997) in leisure volume of tourism = base growth effect + compositional effect + relative share effect.
The three components here are base growth effect, the composition effect, and the relative share effect. The base growth effect is that portion of the change in leisure volume of tourism in a given region that is attributable to the international growth in volume of tourism (including business tourism). The composition effect is that portion of a given regions' volume of tourism change over time that is attributable to the growth in volume of tourism (including business) at the international level over time. The relative share effect is a residual effect in the international volume of tourism changes over time left as a residual that is not captured by either base growth or compositional effects.

The fourth stage involves the implementation of multivariate techniques to assess the proposed model. The model proposes three distinct independent dimensions, modernization, core periphery relations and the push pull factors. First, confirmatory factor analysis will be used to assess the validity of the proposed dimension. EQS analysis will be implemented to achieve this goal. Second, structural equation analysis will be undertaken using EQS to assess the validity of the proposed model. The overall fit of the model as well as the strength of the effects of each of the latent independent dimensions, modernization, core-periphery and pull factors will be presented. These analyses will generate sufficient information to test the hypotheses proposed in this study. The following section is a discussion of the results of the empirical analysis, using the methods mentioned above.

Results

Hot Decked variables are likely to be normally distributed. Table 7 presents the results of the descriptive statistics for the variables before the application of the “Hot Decking”
procedure. Table 8 presents the descriptive statistics after the application of the Hot Decking procedure. Here we find that a good number of the variables display a high level of skewness and kurtosis. A perfect distribution occurs when the mean and the median coincide. But when the mean is greater than the median, the distribution is positively skewed. On examining Table 7, it is apparent that Leisure, Gross domestic product, Consumer price index, number of rooms, foreign direct investment, export and net trade are positively skewed. Variables that are negatively skewed are Human development index and percentage in service sector. Skewness and kurtosis are used to identify the distributional properties of any given variable. A positively skewed curve (longer tail to the right from the central maximum than to the left) indicates an asymmetrical frequency distribution in which larger frequencies are gathered together toward the negative end and smaller frequencies toward the positive end. In a negatively skewed distribution, where the longer end of the tail is toward the left from the central maximum, larger frequencies are found toward the negative end. Kurtosis measures the degree of peakedness of a distribution; leptokurtic or high peaked; platykurtic or flat-topped; and mesokurtic – which is not very peaked or flat-topped. Furthermore, a perfectly symmetrical distribution has the value 0, but in general its values must fall between –3 and 3 (Pearson’s coefficient of skewness). Variables that have the coefficient of skewness between –3 and +3 are; percentage employed in the urban sector, gross domestic product, human development index, heritage, export and language. The remaining variables have a high coefficient of skewness.

The dependent variable, volume of tourism, was modified by obtaining the natural log transformation of the variable, volume of tourism. To overcome the problem of
skewness, variables were transformed into percentiles – this would only change the variation, while retaining the properties. The variables - gross domestic product, human development index, foreign domestic investment, net trade and number of rooms, were transformed into percentile ranks. A new dependent variable was created by transforming the original leisure tourists into a logged variable. A list of all the variable in the proposed model, along with their labels, is presented in Table 9.

The Dependant Variable: The dependant variable, leisure tourists (number of tourists visiting a country with the aim of visiting or leisure) had a standard deviation of 2162, and a mean of 1030.9. The frequency distribution of leisure, which is positively skewed indicates an asymmetric distribution. To overcome this problem, the number of tourist arrivals by leisure per thousand population was modified by obtaining a natural log transformation of the variable. Figure 11 is a presentation of the variable after the log transformation, and shows a symmetric distribution. The descriptive statistics for the transformed dependant variable shows a more normal distribution, with a mean of 1.21 and a median of 1.13.

Percentage living in urban areas (URBPOP): has a mean of 47.16, median 46.10. In a perfect distribution, the mean and the median should coincide, and here as the histogram (Figure 2) shows, it is more of a normal distribution. Gross domestic product (GDP) has a mean of 4013, median is 3216, and is positively skewed. The variable after transformation (TGDP) has a mean of 5.51, and median 5 (Figure 3). The human development index (HDI) had a mean of 0.649 and a median of 0.707, and negatively skewed. The histogram for the transformed variable (THDI) indicates a mean of 5.26 and a mean of 5 – a more regular distribution (Figure 4). The variable, consumer price index
The correlation matrix (Table 10) indicates that the relationship between the variables is
within the range of 0.50. Some variables indicated a high correlation coefficient. A
correlation of 0.75 demonstrates a stronger association than a correlation of 0.50
(Frankfort -Nachmias and Leon Guerrero, 2000). Most of the variables indicate a strong
measure of relationship.
Shift Share Analysis

One of the objectives of this study is to describe regional variations in international tourism in developing nations. Shift Share analysis has been widely used as an analytical technique to describe regional variations in socio-economic phenomena. This technique has been widely used to describe changes in composition of selected characteristics over time. In this study, Shift Share analysis is used to describe the changes in the spatial, temporal and social composition of leisure tourism in developing countries during 1990 and 1997. Consider as an example the case of Asia, where the base growth effect is that portion of the change in the number of Asian leisure tourist arrivals that is attributable to the global growth in overall tourism levels. This portion of the growth would be the change in tourist arrivals that would occur in Asian tourist arrivals if it grew exactly at the same rate as that overall global tourism growth during the 1990-1997. A second component of growth is called composition effect. This is the share of the change in number of Asian leisure tourist arrivals that is attributable to the growth in the number of leisure tourist arrivals globally relative to the change in the number of tourist arrivals globally in other categories. The last component, the relative share effect, focuses on the changes in the number of tourist arrivals in Asia by categories such as leisure during 1990-1997. It is change in the number of leisure tourist arrivals in Asia attributable to the net shift of leisure tourist arrivals into or out of Asia relative to the shifts in all other regions in the world. It is calculated simply by subtracting the base growth effect and the composition effect from the total change in the tourist arrivals by categories such as leisure, in the Asian region. The sum of the composition effect and relative share effect for each category of tourist arrivals in Asia is referred to as the net relative change. This
is a measure of how the Asian levels of tourist arrivals changed net of the impact of the
Asia’s overall level change, the base growth effect. Net relative change measure can be
used to assess the Asia’s net gain or loss in terms of the number of leisure tourist arrivals.

Total change = base growth effect + composition effect + relative share
effect.

Net relative change = Total change - base growth effect.

Consider the results of the Shift Share analysis for Sub Saharan Africa in Table 11. If
leisure arrivals in the Sub- Saharan region had increased at a rate equal to that for all
tourist arrivals in developing countries, the number of tourists would have increased to
2,078,000. However, the actual increase was 5,256,000. Therefore, the number of tourist
arrivals in Sub Saharan region in 1997 over 1990 was not merely due to the overall
increase in tourist arrivals in developing countries. The overall increase in tourism levels
in developing countries would have only accounted for less than fifty percent of the
overall increase in leisure tourism in the Sub- Saharan region during 1990 and 1997.
Thus the base growth effect only accounts for less than 50 percent of the change in
leisure tourist arrivals. There are two other competing sources of this increase in leisure
tourist arrival in Sub-Saharan Africa during 1990- 1997. One source is a tendency for
either a shift away from or into leisure tourism. This would occur when there is a change
in the composition of the types of tourist arrivals, such as business. However, this shift in
composition would have only accounted for 232,000 of the overall increase of 4256,000.
This suggests that, the increase in leisure tourism was only in a very small measure due to
compositional changes in tourism. The relative share effect is however large. It is
approximately 1944,000. That is the Sub-Saharan region gained appreciably its share of all leisure tourist arrivals relative to other regions. This relative share effect accounts for nearly fifty percent of the change in leisure tourist arrivals in Sub-Saharan Africa during 1990-1997. Thus, growth in the Sub-Saharan region in general was driven by both base growth effect and relative share effect.

The reasons for the increase in relative share of volume of tourism in Sub-Saharan Africa as compared to the rest of the world are not well known. Any explanation can only be speculative. Africa’s abundance in wild life and natural resources has attracted a large number of tourists who can be categorized as eco-tourists. Not only did the Sub-Saharan region gain from the overall increase in leisure tourist arrivals during the last decade, but also, the Sub-Saharan region became more of an attractive destination for leisure tourist arrivals.

If leisure arrivals in the South Asian region had increased at a rate equal to that for all tourist arrivals in developing countries, then the number of leisure tourists would have increased to 989,000. Results of the Shift Share analysis for South Asia are presented on Table 12. However, the actual increase was 1169,000. Therefore, the number of tourist arrivals in South Asia in 1997 over 1990 was mostly due to the overall increase in tourist arrivals in developing countries. The overall increase in tourism levels in developing countries accounts for approximately 86 percent of the overall increase in leisure tourism in the South Asian region during 1990 and 1997. Thus the base growth effect accounts for about 86 percent of the change in leisure tourist arrivals. There are two other competing sources of increase in leisure tourist arrival in the South Asian region during 1990-1997. One source is a tendency for either a shift away from or into
leisure tourism. This would occur when there is a change in the composition of the types of tourist arrivals, such as business. However, this shift in composition would have only accounted for 110,000 of the overall increase of 1169,000. This suggests that, the increase in leisure tourism in the South Asian region was only in a very small measure due to compositional changes in tourism. The relative share effect is also very small. It is approximately 68,000 tourist arrivals, out of the total change in leisure tourist arrivals amounting to 1169,000. Thus the South Asian region gained very little in terms of its share of all leisure tourist arrivals relative to other regions. This relative share effect accounts for nearly nine percent of the change in leisure tourist arrivals in South Asian region during 1990-1997. Thus, growth in the South Asian region was driven by a strong base growth effect. In general, the South Asian region failed to attract leisure tourists in any significant way as relative to other region in the developing world. A possible explanation for the absence of increase in leisure tourism can be attributed to political instability and unrest that has plagued the region for some time now.

Table 13 presents the Shift Share analysis for the East Asia Pacific region. If leisure arrivals in East Asia Pacific had increased at a rate equal to that for all tourist arrivals in developing countries, then tourist arrivals would have increased to 7522,000. However, the actual increase was 10218,000, more than the expected number. Therefore, the excess number of tourists arrivals in East Asia Pacific in 1997 over 1990 was not merely due to the overall increase in tourist arrivals in developing countries. The overall increase in tourism levels in developing countries would have only accounted for about 74 percent of the actual increase in leisure tourism in the region during 1990 and 1997. Thus the base growth effect only accounts for less than 75 percent change in leisure
tourist arrivals. The other two sources of competing sources of this increase in leisure tourist arrival in East Asia Pacific during 1990-1997 are composition, and relative share effects. In the case of East Asia Pacific, the shift in composition would have accounted only for 843,000 of the overall increase of 10218,000. This suggests that the increase in leisure tourism was only in a small measure due to compositional changes in tourism. The relative share effect is also moderate. It is approximately 1852,000, and indicates that the East Asia Pacific region gained only a minimal share of all leisure tourist arrivals relative to other regions. This relative share effect accounts for only 18 percent of the change in leisure tourist arrival in the region during 1990-1997. Thus, the growth in the region was driven mostly by base growth effect, that is increase in overall leisure tourist arrivals. Therefore, East Asia Pacific region gained from the overall increase in leisure tourist arrivals during the last decade.

The result of the Shift Share analysis for Central Asia is presented in Table 14. If leisure arrivals in this region had increased at a rate equal to that for all tourist arrivals in developing countries, this would have resulted in an increase of 18363,000. However, the actual increase in tourist arrivals was much less, 16945,000. Thus, Central Asia did not keep pace with the overall growth of tourism increase during 1990-1997. This deficit could be a result of either a shift away to other categories (business, religion, etc) of tourism. This trend would be indicated by compositional effect. The proportion of change in leisure tourism during 1990-1997 in Central Asia due to composition change appears to be moderate. The region would have gained only 2058,000 more tourists due to composition effect. The compositional effect only accounts for the 12 percent of the total change. The relative share effect though moderate, is negative. It is approximately -
3477,000, indicating that the region lost tourists relative to other regions. This relative share effect accounts for about twenty percent of the change in leisure tourist arrivals in the region during 1990-1997. Thus, growth in Central Asia was generally driven by base growth effect. In addition, there was a decline in leisure tourist arrivals in the region as compared to the rest of the regions of the world. Most Central Asian had not achieved sovereignty in 1990. While many more new nations had been born by 1997, most lacked basic infrastructure conducive to development of tourism. Furthermore, political unrest and civil wars in the region made matters worse – in terms of deflecting tourists to other regions.

Table 15 presents results of the Shift Share analysis for Latin America and the Caribbean. If leisure arrivals in this region had increased at a rate equal to that for all tourist arrivals in developing countries, then tourist arrivals would have increased by 7859,000. However, the actual increase was much less – 5395,000. Thus, Latin America did not keep pace with the overall growth of tourism increases during 1990-1997. This deficit could either be a result of either a shift away to other categories of tourism. This trend would be indicated by compositional effect. This proportion of change in leisure tourism during 1990-1997 in the region due to composition change appears moderate. The region would have gained only 881,000 more tourists. The compositional effect accounts for only16 percent of the total change. The relative share effect is strong but negative. It is approximately –3345,000. Therefore, Latin America lost a considerable share of its tourists when compared to all leisure tourist arrivals. This relative share effect accounts for about 42 percent of the change in leisure tourist arrivals for the region during 1990-1997. Thus, tourism growth in the region was driven mostly
by a base growth effect. In addition, there was a strong decline in leisure tourist arrivals in the region compared to the rest of the world regions. Among all the regions of the developing world considered in the study, Latin America appears to have lost the largest amount as compared to other regions due to a flight away from the region among leisure tourists during 1990-1997.

Table 16 presents the results of the Shift Share analysis for Middle East and North Africa. The leisure tourist arrivals that can be attributed to the base growth effect in the region was at 2152,000. However the actual increase in tourist arrivals was 5351,000. Thus Middle East and North Africa witnessed more tourist arrivals in 1997, which was not merely due to the overall increase in tourist arrivals in developing countries. The other two competing sources of increase in leisure tourism in the region are composition and relative share effects. The shift in composition accounted for only 241,000 of the overall increase of 5351,000. This suggests that the increase in leisure tourism was only in a very small measure due to compositional changes in tourism. The relative share effect is substantial - approximately 2957,000. When compared to other regions, the Middle East gained substantially. Thus, the Middle East and North African region gained substantially due to the base growth effect and the relative share effect.

In sum, while all regions gained from the base growth effect, Sub Saharan Africa and the Middle East registered strong relative share effect during 1990-1997. The negative growth in Central Asia and Latin American regions registered considerable decline in terms of relative share effect. The decline in the share of tourist volume in Central Asia and Latin America may be due to political instability in these regions.
Regression Analysis

A preliminary examination, by way of a regression analysis is conducted to find empirical support for the hypotheses. The results of the bivariate regression are presented in Table 17. Results indicate that of the eleven selected independent variables nine are significant at the .05 level. The cook’s distance statistics indicate that the results are not significantly influenced by the presence of outliers. Table 18 presents the results of the multivariate regression of volume of tourism in developing countries. Three variables - human development index (T=1.963), Service (T=3.630) and Accommodation (4.759) are significant.

Of the three significant variables, two are part of the modernization model, while accommodation is part of the Pull model. Since the variable, human development index is significant, the components of the index, literacy, life expectancy, education and development of bureaucratic structures are important indicators of volume of tourism. Secondly, infrastructure development – accommodation – also accounts for levels of volume of tourism.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The confirmatory factor analysis is a useful method for determining if the variables selected as indicators load on the appropriate latent dimensions as expected. The result of confirmatory factor analysis of the three proposed factors in the model of volume of tourism in developing countries is presented in Table 19. The three latent factors are Modernization, Core - Periphery and Pull factors. It is expected that these three factors will explain a high proportion of the variance in the variable measuring the volume of
tourism in developing countries. The four proposed indicators of modernization, percentage living in urban areas (URBPOP), human development index (THDI), percentage employed in the service sector (SERVICE), and gross domestic product (TGDP) load on the Modernization factor as expected. All the factor loadings are above 0.9. This provides support for the presence of construct validity for the concept of modernization. Furthermore, all the R-Squares are high, above 0.6. These results suggest that the four indicators of modernization used in this study have high level of reliability. High levels of reliability among the indicators, along with evidence of satisfactory levels of construct validity ensure that the requirement of developing good measures for the constructs in the model has been adequately satisfied in this study.

The three proposed indicators of core - periphery; net trade (TNWNETRA), export (EXPORT) and foreign direct investment (TFDI) load on the world systems factor as expected. All the factor loadings are above 0.8. This provides support for the presence of construct validity for the concept of world systems. Furthermore, all the R-Squares are high, above 0.8. These results suggest that the three indicators of world system used in this study are reliable.

The four proposed indicators of PULL are consumer price index (TCPI), accommodation (TSROOMS), core country language spoken in the developing regions (NEWLAN), and heritage (HERITAG). All the factor loadings are above 0.6. This provides support for the presence of construct validity for the concept of PULL. Furthermore, all the R-Squares are high, above 0.6. These results suggest that the four indicators of pull used in this study are reliable. Reliable indicators, along with evidence
of satisfactory levels of construct validity ensure that the requirement of developing good measures for the constructs in the model has been adequately satisfied in this study.

Structural Equation analysis is conducted to test all the hypotheses suggested in this study. Results of structural equation analysis are provided in Table 20. The endogenous variables are those variables that achieve the status of a dependent variable in the proposed model of volume of tourism in developing nations. The exogenous variables are the independent variables in the model. The confirmatory factor analysis or the structural equation model’s fit to the data can be assessed statistically. EQS generates goodness-of-fit measures that are functions of chi-square. The goodness-of-fit index (GFI) is the ratio between the minimum of the fitting function after the model is fitted to the fitting function before any model is fitted. The adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) takes into account the degrees of freedom used in estimating the parameters. Both indices range between 0 and 1, with values closer to 1 indicating a better fit of model to data. Most researchers seek values of 0.95 or higher (Knoke, Bohrnstedt & Mee 2002:421). The indices for the goodness-of-fit measures – all around 0.90 or higher–indicating a good fit of the model to data.

The direct effect of modernization on volume of tourism is positive and significant. The path coefficient is 1.516. This provides support to the hypothesis that core – periphery relationships contribute positively to the process of modernization. However, the hypothesis that as the interaction between core and periphery increased, the volume of tourism also increased was not supported. The direct effect of core - periphery on volume of tourism is positive, but insignificant at the .05 level of significance. The direct effect of pull factors on volume of tourism is negative and significant. The path
coefficient is -1.194. This result is contrary to the expected finding. It was hypothesized that the pull factors will have a positive and significant effect on the volume of tourism. The findings suggest the presence of a negative relationship.

In sum, of the four predicted relationships in the model, two were supported. The study found that modernization processes contribute to an increase in the volume of tourism, as also was the relationship between world systems and its contribution to modernization of nations. Of the remaining two, one yielded the expected relationship. This refers to the hypothesized relationship between the world system and the volume of tourism – where the results were as hypothesized, but not statistically significant. In the fourth case, the finding was unexpected. The pull factors while being statistically significant was negatively related to the volume of tourism.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Tourism has emerged as one of the most important business sectors around the globe. International tourism, specifically, had been seen as a factor contributing to the economic development of the peripheral regions of the world. This was based on the Eurocentric idea that the less developed nations were in an earlier phase of the developmental process, and had now only to catch-up with the rest of the developed world. Though some nations have been successful in this endeavor, others who followed suit failed.

Studying the volume of tourism has become increasingly important, in terms of tourism planning. It is quite obvious that if nations want to attract tourists while at the same time preserve the environment, it is important that governments actually plan the development of tourist resorts. The development of nations is also a function of the international political economy – where developing nations rely on the developed nations for technological aid. Furthermore, the attractiveness of a region adds to the pull of the region, thereby, drawing more tourists.

Perhaps one of the notable characteristics of the theoretical development in the field of tourism is the lack of explicit theoretical model development for empirical testing. The development of tourism industry during the last four decades provided impetus for the growth of theoretical research in a number of areas recognized as social
problems ensuing from the growth of tourism in developing countries. Research in this area has become closely associated with sustainability issues at the local and global level. The focus on sustainability emphasizes two distinct aspects of social problems, namely the local and global.

One important source of tourism related social problems, is the volume of tourism. Thus explanations of volume of tourism as an important proximate determinant of tourism related social problems such as intensification of existing social inequalities, environmental degradation and cultural conflict. Even though the role of volume of tourism is developing has for long been identified as a theoretically important concept in studying sustainability issues, very few empirical studies have attempted to investigate the correlates of volume of tourism.

Even though within the sustainability paradigm, two aspects, local and global have been viewed as interrelated, very few studies have examined the relationship between these two components in terms of its impacts on volume of tourism. In this study I have attempted to address these two major components, namely, the external or the global, and the internal or the local. The nature of the relationship between the external and the internal components of volume of tourism is examined in terms of three existing theories. The world system theory, which has its origins in the conflict theory, emphasizes the importance of the external influences on Volume of tourism. The modernization theory focuses on the internal development al processes with respect to growth of economic and social institutions. Finally the pull theory focuses on the attractions of cheap availability of goods and services without paying attention to the
development of social and economic institutions. Therefore, this study attempts to evaluate the empirical support for three theories of volume of tourism.

At a broad level, I have argued that core-periphery relations exert a certain amount of influence on the flow of tourists. This argument is based on the assumption that a large proportion of the exports from the developing countries flow to the developed countries. Therefore, the intensity of trade relations is likely to influence the inflow of tourists to developing nations. The second theory, modernization, argues that as the level of modernization in developing countries increases, tourism industry activities become both expansive and efficient resulting in improvement in volume of tourism. Lastly I have argued that tourists go to destinations where they can effectively communicate and enjoy exotic physical and cultural sites. These three explanations have been proposed as three competing explanations.

The World Systems Perspective

The rise of the world systems approach has coincided with the increasing knowledge that the modernization perspective had failed to explain the lack of development in certain regions of the world. As an alternative to studying modern social change, the world system approach, while drawing from the Marxist tradition, has incorporated various other ideas that seem to provide a way out for the underdeveloped regions. One of the major concepts of the world systems is the division of labor. This division of labor, according to Wallerstein is constituted of forces and relations of production of the world economy as a whole. In the current capitalistic mode of production, the world systems approach argues that core economic organizations have increasingly dominated
economies through corporations. The position of core nations, within the world system, changes relative to each other. This change occurs in response to competition. Even though the location of production may change, it still remains within the core areas. The periphery on the other hand has undergone social and political upheaval in their quest to become core-like economies. Though the peripheral nations maintained their independence, they continue to remain subordinate to the demands of the core. Since the periphery lacks the resources to implement their domestic policies, they participate in the world economy, at the terms of the core nations.

The effect of the international division of labor can be seen within the tourism industry. Since governments in the peripheral regions are dependent on core economies for their economic and political viability, the provision of infrastructure, financial aid and other similar forms of aid are in keeping with the core country requirements (Britton 1996). Britton’s enclave model discusses the dominance of core nations, where tourism development is seen as a component of the overall development process and a function of external factors. Furthermore, even though colonialism has ended in terms of political and military control over developing countries, new forms of control have emerged which are based on broad economic institutions. According to Britton (1996) tourism in a peripheral economy will occur only if there is a demand for it from overseas, and not when it is from within the peripheral region. In addition, only those peripheral economies will be incorporated within the international tourism trade which have appropriate economic networks. Thus, it is the dominance of foreign-owned companies that imposes a “dependent development” (Bornshier 1981). Despite the fact that international tourism
has increased over the past few decades, growth in these regions has been uneven, and has tended to reinforce the core-periphery structure of the traditional plantation economy.

Modernization Theory

Theorists have traced the growth of the process of modernization to the Enlightenment project, where progress and development was equated with education, secularism and rationalism. Modernization was also a very urban phenomenon – marked by rural to urban migration, industrialization and mechanization. The-now well-known Rostow’s stages of growth perspective identified five stages of development for the less developed nations to catch up with the industrialized nations.

Tourism studies have also used the various evolutionary models of development to study the impact of tourism on economic growth. While most studies have examined the impact of tourism on economic development, some studies (Thuot 1973; Miossec 1976; Butler 1980; Gormsen 1981) have analyzed the increase in volume of tourism and change in tourist types, as well as identified the different stages of tourism development. As a society starts on the process of economic development, the number of social classes participating in tourism increases. But it is the final stage of “high mass consumption” that all social classes can afford holiday travel (Schlenke and Stewig 1983). While this argument has been used for the development of domestic tourism, it explains equally well the development of international tourism, specially the flow of tourists from the developed world to the developing world.
Push-Pull approach

According to this theory different factors affect the motivations for moving – some people might move due to stress factors like famines, war, employment, while others move because of the attractiveness of the destination. It is the latter explanation used to analyze the reasons for volume of tourism. Tourists are more likely to visit places that have certain features that attract them. Some of the features that might attract visitors, as international tourists are basic accommodation, presence of heritage sites, whether core country language is spoken and the consumer price index.

The study used Cohen’s (1972) first typology of a tourist, the recreational tourist. Various studies have used the concept of the “recreational” tourist, and is based on the degree tourists seek novelty or familiarity in their travel. Tourists are often treated as a homogenous category, which is misleading. Cohen (1974) distinguishes between sightseers and vacationers. According to Cohen (1974), tourists seek novelty and strangeness as part of international travel. Some seek novel experiences in another land as part of an “environmental bubble” – where they essentially maintain the same comforts as home while traveling abroad (Oppermann 1999). For the organized form of mass tourism, familiarity is high on the travel list, thus the presence or absence of modern facilities would add to the volume of tourism.

General Findings

This study had two objectives. One was to describe volume of tourism in developing countries and the other was to test a proposed model of volume of tourism. The descriptive analysis of data suggests that Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East
registered considerable decline in terms of relative share effect. The reasons for these changes can only be speculated. In most instances, political instability and civil war lead to decrease in volume of tourism. Latin America and the Caribbean were replaced by Africa in terms of change in tourism flows. There may be several reasons for this change. While political stability is an important determinant, there are indications that interest in exploration of new natural habitats is also an important factor that might volume of tourism. Several nations in Sub-Saharan Africa, with their game reserves and wild life reserves succeeded in attracting tourists. Yet very few empirical studies have investigated the reasons for the increase in tourism in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Results from the study support two of the proposed four hypotheses. The hypothesis derived from the world systems theory received only partial support. While the core periphery relationship influences the level of modernization, the core periphery relationship did not influence volume of tourism. Results indicated support for the hypothesis from modernization theory. However, the effect of the pull factors, or the attractiveness of a region, on volume of tourism was found to be negative. In general, it is concluded that modernization process is an important factor in determining the level of volume of tourism. The existing core periphery relationship had a positive influence on modernization of the periphery. But the findings from this study did not support the dominant view that volume of tourism can be determined by the extent of core-periphery relationship. Thus the argument that improvements in volume of tourism can only be achieved under the direct influence of core countries is not substantiated by this study. Instead, results support the contention that modernizing economies in the
developing nations can improve the volume of tourism from within. Results also indicate that these factors do not account for volume of tourism.

The effect of pull factors on the volume of tourism was found to be significant and negative. A number of factors might have contributed to this anomaly. First, the indicators used to measure pull factors may not have been adequate. The variables, language and heritage were both dichotomous. The association of these variables with the rest of the variables in the model was perhaps inadequately measured as correlations rather than by statistics such as tetrachoric correlations. Secondly, the measures such as language used to measure pull factors may have cross-loaded with measures of core periphery variables. It is conceivable that when a large proportion of the population in a developing country speaks a core country language, the influence of the core country may remain strong. In sum, the negative effect of the pull factors on volume of tourism may be a function of a number of measurement issues mentioned above.

Policy Implications

One of the main influences of globalization is being witnessed in the rise of international tourism. Tourism existed long before present times, but it is only in modernity, late modernity, that it has become a mass phenomenon, a “social fact” or an “international fact” (Lanfant 1995). The basic characteristic of tourism is the “desire to see”, as Aristotle described it. This sense of curiosity received a strong impetus from the development of a tourism industry, which is a form of “commoditization of experience” (Graburn 1983:27). Commoditization changes tangibles and intangibles into commodities, and touristic experiences can now be bought at a price. But, while usual
commodities can be consumed at home, tourism must be consumed outside the everyday social space (Thurot and Thurot 1983:175). Tourism has also offered a way for the less developed countries to develop along the lines of the industrialized world. While tourism is considered as a developmental issue for the peripheral regions, it is a cultural response for the core nations (Turner and Ash 1975). As a new form of North-South dialogue, this form of communication is often fraught with problems for the developing nations.

While tourism is a quest to discover nature and exotic cultures, it may at the same time place them at risk. Whereas tourism is the pursuit of an elementary way of life, the search for "simplicity ends in technological complexity and accelerated social change; the pursuit of the exotic and diverse ends in uniformity" (Turner and Ash in Wang 2000:222).

Mass tourism demonstrates these features, prompting critics to denounce tourism and place a ban on tourism. But, as a “social fact”, it is here to stay, and any such move would be unwise. What is at stake here is not whether tourism should be developed, but rather how it should be developed, and how its problematic consequences can be prevented (Wang 2000:222). The problem is not the pattern of tourism, writes Wang (2000) but the “realization that tourism production is often informed by instrumentalism and short-termism, which disregards the interests and long-term well-being of the host community, the local culture and environment”.

Mass tourism we know has created several problems related to environmental degradation, social and cultural degradation, unequal distribution of finances, promotion of paternalistic attitudes and even spread of diseases (M&M 1998:95). In order to reduce the negative effects of tourism, planners and policy-makers need to change from short-term policies to long-term policies that includes the host communities and the environment. Thus sustainable tourism should be the new direction of development. The
ability to holiday anywhere in the world, argue Mowforth and Munt (1998) is now an essential part of the modern professional life in the industrialized world, and the potential for more growth is immense. But can the planet sustain this growth, is an important question.

The need to consider volume of tourism in dealing with sustainable development is supported by the findings of this study. Modernization policies are likely to have positive effects on volume of tourism in developing countries. As volume of tourism increases, several issues with respect to sustainability arise. This study has not focussed on the relationship between sustainability issues and volume of tourism. Nevertheless, there is currently insurmountable evidence to support the contention that there are limits to growth and that it is important to regulate modernization processes as we approach issues of sustainability. In this regard, several theorists had argued that core periphery relationships are of direct relevance for tourism planning and therefore for tackling sustainability issues. The results from this study support the position that it is more important to focus on modernization policies than on issues with regard to core periphery relationships. Furthermore, results also suggest that the volume of tourism may not be neglected when planning for sustainability.

Since it becomes important to control the number of visitors that frequent a site, there are certain tools of sustainability that planners and policy makers ought to consider. These techniques include area protection, regulating the industry, visitor management techniques, environmental impact assessment, carrying capacity calculations, consultation / participation, codes of conduct and sustainability index (Mowforth and Munt 1998:116).
One of the major limitations of the study can be attributed to the measurement of the variables. Some of the indicators, especially those related to the pull factors, were perhaps inadequate, for they did not measure the pull factor itself. These factors while measuring the economic attractiveness of place, did not take into account the historic and cultural connections. It is the presence of both social and historical conditions that motivate people to visit places. Furthermore,

the emergence of tourism also entails a social condition, namely entrepreneurs who are willing to devote their capital to the commercialization of tourism. In this respect the advent of Thomas Cook’s tours signaled the beginning of the commercialization of tourism, a form of social organization based on technological advances (Urry 1995).

Another important factor that was not taken into consideration was political instability. The shift share analysis dealing with the regional variations in the volume of tourism amply illustrates the importance of political stability in the developing world. While there may be other reasons for the fluctuations in volume of tourism, political stability and unrest certainly have the effect of reducing tourism activities. Furthermore, the downward trend in tourism activities, in the aftermath of the September 11, is another indication that political unrest and terrorism are important factors that determine the volume of tourism.

This study has attempted to provide an empirical foundation for examining volume of tourism in developing countries. Having found that modernization plays an important role in controlling volume of tourism, it is necessary to focus on the micro level aspects of modernization and their influence on volume of tourism. In this regard, the role of market-related institutions, social and political agencies that make decisions
with regard to tourism promotion and planning have to be taken into consideration.

Future studies can benefit from comparative studies on volume of tourism under taken in a few countries using a comparative study design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life-Quality Costs</th>
<th>Fiscal Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>Highway construction, police services, public transportation, port and terminal facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Police services, Justice system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Emergencies</td>
<td>Fire protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Pollution</td>
<td>Water Supply and Sewage treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution</td>
<td>Police Services, Public transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>Solid waste disposal, police services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Pollution</td>
<td>Police services, Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of wildlife</td>
<td>Police services, park and recreation facilities, forestry maintenance, fish and game regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of scenic beauty</td>
<td>Park and recreational facilities, police services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of social/cultural heritage</td>
<td>Maintenance of museums and historic sites, police services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Hospital and other health maintenance facilities, sanitation, food-service regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular accidents</td>
<td>Police services, justice system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Principles Behind Sustainable Tourist Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The approach sees policy, planning and management as appropriate, and indeed essential responses to the problems of natural and human resource misuse in tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach is generally not anti-growth, but emphasizes that there are certain limitations to growth and that tourism must be managed within these limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term rather than short-term thinking is necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concerns of sustainable tourism management are not just environmental, but are also economic, social, cultural, political and managerial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach emphasizes the importance of satisfying human needs and aspirations, which entails a prominent concern for equity and fairness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders need to be consulted and empowered in tourism decision-making, and they also need to be informed about sustainable development issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While sustainable development should be a goal for all policies and actions, putting the ideas of sustainable tourism into practice means recognizing that in reality there are often limits to what will be achieved in the short and medium term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of how market economies operate, of the cultures and management procedures of private sector businesses and of public and voluntary sector organizations, and of the values and attitudes of the public is necessary in order to turn good intentions into practical measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are frequently conflicts of interest over the use of resources, which means that in practice trade-offs and compromises may be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The balancing of costs and benefits in decisions on different courses of action must extend to considering how much different individuals and groups will gain or lose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>1997/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban population</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Price Index</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Trade</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CIA Fact book</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in Service Sector</td>
<td>CIA Fact book</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Sites</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Korea, Dem. Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Macedonia, FYR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Gambia, The</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Micronesia, Fed. Sts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. List of countries with missing values on the Dependent Variable (Leisure Tourism).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Ecuador</th>
<th>Malta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Equitorial Guinea</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Togo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Congo</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>West Bank and Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijibouti</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Yuguslovia (Serbia and Montenegro)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6A. Correlation of Rooms with Hot Decked variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beds</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business tourists</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostels</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Trade</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Trade1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6B: Hot Decked variable Number of rooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot Decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>19.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>170.37</td>
<td>-107.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>403.26</td>
<td>-352.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>466.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>163.43</td>
<td>385.31</td>
<td>-221.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>44.89</td>
<td>-25.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor Variables = Business tourists; Population; Net Trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot Decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>19.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>44.89</td>
<td>18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>-2879.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>163.43</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-239.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>-365.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor Variables = Business tourists; Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot Decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>19.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-106.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-351.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>163.43</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>-221.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-24.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor Variables = Business Tourists; Net Trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot Decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>19.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>44.89</td>
<td>18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>-2879.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>163.43</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-239.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>-365.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor Variables = Bed places; Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot Decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-327.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>-2867.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>163.43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>118.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-13.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor Variables = Bed-places; Business Tourists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot Decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-327.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>-2867.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>-333.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>163.43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>119.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-13.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predictor Variables = index of Bed-places and Number of Rooms

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-351.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>163.43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>118.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-218.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6C: Correlation of FDI (N = 95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade(gdp)</td>
<td>-0.405</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>-0.293</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fdi(capital)</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imports(g&amp;s)</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6D: Hot Decked Variable Foreign Direct Investment

Predictor Variables = FDI(Capital) & Imports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on hot decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>-11.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor Variables = Heritage & FDI (capital)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on hot decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor Variable = Heritage & Imports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on hot decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6E: Correlation of GDP ($N^*$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LogLeisure</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanpop</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6F: Hot Decked Variable = Gross Domestic Product.

**Predictor Variables = HDI; Urban population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3557</td>
<td>-3472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>10923</td>
<td>-9205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>9039</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>8932.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13607</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>8567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6132</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>5346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4721</td>
<td>3225</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>-3455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>-1816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Predictor Variables = Service sector & HDI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3557</td>
<td>-3472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>10923</td>
<td>-9205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>9039</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>7950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13607</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>8567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6132</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>5386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4721</td>
<td>3225</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>-3455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>-1816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Predictor Variables = HDI; Urban Population;**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>-4955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>9039</td>
<td>5889</td>
<td>3150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13607</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>12538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6132</td>
<td>10923</td>
<td>-4791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4721</td>
<td>3225</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>-1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>3557</td>
<td>-2157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6G: Correlations of Exports (N°)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade(%gdp)</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdp(cap)</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imports</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6H: Hot Decked Variable = Export

Predictor Variables = HDI & Trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hotdecked Variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>-35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>64.08</td>
<td>-32.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>40.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>40.59</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor Variables = Trade & Imports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hotdecked Variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>64.08</td>
<td>-32.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>40.59</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>10.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6I: Correlations of CPI (N‰)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FDI (cap)</td>
<td>0.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreimp</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6J: Hot Decked Variable = Consumer Price Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Values on Hot decked variables</th>
<th>Predicted values</th>
<th>Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>-235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>-1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables (Capital)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>-1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>-235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of selected variables in the proposed model of Leisure Tourism in Developing Countries, 1997. (Before Hot-decking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>KURTOSIS</th>
<th>SKEW</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEISURE</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1030.91</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>13325</td>
<td>13.814</td>
<td>3.476</td>
<td>2162.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBPOP</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>46.10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-0.918</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>21.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4013</td>
<td>3216.46</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>14763</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td>3013.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.64997</td>
<td>0.70765</td>
<td>.252*</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>-0.373</td>
<td>-0.832</td>
<td>0.15248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>204.84</td>
<td>117.50</td>
<td>91*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2637</td>
<td>27.296</td>
<td>5.279</td>
<td>395.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOMS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36782</td>
<td>5524</td>
<td>211*</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>7017736</td>
<td>32.675</td>
<td>5.149</td>
<td>89783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERITAGE</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.876</td>
<td>-0.398</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.244</td>
<td>2.6906</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>28.14</td>
<td>8.459</td>
<td>2.609</td>
<td>5.0528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPORT</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>36.4787</td>
<td>30.3672</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>115.4</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>20.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48.611</td>
<td>49.75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>13.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWNETRAD</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-257.1709</td>
<td>-291.89</td>
<td>-15961</td>
<td>-15961</td>
<td>42824</td>
<td>42.755</td>
<td>4.924</td>
<td>5320.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1.023</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>2.468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Multiple Modes Exist. The smallest value is Shown
Table 8: Descriptive Statistics of selected variables in the proposed model of Leisure Tourism in Developing Countries, 1997. (After Hot-decking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URBPOP</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>47.15</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>60.74</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>91.06</td>
<td>-0.918</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>21.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGDP</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1.213</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THDI</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1.182</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPI</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.000*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERITAG</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.876</td>
<td>-0.398</td>
<td>0.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFDI</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPORT</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>13.13*</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>115.4</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>48.61</td>
<td>49.75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNWNETRA</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td>.4975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSROOMS</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEISURE</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-4.54*</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Variable Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Tourists (Dependent)</td>
<td>LOGNDV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban population</td>
<td>URBPOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
<td>TGDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in Service Sector</td>
<td>SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
<td>THDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>TFDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Price Index</td>
<td>TCPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export</td>
<td>EXPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Trade</td>
<td>TNWNETRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>TSROOMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>NEWLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Sites</td>
<td>HERITAG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Bivariate Correlation of selected variables with the proposed model of Tourism Volume in Developing Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>URBPOP</th>
<th>TGDP</th>
<th>THDI</th>
<th>TCPI</th>
<th>HERITAG</th>
<th>TFDI</th>
<th>EXPORT</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>TNWNETRA</th>
<th>LAN</th>
<th>TSROOM</th>
<th>LOGNDV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URBPOP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGDP</td>
<td>0.467**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THDI</td>
<td>0.609**</td>
<td>0.690**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPI</td>
<td>0.196*</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERITAG</td>
<td>0.229*</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFDI</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.363**</td>
<td>0.281**</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPORT</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.460**</td>
<td>0.417**</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.290**</td>
<td>0.298**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>0.296**</td>
<td>0.477**</td>
<td>0.356**</td>
<td>-0.349**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.233*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNWNETRA</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>-0.335**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.359**</td>
<td>0.038**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN</td>
<td>0.278**</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.188*</td>
<td>0.531**</td>
<td>0.198*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSROOMS</td>
<td>0.379**</td>
<td>0.580**</td>
<td>0.543**</td>
<td>-0.344**</td>
<td>-0.228*</td>
<td>0.281**</td>
<td>0.389**</td>
<td>0.608**</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGNDV</td>
<td>0.389**</td>
<td>0.604**</td>
<td>0.587**</td>
<td>-0.282**</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
<td>0.267**</td>
<td>0.478**</td>
<td>0.658**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.785**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Table 11: 1990-1997 Shift Share analysis of tourist arrivals for Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BGE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>RSE</th>
<th>NETREL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2078.16</td>
<td>232.97</td>
<td>4256.00</td>
<td>1944.87</td>
<td>2177.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>711.61</td>
<td>1160.05</td>
<td>982.00</td>
<td>-889.66</td>
<td>270.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>842.14</td>
<td>379.02</td>
<td>939.00</td>
<td>-282.16</td>
<td>96.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
<td>495.00</td>
<td>483.86</td>
<td>480.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC= Total change;
BGE = Base effect ;
CE= composition effect;
RSE= relative share effect
NETREL = net relative change

The numericals along the vertical on the extreme left are
1= Leisure tourists
2= Business tourists
3= other (visiting relatives, religious)
4= overnight visitors
Table 12: 1990-1997 Shift Share analysis of tourist arrivals for South Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BGE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>RSE</th>
<th>NETREL</th>
<th>TC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>989.84</td>
<td>110.97</td>
<td>68.19</td>
<td>179.16</td>
<td>1169.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>204.95</td>
<td>334.11</td>
<td>418.06</td>
<td>-83.95</td>
<td>121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>304.00</td>
<td>136.82</td>
<td>-587.81</td>
<td>451.00</td>
<td>-147.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC = Total change;  
BGE = Base effect;  
CE = composition effect;  
RSE = relative share effect  
NETREL = net relative change

The numericals along the vertical on the extreme left are  
1 = Leisure tourists  
2 = Business tourists  
3 = other (visiting relatives, religious)  
4 = overnight visitors.
Table 13: 1990-1997 Shift Share analysis of tourist arrivals for East Asia Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BGE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>RSE</th>
<th>NETREL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7522.02</td>
<td>843.25</td>
<td>10218.00</td>
<td>1852.73</td>
<td>2695.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1352.81</td>
<td>2205.30</td>
<td>5661.00</td>
<td>2102.89</td>
<td>4308.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1029.35</td>
<td>463.27</td>
<td>3837.00</td>
<td>2344.38</td>
<td>2807.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>174.61</td>
<td>-38.72</td>
<td>55124.00</td>
<td>54988.11</td>
<td>54949.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC = Total change;
BGE = Base effect;
CE = Composition effect;
RSE = relative share effect
NETREL = net relative change

The numericals along the vertical on the extreme left are
1 = Leisure tourists
2 = Business tourists
3 = other (visiting relatives, religious)
4 = overnight visitors.
Table 14: 1990-1997 Shift Share analysis of tourist arrivals for Central Asia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BGE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>RSE</th>
<th>NETREL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18363.94</td>
<td>2058.68</td>
<td>16945.00</td>
<td>-3477.62</td>
<td>-1418.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4329.21</td>
<td>7057.34</td>
<td>10085.00</td>
<td>-1301.55</td>
<td>5755.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15622.26</td>
<td>7030.98</td>
<td>7787.00</td>
<td>-14866.2</td>
<td>-7835.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72307.34</td>
<td>-16033.7</td>
<td>38342.00</td>
<td>-17931.7</td>
<td>-33965.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC = Total change;  
BGE = Base effect;  
CE = composition effect;  
RSE = relative share effect  
NETREL = net relative change

The numericals along the vertical on the extreme left are
1 = Leisure tourists  
2 = Business tourists  
3 = other (visiting relatives, religious)  
4 = overnight visitors.
Table 15: 1990-1997 Shift Share analysis of tourist arrivals for Latin America and Caribbean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BGE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>RSE</th>
<th>NETREL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7859.22</td>
<td>881.05</td>
<td>5395.00</td>
<td>-3345.27</td>
<td>-2464.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1083.73</td>
<td>1766.67</td>
<td>2791.00</td>
<td>-59.40</td>
<td>1707.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1069.99</td>
<td>481.56</td>
<td>13942.00</td>
<td>12390.44</td>
<td>12872.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44165.75</td>
<td>-9793.45</td>
<td>-606.00</td>
<td>-34978.3</td>
<td>-44771.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC= Total change;
BGE = Base effect ;
CE= composition effect;
RSE= relative share effect
NETREL = net relative change

The numerics along the vertical on the extreme left are
1= Leisure tourists
2= Business tourists
3= other (visiting relatives, religious)
4= overnight visitors.
Table 16: 1990-1997 Shift–Share analysis of tourist arrivals for Middle East and North Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BGE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>RSE</th>
<th>NETREL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2152.58</td>
<td>241.31</td>
<td>5351.00</td>
<td>2957.10</td>
<td>3198.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>170.60</td>
<td>278.11</td>
<td>1016.00</td>
<td>567.28</td>
<td>845.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>938.32</td>
<td>422.30</td>
<td>2362.00</td>
<td>1001.38</td>
<td>1423.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>746.53</td>
<td>-165.54</td>
<td>-788.00</td>
<td>-1369.00</td>
<td>-1534.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC= Total change;  
BGE = Base effect;  
CE= composition effect;  
RSE= relative share effect  
NETREL = net relative change

The numericals along the vertical on the extreme left are  
1= Leisure tourists  
2= Business tourists  
3= other (visiting relatives, religious)  
4= overnight visitors.
Table 17. Bivariate Regression of Log Leisure on selected and transformed independent variables In the proposed model of Tourism Volume in Developing Countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Unstandardized Beta</th>
<th>Standardized Beta</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Cooke's (max)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Population</td>
<td>.4366</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Price Index</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>-.877</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export</td>
<td>.5441</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Trade</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>-.8083</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Multivariate Regression Analysis of Leisure Tourism Volume (logged) in Developing Countries (1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized B</th>
<th>Standardized B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.584</td>
<td>-4.850</td>
<td>-4.850</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Population</td>
<td>0.00224</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
<td>0.0327</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>1.963</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Price Index</td>
<td>0.000311</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.616</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>-.00477</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export</td>
<td>0.0154</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Sector</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Trade</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (English=1; French=2;other=0)</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>4.759</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R2 = .691
Table 19. Measurement Model of all Latent Factors in the Model of Volume of Tourism in Developing Countries (Standardized Solutions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GFI  AGFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>URBPOP</td>
<td>0.948*</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.95 0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THDI</td>
<td>0.958*</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>0.950*</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TGDP</td>
<td>0.960*</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World System</td>
<td>TNWNETR</td>
<td>0.973*</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.97 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXPORT</td>
<td>0.972*</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TFDI</td>
<td>0.876*</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull</td>
<td>TCPI</td>
<td>0.930*</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.90 0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSROOMS</td>
<td>0.813*</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEWLAN</td>
<td>0.847*</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HERITAG</td>
<td>0.787*</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: p<0.05
Table 20. Structural Model Estimates of the Model of Volume of Tourism in Developing countries. (Standardized solutions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogenous Factors</th>
<th>Endogenous Factors</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Goodness Of Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>1.516*</td>
<td>NNFI=0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World System</td>
<td>0.936*</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>CFI=0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull</td>
<td>-1.194*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: p<0.05
APPENDIX B
Figure 1. Model for Volume of Tourism
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FIGURE 3. HISTOGRAM FOR GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT (TGDP)
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FIGURE 4. HISTOGRAM FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX (THDI)
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FIGURE 5. HISTOGRAM FOR CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (TCPI)
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FIGURE 6. HISTOGRAM FOR FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT (TFDI)
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FIGURE 7. HISTOGRAM FOR EXPORT
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FIGURE 8. HISTOGRAM FOR PERCENTAGE EMPLOYED IN SERVICE SECTOR

![Histogram for Percentage Employed in Service Sector](image)

- **Std. Dev = 13.60**
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- **N = 104.00**
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FIGURE 9. HISTOGRAM FOR NET TRADE (TNWNETRA)
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FIGURE 10. HISTOGRAM FOR ACCOMMODATION (TSROOMS)
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FIGURE 10. HISTOGRAM FOR LEISURE TOURISTS (LOGNDV)
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