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Abstract

While there exists a number of studies on the determinants of tourism development in the literature, however, tourism promotion efforts as an ingredient in the tourism demand have been overwhelmingly neglected in rigorous studies. Moreover, even the very few studies that could be traced focused exclusively on developed country cases and we did not come across any study have been undertaken island economies for which tourism accounts significantly to their economies. The paper thus attempts supplement the dwarf literature on tourism promotion impact and models the latter role on tourist arrival for the case of the small island state of Mauritius using an ARDL approach. After controlling for the classical determinants of tourism demand, our analysis interestingly reveals that tourism marketing and promotion appears to be a significant element, although relatively to a lesser extent than some classical ingredients of the tourism equation.
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The benefits of tourism are widely acknowledged and it plays an important role in (a) contributing to the growth of domestic industries that supply the tourism industry, (b) the economic and technological development of nations by stimulating the development of basic infrastructure and (c) attracting foreign investment (especially in hotels) and facilitating transfer of technology. The positive and significant effects of tourism on a destination’s economy, especially on island states, have been documented by Sinclair (1998) and Durbarry (2002, 2004) and recently Seetanah (2010), among others. Subsequently a second strand of studies has been focusing on the determinants of tourism demand in an economy and among. Among the most prominent determinants of flows in the existing empirical literature are income in country of origin, the cost of travel, relative prices, exchange rates and tourism infrastructure (Witt and Witt, 1995, and Lim, 1997). It is noteworthy that however, very little studies have focused on the role of tourist promotion agencies and marketing efforts in tourism development, despite that many government have been injecting money from their limited budget, via the said agencies in an attempt to market the destination and the services offered. This study attempts to fill in the gap by making an assessment of the tourism marketing promotion on tourism development for the case study of Mauritius. In fact from a theoretical perspective, although Crouch and Ritchie (1999, 2000) identified the various elements that make a destination attractive, yet it is believed that for tourism to be aware of such elements, marketing and promotion efforts are necessary and this is even more important given the high level of competition in the tourism industry.

Following the advent of sugar sector and the declining trends of the EPZ, international tourism has become a major industry in Mauritius during the past decade. It has surpassed Mauritius traditional exports and there has been a significant increase in the number of tourist arrivals and receipts (Refer to Appendix 1). The sector now positions itself as the second pillar of the economy and there exists firm government intention to further promote tourism as witnessed by the increasing promotion budgets, introduction of a brand name, business facilitation initiatives and also by the wave of air access deregulation and liberalization. Given the importance of this sector to the economic growth of the country (see Durbarry, 2002, 2004, Seetanah, 2010), the objective of the study is to identify and quantify the ingredients that could explain Mauritius as an attractive destination to tourists in the first instance. More importantly we shall focus on the importance of tourism promotion efforts in destination development. As it stands little serious research has been undertaken in this respect and the novelty of this paper is that it extends a classical demand for international tourism function to include tourism promotion efforts and also takes into account the time series properties of the data by using an Autoregressive Distributed Lag Model (ARDL).
Moreover the study is based on the small island of Mauritius over the period 1979-2008. The study thus provides an assessment of the relative impact of promotional expenditure and is likely to have insightful policy implications and impact assessments.

The structure of the paper is as follows: section II deals with the theoretical underpinnings of the role of tourism promotion effort in a destination’s attractiveness and also with a brief literature review of major studies in the area, Section III explains the model specification, data collection and discusses the empirical results. Section IV concludes and deals with some policy implications.

Related Literature

Tourism Marketing Promotion and the Role of National Tourism Promotion Agencies/Organisations (NTPAs).

Theoretically tourism promotion efforts (in terms of attendance in road shows, marketing, publicity and brand name among others) aim principally at disseminating as much information as possible about a destination and its attractions in an attempt to make it better known in the ever increasing competitive international tourism market. This is particularly true for island economies which are quite remote from the major tourist generating areas. Moreover, as tourists have grown more sophisticated and knowledgeable about different destinations and tourism products, there is an increasing demand on promotional agencies to provide greater level of information pertaining to services offered (including hotel), activities, uniqueness of the destination and culture among others.

In effect the major bulk of tourism promotion efforts are undertaken by the central or local government (through budgetary grants or allocations as well as tourism related tax) through specialised institutions such as National Tourism Promotion Organisations/Agencies (NTPAs). In Mauritius, promotion effort is done nearly exclusively by the central government via the Mauritius Tourism Promotion Agency (MTPA). National Tourist Organisations engage in sales promotion activities in an attempt to persuade potential tourists to visit the destination, and these activities may take various forms including media advertising and public relations (Witt and Witt, 1995). They typically conceptualise the marketing campaign, designs promotional strategies, and implement the program. They are also responsible for designing the advertising literature, brochures, media advertisement, designing and maintaining of effective web sites and other publications to support the marketing campaign. As a matter of fact, nearly 75% of the developed countries’ population has access to the
Internet from home. In addition 94% of internet users make travel arrangements using the Web. The internet is by far the number one resource for planning travel and vacations at least for developed. Moreover, the promotion efforts can take forms of road shows and ‘Salon Du Tourism’ in major origin countries as well. Most tourism promotion institutions are in charge of operating a network of overseas office to market the country for foreign visitors. The above are designed to present a unified image of the country and focuses on international market.

**Empirical Evidences.**

Existing empirical researches in assessing the relative contribution of tourism promotion effort have been particularly scarce and have mainly been based on developed countries cases. An overwhelming amount of studies have focused on the general determinants of international tourism and only a few studies have been including tourism promotion efforts. It is noteworthy that these were based either on survey analysis or by the estimation of an international demand for tourism equation using time series data.

Among the pioneering works feature Gearing et al (1974) who offered one of the most comprehensive resource inventories in determining the attractiveness of a tourist destination by taking Turkey as a case study. They identified the following the list of attribute groups which were seen to be important namely natural factors, social factors, historical factors, recreational and shopping facilities, food and shelter. Subsequently Richtie and Zins (1978) and Ferrario (1979) among others also identified more or less the same factors which they found to contribute to the attractiveness of a tourism destination. These authors seemed to have identified the important factors for a successful tourism development but still promotion of these are judged to be equally important for the tourist to be aware and fully informed of the destination’s products and attractions. Braithwaite et al (1998) also reported on research looking specifically at the factors responsible for ensuring success of tourism in 13 regional areas of Australia. Analysis of the survey results showed that attractions (natural, cultural and man made) were considered as the most pivotal factor in regional tourism. Equal second were what they termed ‘infrastructure and marketing and promotion’ followed by other factors.

The second set of studies performed in the field of the determinants of tourism was based on the estimation of an international tourism demand equation. Witt and Witt (1995) and Lim (1997) provided a comprehensive overview of the regression analysis, model specification, attributes and proxies. Among the most common independent variables used and reported to be important in the literature are income of origin country, cost of travel, relative prices,
exchange rate, tourism infrastructure and level of development in home country among others. It should be noted that marketing promotion was a relatively under-researched element. Indeed, one of the few study analysing tourism efforts was provided by Uysal and Crompton (1984). They considered promotional expenditure as a factor affecting international tourism flows to Turkey using an international tourism demand equation. The authors reported tourism promotion efforts to be significant on six of the 11 countries studied and that coefficients were low, less than 0.6 in each case (inelastic in all cases ranging from 0.022 for France to 0.596 for Spain). These findings suggest that investment in tourism promotion for Turkey as a tourist destination has had some benefits. Barry and O’Hagan (1972) earlier and Papadopoulos and Witt (1985) with a coefficient of 0.175 (but not significant) later on confirmed the above. The review of literature by Witt and Witt (1995) summarized a median coefficient value of 0.1 for the case of tourism promotion.

Another rare study in the African context was that of Naude and Saayman (2004) who studied the determinants of tourist in the case of African countries using panel data regression approach. Apart from the classical usual factors, the authors also identified political stability, personal safety, available infrastructure and tourism marketing efforts as important factors. The latter was proxied in the context by the number of internet users. Using cross section OLS and Least Absolute deviation (LAD) estimators the authors reported a positive effect of tourism promotion effort in nearly all panel sets analysed namely the total tourist arrivals, arrivals from America, Europe and Africa respectively. However, when using static and dynamic (Generalised Methods of Moments) panel estimates, mixed results were found with respect mainly to the significance level of the tourism marketing promotion variable.

We hardly came across any study using rigorous time series analysis related to co-integration and error correction econometric modeling and including marketing promotion effort as a likely potential factor as part of the explanatory variables. Moreover, studies on small island economies has been very scarce and empirical findings in the above context (especially with respect to the smallness and remoteness aspects of such economies) is believe to add valuable insights in the growing body of literature.

**Methodology and Analysis**

**Model Specification and Data Source**

The study is based on the small island of Mauritius over the year 1979-2008. The economic model pertains to an estimation of a demand function for international tourism and augmented

---
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for the sake of this study by a proxy for tourism promotion. Our preferred model is consistent with the general literature (see Witt and Witt, 1995; Lim 1997; Nordstrom, 2002; Eilav and Eilav, 2003, Naude and Saayman, 2004)) and particularly to Seetanah (2008) for the case of island economies. The function specified is thus as follows

\[ TR_t = f(GDPH_t, GDPF_t, ROOM_t, AIRLIB_t, RELATIVE_t, PROMO_t) \]

The dependent variable (TR), the total number of tourist arrivals per annum is the measure of demand for tourism to Mauritius. The data were available from the Central Statistical Office of the country.

The key independent variables in the model are total tourism expenditures and relative tourism prices. We follow the literature (Nordstrom, 2002 and Naude and Saayman 2004) in using real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita in countries of origin (weighted average) as proxy for total expenditures on tourism. Overseas travel (especially recreational) is expensive and often regarded as a luxury good in which case the discretionary income of origin become important.

As for the case of relative prices (measured as RELATIVE), we follow Eilat and Einav (2003) and Naude and Saayman (2004) by using the CPI of a destination country adjusted by the $ exchange rate as a proxy for relative tourism prices. The inverse of it shows the many baskets of goods a tourist has to give up in his home country in order to buy a basket of goods in the destination country. This measure of relative prices captures changes in the real exchange rate over time as well as cross sectional variation in the cost of travel. Demand for overseas travel in a particular destination is expected to be negatively related to relative tourism prices as higher within the country and relatively higher cost of living would make most tourists less enthusiastic about the destination.

Urbanisation and development level (GPHH) of a destination country is consistent with more tourist arrivals, especially from developed countries Tourist might prefer more developed destinations or a minimum development level in choosing their destination. This is proxied by the income of the destination country. All the above three variables were obtained and constructed from the Penn World Table 6.1.

In case of tourism infrastructure, we follow the standard literature and use hotel rooms (ROOM) available in the country as a measure for the capacity of the tourism sector. The
more the room the more the capacity and more competitive that country’s tourism sector (cheaper price as competition). Moreover a minimum is hotel accommodation size needed for a destination to reach its critical mass and also to convince airlines to establish routes (Naudee and Saayman, 2004). Data on the number of rooms were obtained from the Central Statistical Office of the country.

Air Liberalisation variable (AIRLIB) was also included in the model. Air transport liberalisation has been an important factor in the tourism success in the island as tourist arrival has nearly exclusively been dependent on air services given our relative geographic isolation from most of its major tourism markets. Liberalisation of air transport is expected to result in a significant expansion in airline capacity and competition on a destination’s major routes with increases in air services between the destination and its major markets. The process also enlarges market access, de-restricts routes and allows competition in some or all of them, and abolishes or easing price controls. The aim is thus to introduce competition (or increase it) and enhance efficiency, so as to obtain lower fares. The benefits ultimately would translate in more tourist arrival in the destination. In fact Mauritius has been engaged in the liberalization of air transport since the 1970 and has as to date some 30 bilateral air service agreements signed by the government. The only consistent measure available is the number of bilateral air service agreements (BASA) signed by the Mauritian government with other countries since the first one in early 1970. This was made available by the Ministry of External Communications.

The explanatory variable of interest is tourism promotion effort (PROMO) and this is measured by tourism promotional expenditure (see Clarke (1981) and Uysal and Crompton (1984)) as allocated to the Mauritius Tourism Promotion Agency (MTPA) by the government. It is good to point out that promotion and marketing of tourism is nearly exclusively done by the country’s central government. The figures were provided by the Central Statistical Office, Tourism Department of the island and from the Accountant General Annual report.

**Econometric Modeling**

The regression model of equation 1 can be written as

\[ tr_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 gdph_i + \beta_2 gdpf_i + \beta_3 airlib_i + \beta_4 relative_i + \beta_5 room_i + \beta_6 promo_i + \epsilon_i \]

(2)
The specification is of a log linear one and the small letters denotes the natural logarithm of the variables for ease of interpretation of parameters.

Tests of Stationarity.

To investigate the data univariate properties and to determine the degree to which they are integrated, both the augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) (1979) and Phillips-Perron (PP) (1988) unit-roots tests have been employed. The tests in fact provide solid evidence and tend to suggest that that the series are non-stationary in levels but indeed stationary in first difference except for the case of promo and airlib which were found to be an I(0) variable.

ARDL (Autoregressive Distributed lag model)

Given that not all the variables are integrated to the same order, we employ the testing and estimation procedure advanced in Pesaran et al (1997) and Pesaran and Shin (1999) to examine the existence of a long-term relationship (cointegration) in our analysis namely the ARDL approach. Unlike other cointegration approaches such as the Johansen’s (1988) Maximum Likelihood technique, the ARDL technique does not require the variables in the model to be I(1), or of the same order. The approach also allows us to incorporate some dynamics in the analysis.

For the specification 1 above, the error correction versions of the ARDL model in the variables tr, gdph, gdpf, airlib, room, relative and promo is given respectively by

$$\Delta tr = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \Delta tr_{-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \Delta gdph_{-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \Delta gdpf_{-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i \Delta relative_{-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i \Delta airlib_{-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i \Delta rooms + \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i \Delta promo + \delta_1 \Delta tr_{-1} + \delta_2 \Delta gdph_{-1} + \delta_3 \Delta gdpf_{-1} + \delta_4 \Delta relative_{-1} + \delta_5 \Delta airlib_{-1} + \delta_6 \Delta rooms_{-1} + \delta_7 \Delta promo_{-1} + \epsilon_i$$

(3)

Since we have annual observations, we chose n=1 for the maximum order of lags in the ARDL model in both cases and carry out the estimation over the period of study. In fact the same lag length was chosen when using the final prediction error due to SBC.

For the model, the hypothesis that is being tested is the null of ‘non-existence of the long run relationship’ defined by

$$Ho: \delta_1=\delta_2=\delta_3=\delta_4=\delta_5=\delta_6=\delta_7=0$$
And the alternative hypothesis is

\[ H_1: \delta_1 \neq 0, \delta_2 \neq 0, \delta_3 \neq 0, \delta_4 \neq 0, \delta_5 \neq 0, \delta_6 \neq 0, \delta_7 \neq 0 \]

The recommended statistic is the F statistics for the joint significance of \( \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4, \delta_5, \delta_6 \) and \( \delta_7 \). Computation of this F statistic requires running the following regression

\[
\Delta t_r = \beta_0 + b\Delta t_{r-1} + c\Delta gdh_{t-1} + d\Delta gdpf_{t-1} + e\Delta relative_{t-1} + f\Delta airlib_{t-1} + g\Delta room_{t-1} + h\Delta prom_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t
\]

and a variable addition test is subsequently made by including the following.

\[
\delta_1 t_{r-1}, \delta_2 gdph_{t-1}, \delta_3 gdpf_{t-1}, \delta_4 relative_{t-1}, \delta_5 airlib_{t-1}, \delta_6 room_{t-1}, \delta_7 promo
\]

It should be noted that the distribution of the F statistic is non-standard, irrespective whether regressors are I(0) or I(1). Pesaran and al (1997) have tabulated the appropriate critical values for different number of regressors and whether the regressors contain an intercept or a time trend.

The F-Statistics \( F(tr/gdph,gdpf, airlib,room, relative, promo) \) turned out to be 6.21 and exceeds the upper bound of the critical value band. We thus reject the null hypothesis of no long run relationship between the variables irrespective of their order. The test results thus suggest that there is a long run relationship between the variable. (This is also confirmed by the Maximum Eigen values and Trace Values of the Johansen test for cointegration)

**Estimation results**

Given that the specification is cointegrated, the unrestricted error correction representation of the ARDL model is given by equation 3. The next stage of the procedure would be to estimate the coefficients of the long run relations and the associated Error Correction Model (ECM) using the ARDL approach. The order of the distributed lag on the dependent variable was selected by the Schwartz Bayesian Criterion (SBC)\(^2\) and turned out to be one.
The SBC criteria selects the ARDL (1,1,1,1,0,0,0) for the model. The long run estimated coefficients are shown in the table 1.

Table 1: Estimated Long run Coefficients based on ARDL approach: Dependent variable is $tr$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regressor</th>
<th>Coefficient (SBC 1,1,1,1,0,0,0)</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$gdph$</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$gdpf$</td>
<td>3.76***</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$relative$</td>
<td>-0.85*</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$airlib$</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$room$</td>
<td>0.38***</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$promo$</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$constant$</td>
<td>5.34***</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed that tourism promotional effort may have indeed contributed positively to the tourist arrival in the country in the long run thus confirming its importance as a potential ingredient in tourism destination. In fact a 1% increase in the promo is associated with a 1.6% increase in the number of tourist arrival in the island. The level of development of the island and tourism infrastructure is also seen to be important factors. The income in the country of origin, a measure of income elasticity seems to indicate that Mauritius is a luxury destination. As such tourist are reported to be price sensitive as revealed by the negative and significant coefficient of the variable relative. Air Access Liberalisation is also seen to be an important element in the development of tourism in the country and this is in line with the theoretical underpinnings and also with the studies of Seetanah (2007).

We proceed to the estimation of the autoregressive distributed lag estimates and the error correction model associated with our long run estimates using SBC. The results are reported in table 2 below.

Table 2: Autoregressive Distributed lag estimates: Dependent variable is $tr$

---

2 Pesaran et al (1997) found that SBC is preferable to AIC, as it is a parsimonious model that selects the smallest possible lag length, while AIC selects the maximum relevant lag length.
The selected ARDL model passes the standard diagnostic tests (Serial Correlation, Functional Form, Normality and Heteroscedasticity) and highlights once again the positive link between tourism marketing and promotion effort and tourism arrival in a dynamic framework and where there is the presence of lagged effects. The positive coefficient of the lagged dependent suggests that repeat tourism is a common phenomenon for the Mauritian case. Moreover, the positive constant term indicates that visitors have a good opinion of the island as a destination resort.

Table 3: Error Correction Representation for the Selected ARDL model: Dependent variable is tr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regressor</th>
<th>Coefficient SBC (1,1,1,0,0,0)</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tr(lagged)</td>
<td>0.345***</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gdph</td>
<td>0.334*</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gdph(lagged)</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gdpf</td>
<td>2.23**</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gdpf(lagged)</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td>-0.534***</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative(lagged)</td>
<td>-0.223</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>airlib</td>
<td>0.095*</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>room</td>
<td>0.325**</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promo</td>
<td>0.143*</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.77***</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R sqr</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dw</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 suggests that the impact of tourism promotion on the tourism development has been positive and significant in the short run as well with a coefficient of 0.143. This which is slightly lower than the estimated long run coefficient of 0.16 suggesting that it these marketing and promotional efforts may take some time to have their full effect. The coefficients for the other explanatory variables are well behaved and have the expected sign and significance. In particular, the long run coefficient for the foreign income is slightly more than reported in the literature and confirms that Mauritius is seen as a more luxury destination in the market. Relative prices and exchange are found to negatively impact on the attractiveness of Mauritius as a destination. The negative and significant adjusted CPI indicates the tourists are relatively price sensitive. It is however estimated to be less than in the literature which reported that the price elasticity often fall with the range of unitary (Crouch, 1999) thus indicating that tourists might be less price sensitive. The positive and significant coefficient of domestic income, used as an indicator for development, suggests that a higher level of development is consistent with more tourist arrival.

Lastly, the coefficient of the error correction model (ECM) of the selected ARDL is negative and highly significant at 1% level. This confirms the existence of a stable long-run relationship and points to a long-run co-integration relationship between variables. The ECM represents the speed of adjustment to restore equilibrium in the dynamic model following a disturbance. The coefficient of the ECM is around -0.4 in implies that a deviation from the long-run equilibrium following a short-run shock is corrected by about 40 per cent after each year.

### Summary & Policy implications

The link between tourism promotion effort and tourism arrival has been analysed using an Autoregressive Distributed Lag framework for the small island state of Mauritius following rigorous time series properties tests. Results from the analysis show that tourism promotion efforts may have contributed positively, though relatively not to a sizeable level to the number of tourist arrival in both short and long run. The income and price elasticities from the study further revealed that the Mauritius is considered to be a luxury and that tourists are
also price sensitive. Tourism infrastructure and the country development level are also part of the overall ingredient for Mauritius’s successful tourism development. Moreover the phenomenon of repeat tourist is well present in the country.

As far as policy recommendations are concerned, it is believed that the government should have a consistent policy with respect to tourism promotion allocations and grants especially in times of budget constraint. The case of private financing and joint public/private financing arrangements should thus be less ambiguous so long there is addition to the funding of such efforts and government should ensure that the private sector have sufficient incentive to contribute. There should be an awareness between all stakeholders that such promotion is for a common cause and mutually beneficial for all. A spillover benefit of public private partnerships in tourism is that private sector has more sense of entrepreneurship and is more responsive than the government these industry members and can thus provide valuable expertise for a market driven promotional and marketing activities.
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Appendix A

Table A1: Some key figures about the Mauritian Tourism Sector
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population ('000)</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1159.7</td>
<td>1174.4</td>
<td>1186.1</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>1190.3</td>
<td>1195.4</td>
<td>1197.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Hotels</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Rooms</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>4603</td>
<td>6809</td>
<td>7267</td>
<td>8255</td>
<td>8657</td>
<td>9024</td>
<td>9647</td>
<td>10233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist arrival ('000)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>291.5</td>
<td>558.1</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>656.5</td>
<td>660.3</td>
<td>681.6</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Receipt (million)</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>9207</td>
<td>11890</td>
<td>14668</td>
<td>14234</td>
<td>18166</td>
<td>18238</td>
<td>19397</td>
<td>21865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Receipts (% of GDP)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSO (2008)