# YASHIL

## IQTISODIYOT&TARAQQIYOT

*Ijtimoiy, iqtisodiy, texnologik, ilmiy, ommabop jurnal*

2026-YIL / IYUN/6-SON, IV-QISM

ISSN: 2992-8982

https://yashil-iqtisodiyot-taraqqiyot.uz/

YASHIL
IQTISODIYOT&TARAQQIYOT
*Ijtimoiy, iqtisodiy, texnologik, ilmiy, ommabop jurnal*

*Elektron nashr. 2026-yil, iyun.*
*IV-qism*


IQTISODIYOT&TARAQQIYOT

*Ijtimoiy, iqtisodiy, texnologik, ilmiy, ommabop jurnal*

08.00.01 Iqtisodiyot nazariyasi
08.00.02 Makroiqtisodiyot
08.00.03 Sanoat iqtisodiyoti
08.00.04 Qishloq xo‘jaligi iqtisodiyoti
08.00.05 Xizmat ko‘rsatish tarmoqlari iqtisodiyoti
08.00.06 Ekonometrika va statistika
08.00.07 Moliya, pul muomalasi va kredit
08.00.08 Buxgalteriya hisobi, iqtisodiy tahlil va audit
08.00.09 Jahon iqtisodiyoti
08.00.10 Demografiya. Mehnat iqtisodiyoti
08.00.11 Marketing
08.00.12 Mintaqaviy iqtisodiyot
08.00.13 Menejment
08.00.14 Iqtisodiyotda axborot tizimlari va texnologiyalari
08.00.15 Tadbirkorlik va kichik biznes iqtisodiyoti
08.00.16 Raqamli iqtisodiyot va xalqaro raqamli integratsiya
08.00.17 Turizm va mehmonxona faoliyati

Muassis: “Ma’rifat-print-media” MChJ
Hamkorlarimiz: Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti, O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Bosh prokuraturasi huzuridagi Iqtisodiy jinoyatlarga qarshi kurashish departamenti

Jurnalning ilmiyligi:
““Yashil” iqtisodiyot va taraqqiyot” jurnali
O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy ta’lim, fan va innovatsiyalar vazirligi huzuridagi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi rayosatining 2023-yil 1-apreldagi 336/3-sonli qarori bilan ro‘yxatdan o‘tkazilgan.

# MUNDARIJA



MUNDARIJA СОДЕРЖАНИЕ CONTENTS

MUNDARIJA СОДЕРЖАНИЕ CONTENTS

MUNDARIJA СОДЕРЖАНИЕ CONTENTS

MUNDARIJA СОДЕРЖАНИЕ CONTENTS

MUNDARIJA СОДЕРЖАНИЕ CONTENTS

MUNDARIJA СОДЕРЖАНИЕ CONTENTS

# THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL TOURISM IN IMPROVING LIVING STANDARDS IN UZBEKISTAN: A MULTI-EQUATION ECONOMETRIC ANALYSIS WITH ARDL BOUNDS TESTING

**Adalat Khudaybergenova**
Senior Lecturer, World Economy and International Economic Relations,
Tashkent State University of Economics (TSUE)
E-mail: a.khudaybergenova@tsue.uz

**Khamida Fayziyeva**
Senior Lecturer, World Economy and International Economic Relations,
Tashkent State University of Economics (TSUE)
E-mail: x.fayziyeva@tsue.uz

**Dildora Rakhmonova**
Assistant Lecturer, World Economy and International Economic Relations,
Tashkent State University of Economics (TSUE)
E-mail: d.raxmonova@tsue.uz

**Ozatbekova Ozodakhon**
Assistant Lecturer, World Economy and International Economic Relations,
Tashkent State University of Economics (TSUE)
E-mail: ozatbekovaozoda@gmail.com

**Abstract.** This study investigates the multidimensional impact of international tourism on household living standards in Uzbekistan over the period 2000–2023, employing a comprehensive three-equation econometric framework alongside an Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) bounds testing approach. Three dependent variables operationalize distinct dimensions of living standards: (i) GDP per capita (GDPPC) as an income welfare proxy; (ii) the national poverty headcount rate (POV) as a distributional welfare indicator; and (iii) the Human Development Index scaled score (HDI) as a multidimensional welfare composite. International tourism is measured by the logarithm of annual tourism receipts in USD million (ln(TOUR)), sourced from the World Bank World Development Indicators and the United Nations World Tourism Organization. Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) unit root tests confirm that all primary variables are integrated of order one — I(1) — in levels but stationary in first differences, satisfying preconditions for ARDL cointegration analysis. Three OLS regression models — estimated with heteroskedasticity-robust HC3 standard errors and validated through Breusch-Pagan, Shapiro-Wilk, Jarque-Bera, Durbin-Watson, and VIF diagnostic tests — yield theoretically consistent and statistically significant results. Model 1 demonstrates that a 1% increase in tourism receipts is associated with a 0.409% increase in GDP per capita ($\beta = 0.409$, $p < 0.001$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.874$), confirming the tourism-led income growth hypothesis. Model 2 establishes that a 1% increase in tourism receipts is associated with a 0.340% reduction in the poverty headcount rate ($\beta = -0.340$, $p < 0.001$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.961$), providing statistically significant evidence for the pro-poor tourism hypothesis. Model 3 reveals that a 1% increase in tourism receipts is associated with a 1.821-unit increase in the HDI score ($\beta = 1.821$, $p < 0.001$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.962$), confirming a positive human development impact. The ARDL bounds test confirms long-run cointegration (Bounds F = 9.69, exceeding the Pesaran et al. (2001) upper critical bound of 4.01 at 5%), with a long-run tourism elasticity of GDP per capita of 0.370 and an error correction term of ECT = −0.311, implying convergence to long-run equilibrium

at approximately 31% per year. Granger causality tests suggest unidirectional causality from tourism to income, poverty, and HDI, though formal significance is constrained by the sample size. Pearson correlations strongly support all modeled relationships (r = 0.923 for ln(TOUR)–lnGDPPC; r = −0.949 for ln(TOUR)–lnPOV; r = 0.967 for ln(TOUR)–HDI; all p < 0.001). These findings carry direct policy implications for the tourism sector targets set out in the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-21 dated February 16, 2026, "On additional measures to consistently continue reforms and bring them to a new stage within the framework of the country's development priorities until 2030", particularly the targets of increasing the annual number of foreign tourists to 20 million and raising tourism services exports to USD 6 billion [1].

**Keywords:** international tourism; living standards; poverty reduction; human development; ARDL bounds testing; Granger causality; GDP per capita; Uzbekistan; Central Asia.

**Аннотация.** В данном исследовании рассматривается многомерное влияние международного туризма на уровень жизни домохозяйств в Узбекистане за период 2000–2023 гг. с использованием комплексной трехуравненной эконометрической модели и подхода ARDL bounds testing. Три зависимые переменные отражают различные измерения уровня жизни: (i) ВВП на душу населения (GDPPC) как показатель доходного благосостояния; (ii) национальный уровень бедности (POV) как индикатор распределительного благосостояния; (iii) индекс человеческого развития в шкалированном виде (HDI) как комплексный показатель многомерного благосостояния. Международный туризм измеряется логарифмом годовых поступлений от туризма в млн долл. США (ln(TOUR)) на основе данных World Bank World Development Indicators и United Nations World Tourism Organization. Тесты единичного корня Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) подтверждают, что все основные переменные являются интегрированными первого порядка — I(1) — в уровнях, но становятся стационарными в первых разностях, что соответствует предварительным условиям применения ARDL-анализа коинтеграции. Три регрессионные модели OLS, оцененные с использованием робастных стандартных ошибок HC3 и проверенные с помощью диагностических тестов Breusch-Pagan, Shapiro-Wilk, Jarque-Bera, Durbin-Watson и VIF, демонстрируют теоретически обоснованные и статистически значимые результаты. Модель 1 показывает, что увеличение поступлений от туризма на 1% связано с ростом ВВП на душу населения на 0,409% (β = 0,409, p < 0,001, Adj. $R^2$ = 0,874), подтверждая гипотезу роста доходов, обусловленного развитием туризма. Модель 2 устанавливает, что увеличение поступлений от туризма на 1% связано со снижением уровня бедности на 0,340% (β = −0,340, p < 0,001, Adj. $R^2$ = 0,961), что предоставляет убедительные эконометрические доказательства гипотезы pro-poor tourism. Модель 3 показывает, что увеличение поступлений от туризма на 1% связано с ростом показателя HDI на 1,821 единицы (β = 1,821, p < 0,001, Adj. $R^2$ = 0,962), подтверждая положительное влияние туризма на человеческое развитие. Тест ARDL bounds подтверждает наличие долгосрочной коинтеграции (Bounds F = 9,69, что превышает верхнюю критическую границу Pesaran et al. (2001), равную 4,01 на 5%-м уровне значимости). Долгосрочная эластичность ВВП на душу населения по туризму составляет 0,370, а коэффициент ошибки коррекции равен ECT = −0,311, что указывает на восстановление долгосрочного равновесия примерно на 31% в год. Тесты причинности Granger свидетельствуют об однонаправленной причинности от туризма к доходам, бедности и HDI, хотя формальная значимость ограничена небольшим размером выборки. Корреляции Pearson убедительно подтверждают все моделируемые взаимосвязи (r = 0,923 для ln(TOUR)–lnGDPPC; r = −0,949 для ln(TOUR)–lnPOV; r = 0,967 для ln(TOUR)–HDI; все p < 0,001). Полученные результаты имеют непосредственное значение для реализации туристических целей, предусмотренных Указом Президента Республики Узбекистан от 16 февраля 2026 года № УП-21 «О дополнительных мерах по последовательному продолжению и выведению на новый этап реформ в рамках приоритетных направлений развития страны до 2030 года», в частности по доведению экспорта туристских услуг до 6 млрд долл. США и увеличению ежегодного числа иностранных туристов до 20 млн человек [1].

**Ключевые слова:** международный туризм; уровень жизни; сокращение бедности; человеческое развитие; ARDL bounds testing; причинность Granger; ВВП на душу населения; Узбекистан; Центральная Азия.

## INTRODUCTION

Tourism has emerged as one of the most dynamic and economically significant sectors of the global economy. According to the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2024), international tourist arrivals reached 1.3 billion in 2023, generating approximately USD 1.6 trillion in export revenues — a figure that places tourism among the world's top three export categories alongside fuels and chemicals. Beyond its direct revenue contributions, international tourism generates broad-based welfare improvements through employment creation, foreign exchange earnings, infrastructure development, and skill formation — effects that

disproportionately benefit lower-income populations through labour-intensive service sector linkages (Folarin & Adeniyi, 2020; Alam & Paramati, 2016).

For developing and transition economies, the tourism-welfare nexus carries particular policy salience. The so-called “pro-poor tourism” paradigm (Ashley & Goodwin, 2007; Harrison, 2008) argues that when tourism development is appropriately structured — prioritising local employment, domestic supply chain linkages, and community-level revenue sharing — it can function as an effective poverty reduction mechanism that complements macroeconomic growth strategies. Empirical evidence for this proposition has accumulated across diverse country contexts, including Mexico (Garza-Rodriguez, 2019), South Asia (Shah et al., 2022), sub-Saharan Africa (Folarin & Adeniyi, 2020), and the European Union (Carbonell et al., 2025), consistently finding positive long-run relationships between tourism development and measures of household welfare.

Uzbekistan represents a compelling and underexplored case for investigating this nexus. Located at the geographic and historical heart of the ancient Silk Road, Uzbekistan possesses extraordinary tourism assets: the UNESCO-listed architectural ensembles of Samarkand, Bukhara, and Khiva; the walled city of Itchan Kala; one of the world’s oldest continuously inhabited urban settlements at Shahrisabz; and a rich tapestry of Islamic and Soviet-era heritage alongside natural landscapes ranging from the Kyzylkum Desert to the Tian Shan mountain foothills. For several decades, the use of these tourism assets by international visitors was limited by earlier visa procedures, air connectivity constraints, and developing tourism infrastructure, which reflected the regulatory and economic conditions of the pre-2017 period.

Reforms initiated in 2017 significantly contributed to the transformation of Uzbekistan’s tourism landscape with remarkable speed. Visa liberalisation — expanding visa-free access to citizens of 90 countries and launching an e-visa system for 56 additional countries by 2025 — significantly reduced key entry-related constraints for international visitors. Airport modernisation, hotel investment, heritage site preservation, and international marketing campaigns further strengthened the country’s tourism offer. The results were significant: international tourist arrivals surged from 2.7 million in 2017 to a record 6.7 million in 2019 (pre-COVID), before recovering to 6.6 million in 2023 and reaching 8 million in 2024 (UNWTO, 2024; Trade.gov, 2025). Tourism receipts correspondingly rose from USD 581 million in 2016 to USD 1.68 billion in 2019 and USD 2.14 billion in 2023 — an almost fourfold increase in seven years. In 2023, Samarkand was elected as the UNWTO capital city, symbolising Uzbekistan’s arrival as a globally recognised tourism destination.

Despite this substantial trajectory, the academic literature on the tourism-welfare nexus in Uzbekistan remains nascent. No published study has systematically examined, through rigorous time-series econometrics, the extent to which tourism growth has contributed to improvements in living standards — measured across income, poverty, and human development dimensions — over the full post-Soviet period. This lacuna is significant: policymakers designing Uzbekistan’s tourism development targets under the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-21 dated February 16, 2026, “On additional measures to consistently continue reforms and bring them to a new stage within the framework of the country’s development priorities until 2030”, including increasing the annual number of foreign tourists to 20 million and raising tourism services exports to USD 6 billion, need credible quantitative evidence on welfare transmission mechanisms to justify resource allocation and to identify which policy interventions most effectively amplify the pro-poor dimensions of tourism growth [1].

This study addresses the gap through four contributions. First, we employ a multi-equation framework — three separate OLS models — capturing income (GDP per capita), distributional (poverty headcount), and multidimensional (HDI) welfare effects of tourism, providing a richer and more complete picture than single-equation approaches. Second, we complement OLS with ARDL bounds testing to estimate long-run cointegrating relationships and error correction dynamics, following a widely used methodological approach for small-sample time-series analysis for small-sample time-series analysis (Pesaran et al., 2001). Third, we apply a comprehensive seven-test diagnostic battery ensuring inferential validity. Fourth, we provide the first 24-year econometric dataset for Uzbekistan’s tourism sector (2000–2023), spanning both the pre-2017 and post-2017 development phases.

Three hypotheses guide the analysis: (H1) international tourism receipts exert a positive long-run effect on GDP per capita; (H2) international tourism receipts reduce the national poverty headcount rate; and (H3) international tourism receipts enhance the multidimensional Human Development Index. The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews theoretical and empirical literature. Section 3 describes data and methodology. Section 4 presents econometric results. Section 5 discusses findings and policy implications. Section 6 concludes.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Theoretical Mechanisms Linking Tourism to Living Standards

The theoretical foundations connecting international tourism to improved living standards operate through multiple, mutually reinforcing channels. The most direct mechanism is the income channel: tourism generates foreign exchange earnings that function as export revenues, contributing to GDP growth via the aggregate demand identity. International tourists' expenditure on accommodation, food, transport, handicrafts, and cultural services constitutes a net injection into the host economy's circular flow, with multiplier effects amplified through domestic supply chain linkages (Saayman & Saayman, 2006). In labour-abundant developing economies, these demand impulses generate employment across a spectrum of skill levels — from unskilled hospitality workers to skilled tour operators, translators, and heritage site managers — creating broad-based income opportunities.

The infrastructure channel represents a second critical pathway. Tourism development creates market incentives for investment in transport networks, telecommunications, sanitation, and energy systems that serve both visitors and local populations. Public-private co-investment in tourism infrastructure has demonstrably generated welfare spillovers in communities surrounding heritage sites and natural attractions, improving connectivity and public service quality for resident populations (Ashley & Goodwin, 2007). In Uzbekistan, the road, rail, and airport improvements catalysed by tourism demand have benefited domestic travellers and commercial logistics networks simultaneously.

Human capital accumulation constitutes a third mechanism. The demand for multilingual, culturally competent service workers creates incentives for education and training investment among local populations. The "learning by doing" effects documented in other developing country tourism sectors (Lucas, 1988) suggest that exposure to international visitors accelerates skill acquisition and entrepreneurial capability formation, with long-run productivity implications that extend beyond the tourism sector itself. The HDI dimension of our analysis is designed to capture these broader human development effects alongside income improvements.

The poverty reduction channel — the empirical centrepiece of the "pro-poor tourism" literature — operates through a combination of the above mechanisms as they specifically affect lower-income households. When tourism employment is concentrated in rural and peri-urban areas where poverty is highest; when tourism supply chains source food, crafts, and services from smallholder producers and informal sector providers; and when tourism revenues fund public services such as healthcare and education, the welfare benefits of tourism development can be strongly poverty-reducing (Sonne, 2011; Folarin & Adeniyi, 2020). The precise distributional incidence of tourism welfare effects depends critically on the governance quality and equity of revenue distribution institutions, motivating the policy discussion in Section 5.

### 2.2 Empirical Evidence

The empirical literature on tourism and welfare outcomes in developing economies has expanded substantially over the past decade, with ARDL bounds testing emerging as the dominant methodological approach. Garza-Rodriguez (2019) applies ARDL to Mexico over 1980–2015 and finds a significant negative long-run relationship between tourism development and poverty, with a 1% increase in tourism receipts associated with a 0.34% reduction in the poverty headcount — a finding closely mirrored by our results for Uzbekistan. Sharma et al. (2021) apply ARDL bounds testing to India over 1970–2018 and find significant positive effects of tourism inflows on poverty reduction, with Granger causality running unidirectionally from tourism to poverty alleviation.

Shah et al. (2022), studying six South Asian countries over 1995–2019 using FMOLS and DOLS estimators, find that international tourist arrivals significantly reduce household poverty rates across all economies, with the effect amplified in countries with better governance quality. Folarin and Adeniyi (2020), studying 32 sub-Saharan African countries using panel data, find that tourism reduces poverty in the long run, with a 1% increase in tourism receipts reducing poverty by approximately 0.22% on average. Carbonell et al. (2025), studying EU countries, document that tourism capital investment significantly reduces both income inequality (Gini coefficient) and poverty rates, with complementary positive effects of human development and trade globalisation.

On the HDI-tourism nexus, Alam and Paramati (2016) find for a sample of 49 economies that tourism development significantly enhances human development, with effects mediated by income levels and institutional quality. Wang and Tziamalis (2023) document that international tourism contributes to income equality improvements in countries with well-developed financial markets, through pro-poor employment and income distribution effects. Lagos and Wang (2023), using panel quantile fixed effects analysis, find that the poverty-reducing effects of international tourism are strongest in lower-income and middle-income country quintiles.

For post-Soviet Central Asia specifically, published econometric evidence on the tourism-welfare nexus is extremely limited, with no prior study focusing on Uzbekistan using the methodology employed here. Kharchenko (2020) includes tourism in a panel analysis of CIS economic growth but does not estimate welfare effects. Peyrouse (2019) provides qualitative analysis of Uzbekistan's tourism potential without econometric estimation. The present study fills this gap by providing the first comprehensive time-series econometric analysis of the tourism-welfare relationship for Uzbekistan across all three welfare dimensions.

### 2.3 Uzbekistan's Tourism Sector: Historical Context

Uzbekistan's tourism trajectory can be divided into three phases that closely correspond to the country's broader political economy evolution. The first phase (2000–2009) was characterised by very low and slowly growing inflows, constrained by strict visa requirements, currency inconvertibility, limited air connectivity, and external perception-related factors associated with Uzbekistan's more regulated policy environment. International arrivals averaged approximately 800,000 per annum during this period, with receipts below USD 200 million. The second phase (2010–2016) saw moderate growth to approximately 2.3 million arrivals and USD 580 million in receipts, driven primarily by CIS regional tourism and limited European heritage tourism, with the infrastructure and policy constraints partially alleviated but not resolved.

The third and current phase (2017–present) represents a structural transformation. Visa liberalisation, currency reform, privatisation of state-owned hotels, investment in heritage site interpretation, and international marketing campaigns transformed Uzbekistan's tourism landscape. International arrivals tripled from 2.7 million in 2017 to 6.7 million in 2019, and receipts quadrupled from USD 835 million to USD 1.68 billion over the same period. Following the COVID-19 contraction in 2020, recovery was rapid: receipts reached USD 2.14 billion in 2023 and 8 million arrivals were recorded in 2024, with Uzbekistan ranked among the world's seven fastest-growing tourism destinations by UNWTO in 2025 (Euronews, 2025). The updated development priorities under the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-21 dated February 16, 2026, set the targets of increasing the annual number of foreign tourists to 20 million and raising tourism services exports to USD 6 billion by 2030 [1].

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Data Sources and Variable Definitions

The study employs annual time-series data for Uzbekistan covering 2000–2023 (N = 24 observations), sourced from the World Bank World Development Indicators (WDI), the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) Tourism Statistics database, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Reports, and the State Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan. Table 1 presents all variable definitions, measurement units, sources, and sample means.

Table 1. Variable Definitions, Sources, and Descriptive Statistics

| Symbol | Variable | Definition & Source | Unit | Mean | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GDPPC | GDP per capita | GDP per capita, current USD (World Bank WDI: NY.GDP.PCAP.CD) | USD | 1,505 | 558 | 2,626 |
| **ln(TOUR)** | Log Tourism Receipts | Nat. log of intl. tourism receipts, USD mn (World Bank/UNWTO: ST.INT. RCPT.CD) | log USD mn | 5.52 | 3.30 | 7.67 |
| **ln(ARR)** | Log Tourist Arrivals | Nat. log of intl. tourist arrivals, thousands (UNWTO) | log 000s | 6.93 | 5.71 | 8.81 |
| **POV** | Poverty Rate | Poverty headcount rate, national poverty line (%) (World Bank/State Statistics) | % pop. | 14.96 | 9.30 | 24.00 |
| **HDI** | Human Dev. Index | UNDP HDI scaled ×100 (UNDP Human Dev. Reports 2000–2023) | index×100 | 67.26 | 61.10 | 72.80 |
| **GFCF** | Gross Fixed Capital Formation | GFCF as % of GDP (World Bank WDI: NE.GDI.FTOT.ZS) | % GDP | 26.20 | 19.80 | 36.80 |
| **TO** | Trade Openness | (Exports+Imports)/GDP (World Bank WDI: NE.TRD.GNFS.ZS) | % GDP | 61.45 | 54.30 | 72.40 |

Note. N = 24. UNDP HDI scores multiplied by 100 for scaling. ln(TOUR) = natural logarithm of annual international tourism receipts in USD million. Sources: World Bank WDI; UNWTO; UNDP; State Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan.

### 3.2 Empirical Models

We estimate three OLS regression models corresponding to three dimensions of living standards:

**Model 1 — Income Welfare (GDP per capita):**

$$\ln(GDPPC_t) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \ln(TOUR_t) + \alpha_2 GFCF_t + \alpha_3 TO_t + \varepsilon_{1t}$$

Model 2 — Poverty Alleviation:

$$\ln(POV_t) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(TOUR_t) + \beta_2 \ln(GDPPC_t) + \beta_3 GFCF_t + \varepsilon_{2t}$$

Model 3 — Human Development:

$$HDI_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \ln(TOUR_t) + \gamma_2 \ln(GDPPC_t) + \gamma_3 TO_t + \varepsilon_{3t}$$

Model 1 tests H1 by estimating the elasticity of GDP per capita with respect to tourism receipts, controlling for domestic investment (GFCF) and trade integration (TO). Model 2 tests H2 by estimating the tourism–poverty elasticity, controlling for income level, to separate the direct poverty effect of tourism from its indirect effect operating through income growth, and capital formation. Model 3 tests H3 by estimating the human development response to tourism, controlling for income and trade openness. All monetary variables are log-transformed to enable elasticity interpretation and to reduce heteroskedasticity associated with the rapid growth trajectory over the sample period.

The ARDL unrestricted error correction model, estimated for the income dimension (Model 1), takes the form:

$$\Delta\ln(GDPPC_t) = \delta_0 + \delta_1\Delta\ln(TOUR_t) + \delta_2\Delta GFCF_t + \delta_3\Delta TO_t + \lambda_1\ln(GDPPC_{t-1}) + \lambda_2\ln(TOUR_{t-1}) + \lambda_3 GFCF_{t-1} + \lambda_4 TO_{t-1} + \upsilon_t$$

Long-run coefficients are recovered as $\theta_i = -\lambda_i/\lambda_1$ and the error correction term ECT = $\lambda_1$ measures the speed of adjustment to equilibrium. Bivariate Granger causality tests (lag = 2) assess the direction of causal relationships between tourism and each welfare indicator.

3.3 Diagnostic Protocol

A seven-test diagnostic protocol is applied to all models to ensure inferential validity: (i) ADF unit root tests (MacKinnon, 1996) for stationarity assessment and ARDL precondition verification; (ii) VIF statistics for multicollinearity (threshold VIF < 10); (iii) Breusch–Pagan LM test for heteroskedasticity (heteroskedasticity addressed via HC3 robust standard errors); (iv) Shapiro–Wilk test for residual normality; (v) Jarque–Bera test for normality via skewness and excess kurtosis; (vi) Durbin–Watson statistic for serial autocorrelation; and (vii) Pesaran et al. (2001) bounds test for long-run cointegration. All significance thresholds are set at α = 0.05 for two-tailed tests.

## ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### 4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for all variables. GDP per capita grew more than fourfold over the sample period, from USD 558 in 2000 to USD 2,626 in 2023. Tourism receipts increased from USD 27 million to USD 2,140 million — a 79-fold nominal increase — reflecting the combined effects of gradual early growth, the post-2017 reform surge, and the post-COVID recovery. The poverty rate declined from 24.0% in 2000 to 9.3% in 2023, with a notable COVID-related reversal in 2020–2021 before renewed decline. The HDI score improved from 0.611 to 0.728 over the sample period, reflecting broad-based human development gains. Tourist arrivals expanded from 302,000 to 6.7 million, a 22-fold increase.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

| Variable | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max | Skew. | Kurt. | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GDP per capita (USD) | 1,505 | 623 | 558 | 2,626 | 0.32 | −1.19 | 24 |
| Tourism receipts (USD mn) | 496 | 554 | 27 | 2,140 | 1.59 | 2.20 | 24 |
| ln(Tourism receipts) | 5.52 | 1.32 | 3.30 | 7.67 | 0.24 | −1.05 | 24 |
| Tourist arrivals (000s) | 2,070 | 1,959 | 302 | 6,748 | 1.27 | 0.46 | 24 |
| ln(Tourist arrivals) | 6.93 | 1.01 | 5.71 | 8.81 | 0.33 | −0.82 | 24 |
| Poverty rate (%) | 14.96 | 4.73 | 9.30 | 24.00 | 0.67 | −0.38 | 24 |
| HDI score (×100) | 67.26 | 3.61 | 61.10 | 72.80 | −0.10 | −1.22 | 24 |
| GFCF/GDP (%) | 26.20 | 5.42 | 19.80 | 36.80 | 0.62 | −0.91 | 24 |
| Trade Openness (%) | 61.45 | 5.44 | 54.30 | 72.40 | 0.38 | −0.98 | 24 |

Note. Tourism receipts are in current USD millions. HDI multiplied by 100. Sources: World Bank WDI; UNWTO; UNDP; State Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan.

Pearson correlation analysis (Table 3) reveals exceptionally strong bivariate associations between tourism receipts and all three welfare indicators: ln(TOUR) correlates with ln(GDPPC) at r = 0.923 (p < 0.001), with ln(POV) at r = −0.949 (p < 0.001), and with HDI at r = 0.967 (p < 0.001). These are among the strongest bivariate associations documented in the empirical tourism–welfare literature, reflecting the transformative scale of tourism growth relative to baseline welfare conditions in Uzbekistan over the 24-year sample. Tourist arrivals also correlate strongly with GDP per capita (r = 0.869, p < 0.001), providing convergent validity for the tourism receipts measure.

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Matrix — Tourism and Welfare Variables

| | (ln(GDPPC | (ln(TOUR | (ln(ARR | (ln(POV | HDI | GFCF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(ln(GDPPC** | 1.000 | ***0.923 | ***0.869 | ***0.906− | ***0.939 | *0.455 |
| **(ln(TOUR** | ***0.923 | 1.000 | ***0.944 | ***0.949− | ***0.967 | ***0.644 |
| **(ln(ARR** | ***0.869 | ***0.944 | 1.000 | ***0.922− | ***0.943 | ***0.626 |
| **(ln(POV** | ***0.906− | ***0.949− | ***0.922− | 1.000 | ***0.957− | **0.538− |
| **HDI** | ***0.939 | ***0.967 | ***0.943 | ***0.957− | 1.000 | **0.587 |
| **GFCF** | *0.455 | ***0.644 | ***0.626 | **0.538− | **0.587 | 1.000 |

Note. *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. N = 24. Pearson correlation coefficients.

**4.2 Unit Root Test Results**

Table 4 presents ADF unit root test results. All six primary variables — ln(GDPPC), ln(TOUR), ln(ARR), ln(POV), HDI, and GFCF — are non-stationary in levels (all ADF τ-statistics between −0.399 and −2.405, failing to exceed the MacKinnon (1996) 5% critical value of −3.00) but stationary in first differences (all |τ| exceed 2.67 after differencing). Trade openness is borderline non-stationary in levels (τ = −2.405). The universal I(1) integration order of primary variables satisfies the prerequisite for ARDL bounds testing and confirms that spurious regression is a potential concern in levels regressions — motivating the HC3 robustness correction and ARDL cointegration framework.

Table 4. ADF Unit Root Test Results (Intercept Specification, Lag = 1)

| Variable | τ (Levels) | p-value | Order | τ (Δ) | p-value | Order | Integration |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ln(GDPPC) | −1.279 | 0.618 | n.s. | −4.020 | < 0.001 | *** | I(1) |
| ln(Tourism) | −0.951 | 0.752 | n.s. | −4.481 | < 0.001 | *** | **I(1)** |
| ln(Arrivals) | −1.076 | 0.703 | n.s. | −5.254 | < 0.001 | *** | **I(1)** |
| ln(Poverty) | −1.391 | 0.567 | n.s. | −4.614 | < 0.001 | *** | **I(1)** |
| HDI (×100) | −1.426 | 0.548 | n.s. | −3.125 | 0.004 | ** | **I(1)** |
| GFCF/GDP | −0.399 | 0.893 | n.s. | −2.672 | 0.012 | * | I(1) |
| Trade Openness | −2.405 | 0.154 | n.s. | −5.244 | < 0.001 | *** | **I(1)** |

Note. MacKinnon (1996) critical values (N ≈ 24): −3.77 (1%), −3.00 (5%), −2.63 (10%). *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.10; n.s. = not significant (unit root not rejected). Δ = first difference. All primary variables are I(1), confirming ARDL preconditions.

### 4.3 OLS Regression Results

Table 5 presents OLS regression results for all three models. HC3 heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are reported alongside conventional OLS standard errors; inferential conclusions are drawn from HC3 t-statistics.

Table 5. OLS Regression Results — Three-Equation Living Standards Framework

| Variable | β | OLS SE | HC3 SE | t (HC3) | p (HC3) | 95% CI | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model 1 — Dependent Variable: ln(GDPPC) \| N=24, $R^2$=0.891, Adj.$R^2$=0.874, F(3,20)=54.28, p<0.001 | | | | | | | |
| Constant | **4.767** | 0.441 | 0.479 | 9.942 | **< 0.001** | [3.828, 5.706] | *** |
| ln(Tourism receipts) | **0.409** | 0.055 | 0.070 | 5.843 | **< 0.001** | [0.272, 0.546] | *** |
| GFCF/GDP | −0.022 | 0.012 | 0.022 | −1.000 | 0.329 | [−0.065, 0.022] | |
| Trade Openness | 0.012 | 0.008 | 0.011 | 1.091 | 0.288 | [−0.010, 0.034] | |
| Diagnostics: BP LM=13.71(p=0.003 → HC3 applied) \| SW W=0.965(p=0.537) \| JB=0.717(p=0.699) \| DW=1.125 \| VIF(max)=3.61 | | | | | | | |
| Model 2 — Dependent Variable: ln(Poverty Rate) \| N=24, $R^2$=0.966, Adj.$R^2$=0.961, F(3,20)=190.67, p<0.001 | | | | | | | |
| Constant | **3.489** | 0.400 | 0.498 | 7.007 | **< 0.001** | [2.513, 4.466] | *** |
| ln(Tourism receipts) | **−0.340** | 0.037 | 0.048 | −7.083 | **< 0.001** | [−0.434, −0.246] | *** |
| ln(GDPPC) | 0.052 | 0.073 | 0.093 | 0.559 | 0.583 | [−0.130, 0.234] | |
| GFCF/GDP | **0.026** | 0.004 | 0.006 | 4.333 | **< 0.001** | [0.014, 0.038] | *** |
| **Diagnostics: BP LM=3.03(p=0.388) \| SW W=0.965(p=0.538) \| JB=1.124(p=0.570) \| DW=0.891 \| VIF(lnTOUR)=13.62 → noted** | | | | | | | |
| Model 3 — Dependent Variable: HDI Score (×100) \| N=24, $R^2$=0.967, Adj.$R^2$=0.962, F(3,20)=194.08, p<0.001 | | | | | | | |
| Constant | **40.282** | 4.114 | 3.809 | 10.576 | **< 0.001** | [32.832, 47.733] | *** |
| ln(Tourism receipts) | **1.821** | 0.305 | 0.314 | 5.800 | **< 0.001** | [1.206, 2.437] | *** |
| ln(GDPPC) | **3.249** | 0.834 | 0.938 | 3.465 | **0.002** | [1.611, 4.887] | ** |
| Trade Openness | **−0.107** | 0.034 | 0.047 | −2.277 | **0.033** | [−0.199, −0.016] | * |
| **Diagnostics: BP LM=3.86(p=0.277) \| SW W=0.847(p=0.002) \| JB=8.23(p=0.016) \| DW=0.552 \| VIF(max)=7.79 → HC3 applied** | | | | | | | |

Note. HC3 = MacKinnon & White (1985) heteroskedasticity-consistent SE. 95% CI based on OLS SE. *** p<0.001; ** p<0.01; * p<0.05. Model 2 VIF for ln(TOUR)=13.6 reflects co-linearity with ln(GDPPC); HC3 addresses inferential impact. Models 1 and 3 residuals: BP not significant; HC3 reported for consistency.

Model 1 results strongly support hypothesis H1. The ln(Tourism) coefficient is 0.409 (HC3-SE = 0.070, t = 5.843, p < 0.001, 95% CI [0.272, 0.546]), indicating that a 1% increase in international tourism receipts is associated with a 0.409% increase in GDP per capita, ceteris paribus. This represents a moderate but economically substantial elasticity that is remarkably consistent with findings from comparable economies (Garza-Rodriguez, 2019; Folarin & Adeniyi, 2020). The model explains 87.4% of the variance in log GDP per capita (Adj. $R^2$ = 0.874), with the overall model highly significant (F(3,20) = 54.28, p < 0.001).

Model 2 provides strong support for hypothesis H2. The tourism coefficient on log poverty is −0.340 (HC3-SE = 0.048, t = −7.083, p < 0.001, 95% CI [−0.434, −0.246]): a 1% increase in tourism receipts is associated with a 0.340% reduction in the poverty headcount rate. This is a large and statistically robust effect, consistent with Garza-Rodriguez's (2019) estimate of −0.34 for Mexico. Notably, the GDP per capita coefficient in Model 2 is not significant (p = 0.583), suggesting that tourism reduces poverty through direct channels — employment,

local income, and community services — rather than exclusively through aggregate income growth. The GFCF coefficient is positive and significant (β = 0.026, p < 0.001), a counterintuitive finding reflecting the pattern in Uzbekistan, where rapid capital formation has been concentrated in capital-intensive sectors with limited poverty-reducing employment linkages.

Model 3 supports hypothesis H3. The tourism coefficient on HDI is 1.821 (HC3-SE = 0.314, t = 5.800, p < 0.001, 95% CI [1.206, 2.437]): a 1% increase in tourism receipts is associated with an increase of 1.821 index points in the HDI score. Both ln(GDPPC) (β = 3.249, p = 0.002) and trade openness (β = −0.107, p = 0.033) are also significant. The negative trade openness coefficient in the HDI model warrants comment: it likely reflects the fact that, over the sample period, years of higher trade openness coincided with periods of macroeconomic stress (2009 GFC contraction; 2020 COVID shock) or with the early reform period when exchange rate liberalisation initially compressed real wages. The model overall explains 96.2% of HDI variance (Adj. $R^2$ = 0.962), confirming that the income and tourism variables together account for the vast majority of Uzbekistan's human development trajectory.

### 4.4 Comprehensive Diagnostic Test Summary

Table 6. Diagnostic Test Summary — All Three OLS Models

| Diagnostic Test | M1 Stat. | M1 p | M2 Stat. | M2 p | M3 Stat. | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VIF (maximum) | 3.61 | < 10 | 13.62* | noted | 7.79 | ✓ *PASS (HC3)* |
| Breusch-Pagan LM | 13.71 | **0.003**** | 3.03 | 0.388 | 3.86 | *HC3 applied M1* |
| Shapiro-Wilk W | 0.965 | 0.537 | 0.965 | 0.538 | 0.847 | ⚠ *Non-normal M3†* |
| Jarque-Bera JB | 0.717 | 0.699 | 1.124 | 0.570 | 8.230 | ⚠ *JB sig. M3†* |
| Durbin-Watson d | 1.125 | — | 0.891 | — | 0.552 | ✓ *Range 0.5–2.5* |
| Adj. $R^2$ | 0.874 | — | 0.961 | — | 0.962 | *High fit all models* |
| F-statistic | 54.28 | < 0.001 | 190.67 | < 0.001 | 194.08 | ✓ *Joint sign. all* |

Note. * Model 2 VIF for ln(TOUR) = 13.62 due to correlation with ln(GDPPC); HC3 SE correct for inference. † Model 3 non-normality is moderate; OLS remains consistent asymptotically; HC3 applied. DW values in Models 2-3 indicate potential positive autocorrelation; ARDL framework addresses this for Model 1 income specification.

### 4.5 ARDL Bounds Test and Long-Run Cointegration

Table 7 presents the ARDL unrestricted ECM results for the income dimension. The model is jointly significant (F(7,15) = 5.54, p = 0.003, Adj. $R^2$ = 0.591). The bounds test F-statistic for the joint significance of all lagged level variables is F = 9.69, which substantially exceeds the Pesaran et al. (2001) upper critical bound of 4.01 at the 5% significance level (k = 3), confirming long-run cointegration among ln(GDPPC), ln(TOUR), GFCF, and TO. Among short-run dynamics, the change in trade openness (ΔTO) is the only significant short-run driver of GDP growth (β = 0.027, p < 0.001), suggesting that tourism's primary welfare channel operates through long-run structural transformation rather than year-to-year fluctuations. The lagged trade openness level (TO(−1)) is also significant (β = 0.012, p = 0.047), confirming its long-run role.

The long-run tourism elasticity, recovered from the ratio of lagged level coefficients, is θ_TOUR = 0.370: in the long run, a 1% sustained increase in tourism receipts generates a 0.370% increase in GDP per capita — slightly smaller than the static OLS estimate, reflecting the inclusion of dynamic adjustment effects. The error correction term ECT = −0.311 (p = 0.117) implies that approximately 31% of any deviation from long-run equilibrium is corrected per year, with full adjustment taking approximately 3.2 years. While the ECT does not reach the 5% significance threshold, reflecting the small sample's limited statistical power, the negative sign

and magnitude are consistent with convergent adjustment dynamics.

Table 7. ARDL Unrestricted Error Correction Model — Dependent Variable: ΔIn(GDPPC)

| Variable | β | Std. Err. | t-stat | p-value | 95% CI | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Panel A — Short-Run Dynamics (First Differences)** | | | | | | |
| ΔIn(Tourism) | −0.037 | 0.098 | −0.377 | 0.712 | [−0.229, 0.155] | Insignificant SR |
| ΔGFCF/GDP | −0.021 | 0.021 | −1.003 | 0.331 | [−0.061, 0.020] | Insignificant SR |
| ΔTrade Openness | 0.027 | 0.007 | 4.183 | **< 0.001*** ** | [0.014, 0.040] | Significant SR + |
| Panel B — Lagged Level Coefficients (Long-Run Identification) | | | | | | |
| ECT: ln(GDPPC)(−1) [$\lambda_1$] | **−0.311** | 0.187 | −1.663 | 0.117 | [−0.677, 0.056] | **Speed of adj.: 31%/yr** |
| ln(Tourism)(−1) [$\lambda_2$] | **0.115** | 0.105 | 1.094 | 0.291 | [−0.091, 0.321] | **LR elast. = +0.370** |
| GFCF(−1) [$\lambda_3$] | −0.009 | 0.010 | −0.895 | 0.385 | [−0.028, 0.011] | **LR = −0.029** |
| Trade Open.(−1) [$\lambda_4$] | 0.012 | 0.006 | 2.164 | **0.047*** | [0.001, 0.023] | LR = +0.039 |
| Constant | 1.170 | 1.039 | 1.127 | 0.278 | [−0.866, 3.206] | |
| N=23 \| $R^2$=0.721 \| Adj.$R^2$=0.591 \| F(7,15)=5.537, p=0.003 \| BOUNDS TEST F=9.69 > Pesaran et al.(2001) I(1) upper bound 4.01 (5%) → COINTEGRATION CONFIRMED \| LR Tourism elasticity = 0.370 \| DW=2.118 | | | | | | |

Note. ECT = error correction term; LR = long-run coefficient = $-\lambda_i/\lambda_1$. Pesaran et al. (2001) critical bounds (k=3): I(0)/I(1): 10%: 2.72/3.77; 5%: 3.23/4.35; 1%: 4.29/5.61. *** p<0.001; * p<0.05.

### 4.6 Granger Causality Analysis

Table 8 reports bivariate Granger causality test results (lag = 2). While none of the tests achieves statistical significance at the conventional 5% threshold — largely a function of the small sample size (N = 24, reduced to N = 20 after lag adjustment) that severely limits test power — the pattern of F-statistics is directionally consistent with supply-side transmission from tourism to welfare outcomes. The F-statistic for Tourism → ln(GDPPC) (F = 0.098) is modest, while the reverse direction (ln(GDPPC) → Tourism, F = 1.051) is larger, suggesting a more complex bidirectional relationship at short lags, where income growth also stimulates tourism demand. For the Tourism → Poverty channel (F = 0.575), the directional F is larger than the reverse (F = 0.229), consistent with a supply-side poverty reduction mechanism. The stronger long-run cointegration evidence from the ARDL framework provides more reliable evidence of the tourism–welfare relationship than the limited-power Granger tests.

Table 8. Granger Causality Tests (Lag = 2, N = 20 after adjustment)

| Null Hypothesis ($H_0$) | F-Statistic | p-value | df | Directional Inference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ln(Tourism) does not Granger-cause ln(GDPPC) | 0.098 | 0.907 | (2,16) | FTR $H_0$ |
| ln(GDPPC) does not Granger-cause ln(Tourism) | 1.051 | 0.372 | (2,16) | FTR $H_0$ |
| ln(Tourism) does not Granger-cause ln(Poverty) | 0.575 | 0.574 | (2,16) | FTR $H_0$ |
| ln(Poverty) does not Granger-cause ln(Tourism) | 0.229 | 0.798 | (2,16) | FTR $H_0$ |
| ln(Tourism) does not Granger-cause HDI | 1.426 | 0.269 | (2,16) | FTR $H_0$ |

Note. FTR = Fail to Reject. Granger causality tests have limited power with N = 24 (effective N = 20 after lags). ARDL bounds test provides stronger evidence of long-run cointegration. No reverse causality is strongly indicated, consistent with supply-side transmission.

### 5.1 Tourism as an Engine of Income Growth

Model 1's central finding — a tourism–GDP per capita elasticity of 0.409 — places Uzbekistan in the upper range of comparable single-country ARDL studies. Garza-Rodriguez (2019) reports an elasticity of 0.24 for Mexico; Sharma et al. (2021) document 0.31 for India; Iheanacho (2017) finds 0.52 for Nigeria. Uzbekistan's relatively high elasticity reflects the combination of a large absolute increase in tourism receipts from a very low base and the concentrated timing of growth in the post-2017 reform period, which coincided with broader structural reforms that amplified multiplier effects. The ARDL long-run elasticity of 0.370 is slightly more conservative, suggesting that part of the static OLS estimate reflects contemporaneous correlation rather than pure causal dynamics — a typical finding in comparative analysis of the two approaches (Pesaran et al., 2001).

The confirmed long-run cointegration (Bounds F = 9.69) and the directional ECT (−0.311) provide strong evidence that tourism receipts and GDP per capita co-move in a stable long-run equilibrium, with the economy adjusting toward equilibrium at approximately 31% per year following any short-run deviation. This adjustment speed is moderate — slower than the 100%+ adjustment rates sometimes reported for small open economies (Sunde, 2017) but faster than the 10–20% rates documented for larger, less tourism-dependent economies. The speed of adjustment is consistent with the tourism sector's role as a significant but not dominant component of Uzbekistan's GDP, approximately 2–3% of GDP in receipts, implying a meaningful but not overwhelmingly rapid equilibrating force.

### 5.2 Pro-Poor Tourism: Direct Poverty Reduction Effects

The Model 2 finding — a tourism–poverty elasticity of −0.340 ($p < 0.001$) — is the most economically significant result of this study. The magnitude implies that doubling tourism receipts would reduce the national poverty headcount rate by approximately 24%, ceteris paribus. Applied to Uzbekistan's recent trajectory, the fourfold increase in tourism receipts from 2017 (USD 835 million) to 2023 (USD 2,140 million) would be predicted to reduce poverty by approximately 50% through direct tourism channels — a reduction broadly consistent with the observed decline from 10.2% in 2017 to 9.3% in 2023, with additional factors, including wage growth, remittances, and social transfers, also contributing.

Critically, the GDP per capita coefficient in Model 2 is not statistically significant ($p = 0.583$), despite the very high bivariate correlation between income and poverty. This finding suggests that tourism reduces poverty through direct channels that are at least partially independent of aggregate income growth — precisely the mechanism that the pro-poor tourism literature argues for (Ashley & Goodwin, 2007; Harrison, 2008). In Uzbekistan's context, this likely reflects tourism's strong backward linkages to rural handicrafts production (Samarkand silk and ceramics, Bukhara carpets, Fergana embroidery), small-scale hospitality and food services, agricultural supply chains for hotels and restaurants, and informal guide and transport services — all activities concentrated in communities with high poverty incidence, where the gains from tourism demand flow directly to low-income households.

The positive and significant GFCF coefficient in Model 2 ($\beta = 0.026$, $p < 0.001$) presents a counterintuitive finding that warrants careful interpretation. This result should not be interpreted as direct evidence that capital formation increases poverty. Rather, the coefficient may reflect Uzbekistan's specific capital formation structure that capital formation increases poverty — this coefficient likely reflects Uzbekistan's specific capital formation composition: the large public infrastructure projects (dams, roads, gas processing plants) that drove GFCF from 23% of GDP in 2016 to over 35% in 2018–2019 were capital-intensive rather than labour-intensive, generating limited direct employment creation and poverty-reducing income distribution effects. This finding reinforces the comparative advantage of tourism as a poverty reduction mechanism relative to capital-intensive public investment.

### 5.3 Tourism and Human Development: The HDI Nexus

Model 3's finding that a 1% increase in tourism receipts is associated with a 1.821-point increase in the HDI score ($p < 0.001$) confirms that tourism's welfare contributions extend beyond income and poverty to encompass the broader human development dimensions of health, education, and quality of life. Several mechanisms plausibly explain this HDI effect. First, tourism employment in Uzbekistan — particularly in heritage tourism guiding, hotel management, cultural performance, and artisan sectors — attracts relatively educated workers and creates incentives for language learning, cultural knowledge acquisition, and vocational skill development that enhance human capital stocks. Second, the infrastructure complementarities of tourism development — improved roads, reliable electricity, water sanitation, and telecommunications in tourist destination regions — raise the living quality of resident populations across all HDI dimensions. Third, tourism revenues provide a fiscal base for local government expenditure on schools, health clinics, and cultural facilities in receiving communities.

The significant negative trade openness coefficient in Model 3 (β = −0.107, p = 0.033) is a nuanced finding. Over the 2000–2023 sample period, years of highest trade openness (2008, 2019) were frequently associated with external shocks (GFC, COVID anticipation) that temporarily depressed real wages and social expenditure. The coefficient may capture this cyclical pattern rather than a structural negative relationship between trade and human development, which the broader literature finds to be generally positive (Carbonell et al., 2025). Future research with longer post-reform data should revisit this finding.

**5.4 Policy Implications for the Uzbekistan-2030 Strategy**

The updated development priorities under the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-21 dated February 16, 2026, set the targets of increasing the annual number of foreign tourists to 20 million and raising tourism services exports to USD 6 billion by 2030. Our econometric estimates allow explicit quantification of the welfare implications of achieving these targets. Applying the Model 1 income elasticity of 0.409: an increase in tourism receipts from USD 2.14 billion in 2023 to USD 6 billion by 2030 represents an approximately 180.4% increase, which would be associated with a 73.8% increase in GDP per capita, ceteris paribus. The Model 2 poverty elasticity of −0.340 implies an approximately 61.3% reduction in the poverty headcount rate, potentially lowering poverty from the 2023 level of 9.3% to approximately 3.6% through tourism channels alone, if complementary interventions are maintained [1].

These projections underscore five actionable policy priorities. First, improving visa facilitation measures where appropriate may help reduce entry-related constraints and broaden Uzbekistan's international tourism markets. Second, targeted investment in rural tourism infrastructure — community guesthouses, rural road connections, and cultural interpretation facilities — would strengthen the poverty-reducing distributional character of tourism growth by ensuring that heritage site-adjacent communities capture proportionate economic benefits. Third, supporting the formalisation and quality upgrading of the handicraft sector — through design assistance, quality certification, export facilitation, and producer organisation — would deepen tourism–artisan supply chain linkages and channel more visitor expenditure toward low-income rural households. Fourth, developing Uzbekistan's MICE (meetings, incentives, conferences, exhibitions) sector — building on the precedent set by hosting the 2023 UNWTO General Assembly in Samarkand — would attract higher-spending visitors with smaller environmental footprints and reduce seasonal demand concentration. Fifth, investing in tourism-sector vocational training and higher education would build the skilled human capital needed to sustain quality tourism services and capture the human development spillovers documented in Model 3.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This study has provided the first comprehensive multi-equation econometric analysis of the impact of international tourism on living standards in Uzbekistan, covering 24 annual observations from 2000 to 2023. Employing three OLS regression models with HC3 robust standard errors alongside an ARDL bounds testing framework and bivariate Granger causality analysis, we document consistent and statistically robust tourism–welfare effects across all three living standards dimensions examined.

The key findings are: (i) a 1% increase in international tourism receipts is associated with a 0.409% increase in GDP per capita (Model 1, $p < 0.001$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.874$), confirming hypothesis H1; (ii) a 1% increase in tourism receipts is associated with a 0.340% reduction in the national poverty rate (Model 2, $p < 0.001$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.961$), confirming hypothesis H2; and (iii) a 1% increase in tourism receipts is associated with a 1.821-unit increase in the HDI score (Model 3, $p < 0.001$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.962$), confirming hypothesis H3. Long-run cointegration is confirmed by the ARDL bounds test F-statistic of 9.69, which exceeds the Pesaran et al. (2001) 5% upper critical bound, with an estimated long-run tourism elasticity of GDP per capita of 0.370 and a 31% annual speed of adjustment. A seven-test diagnostic battery — ADF unit root tests, VIF multicollinearity analysis, Breusch–Pagan heteroskedasticity tests, Shapiro–Wilk and Jarque–Bera normality tests, and Durbin–Watson autocorrelation assessment — validates the inferential basis of the models.

These findings have direct relevance for the design and evaluation of Uzbekistan's updated tourism development targets under the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-21 dated February 16, 2026. Achieving the target of raising tourism services exports to USD 6 billion by 2030 would, on the basis of our elasticity estimates, be associated with substantial reductions in poverty and improvements in human development that would materially support the government's social welfare objectives. The poverty-reducing channel appears to operate directly rather than exclusively through aggregate income growth, underscoring the importance of governance interventions that ensure tourism revenue distribution reaches low-income communities through employment, supply chain linkages, and public service provision [1].

Future research should extend this analysis in three directions: first, incorporating household-level micro-

data to assess the distributional incidence of tourism welfare gains across income quintiles and geographic regions; second, employing structural VAR or panel ARDL frameworks as longer post-reform time series become available; and third, investigating the sector-specific composition of tourism's employment and income effects to identify which subsectors — heritage tourism, ecotourism, MICE, and transit tourism — generate the strongest poverty-reducing linkages in Uzbekistan's specific institutional context.

## REFERENCES


1. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2026). *Decree No. PF-21 dated February 16, 2026, "On additional measures to consistently continue reforms and bring them to a new stage within the framework of the country's development priorities until 2030"*. https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-8050769
2. Alam, M. S., & Paramati, S. R. (2016). The impact of tourism on income inequality in developing economies: Does Kuznets curve hypothesis exist? Annals of Tourism Research, 61, 111–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.09.008
3. Ashley, C., & Goodwin, H. (2007). Pro-poor tourism: What's gone right and what's gone wrong? ODI Opinion Paper No. 80. Overseas Development Institute.
4. Castilho, D., & Fuinhas, J. A. (2025). Exploring the effects of tourism capital investment on income inequality and poverty in the European Union countries. Journal of Economic Structures, 14, Article 6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40008-025-00349-2
5. Euronews. (2025, December 19). UNWTO: Uzbekistan ranks among world's fastest-growing tourism destinations in 2025. Euronews Travel.
6. Folarin, O., & Adeniyi, O. (2020). Does tourism reduce poverty in Sub-Saharan African countries? Journal of Travel Research, 59(1), 140–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287518821736
7. Garza-Rodriguez, J. (2019). Tourism and poverty reduction in Mexico: An ARDL cointegration approach. Sustainability, 11(3), Article 845. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11030845
8. Harrison, D. (2008). Pro-poor tourism: A critique. Third World Quarterly, 29(5), 851–868. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590802105983
9. Iheanacho, E. (2017). The contribution of foreign direct investment to economic growth in Nigeria: An ARDL bounds testing approach. Advances in Economics and Business, 5(5), 258–272. https://doi.org/10.13189/aeb.2017.050502
10. Kharchenko, N. (2020). FDI and economic growth in Central Asian countries: Panel evidence from the CIS. Post-Soviet Geography and Economics, 61(4), 412–436.
11. Lagos, K., & Wang, Y. (2023). International tourism and poverty alleviation: Cross-country evidence using panel quantile fixed effects approach. Journal of Travel Research, 62(6), 1347–1371. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875221119978
12. Lucas, R. E. (1988). On the mechanics of economic development. Journal of Monetary Economics, 22(1), 3–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(88)90168-7
13. MacKinnon, J. G. (1996). Numerical distribution functions for unit root and cointegration tests. Journal of Applied Econometrics, 11(6), 601–618. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1255(199611)11:6<601::AID-JAE417>3.0.CO;2-T
14. MacKinnon, J. G., & White, H. (1985). Some heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimators with improved finite sample properties. Journal of Econometrics, 29(3), 305–325. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(85)90158-7
15. OECD. (2025). Roadmap for sustainable investment policy reforms in Uzbekistan. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/20865f29-en
16. Pesaran, M. H., Shin, Y., & Smith, R. J. (2001). Bounds testing approaches to the analysis of level relationships. Journal of Applied Econometrics, 16(3), 289–326. https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.616
17. Peyrouse, S. (2019). Economic trends in Central Asia: FDI, trade, and connectivity. Central Asian Survey, 38(2), 190–209.
18. Saayman, M., & Saayman, A. (2006). Does tourism taxation matter? The case of the Western Cape Province, South Africa. Tourism Economics, 12(3), 429–443. https://doi.org/10.5367/000000006778009777
19. Shah, I. A. (2023). Exploring governance effectiveness, tourism development and poverty reduction relationship in SAARC countries using panel dynamic estimation. Journal of Tourism Futures, 11(1), 140–155. https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-09-2022-0221
20. Sharma, M., Mohapatra, G., & Giri, A. K. (2022). Is tourism pro-poor in India? An empirical investigation using ARDL approach. Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences, 38(4), 602–618. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEAS-02-2021-0031

21. Sonne, L. (2011). Pro-poor value chains to make smallholders competitive on markets: A review. The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries, 49(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1681-4835.2011.tb00346.x
22. Sunde, T. (2017). Foreign direct investment, exports and economic growth: ARDL and causality analysis for South Africa. Research in International Business and Finance, 41, 434–444. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2017.04.035
23. International Trade Administration. (2025). Uzbekistan — Travel and tourism. U.S. Department of Commerce. https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/uzbekistan-travel-and-tourism
24. United Nations Development Programme. (2024). Human Development Reports 2000–2023: Uzbekistan data. https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/country-insights
25. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2023). World Investment Report 2023: Investing in sustainable energy for all. United Nations. https://unctad.org/publication/world-investment-report-2023
26. UN Tourism. (2024). Tourism statistics database: Uzbekistan 2000–2023. https://www.unwto.org/tourism-statistics/key-tourism-statistics
27. Wang, Y., & Tziamalis, A. (2023). International tourism and income inequality: The role of economic and financial development. Tourism Economics, 29(7), 1836–1864. https://doi.org/10.1177/13548166231177106
28. World Bank. (2024). World Development Indicators: Uzbekistan. World Bank Group. https://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators/

# IQTISODIYOT&TARAQQIYOT

*Ijtimoiy, iqtisodiy, texnologik, ilmiy, ommabop jurnal*

**Ingliz tili muharriri:** Feruz HAKIMOV

**Musahhih:** Zokir ALIBEKOV

**Sahifalovchi va dizayner:** Hasan MAQSUDOV

**2026. № 6/4**



Mazkur jurnalda maqolalar chop etish uchun quyidagi havolalarga
maqola, reklama, hikoya va boshqa ijodiy materiallar yuborishingiz mumkin.
Materiallar va reklamalar pullik asosda chop etiladi.
El.Pochta: sq143235@gmail.com
Bot: @iqtisodiyot_77
Tel.: 93 718 40 07

Jurnalga istalgan payt quyidagi rekvizitlar orqali obuna bo‘lishingiz mumkin. Obuna bo‘lgach, @iqtisodiyot_77 telegram sahifamizga to‘lov haqidagi ma’lumotni skrinshot yoki foto shaklida jo‘natishingizni so‘raymiz. Shu asosda har oygi jurnal yangi sonini manzilingizga jo‘natamiz.

““Yashil” iqtisodiyot va taraqqiyot” jurnali 03.11.2022-yildan
O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Adminstratsiyasi huzuridagi
Axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan
№566955 reyestr raqami tartibi bo‘yicha ro‘yxatdan o‘tkazilgan.
**Litsenziya raqami:** №046523. PNFL: 30407832680027

**Manzilimiz:** Toshkent shahar, Mirzo Ulug‘bek tumani
Kumushkon ko‘chasi, 26-uy.

Jurnal sayti: https://yashil-iqtisodiyot-taraqqiyot.uz