Online Appendix

Appendix A (Tables A1 to A12)

Table A1

Socio-demographic Characteristics of the LFS Sample

Sample	Whole sample (1)	Prime-age sample (2)
Age	41.00	40.62
	(13.80)	(8.68)
Female	0.51	0.51
High-school dropouts	0.51	0.45
High-school graduates	0.31	0.32
University education	0.18	0.23
Immigrant	0.08	0.09
Participation	0.69	0.82
Employed	0.58	0.70
Tourism-rel. employment	0.07	0.08
Services employment	0.34	0.41
Manufacturing employment	0.09	0.10
Primary sector	0.09	0.11
Permanent contract	0.34	0.43
Temporary contract	0.13	0.15
Full-time employed	0.51	0.62
Part-time employed	0.07	0.08
Log usual hours of work	2.00	2.44
	(1.81)	(1.72)
Log tourist inflow	5.78	5.79
	(1.10)	(1.10)
Log terrorist incidents	-1.21	-1.21
	(0.77)	(0.77)
Obs.	7,891,227	5,178,218
Log daily wage	3.91	3.94
	(0.54)	(0.53)
Obs.	3,915,107	3,195,666

Note: sample used in the labour market analysis comes from the Labor Force Survey years 2001 to 2018 and includes individuals aged 16 to 65 in column 1 and individuals aged 25 to 55 in column 2. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses. Wage information is based on the data from Social Security records.

Table A2

Tourist Inflows to Provinces Most Exposed to Shocks in the Third Quarter of 2015

Dep.var.	Log tourist inflows	
Data level	Province-Quarterly	
Sample	Whole period, 2001-2018	2001-2017
	(1)	(2)
More affected provinces x Post-2015Q3	0.0592*	0.0645**
	(0.0300)	(0.0295)
Observations	3,744	3,328
Number of clusters	52	52
Number of years	18	17
Year-quarter FE	yes	yes
Province FE	yes	yes

Notes: The table presents a difference-in-difference specification, illustrating the differential increase in tourism inflows in provinces most exposed to shocks during the third quarter of 2015. The analysis is based on a province-quarter level panel. A province is considered "most affected" if its measure of exposure is above the median for the third quarter of 2015. Robust standard errors clustered at a province level . *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table A3

Exposure to the Shocks in 2015Q3 and Tourist Inflows Across Spanish Provinces

Dep.var.	Employment in tourism industry			
Data level	Full period,	Drop 2018,	Full period,	Drop 2018,
Sample	ages 16-65	ages 16-65	ages 25-55	ages 25-55
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
More affected provinces x Post-2015Q3	0.00379*	0.00400*	0.00513*	0.00597**
	(0.0022)	(0.0022)	(0.0030)	(0.0030)
Observations	7,894,097	7,482,731	5,180,108	4,917,519
Number of clusters	52	52	52	52
Number of years	18	17	18	17
Year-quarter FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
Province FE	yes	yes	yes	yes

Notes: The table presents a difference-in-difference specification, illustrating the differential increase in tourism inflows in provinces most exposed to shocks during the third quarter of 2015. The analysis is based on a province-quarter level panel. A province is considered "most affected" if its measure of exposure is above the median for the third quarter of 2015. Robust standard errors clustered at a province level . *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A4

First Stage for Dometics vs International Tourist Inflows

Dep.var.	Log inflows	
Sample	International	Domestic
	(1)	(2)
Log number fatal incidents	0.6281***	0.3745***
	(0.0875)	(0.0604)
F-stat.	51.58	38.40
SD Regressor	0.77	0.77
Observations	5,178,218	5,178,218
R-squared	0.97	0.97
Province FE	yes	yes
Region-year-quarter FE	yes	yes
Demographic controls	yes	yes

Notes: table displays individual-level first-stage regressions where the outcome variables are log inflow of international and domestic tourists in columns 1 and 2, respectively. The F-statistic on the excluded instruments is displayed at the bottom. Standard errors clustered on year-quarter level. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table A5

Decomposing the Employment Effects by Sector, Conditional on Employment

Sample	Whole sample		Prime-age sample	
Specification	FE	2SLS	FE	2SLS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Panel A: Tourism-related employment				
Log inflow	0.0443***	0.0427***	0.0418***	0.0416***
	(0.0016)	(0.0047)	(0.0016)	(0.0051)
Avg. Dep. Var.	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
Panel B: Employment in other services				
Log inflow	-0.0092***	0.0219*	-0.0059*	0.0241*
	(0.0035)	(0.0131)	(0.0035)	(0.0127)
Avg. Dep. Var.	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67
Panel C: Manufacturing employment				
Log inflow	-0.0076***	-0.0127***	-0.0078***	-0.0142***
	(0.0012)	(0.0047)	(0.0013)	(0.0046)
Avg. Dep. Var.	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14
Panel D: Employment in primary sectors				
Log inflow	-0.0274***	-0.0519***	-0.0281***	-0.0515***
	(0.0021)	(0.0126)	(0.0022)	(0.0125)
Avg. Dep. Var.	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
F-stat on excl. IV		54.40		54.33
Observations	3,879,817	3,879,817	3,166,858	3,166,858
Demographics	yes	yes	yes	yes
Province FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
Region-Quarter-Year FE	yes	yes	yes	yes

Note: table shows estimates of tourism on employment across different sectors (specifically, tourism, services, manufacturing and primary in panels A, B, C and D, respectively) using the fixed effects and two-stage-least-square regressions, where tourist inflows are instrumented by the number of terrorist attacks in alternative destinations accrued to a province. The results are conditional on individual employment. In columns 1-2, the whole sample is included, while in columns 3-4 the focus is on the prime-age individuals, 25 to 55 years old. Robust standard errors clustered on quarter-year level in parentheses. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table A6

Event Study, First Stage and Reduced Form Estimates

Dep. var.	Log tourist inflows	Tourism-related employment	Employment in other sectors
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Log number fatal incidents t-4	-0.0092	0.0016	0.0062
	(0.0566)	(0.0018)	(0.0037)
Log number fatal incidents t-3	0.0061	0.0023	-0.0013
	(0.0507)	(0.0018)	(0.0031)
Log number fatal incidents t-2	0.0719	0.0023	0.0024
	(0.0499)	(0.0018)	(0.0032)
Log number fatal incidents t	0.3691***	0.0046*	-0.0049
	(0.0687)	(0.0025)	(0.0034)
Log number fatal incidents t+1	-0.0347	-0.0002	0.0014
	(0.0433)	(0.0015)	(0.0031)
Log number fatal incidents t+2	-0.0361	0.0001	-0.0001
	(0.0502)	(0.0016)	(0.0027)
Log number fatal incidents t+3	-0.0477	0.0003	-0.0007
	(0.0501)	(0.0018)	(0.0028)
Log number fatal incidents t+4	0.7601***	0.0124***	-0.0091**
	(0.0804)	(0.0031)	(0.0038)
Observations	4,259,437	4,259,437	4,259,437
Demographics	yes	yes	yes
Province FE	yes	yes	yes
Region-Quarter-Year FE	yes	yes	yes

Note: table shows estimates of the dynamic effects of terrorist incidents in the alternative destinations on tourist inflows in column 1 and on the tourism-related and other employment in columns 2 and 3, respectively. The estimates are based on the prime-aged population. Standard deviation log tourist inflow is 1.10. Robust standard errors clustered on quarter-year level in parentheses. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table A7a

Robustness to Different Types of Incidents

Type of attack used for Instrument contruction	Perpetrators are Islamic groups	Non-Islamic groups	Excluding transnational		Transnational attacks
			Based on target	Based on target and victim	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel A: Employment (all sectors)					
Log inflow	-0.0162	0.0047	0.0026	0.0022	-0.0032
	(0.0117)	(0.0055)	(0.0058)	(0.0059)	(0.0148)
Panel B: Log hours employment					
Log inflow	-0.0372	0.0643***	0.0531**	0.0530**	0.0342
	(0.0446)	(0.0194)	(0.0205)	(0.0206)	(0.0537)
Panel C: Tourism-related employment					
Log inflow	0.0235***	0.0099***	0.0099***	0.0098***	0.0179*
	(0.0056)	(0.0034)	(0.0037)	(0.0037)	(0.0098)
F-stat on excl. IV	22.54	56.68	52.64	52.71	11.95
Observations	5,178,218	5,178,218	5,178,218	5,178,218	5,178,219
Demographics	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Province FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Region-Quarter-Year FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Notes: The table presents estimates of the impact of tourism on total employment, employment in tourism-related activities, and usual hours of work, using two-stage least squares regressions where tourist inflows are instrumented by the number of terrorist attacks in alternative destinations assigned to each province. The sample includes individuals aged 25 to 55. Column 1 includes only attacks by Islamic terrorist groups, while column 2 excludes Islamic terrorism from the instrument. Columns 3 and 4 exclude transnational incidents, whereas column 5 focuses solely on transnational incidents. Column 6 considers attacks against civilian populations, column 7 excludes incidents that might not be terror-related (likely guerrilla actions or other crimes), column 8 drops country-year observations with the highest number of attacks in a given year, and column 9 excludes attacks occurring in Spain. The standard deviation in log inflow is 1.10. Robust standard errors are clustered at the quarter-year level and reported in parentheses. Significance levels are indicated as follows: *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$.

Table A7b

Robustness to Different Types of Incidents

Type of attack used for Instrument contruction	Attacks against civilian population	Excl. attacks that are doubted to be terror-rel.	Drop 1% most affected alt. desti-nations	Excluding shocks in Spain
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Panel A: Employment (all sectors)				
Log inflow	0.0015	0.0018	0.0018	0.0025
	(0.0079)	(0.0057)	(0.0063)	(0.0062)
Panel B: Log hours employment				
Log inflow	0.0359	0.0492**	0.0504**	0.0289
	(0.0293)	(0.0208)	(0.0226)	(0.0199)
Panel C: Tourism-related employment				
Log inflow	0.0134***	0.0088**	0.0090**	0.0141***
	(0.0039)	(0.0036)	(0.0040)	(0.0035)
F-stat on excl. IV	29.20	50.19	46.06	64.00
Observations	5,178,218	5,178,218	5,178,218	5,178,218
Demographics	yes	yes	yes	yes
Province FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
Region-Quarter-Year FE	yes	yes	yes	yes

Notes: The table presents estimates of the impact of tourism on total employment, employment in tourism-related activities, and usual hours of work, using two-stage least squares regressions where tourist inflows are instrumented by the number of terrorist attacks in alternative destinations assigned to each province. The sample includes individuals aged 25 to 55. Column 1 includes only attacks by Islamic terrorist groups, while column 2 excludes Islamic terrorism from the instrument. Columns 3 and 4 exclude transnational incidents, whereas column 5 focuses solely on transnational incidents. Column 6 considers attacks against civilian populations, column 7 excludes incidents that might not be terror-related (likely guerrilla actions or other crimes), column 8 drops country-year observations with the highest number of attacks in a given year, and column 9 excludes attacks occurring in Spain. The standard deviation in log inflow is 1.10. Robust standard errors are clustered at the quarter-year level and reported in parentheses. Significance levels are indicated as follows: *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$.

Table A8

Robustness to Defining Tourist Inflows Relative Local Population

Specification	FE	2SLS
	(1)	(2)
Panel A: Employment (all sectors)		
Inflow (per capita)	0.0271***	0.0029
	(0.0017)	(0.0080)
Panel B: Log hours employment		
Inflow (per capita)	0.1014***	0.0706**
	(0.0052)	(0.0283)
Panel C: Tourism-related employment		
Inflow (per capita)	0.0210***	0.0130***
	(0.0008)	(0.0047)
F-statistic on excl. IV		43.05
Observations	5,178,218	5,178,218
Demographics	yes	yes
Province FE	yes	yes
Region-Quarter-Year FE	yes	yes

Notes: The outcome variables include an indicator for employment (Panel A), the logarithm of hours worked (Panel B), and employment in tourism-related activities (Panel C). The main regressor is defined in terms of tourists per inhabitant. Robust standard errors, clustered at the quarter-year level, are reported in parentheses. Significance levels are denoted as follows: *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$.

Table A9

Robustness to Fixing Tourism Composition to Its 2000 Level

Specification	Inflow and outflow shares fixed on 2000 level	Outflow shares fixed on 2000 level	Inflow shares fixed on 2000 level
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A: Employment (all sectors)			
Log inflow	0.0234***	0.0042	0.0225***
	(0.0054)	(0.0060)	(0.0055)
Panel B: Log hours employment			
Log inflow	0.1137***	0.0580***	0.0924***
	(0.0224)	(0.0210)	(0.0227)
Panel C: Tourism-related employment			
Log inflow	0.0082**	0.0098**	0.0088**
	(0.0036)	(0.0038)	(0.0034)
F-stat on excl. IV	34.87	46.24	36.84
Observations	5,180,108	5,178,218	5,180,108
Demographics	yes	yes	yes
Province FE	yes	yes	yes
Region-Quarter-Year FE	yes	yes	yes

Note: table shows estimates of tourism on employment across different sectors using two-stage-least-square regressions. The sample is includes prime-age individuals, 25 to 55 years old. In column 1, the instrument is specified using shares fixed at the year 2000 level, both for tourist inflows and outflows. In column 2, the outflow shares are fixed, but the inflow composition is allowed to vary and takes on the lagged values from the previous year. In columns 3, the outbound tourism composition is allowed to change but the composition of the inflows is fixed. Robust standard errors clustered on quarter-year level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A10

First Stage Alternative Instrument

Dep.var.	Log tourist inflows			
IV specification	Using coast instrument, linear trend	Using coast instrument, square trend	Using coast and patrimony instrument, linear trend	Using coast and patrimony instrument, square trend
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Log coast (km) * Mediterranean * Time	-0.0028**	-0.0057	-0.0023**	-0.0044
	(0.0011)	(0.0044)	(0.0010)	(0.0042)
Log coast (km) * Time	0.0002	0.0018***	-0.0001	0.0012*
	(0.0001)	(0.0005)	(0.0002)	(0.0007)
Mediterranean * Time	0.0146***	0.0260	0.0124***	0.0202
	(0.0047)	(0.0195)	(0.0044)	(0.0183)
Patrimonio 1 * Time			0.0000	-0.0024**
			(0.0003)	(0.0011)
Patrimonio 2 * Time			-0.0010**	-0.0052***
			(0.0005)	(0.0019)
Patrimonio 3-5 * Time			0.0039***	0.0069***
			(0.0005)	(0.0019)
Log coast (km) * Mediterranean * Time sq.		0.0000		0.0000
		(0.0001)		(0.0001)
Log coast (km) * Time sq.		-0.0000***		-0.0000*
		(0.0000)		(0.0000)
Mediterranean * Time sq.		-0.0002		-0.0001
		(0.0003)		(0.0002)
Patrimonio 1 * Time sq.				0.0000**
				(0.0000)
Patrimonio 2 * Time sq.				0.0001**
				(0.0000)
Patrimonio 3-5 * Time sq.				-0.0000
				(0.0000)
F-stat.	60.27	54.48	41.40	77.13
Observations	5,178,218	5,178,218	5,178,218	5,178,218
R-squared	0.97	0.98	0.97	0.98
Province FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
Region-year-quarter FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
Demographic controls	yes	yes	yes	yes

Notes: table displays individual-level first stage regressions, where we test the strength of the alternative instrumental variable strategy as described in Section 2.3. The F-statistic on the excluded instruments is displayed at the bottom. Standard errors clustered on year-quarter level. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table A11

Impact of Tourism on Commuting

Dep. Var.	Commuting indicator	
Specification	FE	2SLS
	(1)	(2)
Log inflow province of work	0.0124***	0.0150***
	(0.0026)	(0.0056)
F-stat on excl. IV		54.404
Observations	3,195,660	3,195,660
Demographics	yes	yes
Province FE	yes	yes
Region-Quarter-Year FE	yes	yes

Notes: we estimate the impact of tourism into a province on the probability that workers commute to work from a different province. Based on the Social Security data and a sample of prime-aged workers. Robust standard errors, clustered at the quarter-year level, are reported in parentheses. Significance levels are indicated as follows: *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$.

Table A12

Impact of Tourism Shocks on Province's Population

Dep.Var.	Log prime-age pop.			
Specification	FE	2SLS	FE	2SLS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Log inflow	0.0006	0.0464	-0.0054*	0.0086
	(0.0035)	(0.0471)	(0.0028)	(0.0157)
Avg. Dep. Var.	12.42	12.42	12.42	12.42
F-statistic		58.88		67.87
Observations	3,736	3,736	3,736	3,736
Demographics	no	no	no	no
Province FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
Quarter-Year FE	yes	yes		
Region-Quarter-Year FE			yes	yes

Note: table shows province-level estimates of the impact of tourism on (log) prime-age population of the province. Robust standard errors clustered on quarter-year level in parentheses. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Appendix B (Tables B1 to B5)

Table B1

Share of Tourist Outflows by Destination from the United Kingdom, Germany, France and the United States

United Kingdom		Germany		France		United States	
Panel A: 2001							
Spain	24.43	France	20.59	Spain	26.54	Mexico	29.06
France	17.57	Italy	17.93	Italy	18.42	Canada	24.29
USA	7.52	Spain	15.11	Tunisia	3.97	France	5.52
Ireland	7.07	Austria	11.54	USA	3.42	Puerto Rico	4.08
Greece	5.38	Turkey	4.06	Germany	3.37	Germany	3.26
Italy	4.18	Switzerland	3.65	Belgium	3.22	Italy	2.35
Netherlands	3.81	Greece	3.48	Andorra	3.21	Bahamas	2.04
Germany	3.34	Netherlands	2.01	Morocco	3.19	Netherlands	1.74
Cyprus	2.73	USA	1.95	Greece	2.84	Spain	1.73
Belgium	2.44	Czech Rep.	1.83	Switzerland	2.22	Switzerland	1.46
Portugal	2.09	Poland	1.48	Turkey	1.86	Jamaica	1.43
Canada	1.56	Tunisia	1.35	Netherlands	1.76	Ireland	1.29
Switzerland	1.37	Portugal	1.22	Portugal	1.66	Hong Kong	1.23
Turkey	1.22	Hungary	0.95	Martinique	1.50	Austria	1.05
Austria	1.19	Belgium	0.94	Austria	1.44	Dominican Rep.	0.96
Thailand	0.95	Croatia	0.92	Canada	1.41	Brazil	0.93
Malta	0.83	Norway	0.84	UK	1.34	China	0.82
India	0.72	Thailand	0.59	Reunion	1.28	Thailand	0.76
South Africa	0.65	Egypt	0.59	Ireland	1.09	Aruba	0.70
UAE	0.62	Sweden	0.53	Thailand	0.93	Virgin Islands	0.69
Panel B: 2010							
Spain	23.33	France	17.86	Spain	24.33	Mexico	27.92
France	11.40	Spain	13.44	Italy	14.07	Canada	17.89
Ireland	7.40	Italy	13.25	Morocco	5.31	France	4.19
USA	7.22	Austria	12.74	Germany	4.08	Puerto Rico	3.97
Italy	5.75	Turkey	6.22	Tunisia	4.02	Germany	3.60
Turkey	4.41	Switzerland	3.86	USA	4.02	Italy	3.40
Germany	3.79	Hungary	3.35	Belgium	3.26	Jamaica	1.87
Greece	3.38	Greece	3.11	Greece	2.60	Dominican Rep.	1.84
Netherlands	3.13	USA	2.63	Turkey	2.49	Spain	1.71
Portugal	2.06	Netherlands	2.56	Switzerland	2.37	China	1.67
Cyprus	1.87	Poland	1.60	Netherlands	1.96	Bahamas	1.65
Belgium	1.69	Czech Rep.	1.54	Portugal	1.83	Netherlands	1.52
Switzerland	1.55	Egypt	1.12	Austria	1.40	India	1.36

Egypt	1.51	Portugal	1.11	Thailand	1.32	Hong Kong	1.26
Thailand	1.43	Belgium	1.10	Canada	1.30	Costa Rica	1.21
India	1.38	Croatia	0.93	UK	1.30	Ireland	1.17
Canada	1.33	Thailand	0.91	Martinique	1.12	Switzerland	1.16
Austria	1.31	Sweden	0.70	Guadeloupe	1.11	Brazil	0.97
South Africa	0.85	Tunisia	0.68	Reunion	1.04	Virgin Islands	0.92
Hong Kong	0.79	Ireland	0.58	Ireland	1.03	Israel	0.91

Panel C: 2018

Spain	25.20	Italy	15.04	Spain	25.56	Mexico	31.57
France	8.42	France	14.07	Italy	16.70	Canada	13.60
Italy	7.48	Spain	13.09	Germany	4.15	France	4.23
Ireland	6.53	Austria	12.20	Morocco	4.03	Italy	3.37
USA	6.35	Greece	5.02	USA	3.98	Germany	3.02
Greece	4.01	Turkey	4.97	Greece	3.43	Spain	2.78
Germany	3.73	Netherlands	3.89	Portugal	3.30	Puerto Rico	2.51
Netherlands	3.20	Hungary	2.64	Belgium	2.57	Dominican Rep.	2.20
Turkey	2.93	USA	2.37	Netherlands	2.07	Ireland	1.64
Portugal	2.82	Switzerland	2.25	Switzerland	1.82	Netherlands	1.56
Cyprus	1.81	Poland	1.97	Tunisia	1.71	Jamaica	1.53
UAE	1.77	Czech Rep.	1.74	Thailand	1.63	India	1.33
India	1.36	Portugal	1.61	Turkey	1.58	China	1.29
Thailand	1.30	Egypt	1.08	Canada	1.36	Bahamas	1.23
Austria	1.24	Thailand	1.00	Ireland	1.18	Costa Rica	1.16
Belgium	1.16	Croatia	0.99	Austria	1.11	Switzerland	1.12
Switzerland	1.11	Belgium	0.94	Andorra	1.09	Greece	1.03
Canada	1.08	Ireland	0.88	UK	1.00	Thailand	1.03
Hungary	1.04	Bulgaria	0.73	Reunion	0.96	Philippines	0.97
Malta	0.87	UAE	0.72	UAE	0.88	Portugal	0.88

Notes: The table displays the composition of outbound tourist flows in 2001, 2010, and 2018 from the UK, Germany, France, Italy, and the USA. Only the 20 destinations with the largest tourist inflows are shown. The data is sourced from the UNWTO outbound tourism series.

Table B2

Tourist Inflow Composition to Provinces of Barcelona, Balearic Islands, Madrid and Málaga

2001		2010		2018	
Panel A: Barcelona					
United Kingdom	14.48	Italy	12.17	France	13.92
Italy	11.56	France	11.95	United Kingdom	12.53
France	9.97	United Kingdom	11.18	United States	10.11
United States	8.94	United States	8.22	Italy	9.85
Germany	7.75	Germany	7.77	Germany	9.65
Japan	7.22	Japan	3.80	Netherlands	3.70
Netherlands	3.90	Netherlands	3.53	Russia	3.39
Portugal	2.74	Sweden	2.36	Japan	3.05
Switzerland	2.59	Portugal	2.32	Belgium	2.61
Belgium	2.45	Belgium	1.85	Switzerland	2.45
Sweden	1.53	Switzerland	1.83	Portugal	2.38
Norway	1.37	Ireland	1.69	Sweden	1.92
Greece	1.24	Russia	1.69	Poland	1.53
Ireland	1.07	Denmark	1.33	Denmark	1.36
Austria	0.88	Greece	1.31	Ireland	1.32
Finland	0.87	Austria	1.26	Austria	1.08
Denmark	0.84	Finland	1.18	Norway	0.99
Russia	0.70	Norway	1.17	Finland	0.97
Poland	0.38	Poland	0.79	Greece	0.60
Czech Republic	0.24	Czech Republic	0.32	Czech Republic	0.49
Luxembourg	0.13	Luxembourg	0.13	Luxembourg	0.14
Panel B: Madrid					
United States	15.30	Italy	12.06	United States	11.61
United Kingdom	11.72	United States	10.37	France	9.08
France	7.74	France	8.25	United Kingdom	8.93
Italy	7.44	United Kingdom	8.09	Italy	8.91
Japan	6.76	Portugal	6.00	Germany	6.50
Germany	5.58	Germany	5.99	Portugal	6.07
Portugal	5.05	Japan	3.57	Netherlands	3.29
Netherlands	2.18	Netherlands	2.70	Japan	2.49
Belgium	1.66	Belgium	1.59	Russia	2.01
Sweden	0.94	Russia	1.50	Switzerland	1.93
Switzerland	0.89	Ireland	1.43	Belgium	1.80
Austria	0.72	Switzerland	1.13	Ireland	1.22
Greece	0.63	Greece	1.12	Poland	1.20
Ireland	0.60	Sweden	0.91	Sweden	1.10
Russia	0.59	Austria	0.90	Denmark	0.95

Norway	0.51	Denmark	0.86	Austria	0.84
Denmark	0.50	Poland	0.72	Finland	0.68
Poland	0.47	Finland	0.71	Norway	0.61
Finland	0.39	Norway	0.64	Greece	0.53
Czech Republic	0.15	Czech Republic	0.32	Czech Republic	0.34
Luxembourg	0.15	Luxembourg	0.12	Luxembourg	0.13

Panel C: Balearic Islands

Germany	61.44	Germany	73.50	Germany	56.53
United Kingdom	19.98	United Kingdom	10.61	United Kingdom	15.18
France	3.19	Austria	2.60	Switzerland	2.99
Italy	2.68	Switzerland	1.56	Sweden	2.93
Switzerland	2.04	France	1.56	France	2.79
Sweden	1.40	Sweden	1.05	Italy	2.12
Belgium	1.18	Netherlands	0.97	Austria	2.00
United States	0.92	Denmark	0.90	Netherlands	1.94
Netherlands	0.87	Italy	0.87	Denmark	1.86
Austria	0.80	United States	0.84	United States	1.28
Denmark	0.80	Norway	0.36	Norway	1.25
Luxembourg	0.63	Belgium	0.35	Belgium	1.24
Czech Republic	0.47	Russia	0.32	Poland	0.99
Finland	0.31	Portugal	0.32	Finland	0.79
Russia	0.25	Ireland	0.21	Russia	0.76
Japan	0.16	Luxembourg	0.18	Portugal	0.56
Norway	0.14	Czech Republic	0.16	Ireland	0.43
Portugal	0.09	Poland	0.15	Japan	0.38
Ireland	0.06	Japan	0.14	Luxembourg	0.26
Poland	0.04	Finland	0.09	Czech Republic	0.21
Greece	0.04	Greece	0.06	Greece	0.08

Panel D: Alicante

United Kingdom	62.29	United Kingdom	53.68	United Kingdom	52.64
Belgium	5.41	Belgium	5.94	Netherlands	6.18
Netherlands	5.27	Germany	5.13	Belgium	6.02
Germany	5.16	Netherlands	4.50	France	4.21
France	4.51	France	3.89	Germany	3.99
Italy	2.64	Portugal	3.22	Norway	3.07
Norway	1.24	Italy	2.71	Sweden	2.80
United States	1.18	Norway	1.85	Italy	2.76
Russia	0.87	Ireland	1.82	Ireland	1.79
Portugal	0.82	Sweden	1.14	Russia	1.41
Switzerland	0.74	United States	0.99	Switzerland	1.32
Sweden	0.65	Russia	0.98	Finland	1.26

Ireland	0.56	Switzerland	0.91	Denmark	1.19
Denmark	0.33	Poland	0.71	United States	1.07
Greece	0.26	Denmark	0.64	Poland	1.02
Poland	0.26	Finland	0.53	Portugal	0.85
Finland	0.25	Austria	0.37	Austria	0.27
Japan	0.19	Czech Republic	0.18	Czech Republic	0.24
Austria	0.13	Greece	0.15	Japan	0.12
Czech Republic	0.13	Japan	0.14	Greece	0.09
Luxembourg	0.05	Luxembourg	0.06	Luxembourg	0.08

Notes: The table displays the composition of international tourist inflows during the first quarter of 2001, 2010, and 2018 for four destination provinces: Barcelona, Madrid, the Balearic Islands, and Alicante. Data is sourced from FRONTUR.

Table B3

International Tourist Arrivals to Spain by Origin

2001		2009		2018	
Germany	22.35	United Kingdom	20.07	United Kingdom	18.82
United Kingdom	22.34	Germany	19.03	Germany	14.07
France	9.78	France	10.92	France	10.90
Italy	6.25	Italy	6.99	United States	5.47
United States	5.92	United States	4.79	Italy	5.46
Netherlands	3.69	Netherlands	3.98	Netherlands	3.89
Belgium	3.37	Portugal	3.52	Portugal	2.80
Portugal	3.33	Belgium	2.97	Belgium	2.57
Japan	2.14	Sweden	1.74	Sweden	2.22
Switzerland	1.79	Ireland	1.72	Switzerland	1.83
Sweden	1.69	Switzerland	1.62	Russia	1.77
Russia	0.98	Japan	1.60	Ireland	1.74
Norway	0.86	Russia	1.35	Poland	1.66
Ireland	0.83	Denmark	1.15	Denmark	1.23
Denmark	0.70	Norway	1.00	Norway	1.21
Austria	0.69	Poland	0.97	Japan	1.01
Poland	0.60	Austria	0.87	Austria	0.89
Czech Republic	0.52	Finland	0.73	Finland	0.80
Finland	0.51	Czech Republic	0.52	Czech Republic	0.50
Greece	0.29	Greece	0.40	Greece	0.25
Luxembourg	0.24	Luxembourg	0.20	Luxembourg	0.16
Cumulative	88.86		86.13		79.22

Note: The table displays the compostion of international tourist inflows in 2001, 2009 and 2018. The table displays the 21 countries with highest tourist inflows to Spain covered by the FRONTUR data on international arrivals to Spain.

Table B4

Conditinal Correlations Across Reported Tourist Inflows

D.V.	Arrivals of tourists by country of residence				Arrivals of tourists by nationality		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Arrivals of tourists by nat.	0.966***						
	(0.001)						
Arrivals of visitors by res.		0.121***					
		(0.001)					
Arrivals tourists to hotels by res.			1.125***				
			(0.026)				
Arrivals tourists to all accommodation by res.				0.848***			
				(0.019)			
Arrivals of visitors by nat.					0.573***		
					(0.137)		
Arrivals tourists to hotels by nat.						0.900***	
						(0.099)	
Arrivals tourists to all accommodation by nat.							0.771***
							(0.098)
R-squared	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.97	0.97
Observations	1,248	1,992	2,930	1,960	2,701	2,663	1,233
Origin-Destination FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Notes: Standard errors clustered on destination country level in parentheses. World Tourism Organization data. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table B5

Tourism-Related Employment Shares Across Provinces

Year	2001		2018	
	Rank	Employment share	Rank	Employment share
Balearic Islands	1	24.19	2	27.37
Las Palmas	2	21.33	1	31.22
Málaga	3	17.22	4	19.79
Girona	4	16.68	6	16.26
Tarragona	5	13.47	8	14.54
Cantabria	6	13.18	11	12.42
Madrid	7	12.97	9	13.14
Granada	8	12.19	13	12.32
Sevilla	9	12.05	23	11.18
Alicante	10	12.03	7	16.17
Asturias	11	11.69	20	11.32
Ávila	12	11.59	21	11.27
Cádiz	13	11.58	5	17.66
Salamanca	14	11.40	27	10.80
Huesca	15	11.40	12	12.34
Almería	16	11.40	24	11.10
Vizcaya	17	11.19	31	10.17
Burgos	18	11.17	28	10.50
Valencia	19	11.01	14	11.84
Barcelona	20	10.95	10	13.03
Valladolid	21	10.39	35	9.76
Pontevedra	22	10.38	22	11.25
Castellón	23	10.36	18	11.37
Guipúzcoa	24	10.30	17	11.60
Albacete	25	10.19	47	8.26
Álava	26	10.17	39	9.30
León	27	10.12	29	10.36
Cuenca	28	10.11	37	9.60
Navarra	29	9.91	38	9.57
Zaragoza	30	9.86	33	9.83
Segovia	31	9.83	15	11.69
Murcia	32	9.57	40	9.25
Cáceres	33	9.53	42	9.20
Palencia	34	9.51	41	9.24
A Coruña	35	9.40	19	11.36
Jaén	36	9.39	45	8.55

Toledo	37	9.31	43	9.05
La Rioja	38	9.26	50	7.68
Ciudad Real	39	9.11	49	7.97
Córdoba	40	8.90	25	11.10
Lleida	41	8.85	32	10.00
Ourense	42	8.73	26	10.84
Huelva	43	8.57	36	9.61
Guadalajara	44	8.54	3	19.90
Soria	45	8.54	46	8.35
Teruel	46	8.30	16	11.62
Lugo	47	8.28	34	9.76
Zamora	48	7.78	48	8.03
Badajoz	49	7.75	44	8.99
Melilla	50	7.18	51	7.63
Ceuta	51	7.08	30	10.22
Average		10.86		11.87
SD		(3.16)		(4.51)
Min		7.08		7.63
Max		24.19		31.22

Note: the table displays province-level employment shares in tourism-related activities, which include hospitality, transport and entertainment and culture industries. The employment share is computed over the total number of people employed in each year and province. The data source is the Spanish Labor Force Survey (LFS). The shares were computed using sampling weights from the survey.

Appendix C. Data availability and replication materials

Our analysis uses data from six sources:

1) Spanish labor force survey ("Encuesta de Población Activa"), made publicly available by the Spanish National Statistical Institute (INE, https://ine.es/).

2) Continuous Sample of Employment Biographies ("Muestra continua de vidas laborales"), made publicly available by the Spanish Social Security (https://www.seg-social.es/).

3) International Tourist Arrivals (Frontur, https://www.dataestur.es/en/travel-leisure/tourism-movement-at-borders-frontur/)

4) World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, https://www.unwto.org/tourism-statistics/tourism-statistics-database)

5) Global Terrorism Database (https://www.start.umd.edu/data-tools/GTD)

6) Data on coast length and national patrimony (from the National Geographic Institute of Spain, Dirección General del Instituto Geográfico Nacional, https://www.ign.es/web/ign/portal).

All of the code required to generate all of the tables and figures from the original data sets is available in the authors' webpages.