

Bouncing back or bouncing forward? Tourism destinations' crisis resilience and crisis management tactics

Eran Ketter^{1*}

¹ Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Kinneret College on the Sea of Galilee, Israel. E-mail: ek@mx.kinneret.ac.il

*Corresponding author

Abstract

In recent years, the tourism literature has demonstrated a growing interest in the concept of resilience and its implications for travel and tourism. However, the research of resilience in tourism is still in its early stages and there are many challenges ahead. In response to these challenges, the current study examines how tourism destinations are practising recovery and resilience in the face of crisis, using case study analysis of global destinations overcoming a crisis: France, Turkey, Russia, Korea, Belgium and Egypt. The results of the study indicate the use of both crisis management practices and tourism resilience tactics by these destinations. Taking the perspective of the resilience theory, the findings of the study demonstrate that, following a crisis, destinations will focus on re-orienting the tourism system and regenerating tourism growth. These responses include investment in infrastructure and facilities, product development, market development and conduct structural reforms. The outcomes of the study contribute to the understanding of resilience tactics and its practices by global destinations, and shed a new light on the relations between tourism destinations, tourism crisis and tourism resilience.

Keywords: Tourism resilience, tourism crises, adaptive cycle model, crisis management, destination adaptive capacity, tourism crisis recovery

Citation: Ketter, E. (2022). Bouncing back or bouncing forward? Tourism destinations' crisis resilience and crisis management tactics. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 31, 3103.



© 2022 The Author(s)

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Introduction

The COVID-19 Coronavirus pandemic had a never-been-seen-before effect on global tourism, causing major disruption to the aviation, hospitality and tourism industries, and leading to 74% drop in international tourist arrivals in 2020 and to a loss of some USD 1.3 trillion (UNWTO, 2021). One of the leading perspectives in analysing the ability of tourism destinations to absorb such crisis and return to full activity is tourism resilience. In recent years, tourism literature has demonstrated a growing interest in the concept of resilience and its implications for the travel and tourism industry (Bangwayo-Skeete and Skeete, 2020; Benítez-Aurioles, 2020; Estevão and Costa, 2020; Filimonau and De Coteau, 2020; Prayag, 2019; Beirman, 2018; Cheer and Lew, 2018; Hall, 2018a; Hall, 2018b; Hartman, 2018; Shipway, 2018; Espeso-Molinero, 2017). The concept of resilience has been established in the scientific literature since the 1970s (Filimonau and De Coteau, 2020; Hall, 2018a), and was introduced to the tourism discourse in the late 1990s as part of a discussion on tourism systems as complex, dynamic and non-linear (Cochrane, 2010), and as a component of community tourism, business sustainability, and business vulnerability (Filimonau and De Coteau, 2020). In tourism studies, the term 'resilience' is being used in a large variety of contexts, mainly to describe economic resilience and social-ecological resilience (Filimonau and De Coteau, 2020; Hall, 2018b; Prayag, 2019). One of the factors contributing to this growth in popularity is the use of tourism resilience as a "conceptual umbrella", which connects various disciplinary approaches and links different knowledge domains (Hall, 2018b). In addition to tourism, the concept of resilience is used in diverse contexts, including engineering, community and ecology (Cheer and Lew, 2018). According to Hall (2018a), in a very resilient manner the concept of resilience has been adapted and changed to suit the different needs of different academic disciplines.

A second leading perspective in the context of tourism crises is crisis management. According to Beirman (2018), tourism crisis management is a set of work methods, tools and guidelines to support tourism decision makers before, during and following a crisis. Crisis management is based on several key stages: pre-crisis stage of risk assessment, crisis management planning, risk reduction and taking preventive measures; crisis stage of emergency response procedures, crisis communication, and mitigating the damage; and post-crisis stage of recovering the destination and its image and restoring functionality. The crisis management stages can be implemented in the national, regional or in the level of a single tourism site, and their implementation is critical for the successful management of a tourism crisis (Avraham and Ketter, 2017).

These two theoretical constructs - tourism resilience and tourism crisis management - suggest different perspectives, strategies and measures when it comes to managing and recovering from a tourism crisis event. The tourism resilience literature has higher focus on agility and adaptability, supporting the destination in bouncing forward and shifting away from the crisis. On the other hand, the tourism crisis management literature emphasis recovery and restoration, bouncing back to 'business as usual' functionality. As these approaches offer a different perspective on how destinations should act in times of crisis, the current study set to examine how selected tourism destinations are responding to crisis, observing this phenomenon in its real-life context. Using the research method of case study analysis, the research examines how tourism destinations are practising recovery and resilience in the face of a tourism crisis, inspecting the cases of France, Turkey, Russia, Korea, Belgium and Egypt. That, with the aim of (a) understanding these two theories in their real-life context, (b) proposing a framework for the relations between tourism resilience and tourism crisis management, and (c) enriching the tourism literature with case-based strategies and measures for responding to tourism crisis from the world's leading tourism destinations.

Literature review

The academic literature offers several definitions of resilience. Starting from businesses, a business resilience is defined as "the capacity for an enterprise to survive, adapt and grow in the face of turbulent change" (Cheer and Lew, 2018, p.8). This straightforward definition emphasises the adaptive capacity of the business in response to a critical change. An additional definition is provided by Cochrane (2010), describing system resilience as "the capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while undergoing change so as to still retain essentially the same function, structure, identity, and feedbacks" (p.174). Based on this definition, resilience is the capacity of a system to effectively absorb exogenous or endogenous stress events and to maintain its key functionalities. A similar definition is provided by the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction: "Resilience is the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions" (UNDRR, 2012, p.3). Together, these definitions suggest that resilience has three key functions: absorb, restore and grow. Hence, the destination is able to successfully absorb a crisis without collapsing or losing its long-term functionality; the destination is able to restore its tourism functions in a timely and efficient manner; and lastly, the crisis serves as a stimulus for growth, making the destination even more competent and resilient.

System theory and adaptive capacity

The discussion on resilience in tourism destinations is based on complexity science and the system theory (Hall, 2018a; Cochrane, 2010). In this view, tourism destinations can be described as a complex adaptive system (Burnett and Johnston, 2020; Cheer and Lew, 2018). In accordance with the system theory, destinations are non-linear and highly complex systems that are always in a process of responding to and anticipating internal and external changes and stresses that influence its development (Hartman, 2018; Cochrane, 2010). When facing a destabilizing event, a critical element of the system is its adaptive capacity, and that capacity depends on various forms of capital accumulated during previous phases and iterations (Cochrane, 2010). The destinations' adaptive capacity is also closely related to the concept of vulnerability (Prayag, 2019; Shipway, 2018). In this view, different functionalities, activities and stakeholders have different levels of adaptive capacity and vulnerability that shape their level of resilience (Prayag, 2019).

Adaptive cycle model and scale, change and resilience model

One fundamental concept for understanding the resilience process is the adaptive cycle model, also described as the resilience cycle model (Hall, 2018b). Based on this model, systems experience major changes in four repeating stages:

- I. *Growth/ Exploitation* - New forms and systems are created through exploitation of the political, economic, social and technological opportunities.
- II. *Equilibrium/ Conservation* - With time, structures are institutionalized and the system becomes less dynamic and more rigid and vulnerable.
- III. *Collapse/ Release* - A fast shock or a slow stress in key variables can destabilize the system, releasing the rigidity of structures.
- IV. *Re-orientation/ Re-organization* - The system responds with regeneration and renewal of structures and functions (Cheer and Lew, 2018; Cochrane, 2010).

Based on the model, systems with a low adaptive capacity will collapse and not manage to complete this cycle, while systems with a high adaptive capacity will effectively go through these four stages, and repeat them in the face of new challenges.

An additional important aspect in the resilience theory is change and its impacts (Hall, 2018a). One way to conceptualize change is using the Scale, Change and Resilience model. The SCR model relates to two dimensions: the tourism scale and the rate of change. In the tourism scale, the impact of the change is either more limited and mainly impacts the tourism sector, or has a more inclusive effect on the entire community - impacting stakeholders, the natural environment and social, political and economic variables. As for the rate of change, this might vary from slow change as in the case of gradual stresses, to a sudden shock as in the case of natural disasters or terror attacks. Using these two dimensions as axes of a matrix can result in four different scenarios: (a) slow change impacting the tourism sector, (b) slow change impacting the community, (c) sudden change that impacts the tourism sector and (d) sudden change impacting the community (Cheer and Lew, 2018). In tourism destinations, some of the key slow factors include climate change, changes in the macro economy and demographic changes. As for fast changes, these may include natural disasters, geopolitical turbulences, acts of terror, changes in consumer preferences, and disturbances resulting from new technologies (Hartman, 2018).

Resilience tactics

Aiming to build resilience in tourism destinations, two fundamental questions arise: what is being resilient - defining what we want to protect; and what should it be resilient to - defining what the destination should adapt to (Lew and Cheer, 2018). In order to enhance resilience, destinations should maintain flexibility and constantly evolve, re-develop and re-invent themselves (Cochrane, 2010). More elaborate guidelines for building resilience in tourism destinations are suggested by Hartman (2018), offering six tactics. Firstly, enhance variety and diversity, and promote novel initiatives, innovations and experiments. Secondly, enhance connectivity with various stakeholders, on both the internal and external levels. Thirdly, promote polycentric management, avoiding the risk of rigidity when decision-making is over-centralized. Fourthly, monitor, identify and analyse changes, including both fast and slow variables. Fifthly, constantly evaluate performance level and adapt accordingly. Sixthly, incorporate adaptive thinking, always examining how to develop, evolve and enhance the destination's level of resilience. However, as destinations are highly complex systems, and as changes tend to involve uncertainty and non-linear dynamics, the practice of building resilience cannot be carried out in a 'one-size-fits-all' manner (Prayag, 2019).

Resilience vs. crisis management

An additional perspective on managing and recovering from fast changes is offered by the crisis management literature. According to Avraham and Ketter (2008), crisis management is a set of proactive strategies and measures aimed to prevent, manage and recover from crisis. The crisis management process focuses on four key stages: (a) precaution, (b) planning and prevention, (c) crisis coping, and (d) post-crisis, with well-developed methodologies to lead the destination through each stage. In the post-crisis stage, destinations will use restorative measures such as ensuring the visitors' safety and security, image repair tactics, proactively communicate on social media and use sales promotion techniques to boost demand (Avraham and Ketter, 2017). An example for these stages could be found in the case study of the Korean hotel industry recovery from the SARS outbreak in East Asia in 2002-2003. In the stage of crisis coping, hotels focused on enhancing safety and hygiene, training the staff on SARS safety, minimizing expenses, reducing staff, have discount offering and establishing a SARS emergency communication network. On the post-crisis stage, hotel offered discounted rooms and invested in intensive promotional campaigns and aggressive advertising activity to rebuild guests' confidence (Kim *et al.*, 2005).

According to Shipway (2018), while much of the literature relating to tourism crisis has used the framework of crisis management, it is argued that the concept of resilience provides a more holistic

perspective on the complex and dynamic relations between crises and destinations. According to this view, the resilience perspective recognizes the full complexity of large tourism systems, which goes beyond the narrow, focused and standardized measures of risk management and crisis management - which might better apply to a hotel or a tourist attraction. Similarly, Cochrane (2010) states that resilience thinking directs a strong focus on crises and their management, but also focus on broader elements and systems that affect the place's adaptive capacity. In other words, resilience offers a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional approach to managing tourism crises, addressing a large variety of issues and integrating them into a diversified knowledge base (Shipway, 2018). However, as the tourism industry tends to focus on short-time interests and on managing the crisis in hand, it is not surprising that much of the relevant literature has focused on crisis management rather than resilience building (Prayag, 2019).

Challenges in researching and practising resilience

Although the term resilience has been growing in popularity in recent years, the resilience theory has not yet been widely applied to tourism in general (Bangwayo-Skeete and Skeete, 2020; Cochrane, 2010) and to tourism crises in particular (Prayag, 2019). With regard to the tourism resilience literature, "Despite some two decades of theoretical and empirical work in social-ecological resilience, definitions and conceptual clarity remain challenging. This is especially the case in tourism studies, which have been late to adopt resilience thinking" (Lew and Cheer, 2018, p. 320). Similarly, Hall (2018b) argues that tourism scholars still argue regarding the definition of resilience, whether resilience is a process or an outcome, and what type of resilience destinations should strive for. In addition, studies on resilience have mainly focused on the community or regional level, with very limited research on the destination level.

Taking the practitioners' perspective to tourism resilience, Hall (2018a) notes that the concept of resilience raises fundamental issues with respect to how it should be translated into practical recommendations and how it should be practised by tourism destinations. In a similar manner, Luthe and Wyss (2014) note there is a lack of work by tourism governance on resilience planning and implementation. Similarly, Hall (2018b) states that the resilience of tourism organizations and of small tourism enterprises are under-explored topics. In a more detailed manner, Hartman (2018) argues that there are four major traps that hinder resilience in tourism destinations: (a) The rigidity trap, when the system has become rigid and inflexible and tends to over-emphasize one particular activity; (b) The lock-in trap, when decision-makers tend to favour and follow decisions made in the past; (c) The poverty trap, when there is a lack of available resources for new thinking and development; and (d) The isolation trap, when destinations fail to identify and respond to changes happening around them. Resulting from these four traps, many tourism destinations tend to demonstrate low levels of resilience, adapting to the situation in a reactive and responsive manner, rather than in a proactive and adaptive manner. To conclude these arguments, Shipway (2018) notes that there is an apparent lack of knowledge in regard to building and practising resilience in tourism.

In response to these challenges, the fundamental research question leading the current study is: How tourism destinations are practising recovery and resilience in the face of a tourism crisis? Based on the study's literature review, the hypotheses of the study are:

H1: *The response of destinations to crisis will involve post-crisis activities, in accordance with the crisis management theory. These to include restorative measures such as ensuring the visitors' safety and security, image repair tactics, proactively communicate on social media and use sales promotion techniques to boost demand (Avraham and Ketter, 2017).*

H2: *The response of destinations to crisis will include the elements of the adaptive cycle model, in accordance with the resilience theory. These to include enhancing variety and diversity, enhancing stakeholders' connectivity, promoting polycentric management, monitoring changes, evaluating performance level and incorporating adaptive thinking (Hartman, 2018).*

Simply, these hypotheses are designed to examine which theoretical construct better explains the pattern of action taken by tourism destinations (on the national level) in response to a tourism crisis.

Methodology

In order to examine the study's hypotheses empirically, the current study employs the research method of case study analysis. In qualitative analysis, case study analysis aims to decompose the phenomenon under investigation, creating a novel perspective and enabling scholars to extrapolate insights to a broader theory (Lindlof, 1995). According to Creswell and Poth (2017), case study analysis is a process with several key stages: identifying and pre-analysing relevant cases, collecting data, comprehensive analysis of the cases, and forming assertions.

Following this methodology, the current research has conducted six major stages:

- I. *Choosing an analytical approach* - The current study employs instrumental case study analysis, using the cases as a tool to further comprehend the phenomenon in the heart of the study (Creswell and Poth, 2017).
- II. *Identifying relevant cases* - Cases were identified using the UNWTO World Tourism Barometer (2019) data on the world's top 50 countries of destination by international tourist arrivals, focusing on countries that experienced tourism decline in the years 2016-2017. This is in contrast to the solid growth of global tourism in these years - 3.8 per cent in 2016 and 7.0 per cent in 2017. This method resulted in the identification of six cases: France, Turkey, Russia, Korea, Belgium and Egypt (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Destinations with negative growth in inbound tourism, 2015-2017 (UNWTO, 2019)*

Destination	Inbound tourism 2015 (in millions)	Inbound tourism 2016 (in millions)	Inbound tourism 2017 (in millions)	Change 16/15 (%)	Change 17/16 (%)
France	84.5	82.7	86.9	-2.1%	+5.1%
Turkey	39.5	30.3	37.6	-23.3%	+24.1
Russia	26.9	24.6	24.4	-8.5%	-0.7%
Korea	13.2	17.2	13.3	+30.3%	-22.7%
Belgium	8.4	7.5	8.4	-10.5%	+11.7%
Egypt	9.1	5.3	8.2	-42.5%	+55.1%

- III. *Pre-analysis of the cases* - To confirm that the cases well represent the phenomenon under investigation, a pre-analysis of the destinations was conducted, identifying a crisis that could be related to the drop in inbound tourism:
 - France - A serious of terror attacks in 2015-2016 including the mass shooting in a music venue, claiming the life of 90 people (November 2015), and the Nice truck attack, claiming the life of 86 people and injuring 458 others (July 2016).
 - Turkey - A serious of terror attacks in 2015-2016, including a bomb in Ankara Central railway station that resulted in the death of 109 people (October 2015), a suicide bomb attack in the

Sultanahmet district killing 12 German tourists (January 2016), and an attack on Atatürk Airport (June 2016), claiming the lives of 43 travellers and injuring 230 others.

- Russia - Several negative events eroding Russia attractiveness, including the war between Russia and Ukraine (2014-2015), Russian interference in the 2016 US elections, and the country's negative media coverage in EU media.
 - Korea - A political turmoil between Korea and China, leading to the ban of all group tourism packages from China - a source market responsible for almost half of all visitors to Korea.
 - Belgium - A series of terror-related issues, including a 5-days security lockdown on Brussels (November 2015) and the Brussels bombings in the city's airport and metro station, killing 25 and injuring 340 others (March 2016).
 - Egypt - A series of terror attacks that included the downing of Metrojet Flight from Sharm el-Sheikh, killing 224 passengers (October 2015) and an attack on resort on the Red Sea, taking the life of two foreign tourists from Austria and one from Sweden (January 2016).
- IV. *Data collection* - Collecting relevant information on the actions taken by these destinations to restore and develop tourism following the crisis using various sources, including policy reports, strategic/ marketing plans, official documents, press releases, related news items and available research publications.
- V. *Analysing the cases* - Comprehensive analysis of the collected data, using the framework of the adaptive cycle model, with the stages of exploration, conservation, release and reorganization as the analysis themes. The case studies were analysed by two independent coders, and the findings of the study only refer to resilience/ crisis management measures that were agreed on by the evaluators.
- VI. *Forming assertions* - Based on the analysis, the results section presents the key findings and assertions. To enhance the validity of the analysis, the manuscript provides references to all the data analysed - allowing readers to judge for themselves and to verify the study's assertions.

Results

The current study examined how tourism destinations are practising recovery and resilience in the face of a crisis, using the method of case study analysis and focusing on the cases of France, Turkey, Russia, Korea, Belgium and Egypt. In accordance with the first hypothesis, the examined destinations have taken numerous post-crisis actions. One of the most fundamental steps to re-stabilise the tourism industry following a crisis is to ensure the visitors' safety and security (Avraham and Ketter, 2008). In this manner, within days of the terror attacks in France in January 2015, the French Government deployed over 10,000 military and police personnel across 830 key locations in the country (WTTC, 2018), and took various measures to enhance the security of visitors and tourists (Gouvernement.fr, 2017). These included the mapping of security-sensitive tourist sites, the establishment of regional tourism safety and security departments, and the awarding of the "sécuri-site" certification for sites committed to responsibly applying the appropriate safety and security measures (Gouvernement.fr, 2018). Similar security steps were taken in Belgium, part of them in cooperation with the French government (EU Observer, 2 February 2016). In order to improve security in Turkey, the country initiated a large-scale campaign against terror, including cross-border operations against terror stemming from Iraq and Syria (Hurriyet Daily News, 1 January 2018). Likewise, and in order to better provide safety for holidaymakers, Egypt's government worked to provide the strongest security measures possible, including the introduction of X-ray machines and security scanners at all tourist resorts. (Egypt Today, 5 March 2018).

Another key component which destinations have to protect and repair in times of crisis is their image (Ketter, 2016). In order to protect its position as the world's top tourist destination, France has

conducted numerous campaigns and marketing activities (Gouvernement.fr, 2017). Firstly, France's Tourism Development Agency aimed to restore confidence to foreign tourists by carrying a reassuring message about security in France. In addition, it aimed to communicate a positive and appealing image that promotes the desire to visit the country (Atout France, 2016). Taking a similar approach, Turkey has engaged in a process of image-building and managing its image in key markets (COMCEC, 2017a). Russia also identified the country's image as one of the key elements in recovering tourism (Kulgachev *et al.*, 2018). According to the Head of the Department for Competition Policy of the Analytical Centre for the government of the Russian Federation, *"What we need to do is develop a systematic approach to positioning specific Russian destinations abroad, conducting promotional campaigns, and creating recognizable brands for specific tourist destinations in Russia."* (Analytical centre, 1 September 2017). In response to this need, the Federal Agency for Tourism and the Russian Export Centre have conducted a large-scale joint programme to set up channels for tour sales and promote Russia as a popular tourist destination by expanding the network of "Visit Russia" tourist offices in foreign countries (TAAS, 26 May 2017).

One prime platform for managing a destination's image is via social media (Ketter, 2016). Launched on December 2015, the campaign "This is Egypt" encourages residents, tourists and members of the tourism industry to share their positive impressions of Egypt using the hashtag #thisisegypt. The contents of the campaign are delivered in a message which runs counter to the negative stories broadcast by the news media about the country. In a media interview regarding the campaign, Egypt's former Minister of Tourism, Hisham Zaazou, stated: *"Egypt has been transformed as a nation in the past four years, and unfortunately the world does not always see our country the same way we do...we need to close that perception gap"* (Egypt Today, 5 March 2018). An additional campaign aimed to deliver an in-counter message was launched in Belgium in response to a security lockdown of Brussels in November 2015. In January 2016 Visit Brussels launched the #callbrussels online campaign, in which three telephone boxes were placed around Brussels and people from all over the world were invited to call and ask random passers-by how life was in Brussels. During the campaign, over 12,000 people from 154 different countries called the campaign's phones, gaining a local perspective of how safe and welcoming Brussels really was (Visit Brussels, 2019). Following the Brussels bombings in March 2016, Visit Flanders, the tourism organization for The Flemish Region of Belgium, launched in June 2016 the #shareoursmile social media campaign. The campaign invited residents and tourists alike to share the impressions of warm Flemish hospitality using the campaign's hashtag (Flanders Today, 20 June 2016). In a similar manner, Turkey also laid emphasis on social media marketing (COMCEC, 2017a), and France's Tourism Development Agency launched the #MadeinFrance and #MadeinParis social media recovery campaigns following acts of terror in the country (Atout France, 2016).

Another component in recovering a destination's image is the use of influencer marketing, getting endorsement from bloggers, celebrities and journalists. This path of action was employed by Egypt during its post-crisis period, hosting a large number of celebrities and high-profile personalities, including Will Smith, Kourtney Kardashian, Lionel Messi, Ronaldinho and Nicolas Cage - sharing their positive experience with millions of followers. (Egypt Today, 5 March 2018). In a similar manner, France hosted some 70 bloggers and YouTubers from ten leading source markets, with the aim of generating a positive coverage and restoring France's touristic image (Atout France, 2016). Similar actions of hosting influencers were also taken by Turkey (COMCEC, 2017a) and Belgium (Headquarters Magazine, 9 September 2016).

Another technique used in the cases analysed is sales promotion, creating short-term incentives to support tourism in its efforts to bounce back. In the case of Turkey, the country provided US\$75 million

in direct subsidies to the tourism sector. This included flight subsidies of US\$60 per capita for selected travel agencies (COMCEC, 2017a), and additional US\$117 million as fuel incentives for flights (Daily Sabah, 17 July 2018). Together, these subsidies helped to create highly attractive holiday packages, boosting demand by lowering the price of air travel to Turkey. In addition, Turkey has also provided US\$85 million in indirect subsidies to the hospitality sector, with special bank credits, tax postponement and fees reduction for a period of three years (COMCEC, 2017a). Similarly, Egypt has provided US\$2,000 in subsidies for international charter flights, which in 2018 were increased to US\$3,000 per flight (Global Trade Alert, 7 November 2017).

In accordance with the second hypothesis, the destinations under review have also taken numerous actions to enhance their resilience. While crisis management and post-crisis recovery are acts of 'bouncing back', resilience involves a key element of growth and should be regarded as 'bouncing forward' Hall (2018b). Following the stages of the adaptive cycle model, the destinations analyzed demonstrated a substantial element of growth and exploration, aimed at creating new forms and systems and capturing new opportunities. One technique to generate growth involves investing in tourism infrastructure and facilities. This technique was employed by Turkey, as part of the prioritization of the tourism industry. In order to generate growth in tourism, the government has invested in creating better port facilities for cruise ships, in the construction of a new mega airport in Istanbul, and in supporting the national airline 'Turkish Airlines' (COMCEC, 2017a). In Egypt, the government invested in new attractions, the development of tourism sites and upgrading tourism infrastructure. In the area of South Sinai and the Red Sea, for example, some 5 billion Egyptian Liras were invested in the renovation of hotels, resorts and tourist attractions (Egypt Today, 5 March 2018). In the case of France, the government mobilized public capital and expertise for local authorities' tourism projects, with a focus on seaside and mountain resorts, as part of the country's post-crisis strategy (Gouvernement.fr, 2017). Similarly, in Russia, the government launched a federal tourism investment strategy (TAAS, 26 May 2017) and priorities were re-oriented towards the development of tourism facilities and events (Kulgachev *et al.*, 2018). One particular important type of investment was carried out by Korea, improving the physical accessibility of tourist sites and creating appropriate tourism products for senior travellers (Forbes, 17 October 2017).

Another aspect of investment is the development of new tourism products and activities. According to Hartman (2018), the diversification and promotion of novel initiatives are important keys for building resilience, as systems will not collapse if one particular product or business activity is replaced or disappears. In Egypt, the Ministry of Tourism supported the development of health tourism with "Tour 'n' Cure" packages for patients with Hepatitis C. The package offers a US\$8,000 package that include flights, a five-star accommodation, medical analysis, medications and three days of tours around Egypt's top tourism sites. An additional product developed by Egypt was religious tourism aimed at the Christian market. In the launching of this product, Pope Francis visited Egypt in April 2017 and acknowledged the Holy Family's journey in Egypt as an official Christian pilgrimage (Egypt Today, 5 March 2018). Lastly, Egypt also concentrated efforts in promoting the country as a MICE (Meetings, Incentives, Conferences and Exhibitions) destination and hosting large-scale global conferences as part of developing its MICE sector (COMCEC, 2017a).

One country investing in the development of MICE tourism is Korea, with a similar focus on MICE tourism and the hosting of more international conferences (Forbes, 17 October 2017). In addition, KTO (Korea Tourism Organization) has also developed cultural tourism products such as pop music tours, capturing the growing interest in K-pop (Forbes, 17 October 2017). Another country to diversify its appeal to tourists is Turkey. According to the Daily Sabah, "Back in 2002, people would think only of

resort towns when talking about tourism, but Turkey has managed to expand its tourism sector into the sports, gastronomy, thermal and healthcare sectors, also broadening activities in religious tourism"(17 July 2018). With this in mind, Turkey has worked intensively on expanding its tourism portfolio, diversifying its risks and appealing to a large variety of audiences.

Another key element in generating growth is market development and diversification (Hartman, 2018). In Korea the act of diversification became critically important after a 40% fall in Chinese inbound tourism - the source market for almost half of all visitors to Korea. This, resulting from the deployment of a US defence system in March 2017 in Korea, had led to the ban of all group tourism packages from China (Forbes, 17 October 2017). In response to this sharp drop in incoming tourism, KTO has developed a new tourism strategy based on market diversification (Travel Impact Newswire, 23 May 2018). For the Muslim market, KTO promoted Muslim visitors from Southeast Asia, such as Indonesia and Malaysia, with KTO organizing events lasting two months on Halal cuisine. Additional efforts to diversify the source markets included the development of tourism from Central Asia countries, such as Kazakhstan (Forbes, 17 October 2017). Also, Korea shifted resources from the Chinese market to alternative Asian source countries such as Japan, Taiwan and Vietnam (Korea Bizwire, 20 May 2019). As for Japan, KTO announced of a "Korea tourism boom-up" that included a marketing campaign in partnership with major local travel agencies, producing and running Korean versions of popular Japanese TV programs including *Lonely Gourmet*, and holding a Korea tourism festival in Tokyo (Forbes, 17 October 2017). Employing these efforts, inbound tourism to Korea grew from 13.3m in 2017 to 15.3m in 2018 and 17.5m in 2019 (UNWTO, 2021).

Another country to focus on the Muslim market is Egypt. During the holy month of Ramadan in 2017 the country launched a marketing campaign in several Arab countries, such as Saudi Arabia, UAE, Kuwait, Bahrain, Lebanon, Jordan and Gulf countries (Egypt Today, 5 March 2018) - markets that were less affected by the threat of terror linked to Islamic extremism. Similarly, in 2016, the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism in Turkey took several measures to develop Muslim-friendly tourism. As a key step, the Turkish Standards Institution launched the Halal Management System aimed at promoting Muslim-friendly tourism in hotels and holiday resorts (COMCEC, 2017b). As a result, while in 2016 there was a major drop in key source markets such as Russia (-88%), UK (-31%) and Germany (-28%), Turkey managed to generate a double-digit growth from Arab countries such as Jordan (+19%) and Saudi Arabia (+13%) (Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2019).

One last element of market development involves addressing the local market. Resulting from the tourism crisis in Turkey, many tourism businesses have focused their attention on the domestic market (COMCEC, 2017a). Similarly, in Russia, the emphasize has shifted towards domestic tourism; this has grown by 18% (50 million trips) in 2015 and 10% (55 million trips) in 2016 (Kulgachev *et al.*, 2018).

The cases analysed above demonstrate an additional pattern of action that can be linked to the stage of Reorientation/ Reorganization in the adaptive cycle model. One fundamental step of reorganization is to conduct reforms in the tourism supply system. In November 2018, Egypt's Ministry of Tourism launched a tourism reform programme, aimed at implementing structural reforms to strengthen the sector's competitiveness. This is part of the understanding that rigid management leads to fragility, while constant evolution and adaptive management promotes resilience (Espeso-Molinero, 2017). Egypt's programme laid out five key pillars for structural reform, as well as dozens of reform acts. For example, in regard to institutional reform, the programme recommends: modernising the Ministry's organizational structure; capacity building and improving the skill set of the tourism workforce; strengthening price competitiveness; establishing strategic partnerships with international institutions;

and creating a database on tourism performance and contribution (Egypt's Ministry of Tourism, 2018). Another type of reform was conducted by Russia, introducing a new set of tourism performance indicators and objectives by the federal state authorities to the regional level, to increase the prioritization of tourism (Kulgachev *et al.*, 2018). An additional type of reform was introduced by France: it conducted a wide range of training programmes for those working in the tourism sector, aimed at ensuring the quality of the service offer, improving the tourist experience and enhancing France's competitive position (WTTC, 2018; Gouvernement.fr, 2017). This, in accordance with Espeso-Molinero (2017) who emphasize the role of training and capacity building as resilience-building tools.

One specific component of reorganization is to change regulations in regard to the entry visa. In a response to the terror acts in the country, France introduced 48-hour visa approvals for several countries in Africa, the Middle East and the Far East (WTTC, 2018). Similarly, Russia reduced administrative barriers, eased visa formalities and expanded the practice of electronic visas to foreigners (TAAS, 26 February 2019). In addition, Russia also introduced visa-free travel for Chinese tour groups (The Moscow Times, 27 February 2019). Similar processes were implemented by Turkey (COMCEC, 2017a) and Egypt (Skift, 24 April 2017).

Discussion

The current study examined how tourism destinations are showing recovery and resilience in the face of a tourism crisis, looking at post-crisis activities in accordance with the crisis management theory, and practising the adaptive cycle model in accordance with the resilience theory. Looking at the perspective of the crisis management theory, the results of the study indicate that destinations will use restorative measures to recover the destination's tourism functions and image. This includes enhancing the visitors' security, using an image restoration campaign and social media promotion, as well as influencer marketing and sales promotion. Taking the perspective of the resilience theory, the findings of the study demonstrate that following a crisis (described by the adaptive cycle model as a stage of collapse or release), destinations will focus on re-orienting the tourism system and regenerating tourism growth. This includes investment in infrastructure and facilities, product development, market development and conducting structural reforms. The link between the destination, crisis cause, key resilience measures and key crisis management measures are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. *Key resilience crisis and management measures taken by the selected case studies*

Destination	Crisis cause	Resilience measures	Crisis management measures
France	Terror	Investment in development; system reorganization	Re-establish safety; image restoration campaign
Turkey	Terror	Investment in development; new tourism products; market development; system reorganization	Re-establish safety; image restoration campaign; sales promotion
Russia	Political unrest	Investment in development; market development; system reorganization	Image restoration campaign
Korea	Political unrest	Investment in development; new tourism products; market development	
Belgium	Terror		Re-establish safety; image restoration campaign
Egypt	Terror	Investment in development; new tourism products; market development; system reorganization	Re-establish safety; image restoration campaign; sales promotion

Most destinations examined in the current study - France, Turkey, Russia and Egypt - have used both crisis management and tourism resilience tactics to step out of the crisis situation. In a few cases, some destinations have taken only one course of action: Belgium has focused its efforts on crisis management, and Korea has focused its efforts on tourism resilience. These findings provide support for both hypotheses. In this view, few destinations will choose to limit their efforts to crisis management or to tourism resilience, while most destinations will end by creating a mix-and-match assortment of tools and solutions to promote tourism in what they consider to be the most timely and effective manner. In other words, the results of the study indicate that following a tourism crisis on a national scale, destinations will use the widest possible set of strategies and tactics both to bounce back and to bounce forward.

Implications and contribution

The use of crisis management practices together with tourism resilience tactics yields two theoretical points of view. An initial point of view suggests that crisis management and tourism resilience are complementary models; crisis management provides a short term and concentrated remedy, while resilience actions are more focused on the medium and long term. In this manner, the post-crisis stage in the crisis management theory supports destinations as the smoke clears, and more complex recovery efforts are guided by the tourism resilience theory. However, a more inclusive perspective suggests that all actions recorded in this research are actually part of tourism resilience. In this view, the actions taken by destinations are more than corrective acts following a crisis - as suggested by the crisis management theory - but are aimed at preventing future crises, generating tourism growth and making the destination more resilient. Destinations do use post-crisis crisis management strategies, but as part of wider context of resilience. In this manner, destinations constantly strive for growth, development and diversification towards new opportunities. When facing a crisis, destinations are forced to slow down and take some restorative measures, but still continue in their ongoing mission to enhance resilience. Hence, the long-term focus is on destination resilience, and crisis management is a short-term solution for overcoming some bumps in the road, and is an integral part of the collapse stage in the adaptive cycle model.

The primary theoretical construct to guide this study with regard to resilience is the adaptive cycle model. The current study elaborates the adaptive cycle model and extends it to meet the actions taken by the world's leading tourism destinations. The adaptive cycle model was developed by Holling in the 1980s and in recent years it has been adapted for tourism (Espeso-Molinero, 2017; Lew and Cheer, 2017; Pelling and Manuel-Navarrete, 2011). While a more recent version of the model (Lew and Cheer, 2017) provides a clear illustration of its relevance to tourism destinations, the findings of the study propose few major advances regarding the model and its application for destinations facing a crisis. Firstly, in the stage of release, destinations will employ the crisis management tactics of enhancing the visitors' security, image restoration campaign, social media promotion, influencer marketing and sales promotion - all in order to counter the negative outcomes of a crisis and to bounce back. Secondly, in the stage of reorganization, destinations will aim to re-orient the tourism system using structural and regulatory reforms. Thirdly, in the stage of growth, even in the face of a crisis, destinations will still strive to further evolve, investing in infrastructure and facilities, as well as in product development and market development. The three advances made in the adaptive cycle model contribute by making it a practical tool for the analysis of the activities taken by destinations following a crisis. Furthermore, these advances also promote resilience thinking in destinations, elaborating on the actual implications of resilience to tourism destinations and thus avoiding the common pitfall of using resilience as an ambiguous buzzword (Hall, 2018a).

In addition to its theoretical contribution, the current study also offers a contribution to practitioners. In response to tourism crisis, such as the one resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, tourism decision makers should curate a mix of crisis management and tourism resilience tools and solutions to support their path to growth. The practitioners' toolbox should include restorative measures to recover the destination's tourism functions and image, taking the required steps to re-assure visitors' safety and security and conducting a marketing campaign to restore the destination's favourable image. In addition, the response should also include resilience measures, aimed at re-orienting the tourism system and bouncing forward. This to include acts aimed to regenerate tourism growth such as product development - creating a new value proposition to current markets - and market development - introducing the current value proposition to new markets.

Limitations

One key limitation of the current research is the use of case study analysis that is based on secondary data. While the analysis is based on a large variety of information sources, including policy reports, strategic plans, official documents, press releases, related news items and research publications, it does not necessarily cover all actions taken by destinations. Hence, there might be missing data in regard to crisis management acts and tourism resilience activities that were not analysed. In addition, the analysis used only data published in English, overlooking material in local languages: French, Turkish, Russian, Korean, Flemish and Arabic. A possible additional limitation is the focus on destinations suffering from a sudden shock, without considering destinations that battle the negative results of gradual stresses. While it is important to build resilience to sudden and unexpected changes, such as terror acts or natural disasters, destinations often neglect the importance of slow change. In order to enhance resilience, destinations should also monitor and analyse external drivers of slow change and model the adaptive cycle of large systems that change slowly over time (Lew and Cheer, 2018).

Future research

Tourism resilience is an emerging field of study (Cheer and Lew, 2018; Hall, 2018a; Hartman, 2018), with a great potential contribution for destinations in today's turbulent world. To further explore the practice of tourism resilience tactics by destinations, three research directions are suggested. Firstly, to examine the use of tourism resilience tactics using in-depth interviews with tourism stakeholders. In this way, the researcher could explore the considerations behind the use of a specific tactic, why it was chosen and what are the key challenges for its successful implementation. Secondly, to look into the use of tourism resilience tactics based on the crisis cause or a specific geographical region. Such research could potentially explore the link between the use of resilience tactics, one of the world's tourism regions, or a specific type of crisis - such as the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic. Thirdly, future studies could employ the perspective of political economy, focusing on the role of governments and policies in shaping tourism demand and revenues in times of crisis. It is hoped that the current study, together with future ones, will further support the development of resilience thinking as well as guiding tourism scholars and practitioners in turning a crisis into an opportunity.

References

- Analytical Center for the government of the Russian Federation (2017). "Russia gets the largest numbers of inbound tourists from Asia and the Middle East". Retrieved from: <http://ac.gov.ru/en/events/014117.html>
- Atout France (2016). Promotion campaign for destination Paris. Retrieved from: https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/dp_campagne_de_relance_destination_paris_hd_2_cle_486e3e.pdf

- Avraham, E. (2015). Destination image repair during crisis: Attracting tourism during the Arab Spring uprisings. *Tourism Management*, 47, 224-232.
- Avraham, E. and Ketter, E. (2008). *Media Strategies for Marketing Places in Crises: Improving the Image of Cities, Countries, and Tourist Destinations*. Oxford, England: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Avraham, E. and Ketter, E. (2017). Destination marketing during and following crises: combating negative images in Asia. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 34(6), 709-718.
- Bangwayo-Skeete, P. F. and Skeete, R. W. (2020). Modelling tourism resilience in small island states: A tale of two countries. *Tourism Geographies*, 1-22.
- Bairman, D. (2018). Tourism Crisis and Safety Management. *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Management*.
- Benitez-Aurioles, B. (2020). Tourism Resilience Patterns in Southern Europe. *Tourism Analysis*, 25(4), 409-424.
- Benoit, W. L. (2015). *Accounts, excuses and apologies: Image repair theory and research* (2nd edition). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Burnett, M., & Johnston, T. (2020). Brexit anticipated economic shock on Ireland's planning for hospitality and tourism: resilience, volatility and exposure. *Tourism Review*, 75(3): 595-606.
- Cheer, J.M. and Lew, A.A. (2018). Understanding tourism resilience. In: Lew, A. A. and Cheer, J. M. (Eds.). *Tourism resilience and adaptation to environmental change: Definitions and frameworks*. New York: Routledge.
- Cochrane, J. (2010). The sphere of tourism resilience. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 35(2), 173-185.
- COMCEC - The Standing Committee for Economic and Commercial Cooperation of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (2017a). *Risk and Crisis Management in Tourism Sector: Recovery From Crisis in the OIC Member Countries*. Retrieved from: https://www.sbb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Ris_and_Crisis_Management_in_Tourism_Sector-.pdf
- COMCEC - The Standing Committee for Economic and Commercial Cooperation of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (2017b). *Muslim Friendly Tourism: Regulating Accommodation Establishments In the OIC Member Countries*. Posted February 1st on: http://www.sbb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Muslim_Friendly_Tourism_MFT_Regulating_Accommodation_Establishments_in_the_OIC_Member_Countries%E2%80%8B.pdf
- Coombs, W. T. (2015). The value of communication during a crisis: Insights from strategic communication research. *Business Horizons*, 58(2), 141-148.
- Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. (2014). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th edition). Sage publications.
- Creswell, J. W. and Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publications.
- Daily Sabah* (2018). Enjoying recovery, Turkey aims to boost tourism revenue to \$32 billion. Retrieved from: <https://www.dailysabah.com/tourism/2018/07/18/enjoying-recovery-turkey-aims-to-boost-tourism-revenue-to-32-billion>
- Egypt Ministry of Tourism (2018). Egypt - Tourism Reform Program. Retrieved from: <http://egypt.travel/media/2338/tourism-reform-program-en.pdf>
- Egypt Today* (2018). "Bringing Tourists Back: A look at initiatives and policies launched". Retrieved from: <https://www.egypttoday.com/Article/3/44535/Bringing-Tourists-Back-A-look-at-initiatives-and-policies-launched>
- Espejo-Molinero, P. (2017). Collaborative capacity building as a resilience strategy for tourism development in indigenous Mexico. In: *Tourism, Resilience and Sustainability* (pp. 184-201). London: Routledge.
- Estevão, C. and Costa, C. (2020). Natural disaster management in tourist destinations: a systematic literature review. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 25, 2502.

- EU Observer* (2016). "France, Belgium step up security cooperation". Retrieved from: <https://euobserver.com/justice/132099>
- Filimonau, V. and De Coteau, D. (2020). Tourism resilience in the context of integrated destination and disaster management (DM2). *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 22(2), 202-222.
- Flanders Today* (2016). "Flanders launches charm offensive for tourists". Posted 20 June: <http://www.flanderstoday.eu/business/flanders-launches-charm-offensive-tourists>
- Forbes* (2017). "After Losing Chinese Tourists, South Korea Wants To Grow Its Burgeoning Muslim Tourism Numbers". Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/rachelpremack/2017/10/19/south-korea-wants-to-solve-its-tourism-crisis-with-halal-food/#657b9cc33640>
- Global Trade Alert (2017). Egypt: The government increased the subsidies applicable to international charter flights carrying tourists in several Egyptian destinations. Retrieved from: <https://www.globaltradealert.org/intervention/59021/production-subsidy/egypt-the-government-increased-the-subsidies-applicable-to-international-charter-flights-carrying-tourists-in-several-egyptian-destinations>
- Gouvernement.fr (2017). Interministerial Council for Tourism. Posted 26 July 2017 on: <https://www.gouvernement.fr/en/interministerial-council-for-tourism>
- Gouvernement.fr (2018, 22 January). Promotion and investment: two priorities of an ambitious policy for tourism. Retrieved from: <https://www.gouvernement.fr/en/promotion-and-investment-two-priorities-of-an-ambitious-policy-for-tourism>
- Hall, C.M. (2018a). Resilience in Tourism. In: Lew, A. A. and Cheer, J. M. (Eds.). *Tourism resilience and adaptation to environmental change: Definitions and frameworks*. New York: Routledge.
- Hall, C. M. (2018b). Resilience theory and tourism. In: Saarinen, J. and Gill, A. M. (Eds.). *Resilient Destinations and Tourism: Governance Strategies in the Transition Towards Sustainability in Tourism*. Routledge.
- Hartman, S. (2018). Resilient tourism destinations? Governance implications of bringing theories of resilience and adaptive capacity to tourism practice. In: Innerhofer, Fontanari & Pechlaner (Eds.). *Destination Resilience - Challenges and Opportunities for Destination Management and Governance*. (pp. 66-75). Abingdon: Routledge
- Headquarters Magazine* (2016). "Flanders: We #SHAREOURSMILE, also with our Business Travellers". Posted 9 September on: <http://www.meetingmediagroup.com/article/flanders-we-shareoursmile-also-with-our-business-travellers>
- Hurriyet Daily News* (2018, 01 January). Turkish tourism will see full recovery in 2018: Culture Minister Kurtulmuş. Retrieved from: <http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkish-tourism-will-see-full-recovery-in-2018-minister-125034>
- Ketter, E. (2016). Destination Image Restoration on Facebook: The Case Study of Nepal's Gurkha Earthquake. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 28: 66-72.
- Kim, S. S., Chun, H., & Lee, H. (2005). The effects of SARS on the Korean hotel industry and measures to overcome the crisis: A case study of six Korean five-star hotels. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(4), 369-377.
- Korea Bizwire* (2019, 20 May). "Tourism Industry Transformed After THAAD Crisis". Retrieved from: <http://koreabizwire.com/tourism-industry-transformed-after-thaad-crisis/137630>
- Kulgachev, I., Zaitseva, N., Larionova, A., Ivanova, E., Gladilin, V., & Zhenzhebir, V. (2018). The main directions of stimulating the development of inbound tourism in the Russian Federation. *Espacios*, 39(22), 10-10.
- Lew, A.A. and Cheer, J. (2018). Lessons Learned: Globalization, Change, and Resilience in Tourism Communities. In J. Cheer and A.A. Lew, editors. 2017. *Tourism, Resilience, and Sustainability: Adapting to Social, Political and Economic Change*, pages 319-323. London: Routledge.
- Lindlof, T. R. (1995). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

- Luthe, T. and Wyss, R. (2014). Assessing and planning resilience in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 44, 161-163.
- Mair, J., Ritchie, B. W. and Walters, G. (2016). Towards a research agenda for post-disaster and post-crisis recovery strategies for tourist destinations: A narrative review. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(1), 1-26.
- Okuyama, T. (2018). Analysis of optimal timing of tourism demand recovery policies from natural disaster using the contingent behavior method. *Tourism Management*, 64, 37-54.
- Pelling, M. and Manuel-Navarrete, D. (2011). From resilience to transformation: the adaptive cycle in two Mexican urban centers. *Ecology and Society*, 16(2).
- Prayag, G. (2019). Building destination resilience through community and organizational resilience. In: Isaac, R.K., Cakmak, E. and Butler, R. (Eds.). *Tourism and Hospitality in Conflict-Ridden Destinations*. Routledge.
- Shipway, R. (2018) Building resilience and managing crises and disasters in sport tourism. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 22(3): 265-270.
- Skift (2017). "Egypt to Diversify Tourism and Target New Markets In Recovery Plan" Published 24 April on: <https://skift.com/2017/04/24/egypt-to-diversify-tourism-and-target-new-markets-in-recovery-plan/>
- TAAS (2017, 26 May). "Destination Russia – Shifting Trends Towards Domestic and Incoming Tourism" Retrieved from: <https://tass.com/sp/947446>
- TAAS (2019, 26 February). "Electronic visas can increase foreign tourism in Russia by 20-30%". Retrieved from: <https://tass.com/economy/1046509>
- The Moscow Times (2019, 27 February). "Russia Welcomed 10% More Tourists in 2018, FSB Says". Retrieved from: <https://www.themoscowtimes.com/2019/02/27/russia-welcomed-10-more-tourists-in-2018-fsb-says-a64630>
- Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2019). Comparison of foreigners arriving in turkey by nationalities in 2014-2016. Retrieved from: <https://www.ktb.gov.tr/EN-153017/tourism-statistics.html>
- UNDRR (2012). Disaster risk and resilience: UN system task team on the post 2015 UN development agenda. Retrieved from: https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/thinkpieces/3_disaster_risk_resilience.pdf
- UNWTO (2019). *UNWTO World Tourism Barometer and Statistical Annex*, 17(1). Madrid, Spain: UNWTO.
- UNWTO (2021). *World Tourism Barometer*, 19(1). Madrid: UNWTO.
- Visit Brussels (2019). *Call Brussels Press Room*. Retrieved July 24th from: <https://callbrussels.prezly.com/#>
- Vogus, T. J. and Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). Organizational resilience: towards a theory and research agenda. *Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 3418-3422.
- World Travel & Tourism Council (2018, 05 July). Tourism recovery after terrorism: How France bounced back. Retrieved from: <https://worldtraveltourismcouncil.medium.com/tourism-recovery-after-terrorism-how-france-bounced-back-ff2d25c2834a>

Received: 14/06/2020

Accepted: 19/04/2021

Coordinating editor: Stanislav Ivanov