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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this study is to examine the drivers and barriers of travel behavior associated with tourist behavior during/post-COVID-19 pandemic to provide a knowledge base as well as an agenda for future research.

Design/methodology/approach – The authors utilized the Systematic Literature Review (SLR) technique for searching the articles published in Web of Science (WOS) and Scopus, to identify the main drivers and barriers affecting the tourist behavior during/post-COVID-19 pandemic. Eventually, 47 articles were chosen for the final analysis.

Findings – The findings are reported in three sections, (1) quantitative research profile, (2) qualitative synthesis and (3) future agenda. This study addresses the nuanced questions regarding the significant change in tourist travel behavior, emotional dynamics and a detailed understanding of mechanisms, such as which drivers and barriers affect tourist behavior in a particular destination. Drivers and barriers to tourist travel behavior were characterized in personal-related, destination-related, and health-related factors. Moreover, this study provides thought-provoking ideas in theory, policy and practice in the field of tourism and hospitality.

Research limitations/implications – This study has three limitations, as follows. First, the authors searched only two databases, Scopus and Web of Science, due to which the authors might be missing some related studies existing on the other databases. Although these databases provide an extensive range of academic literature, further studies could extend the data collection from the other databases (e.g. via Taylor & Francis). However, our systematic literature review (SLR) coverage is quite extensive, since journals are listed on these three main databases. Second, the authors followed a main study search protocol based on the synonyms and related keywords, however, some of the studies that may be related to the tourist behavior towards the destination are missing on account of the lack of our keywords in there, title, author, keyword and abstract. Furthermore, future research could endeavor to add other keywords to expand the results of studies. Third, although the accurate analysis was conducted to reduce subjectivity in identifying themes for drivers and barriers of tourist behavior, future studies on categorization could work to ensure that other sub-themes categorize.

Practical implications – The recent study has some key practical implications. First, this study is valuable for all the stakeholders in a unique way, including destination managers, academicians and policymakers, because it provides insight into barriers and drivers that influence the development of tourist behavior towards the destination. Second, the current study also offers practical implications for people involved in tourism service industries including governments and private businesses. Policymakers and other leaders are increasingly interested in harnessing the economic potential of tourism. Therefore, identifying the barrier which is inhibiting the tourist traffic towards the destination is beneficial to understand and effectively develop strategies to minimize the effect of such factors. Moreover, drivers and barriers of tourist behavior towards the destination in the COVID-19 pandemic situation towards the destination may help to create a framework for the development of destinations according to the current vulnerable situation. Third, current findings suggest that tourism...
marketers understand the drivers and barrier constructs found in this study and tailor their marketing strategies for attracting existing and new tourists. For instance, marketers should understand the drivers and barriers of tourist behavior for effective strategy development to increase the positive effect of drivers and to reduce the negative effect of barriers.

**Originality/value** – This is the first systematic literature review on the impact of drivers and barriers of tourist travel behavior. This paper analyses the methods and approaches that have been used in the previous literature to examine the drivers and barriers of tourist travel behavior. The paper ends with the research implication and limitations of the studies.
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1. Introduction

The outbreak of COVID-19 has adversely affected all businesses globally (Alvarez-Risco et al., 2021; Meyer et al., 2022; Ratten, 2021; Sahu et al., 2020; Seetharaman, 2020; Yan et al., 2021). However, the travel and tourism industry is not an exception; rather this sector has been predominantly affected due to strict travel policies (Fotiadis et al., 2021; Wong et al., 2020; Yeh et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021a, b). Notably, after the announcement of the World Health Organization (WHO) warnings about the COVID-19 pandemic, more or less, every country imposed proactive policies (e.g. social distancing, restricting tourist flows and business operations, online education and work from home, the closer of the restaurant, public gatherings restriction impose, lockdown borders and airports, domestic and international travel bans) for limiting human movements to quash the widespread of infectious disease, yet that is why tourism industry almost faced a shutdown situation (Seyfi et al., 2020).

Furthermore, the implications of social distancing have been extreme. Because of this change in tourist habits, the COVID-19 pandemic pervasively has affected the way tourists interact and travel later on (Abdullah et al., 2020). Unfortunately, tourist travel behavior affected by the COVID-19 pandemic significantly results in behavior change. Besides, the pandemic harmed the growth of the travel and tourism industry (Matiza, 2022) As a result, the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) anticipated a 60–80% decline in the travel and tourism sector worldwide (OECD, 2020). At the same time, the recent past has witnessed a constantly growing scholarly and practical debate for the survival, recovery and growth of the tourism sector in the era of the COVID-19-19 situation (Hassan and Soliman, 2021).

The mainstream tourism research predominantly focused on the fundamental question: how do COVID-19 crises affect travel and tourism behaviors? Despite a wide range of publications assessing the travel behavior of tourists to various settings, previous study investigations highlighted several factors that positively affect tourist behaviors, such as perceived trust and reputation of the destination (Hassan and Soliman, 2021), destination social responsibility and previous experience (Hu and Xu, 2021). On the other hand, empirical evidence also reported the factors that negatively affect revisit behaviors, such as perceived risk (Wang et al., 2020), the perceived probability of infection (Golets et al., 2020), travel Anxiety, fear of COVID-19 (Luo and Lam, 2020) and animosity ethnocentrism (Wang et al., 2021). Ostensibly, the majority of the previous studies have investigated the antecedents (i.e. motivators and constraints) of tourists’ intention/behavior to visit during and/or revisit after pandemic to a particular destination (He and Luo, 2020; Imran et al., 2021a, b; Zhang et al., 2021a, b).

In the current climate of uncertainty, the previous studies explored all relevant factors that promote and restrict tourist travel behavior. Besides that, the study of travel behavior of tourists emerges as one of the most researched areas in the tourism literature in an era of COVID-19 but there are still few reviews about the topic. Despite such significant efforts to understand travel behavior in this COVID-19 pandemic, our understanding is limited in several ways. For instance, previous studies examining tourist travel behaviors have utilized various theoretical lenses that complicate the comparability as well as the generalizability of empirical findings. Moreover, the literature around
drivers and barriers to tourist travel behavior is growing since the arrival of COVID-19, yet it has been vastly scattered and fragmented.

To the best of our knowledge, there is a complete absence of a comprehensive literature review on this topic. Against these backdrops, this study aims to identify, review and synthesize the findings of existing research to present a holistic and comprehensive understanding of the drivers and barriers associated with tourist travel behavior during/post-COVID-19 pandemic. This special manuscript is intended to dissect the ways of behaving that lessen tourist travel behavior and how to proactively animate them.

Owing to the strategic importance of this phenomenon, synthesized knowledge, as well as the critical analysis on previous literature, would contribute towards the effective strategy development process for practitioners and direct scholarly attention towards a unified direction. By doing so, we contribute to the extant literature in various ways. In the first place, this synthesis gives straightforward and reproducible research. Moreover, it allows researchers to identify research gaps more clearly. Second, a key theoretical contribution of this review is the development of a comprehensive framework from the underpinnings of behavioral reasoning theory (BRT). Given the lack of a consensual lens as well as the limitations of existing behavioral theories (e.g. TPB, TRA), BRT theory would serve as a unified framework for further development of knowledge related to travel and tourism behaviors. Third, the research in tourism management has now gotten more interdisciplinary and reliant (Aruan and Felicia, 2019). This systematic literature review will provide a systematic understanding of the whole phenomenon. Ultimately, the literature on tourist behavior is accessible in various journals with various scopes, countries and audiences. Therefore, this study helps us to fully explore this phenomenon from multiple perspectives to provide a more nuanced understanding.

This paper is organized as follows. The next section discusses the systematic literature review (SLR) methodology used in this paper. Afterward, we discuss the results of this review in two subsections, namely (1) descriptive quantitative analysis and (2) qualitative literature synthesis. In section four, we discuss the knowledge gaps and limitations in the current literature and propose the BRT framework for utilization in future research in the travel and tourism sector. Lastly, we discuss the theoretical and practical implications followed by the conclusion section.

2. Methodology

A systematic literature review (SLR) was conducted to find the factors that influence tourist travel behavior. This study aimed to understand the factors associated with tourist travel behavior during/post-COVID-19 pandemic. Later, the idea of these factors, assuming that they go about as drivers and barriers to tourists’ travel behavior, was explored. Systematic literature review (SLR) is the most trusted and well-established method of literature review while dealing with broad scholarly works (Brereton et al., 2007). Unlike traditional literature review methods (e.g. narrative), SLR is focused on answering context-specific and practical problems (Noble and Smith, 2018). It enables researchers to understand the depth and breadth of the phenomenon at hand (Ahmad et al., 2020a; Haradhan, 2018; Khalid et al., 2021b). Hence, systematic reviews can incorporate information created through both qualitative and quantitative approaches (Imran et al., 2021a, b; Mengist et al., 2020). It assists with gathering every single related publication and document that fits our predefined inclusion criteria to respond to a particular research question. It utilizes unmistakable and systematic methodology to limit the event of bias during searching, identification, appraisal, synthesis, analysis and summary of studies (Antman et al., 1992) At point when the technique is done appropriately and has no significant mistake, the review can give reliable findings and reliable conclusion that could end up being useful to decision-makers and scientific practitioners to act accordingly (Antman et al., 1992; Khizar et al., 2021). The SLR is the fundamental procedure and it guarantees that the work is thoroughly arranged before the actual review work starts (Mengist et al., 2020).
Tranfield et al. (2003) found the systematic literature review (SLR) criteria in the field of business management and administration. Much past literature has used this approach to review prior literature (Kushwah et al., 2019; Pertheban et al., 2020; Sahu et al., 2020; Tribis et al., 2018; Khizar et al., 2022). Following the standard protocols, this study aims to review and analyze the scholarly publications relevant to tourist behavior during-/post-COVID-19 epidemic periods. Our review assists academicians and practitioners by developing a trustworthy knowledge base by accumulating knowledge from a range of studies (Tranfield et al., 2003; Khalid et al., 2021a). In addition, our review would set the basis for future scholarly debates in this field of research. In the current review, five SLR stages are attempted, which were adapted by Pickering and Byrne (2014) see below: Figure 1.

2.1 Research questions

Our principle research question is into three sections with the end goal of analysis, also, as needs are the present SLR addressed the accompanying research questions (RQs).-

- **RQ1.** What is the current status of research on tourist behaviors during and post COVID-19 periods?
- **RQ2.** What are the key drivers and barriers of tourists’ travel behaviors during and post COVID-19 periods?
- **RQ3.** What are the gaps and limitations in existing literature? And what are the avenues for further research?
2.2 Literature review

2.2.1 Selecting database. We followed an SLR method Siddaway et al. (2014) as a structured methodology in a replicable form. To achieve multidisciplinary breadth, the relevant literature was searched in tourism and hospitality most important e-databases. We selected the two databases to identify the relevant literature, (1) Scopus and (2) Web of Science. Web of Science (WoS) is the most usually involved search engine for literature reviews; in any case, it does not contain a sufficient number of tourism journals. Scopus was hence utilized as an integral database because its inclusion of tourism journals is more comprehensive (McKercher, 2008). Moreover, both are notable databases that have been much of the time used in past systematic literature review studies (Dhir et al., 2020; Kuhzady et al., 2020; Mengist et al., 2020; Michel-Villarreal et al., 2019; Qiu et al., 2021; Sánchez-Rebull et al., 2018; Tandon et al., 2020). Furthermore, probably the biggest data set of peer-reviewed literature (journals, books and conference proceedings). In addition, Google Scholar was used for additional searches (i.e. backward/forward snowballing).

2.2.2 Appropriate search term. Tourists’ travel is connected with the previous behaviors of their traveling. This is conceptualized as travel conduct. This behavior is the immediate consequence of the association between certain personal and environmental variables consistently. Travel behavior can thus be defined as the manner in which tourists’ behavior is indicated by their attitudes towards a certain product and their reaction by utilizing the product.

The systematic literature review analysis requires high-quality original information to try not to delude results. For this SLR the researchers selected the two databases to identify the relevant literature, (1) Scopus and (2) Web of Science. These databases search API supports a Boolean syntax, which is a kind of search allowing the combination of keywords with operators such as ‘AND’, ‘OR’ and ‘NOT’ to deliver more relevant outcomes (Lukosevičiute et al., 2022). For effective search, we searched for all possible synonyms of the pursuit objective words; accordingly, keywords. This assessment was done on two academic databases. To identify potentially all relevant articles, we developed a comprehensive search sting: (tour* OR travel*) and (revisit* OR ”repeat visit*” OR ”visit* again” OR ”future visit*” OR ”future travel*” OR ”travel* again” OR ”again visit*” OR ”again travel*” OR ”visit* again” OR loyalty) AND (covid OR covid-19 OR corona*).

2.2.3 Inclusion/exclusion criteria. We utilized six different inclusion criteria: (1) studies should focus on drivers (positive) and barriers (negative) factors in the context of tourist travel behavior, (2) studies published focused (since the happening of Corona Virus),(3) studies published in the English language, (4) only peer-reviewed journal articles are included, (5) drivers and barriers were empirically measured, (6) title, abstract, keywords and, sometimes, introduction were examined to evaluate if the focus was on tourist behavioral and COVID-19 perspective. Further, this study applied the exclusion criteria: (1) relevance, (2) review and thesis dissertations were ignored, (3) duplicate studies and (4), studies before the COVID-19 epidemic.

2.2.4 Sample selection. The process for selecting the relevant sample of studies to be included in this review started with the execution of keywords searches in the specified databases. The search execution was performed in late December 2021. Initially, we identified 384 potentially relevant research articles. We followed the methodology of Reporting Items for SLR and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) procedure. Several past types of research in tourism research were used (PRISMA) (Janjua et al., 2021; Rahmadian et al., 2021). The reason behind the choice of PRISMA (Moher et al., 2009), over other existing protocols, lies in the acknowledgment of its comprehensiveness, its utilization in several disciplines around the world and its capability to increment consistency across reviews (Kuhzady et al., 2020). A PRISMA flowchart for the literature screening process (see Figure 2).
After deleting duplicates \((n = 68)\) across databases, the titles and abstracts of all the remaining articles \((n = 316)\) were scanned to ensure their relevance to the research questions of this review. This process resulted in selecting \((n = 105)\) relevant articles for further review and analysis. Subsequently, two authors independently performed in-depth readings of these articles based on the inclusion/exclusion criteria, and consequently, selected a sample of \((n = 41)\) articles with consensus. Additionally \((n = 6)\) relevant papers were identified during the revision process. Thus, increasing the final study sample to \((n = 47)\). Afterward, in the first stage, the corresponding to Microsoft Excel at a descriptive analysis of the published literature on tourist travel behavior in the epidemic situation, information extracted from the published studies, like country, journal and theory. Next stage, the content analysis was done to distinguish and analyze the primary research stream, reporting the outright way on the various areas and additionally referencing the future opportunities and challenges to research (Eusébio et al., 2020).

3. Results
We have conducted a state-of-the-art systematic review of the current literature on tourists’ travel behavior during and post COVID-19. The results of this review are presented in two subsections, as follows; (1) descriptive quantitative analysis and (2) qualitative synthesis. Initially, a descriptive quantitative analysis was performed to understand how tourist travel behavior models have evolved the Geographic distribution of publications and to identify the leading journals, and countries that publish those studies. A qualitative synthesis has been applied to look at the theoretical perspectives, (2) drivers and (3) barriers of tourists’ travel behaviors during and post COVID-19.
3.1 Descriptive quantitative analysis

3.1.1 Geographical contexts. Figure 3 below presents the geographical contexts where empirical studies were conducted. We found that most of the empirical research was carried out in Indonesia (n = 12) (Afriani and Sugianto, 2020; Alwi et al., 2022; Azis et al., 2020; Bustan and Setiawan, 2021; Kadir et al., 2020; Lenny et al., 2020; Pinem et al., 2021; Sianipar et al., 2021; Sihotang and Sukamaatmadja, 2021; Sitinjak et al., 2021; Sukamaatmadja et al., 2022; Zainuddin et al., 2022). After that, 7 studies were based on the data collected from China (Agyeiwaah et al., 2021; Cai et al., 2021a; Han et al., 2021; Hu and Xu, 2021; Jiang et al., 2022; Riestyaningrum et al., 2020; Zeng and Li, 2021) followed by the Malaysia (n = 5) (Ahmad et al., 2021a, b; Hanafiah et al., 2021; Ramli et al., 2021; Tiam Chin et al., 2021) and India (n = 4) (Gupta et al., 2021; Kour et al., 2021; Rather, 2021a, b) and in Korea (n = 4) (Shin et al., 2022; Sinha and Nair, 2021; Yoo et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2021). We also noted that three studies were conducted in the USA context (Chua et al., 2020, 2021; Milman et al., 2020; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2021). While three studies utilized the data collected from multiple countries’ contexts (Chua et al., 2020; Neuberger and Egger, 2021; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2021). Moreover, (n = 2) studies were conducted in the UK (Hang et al., 2020; Yilmaz, 2021), Similarly (n = 2) studies were conducted in Egypt (Hassan and Soliman, 2021; Hassan and Salem, 2021). Moreover, Turkey conducted (n = 1) (Cifci, 2021), Spain (N = 1) (Sanchez-Cañizares et al., 2021), Serbia (n = 1) (Bratic et al., 2021), Hong kong (n = 1) (Bhati et al., 2020), Brazil (n = 1) (Golets et al., 2020).

3.1.2 Publication outlets. Figure 4 below shows the list of journals where selected studies have been published along with the frequency of papers published in each journal. We found that articles selected in this review are published in various multidisciplinary journals and conference proceedings which reveal the relevance and breadth of this topic to different fields. The majority of the papers are published in the Current Issues in Tourism (n = 6), Journal of Destination Marketing and Management (n = 5) and Sustainability (n = 3). All remaining journal published (n = 1) papers.
3.2 Qualitative synthesis

We reviewed and content analyzed the selected articles to delineate existing literature into three key themes, (1) theoretical perspectives, (2) drivers and (3) barriers of tourists’ travel behaviors during and post COVID-19.

3.2.1 Theoretical perspectives. Extent literature has adopted a vast range of theoretical underpinnings to investigate drivers (motivating) and barriers (hindering) factors of tourists’ traveling intentions and behavioral decisions. Among other intention-behavior models, the theory of planned behavior (TPB) is the most applied in existing literature (Ahmad et al., 2020b, 2021a; Bae and Chang, 2021; Han et al., 2020). Besides, there is a healthy list of theories (n = 17) that has been used previously to study tourists’ behavior during the times of COVID-19. These include (1) protection motivation theory (Bhati et al., 2020), (2) health belief model (Gupta et al., 2021), (3) risk perception theory (F. Wang et al., 2020), (4) prospect theory (Golets et al., 2020), (5) construal level theory (Chemli et al., 2020), (6) seminal marketing theory (Matiza, 2022), (7) equity theory (Zhang et al., 2020), (8) set-theory approaches (Karl et al., 2020), (9) substantiate strategic memory protection theory, (10) self-congruity theory (Cifci, 2021), (11) psychological emotion theory (Bhati et al., 2020), (12) cognitive appraisal theory (Agyeiwaah et al., 2021), (13) mobility turn theory (Hassan and Salem, 2021), (14) expectancy-disconfirmation theory (Azis et al., 2020), (15) information integration theory, (16) uncertainty reduction theory (Chua et al., 2021) and (17) push-pull theory (Sukaatmadja et al., 2022).
3.2.2 Drivers of tourist behavior. Scholarly research on tourist behavior has utilized various drivers based on multiple approaches. Those drivers have a positive relationship with tourists’ behavioral particular destinations. Based on our analysis we have categorized these factors into multiple categories based on the nature of the variables. For example, personal, health-related and destination-related.

3.2.2.1 Personal drivers. Personal drivers are the factors that are associated with the personality of individual tourists. There are several factors studied in prior research that can be categorized as personal drivers. Such as, memorability of a previous travel experience, tourist Experience, past travel experience, quality of Experience, flow experience has a significant positive effect on tourist revisit intention (Ibrahim et al., 2021; Pinem et al., 2021; Setiawan et al., 2021; Sinha and Nair, 2021; Zeng and Li, 2021). Likewise, the past study found that past travel experience from the destination positively affects the future travel intention of tourists (Shin et al., 2022). Overall, tourist memories from the past travel experience of the destination can affect the tourist’s future decision or travel intention.

Moreover, the Positive attitude of tourists is the most studied personal driver of tourist travel behavior. Studies by Afriani and Sugiarto (2020) and Rather (2021a, b) found that tourists have a positive attitude that affects the tourist’s revisit intention towards the destination in this epidemic situation. A previous study was done by Chua et al. (2020) and Shin et al. (2022) tourist attitude strong predictor of future travel intention post-pandemic. Moreover, previous studies by Riestyaningrum et al. (2020) and Sánchez-Canizares et al. (2021) attitude positively affect tourist travel intention. However, a recent study by Hanafiah et al. (2021), found that attitude significantly positively affects future travel intention. Likewise study found that attitude has a significant relationship with revisit intention (Sukaatmadja et al., 2022). Overall, the finding of the past studies suggests that if the tourist has a positive attitude will increase travel internationally during or post-pandemic situation.

The most significant personal drivers Perceived behavioral control, subjective norms are located in four studies (Chua et al., 2021; Hanafiah et al., 2021; Sánchez-Canizares et al., 2021; Shin et al., 2022). The above Studies found that Perceived behavioral control; subjective norms positively increase tourist travel intention. Furthermore, satisfaction is the main predictor of change in tourist behavior in this COVID-19 situation. Past studies found that satisfaction has a positive effect on tourist loyalty. Similarly, a previous study found that satisfaction has a positive influence on revisit intention (Afriani and Sugiarto, 2020; Alwi et al., 2022; Kour et al., 2021; Sitinjak et al., 2021). If the tourist is satisfied with the destination they will be loyal to the destination and visit again the same destination near future (Azis et al., 2020; Cai et al., 2021a, b; Han et al., 2021; Lemy et al., 2020; Milman et al., 2020).

Furthermore, nostalgia, Hu and Xu (2021) positive influence revisit intention through nostalgia, the extent of change at a tourist destination choice. Because nostalgic memories are generally special and idealized, previous memories can raise expectations regarding the destination. So if the tourist has a positive nostalgia will influence the tourist to travel to the destination. Despite these generic natures of personal variables, there are some context-specific variables that are also studied about in tourist future travel behavior. Previous studies found that customer brand engagement, personal selling, emotion regulation ability, motivation, customer brand engagement, tourist happiness, perceived value, actual self-congruity, ideal self-congruity, e-WOM quantity, epistemic value has a positive effect on tourist revisit intention towards the destination during COVID-19 (Afriani and Sugiarto, 2020; Cifci, 2021; Ramli et al., 2021; Hu and Xu, 2021; Kadir et al., 2020; Ladiwala et al., 2021; Pinem et al., 2021; Rather, 2021a, b; Yu et al., 2021). A recent study found that Push motivation and pull motivation have a significant positive effect by revisiting intention (Sukaatmadja et al., 2022). Moreover, the study found that Electronic Word of Mouth (e-WOM) positively affects the tourist decision to Visit during the COVID-19 Pandemic (Zainuddin et al., 2022).

Furthermore, socio-demographic variables (Gender, marital status, education and monthly income), functional value, contextual value, emotional value, cognitive value, economic value, are more significant drivers of tourist post-COVID-19 travel intention. Past studies found that the above-mentioned factors are a positive effect on post-COVID-19 travel intention towards the destination (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2021; Sinha and Nair, 2021; Zeng and Li, 2021). However, some
previous studies found that perceived positive impact of COVID-19, positive emotion, emotional attachment, brand humanization, shared emotions, perceived response efforts, physical factors, socio-psychological factors, financial factors, physical, socio-psychological and financial drivers have a direct and positive effect on tourist travel intention (Agyeiwaah et al., 2021; Ahmad et al., 2020b, 2021a; Chua et al., 2021; Hang et al., 2020). Recently, a study also confirmed that media influence has positive effects on travel intention (Jiang et al., 2022). From the above discussion personal drivers are those who have positively associated with the tourist behavioral intention towards the destination. Our study considers the factors as drivers of tourist behavior. Furthermore, positive drivers of tourist behavior see below in Table 1.

3.2.2.2 Destination related drivers. Destination-related factors have gained appropriate scholarly attention in prior literature. Destination-related drivers are those factors that are positively related to a tourist destination. Moreover, destination-related factors are those factors that enhance tourists to visit or revisit the destination in this pandemic situation. For example, general sale promotion, perceived trust, tourist attraction, service quality, demographic characteristics, destination image, destination attachment, attractiveness, accommodation on service, airport service quality, innovative measures, staff- and traveler-related measures, sanitation and logistics operations positive perception or impressions of a destination is likely to mold the decision in destination's favor to revisit destination (Ciftci, 2021; Hassan and Soliman, 2021; Kadir et al., 2020; Kour et al., 2021; Pinem et al., 2021; Ramli et al., 2021; Sianipar et al., 2021; Sihotang and Sukaatmadja, 2021).

Similarly, destination reputation and destination social responsibility is also found to have a positive relationship with revisit intention (Hassan and Soliman, 2021; Kadir et al., 2020). Among all the above, destination reputation-related variables have been studied in two studies (Hassan and Soliman, 2021; Kadir et al., 2020). Moreover, a study found that Smart tourism technologies, Tourism public health service quality (TPHSQ), tourists’ trust positively affect Tourist destination loyalty (Ahmad et al., 2020b, 2021a; Azis et al., 2020; Han et al., 2021). Moreover, crisis communication strategy also evolved the intention to visit the destination post the COVID-19 situation (Hang et al., 2020). A recent study (Yoo et al., 2022) found that the Perceived effectiveness of COVID-19 protective measures, mediates the relationship between risk perception and travel intention. Similarly, the study found that accommodation type moderates the relationship between the perceived effectiveness of COVID-19 protective measures and travel intention during pandemics (Yoo et al., 2022).

It also confirmed that post-crisis destination image, corporate social responsibility, destination attachment and monetary promotions have a positive effect on the intention to visit the destination. The above study confirmed that when the COVID-19 will end then these drivers positively affect the tourist intention to revisit the destination (Ahmad et al., 2021b; Chua et al., 2020). A recent study also confirmed that Destination image has a positive effect on travel intention (Jiang et al., 2022). Among all the above destination-related variables the most studied and emphasized factor is destination image has a positive effect on travel intention (Jiang et al., 2022). From the above discussion personal drivers are those who have positively associated with the tourist behavioral intention towards the destination. Our study considers the factors as drivers of tourist behavior. Furthermore, positive drivers of tourist behavior see below in Table 1.

3.2.2.3 Health-related drivers. Health-related factors are referred to those factors which are associated directly or indirectly with the health concerning values of the individual traveler. Within this category, the main focus is on the hygiene and physical health-related factors and these variables are considered the most important aspects of health-protective behavior (Bhati et al., 2020), the individuals who have high thoughts of health, hygiene and mental health-related factors will see the current health risk at a lot more elevated level and consequently influence their visit intentions. Similarly, prior research has supported that hygiene, health preventive behavior, familiarity with COVID-19, have a positive impact on tourist travel behavior (Chua et al., 2020; Gupta et al., 2021; Riestyaningrum et al., 2020). A recent study found that tourist decisions to visit during the COVID-19
| Drivers | Dependent variable | Author |
|---------|--------------------|--------|
| Personal | Revisit intention | Setiawan et al. (2021) |
| Memorability of a previous travel experience | Revisit intention | Azis et al. (2020), Cifci (2021), Pinem et al. (2021) |
| Tourist Experience | Revisit intention | Sitiinjak et al. (2021) |
| Quality of Experience, flow experience | Future travel intention after the pandemic | Shin et al. (2022) |
| Past travel experience | Future travel intention after the pandemic | Rather (2021b), Afriani and Sugiarto (2020) |
| Attitude | Behavioral intention for safer destination post-pandemic | Han et al. (2020) |
| | Intention to travel | Sánchez-Cañizares et al. (2021) |
| | Travel intention | Riestyaningrum et al. (2020) |
| | Future travel intention | Hanafiah et al. (2021) |
| | Revisit intention | Sukaatmadja et al. (2022) |
| | Behavioral intention for safer destination post-pandemic | Chua et al. (2020) |
| | Future travel intention after the pandemic | Shin et al. (2022) |
| | Intention to travel | Sánchez-Cañizares et al. (2021) |
| | Revisit intention | Han et al. (2021) |
| | Milman et al. (2020) | Cai et al. (2021b) |
| | Emotional attachment, brand humanization, Shared emotions | Chua et al. (2020) |
| | Behavioral intention for safer destination post-pandemic | Sitiinjak et al. (2021) |
| | Destination tourist loyalty | Kour et al. (2021) |
| | Intention to travel | Afriani and Sugiarto (2020) |
| Perceived behavioral control, subjective norms | Revisit intention | Alwi et al. (2022) |
| | Future travel intention after the pandemic | Zeng and Li (2021) |
| | Satisfaction | Afriani and Sugiarto (2020), Cifci (2021), Ramli et al. (2021), Hu and Xu (2021), Kadir et al. (2020), Pinem et al. (2021), Rather (2021a, b), Yilmaz (2021), Yu et al. (2021), Sukaatmadja et al. (2022) |
| | Post-trip behavior intention | Zeng and Li (2021) |
| | Revisit intention | Afriani and Sugiarto (2020), Cifci (2021), Ramli et al. (2021), Hu and Xu (2021), Kadir et al. (2020), Pinem et al. (2021), Rather (2021a, b), Yilmaz (2021), Yu et al. (2021), Sukaatmadja et al. (2022) |
| Socio-demographic variables | The decision to Visit During the COVID-19 Pandemic | Zainuddin et al. (2022) |
| Gender, marital status, education and monthly income Solidarity | Post-COVID-19 travel intention destination | Sinha and Nair (2021) |
| Functional value, contextual value, emotional value, cognitive value, economic value | Travel intention | Rasoolimanesh et al. (2021) |
| Perceived positive impact of COVID-19, Positive emotion | Hang et al. (2020) |
| Emotional attachment, brand humanization, Shared emotions | Agyeiwaah et al. (2021) |
| Perceived response efforts | Chua et al. (2020) |
| Physical factors, Socio-psychological factors, financial factors | Chua et al. (2020) |
| Physical, socio-psychological and financial factors | Ahmad et al. (2020b, 2021a) |
| Media influence | González-Arnau et al. (2021) |
Pandemic were positively affected by health awareness (Zainuddin et al., 2022). From the above discussion, a present study found those factors which are positively associated with the tourist behavior during or post COVID-19 pandemic. We can see health-related divers in Table 3.

3.2.3 Barrier of tourist behavior. The second concept that comes under the scope of our review is the factors that negatively affect tourist behavior. The review of selected studies in this systematic process suggests that scholars have examined different barriers that indicate a negative relationship with tourist behavior toward destination during or post COVID-19 pandemic situation. These factors are further divided into three categories named, personal, health-related and destination-related.

3.2.3.1 Personal barrier. Factors associated with the personality of an individual may inhibit tourists from visiting a particular destination. There are various factors identified in prior literature such as fear arousal due to COVID-19, perceived disappointment risk, fear arousal negatively, perceived risk having a negative relationship with their intention to revisit (Hassan and Soliman, 2021; Hu and Xu, 2021; Ramli et al., 2021; Rather, 2021b). Moreover, Gupta et al. (2021) has found that financial risk, time risk has a negative relationship with revisit desire (Chua et al., 2021). Furthermore, found by Agyeiwaah et al. (2021) and Golets et al. (2020) intolerance of uncertainty, expected duration of COVID-19 pandemic, perceived COVID-19 severity, perceived probability of contracting it, age, income education level,

| Table 2 | Destination drivers |
|---------|---------------------|
| Drivers | Dependent variable | Author |
| Destination | Revisit intention | Kadir et al. (2020) |
| Sales promotion, reputation | Travel intention | Hassan and Soliman (2021) |
| Destination social responsibility, destination reputation, perceived trust | Travel intention during a pandemic | Sihotang and Sukaatmadja (2021) |
| Tourist attraction, service quality | Tourist destination loyalty | Azis et al. (2020) |
| Demographic Characteristics, destination Image | Intention to visit when the outbreak ends | Han et al. (2021) |
| Destination image | Behavioral intention | Hang et al. (2020) |
| Destination attachment | Intention to visit | | |
| Attractiveness, accommodation on Service | | | |
| Airport service quality | | | |
| Innovative measures, Staff- and traveler-related measures, sanitization and logistics operations | | | |
| Destination image, government initiatives | Travel intention | Jiang et al. (2022) |
| Accommodation type | Travel intention during a pandemic | Yoo et al. (2022) |
| Perceived effectiveness of COVID-19 protective measures | | | |
| Smart tourism technologies | | | |
| Tourism public health service quality (TPHSQ), tourists’ trust | | | |
| Crisis communication strategy | | | |
| Post crises destination image | | | |
| Corporate social responsibility, destination attachment, monetary promotions | | | |
| Destination image | visit intention | Ahmad et al. (2020b, 2021a) |
| Trust, crisis management, healthcare system | post-pandemic travel intention | Chua et al. (2020) |
| Destination trust, Political trust, Interactional trust | future travel intention after the pandemic | Rasoolimanesh et al. (2021) |

| Table 3 | Health drivers |
|---------|----------------|
| Drivers | Dependent variable | Author |
| Health | Travel intention | Riestyaningrum et al. (2020) |
| Hygiene and safety | Behavioral intention | Chua et al. (2020) |
| Health preventive behavior | Travel evading | Gupta et al. (2021) |
| Familiarity with COVID-19 | Decision to Visit During the COVID-19 Pandemic | Zainuddin et al. (2022) |
negative emotion, harms travel intention. Moreover, fear of COVID-19, risk attitude, travel anxiety, perceived knowledge of COVID-19, intrapersonal constraints, interpersonal constraints harm future intention to travel after the pandemic. Likewise, the perceived risk associated with COVID-19 has a positive effect on travel evading behavior (Gupta et al., 2021). However, the study found that perceived risk from epidemic negatively affects the tourist’s future travel intention (Hanafiah et al., 2021). A recent study found that if the tourist has high perceived risk (Physical risk, equipment risk, cost risk, social risk, performance risk and psychological risk) that negatively affect the travel intention (Jiang et al., 2022). Also study found that risk aversion negatively affects the travel intention (Jiang et al., 2022). Furthermore, the result of a recent study shows that perceived risk negatively affects the tourist decision to visit during the COVID-19 Pandemic (Zainuddin et al., 2022). Correspondingly, the study found that COVID-19 risk perception related factors Perceived avoid the ability of COVID-19, Perceived susceptibility to COVID-19, Perceived severity of COVID-19 significant negatively associated with travel intention during pandemic (Yoo et al., 2022). Mental well-being perceived uncertainty negatively affecting tourist travel behavior over a short period or long term period (Chua et al., 2020). From the above discussion, all the above factors are related to the intrapersonal barriers of tourist behavior. The present study found barriers that negatively affect tourist behavior during the pandemic or post-pandemic situation. Furthermore, we can see the interpersonal barrier in Table 4.

3.2.3.2 Destination-related barriers. Factors that are associated with the destination may leverage a negative impression on tourist behavior (Harun et al., 2018; Sonmez and Graefe, 1998). Perceived travel risk and negative effect of the perceived risk of traveling during COVID-19 are documented negative relationships with destination visit intention (Agyelwaah et al., 2021; Sánchez-Cañizares et al., 2021). Moreover, travel risk perception Bhati et al. (2020) has also been found to affect travel intention negatively. Likewise, negative attitudes from the COVID-19 negatively affect both short-term avoidance and long-term avoidance (Chua et al., 2020). Likewise, experience from the epidemic is negatively affecting the post-pandemic travel intention. From the above discussion, destination-related barriers are those factors that have negatively affected the tourist behavior towards the destination. We can see in Table 5 destination-related barriers;

| Table 4 | Personal barriers |
|---------|-------------------|
| Barriers | Dependent variable | Author |
| Personal | Revisit intention | Hu and Xu (2021) |
| Perceived disappointment risk | | Hassan and Solliman (2021) |
| Fear arousal negatively | | Rather (2021b) |
| Fear of COVID-19 and perceived risk | Decision to Visit During the COVID-19 Pandemic | Ramli et al. (2021) |
| Perceived risk | Future travel intention | Hanafiah et al. (2021) |
| Perceived Risk | | Zainuddin et al. (2022) |
| Perceived risk (Physical risk, equipment risk, cost risk, social risk, performance risk and psychological risk) | Travel intention | Jiang et al. (2022) |
| Perceived avoid ability of COVID-19, Perceived susceptibility to COVID-19, Perceived severity of COVID-19 | Travel intention during pandemic | Yoo et al. (2022) |
| Financial risk, time risk | Revisit desire | Chua et al. (2021) |
| Intolerance of uncertainty, Expected duration of COVID-19 pandemic, perceived COVID-19 severity, perceived probability of contracting it, age, income education level | travel intentions | Golets et al. (2020) |
| Negative emotion | Travel intention | Agyelwaah et al. (2021) |
| Risk aversion | travel intention | Jiang et al. (2022) |
| Fear of COVID-19, risk attitude, travel anxiety | Travel intentions post-crisis | Bhati et al. (2020) |
| Perceived risk associated with COVID-19 | Travel evading | Gupta et al. (2021) |
| Perceived knowledge of COVID-19 | Behavioral intention for safer destination post-pandemic | Chua et al. (2020) |
| Intrapersonal constraints, interpersonal constraints | Future travel intention after the pandemic | Shin et al. (2022) |
| Mental wellbeing | Short-term avoidance, long-term avoidance | Chua et al. (2020) |
3.2.3.3 Health-related barrier. Health-related barriers are those which trigger the health consciousness and health vulnerability issues and hence steer away tourists to visit a particular destination. Perceived risk from COVID-19, post-traumatic stress disorder, intrusive thoughts, COVID-19-related situational animosity harms tourist revisit intention (Rather, 2021b; Yilmaz, 2021; Yu et al., 2021). However, perceived negative impact of COVID-19, perceived severity of COVID-19, the perceived probability of infection, risk perception of COVID-19, perceived disease risk, psychological risk and perceived health risk harm the tourist’s future visit intention towards the destination (Agyeiwaah et al., 2021; Chua et al., 2020; Golets et al., 2020; Neuburger and Egger, 2021; Shin et al., 2022). Found by Bratić et al. (2021) travel anxiety due to the COVID-19 pandemic, general travel anxiety harms tourist travel plans behavior. Past study Chua et al. (2020) have found that the perceived health risk of COVID-19 is associated negatively with both Short-term avoidance and long-term avoidance. Likewise, the study found that perceived health risk has a significant negative effect on tourist attitude and revisit intention. Furthermore, physical risk, socio-psychological risk harms the revisit desire (Chua et al., 2021) (Table 6).

4. Framework development – behavioral reasoning theory (BRT) perspective

Our review of the extant literature suggests that scholars have utilized several theoretical frameworks to understand the human decision-making process (e.g. travel intentions). Our review highlighted that the majority of the selected empirical studies have examined the tourist’s travel decisions through the lens of TPB. In addition, various other theoretical models were applied to understand the risk perceptions, health beliefs and motivations behind the traveler’s decision-making. We found that 17 different theories were utilized in prior literature. In this vein, we argue that

| Table 5 | Destination barriers |
|---|---|---|
| **Barriers** | **Dependent variable** | **Author** |
| Health-related barrier | Health-related barrier | Health-related barrier |
| Perceived travel risk | Travel intention | Agyeiwaah et al. (2021) |
| Perceived risk of traveling during COVID-19 | Intention to travel during COVID-19 | Yu et al. (2021) |
| Travel risk perception | Travel behavior | Yilmaz (2021) |
| Attitude towards international travel | Short-term avoidance, long-term avoidance | Agyeiwaah et al. (2021) |
| Past experience | post-pandemic travel intention | Golets et al. (2020) |

| Table 6 | Health-related barriers |
|---|---|---|
| **Barriers** | **Dependent variable** | **Author** |
| Health-related barrier | Health-related barrier | Health-related barrier |
| Perceived risk from COVID-19 | Revisit intention during COVID-19 | Rather (2021b), Yu et al. (2021) |
| Post-traumatic stress disorder, Intrusive thoughts | Revisit intention | Yu et al. (2021) |
| COVID-19-related situational animosity | Intention to Revisit | Yilmaz (2021) |
| Perceived negative impact of COVID-19 | Travel intention | Agyeiwaah et al. (2021) |
| Perceived severity of COVID-19, Perceived probability of infection | Travel intentions | Golets et al. (2020) |
| Perceived avoid ability of COVID-19, Perceived susceptibility to COVID-19, Perceived severity of COVID-19 | Travel intention during pandemic | Yoo et al. (2022) |
| Risk perception of COVID-19 | Travel behavior | Neuburger and Egger (2021) |
| Perceived disease risk | Travel intention | Agyeiwaah et al. (2021) |
| Psychological risk | Behavioral intention for safer destination post-pandemic | Chua et al. (2020) |
| Perceived health risk | Future travel intention after the pandemic | Shin et al. (2022) |
| Perceived health risk | Revisit intention | Sukaatmadja et al. (2022) |
| Travel anxiety due to COVID-19 pandemic, general travel anxiety | Travel plans | Bratić et al. (2021) |
| Perceived health risk | Short-term avoidance, long-term avoidance | Chua et al. (2020) |
| Physical risk, socio-psychological risk | Revisit desire | Tiam Chin et al. (2021) |
the application of various theoretical frameworks borrowed from other disciplines (e.g. psychology, sociology) would not produce compelling as well as comparable results. Although it highlights the breadth and multidisciplinary coverage of the literature, at the same time it complicates the overall understanding and generalizability of the research findings. Furthermore, the theory of planned behavior (TPB) is the most adopted theoretical lens in tourists’ decision-making-related literature. This theory has long been criticized in previous literature for its potential to predict generalized consumer decision makings as well as it does not include the factors that resist/hinder behavioral decisions (Gilal et al., 2019).

Against these backgrounds, we suggest that future research regarding travel decisions should utilize the behavioral reasoning theory (BRT) (Westaby, 2005b). BRT can be seen as an extension of the TPB (Ajzen, 1991) that additionally allows investigating the relative influence of the context-specific reasons (i.e. reasons for and reasons against) in behavioral decisions. Reasons are important factors behind human behaviors that capture the justification and defense mechanisms to maintain people’s self-worth. In other words, reasons are influential drivers of intention because individuals feel more comfortable with themselves when they have reasons that defend and justify their expected action (Westaby, 2005a, b). BRT is an emerging theoretical framework that provides scholars with a reasoning perspective on the human decision-making process (Sahu et al., 2020). BRT theory postulates that reasons serve as an important linkage between global motives (i.e. attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control), intentions and behavior which is consistent with the theory of explanation-based decision making (Pennington and Hastie, 1988) and reasons theory (Westaby, 2005a).

According to Westaby (2005b), reasons are defined as “specific subjective factors people use to explain their anticipated behavior and can be conceptualized as anticipated reasons, concurrent reasons and post hoc reasons”. There are two dimensions to reasons for executing a behavior/intention, (1) reasons for and (2) reasons against. In past studies, the opposing forces have been represented as pros and cons, benefits and costs, drivers and barriers and facilitators and constraint factors (Westaby, 2005a, b). The literature in the domain of social psychology supports the argument that the (drivers) and (barriers) might not be merely logical opposites (Westaby et al., 2010). The BRT has been recently applied to understand innovation adoption (Claudy et al., 2013; Westaby et al., 2010) and the findings are encouraging supporting the argument that these conceptually distinct antecedents can be studied in a single framework. The findings of our review reported that various factors behind tourist behavior have been studied independently, till date no study examined the drivers and barriers in the light of reasoning perspective (i.e. reasons for and reasons against) in tourist behavior research. Drawing from the BRT, we develop a comprehensive framework (Figure 5) for further development of knowledge in this field of study. We believe that this framework would serve as a springboard to extend scholarly debate in tourism research.

5. Research implications

5.1 Theoretical implications

The findings of the current systematic literature review advance the existing knowledge on the drivers and barriers of tourist behavior in the context COVID-19 pandemic. The findings of this systematic literature review (SLR) provide several theoretical implications. First, the present study is the first systematic literature review of the existing knowledge base on the different drivers and barriers underlying tourist behavior. Our review proposes that, although various investigations have been published regarding this matter “Between 2019 and 2022” their discoveries are divided and contextualized and could not be summed up and closed. Therefore, the current systematic literature review critically examines the drivers and barriers of tourist behavior and uncovers insightful knowledge such as theoretical underpinnings, research methods, geographic scope, publishing timeline, drivers, barriers and their association with tourist behavior.

Second, this SLR provides a holistic picture of the overall literature and highlights the key future research areas and variables. This could serve as the first step for future researchers to better
understand the drivers and barriers of tourist behavior. Third, we have presented the extensive research profiling of the existing scholarly literature. Hence, this facilitating scholars to identify an important geographical area for future research and key journals that are accepting the work in this domain. Lastly, in this review, we have critically evaluated the literature on tourist behavioral intention during the COVID-19 pandemic and identified future research areas and knowledge gaps to guide future researchers. Overall this review provides scholars with a comprehensive overview of the existing literature and guides them towards future avenues of research within this field.

5.2 Practical implications

The recent study has some key practical implications. First, this study is valuable for all the stakeholders in a unique way, including destination managers, academicians and policymakers, because it provides insight into barriers and drivers that influence the development of tourist behavior towards the destination. Second, the current study also offers practical implications for people involved in tourism service industries including governments and private businesses. Policymakers and other political leaders are increasingly interested in harnessing the economic potential of tourism. Therefore, identifying the barrier which is inhibiting the tourist traffic towards the destination is beneficial to understand and effectively develop strategies to minimize the effect of such factors.

Moreover, drivers and barriers of tourist behavior towards the destination in the COVID-19 pandemic situation towards the destination may help to create a framework for the development of destinations according to the current vulnerable situation. Third, current findings suggest that tourism marketers understand the drivers and barrier constructs found in this study and tailor their marketing strategies for attracting existing and new tourists. For instance, marketers should understand the drivers and barriers of tourist behavior for effective strategy development to increase the positive effect of drivers and to reduce the negative effect of barriers.

6. Limitation and conclusion

Our study has three limitations, as follows. First, we searched only two databases, Scopus and Web of Science, due to which we might be missing some related studies existing on the other
Tourist behavior is a prime area of concern for tourism organizations, marketing managers and destination countries in this pandemic situation of COVID-19. Our review suggests the number of empirical studies on tourist behavior has sharply risen since the arrival of COVID-19, indicating a growing interest in destination-related behavior. We have evaluated the selected 47 studies on various parameters, such as inclusion, exclusion criteria and in-depth content analysis of selected studies. The understanding of tourist behavior starts with its drivers and barriers. The current study is one of the first comprehensive reviews that juxtapose both drivers and barriers of tourist behavior in one study. We have categorized the drivers and barriers into different categories based on contextual, personal, destination, social and health-related factors. Even though this article provides a few starting points for practitioners and future analysts while investigating tourist behavior and its drivers and barriers, it isn’t excluded from limitations: it is restricted to the Scopus and Web of Science database, empirical evidence and the English language. A further augmentation, including different databases, a review of meta-analyses and different reviews, just as articles in different dialects would give fascinating findings.
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