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ABSTRACT

Research about disasters in tourism has emerged in earnest since the 1990s covering insights for preparedness and response. However, recently, authors have called for more systematic and holistic approaches to tourism disaster management research. To address this gap, this study adopted a public relations perspective to refocus attention to relationships and stakeholder expectations of destination communities across multiple phases of disaster management. The authors used a mixed method approach and developed a battery of disaster management attributes by conducting interviews and analysing industry documents and the extant literature. These attributes formed part of a survey of tourism businesses. Exploratory Factor Analysis resulted in a two factor solution: i) business disaster preparedness, and ii) destination disaster response and recovery. Findings also show that participants reported a gap between the importance and destination performance of these attributes. In particular, tourism businesses perceived destinations did not adequately engage in disaster preparedness activities, which had implications for disaster response and recovery.

© 2016 The Authors.

1. Introduction

Disasters are unexpected natural or man-made events that injure people, damage property and infrastructure, and threaten the survival of organisations (Pearson & Clair, 1998). Past disasters include terrorist attacks, natural hazards, and organisational incidents such as technical errors or corporate malfeasance. The tourism industry is particularly susceptible to the short term and longer term effects of disasters due to: i) disruption of services at destinations and along the transit routes, and ii) the (mis)perceptions of consumers in distant markets. Recent examples of disasters to impact on tourism are highlighted in Table 1.

Disaster management comprises four phases: prevention, preparedness, response and recovery (PPRR). Prevention involves preventing or mitigating hazard impact such as disaster-proof infrastructure, preparedness ensures measures are in place before a disaster occurs, response comprises effective and efficient reaction to a disaster, and recovery includes the short and long-term efforts to restore communities following disasters (Cronstedt, 2002).

Despite the range of disasters and the existence of disaster management and engagement strategies, preparedness levels within the tourism sector remain historically low (Faulkner & Vikulov, 2001; Hystad & Keller, 2008; Paraskevas, Altinay, McLean, & Cooper, 2013). Although past disaster experience can motivate action (Giocco & Michael, 2007), the traditionally low levels of disaster preparedness amongst tourism businesses are attributed to beliefs that disasters are not likely (Faulkner & Vikulov, 2001; Hystad & Keller, 2008), and a lack of funds, staff, and time (Spillan & Hough, 2003). A lack of disaster preparedness in the tourism industry has the potential to impede disaster response and recovery for individual destination stakeholders and the economic health of the sector.

A key influencer in disaster management, from preparedness to recovery, is the destination marketing organisation (DMO). A DMO is formed as a result of a community seeking to become organised in the pursuit of destination competitiveness, and predominantly coordinates marketing communications (Pike & Page, 2014). Some DMOs have supported knowledge-building activities related to disasters (Blackman, Kennedy, & Ritchie, 2010; Blackman & Ritchie, 2008), yet the field of DMO involvement in disaster management is relatively new (Paraskevas et al., 2013).
Table 1

Recent disasters impacting on tourism.

| Year | Event |
|------|-------|
| 2015 | Terrorist attacks, Paris |
|      | Earthquake and landslides, Nepal |
|      | Wildfires, Canada, USA |
|      | Volcano eruption, Mount Raung, Bali |
|      | Capsized cruise ship, China |
|      | Cyclone Pam, Vanuatu |
|      | Juno Blizzard, USA |
|      | Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS), South Korea and Middle East |
| 2014 | Typhoon Hayan, Philippines |
|      | Malaysian Airlines Flights MH370 and MH17 |
|      | Polar Vortex, USA |
|      | Mount Everest Avalanche, Nepal |
|      | Ebola Virus Outbreak, Western Africa |
| 2013 | Hurricanes Manuel and Ingrid, Mexico |
|      | Typhoon Phailin, India |
|      | Earthquake and Tsunami, Solomon Islands |
|      | Tornadoes, USA |
|      | Bombing, Boston Marathon, USA |
| 2012 | Protests, Arab Spring, Egypt |
|      | Hurricane Sandy, USA |
|      | Shooting, Sandy Hook Elementary School, USA |
| 2011 | Floods, Philippines |
|      | Fukushima nuclear disaster, Japan |
|      | Christchurch earthquake, New Zealand |
|      | Tropical cyclone Washi, Philippines |
|      | Drought, East Africa |
|      | Floods, Thailand |

Although existing studies have examined strategies for disaster preparedness, response and recovery, comparatively few studies examine disaster management in holistic and systematic ways (Faulkner, 2001; Paraskevas et al., 2013; Ritchie, 2004). The lack of research covering multiple phases of disaster management and the relationships within the sector potentially limits how the tourism industry manages change, complexity and follow-on disruptions that are commonly associated with disasters. To address this lack of research, this study adopts a public relations perspective to examine the multiple phases of disaster management from the perspective of key stakeholders in destination communities.

Public relations emphasises the value of relationships between organisations and their environments. According to one of the most frequently cited definitions, public relations is “the management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the publics on whom its success or failure depends” (Broom, 2009, p. 25). While public relations is commonly understood as a publicity and promotion function for organisations, its value in relationships and stakeholder engagement deliver sustained and mutually beneficial outcomes. This study focuses on public relations practices around stakeholder engagement that are designed to enhance and/or create capabilities in disaster management and preparedness.

Building on the opportunity to contribute to existing research and enhance engagement processes, the study investigates tourism destination stakeholders’ perceptions of current disaster management preparedness initiatives at their destination. The study contributes to disaster management research in the tourism literature by giving attention to disaster preparedness, response and recovery phases to enhance engagement and build resilience in the sector. In addition, the study builds understanding of the expectations that drive the relationship and engagement between DMOs and tourism destination stakeholders in disaster management. The aims of the study were twofold: i) to identify destination management attributes deemed important to stakeholders and ii) to identify stakeholders’ perceptions of their destination’s disaster management performance.

2. Literature review

2.1. Stakeholder engagement and DMOs in disaster management

A destination community contains diverse stakeholders with varying levels of vested interests in the success of their destination community (Page, 2014). For DMOs, stakeholder engagement and relationship management are important because they build trust, resilience and performance (Sloan, 2009). As a key function of public relations, stakeholder engagement is conceptualised in this study as the relationship-building principles that can improve tourism destination stakeholders’ business capabilities in disaster management (Taylor & Kent, 2014). There are multiple ways to engage and manage relationships with stakeholders from monitoring to involvement to deep collaboration or integration into decision-making (Basu, Bose, & Ghosh, 2013; Burnside-Lawry & Carvalho, 2015). The relationships between DMOs and destination stakeholders create social capital, which is an important part of public relations practice as it enables the achievement of business and social outcomes (Taylor & Kent, 2014).

Engagement is also an important part of effective disaster management. The role of DMOs is most clearly defined in disaster response and recovery which brings a focus on marketing activities designed to restore the industry (Blackman & Ritchie, 2008; Wang & Pizam, 2011). Although researchers have identified DMOs as industry educators that can assist businesses to plan for and cope with the negative effects of crisis (Blackman et al., 2010), there is limited research that explores the critical relationship between these organisations.

Engagement around all areas of disaster management will be influenced by the pre-disaster relationships (Coombs & Holladay, 2001), in this case between DMOs and destination stakeholders including tourism operators. Tourism research shows divergence in these pre-disaster relationships. For example, less interest in destinations and their competitiveness is shown by small tourism businesses whose owner/operators are motivated by lifestyle (Thomas, Shaw, & Page, 2011), over business design. However, DMOs, their stakeholder engagement strategies and the competitiveness of the destination influences the success of individual tourism ventures and cooperatives (Pike, 2004).

For DMOs, the ultimate aim is to achieve alignment between their actions and tourism destination stakeholder expectations, an outcome also shared by public relations. The lack of alignment between organizational and stakeholder interests can reflect in social and economic performance (Sloan, 2009). In this regard, there has been a relatively small stream of research investigating tourism destination stakeholder perceptions of the effectiveness of the DMO’s destination leadership (see for example Bornhorst, Ritchie, & Sheehan, 2010; Donnelly & Vaske, 1997; Dwyer, Cvelbar, Edwards, & Mihalic, 2012; Evans & Chon, 1989; Selin & Myers, 1998; Wagner & Peters, 2009). Within these studies, a noticeable gap is the extent to which destination stakeholders are satisfied with their destination’s disaster management. A DMO’s disaster management activities are vital in ensuring resilience in the tourism industry. In the context of disaster management, the lack of alignment has the potential to affect how stakeholders, in this case tourism businesses prepare, respond to and recover from disasters.

2.2. Evaluating DMO performance using expectation confirmation theory

Expectation confirmation theory (ECT) was originally developed by Oliver (1980) who suggested expectations and perceived performance lead to satisfaction. This effect is mediated through a
positive or negative confirmation or discrepancy between expectations and performance. For example, if a service exceeds the expectations of the consumer (positive confirmation), satisfaction will occur and if a service falls short of expectations (negative confirmation), dissatisfaction is likely to result (Chou, Lin, Woung, & Tsai, 2012; Oliver, 1980).

ECT has been widely used to study satisfaction amongst consumers in marketing environments, urban services and information technology (Bhattacherjee, 2001; Chou, Kiser, & Rodriguez, 2012; Thong, Hong, & Tam, 2006; Van Ryzin, 2004). Satisfaction levels are predicted through two constructs: expectation of the service and confirmation of that expectation following the experience (Bhattacherjee, 2001). The expectation provides the base line against which confirmation is assessed in order to determine overall satisfaction. This is due to the fact that high satisfaction implies a number of positive outcomes such as purchase, endorsement, profit or return on investment (Bowden, 2009). In tourism, ECT has been applied to examine individual tourist satisfaction with destinations (Hui, Wän, & Ho, 2007; O’Rourke & O’Rourke, 1984; Pizam & Ellis, 1999; Pizam & Milman, 1993; Van Raaij & Franckien, 1984; Weber, 1997) and with tourism trends such as medical tourism (Chou et al., 2012).

The application of ECT to a service-oriented sector and business-to-business relationship, the focus of this study, is a comparatively unique approach. In the past, researchers’ critiques of ECT related to the low familiarity of customers with tourism-related services (Yüksel & Yüksel, 2001). Applying ECT to a pre-existing relationship between DMOs and tourism businesses, in part overcomes some of these concerns. This study responds to Yüksel and Yüksel (2001) call for further empirical research to test the validity of the ECT measure in tourism.

This study attempts to better understand the relationship between DMOs and the tourism organisations they represent within disaster management. This relationship will be examined through the application of ECT. Through this application, the research will explore current DMO engagement strategies with regard to disaster management within the tourism industry, and consequently the levels of satisfaction held by stakeholders in Australia. The research questions for this study are:

RQ1: What functions of destination disaster management are important to tourism stakeholders?
RQ2: To what extent do stakeholders’ expectations for and the perceived performance of the destination’s disaster management align?

3. Methodology

To identify the functions of disaster management in tourism and explore congruence between these expectations and performance of destination disaster management, a mixed-method design was adopted. Exploratory qualitative research was undertaken as the constructs that defined disaster management were not yet established in the literature. Three stages of data collection were used to address the first research question. First, key journal articles and books sourced from disaster management, crisis communication, and tourism literatures were analysed for checklists and lists of disaster preparedness, response, and recovery attributes. Second, an Internet search revealed five crisis management or disaster response plans from DMOs or tourism organisations. These plans represented guides for tourism operators or DMOs in the case of risk and disaster and were sourced from state, federal and international organisations.

Third, six semi-structured interviews were conducted with various individuals working for organisations within the tourism industry in Queensland. Participants included tourism operators, DMO executives, and members of local government who were involved in disaster management programs for their constituency. Participants consisted of two tourism operators, two employees of DMOs, and two individuals from local government. The semi-structured interviews consisted of four open-ended questions. These real-world insights consequently added a new dimension to the emerging list of attributes. Interviews were then transcribed and coded, in an attempt to derive disaster management attributes from the text. Manual coding was undertaken, whereby the raw data were first transformed into preliminary codes, then final codes (Saldana, 2012). The three lists of attributes were triangulated by comparing and contrasting, and integrating the separate lists into a definitive battery of attributes (Berg & Lune, 2004). Similar attributes were combined, and attributes that were only mentioned in one of the lists were eliminated. From these tables, a final list of 14 attributes was developed, as shown in Table 2.

An online survey was then used to address the second research question. Participants were asked to rate the level of importance of for each of the 14 destination disaster management attributes using a seven point Likert type scale anchored at 1 (not important) and 7 (very important). A separate ‘0’ (Don’t Know/No Opinion) non-response option was also provided alongside each scale item. Participants were then asked to rate their destination’s performance for the same 14 attributes, using a seven point scale anchored at 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree). Again, a separate ‘0’ (don’t know/no opinion) non response item was used to minimise potential bias of uninformed responses. Participants were also asked if they had ever experienced a disaster and about the characteristics of the organisation that the respondent represented. These questions were asked to gain a better understanding of the differences in responses based on participant’s disaster experience and an organisation’s size, type, industry, age, and geographic location.

The target population for the online survey included any individual employed by an organisation operating within or affected by the tourism industry in Australia and New Zealand. Sectors considered as part of the tourism industry for the purpose of this research were: the accommodation industry, visitor attraction, cafes, restaurants, and takeaway food services, clubs, pubs taverns and bars, transport, casinos and gambling services, motor vehicle, travel agencies and tour operator services, sports and recreational services, automotive fuel retailing, retail trade and any trade association representing these sectors (Tourism Research Australia, 2012). Participants were recruited from two sources. First, databases of destination marketing organisations and tourism trade organisations that agreed to assist with the dissemination of the survey. Organisations that agreed to disseminate the survey include destination management and regional development organisations in New Zealand, Queensland, New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria, Western Australia, Tasmania, and industry associations such in accommodation and aviation in Australia and New Zealand. This avenue yielded 25 responses. An external panel was sourced from Research Now, a multi-national market research organisation that complies with research standards through membership to the Research Association of New Zealand, The Australian Market and Social Research Society and the Travel and Tourism Research Association. This resulted in a further 264 participants.

4. Results

The results identified the key functions of disaster management that were considered important among tourism stakeholders. By mapping these rankings against stakeholder evaluations of
perceived performance of the destination, the results indicate a gap, indicating misalignment in performance. These results are presented next.

4.1. Sample characteristics

A total of 289 usable responses were received. The characteristics of the sample are summarized in Table 3. One in five participants had experienced a disaster at their destination. Just over half of the participants were from small businesses with less than 20 staff (55%), followed by businesses with 20–200 staff (24%) with the remaining 21% from businesses with over 200 employees. The majority of participants (76%) worked in organizations that had been in operation for five years or more. Almost half of the participants (46%) were from businesses operating within the retail sector. Other sectors identified included tourism, hospitality, accommodation and consultants. One in five participants was an owner-operator, and a further 25% held management positions. Almost one-third of the participants were located in New South Wales (27%), followed by Queensland (18%), and Victoria (17%).

4.2. Destination disaster management attributes

As shown in Table 4, attribute importance means ranged from a high of 5.49 for ‘Has a strategy to handle the disaster situation’, to a low of 4.62 for ‘Holds pre-disaster workshops to teach me how to adequately plan for disaster situations’. All attributes had a mean above the scale mid-point with a grand mean of 5.05, indicating face validity. The Cronbach Alpha for was .965, which is well above the identified acceptable level (> .7) indicating strong internal consistency (Cronbach, 1951).

Independent-samples t-tests by participants’ disaster experience indicated that only one item with a statistically different mean between these groups ‘Has a strategy to handle a disaster situation’ (t = 2.759, p = .006). Those who had experienced a disaster were more likely to believe it important for communities to have a strategy to handle a disaster situation. One-way ANOVA did not reveal any statistically significant differences between means by business type, location, or the participant’s position within the business or business size.

4.3. Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was undertaken to examine the underlying structure among the variables in the analysis (Joseph, Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). The correlation matrix showed each attribute correlated with every other attribute (Pallant, 2010). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) was .949, while Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was significant at the .001 level. The EFA was conducted using principal components analysis with a varimax rotation. The two factor solution explained 74.32% of variance, as shown in Table 5. Attributes that loaded onto Factor 1 had an individual focus, whereby items were presented in personalized activities designed to enhance disaster preparedness within individual businesses. Attributes which loaded onto Factor 2, were deemed to have a disaster response and recovery function that operated at a destination level. This second factor of attributes reflected a strategic focus rather than a tactical approach geared at individual businesses as in Factor one.

4.4. Perceptions of destination performance

Pooled perceived destination performance results are listed in Table 6 where it can be seen the means ranged from a high of 4.35 for ‘Has a strategy to handle the disaster situation’ to a low of 3.66 for ‘Holds pre-disaster workshops to teach me how to adequately plan for disaster situations’. In contrast to the importance ratings, seven of the means for the perceived performance ratings along with the grand mean were below the scale mid-point. Of these seven attributes, six were items from factor one, which focused on the disaster preparedness activities for individual businesses.

Gap analysis is a helpful visual aid to highlight the practical implications of the research for stakeholder engagement and relationship building in destination communities. As shown in Fig. 1, there is a gap or misalignment between the importance ratings of and stakeholder perceptions of destination performance for every disaster management attribute.

5. Discussion

This study shed light on elements relating to public relations and stakeholder engagement in the tourism disaster management in several ways. First, this study identified multi-phase disaster management attributes that were important to tourism businesses, contributing to existing research that is phase-specific. A number of these attributes were rated as very important to tourism businesses, signalling priority areas for tourism destination stakeholders. From a public relations perspective, this information identified the criteria to judge the performance of DMOs and created a platform to guide stakeholder engagement activities before, during and after disasters.

Second, these attributes identified as two factors. Factor one, disaster preparedness, comprised the activities that tourism business expect to be provided by destinations in the pre-disaster context. The framing of these attributes showed a dependence on the destination to provide support for risk assessment and crisis training among others. Taken another way, tourism businesses externalized the responsibility of pre-disaster preparedness to destinations. Factor two, destination disaster response and recovery, focused mostly on the latter phases of disaster management with activities that operated at the industry level such as grant assistance and post-disaster recovery communication or promotions. This factor comprised the engagement activities that DMOs undertake with emergency services organizations and governments.
These factors provided a concise and reliable way to measure disaster management attributes across multiple phases. Although these factors were developed and tested in a predominantly Australian context, further research could examine how the factors operate in other developed and emerging economies to better understand tourism disaster management practices.

Third, the study identified a consistent gap between tourism businesses’ evaluation of the importance of and destination performance against disaster management attributes. In particular, seven attributes fell below the scale mid-point with six of these attributes belonging to factor one, business disaster preparedness. This finding suggested that tourism businesses perceived that destinations were not performing well in activities that directly engaged them around disaster preparedness. When effectively applied, stakeholder engagement has the potential to enhance tourism business’ capabilities in disaster management (Taylor & Kent, 2014). The attributes identified above included a number of areas that have the ability to improve owner/operator and business capability for disaster preparedness, response and recovery. At the same time, seven attributes sat above the scale mid-point with the majority belonging to factor two, destination disaster response and recovery. This finding suggested that destinations were perceived to do a better/adequate job at destination level than at the individual business level. Overall, this analysis focused on stakeholder perceptions of performance rather than actual performance. This finding might suggest that destinations need to better engage their stakeholders and communities to enhance visibility about existing work in disaster management.

5.1. Research limitations

Various limitations to this study have been identified. First, despite the relative large overall sample size within this study, participant numbers for some Australian States have been under-represented, which restricts the ability to generalise findings. Difficulty gaining business participants as opposed to individual consumers is an issue faced frequently by researchers, as acknowledged by Pike, Murdy, and Lings (2011). As such, the use of an external panel organisation was vital in ensuring an adequately sized sample, yet use of such a panel poses limitations for the current study. The utilisation of judgement sampling, specifically the panel organisation’s offer of a small incentive to complete the survey may have resulted in cases of self-selection bias. Self-selection bias occurs when participants decide entirely for themselves whether or not to participate in the survey. This occurs to the extent that the participants’ propensity for participating is correlated with the phenomenon the researcher is attempting to investigate (Hall, 2008). While acknowledging these shortcomings, results of this research reveal useful insights into the relationship between communities and the tourism operators they represent, and contributes to current work in disaster management.

Table 3
Sample characteristics.

| Disaster experience | Yes | 60 | 20.8 |
|---------------------|-----|----|------|
|                     | No  | 229| 79.2 |
|                     | Total | 289| 100  |
| Business size       | Less than 20 people | 158 | 54.7 |
|                     | 20 or more people, but less than 200 people | 70 | 24.2 |
|                     | 200 or more people | 61 | 21.1 |
|                     | Total | 289| 100  |
| Business age        | Less than 5 years | 69 | 23.9 |
|                     | 5 years or more | 220 | 76.1 |
|                     | Total | 289| 100  |
| Business type       | Accommodation | 19 | 6.6 |
|                     | Visitor attraction | 7 | 2.4 |
|                     | Cafes, restaurants, and takeaway food services | 19 | 6.6 |
|                     | Clubs, pubs, and taverns | 6 | 2.1 |
|                     | Transport | 9 | 3.1 |
|                     | Casinos and other gambling services | 3 | 1.0 |
|                     | Motor vehicle | 9 | 3.1 |
|                     | Travel agency and tour operators | 6 | 2.1 |
|                     | Sports and recreation services | 5 | 1.7 |
|                     | Automotive fuel retailing | 1 | 0.3 |
|                     | Retail trade | 134 | 46.4 |
|                     | DMO | 4 | 1.4 |
|                     | Trade association | 11 | 3.8 |
|                     | Other | 56 | 19.4 |
|                     | Total | 289| 100  |
| Respondent’s position | Owner operator | 56 | 19.4 |
|                     | Management | 73 | 25.3 |
|                     | Employee | 160 | 55.4 |
|                     | Total | 289| 100  |
| Location of organisation | QLD | 53 | 18.3 |
|                     | VIC | 49 | 17 |
|                     | TAS | 12 | 4.2 |
|                     | NSW | 79 | 27.3 |
|                     | NT | 2 | 0.7 |
|                     | ACT | 7 | 2.4 |
|                     | WA | 13 | 4.5 |
|                     | SA | 20 | 6.9 |
|                     | NZ | 2 | 0.7 |
|                     | Australia wide | 5 | 1.7 |
|                     | Worldwide | 1 | 0.3 |
|                     | Other | 46 | 15.9 |
|                     | Total | 289| 100  |

Table 4
Attribute importance.

| Attribute | n | Mean | S.D | Cronbach Alpha if item removed |
|-----------|---|------|-----|--------------------------------|
| Has a strategy to handle the disaster situation | 278 | 5.49 | 1.47 | .963 |
| Keeps up to date with developments in the media regarding the disaster situation | 279 | 5.39 | 1.54 | .963 |
| Co-ordinates and establishes relationships with important groups (Emergency Services, Governments, and Police) in order to be ready for a disaster | 278 | 5.32 | 1.59 | .962 |
| Establishes communication and command chains to be followed during a disaster | 277 | 5.27 | 1.60 | .961 |
| Communicates with me about the status of disaster situations including the response and recovery efforts | 278 | 5.24 | 1.56 | .962 |
| Promotes my destination to help bring visitors back to the area following a disaster | 279 | 5.22 | 1.64 | .964 |
| Organises or provides financial help for my business after a disaster through small grants or tax cuts | 277 | 5.06 | 1.66 | .961 |
| Creates an emergency preparedness checklist for me to use during a disaster | 277 | 5.04 | 1.74 | .961 |
| Provides me with access to free online and offline crisis management resources and tools to help my business be disaster ready | 276 | 5.01 | 1.70 | .962 |
| Provides me with crisis management training and advice in the event of a disaster | 274 | 4.84 | 1.72 | .961 |
| Holds drills, rehearsals, and simulations of potential disaster situations | 275 | 4.80 | 1.65 | .962 |
| Conducts a risk assessment of my business’ ability to cope with potential disasters | 273 | 4.77 | 1.69 | .962 |
| Provides my business with a written crisis management plan | 269 | 4.67 | 1.75 | .964 |
| Holds pre-disaster workshops to teach me how to adequately plan for disaster situations | 276 | 4.62 | 1.73 | .961 |
| **Grand mean** | **5.05** |
understanding of disaster management in Australia.

6. Conclusion

This study identified attributes that were important to tourism destination stakeholders across multiple phases of disaster management. The authors also showed the misalignment between stakeholder importance and perceived destination performance against these attributes. In doing so, the work provides a first step for improving stakeholder engagement in ways that can enhance tourism destination stakeholder capability, build resilience in tourism, and encourage further research in this area.
