

UNDERSTANDING RESILIENCE IN TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY

János DEBRECENI, Zsófia FEKETE-FROJIMOVICS

Budapest Business School, 1054 Budapest, Alkotmány utca 9-11. Hungary

ABSTRACT

The two years that have passed since the spring of 2020 have been an extremely unfavorable period for businesses in the tourism and hospitality sector. The coercive measures introduced due to Covid-19 led to adverse events, often crises in the operation of stores. The literature on resilience gives the most adequate answers to the question of how successfully a company resists or adapts to an unfavorable market situation. Resilience refers to the ability of the organization to continue to function during an adverse event by bouncing back or adapting to the circumstances in a new way. The purpose of this study is to summarize the concepts of resilience and present its aspects related to tourism and hospitality. The systematic processing of the results of resilience research found in the literature is not only useful for understanding the current situation but can also provide an effective coping strategy for another period of crisis. Since the research of corporate skills plays an important role in the post-Covid-19 recovery, the study proposes possible research methods for resilience and points out the challenges of business research.

Keywords: crisis, organizational resilience, systemic resilience, recovery

INTRODUCTION

In 2019, world tourism performed more than ever before. According to *Statista* (2020a), the contribution of tourism to the global economy was \$2.9 trillion directly and \$9.25 indirectly. The number of tourist arrivals increased to \$1.46 billion. Since March 2020, tourism-related businesses have found themselves in one undesirable situation after another. The first wave of Covid-19 halved tourism: leisure spending fell by 50% (*Statista*, 2020b), while business spending dropped by more than 60% (*Statista*, 2020c). The emergency health measures have made the recovery for tourism difficult or limited for two years. As we can see from the industrial statistics of Hungary, the recovery is far from over, while new crises are threatening the sector: energy crisis, inflation, disposable income of target groups, or a drastic increase in facility operation costs. The ability of firms to survive and adapt can best be understood and examined in terms of resilience.

The relevance of resilience studies in tourism

The *Oxford Learner's Dictionary* (2022). reflects the original meaning of resilience as the ability of people and objects to recover from an unpleasant external impact such as

shock or injury. The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary and Thesaurus introduces the phenomena of misfortune and changes alongside unpleasant external influences; therefore, resilience refers to the ability to recover from shocks or adapt easily to unpleasant situations (Merriam-Webster, 2022). The etymology of the word resilience is derived from the Latin *resilire*, meaning to bounce back, and is related to the Italian *salire*, meaning to leap. In the academic literature, it is worth starting from Holling's (1973) definition of resilience as the ability of a system to maintain its identity and inherit its basic structure and characteristics in the event of malfunction (Holling, 1973).

When assessing resilience, it is primarily necessary to identify dysfunctions and adverse events. Although these can be diverse, they all have in common that they cause a state of imbalance in the functioning of the organization. According to Faulkner (2001), while disasters occur suddenly and the event that causes them is beyond the control of those involved, in a crisis, decisions may be made by those involved in several circumstances. Whichever the case, from the point of view of the organizations – or set of organizations – affected, adverse events typically have a determinate and negative impact on business, as usual. According to Faulkner's (2001) synthesis, the defining characteristics of crisis and disaster situations are 1) a major trigger event that challenges the existing structure, the ability to carry out routine operations, and, indeed the survival of the organization, 2) a high threat characterized by surprise, urgency, and short decision times, 3) the perception of an inability to cope among the organizations directly affected, 4) a turning point or a decisive change that can move the organization in either a positive or a negative direction, and 5) flexible, unstable, dynamic situations.

When assessing the situation of tourism, the above indicates that a crisis can be identified for the coronavirus (hereafter: COVID-19). In Hungary, to control the COVID-19 outbreak, Government Decree 40/2020 (11.3.2020), which entered into force on 11 March 2020, first restricted the opening hours of restaurants, and a few weeks later it only allowed takeaway and home delivery. At the same time, the accommodation market faced a simultaneous drop in new bookings and the impossibility of receiving guests with reservations, while restrictions on entry and exit between countries were constantly changing. The situation was a combination of a major trigger event (regulation), short decision times (immediate restriction of service), and an inability to cope (operators had no experience in dealing with similar situations). The question is, however, how to characterize the situation in the tourism sector, and what to consider as a crisis based on the macro data for the sector?

Although tourism was considered a successful sector not only in Hungary but also worldwide before COVID-19, it is difficult to estimate the performance and output of the sector, and even more difficult to measure its true size and contribution to GDP. The reason is that tourism is not a productive or commercial activity, nor a consumer good, which has a well framed value-chain, but it is a set of 12 tourism products and economic activities. Although the Tourism Satellite Accounts (TSA) aim to estimate the output of the 12 products (Accommodation services for visitors, Food- and beverage-serving services, Railway passenger transport services, Road passenger transport services, Water passenger transport services, Air passenger transport services,

Transport equipment rental service, Travel agencies and other reservation services, Cultural services, Sports and recreational services, Spa services, Travel supporting services) as accurately as possible, *Hinek* (2020) points out the challenges of the TSA indicators. *Hinek* (2020) presents anomalies that can lead to misunderstandings and false conclusions. Indeed, only some of the products monitored by the TSA are purchased by tourists and travelers exclusively. A vast majority of hospitality services are used by local visitors, as well, as is the case for domestic passenger transport, which is predominantly used for commuting (to work, school, and intra- and inter-municipal destinations). Passenger transport infrastructure does not exclusively serve the needs of people far from home, either, but is rather a key element of a country's mobility. The case of spas is also typical, as a significant proportion of their volume is generated by residents.

Of tourism-specific products, this study focuses on accommodation services, food-and beverage service, travel agencies, and other reservation services. These three tourism-related products - also known as economic subsectors - were the most successful sectors of the years before the COVID-19 crisis. The industrial statistics of the companies producing the above-mentioned tourism products help to understand that the sector is still in the recovery phase. The evolution of the number of enterprises in the sub-sectors 55 Accommodation, 56 Food and beverage service activities, and 79 Travel agency, tour operator and other reservation service and related activities, the number of formations and terminations, the annual net turnover and the number of employees, according to NACE '08, are summarized in *Table 1*.

Table 1: Industrial statistics of tourism businesses in Hungary

	31 December 2019			31 December 2020			31 December 2021			31 December 2022		
	55	56	79	55	56	79	55	56	79	55	56	79
Number of enterprises (thousand)	4.9	21.3	1.9	4.9	20.8	1.8	4.9	20.8	1.7	5.0	20.9	1.7
Number of business formation (piecewise)	218	1.383	292	273	1.286	45	252	1.255	45	200	1.096	53
Number of business termination (piecewise)	234	1.785	332	190	1.231	105	133	758	75	179	1.195	84
Net revenue (million HUF)	524	1.084	374	280	837	374	355	1.088	88	-	-	125
Staff headcount (thousand people)	35.8	120.6	6.3	35.1	119.3	6.3	30.4	114.1	4.7	34.8	106.6	4.5
Average staff headcount (people)	7.3	5.7	3.3	7.2	5.7	3.5	6.2	5.5	2.8	7.0	5.1	2.6
55: Accommodation												
56: Food and beverage service activities												
79: Travel agency, tour operator and other reservation service and related activities												

Source: Based on *Nemzeti Cégtár*, 2023

Of the three priority sub-sectors, although food and beverage services have already realized pre-COVID-19 sales in 2021, accommodation and travel services were still far behind the record year of 2019. By the end of 2022, the sales revenue of accommodation and travel services may approach the pre-crisis level. To answer whether the increase in income is caused by sales prices or sales volume, it is worth

considering the industry indicators of accommodation and tourist arrivals. Since at the time of writing the study, the accommodation statistics of the Central Statistical Office (hereinafter: KSH) only date back to 2021 and previous annual summaries are not available, it is necessary to rely on the reports of the Hungarian Hotel and Restaurant Association (hereinafter: HAH).

Regarding the average number of staff headcount, the market of tourism-related businesses consists of micro and small-scale enterprises. Therefore, when analyzing market indicators, it is worth considering the research experience of *Csapai & Berke* (2020), according to which the strength of the market position and the market contest-power is positively related to the size of the enterprises.

Although the reports only summarize the performance of hotels, this can be considered relevant data as hotels accounted for 67% of all rentable rooms in 2021 (KSH, 2022a). Therefore, the data represent the dominant share of the sector. According to the report summarizing the year of 2021 (HAH, 2022a), the number of guest nights spent in accommodation in 2021 was only 44.8% of the value of 2019 (23,471 thousand guest nights). 2022 will probably be better than 2021, but lower performance is expected than the record year 2019. The number of guest nights between January and August 2022 (11,933 thousand total guest nights) corresponds to 74.8% of the same period in 2019 (HAH, 2022b). The dynamics of the accommodation market are slowly approaching pre-crisis (2019) levels for the time being, so it is worth examining the development of average prices. In August 2022, hotels nationwide showed an average gross rate of HUF 33,905 per room, which is a 37% increase compared to August 2019. The hotels at Lake Balaton showed the highest increase in room rates, an average of 67% (HAH, 2022b). The statistics of tourist arrivals also support the impact of average spending on the development of the tourism industry performance. Based on the KSH database, the volume of multi-day inbound trips to Hungary (239,357) in the first six months of 2022 was 28% below the volume of the same period in 2019, while the passenger spending exceeded that of the record year by 0.7% (KSH, 2022b).

In conclusion, while the market for the main tourism products reaches or has already exceeded the levels before COVID-19 in terms of average prices and revenue, the volume of tourism, based on accommodation statistics and travel statistics, is significantly lower than in 2019. However, another figure draws attention to a small crisis of tourism: the number of business formations in *Table 1*. This information may be relevant because in most sectors – especially in tourism and hospitality - new entrants and the market turbulence bring innovations, new business models and more efficient ways of operation, and force those on the market to change. In a concentrated and saturated market, the old methods are more likely to be conserved, obsolete falling behind in the global tourism competition.

The trends in tourism products after COVID-19 justify the relevance of examining the resilience of businesses and research on resistance capabilities. The present study aims to review the literature on resilience in the context of tourism businesses. The study summarizes the findings of the systematic processing of literature and reports the approaches and interpretation frameworks in which resilience could be studied further.

DISCUSSION ON LITERATURE REVIEW

From January 2021 to July 2022, 106 scientific publications on the relationship between tourism and resilience were identified using Google Scholar and ScienceDirect databases with the keywords: *resilience*, *tourism*, *hospitality*, and their combinations. After filtering the findings, 57 journal articles were selected for a more thorough review. These papers examined resilience in a tourism-related paradigm or theoretical framework. Except for 8 publications, every article was published in Q1-Q4 ranked journals such as the International Journal of Hospitality Management, Tourism Management, or Tourism and Hospitality Research.

Resilience is a flexible concept, the boundaries of which are defined by the context and research objectives; therefore, it is worthwhile to understand the typical approaches. In the literature reviewed, two major approaches can be identified: *systemic* and *organisational*. The former refers to the holistic analysis of a given sector, industry, or market, while the latter approach is the analysis of organizations performing a specific activity.

Systemic approaches

In a systemic approach to tourism research, the context of *destination resilience*, *economic resilience*, *community resilience*, *resilience cycles*, *the resilience of socio-ecological systems*, *multi-level perspectives*, or *disaster resilience framework* can be applied.

In terms of *destination resilience*, Luthe & Wjss (2014) have pointed out that a destination must continuously respond and adapt to increasingly complex and global changes. According to Hall *et al.* (2018), a destination is resilient if its stakeholders (1) are aware of vulnerabilities and the impacts of potential threats, (2) develop in ways that benefit the community as a whole, (3) plan for networking and collaboration, (4) redefine meta-governance of the destination as „soft” means of influence and control, (5) operate predominantly from local and regional resources, and (6) are reflexive, learning from past crises to reduce future vulnerabilities of the destination. Cellini & Cuccia (2015) published a study of Italy’s tourism performance following the 2008 financial crisis and defined *economic resilience* as the ability of cities, regions, and countries to withstand and recover from negative shocks. In the approach to economic resilience, recovery is defined as the ability to bounce back to the level of output before the negative shock, restore previous growth performance, or develop a new and better growth strategy. The measure used to compare different cases and destinations is the time needed for recovery or bouncing back. According to Brown *et al.* (2017), *community resilience* is the prevalence of four attributes, such as (1) economic development, or more precisely, the equitable distribution of resources within a community, (2) social capital, or relationships as resources, (3) information and communication, which require shared meanings, interpretations, and information networks that can make communication during stressful situations more effectively, and (4) community competence, or the ability to make decisions and act together. The *resilience cycle*, also known as Holling’s loop, was synthesized by Cochrane (2010). Holling was an ecologist and a pioneer of ecosystem dynamics, resilience and ecological economics. In Holling’s (1973) approach, resilience is the result of the interdependence of the economy, society and

environment. The loop named after Holling is a recursive formation, its starting point is *reorganization*, i.e., rapid change after a destabilizing event with the renewal of previous structures. The next stage is *exploitation*, which is the exploitation of the potential for reorganization by renewed structures. Exploitation is followed by *conservation*, which refers to the structures created in the reorganization and those that thrive in exploitation are combined, new ones are built on top of them, and the system becomes consolidated and flexible. Eventually, the system faces another destabilizing outcome, what it calls the *escape* stage. As a result, the structure breaks up again, becomes resilient, and tends to reorganize itself (Cochrane, 2010). The *resilience of socio-ecological systems (SES)* also returns to the ecological approach used since Holling. Sheppard & Williams (2016) identified four closely interacting factors in applying the SES approach in tourism research: (1) mastering the ability to cope with change and uncertainty, (2) maintaining diversity in reorganization and renewal, (3) combinatorial application of different knowledge elements, and (4) creating opportunities for self-organization. Amore et al. (2018) validated the *multi-level perspective (MLP)* model of destination resilience to support sustainability transitions, as proposed by Geels (2011). Amore and co-authors (2018) concluded that the four levels of the MLP: the *actor* (individual, personal decision-making level), the *niche* (resident population and travelers), the *regime* (organizational and institutional decision-making, tourism, and non-tourism operators), and the *landscape* (ecological and natural environment, biodiversity) form a complex adaptive system in terms of resilience. In this system, ecological, socio-ecological, socio-political, socio-economic, and socio-technological dynamics are at work and interact. According to Amore et al. (2018), the patterns of interaction, coordination, governance, risk management and cooperation within and between levels must be implemented to develop resilience in a destination.

A more specific approach to the above is the *Disaster Resilience Framework for Hotels (DRFH)*, which is based on the work of Brown et al. (2018). The DRFH identifies variables whose performance and condition can predict the resilience of a hotel or the accommodation service to a disaster or shock. These variables are, with the phenomena to be assessed in brackets, *economic capital* (access to resources, diversity of income sources, financial background, financial state of the staff), *social capital* (social network, cohesion, ability to work together, business confidence), *human capital* (health of staff, skills, adaptability, skills), *physical capital* (safe environment, business continuity), *natural capital* (natural and environmental risks of the location, impact of the activity on the environment) and *cultural capital* (cultural impact of the activity on society, accumulated cultural knowledge and value). Although Brown et al. (2018) have formulated the elements of the framework specifically for hotels, the approach can be adapted to different activities and areas exposed to crisis situations.

Organizational approaches

Systemic approaches are abstract, generalizable theoretical relationships that are difficult to implement in concrete cases. These approaches focus on a specific part of the internal functioning of organizations, enterprises and institutions through which the organization's flexible ability to resist can be developed. The most typical

ones include the *resilience of the workers*, the *ability to recover*, *resilient management*, and *planned* and *adaptive resilience*.

The *resilience of workers* is a dispositional factor related to the human ability to return to its original state after crises and traumatic situations, and on the other hand, it is a process aimed at the development of endurance, coping and innovation capacity of individuals as workers. (Kuntz *et al.* 2016). Saad & Elshaer (2020) examined the employees of the sales and marketing departments of five-star hotels and the employees of travel agencies specialized in luxury travel in Egypt that were directly or indirectly affected by a terrorist attack. According to the responses of 960 employees, if workers' resilience is stronger, job insecurity (fear of losing one's job) is lower, and creative performance is higher. Path analysis confirmed that distributive justice (equal share of the organization's performance) and trust play a mediator role between employee resilience and workplace insecurity.

According to Dartey-Baah (2015), *resilient leadership* is the integration of transformational (aiming to transform the system) and transactional (promoting and requesting tasks). This management style and ability are necessary to be able to implement changes affecting the organization. Suryaningtyas *et al.* (2019) interviewed directors and human resource managers of three-star hotels in Indonesia in their research. According to their findings, organizational resilience positively affects resilient leadership, and resilient leadership leads to better organizational performance.

In the research of Prayag *et al.* (2018), organizational resilience was identified as *planned* and *adaptive resilience*. Regarding planned resilience, the organization already has an emergency plan and priorities before a crisis or disaster, or at least has an idea of how it would react to undesirable events and tries to predict the occurrence of events by continuously monitoring the natural and economic environment. On the other hand, adaptive resilience is developed after a disaster event or because of a crisis. It requires appropriate leadership, external relations, internal cooperation, and the learning ability from past crises. Prayag *et al.* (2018) involved 84 New Zealand tourism businesses (accommodation services, passenger transport specialized in tourism, and attraction management) and concluded that if planned resilience has a significant and positive effect on adaptive resilience, the financial performance of businesses is not affected. On the other hand, adaptive resilience has a positive effect on the financial performance of enterprises.

Empirical experiences of resilience in tourism research

The summary of some empirical research helps to understand the validity and the explanatory power of the system and organizational level. It is worth dividing the results into groups: before the COVID-19 pandemic and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Long before COVID-19, Sheppard & Williams (2016), based on a qualitative study of Whistler, British Columbia, stated that socio-ecological features (see Chapter 3.1) enhance the resilience of tourism-focused communities.

To understand the context of organizational resilience, Melián-Alzola, Fernández-Monroy, & Hidalgo-Peñate (2017) conducted research in the Canary Islands in 2017, involving 72 hotels. They chose strategy and change management as antecedent

variables of organizational resilience, and variables such as competitors (appearance of new hotels, changes in competitors' offers), guests (changes in guest composition, changes in demand) or the economic context (exchange rates) were used as changes or threats (unfavorable change, downturn). According to their research results (Melián-Alzola *et al.* 2020), the two antecedent variables individually and together positively influence the resilience of the hotel as an organization.

BREXIT was the reason for the 2018 research conducted by Burnett & Johnston (2020) in Ireland, involving a total of 27 senior managers, industry association members and policy makers. Although the analysis (Burnett & Johnston, 2020) revealed that at the time of the survey, tourism representatives praised the performance of the industry and were not particularly prepared for BREXIT, but they recognized innovation and the development of new markets as the way to better resilience.

Based on their research in New Zealand, Tibay *et al.* (2019) concluded that the most important indicators of the resilience of tourism enterprises are the quality of management, the core competencies of the staff, planning and preparedness, market sensitivity and regulatory compliance.

The role played by resilience in vulnerability was investigated in Turkey by Dođantan & Kođak (2019). Based on their sample of more than 400 respondents, including hotel managers, representatives of travel agencies and private airlines, they proved (Dođantan & Kođak, 2019) that the effect of flexible resilience on vulnerability is significant and negative; in terms of planning and proactivity in the face of crises, there is no difference between the examined stakeholders in tourism, and managerial resilience is significantly higher in the case of travel agencies.

Senbeto & Hon (2019) investigated the relationship between hotel staff and organizational resilience by asking nearly 300 subordinates and nearly 80 managers in Ethiopia. According to their results (Senbeto & Hon, 2019), market turbulence has a negative relationship with employee resilience, while employee resilience has a positive relationship with service innovation and mediates the relationship between market turbulence and service innovation.

Hallak, Assaker, O'Connor, & Lee (2018) investigated the correlations of creative self-efficacy, innovation, and industry experience with resilience concerning upscale restaurants in Australia long before COVID-19. They interviewed more than 180 restaurant managers or owners. In the research design they used, creative self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief and confidence in his or her abilities to perform creatively (Tierney & Farmer, 2002). Hallak *et al.* (2018) have proven that the operator's ability to resist (leadership resilience) has a positive effect on creative self-efficacy and innovation but does not affect the performance of the restaurant while time, creative self-efficacy, and the commitment of the restaurant to innovations had a positive effect on the restaurant manager's perceived performance. An important finding of the study is that the role of resilience as a mediator between creative self-efficacy, innovation and performance increases with the number of years spent in the sector.

Ivkov *et al.* (2019) examined the resilience of hotels in Europe involving hotels from 12 countries affected by natural disasters. At the time of the research, the countries most affected by natural disasters were Russia, France, and Italy. According

to the results based on the answers of 60 hotels in total, the hotel managers who have already experienced a natural disaster as managers or individuals, or who have been working as managers for a longer period, rate their ability to resist natural disasters better. In addition, the size of the organization and the quality of the hotel positively influence resilience against natural disasters.

Jia, Chowdhury, Prayag & Chowdhury (2020) examined the relationship between proactive and reactive organizational resilience and various capital factors of organizations among a total of 65 enterprises affected by the 2008 Sichuan earthquake. Of capital factors, structural, relational and cognitive capital was used in the research. Structural capital refers to the efficiency and speed of information flow between people involved in the operation of the organization (*Burt, 1992*); cognitive capital includes the similar ambitions, visions, goals, and cultural values of the organization's actors (*Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998*); and relational capital refers to the relationships of the organization that are characterized by trust, friendship, respect, and reciprocity and develop through the organization's stakeholder relationships (*Li et al. 2016*). Based on the experiences of the 2008 natural disaster, it was established that stronger structural capital increases proactive resilience and stronger relational capital increases reactive resilience, while cognitive capital has no significant effect (*Jia et al. 2020*).

Romão (2020) examined the growth capacity, vulnerability, absorptive capacity and recovery of tourism from the 2008-2012 crisis in 55 NUTS2 European regions. Based on *Romão's (2020)* statistical analysis, gross added value of tourism, guest nights, the situation of the agriculture and food industry, environmental technology, mobility and transport, culture and creative industry, as well as maritime and biotechnology increase the absorption capacity of an area. However, guest nights and environmental technology do not contribute to the recovery from the crisis.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, *Filimonau, Derqui & Matute* examined the impact of senior hotel directors' and managers' organizational commitment to coping with the COVID-19 crisis in Spain. According to the study based on 244 valid questionnaires (*Filimonau et al. 2020*), resilient hotels responded more effectively to the crisis. During the pandemic situation, the workplace insecurity felt by interviewed managers depended on the strength of organizational resilience but after the pandemic situation there was a significant and positive relationship between insecurity and organizational resilience. Interestingly in large hotels, not only the manager's commitment to the organization was lower but also the ability of the organization to resist.

Neise, Verfürth & Franz (2021) investigated the resilience of restaurant hospitality under COVID-19 in Germany through their large-scale survey of more than six hundred restaurant owners and managers. Of their results (*Neise et al. 2021*), it is worth noting that the better financial and economic situation of the restaurants, as well as the value of the tangible and intangible assets available, did not affect their ability to resist flexibly. On the other hand, the ability to respond quickly and in the short term, the experience of the owner and manager in the industry, and the fact that the owner is involved in the management of the restaurant, increase the resilience of businesses.

Sobaih, Elshaer, Hasanein, & Abdelaziz demonstrated in their large-scale research on small hotels and restaurants from Egypt (*Sobaih et al.* 2021) that both planned and adaptive resilience positively affect the performance of enterprises, and that adaptive resilience contributes to sustainable tourism development.

CONCLUSION

The review and processing of the literature examining the resistance capacity of tourism enterprises led to both a more effective planning of resilience research, an understanding of the capabilities of the enterprises and the formulation of proposals for them. Studies using systemic approaches have confirmed that the ability to resist adverse events does not only depend on a number of environmental variables but is also a consequence of the social, economic and cultural environment of a given destination, sector or enterprise. The resilience-enhancing concepts and variables listed among systemic approaches reflect values, attitudes, and, as one might say, mentality which is more deeply rooted in the sociocultural environment than we might think at first. In the strict sense of the word, their development is difficult or impossible, but the recognition of the need for development and the effort may improve the flexible resistance capacity of those involved.

The organizational-level approaches point to the generalized resilience concepts that can be well specified for each organization, destination, and activity. It is worth observing how much of a role is assigned to the staff involved in the activity and the community they form in this approach. Concepts and conditions that can be read in systemic approaches can presumably be easily identified in a specific organization, and initiatives aimed at its development can nevertheless facilitate the path to development.

Empirical research results are already extremely specific for each case or for a well-defined group of stakeholders. Here, the question may arise as to what further possibilities lie in resilience research. Although the limitations of the scope of this study do not allow us to get to know the methodology of the cited research in more detail, the experiences of the literature review provide several consequences. In general, it can be said that quantitative research methods are overrepresented in the reviewed studies. In these cases, validated organizational and entrepreneurial attitude scales were typically used with methodologically appropriate results. Still, it is important to note that when filling out a questionnaire containing scale variables, it can easily suggest self-evaluation for an owner, organization or department manager, and therefore, the socially expected answer is a real risk of measurement. Another difficulty – also arising from our own research experience – is the separation of the characteristics of business and enterprise in the case of a specific business activity. It may easily be that the company, especially its organizational culture, behavior, and practices, does not strengthen resilience, however, the financial and influence opportunities of the operating enterprise still make the business resilient.

Finally, it is worth looking briefly at the uniformity of qualitative research since in-depth interviews are exclusively used when the qualitative methodology is conducted. In this field, there are many research opportunities with the innovative

use of participant observation, ethnographic methods, action research and other alternative research methods. The application of non-conventional research methods not only makes the final study interesting and instructive for the readers of the literature but can also provide real, in-depth results and feasible practical suggestions for the examined sector.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are members of the Centre of Excellence for Visitor Economy and the Proactivity for Hospitality Research Group at Budapest Business University. This study is part of a research stream supported by the Research Grant for Business Development of the Demjén Sándor Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Amore, A., Prayag, G., & Hall, M. C. (2018). Conceptualizing Destination Resilience From a Multilevel Perspective. *Tourism Review International*, 22(3-4), 235-250.
<https://doi.org/10.3727/154427218X15369305779010>
- Brown, N. A., Rovins, J. E., Feldmann-Jensen, S., Orchiston, C., & Johnston, D. (2017). Exploring disaster resilience within the hotel sector: A systematic review of literature. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 22, 362-370.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2017.02.005>
- Brown, N. A., Orchiston, C., Rovins, J. E., Feldmann-Jensen, S., & Johnston, D. (2018). An integrative framework for investigating disaster resilience within the hotel sector. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 36, 67-75.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.07.004>
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-04-2019-0118>
- Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*, Harvard University Press
- Cellini, R., & Cuccia, T. (2015). The economic resilience of tourism industry in Italy: What the 'great recession' data show. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 16, 346-356.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.09.007>
- Cochrane, J. (2010). The sphere of tourism resilience. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 35(2), 173-185.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2010.11081632>
- Csapai, Gy. E., & Berke, Sz. (2020). Analysis of organizational excellence based on independent key indicators among Hungarian SME leaders. *Regional and Business Studies*, 12(2), 47-63.
<https://doi.org/10.33568/rbs.2519>
- Dartey-Baah, K. (2015). Resilient leadership: A transformational-transactional leadership mix. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 6(1), 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-07-2014-0026>
- Doğantan, E., & Kozak, M. A. (2019). Resilience capacity in different types of tourism businesses. *Tourism*, 60(2), 126-146.
- Faulkner, B. (2001). Towards a framework for tourism disaster management. *Tourism Management*, 22, 135-147. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(00\)00048-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00048-0)
- Filimonau, V., Derqui, B., & Matute, J. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic and organisational commitment of senior hotel managers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102659>

- Geels, F. W. (2011). The multi-level perspective on sustainability transitions: Responses to seven criticisms. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 1(1), 24–40.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2011.02.002>
- HAH (2022): *Trendriport 2021*. <https://www.hah.hu/elemzesek/trendriport/trendriport-archiv-2010-2019/trendriport-2021/>
- HAH (2022b): *Trendriport 2022* (from January to August). Retrieved [10 May 2023] from https://www.hah.hu/elemzesek/trendriport?ccm_paging_p_b2564=1
- Hall, C. M., Prayag, G., & Amore, A. (2018). *Tourism and resilience: Individual, organisational and destination perspectives*. Channel View Publications
- Hallak, R., Assaker, G., O'Connor, P., & Lee, C. (2018). Firm performance in the upscale restaurant sector: The effects of resilience, creative self-efficacy, innovation and industry experience. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Service*, 40, 229–240.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.10.014>
- Hinek, M. (2020). A turizmus közvetlen hozzájárulása a magyar gazdaság teljesítményéhez: a Turizmus Szatellit Számlák fejlesztésének alternatívái. *Turizmus Bulletin*, 20, 45–52.
<https://doi.org/10.14267/TURBULL.2020v20n4.4>
- Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245>
- Ivkov, M., Blešić, I., Janičević, S., Kovačić, S., Miljković, D., Lukić, T., & Sakulski, D. (2019). Natural Disasters vs Hotel Industry Resilience: An Exploratory Study among Hotel Managers from Europe. *Open Geosciences*, 11(1), 378–390.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/geo-2019-0030>
- Jia, X., Chowdhury, M., Prayag, G., & Chowdhury, Md. M. H. (2020). The role of social capital on proactive and reactive resilience of organizations post-disaster. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101614>
- KSH (2022a). 27.2.1.13. A kereskedelmi szálláshelyek kapacitása szállástípusonként, havonta. Retrieved [10 May 2023] from https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/tur/hu/tur0071.html
- KSH (2022b). 27.2.1.4. A Magyarországra tett külföldi utazások főbb mutatói (utazások száma, tartózkodási idő, kiadások) az utazás fő célja szerint (új motivációs bontásban), negyedévente. Retrieved [10 May 2023] from https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/tur/hu/tur0045.html
- Kuntz, J., Näswall, K., & Malinen, S. (2016). Resilient employees in resilient organizations: Flourishing beyond adversity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 456–462
<https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2016.39>
- Li, Y., Zhang, Y., & Zheng, S. (2016). Social capital, portfolio management capability and exploratory innovation: evidence from China. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 31(6), 794–807. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-09-2012-0166>
- Luthe, T., & Wyss, R. (2014). Assessing and planning resilience in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 44, 161–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.03.011>
- Melián-Alzola, L., Fernández-Monroy, M., & Hidalgo-Peñate, M. (2020). Hotels in contexts of uncertainty: Measuring organisational resilience. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 36.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100747>
- Merriam-Webster (2022). Resilience. Retrieved [12 May 2023] from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resilience>
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242–266.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/259373>
- Neise, T., Verfürth, P., & Franz, M. (2021). Rapid responding to the COVID-19 crisis: Assessing the resilience in the German restaurant and bar industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.102960>

- Nemzeti Cégtár (2022). Interaktív statisztikák. Retrieved [12 May 2023] from <https://www.nemzeticetgar.hu/interaktiv-grafikon>
- Oxford Learners' Dictionary (2022). Resilience. Retrieved [12 May 2023] from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/resilience?q=resilience>
- Prayag, G., Chowdhury, M., Spector, S., & Orchiston, C. (2018). Organizational resilience and financial performance. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 73, 193-196.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2018.06.006>
- Romão, J. (2020). Tourism, smart specialisation, growth, and resilience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102995>
- Saad, S. K., & Elshaer, I.A. (2020). Justice and trust's role in employees' resilience and business' continuity: Evidence from Egypt. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 35.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100712>
- Senbeto, D. L., & Hon, A. H. Y. (2019). Market turbulence and service innovation in hospitality: examining the underlying mechanisms of employee and organizational resilience. *The Service Industries Journal*, 40(15-16), 1119-1139.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2020.1734573>
- Sheppard, V. A., & Williams, P. W. (2016). Factors that strengthen tourism resort resilience. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 28, 20-30.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.04.006>
- Sobaih, A. E. E., Elshaer, I., Hasanein, A. M., & Abdelaziz, A. S. (2021). Responses to COVID-19: The role of performance in the relationship between small hospitality enterprises' resilience and sustainable tourism development. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102824>
- Statista (2020a). Global tourism industry - statistics & facts. Retrieved [8 May 2023] from <https://www.statista.com/topics/962/global-tourism/#dossierSummary>
- Statista (2020b). Leisure tourism spending worldwide from 2000 to 2020. Retrieved [8 May 2023] from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1093335/leisure-travel-spending-worldwide/>
- Statista (2020c). Business tourism spending worldwide from 2000 to 2020. Retrieved [8 May 2023] from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1093295/business-travel-spending-worldwide/>
- Suryaningtyas, D., Sudiro, A., Troena, E. A., & Irawanto, D. W. (2019). Organizational resilience and organizational performance: examining the mediating roles of resilient leadership and organizational culture. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 18(2), 1-7.
- Tibay, V., Miller, J., Chang-Richards, A. (Y.), Egbelakin, T., Seville, E., & Wilkinson, S. (2019). Business resilience: A study of Auckland hospitality sector. *Procedia Engineering*, 212, 1217-1224.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2018.01.157>
- Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M., (2002). Creative self-efficacy: its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6), 1137-1148.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3069429>

Corresponding author:

János DEBRECENI

Budapest Business University, Faculty of Commerce, Hospitality and Tourism

1054 Budapest, Alkotmány utca 9-11., Hungary

e-mail: debreceni.janos@uni-bge.hu

© Copyright 2020 by the authors.

This is an open access article under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons attribution (CC-BY-NC-ND) license 4.0.

