Alfonso Vargas-Sánchez and Diego Rodríguez-Toubes

12 Revisiting tourism crisis management practice: Learning from COVID-19 in Spain

Introduction

Since the publication of the seminal work by Faulkner (2001), various models have studied how to deal with crises (Heath, 1998; Ritchie, 2004; Wilks & Moore, 2004). There has been ample consensus regarding approaching crisis management from a strategic perspective, emphasizing crisis preparation and planning (Burnett, 1998; Paraskevas & Arendell, 2007) with a proactive/anticipatory focus. Indeed, crises are often unpredictable when it comes to where, when, and how they occur, but it is no less true that planning lays the foundation for a faster, coordinated, and effective response (Fink, 2002). The interest in providing more elements of strategic content is aimed at providing crises managers with a higher responsiveness capacity (Rodríguez-Toubes & Fraiz Brea, 2012), although, as stated by Ritchie and Jiang (2019, p. 2), “existing tourism crisis and disaster frameworks have not been suitably tested despite their long existence.”

Among them, perhaps the most intuitive one is the 4Rs model by Wilks and Moore (2004), which incorporates the phases of reduction, readiness, response, and recovery with actions such as policies for monitoring and surveillance, planning, procedures for emergency responses, communication and audits (Jordana, Frieta, & Agbaba, 2020).

Organizations located in tourism destinations that have suffered previous crises have accumulated experiences that should help them to cope with future crises. As long as a process of suitable learning has taken place, they can nurture the knowledge base necessary for the development of the above-mentioned phases.

In this line, this chapter analyses the extent to which the models used up to now, particularly Faulkner's model, are applicable, bearing in mind the peculiarities to be considered and the variables to be introduced from the perspective of organizational learning. Specifically, three elements are studied: 1) the identification of the potential risk factors (risk scenarios and impacts); 2) the indicators or alarm signals and their monitoring; and 3) the preparation to respond to an unprecedented crisis that has cut off tourism activity worldwide.

This study has focuses on Spain and the COVID-19 pandemic. The importance of tourism in this country is outstanding, and the sector has significant experience in crisis management in areas such as terrorism, crime, and disasters, such as fires and oil spills. However, unlike other countries in Asia, Africa, and South America, the impact of epidemics is rare and until now has hardly been deemed a risk factor. Despite being one of the most affected countries in the world, the aim of this work is not focused on showing the situation of the tourism sector in Spain as a result of the crisis

caused by the new coronavirus disease. Rather, the focus is on developing conceptual proposals about crisis management in a context in which a revisitation of the established models is required.

Viruses, pandemics, and tourism

The SARS-CoV2 virus's impact on tourism is unparalleled, being Spain one of the most affected countries worldwide in terms of its population (the updated number of confirmed cases, deaths, and other indicators can be consulted at <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html> or <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>). It is not the first time that a virus has affected society and, by extension, the tourism sector. In the first 20 years of the 21st century, different types of viruses—Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS-CoV), Swine Flu or Influenza A (H1N1), Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS-CoV), Ébola, Zika—have been responsible for a large number of deaths. They have fundamentally affected countries in Asia, South America, and Africa.

The aforementioned epidemics initially caused sanitary problems in addition to having social and economic repercussions that affected the tourism sector and changed the behavior of international travel. Numerous academic papers and specialized journals have dealt with this matter (Irvine & Anderson, 2005; Johnson Tew, Lu, Tolomiczenko, & Gellatly, 2008; Joo et al., 2019; McKercher & Chon, 2004; Pine & McKercher, 2004). The analysis of the management of the crisis caused by these disasters in the various territories represents a key source of information for an accurate and realistic interpretation of the strategies to be developed to drive the recovery of the sector. For example, the SARS crisis in 2003 evidenced the lack of experience and coordination of governments in managing this type of transnational health crisis, with an initial lack of response, late overreaction, and strong exposure and media attraction (McKercher & Chon, 2004).

The current situation in many Western (particularly European) countries seems to replicate that crisis but on much greater magnitudes. A lesson learned was the need for international collaboration and coordination among the ministries of tourism to develop effective responses. It became clear that initiatives promoting common strategies, together with agreements for cross-border movements, reduce the level of uncertainty for operators and offer an image of confidence and security to travelers.

Experience and learning in the Spanish tourism sector

Tourism is one of the pillars of the Spanish economy, which in 2018 contributed 147,946 million euros, 12.3% of GDP, and 2.62 million jobs, which represented 12.7% of total employment (National Institute of Statistics, 2019). The COVID-19 pandemic

has impacted the tourism industry with particular severity. Tens of thousands of businesses of the various subsectors (transport, accommodation, catering, leisure, and entertainment) were forced to stop their activities for several months, with catastrophic impacts expected in the short and medium terms after a slow-paced and uncertain recovery. Besides, the cross-cutting nature of the tourism industry means that other related sectors are also suffering harshly from the pandemic impact.

In Spain, the tourism sector has already faced stressful situations caused by unforeseen events in the past. Many companies and other organizations have had to deal with other crises apart from the last financial crisis that started in 2008, although these crises lacked the characteristics of the current one. The main ones have been caused by fires, spills in coastal areas, terrorism or floods (Rodríguez-Toubes, 2010; Rodríguez-Toubes & Fraiz Brea, 2011; Toubes, Gössling, Hall, & Scott, 2017). The effects of climate change also present a threat to tourist destinations; in more vulnerable territories, they are already being noticed.

Organizational learning in crisis management

Organizational learning in the tourism domain has been quite neglected, and few managers have established mechanisms to develop in-depth learning as a result of crisis management (Deverell, 2009; Ghaderi, Som, & Wang, 2014; Smith & Elliott, 2007). In addition, in this area, there are barriers to the learning process, many of which are associated with the organizational culture, rigidities, and ineffective communications (Smith & Elliott, 2007).

Two main workstreams connect learning and crises. One refers to building resilience (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001), whereas the other concerns learning as part of crisis preparedness (Carmeli & Schaubroeck, 2008; Mitroff, Pauchant, & Shrivastava, 2006). Both perspectives adopt a fundamentally cognitive approach to learning, that is, the relationship between crises and learning is based on the assumption that a better understanding of the causes of crises and the opportunity to learn from them can prevent their recurrence in the future (Antonacopoulou & Sheaffer, 2014). However, practice is the key: crisis management capacity is developed with the training provided by the succession of recurring exercises (van Laere & Lindblom, 2019). It is essential to understand the learning that takes place during a crisis. In this sense, the learning in crisis approach (Antonacopoulou & Sheaffer, 2014) focuses on the learning practices and practical judgments that inform how daily operations are performed.

The categorization of organizational learning that has probably had the most influence is the one developed by Argyris and Schön (1996), which distinguishes between single-loop and double-loop learning. Single-loop learning is achieved when members of the organization detect and correct the defects identified in it without inquiring into its premises and basic rules. However, in times of drastic changes, scrutiny should be

undertaken to question the status quo of the organization. These double-loop learning investigations can conclude the need to carry out a restructuring of strategies and organizational assumptions, discarding old ways of doing (objectives, rules, and working procedures) and adopting new ones. Even triple-loop learning has been mentioned; this refers to a company's ability to learn how to learn.

Operationalizing and measuring these concepts is not easy. To do so, the identification of specific indicators of learning and their relationship to organizational performance is needed (Goh, Elliott, & Quon, 2012). In this work, an approach at the conceptual level is carried out, taking as a reference frame the panorama that the degree of understanding and data availability make up in a given domain, as presented in Table 12.1.

Table 12.1: In search of knowledge – how competent and conscious we are.

	Understanding	Lack of understanding
Data availability	Known knowns 1 I know what I know	Known unknowns 3 I know what I don't know
Data unavailability	Unknown knowns 2 I don't know what I know	Unknown unknowns 4 I don't know what I don't know

Source: Authors.

Any organization will aspire to increase its space of understanding and data availability. In this case, we relate organizations' learning to the three elements of crisis management practice that need to be updated: risk factors, warning signs, and experience.

There is a high level of uncertainty in the potential risk factors and related indicators or warning signals: we know what can happen, but we don't know the corresponding intensity, the probability, and when it will happen (known unknowns – Position 3 in the matrix). However, experience has also been incorporated into the organization and should be used, although sometimes it represents pieces of the knowledge that we have and that we are not aware we have (unknown knowns – Position 2 in the matrix). In addition to these two categories (Fortis, Maon, Frooman, & Reiner, 2018), Position 1 in the matrix is attributable to organizations that have been able to make explicit the tacit knowledge accumulated in previous crises. This knowledge is accessible and capable of being shared; in other words, learning is passed from people to the organization, unlike in Position 2. Unfortunately, the cases of zero organizational learning from serious crises are not anecdotal (Vargas-Sánchez, 2018); thus, Position 4 is the most dangerous of all and can easily lead to baseless and reckless decisions.

An understanding of organizational learning in its different aspects can help answer three questions that organizations are currently facing in the new scenario created by the COVID-19 crisis:

- a) How can the organization better diagnose potential risk factors?
- b) How can the organization more accurately identify and monitor warning signs?
- c) How can the organization better prepare for the future?

In the following sections, we review how these questions can affect the models that usually serve as a guide for crisis management in tourism. Specifically, the analysis is carried out based on Faulkner's model, recognized by Ritchie (2004) as the first tourism disaster management framework. The first two issues are related to risk assessment and are therefore included in the first phase of that model (Pre-event). The third question is related to the experience and knowledge transfer in the organization, so we understand that it has a strong link to the review phase of the disaster contingency plans.

Mitroff (2006) proposes five crisis management mechanisms: signal detection, preparation/prevention, containment/damage limitation, recovery, and learning. Signal detection and preparation/prevention are proactive types of crisis management, and these are the mechanisms or phases, that we will focus on in this section. The learning phase points to the interactive aspect of crisis management. It can arise either as part of a crisis management plan in the absence of crisis or as a result of the experience of the crisis (Elsabbagh, Fildes & Rose, 2004). The other two phases, containment/damage limitation, and recovery are reactive activities carried out after a crisis has happened. A proper analysis of these two phases would require time to assimilate the effects of the current crisis. The containment/damage phase is aimed at limiting the damage to an area, restricting the crisis, or encapsulating it in a territory, which is very difficult to achieve effectively during a crisis. The recovery phase requires a minimum service plan and procedures for carrying it out, designating those who will be responsible, and providing the necessary resources to be used in the recovery period (Pearson & Mitroff, 1993).

Identification of risk factors

The assessment of potential disasters and their probability of occurrence are among the principal ingredients of the disaster management strategies included in Faulkner's model. To encourage proactive crisis management, Vargas-Sanchez (2018) proposes, first, the correct identification of potential risk factors that could cause a crisis in the tourism sector, which requires performing a prioritization of such factors, taking into account their levels of impact and the urgency in the response they require. In the same vein, Robertson, Kean, Moore Gurtner, Holcombe, and Wilks (2006) propose a

preliminary analysis aimed at identifying the main sources of risk for tourism operators and organizations. This involves the study of likelihood and the consequences of risk factors by building a matrix of qualitative analysis that combines impacts and the level of probability. Once the sources of risk have been identified, it is necessary to improve the understanding of the level of threat and its expected outcomes so that organizations can decide what the main challenges, to be addressed with priority, are.

Burnett (1998) classifies the typology of crises according to four variables: the threat level (low versus high), response options (many versus few), time pressure (intense versus minimal), and degree of control (low versus high). An organization is faced with the highest degree of potential crisis when time pressure is intense, the degree of control is low, the threat level is high and the response options are limited (we could say that this has been the case of the pandemic caused by the SARS-CoV 2). This classification allows the diagnosis of complex situations in a simplified manner, unifying in a single tool the set of challenges or threats that should be addressed, providing a basis for the establishment of priorities, helping with the deployment of administrative and financial resources, and easing the implementation of strategic planning (Burnett, 1998).

Senior managers can make better diagnoses of potential risk factors by asking stakeholders to identify the most important challenges to achieve the organizational objectives and discussing collectively possible avenues to face them (Burnett, 1998). In this sense, relating both the probability of risk and the magnitude of the impact with the mission and objectives of the organization contributes to dimensioning the existing degree of threat. This approach, which helps with fostering a culture of engagement, is a key element of organizational double-loop learning and facilitates the organization's adaptation to an environment of constant change.

In fact, in the past, the risk that epidemics have posed for tourism could be deemed high in certain zones of Asia, Africa, and South America; however, the probability of impact caused by a pandemic was exceptional in Spain. The new scenario puts this risk factor in the range of possible and even probable ones in the future, with very severe potential consequences as we have seen. In this assessment, the risk for the tourism industry as a whole is considered. Taking as a reference what happened on October 6, 2014, with the Ebola virus, a massive contagion would have had dramatic consequences for tourism in Spain; however, the local infection of a single person (a nurse who cared for an infected repatriated person) had a small effect in the short term: for example, the listing of the Iberia airline fell 8.3% in 10 days but recovered its value in just over one month.

Early warning signals

Although Faulkner (2001, p. 145) specifically notes that “systems for communicating warnings are also important,” however, he does not provide in his model objective

indicators or clear identification of the parameters to be established. Even though early warning signals are often unclear, systems that provide alerts and information related to the current pandemic in Spain have shown their limitations. There was no early detection in February when the first clear signs were already being given in Asian countries. Until February 25th, the detection protocol was applied only to travelers from Wuhan (China), and when its application was expanded, the surveillance systems were overwhelmed. There were changes in the criteria in the information systems, both in the format and in the accounting of data. This caused the series to be interrupted, which made reusing them difficult (Llaneras, 2020). These erratic and confusing figures, even for scientists, have prevented from following the historical track of the pandemic, which has created uncertainties in citizens and managers of public administrations (Dombey & Burn-Murdoch, 2020).

Some leaders and media claim that the COVID-19 crisis was unexpected and surprised everyone without sufficient preparation. In this regard, the Spanish Institute for Strategic Studies, of the Ministry of Defense, had been warning in various reports about the risk of pandemics' proliferation in the short and medium terms. This was highlighted, for example, in the document "Panorama of Geopolitical Trends. Horizon 2040," issued in December 2018, and in a more recent one dated in February 2020, entitled "Pandemic Emergencies in a Globalized World: Security Threats." In the latter, it is stated that "population movements due to voluntary or forced migrations as a consequence of armed conflicts, or caused by tourism, are more intense than ever, with the potential transport of pathogens" (p. 12). Likewise, in the document "National Security Strategy 2017," the following paragraph can be found: "Spain, a country that receives more than 75 million tourists a year [a volume that continued to grow in subsequent years], with ports and airports that are among the busiest in the world, a climate that increasingly favors the spread of disease vectors, with an aging population and a polarized geopolitical situation, is not without threats and challenges associated with both natural and intentional infectious diseases" (p. 74). There was therefore a basis for taking this threat seriously and for having at least started the preparation for it with some contingency plan (a plan in which the tourism sector should be an active part) without leaving it to the adventure of improvisation.

In this area, as a consequence, the tourism industry needs to be proactive to threats of this nature and needs to promote an organizational culture with the ability to incorporate new knowledge, work processes, and warning systems that better anticipate these risks (Goh, Quon, & Cousins, 2007). Nevertheless, it is clear that tourism operators cannot deal with this kind of risk on their own, but in close collaboration with public authorities.

Within the unavoidable uncertainty, some indicators that have functioned as alarm signals have been, among others, the behavior of stock prices; the decisions made by major tour operators and multinationals; and travel recommendations for and restrictions on the main tourist-sending and tourist-receiving countries, respectively.

As for the stock quotes, on February 3rd, the Shanghai Stock Exchange fell 7.7%, the biggest drop in five years. Variations in prices of this magnitude in countries of the size and influence of China anticipate declines (or crises) in other countries of the world, with repercussions at the economic and social levels.

Tour operators and multinationals, considering their privileged strategic positions when it comes to monitoring and evaluating changes in the market, act as agents or risk brokers (Cavlek, 2002). For instance, a significant number of large multinationals announced their resignation to participate in the Mobile World Congress scheduled in Barcelona from February 24th–27th, 2020, due to the risk associated with COVID-19 (LG on February 4th, Amazon on February 8th). This occurred when there were five cases diagnosed in Spain (only one on the peninsula). Apart from humanitarian factors, these companies consider the financial responsibility risk that they must assume in the event of the contagion (or death) of their employees, and they also consider that they could be accused of misbehavior and recklessness.

Finally, the impact of the attitudes of some governments in countries with high tourist numbers could also provide a clue regarding how events could evolve. Thus, on February 2nd, 2020, the US government proclaimed a ban on entry into the country of foreigners who had traveled to China within the past 14 days.

The three indicators mentioned above, known publicly in early February, served as early warnings and gave governments and organizations in the tourism sector important information for making decisions within a certain time margin. However, these indicators were not addressed or interpreted in due form. Given the high rate of contagion, taking measures in advance, even if only for a few days, is the difference between a small and controllable number of infections and a huge and uncontrollable number of infected people, with the latter having the potential to tarnish the image of a destination.

Preparing for the future

Single-loop managerial responses, which focus on identifying and correcting organizational defects, “need to be supplemented by a more fundamental, double-loop response which challenges our traditional beliefs about the nature and objectives of strategic management” (Richardson, 1994, p. 78). Double-loop learning is presented as a new form of knowledge in which there is a paradigm shift in how to organize and manage the strategy of the organizations involved in the crisis (Richardson, 1994).

After a crisis, it is necessary to open a period of reflection and feedback in companies and other organizations to integrate what has been learned. This point is particularly pertinent about the longer-term disaster preparedness of a destination (Faulkner, 2001, p. 146). However, there are antecedents of crises in which there was not a period of constructive dialogue and reflection, but the opposite instead. For example, during the foot and mouth disease crisis that affected the UK in 2001, deep divisions were

generated within the territory that led to the worsening of relations between rural and urban areas (Miller & Ritchie, 2003).

The integration and transfer of knowledge gained from experience are key dimensions of organizational learning. In this field, we can identify two types of actions that would allow the company to be better prepared for an uncertain future and to enrich the review phase of the tourism disaster management planning process presented by Faulkner (2001):

- Knowledge transfer at the firm level, to avoid information silos and integrate past experiences into the stock of knowledge that can be shared with its members (Jerez-Gómez et al., 2005; Goh et al., 2007).
- Establishment of systems of networking to enable and ease learning from the knowledge and experience of other organizations, that is, systems that allow learning from successful practices at other organizations (Goh et al., 2007). The tourism sector consists mostly of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs), so its resilience is based on a complex set of networks (Scott & Laws, 2005).

The protagonists of a crisis are the best placed to reflect on the circumstances and errors that caused the problems and to introduce a shift in its approach. The process of reflection on the experience of a crisis should lead to proposing a solution; if it is finally implemented, the proposed solution leads to a new experience and a new round of solutions (Kolb, 1984). This double-loop learning requires a paradigm shift so that, as a result of experience, the emergence of new knowledge occurs, and ultimately, a new understanding is derived. This approach connects with the idea of the knowledge-creating company proposed by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), with their model of knowledge types (tacit and explicit) and stages (socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization).

From crisis management to resilience management?

Although the importance of a proactive approach in crisis management has been widely addressed (Ritchie & Jiang, 2019), new disaster scenarios have led to the need to improve risk assessment protocols and the establishment of early warning signals. Instant access to global information allows us to know events and impacts in real-time from anywhere in the world. Globalization has made it economically worthwhile to monitor crises that come from contexts outside the organization and happen with little or no warning (de Sausmarez, 2007). The indicators presented in this work have the capacity to enhancing the potential effectiveness of crisis management strategies, especially at the pre-event and resolution phases (Blackman & Ritchie, 2008).

Although organizational learning is referred to in Faulkner's model, in our opinion greater focus on knowledge management could improve disaster plans and responses. Tourism products are predominantly immaterial and often depend on perceptions,

making the nature of markets, services, and operations in this sector more susceptible to a crisis (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction [UNISDR], 2015). However, the reconstruction of immateriality is possible even in times of non-activity. Precisely, one strategy for gaining resilience is to cultivate the intangible (reputation, talent, image).

The concept of resilience offers a broader perspective of crisis management to understand how the systems face various levels of adversity (Hall, 2010; Hall, Prayag, & Amore, 2017; Lew, 2014; Prayag, 2018). Resilience refers to the ability to respond to changes (Holling, 1973) and includes learning on the part of individuals, businesses, governments, and other stakeholders after an unforeseen event. Learning enables systems to respond, recover and adapt successfully to new conditions (Cutter, 2016). This is a fundamentally endogenous process that favors the high level of internal self-organization that, in turn, presents resilient systems (Prayag, 2018; Walker, Hollin, Carpenter, & Kinzig, 2004).

Therefore, organizational learning is essential for facilitating the change to new scenarios, and consequently, the disaster management practice should evolve and be strengthened by incorporating this perspective of resilience. A tourism economy as powerful as the Spanish one has revealed the need to increase its resilience through a more diversified client base and a more flexible administrative-legal framework. The complexity of the challenge that companies and destinations must manage requires endogenizing the factors of the environment, assuming that solutions are contingent, as they cannot be isolated from the specific characteristics of such an environment.

Conclusion

What happened in Spain cannot be understood if particularities such as the political-administrative landscape of the State (highly decentralized at the regional level, in the so-called autonomous communities), as well as the representation and weight of the tourism sector in dialogues with public administrations and other social agents, are omitted. The first feature has shown advantages (easier adaptation to local circumstances) and disadvantages (political disputes, remarkable difficulties of coordination, and citizens' confusion). The second one has shown to be insufficient for lobbying more effectively.

Within this landscape, in August 2020, the highest hotel occupancy rates were in the northern communities, the so-called "Green Spain," closely linked to rural and nature tourism; 70.6% in Cantabria and 68.2% in Asturias (INE, 2020). In the traditional international tourist destinations, the drop in overnight stays in August compared to 2019 was drastic: 85.6% in the Balearic Islands, 79.9% in the Canary Islands, and 88.1% in Catalonia. The virus unevenly affected the autonomous communities, and some of them decided to disassociate their image from that of Spain – as a

destination especially affected by the pandemic – by launching their own tourism brand campaign, in addition to the centralized one. Particularly revealing of the lack of coordination has been the process of creating tourist safety seals during the crisis. In May, the Institute for Spanish Tourism Quality (ICTE) launched the “Safe Tourism Certified” in conjunction with business associations from the tourism subsectors and the Spanish Federation of Municipalities and Provinces (FEMP). Later on, several autonomous communities issued their own “safe tourism” or “trust tourism” certifications, and various initiatives were also developed at the local level. Social agents, such as the Spanish Confederation of Hotels and Tourist Accommodation (CEHAT), obtained their own certifications and, finally, at the end of June, the central government’s Secretary of State for Tourism launched the emblem “Responsible Tourism.” Another example is the launching of holiday voucher schemes in various regions to stimulate tourism activity in their communities, with a lack of coordination at the State level.

This crisis has reinforced the importance of coordination and centralization of data for efficient decentralized management. These factors are variables to introduce and watch in any model aimed at intervening in the management of this type of situation. The vulnerability of individuals (as consumers of tourism services) and companies (as providers of such services) to the impact of the crises can be mitigated by implementing management strategies and strengthening organizational resilience. Organizational learning allows for establishing the necessary channels for this transformation and for planning more robust (resilient) scenarios for future pandemics. For tourism firms, the crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic is a propitious context for implementing learning tools and adopting strategic approaches (Shaw, Hall, Edwards, & Baker, 2007) that promote changes in their business models and basic organizational assumptions (double-loop learning). Some learning tools in the context of the pandemic could include: (i) contingency planning to retain the knowledge and skills of staff in key roles, for example, by providing incentives and rewards for innovative and useful ideas; (ii) building an open and supportive working environment, e. g. encouraging employees to express their opinions, make suggestions or question the way things are done; (iii) encouraging teamwork, knowledge sharing about each other’s roles, and networking between departments and teams (Goh et al., 2012).

In the context of the Spanish tourism industry, the profound changes expected require openness to new ideas and contributions stimulated by a governance approach that reinforces its bottom-up dimension and the links between public/private actors and knowledge agents. This is a central idea for double-loop learning, which requires a climate of openness that welcomes the arrival of new ideas and points of view, both from internal and external stakeholders. Openness to new ideas allows the constant renewal, expansion, and improvement of knowledge, encourages experimentation, and involves finding new ways to do the job and freedom to take risks (Jerez-Gómez et al., 2005).

The new scenario is an opportunity to target measures aimed at facilitating the recovery of tourism via a solution of optimization, instead of maximization. That is,

the target is not focusing exclusively on increased tourist arrivals, but to integrate the diverse stakeholders, particularly the local community, into tourism development (Gössling, Scott, & Hall, 2021; Gössling et al., 2016), in line with the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations' 2030 Agenda. It is time to articulate a recovery that takes into account new ways of understanding travel and tourism, as well as to investigate the possibility of transformation towards the regenerative paradigm (Ateljevic, 2020). According to this paradigm, post-pandemic tourism must be more equitable. This commitment to equity consists of making specific changes in decisions and practices that question the consumerist model that has contributed to the massive growth of tourism and, instead, benefits a system that promotes sustainable and equitable growth (Benjamin, Dillette, & Alderman, 2020). In short, the paradigm of regenerative tourism articulates recovery with a new sustainable and inclusive perspective on travel and tourism.

References

- Antonacopoulou, E.P., & Sheaffer, Z. (2014). Learning in Crisis: Rethinking the Relationship Between Organizational Learning and Crisis Management. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(1), 5–21.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D.A. (1996). *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice*: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Ateljevic, I. (2020). Transforming the (tourism) world for good and (re)generating the potential 'new normal'. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 467–475.
- Benjamin, S., Dillette, A., & Alderman, D.H. (2020). "We can't return to normal": Committing to tourism equity in the post-pandemic age. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 476–483.
- Blackman, D., & Ritchie, B. W. (2008). Tourism crisis management and organizational learning: The role of reflection in developing effective DMO crisis strategies. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 23(2–4), 45–57.
- Burnett, J.J. (1998). A strategic approach to managing crises. *Public Relations Review*, 24(4), 475–488.
- Carmeli, A., & Schaubroeck, J. (2008). Organisational crisis-preparedness: The importance of learning from failures. *Long Range Planning*, 41(2), 177–196.
- Cavlek, N. (2002). Tour operators and destination safety. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 478–496.
- Cutter, S.L. (2016). Resilience to What? Resilience for Whom? *Geographical Journal*, 182(2), 110–113.
- De Sausmarez, N. (2007). The potential for tourism in post-crisis recovery: lessons from Malaysia's experience of the Asian financial crisis. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 13(2), 277–299.
- Deverell, E. (2009). Crises as Learning Triggers: Exploring a Conceptual Framework of Crisis-Induced Learning. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 17(3), 179–188.
- Dombey, D., & Burn-Murdoch, J. (2020, 4 June). Flawed data casts cloud over Spain's lockdown strategy. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.ft.com/content/77eb7a13-cd26-41dd-9642-616708b43673> (last access: July 19, 2020).
- Elsubbaugh, S., Fildes, R. and Rose, M.B. (2004), Preparation for Crisis Management: A Proposed Model and Empirical Evidence. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 12, 112–127.

- Faulkner, B. (2001). Towards a framework for tourism disaster management. *Tourism Management*, 22(2), 135–147.
- Fink, S. (2002). *Crisis Management: Planning for the inevitable*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Backinprint.com.
- Fortis, Z., Maon, F., Frooman, J., & Reiner, G. (2018). Unknown Knowns and Known Unknowns: Framing the Role of Organizational Learning in Corporate Social Responsibility Development. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(2), 277–300.
- Ghaderi, Z., Som, A.P.M., & Wang, J. (2014). Organizational Learning in Tourism Crisis Management: An Experience from Malaysia. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 31(5), 627–648.
- Goh, S.C., Elliott, C., & Quon, T.K. (2012). The relationship between learning capability and organizational performance: A meta-analytic examination. *The Learning Organization*, 19(2), 92–108.
- Goh, S.C., Quon, T.K., & Cousins, J.B. (2007). The Organizational Learning Survey: A Re-Evaluation of Unidimensionality. *Psychological Reports*, 101(3), 707–721.
- Gössling, S., Ring, A., Dwyer, L., Andersson, A.C., & Hall, C.M. (2016). Optimizing or maximizing growth? A challenge for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(4), 527–548.
- Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C.M. (2021). Pandemics, tourism and global change: a rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1), 1–20.
- Hall, C.M. (2010). Crisis events in tourism: subjects of crisis in tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(5), 401–417.
- Hall, C.M., Prayag, G., & Amore, A. (2017). *Tourism and resilience: Individual, organisational and destination perspectives*: Channel View Publications.
- Heath, R. (1998). *Crisis Management for Managers and Executives: Business Crises the Definitive Handbook to Reduction, Readiness, Response and Recovery*. Londres: Pearson Education.
- Holling, C.S. (1973). Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4(1), 1–23.
- INE (2029). *Coyuntura Turística Hotelera* (EOH/IPH/IRSH). August 2020. Datos provisionales. Instituto Nacional de Estadística, September 23, 2020.
- Irvine, W., & Anderson, A.R. (2005). The Impacts of Foot and Mouth Disease on a Peripheral Tourism Area: The Role and Effect of Crisis Management. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 19(2–3), 47–60.
- Jerez-Gómez, P., Céspedes-Lorente, J., & Valle-Cabrera, R. (2005). Organizational learning capability: a proposal of measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(6), 715–725.
- Johnson Tew, P., Lu, Z., Tolomiczenko, G., & Gellatly, J. (2008). SARS: lessons in strategic planning for hoteliers and destination marketers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(3), 332–346.
- Joo, H., Maskery, B.A., Berro, A.D., Rotz, L.D., Lee, Y.-K., & Brown, C.M. (2019). Economic Impact of the 2015 MERS Outbreak on the Republic of Korea's Tourism-Related Industries. *Health Security*, 17(2), 100–108.
- Jordana, D.S., Frieta, D.S., & Agbaba, R. (2020, 26–27 March). *Crisis Management in Tourism – Literature Review*. Paper presented at the 51st International Scientific Conference on Economic and Social Development, Rabat.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Lew, A.A. (2014). Scale, change and resilience in community tourism planning. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(1), 14–22.
- Llaneras, K. (2020, 21 June). Los problemas de usar datos del siglo pasado para una pandemia del siglo XXI. *El País*. Retrieved from <https://elpais.com/sociedad/crisis-del-coronavirus/2020-06-20/los-problemas-de-usar-datos-del-siglo-pasado-para-una-pandemia-del-siglo-xxi.html> (last access: July 19, 2020).

- McKercher, B., & Chon, K. (2004). The over-reaction to SARS and the collapse of Asian tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 716–719.
- Miller, G.A., & Ritchie, B.W. (2003). A Farming Crisis or a Tourism Disaster? An Analysis of the Foot and Mouth Disease in the UK. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 6(2), 150–171.
- Mitroff, I.I. (2005). *Why some companies emerge stronger and better from a crisis: 7 essential lessons for surviving disaster*. New York: AMACOM/American Management Association.
- Mitroff, I.I., Pauchant, T.C., & Shrivastava, P. (2006). The Structure of Man-made Organizational Crises: Conceptual and Empirical Issues in the Development of a General Theory of Crisis Management. In D. Smith & D. Elliot (Eds.), *Key readings in crisis management: Systems and structures for prevention and recovery* (pp. 47–74). London, England: Routledge.
- National Institute of Statistics (2019). Cuenta Satélite del Turismo de España. Revisión estadística 2019. Serie 2016–2018 [Press release]. Retrieved from https://www.ine.es/prensa/cst_2018.pdf (last access: July 19, 2020).
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge-creating company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Paraskevas, A., & Arendell, B. (2007). A strategic framework for terrorism prevention and mitigation in tourism destinations. *Tourism Management*, 28(6), 1560–1573.
- Pearson, C., & Mitroff, I. (1993). From Crisis-Prone to Crisis-Prepared: A Framework for Crisis Management. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7 (1), 48–59.
- Pine, R., & McKercher, B. (2004). The impact of SARS on Hong Kong's tourism industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(2), 139–143.
- Prayag, G. (2018). Symbiotic relationship or not? Understanding resilience and crisis management in tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 25, 133–135.
- Richardson, B. (1994). Crisis management and management strategy – Time to ‘Loop-the Loop’? *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 3(3), 59–80.
- Ritchie, B.W. (2004). Chaos, crises and disasters: a strategic approach to crisis management in the tourism industry. *Tourism Management*, 25(6), 669–683.
- Ritchie, B. W., & Jiang, Y. (2019). A review of research on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management: Launching the annals of tourism research curated collection on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 79, 102812.
- Robertson, D., Kean, I., Moore, S., Gurtner, Y., Holcombe, C., & Wilks, J. (2006). Tourism risk management: An authoritative guide to managing crises in tourism. *APEC International Centre for Sustainable Tourism (AICST)*.
- Rodríguez-Toubes, D. (2010). Comunicación institucional en el sector turístico en situaciones de crisis: Estrategia de las Destination Management Organization (DMO) ante las mareas negras. *Revista de Comunicación*, 9, 42–59.
- Rodríguez-Toubes, D., & Fraiz Brea, J.A. (2011). Prácticas hoteleras en la gestión de crisis por catástrofes: el caso de Galicia. *Revista Galega de Economía*, 20(2), 1–17.
- Rodríguez-Toubes, D., & Fraiz Brea, J.A. (2012). Desarrollo de una política de gestión de crisis para desastres en el turismo. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 8, 10–18.
- Scott, N., & Laws, E. (2005). Tourism Crises and Disasters: Enhancing Understanding of System Effects. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 19(2–3), 149–158.
- Shaw, D., Hall, M., Edwards, J.S., & Baker, B. (2007). Responding to crisis through strategic knowledge management. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20(4), 559–578.
- Smith, D., & Elliott, D. (2007). Exploring the barriers to learning from crisis – Organizational learning and crisis. *Management Learning*, 38(5), 519–538.
- Toubes, D.R., Gössling, S., Hall, C.M., & Scott, D. (2017). Vulnerability of Coastal Beach Tourism to Flooding: A Case Study of Galicia, Spain. *Environments*, 4(83), 1–23.

- UNISDR (2015, 14–18 March). *Towards a Resilient Tourism Sector, Working Session*. Paper presented at the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, Sendai, Japan.
- van Laere, J., & Lindblom, J. (2019). Cultivating a longitudinal learning process through recurring crisis management training exercises in twelve Swedish municipalities. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 27(1), 38–49.
- Vargas-Sánchez, A. (2018). Crisis situations in tourist destinations: how can they be managed? *Enlightening Tourism. A Pathmaking Journal*, 8(1), 47–69.
- Walker, B., Hollin, C.S., Carpenter, S.R., & Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society*, 9(2), 5.
- Weick, K.E., & Sutcliffe, K.M. (2001). *Managing the Unexpected: Assuring High Performance in an Age of Complexity*: Wiley.
- Wilks, J., & Moore, S. (2004). *Tourism Risk Management for the Asia Pacific Region: An Authoritative Guide for Managing Crises and Disasters*. Golden Coast, Australia: APEC International Centre for Sustainable Tourism (AICST), CRC for Sustainable Tourism. Retrieve from: http://publications.apec.org/-/media/APEC/Publications/2004/12/Tourism-Risk-Management-for-the-Asia-Pacific-Region-An-Authoritative-Guide-for-Managing-Crisis-and-D/04_twg_risk__management_report.pdf (last access: July 19, 2020).