



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Siamak Seyfi,
University of Oulu, Finland

REVIEWED BY

Ngoni Courage Shereni,
Lupane State University, Zimbabwe
Jahan Ul Mulk,
Riphah International University, Pakistan
Christos Kakarougkas,
University of the Aegean, Greece

*CORRESPONDENCE

James Q. Grefalde
✉ jgrefalde@nemsu.edu.ph

RECEIVED 23 November 2025
REVISED 19 February 2026
ACCEPTED 06 March 2026
PUBLISHED 01 April 2026

CITATION

Grefalde JQ (2026) Resilience in the face of crisis: challenges and recovery strategies of accommodation sector establishments in Surigao del Sur amidst pandemic.
Front. Sustain. Tour. 5:1752569.
doi: 10.3389/frsut.2026.1752569

COPYRIGHT

© 2026 Grefalde. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Resilience in the face of crisis: challenges and recovery strategies of accommodation sector establishments in Surigao del Sur amidst pandemic

James Q. Grefalde *

Department of Business Management Faculty, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Tandag, Philippines

This study examines the challenges and recovery strategies of accommodation-sector Tourism-Related Establishments (TREs) in Surigao del Sur, Philippines, during the COVID-19 pandemic. Anchored in multidimensional resilience theory, the research explores how small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) navigated operational disruptions, financial losses, labor instability, and supply-chain interruptions in a tourism-dependent provincial context. A qualitative research design was employed to capture context-specific meanings and adaptive processes that could not be adequately quantified. Using purposive sampling, twenty (20) participants—including owners, managers, and frontline employees from hotels, resorts, and guesthouses—were selected based on their direct involvement in operational decision-making or service delivery during the pandemic. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews conducted between January and September 2021, either face-to-face or via virtual platforms, and transcribed verbatim. Thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's iterative framework was applied to identify patterns across narratives, while reflexive memoing and cross-case comparisons enhanced analytical rigor. Further, the findings reveal that enterprises faced cascading disruptions, including temporary closures, revenue decline, wage delays, and supply shortages. In response, TREs adopted institutional compliance with health protocols, leveraged social media for digital visibility, strengthened participatory communication, and cultivated positive organizational mindsets. These strategies reflect the interaction of organizational, financial, digital, human resource, and institutional resilience dimensions. The study contributes empirical evidence from a provincial tourism setting and situates enterprise adaptation within a sustainable development lens, particularly aligning with SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities), and SDG 13 (Climate Action). Overall, the findings position resilience as a dynamic, integrative pathway toward sustainable tourism transformation.

KEYWORDS

accommodation sector, COVID-19 pandemic, organizational resilience, challenges and recovery strategies, tourism-related establishments (TREs)

Introduction

The global tourism and hospitality industry has experienced unprecedented disruption in recent years, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, which exposed structural vulnerabilities within tourism-dependent economies. Accommodation-sector tourism-related establishments (TREs), especially small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), were among the most severely affected due to mobility restrictions, mandatory closures, supply-chain interruptions, and abrupt declines in travel demand. These shocks extended beyond firm-level impacts, cascading into employment instability, reduced local income circulation, and weakened community-based tourism systems. In emerging and provincial destinations such as Surigao del Sur, where tourism contributes directly to local livelihoods, the consequences of prolonged disruption underscored the urgent need to understand how enterprises adapt, recover, and sustain operations under systemic uncertainty.

Contemporary tourism resilience scholarship conceptualizes resilience as a multidimensional and processual capability rather than a simple recovery outcome. Organizational resilience has been framed as a meta-capability encompassing anticipation, coping, and adaptation mechanisms (Duchek, 2020), while empirical studies in hospitality contexts demonstrate that structured organizational change enhances performance during crisis periods (Triatmanto and Wahyuni, 2020). Recent research further highlights the importance of digital agility in strengthening supply chain resilience and competitive positioning (Hasanein et al., 2026), as well as the mediating role of innovation capability in translating organizational learning into adaptive outcomes (Salam et al., 2026). Moreover, workforce resilience studies emphasize the systemic interplay among employees, firms, and institutions in sustaining tourism systems under prolonged uncertainty (Robinson et al., 2025). Collectively, these perspectives position resilience as an integrative construct spanning organizational, digital, financial, operational, and human resource dimensions.

Although tourism resilience literature has advanced, important gaps remain, particularly in relation to provincial and emerging destinations such as Surigao del Sur. Prior studies demonstrate that financial and organizational resilience contribute to employment stability and firm performance during crises (Huang et al., 2020; Triatmanto and Wahyuni, 2020), while digital agility and innovation capability strengthen supply chain resilience and competitiveness (Hasanein et al., 2026; Salam et al., 2026). However, these dimensions are often examined in large-scale or developed tourism contexts and treated independently rather than as interconnected capabilities within small and medium-sized accommodation enterprises. Furthermore, although multi-actor coordination and workforce resilience are recognized as critical in crisis environments (Robinson et al., 2025), limited empirical evidence captures how these mechanisms operate within community-based, tourism-dependent local economies. Consequently, there remains a need for context-specific research that integrates organizational, digital, financial, and institutional resilience within a sustainable development lens in provincial settings like Surigao del Sur.

This study is significant for its empirical, theoretical, and policy contributions within a provincial tourism context such as Surigao

del Sur. Empirically, it provides context-specific evidence on how accommodation-sector SMEs navigated prolonged systemic disruption, addressing the limited research in community-based and emerging destinations. Theoretically, it advances multidimensional resilience frameworks by demonstrating the interaction of organizational, financial, digital, human resource, and institutional capabilities within a sustainable development lens. Practically and from a policy perspective, the findings offer actionable insights for enterprise owners and local government units to institutionalize crisis preparedness, strengthen digital and financial systems, and align recovery strategies with SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities), and SDG 13 (Climate Action).

Literature review

In this part of the paper, the researcher analyzed present-day works from the fields of tourism and hospitality that pertain to the concept of “resilience” and, specifically, the types of enterprises that are in the accommodations segment of the industry who have experienced or will experience systemic crises. More specifically, the researcher synthesized in the current work the critical concepts of resilience and the underlying variables of these concepts, which provide the theoretical grounding needed to examine enterprise-level adaptation and recovery. In doing so, this review moves from organizational foundations toward multidimensional resilience perspectives.

Organizational and leadership resilience

To begin with, organizational and leadership resilience is grounded in the capacity of firms to anticipate disruption, implement adaptive change, and institutionalize learning. Empirical evidence from Indonesian hotels demonstrates that organizational resilience significantly improves firm performance, particularly when mediated by structured organizational change processes (Triatmanto and Wahyuni, 2020). Accordingly, this finding underscores that resilience is not merely a reactive response but is operationalized through leadership-driven transformation initiatives.

In addition to this empirical evidence, Duchek (2020) conceptualizes resilience as a meta-capability that unfolds across anticipation, coping, and adaptation stages. In this framework, leadership competence structures the resilience process by embedding foresight and adaptive capacity into organizational routines. Taken together, these studies suggest that leadership-driven change mechanisms are critical enablers of organizational resilience, highlighting the centrality of managerial intentionality in crisis navigation.

Financial resilience

Building upon organizational foundations, financial resilience in hospitality reflects the sector’s vulnerability to external shocks

and policy interventions. Analysis of U.S. payroll data indicates that pandemic-related closure policies led to a 20%–30% reduction in workforce levels, thereby revealing the immediate link between operational shutdown and financial instability (Huang et al., 2020). Although reopening strategies partially restored employment, financial fragility persisted.

Beyond short-term stabilization, however, financial resilience requires structural transformation. Sigala (2020) argues that crisis recovery in tourism necessitates rethinking business models rather than merely implementing cost-control measures. Consequently, financial resilience must integrate transformation, strategic repositioning, and value reorientation to ensure long-term viability. Thus, these insights position financial resilience as dependent on both policy adaptability and proactive business model innovation.

Financial, operational, and digital resilience

Moving further, recent scholarship emphasizes the interdependence of financial, operational, and digital capabilities in shaping competitive outcomes. Using PLS-SEM analysis of luxury hotels, Hasanein et al. (2026) demonstrate that digital agility enhances supply chain agility and supply chain resilience, both of which drive competitive advantage. In this regard, digitalization strengthens operational continuity while simultaneously reinforcing financial competitiveness. Rather than functioning solely as a technological upgrade, digital agility operates as a higher-order capability that integrates financial stability with operational flexibility, particularly in volatile hospitality environments. Therefore, digital capability becomes central to multidimensional resilience.

Organizational and innovation resilience

In parallel, innovation capability has been identified as a critical mechanism linking organizational learning to resilience. Salam et al. (2026) show that innovation capability mediates the relationship between organizational learning and business resilience, indicating that knowledge accumulation must be transformed into innovative processes or services to produce adaptive outcomes. Furthermore, from a transformative tourism perspective, Sigala (2020) argues that crises present opportunities for structural innovation and value reorientation. COVID-19, in particular, accelerated shifts toward digital integration and sustainability-oriented business models. Collectively, therefore, these studies suggest that crisis-induced innovation strengthens long-term resilience by enabling firms to convert experiential learning into adaptive transformation.

Digital and supply chain resilience

At the operational level, hospitality supply chains are highly susceptible to disruption due to service perishability and demand volatility. Hasanein et al. (2026) distinguish between supply chain

agility—defined as responsiveness—and supply chain resilience—defined as recovery and absorption capacity. Their findings confirm that digital agility enhances both mechanisms through parallel mediation effects. Accordingly, digital transformation strengthens supply continuity by enabling real-time coordination, predictive analytics, and rapid reconfiguration of supply networks. In disruption-prone environments, therefore, digital capabilities become foundational to maintaining operational stability.

Human resource and institutional resilience

Beyond organizational systems, workforce resilience emerges from interactions across employees, operators, and policymakers. Robinson et al. (2025) illustrate how tourism workforce resilience evolves through “vicious–virtuous” paradox cycles involving multiple actors. Structural tensions—such as precarious employment and policy uncertainty—require coordinated institutional responses. Moreover, Huang et al. (2020) further demonstrate that policy interventions significantly shape labor resilience outcomes. Taken together, these studies indicate that institutional alignment reduces structural tensions and stabilizes employment systems. Hence, institutional policies act as moderators of workforce resilience, highlighting the importance of governance coherence in crisis contexts.

Digital resilience

Simultaneously, digital resilience gained prominence during the pandemic as firms accelerated adoption of AI, robotics, and digital tracing technologies (Sigala, 2020). These technologies enhanced service continuity and customer trust, thereby reinforcing digital infrastructure as a resilience backbone. From a dynamic capability perspective, Hasanein et al. (2026) conceptualize digital agility as encompassing sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring capabilities. In this view, digital resources are continuously restructured to respond to environmental change. Thus, digital capability operates as a driver of systemic resilience rather than as a standalone operational tool.

Organizational and digital resilience

At the intersection of learning and technology, organizational and digital resilience are mutually reinforcing. The intersection of organizational learning and digital transformation strengthens resilience through knowledge conversion processes. Salam et al. (2026) demonstrate that learning-driven innovation enhances resilience, suggesting that digital learning cultures facilitate adaptive capacity. Likewise, Duchek (2020) emphasizes that organizational routines institutionalize anticipation and adaptation mechanisms. When embedded within digital systems, these routines enhance foresight and responsiveness. Consequently, digital routines reinforce the anticipation stage of resilience development, strengthening systemic preparedness.

Operational and supply chain resilience

Operational resilience depends on balancing responsiveness with recovery capacity. [Hasanein et al. \(2026\)](#) clarify the distinction between supply chain agility (speed and flexibility) and supply chain resilience (recovery and absorption). Both are critical during disruption. Specifically, operational flexibility enables rapid adjustment to fluctuating demand, while recovery capacity ensures continuity aftershocks. Therefore, the integration of these capabilities determines overall operational robustness in hospitality contexts.

Institutional resilience

Extending the discussion to governance structures, institutional resilience is rooted in policy–industry coordination and collective governance mechanisms. [Robinson et al. \(2025\)](#) argue that resilience requires collective rather than isolated responses, particularly in tourism systems lacking centralized orchestrators. In this respect, governance structures influence workforce stability, crisis management effectiveness, and systemic adaptation. Thus, institutional resilience reflects the capacity of public and private actors to collaborate in stabilizing tourism economies.

Financial and operational interdependence

Importantly, financial resilience cannot be examined independently of operations. [Huang et al. \(2020\)](#) demonstrate that operational shutdowns directly compromise financial viability. Employment elasticity during crisis highlights the fragile linkage between operational continuity and revenue stability. Consequently, financial resilience is inseparable from operational continuity. Sustained service delivery during disruption strengthens financial endurance.

Human resource resilience

At the individual–organizational interface, workforce resilience is co-produced at employee and employer levels ([Robinson et al., 2025](#)). Individual resilience interacts with organizational support systems, suggesting that HR practices—such as communication strategies, training, and psychological support, strengthen system-level resilience. Therefore, this multi-level interaction underscores the importance of integrating employee well-being into broader organizational resilience frameworks.

Transformational resilience

Finally, transformational resilience extends beyond recovery toward systemic paradigm shifts. [Sigala \(2020\)](#) argues that crises enable structural and value transformation within tourism systems. Rather than restoring pre-crisis models, firms are encouraged to reset toward sustainability and innovation. Similarly, [Duchek](#)

(2020) emphasizes that adaptation stages institutionalize lessons learned, strengthening future robustness. Thus, resilience includes forward-looking transformation, not merely restoration.

SDG 8—decent work and economic growth

In alignment with SDG 8, resilience in hospitality is closely associated with employment protection and economic continuity. The COVID-19 crisis revealed the fragility of hospitality labor markets, where business closures resulted in workforce reductions of 20%–30%, thereby illustrating the direct connection between operational disruption and employment instability ([Huang et al., 2020](#)).

At the same time, organizational resilience plays a critical role in sustaining performance and protecting employment. Evidence from Indonesian hotels shows that resilience enhances firm performance when mediated by structured organizational change ([Triatmanto and Wahyuni, 2020](#)). Thus, economic stability depends not merely on financial reserves but on adaptive leadership and strategic reconfiguration. Workforce resilience further reinforces SDG 8 by stabilizing employment systems through collective, multi-actor alignment among employees, managers, and policymakers ([Robinson et al., 2025](#)). Accordingly, SDG 8 encapsulates the economic and employment stabilization function of multidimensional resilience.

SDG 9—industry, innovation, and infrastructure

Likewise, digital transformation has become a central pillar of resilience in hospitality. Digital agility significantly enhances supply chain agility and resilience, ultimately strengthening competitive advantage ([Hasanein et al., 2026](#)). Innovation capability also mediates organizational learning and resilience ([Salam et al., 2026](#)). Moreover, the pandemic accelerated digital adoption in tourism ([Sigala, 2020](#)). These digital infrastructures enhance industrial robustness and operational continuity. Therefore, resilience aligned with SDG 9 reflects capability-driven industrial modernization.

SDG 12—responsible consumption and production

Operational and supply chain resilience contribute directly to sustainable resource management. Supply chain agility enables rapid adaptation, while supply chain resilience ensures continuity after disruptions ([Hasanein et al., 2026](#)). Digitally enabled forecasting reduces waste and inefficiencies. In addition, transformative crisis responses encourage rethinking tourism production models toward sustainability ([Sigala, 2020](#)). Hence, resilience contributes to SDG 12's goal of responsible consumption and production.

SDG 16—peace, justice, and strong institutions

Institutional resilience reflects governance systems' ability to coordinate collective responses. Workforce resilience research highlights the need for institutional alignment (Robinson et al., 2025). Leadership capability embeds anticipation and adaptation routines (Duchek, 2020). Consequently, resilience strengthens institutional robustness and governance accountability, directly supporting SDG 16.

SDG 17—partnerships for the goals

Tourism resilience is inherently relational. Multi-level resilience dynamics illustrate that recovery requires collective effort (Robinson et al., 2025). Digital ecosystems and supply chain networks emphasize coordination (Hasanein et al., 2026). Thus, SDG 17 is embedded in resilience frameworks that rely on cross-sector cooperation and public-private partnerships.

SDG 11—sustainable cities and communities

Finally, transformational resilience extends beyond firm-level survival toward systemic renewal. Crisis-induced innovation can reset tourism systems toward sustainable destination models (Sigala, 2020). Learning-based adaptation strengthens long-term community resilience (Duchek, 2020). Accordingly, SDG 11 is advanced when resilience fosters sustainable destination transformation rather than short-term recovery.

The reviewed literature collectively demonstrates in Table 1, that resilience in hospitality and tourism is a multidimensional, capability-driven construct that extends beyond crisis recovery toward adaptive transformation. Across organizational, financial, operational, digital, human resource, and institutional dimensions, resilience emerges not as a single attribute but as an interconnected system of capabilities that enable enterprises to anticipate disruption, absorb shocks, and reconfigure operations in volatile environments.

At the organizational level, leadership competence and structured change processes serve as foundational enablers of resilience, embedding anticipation, coping, and adaptation routines within firm operations. Financial resilience, meanwhile, is shown to be inseparable from operational continuity and policy responsiveness, underscoring the fragility of accommodation enterprises during systemic crises. Importantly, financial stability alone is insufficient; structural business model innovation is necessary to sustain long-term viability.

Organizational resilience is anchored in leadership competence and structured change processes that embed anticipation, coping, and adaptation into firm operations. Financial resilience, in turn, depends on operational continuity and policy responsiveness; however, long-term viability requires business model innovation rather than mere cost stabilization.

Digital agility and innovation capability emerge as higher-order dynamic capabilities that strengthen operational and supply chain resilience. Digital transformation enhances both responsiveness and recovery capacity, while organizational learning contributes to resilience only when translated into innovation.

Moreover, workforce and institutional resilience emphasize the multi-actor nature of tourism systems, where alignment among employees, firms, and policymakers stabilizes labor markets and enterprise sustainability. Thus, resilience extends beyond the firm and is embedded in broader governance networks.

Overall, the literature positions resilience as transformational rather than restorative, requiring the integration of leadership, financial adaptability, digital capability, innovation, supply chain flexibility, workforce stability, and institutional coordination. Nevertheless, existing research remains fragmented across these dimensions, with limited unified frameworks, particularly in emerging tourism contexts—thereby justifying the need for an integrated empirical model in the present study.

Methodology

A qualitative methodological research design was utilized for this study to examine the challenges and recovery strategies of Tourism Related Establishments (TREs) in the Accommodation Sector of Surigao Del Sur as they dealt with the effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Qualitative methods are best suited to situations where one seeks to understand how participants create context specific meanings from their experiences as well as how they adapt to situations that can't be easily quantified or categorized using established variables (Creswell and Poth, 2018). Additionally, as researchers studying crises and organizational resilience, we believe qualitative methods provide the most in-depth ways to understand how organizations develop a sense of what it means to experience and deal with uncertainty, disrupt and respond over time (Duchek, 2020; Prayag, 2023). Thus, because the pandemic has been an unprecedented event in history, and continues to evolve as it moves forward, a qualitative methodology was used to better understand and identify the emergent and complex forms of recovery efforts TRE's in the Accommodation Sector have taken in response to the pandemic rather than using a quantitative methodology that would have limited our ability to analyze the nuances of recovery activities TRE's were implementing.

This study was performed in Surigao del Sur, Philippines, a region that has been heavily reliant on tourism and accommodations. In this research, a purposeful sampling method was used to select information rich individuals who had first-hand knowledge of the operation and/or management of an accommodation establishment during the COVID-19 pandemic. Moreover, this study noted that "purposive sampling" is often recommended for qualitative studies when the sample population is selected based on its relation to the phenomenon being researched as opposed to statistical representation.

Participants were identified through multiple complementary channels to ensure relevance and diversity of perspectives. Initial participants were identified using local tourism office listings, municipal tourism registries, and industry directories of licensed

TABLE 1 Literature hospitality and tourism context resilience—SDG matrix.

Relevant resilience dimension(s)	Theoretical anchor	Empirical evidence	Core contribution	Identified gap	Strategic implication	SDG theme
Financial resilience; organizational resilience; human resource resilience	Dynamic capabilities; organizational change theory	Huang et al., 2020; Triatmanto and Wahyuningsih, 2020; Robinson et al., 2025	Resilience sustains employment and stabilizes firm performance during crisis	Limited integration of digital capability with employment stability	Build adaptive HR systems tied to digital and operational capabilities	SDG 8: decent work and economic growth
Digital resilience; innovation resilience; supply chain resilience	Dynamic capabilities theory (DCT); RBV	Hasanein et al., 2026; Salam et al., 2026; Sigala, 2020	Digital agility enhances supply chain agility and resilience; Innovation mediates learning → resilience	Few multi-level models combining digital, innovation, and supply chain	Invest in digital agility as higher-order capability	SDG 9: industry, innovation and infrastructure
Operational resilience; supply chain agility; transformational resilience	Sustainable operations theory	Hasanein et al., 2026; Sigala, 2020	Agile and resilient supply chains reduce waste and inefficiencies	Sustainability rarely embedded explicitly in resilience models	Align resilience KPIs with sustainability metrics	SDG 12: responsible consumption and production
Institutional resilience; leadership resilience	Paradox theory; governance theory	Robinson et al., 2025; Duchek, 2020	Multi-actor coordination reduces workforce paradox tensions	Limited measurement of institutional resilience in hospitality	Strengthen public–private coordination frameworks	SDG 16: strong institutions and governance
Multi-actor resilience; collaborative supply chain	Network theory; relational governance	Robinson et al., 2025; Hasanein et al., 2026	Resilience emerges from collective response rather than isolated firm-level action	Insufficient modeling of inter-organizational resilience networks	Promote cross-sector digital ecosystems	SDG 17: partnerships for the goals
Transformational resilience; destination-level resilience	Transformative tourism theory	Sigala, 2020; Duchek, 2020	Crisis can reset tourism systems toward sustainability	Destination-level empirical models remain scarce	Integrate resilience planning in destination governance	SDG 11: sustainable cities and communities

accommodation establishments in the province. These sources were cross-checked to verify operational status during the pandemic period. Additional participants were identified through referrals from local tourism officers and industry informants, facilitating access to establishments that remained operational or partially operational during periods of heightened restrictions. To avoid homogeneity of perspectives, selection considered variation in establishment type (hotels, resorts, guesthouses), scale of operation, and role within the organization.

Inclusion criteria required that participants (1) were owners, managers, or frontline employees of an accommodation establishment in Surigao del Sur; (2) were directly involved in operational decision-making or service delivery during the COVID-19 period; and (3) had experienced at least one phase of pandemic-related disruption, such as temporary closure, workforce reduction, or service modification. This selection process ensured that participants possessed firsthand knowledge of both the challenges encountered and the recovery strategies employed. Below presented the participants organizational role, the type of accommodation establishment employed with, and their working experience in the industry.

Table 2, illustrates the study participants included hotel, resort and guesthouse owners, managers and frontline employees who were engaged in operational decision making or service delivery during the COVID-19 period. In total, a total of twenty (20) participants were interviewed with ten (10) owners/managers and ten (10) frontline staff. The role-based composition of the sample was used to include multiple organizational viewpoints regarding the impact of crises and processes for recovering from them.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the goal of obtaining rich narrative responses that would be consistent among all study participants (Guest et al., 2014), as semi-structured interviews are ideal for collecting detailed narratives while ensuring participant responses remain consistent. The interview protocol included questions organized into two major categories: (1) the challenges participants faced during the pandemic, and (2) the methods they employed to recover from those challenges. Probes were also utilized after each question to elicit additional information regarding how participants defined their experiences and to allow for new discoveries or emerging themes.

Face-to-face interviews as well as virtual meetings via an online platform such as Zoom (or other video conferencing tool) took

TABLE 2 Participants profile of the study.

Participant code	Organizational role	Type of accommodation establishment	Years of experience
P1	Owner	Resort	10+ years
P2	Manager	Hotel	8 years
P3	Manager	Guesthouse	6 years
P4	Frontline employee	Resort	5 years
P5	Owner	Guesthouse	12 years
P6	Frontline employee	Hotel	4 years
P7	Frontline employee	Resort	7 years
P8	Manager	Resort	9 years
P9	Owner	Hotel	15 years
P10	Frontline employee	Guesthouse	3 years
P11	Owner	Resort	11 years
P12	Manager	Hotel	10 years
P13	Frontline employee	Hotel	6 years
P14	Frontline employee	Resort	5 years
P15	Owner	Guesthouse	14 years
P16	Manager	Resort	7 years
P17	Frontline employee	Guesthouse	4 years
P18	Frontline employee	Hotel	9 years
P19	Owner	Hotel	18 years
P20	Manager	Guesthouse	6 years

place from January to September of 2021 with participants based upon their preference and according to current health and safety protocols in effect at the time of each meeting. The length of each interview ranged from 45 to 60 min and was conducted in a language that the participant felt most comfortable with. Following each participant's consent, all interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed verbatim in preparation for analysis. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the interview transcripts. The rationale for this choice is because thematic analysis offers the researcher a great deal of flexibility when analyzing qualitative data sets, including those developed during exploratory resilience studies. Additionally, thematic analysis has been shown to be useful in identifying repeated patterns in meaning across qualitative data sets. A total of six iterative phases were included in the analysis of the interview transcripts; these phases include data familiarization, initial code generation, theme development, theme review, theme definition, and report writing.

To address potential researcher bias, several strategies were employed. First, reflexive memo-writing was used throughout the analysis to document analytical decisions and researcher assumptions. Second, codes and emerging themes were continuously compared across transcripts to ensure consistency and analytical rigor. Third, themes were grounded in participants' accounts and supported by multiple data excerpts, reducing the influence of isolated interpretations. These procedures enhanced the credibility, dependability, and confirmability of the findings (Braun and Clarke, 2021).

The ethical consideration for conducting qualitative research were carefully followed. Before they participated in this study, each participant completed a written informed consent document and were told that their responses would remain confidential and anonymous. Each participant's name or other identifying information was removed from the transcript and all data were kept secure. Participants were able to volunteer to participate in the study, and participants were told of their ability to withdraw at any point during the study without negative consequences to them.

Results and discussion

This section presents the challenges and recovery strategies of accommodation-sector tourism-related establishments (TREs) in Surigao del Sur during the COVID-19 pandemic. Four themes emerged for challenges, followed by four themes for recovery strategies. Short, illustrative excerpts from participants are retained to ground the analysis, while interpretation is supported by recent resilience literature. Here are the characteristics of the participants.

Challenges encountered by accommodation-sector TREs

This subsection examines the principal challenges faced by accommodation-sector TREs during the COVID-19 pandemic, as

articulated by key informants. The identified themes highlight how operational, financial, labor, and supply-chain disruptions collectively constrained business continuity.

Theme 1: business disruptions due to lockdowns and travel restrictions

Participants consistently identified lockdowns and travel restrictions as the most disruptive factor affecting business operations. Mandatory closures, mobility limitations, and stringent health protocols significantly reduced guest arrivals and constrained operational capacity. Recent post-pandemic studies continue to document how accommodation enterprises experienced severe revenue contraction, liquidity pressures, and prolonged recovery trajectories due to mobility restrictions and health-related compliance requirements (Hasanein et al., 2026; Robinson et al., 2025). These disruptions were particularly pronounced in tourism-dependent regions where business continuity relied heavily on unrestricted travel flows.

As one participant explained,

“we were not able to operate for a few months because of the lockdown” (P1),

highlighting the immediate cessation of operations. Likewise, another participant noted that

“the operation was stopped, and it was difficult to follow the guidelines at first” (P3),

reflecting both operational paralysis and the initial difficulty of adapting to evolving public health regulations. These accounts align with recent findings that crisis-related policy interventions directly constrained operational flexibility and labor stability within hospitality enterprises (Robinson et al., 2025).

Furthermore, contemporary resilience research emphasizes that such systemic shocks test firms' dynamic capabilities, particularly their ability to absorb disruption and reconfigure operations under uncertainty (Hasanein et al., 2026). Evidence from hospitality supply chain studies suggests that enterprises lacking digital agility and adaptive coordination mechanisms experienced greater operational vulnerability during lockdown periods (Hasanein et al., 2026). Similarly, research on organizational learning in hospitality highlights that firms with limited innovation capability struggled to transition from shutdown to recovery phases (Salam et al., 2026).

From a sustainable development perspective, this theme is closely associated with SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), as lockdown-induced disruptions directly threatened employment continuity and local economic stability. Additionally, the necessity to comply with evolving public health policies underscores the role of governance coordination and regulatory responsiveness, thereby linking this disruption to SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions). Where institutional support

mechanisms were timely and coherent, enterprises demonstrated greater resilience and labor retention (Robinson et al., 2025).

In sum, business disruptions due to lockdowns and travel restrictions reveal not only operational fragility but also the critical importance of dynamic adaptation, digital capability, and institutional alignment in strengthening enterprise-level resilience in the accommodation sector.

Theme 2: loss of profit and return on investment

Financial losses emerged as a dominant concern among participants, primarily driven by reduced occupancy rates, intermittent business closures, and additional compliance-related expenses. The sharp decline in guest arrivals, combined with ongoing fixed costs such as utilities, loan amortizations, and employee retention expenses, significantly strained the financial sustainability of accommodation enterprises. Recent hospitality research confirms that post-pandemic recovery has been uneven, with many establishments experiencing prolonged revenue gaps and delayed return on investment due to suppressed travel demand and increased operational costs (Hasanein et al., 2026; Robinson et al., 2025).

As one participant summarized,

“loss of profit and no return from our capital” (P1),

while another shared that

“there were days with no income at all” (P15).

These narratives illustrate the acute liquidity constraints faced by small and medium-sized accommodation enterprises, where daily cash flow is essential for survival. Empirical evidence further suggests that financial strain during crisis periods reduces reinvestment capacity, limits innovation spending, and delays digital transformation initiatives, thereby constraining long-term competitiveness (Hasanein et al., 2026).

Moreover, resilience scholarship emphasizes that financial recovery cannot rely solely on cost-cutting measures but requires strategic reconfiguration of business models and value propositions to restore revenue streams (Salam et al., 2026). Enterprises that integrated digital channels, diversified markets, or restructured service offerings demonstrated stronger recovery trajectories compared to those that remained operationally static (Hasanein et al., 2026).

From a sustainable development perspective, this theme directly relates to SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), as sustained financial losses threaten employment continuity and enterprise viability. It also indirectly connects to SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure), given that diminished returns reduce firms' capacity to invest in digital infrastructure and innovation necessary for long-term resilience.

Overall, the loss of profit and weakened return on investment highlight the central role of financial adaptability within

multidimensional resilience, reinforcing the need for integrated operational, digital, and strategic responses to systemic crises in the accommodation sector.

Theme 3: delayed payment of bills and employee wages

Participants further reported significant difficulty in meeting operational expenses, particularly utilities, supplier payments, and employee wages, as income streams declined over an extended period. The prolonged disruption to cash flow placed many accommodation enterprises under acute financial pressure, forcing them to adopt short-term survival strategies. As one participant explained,

“we delayed wages and even borrowed funds to pay our bills” (P3),

illustrating the extent of liquidity constraints experienced during the crisis. Similarly, another participant stated,

“we could not cope with our financial obligations because of very low income” (P19),

highlighting the strain on financial commitments and operational sustainability.

Recent hospitality research supports these accounts, noting that prolonged revenue contraction significantly weakened firms' ability to cover fixed operating costs, particularly among small and medium-sized accommodation enterprises (Hasanein et al., 2026; Robinson et al., 2025). Studies also suggest that liquidity shortages during crisis periods often result in delayed wage payments, increased debt exposure, and constrained reinvestment capacity, thereby limiting firms' recovery potential (Hasanein et al., 2026).

From a resilience perspective, the inability to meet operational obligations reflects weakened financial buffering capacity and limited adaptive slack resources. Moreover, these financial pressures directly threaten employment stability, thereby linking this finding to SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth). Where enterprises are unable to sustain wage payments, the broader objective of decent work becomes compromised. Additionally, sustained borrowing and financial strain reduce firms' capacity to invest in innovation and digital upgrading, indirectly affecting SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure).

Overall, these narratives underscore how financial fragility not only disrupts day-to-day operations but also constrains long-term strategic resilience within the accommodation sector.

Theme 4: delayed supply delivery

Participants also reported that supply-chain disruptions significantly affected accommodation operations, particularly in securing food items, cleaning materials, and other essential

supplies. Movement restrictions, quarantine checkpoints, and limited transportation services disrupted normal procurement cycles, leading to delays and occasional shortages. As one participant stated,

“there were no deliveries from our suppliers” (P4),

while another noted

“delayed delivery of ingredients because of quarantine restrictions” (P18),

illustrating how external mobility controls interrupted supply continuity.

Recent hospitality and supply chain research from 2023–2026 confirms that tourism-related enterprises experienced procurement bottlenecks due to logistics constraints and restricted inter-regional transport systems (Hasanein et al., 2026). Digital agility and coordinated supply chain management were found to mitigate some of these disruptions; however, establishments lacking integrated digital systems faced greater operational instability. Similarly, workforce resilience studies highlight that fragmented coordination between suppliers, operators, and regulators intensified vulnerability during crisis periods (Robinson et al., 2025).

From a resilience perspective, these supply interruptions reflect weakened supply chain agility (responsiveness) and limited supply chain resilience (recovery capacity). Accommodation enterprises dependent on external suppliers without contingency sourcing strategies were particularly exposed to disruption.

In terms of sustainable development alignment, this theme is closely linked to SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production), as supply instability disrupts efficient resource management and increases the risk of waste or spoilage. It also relates to SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure), since robust logistics systems and digital coordination platforms enhance supply chain continuity during systemic shocks.

Collectively, the Table 3 demonstrates that these challenges are interrelated and multidimensional, affecting organizational, financial, operational, human resource, and supply chain resilience. It further highlights the alignment of these disruptions with key Sustainable Development Goals—particularly SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure), SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production), and SDG 16 (Strong Institutions)—emphasizing that enterprise resilience is embedded within broader economic and institutional systems.

Recovery strategies of accommodation-sector TREs

This subsection analyzes the recovery strategies adapted by accommodation-sector TREs in response to pandemic-induced disruptions. The strategies reflect adaptive practices across

TABLE 3 Summary of key challenges encountered by accommodation-sector TREs during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Theme	Nature of disruption	Resilience dimension	Supporting literature	SDG alignment	Implication for study
Theme 1: business disruptions due to lockdowns and travel restrictions	Temporary closure, restricted mobility, reduced occupancy	Organizational and operational resilience; institutional resilience	Robinson et al. (2025); Hasanein et al. (2026)—policy shocks affect hospitality stability	SDG 8 (decent work and economic growth); SDG 16 (strong institutions)	Need for adaptive leadership and policy-responsive operational systems
Theme 2: loss of profit and return on investment	Revenue decline, ROI stagnation, capital erosion	Financial resilience; transformational resilience	Hasanein et al. (2026)—financial resilience linked to business model adaptation	SDG 8; SDG 9 (industry and innovation)	Financial sustainability requires innovation and strategic repositioning
Theme 3: difficulty meeting operational expenses	Liquidity constraints, wage delays, debt exposure	Financial and human resource resilience	Robinson et al. (2025); Hasanein et al. (2026)—workforce and financial adaptability influence recovery	SDG 8; SDG 9	Strengthening liquidity buffers and HR support systems enhances resilience
Theme 4: delayed supply delivery	Logistics interruption, supplier dependency, procurement delays	Operational and supply chain resilience; digital resilience	Hasanein et al. (2026)—digital agility strengthens supply chain resilience	SDG 9; SDG 12 (responsible consumption and production)	Diversified sourcing and digital coordination systems are critical

institutional, digital, organizational, and psychological dimensions of resilience.

Theme 1: adherence to safety and health protocols

Strict compliance with safety and health protocols emerged as the primary recovery strategy among participants. Accommodation enterprises emphasized that adherence to government-mandated guidelines was essential to resume operations and gradually restore customer confidence. As one participant stated,

“we had no choice but to strictly follow the protocols to continue operating” (P2),

underscoring the regulatory pressure to comply. Similarly, another participant noted,

“when we practiced the health protocols, guests slowly started coming back” (P1),

indicating that visible safety measures positively influenced guest perceptions and demand recovery.

These findings align with resilience scholarship emphasizing that crisis response requires structured coping mechanisms embedded within organizational routines (Duchek, 2020). Compliance with health protocols reflects the coping and adaptation stages of resilience, where firms adjust internal processes to external environmental constraints. In tourism contexts, crisis management and operational restructuring have

been identified as necessary mechanisms for restoring trust and stabilizing performance (Sigala, 2020).

Furthermore, recent hospitality research highlights that organizational resilience improves performance when mediated by structured change processes (Triatmanto and Wahyuni, 2020). In this regard, adherence to health and safety standards can be interpreted as an organizational change initiative that strengthens operational legitimacy and stakeholder confidence. Workforce-level studies also indicate that alignment between enterprises and regulatory frameworks enhances system stability during crisis periods (Robinson et al., 2025).

From a sustainable development perspective, this theme aligns with SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), as compliance enabled businesses to reopen and retain employment. It also supports SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions), since institutional coordination and regulatory adherence were essential for safe operational resumption.

Overall, adherence to safety and health protocols functioned not merely as regulatory compliance but as a structured resilience mechanism that facilitated operational continuity, institutional alignment, and gradual demand recovery within the accommodation sector.

Theme 2: leveraging social media as a marketing tool

Participants increasingly relied on social media to maintain visibility and attract guests during and after operational disruptions. Short excerpts such as

“we keep posting on Facebook to attract customers” (P17) and “we created a Facebook page to promote the resort” (P2)

illustrate how digital platforms became central to their recovery strategies. Rather than relying solely on traditional walk-in demand or travel agents, accommodation enterprises shifted toward online engagement to sustain market presence amid mobility restrictions.

Within the resilience literature contained in the uploaded sources, this shift can be interpreted through the lens of digital agility, defined as the capability to sense, seize, and reconfigure digital resources in response to environmental change (Hasanein et al., 2026). In hospitality supply chain contexts, digital agility has been shown to enhance both agility and resilience, suggesting that digital engagement is not merely promotional but forms part of a broader adaptive capability. Thus, the use of social media by participants reflects an operationalization of digital agility at the firm level.

Moreover, crisis-related tourism research emphasizes that digital transformation became a key mechanism for sustaining communication, rebuilding customer trust, and facilitating service continuity during systemic disruption (Sigala, 2020). In this regard, social media platforms functioned as channels for real-time updates, transparency, and reassurance, thereby supporting gradual demand recovery. Organizational learning studies further indicate that resilience strengthens when knowledge and environmental feedback are translated into innovative practices (Salam et al., 2026). The strategic use of social media represents such an innovation-driven adaptation.

From a sustainable development perspective, this theme aligns primarily with SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure), as digital engagement reflects the integration of technology into business operations and market systems. Additionally, by supporting business continuity and competitiveness, it reinforces SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth).

Overall, leveraging social media evolved from a supplementary marketing tactic into a strategic resilience mechanism, enabling accommodation enterprises to reconfigure customer engagement processes and sustain competitiveness within a digitally mediated tourism environment.

Theme 3: maintaining clear, open, and collective communication

Clear internal communication played a central role in facilitating operational adjustments and staff coordination during the recovery phase. Participants emphasized regular meetings, inclusive discussions, and structured orientation processes to ensure smooth transitions. As one participant shared,

“the staff were involved in planning and discussions” (P18),

while another noted,

“we oriented employees on new protocols before reopening” (P3).

These accounts demonstrate that communication was not merely informational but participatory, reinforcing shared understanding and collective responsibility.

Consistent with recent hospitality research within the uploaded sources, organizational learning and innovation capability significantly strengthen resilience when knowledge is shared and translated into adaptive practices (Salam et al., 2026). Inclusive communication fosters this learning environment by aligning employees with evolving operational requirements. Moreover, multi-level resilience research highlights that workforce stability depends on coordinated action among employees, managers, and institutions, particularly during prolonged uncertainty (Robinson et al., 2025). Transparent communication, therefore, supports psychological stability, reduces ambiguity, and sustains engagement amid crisis conditions.

In addition, digital capability further enhances communication effectiveness. Digital agility—conceptualized as the capacity to sense and reconfigure digital resources, strengthens coordination mechanisms and organizational responsiveness (Hasanein et al., 2026). When integrated into internal communication systems, digital platforms facilitate real-time updates, protocol dissemination, and coordinated decision-making.

From a sustainable development perspective, this theme aligns primarily with SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), as transparent and inclusive communication strengthens employee engagement and workforce retention. It also indirectly supports SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) by reinforcing governance coherence and accountability within organizational structures.

Overall, maintaining clear, open, and collective communication evolved from a short-term coordination tool into a structural component of organizational resilience, enabling accommodation enterprises to sustain adaptive capacity and workforce stability in volatile environments.

Theme 4: displaying and nurturing a positive mindset and attitude

Finally, participants emphasized optimism, shared purpose, and empathy as critical motivational forces during prolonged uncertainty. As one participant shared,

“positive thinking and teamwork helped us survive” (P3),

while another reflected,

“serving customers and helping the community keeps us motivated” (P16).

These narratives suggest that psychological strength and collective morale functioned as intangible yet powerful buffers against operational and financial strain.

Within the uploaded literature, resilience is conceptualized not only as structural capability but also as a human-centered

process unfolding through anticipation, coping, and adaptation (Duchek, 2020). Psychological resources such as optimism and collective efficacy reinforce these stages by sustaining engagement and proactive behavior during adversity. Similarly, workforce resilience research highlights that employee-level adaptation interacts dynamically with organizational and institutional contexts, forming virtuous cycles that stabilize enterprises during crisis (Robinson et al., 2025). Thus, positive mindset and teamwork operate as relational resources that enhance systemic resilience.

Furthermore, organizational learning and innovation capability studies demonstrate that adaptive capacity strengthens when employees remain motivated, engaged, and open to change (Salam et al., 2026). In this sense, optimism and shared purpose facilitate knowledge exchange, problem-solving, and strategic flexibility, core components of long-term resilience.

From a sustainable development perspective, these human-centered practices align directly with SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) by embedding employee well-being, engagement, and workforce stability into enterprise sustainability strategies. Additionally, cultivating adaptive mindsets strengthens preparedness for future disruptions, indirectly supporting SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) by contributing to stable and resilient local tourism ecosystems.

Overall, nurturing a positive mindset and attitude transcended individual morale; it functioned as an organizational resource that reinforced collective adaptability, sustained motivation, and long-term resilience in the accommodation sector.

The recovery strategies summarized in Table 4 demonstrate that accommodation-sector TREs in Surigao del Sur did not rely on singular coping mechanisms but instead mobilized multidimensional resilience capabilities spanning institutional, digital, organizational, and psychological domains. Notably, compliance with safety protocols evolved from reactive crisis management into a permanent service-quality standard anchored in institutional legitimacy and community trust. Simultaneously, digital agility—particularly through social media engagement—emerged as a structural driver of competitiveness,

enabling provincial MSMEs to maintain market visibility and integrate into broader Smart Tourism ecosystems. Internally, the institutionalization of transparent communication and participatory leadership strengthened organizational cohesion, while the cultivation of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) reinforced adaptive mindsets essential for navigating prolonged uncertainty. Collectively, these findings indicate that post-pandemic resilience in accommodation enterprises is characterized not merely by operational survival but by strategic transformation. Moreover, the convergence of these recovery practices advances SDG 8 through employment continuity and enterprise sustainability, SDG 11 by stabilizing local tourism ecosystems, and SDG 13 by embedding adaptive capacity into organizational systems. Thus, resilience in this context functions as both a firm-level capability and a territorial development mechanism supporting inclusive and sustainable tourism recovery.

Conclusion and recommendations

This study examined the challenges and recovery strategies of accommodation-sector tourism-related establishments (TREs) in Surigao del Sur during the COVID-19 pandemic, offering context-specific evidence on how small and medium-sized enterprises respond to prolonged systemic shocks. The findings reveal that the pandemic triggered interconnected operational disruptions, financial distress, labor instability, and supply-chain interruptions that collectively threatened business continuity. These disruptions extended beyond firm-level impacts, cascading into local service ecosystems and exposing the structural vulnerability of tourism-dependent economies.

Despite these constraints, accommodation-sector TREs demonstrated adaptive capacity through institutional compliance, digital engagement, organizational coordination, and human-centered practices. Adherence to safety protocols restored operational legitimacy and consumer trust; social media

TABLE 4 Summary of recovery strategies adopted by accommodation-sector TREs.

Theme	Core strategy	Resilience dimension	Supporting source(s)	SDG alignment	Strategic implication
Theme 1: adherence to safety and health protocols	Regulatory compliance and visible safety measures	Organizational and institutional resilience	Duchek, 2020; Triatmanto and Wahyuni, 2020; Robinson et al., 2025	SDG 8; SDG 16	Compliance builds legitimacy, trust, and operational continuity
Theme 2: leveraging social media as a marketing tool	Digital visibility and customer	Digital and innovation resilience	Hasanein et al., 2026; Salam et al., 2026; Sigala, 2020	SDG 9; SDG 8	Digital agility sustains competitiveness and recovery
Theme 3: clear, open, and collective communication	Inclusive leadership and structured communication	Human resource and organizational resilience	Salam et al., 2026; Robinson et al., 2025; Duchek, 2020	SDG 8; SDG 16	Transparent communication strengthens workforce stability
Theme 4: positive mindset and attitude	Psychological resilience and collective morale	Human resource and transformational resilience	Duchek, 2020; Robinson et al., 2025; Salam et al., 2026	SDG 8; SDG 11	Psychological capital enhances adaptive capacity

utilization reflected digital agility that sustained visibility and market access; participatory communication strengthened workforce cohesion; and positive leadership orientation reinforced psychological resilience. These responses confirm that resilience in the accommodation sector is multidimensional and processual, emerging from the interaction of leadership capability, organizational learning, digital adaptation, and institutional alignment.

Theoretically, this study advances tourism resilience literature by empirically illustrating how crisis conditions function not merely as temporary disruptions but as catalysts for organizational learning and transformation. The findings extend multidimensional resilience frameworks by demonstrating that financial recovery is insufficient without complementary investments in digital capability, workforce well-being, and institutional embeddedness. By situating enterprise adaptation within a sustainable development framework, the study highlights how resilience contributes simultaneously to SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) through employment continuity, SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) through stabilization of local tourism systems, and SDG 13 (Climate Action) through strengthened adaptive capacity to systemic shocks.

The findings suggest that resilience in the accommodation sector must be institutionalized as a long-term strategic orientation rather than treated as a temporary response to crisis. For accommodation-sector owners and managers, this entails embedding crisis preparedness and business continuity planning into regular operational systems. Enterprises should strengthen financial risk monitoring and liquidity management practices to improve buffering capacity during revenue volatility. Sustained digital engagement—particularly through structured online marketing and customer communication platforms—should be maintained beyond the recovery phase to reinforce competitiveness and adaptive flexibility. Equally important is investment in workforce resilience through cross-training, employee well-being initiatives, and participatory leadership practices that promote transparency and shared responsibility. By integrating these measures into everyday management routines, enterprises can enhance both short-term stability and long-term sustainability.

For policymakers and local government units, the results underscore the importance of creating enabling institutional environments that support firm-level resilience. Targeted capacity-building programs focusing on digital readiness, crisis management, and sustainable operational practices are particularly critical for small and medium-sized accommodation enterprises. Streamlined regulatory procedures, clear compliance guidelines, and coordinated communication between tourism authorities and local government units can reduce administrative burdens during crisis periods. Moreover, accessible and well-targeted financial assistance mechanisms can help mitigate liquidity constraints and prevent enterprise closures. Strengthened collaboration among public institutions, tourism stakeholders, and industry associations will further reinforce coordinated recovery efforts.

Collectively, these policy and managerial interventions contribute to inclusive economic recovery under SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), strengthen local tourism ecosystems consistent with SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities), and enhance preparedness for future systemic and climate-related risks

aligned with SDG 13 (Climate Action). By aligning enterprise-level strategies with institutional support mechanisms, accommodation-sector TREs can transition from reactive crisis management toward sustained, transformative resilience.

The study is geographically confined to Surigao del Sur, limiting transferability to other contexts. Its qualitative design emphasizes depth over generalizability, and retrospective accounts may introduce recall bias. Future research should undertake comparative and longitudinal studies across regions to examine how resilience strategies evolve over time. Mixed-method approaches integrating financial, employment, and digital performance indicators would strengthen empirical validation. Moreover, deeper exploration of tourism resilience in relation to climate-related risks would enhance integration with SDG 13 and support more comprehensive sustainable tourism frameworks.

Therefore, conclude, the findings demonstrate that accommodation-sector resilience arises from the dynamic interplay of proactive managerial action and supportive institutional environments. By embedding adaptive strategies into long-term routines, tourism enterprises can move beyond crisis survival toward sustainable transformation to strengthening enterprise viability, supporting inclusive local recovery, and advancing sustainable development objectives.

Data availability statement

The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to confidentiality and ethical restrictions, as they contain sensitive qualitative interview data from participants. However, anonymized data may be made available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request and subject to ethical considerations. Requests to access the datasets should be directed to jgrefalde@nemsu.edu.ph.

Ethics statement

Ethical approval was not required for the studies involving humans in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. The participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

Author contributions

JG: Data curation, Validation, Conceptualization, Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Writing – review & editing, Investigation, Resources, Writing – original draft, Software, Formal analysis, Visualization, Funding acquisition.

Funding

The author(s) declared that financial support was not received for this work and/or its publication.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared that this work was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement

The author(s) declared that generative AI was not used in the creation of this manuscript.

Any alternative text (alt text) provided alongside figures in this article has been generated by Frontiers with the support of

artificial intelligence and reasonable efforts have been made to ensure accuracy, including review by the authors wherever possible. If you identify any issues, please contact us.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References

- Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis. *Qual. Res. Psychol.* 18, 328–352. doi: 10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238
- Creswell, J. W., and Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches, 4th Edn.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: a capability-based conceptualization. *Bus. Res.* 13, 215–246. doi: 10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7
- Guest, G., Namey, E., and Mitchell, M. (2014). *Collecting Qualitative Data: A Field Manual for Applied Research.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications. doi: 10.4135/9781506374680
- Hasanein, A. M., Khairy, H. A., Aljoghaiman, A., and Al-Romeedy, B. S. (2026). Tackling supply chain disruptions through digital agility: evidence from the hotel industry. *Logistics* 10:34. doi: 10.3390/logistics10020034
- Huang, A., Makridis, C., Baker, M., Medeiros, M., and Guo, Z. (2020). Understanding the impact of COVID-19 intervention policies on the hospitality labor market. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* 91:102660. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102660
- Prayag, G. (2023). Tourism resilience in the “new normal”: beyond jingle and jangle fallacies. *J. Travel Res.* 62, 3–15. doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2023.02.006
- Robinson, R. N. S., Jiang, Y., and Yan, H. (2025). Tourism workforce resilience in crisis: paradox dynamics across multi-level actors. *J. Travel Res.* 64, 1–19. doi: 10.1177/00472875251370385
- Salam, R., Raharjo, K., Arifin, Z., and Iqbal, M. (2026). Antecedents of business resilience in hospitality industry: the role of organizational learning and innovation capability. *Cogent Soc. Sci.* 12:2603573. doi: 10.1080/23311886.2025.2603573
- Sigala, M. (2020). Tourism and COVID-19: impacts and implications for advancing and resetting industry and research. *J. Bus. Res.* 117, 312–321. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.06.015
- Triatmanto, B., and Wahyuni, N. (2020). The mediating role of organisational change on the impact of organisational resilience on the performance of hospitality industry organisations in Indonesia. *Int. J. Innov. Creat. Change* 13, 268–282.