# Post-Pandemic Adaptation Strategies in Sustainable Tourism: Financial Market Reactions and Investor Perceptions

Hanh Thi PHAM *

Posted Date: 30 June 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1

Keywords: Post-COVID-19 Pandemic; Adaptation Strategies; Sustainable Tourism Management; Market Valuation; Technological Integration

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



*Article*

# Post-Pandemic Adaptation Strategies in Sustainable Tourism: Financial Market Reactions and Investor Perceptions

**Hanh Thi Pham**

Dr., Head, Department of Tourism, Faculty of Business Administration, Vietnam Women's Academy, Hanoi, Vietnam; hanh.pham@hvpnvn.edu.vn; Tel.: 84939013689

**Abstract**

The COVID-19 pandemic acted as a critical juncture for the global tourism sector, compelling a structural re-evaluation of its long-term viability and accelerating the imperative for sustainable management practices. This study provides a rigorous quantitative assessment of the financial market's valuation of specific post-pandemic adaptation strategies adopted by tourism firms. Employing an econometric event study methodology on a global sample of publicly listed tourism and hospitality firms from 2020 to 2023, we analyze the stock price reactions to announcements related to four key strategic pillars: sustainability-driven policies, technological integration, community empowerment, and crisis management frameworks. Our empirical results indicate statistically significant positive cumulative abnormal returns (CARs) for firms announcing substantive green infrastructure investments and digital transformation initiatives, suggesting strong investor confidence in these resilience pathways. Conversely, market reaction to community-based and cultural preservation announcements, while positive, is less pronounced and exhibits higher volatility. The analysis quantifies the value-creation potential of different adaptation strategies, offering critical, data-driven insights for policymakers and corporate strategists seeking to align financial performance with sustainable development goals in the post-pandemic era.

**Keywords:** post-COVID-19 pandemic; adaptation strategies; sustainable tourism management; market valuation; technological integration

## 1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic represents the most severe disruption in the history of modern global tourism. Unlike previous shocks, such as geopolitical conflicts, economic recessions, or localized health crises, the pandemic precipitated a near-total and simultaneous cessation of international and domestic travel, exposing the profound structural vulnerabilities of an industry built on mobility and human interaction. The immediate economic consequences were staggering, with unprecedented declines in tourist arrivals, revenue, and employment [1]. However, beyond the immediate financial devastation, the pandemic served as a critical inflection point, a global "great pause" that forced a fundamental reckoning with the prevailing models of tourism development. Pre-existing concerns regarding overtourism, environmental degradation, social inequality, and a lack of resilience were magnified, creating an undeniable imperative to "build back better" [2]. This has catalyzed a global discourse centered on transitioning towards more sustainable, resilient, and equitable forms of tourism management.

While the conceptual and normative arguments for sustainable tourism have been well-established for decades, the post-pandemic landscape has shifted this conversation from a niche concern to a central strategic priority. Policymakers, industry leaders, and local communities are now actively grappling with how to implement tangible adaptation strategies that can withstand future systemic shocks while fostering long-term ecological and social well-being [3]. The response has been

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



multifaceted, encompassing a spectrum of initiatives that can be broadly categorized into four strategic pillars. *First,* there is a renewed emphasis on **sustainability-driven policies**, including investments in green infrastructure, the adoption of renewable energy, and the implementation of circular economy principles to reduce the sector's carbon footprint [4,5]. *Second,* the pandemic has dramatically accelerated **technological integration**, with firms adopting digital tools for marketing, operations, and guest experiences to enhance efficiency and safety, thereby bolstering operational resilience [6,7].

Third, the crisis highlighted the critical importance of a "social license to operate," leading to a focus on **community empowerment**. Strategies in this domain aim to deepen the involvement of local stakeholders in planning and governance, ensuring a more equitable distribution of tourism's benefits and fostering culturally sensitive development [2,8]. Fourth, the experience has underscored the necessity of robust **crisis management and recovery frameworks**. This involves developing proactive risk assessment protocols, adaptive governance structures, and diversified economic models to mitigate the impacts of future disruptions, whether from pandemics, climate change, or other unforeseen events [2,9]. These pillars, while distinct, are interconnected, forming the basis of a new paradigm for post-pandemic tourism management.

Despite a growing body of literature documenting these strategic shifts, much of the research remains qualitative, descriptive, or focused on specific case studies [10]. A significant and critical gap persists in the quantitative assessment of these strategies' effectiveness from a financial and investment perspective. While it is widely *assumed* that adopting sustainable and resilient practices is beneficial in the long run, there is a scarcity of rigorous empirical evidence that quantifies how financial markets—and by extension, investors—value these specific corporate actions. Do shareholders reward firms for announcing investments in green technologies? Is there a measurable, positive stock price reaction to the implementation of advanced digital systems or community partnership programs? Or are these initiatives perceived as costly endeavors that detract from short-term profitability? Answering these questions is paramount for creating a compelling business case for sustainability that resonates in the boardroom and influences capital allocation.

This paper addresses this critical gap by employing a rigorous econometric event study methodology to analyze the financial market's valuation of post-pandemic adaptation strategies in the global tourism sector. Our primary research question is: **How do capital markets react to corporate announcements of specific adaptation strategies related to sustainability, technology, community, and crisis management?** We investigate this by examining the abnormal stock returns of publicly listed tourism and hospitality firms in the immediate aftermath of such announcements. We further seek to disentangle the relative market valuation of different strategies, asking, for instance, whether investors prize technological resilience more highly than environmental sustainability or community engagement. This approach allows us to move beyond normative assertions and provide data-driven evidence on the strategies that create—or are perceived to create—shareholder value.

The contribution of this research is threefold. *First*, we contribute to the sustainable tourism literature by providing one of the first large-scale, quantitative financial assessments of post-pandemic adaptation strategies. We bridge the divide between qualitative management studies and quantitative financial economics, offering a new lens through which to evaluate the efficacy of sustainable practices. *Second*, we provide invaluable insights for tourism industry executives and corporate strategists. By quantifying the market's reaction, our findings can inform investment decisions, help justify expenditures on sustainability initiatives to shareholders, and guide the strategic prioritization of resources in a post-pandemic world. *Third*, the results have significant implications for policymakers. Evidence of a positive market response to certain sustainable strategies can help justify the creation of public policies, subsidies, and regulatory frameworks that incentivize private-sector adoption of these value-enhancing and resilience-building practices.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 3 provides a comprehensive review of the relevant literature. Section 4 describes the data sources and presents descriptive statistics.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



Section 5 outlines the theoretical framework and develops our core hypotheses. Section 6 details the event study methodology. Section 7 presents the empirical results, including the analysis of abnormal returns and risk metrics. Section 8 conducts a series of robustness checks and extensions. Section 9 discusses the findings in the context of the broader literature, and Section 10 outlines the policy and practical implications. Finally, Section 11 concludes with a summary of the research and suggests avenues for future inquiry.

## 2. Literature Review

The discourse on post-pandemic tourism recovery is situated at the intersection of crisis management, sustainable development, and corporate finance. This review synthesizes insights from these domains to establish the theoretical and empirical context for our study. We first examine the structural impacts of the COVID-19 crisis on the tourism sector, then detail the emergent strategic adaptations, connect these to the overarching challenge of climate change, and finally, review the application of event study methodology in assessing the market valuation of corporate strategies, thereby identifying the critical research gap this paper aims to fill.

**The Pandemic as a Structural Break and Catalyst for Change**

The COVID-19 pandemic was not merely a cyclical downturn but a systemic shock that triggered a profound re-evaluation of the global tourism model. The literature extensively documents the immediate and devastating economic consequences, including sharp declines in international arrivals, widespread business closures, and massive job losses, with destinations heavily reliant on tourism being disproportionately affected [1]. Beyond the immediate economic toll, scholars argue that the pandemic acted as a "great revealer," exposing and exacerbating pre-existing structural vulnerabilities such as over-reliance on a narrow set of source markets, the negative externalities of overtourism, precarious labor conditions, and the fragility of long, complex supply chains [2]. This crisis has consequently catalyzed a paradigm shift, moving the conversation from a focus on sheer growth to one centered on resilience, sustainability, and equity. The dominant narrative emerging from academic and policy circles is the call to "build back better," which eschews a return to the pre-pandemic status quo in favor of a transformative recovery aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals [3].

**Key Pillars of Post-Pandemic Adaptation Strategies**

The response to this call has manifested in a suite of adaptation strategies, which the literature broadly groups into four interconnected pillars.

*First*, **Sustainability-Driven Policies and Investments** have gained significant traction. This represents a move beyond superficial "greenwashing" towards substantive changes in operational and strategic models. Research highlights the enactment of policies aimed at reducing the sector's carbon footprint, promoting circular economy principles, and conserving biodiversity [4]. A key component of this pillar is direct investment in green infrastructure, such as the development of eco-friendly accommodations, the integration of renewable energy sources into hotel operations, and the promotion of sustainable transportation systems. These initiatives are not only presented as environmentally responsible but are increasingly framed as long-term investments that enhance destination attractiveness and reduce operational risks associated with resource scarcity and climate change [5,11,12].

*Second*, the pandemic has been a powerful catalyst for **Technological Integration**. Lockdowns, social distancing mandates, and health concerns necessitated a rapid pivot to digital solutions. The literature documents a widespread adoption of technologies across the tourism value chain, including sophisticated digital marketing to reach new domestic audiences, contactless services (e.g., online check-in, mobile room keys), dynamic online booking systems, and the use of data analytics to understand shifting consumer preferences and optimize operations [6]. These technologies are increasingly viewed not just as tools for efficiency but as essential components of operational

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



resilience, enabling firms to adapt quickly to changing market conditions and enhance customer trust [7].

*Third*, there is a renewed emphasis on **Community Empowerment and Cultural Preservation**. The crisis underscored the dangers of a tourism model that alienates or marginalizes local populations. Consequently, post-pandemic strategies increasingly focus on enhancing community involvement in tourism planning, governance, and benefit-sharing [2]. This involves fostering local entrepreneurship, prioritizing local sourcing in supply chains, and ensuring that tourism development aligns with the cultural and social fabric of the destination [8]. This pillar also includes a renewed focus on the preservation and authentic promotion of local culture and heritage, moving away from commodification towards experiences that support community identity and well-being [10,13].

*Fourth*, the development of robust **Crisis Management and Recovery Frameworks** has become a strategic priority. The ad-hoc responses seen in early 2020 have given way to more formalized approaches to risk management. Research in this area emphasizes the importance of building adaptive capacity through proactive risk assessment, scenario planning, stakeholder collaboration, and the establishment of flexible governance structures that can be activated during a crisis [9]. These frameworks aim to enhance the entire sector's resilience to a wide array of future shocks, including but not limited to pandemics [2].

**The Overlapping Crisis: Climate Change and Tourism Adaptation**

The push for post-pandemic adaptation does not occur in a vacuum; it is deeply intertwined with the ongoing climate crisis. Climate change poses significant, long-term threats to tourism assets, particularly in vulnerable coastal and mountain regions. The literature highlights how rising sea levels and coastal erosion threaten beach resorts, while changing snow patterns and glacier retreat jeopardize the viability of ski tourism [14]. Adaptation strategies, therefore, must address both pandemic-induced and climate-induced risks. In this context, sustainable management practices, such as reducing carbon emissions and investing in green infrastructure, serve a dual purpose: they contribute to global climate mitigation efforts and enhance the long-term resilience of tourism destinations [4]. Similarly, diversifying tourism products, for example, by promoting summer activities in mountain resorts, is a direct response to climate-related challenges [15].

**Event Study Methodology and the Research Gap**

While the qualitative and case-study-based literature provides a rich description of these adaptation strategies, it often lacks a rigorous, generalizable assessment of their financial viability. This is where financial economics, and specifically the event study methodology, offers a powerful analytical tool. Grounded in the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH), which posits that asset prices fully reflect all available information, event studies measure the impact of a specific event (e.g., a corporate announcement) by analyzing abnormal stock returns around the event date [16]. A significant abnormal return is interpreted as the market's valuation of the new information contained in the announcement.

This methodology has been applied in the hospitality and tourism literature to assess the financial impact of various external shocks, such as terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and disease outbreaks, consistently finding significant negative impacts on firm value. However, the application of event studies to evaluate firm-initiated *strategic responses*to crises is far less developed. While some studies have examined the value of corporate social responsibility (CSR) announcements in other sectors, there is a distinct lack of research that systematically quantifies the market's reaction to the specific, multifaceted adaptation strategies emerging in the post-pandemic tourism landscape. We do not know, for instance, whether investors perceive an announcement of investment in a renewable energy project with the same enthusiasm as an announcement of a new digital platform. It is this critical empirical gap—the lack of quantitative evidence on the shareholder value creation of specific post-pandemic sustainability and resilience strategies—that our research directly addresses. By

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



applying a rigorous event study framework, we move beyond describing *what* firms are doing to quantifying *how* these actions are valued by the market.

## 3. Data and Descriptive Statistics

This section details the data sources, the systematic process for sample selection and event identification, and presents descriptive statistics for the firms and events analyzed in this study. The construction of our unique dataset is fundamental to the econometric analysis that follows.

### *3.1. Data Sources and Sample Construction*

The empirical analysis requires two primary types of data: (1) financial market data for a global sample of publicly traded tourism and hospitality firms, and (2) event data corresponding to corporate announcements of specific post-pandemic adaptation strategies.

#### 3.1.1. Financial Data

We source daily stock price data and firm-specific financial information from the Refinitiv Eikon database. Our initial sample comprises all publicly listed firms globally classified under the Global Industry Classification Standard (GICS) sub-industries of "Hotels, Resorts & Cruise Lines" (Code: 25301010) and "Airlines" (Code: 20301010). These sectors represent the core of the tourism industry and were among the most directly and severely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. To ensure data quality and liquidity, we apply several screening criteria. First, firms must have continuous daily stock price data available for the full study period, which spans from January 1, 2020, to December 31, 2023. This period captures the onset of the pandemic, the primary response phase, and the subsequent recovery and adaptation period. Second, we require firms to have a market capitalization exceeding US$50 million at the beginning of the study period to exclude highly illiquid micro-cap stocks whose price movements may be sporadic and not reflective of market information processing. Third, firms with more than 20% of non-trading days during the estimation window are excluded. After applying these filters, our final sample consists of 215 unique firms across 38 countries. For each firm, we collect daily closing stock prices, adjusted for splits and dividends, and the corresponding daily values of the MSCI All Country World Index (ACWI), which serves as the market benchmark for calculating abnormal returns.

#### 3.1.2. Event Identification and Classification

The central challenge of this study is the identification of specific, non-confounding corporate announcements related to our four pillars of post-pandemic adaptation. A simple keyword search is insufficient, as it often captures generic statements or non-substantive information. Therefore, we employ a rigorous, multi-step manual collection and verification process.

We systematically search the Factiva news database, which aggregates global news sources, company press releases, and regulatory filings. The search is conducted for each of the 215 firms in our sample over the period from March 11, 2020 (the date the WHO declared COVID-19 a pandemic) to December 31, 2023. We developed a detailed protocol with specific keywords for each of the four strategic pillars:

(1) **Sustainability-Driven Initiatives:** Keywords included "sustainability strategy," "green investment," "carbon neutral," "net-zero commitment," "renewable energy project," "eco-certified," "circular economy," and "science-based targets."

(2) **Technological Integration:** Keywords included "digital transformation," "contactless technology," "AI implementation," "data analytics platform," "guest app," "booking system upgrade," and "automation."

(3) **Community Empowerment:** Keywords included "community-based tourism," "local sourcing initiative," "indigenous partnership," "cultural heritage preservation," "community benefit agreement," and "equitable tourism."

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



(4) **Crisis Management Frameworks:** Keywords included "resilience plan," "crisis management team," "risk mitigation framework," "adaptive governance," and "supply chain diversification."

The initial search yielded over 8,000 potential news items. Each item was then manually read and coded by two independent research assistants to ensure it met several strict criteria. The announcement had to: (a) represent a *new, specific, and voluntary* corporate action or commitment, not a reiteration of past initiatives; (b) be the first public announcement of the specific event; (c) be clearly attributable to the firm itself (e.g., a press release or CEO statement); and (d) not be confounded by other significant corporate news (e.g., earnings announcements, M&A activity, executive turnover) released within a three-day window [−1, +1] of the event date. Discrepancies in coding were resolved by a senior researcher. The date of the announcement published in Factiva was designated as the event date (t=0). If the announcement occurred on a non-trading day, the next trading day was used as t=0.

This meticulous process resulted in a final event sample of 588 distinct announcements across the 215 firms.

### *3.2. Variable Definitions*

- **Daily Stock Return (R_it):** The dependent variable is the continuously compounded daily return for firm *i* on day *t*, calculated as R_it = ln(P_it / P_it-1), where P_it is the closing price on day *t*.
- **Market Return (R_mt):** The return on the value-weighted MSCI ACWI on day *t*, calculated similarly.
- **Estimation Window:** We use a 205-day estimation window, from day t=-250 to t=-46, relative to the event date. This window is sufficiently long to provide stable parameter estimates for the market model while avoiding contamination from pre-event information leakage.
- **Event Window:** Our primary analysis uses a 21-day event window from t=-10 to t=+10. This window is wide enough to capture information leakage before the announcement and the market's post-announcement adjustment.

### *3.3. Descriptive Statistics*

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the 588 identified events by strategic pillar and year. The distribution reveals several notable trends. Announcements related to Technological Integration are the most frequent (n=212), peaking in 2021 as firms rushed to adapt operations to the new health and safety realities. Sustainability-Driven Initiatives also represent a substantial portion of the events (n=185), with a steady increase over the period, suggesting a durable strategic shift rather than a transient response. Announcements concerning Community Empowerment (n=98) and Crisis Management Frameworks (n=93) are less frequent, potentially reflecting their more complex, less easily communicable nature or a lower corporate priority compared to technology and marquee environmental projects.

**Table 1.** Distribution of Corporate Strategy Announcements by Pillar and Year.

| Year | Sustainability | Technology | Community | Crisis Mgt. | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2020 | 25 | 68 | 15 | 41 | 149 |
| 2021 | 48 | 81 | 26 | 28 | 183 |
| 2022 | 59 | 43 | 31 | 16 | 149 |
| 2023 | 53 | 20 | 26 | 8 | 107 |
| **Total** | **185** | **212** | **98** | **93** | **588** |

Source: Authors' compilation.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the financial characteristics of the 215 firms in our sample. The sample is characterized by large, established corporations, as indicated by the mean market capitalization of US 8.76 billion. The significant difference between the mean and median market capitalization (8.76 billion). The significant difference between the mean and median market capitalization (1.98 billion) suggests a right-skewed distribution, with a number of mega-cap firms (e.g., major hotel chains and legacy airlines) influencing the average. The firms exhibit moderate leverage on average (mean Debt-to-Equity of 0.65) and have a Price-to-Book ratio with a mean of 2.89, typical for the asset-intensive hospitality and airline industries. This profile of predominantly large, publicly accountable firms makes them ideal subjects for an event study, as they are closely monitored by the market and their stock prices are more likely to react efficiently to new information.

**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics of Sample Firms (N=215).

| Variable | Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Market Capitalization (US$ Billions) | 8.76 | 1.98 | 15.43 | 0.05 | 98.6 |
| Total Assets (US$ Billions) | 15.21 | 4.55 | 28.90 | 0.12 | 180.4 |
| Debt-to-Equity Ratio | 0.65 | 0.58 | 0.45 | 0.02 | 2.51 |
| Price-to-Book Ratio | 2.89 | 2.54 | 1.87 | 0.65 | 11.2 |
| Firm Age (Years) | 42.5 | 38.0 | 21.3 | 8.0 | 104.0 |

Source: Authors' compilation.

The data collected provide a robust foundation for testing our hypotheses. The granular, manually verified event data allow us to move beyond broad CSR measures and isolate the market's perception of specific, actionable strategies, while the comprehensive financial data

## 4. Theoretical Framework and Hypothesis Development

This section establishes the theoretical underpinnings of our study, drawing from finance, strategic management, and signaling theory to develop a set of testable hypotheses regarding the market valuation of post-pandemic adaptation strategies in the tourism sector. Our central premise is that corporate announcements of these strategies are not merely informational dispatches but are credible signals to investors about a firm's future prospects, risk profile, and management quality. The market's reaction, measured through abnormal stock returns, thus provides a powerful lens for assessing the perceived value of these strategic commitments.

### *4.1. Foundational Theories: EMH, Signaling, and the Resource-Based View*

*The theoretical basis* for this research rests on three pillars of modern corporate finance and strategy. The first is the **Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH)**, which posits that in an efficient market, asset prices fully and rapidly reflect all available public information [16]. In the context of our study, the public announcement of a new adaptation strategy represents new information. According to the EMH, the firm's stock price should adjust swiftly to incorporate the expected impact of this new strategy on its future cash flows and risk profile. Therefore, by analyzing stock price movements around the announcement date, we can infer the market's consensus valuation of the strategy's net present value.

*The second pillar* is **Signaling Theory** [17]. This theory suggests that in situations of information asymmetry—where corporate insiders (managers) have more information about the firm's quality and prospects than outsiders (investors)—managers can use credible actions to signal this private information to the market. A voluntary, costly, and verifiable corporate announcement, such as a multi-million-dollar investment in green infrastructure or the adoption of a new digital platform, serves as such a signal. A credible signal can reduce information asymmetry and lead investors to re-evaluate the firm's worth upwards. We posit that announcements of post-pandemic adaptation

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



strategies signal that the firm is proactive, resilient, and well-managed, thus possessing a higher quality than its less-adaptive peers.

*The third pillar* is the **Resource-Based View (RBV) of the firm** [18,19]. The RBV argues that sustainable competitive advantage stems from a firm's control over valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) resources and capabilities. We argue that the post-pandemic adaptation strategies under investigation are mechanisms for building such VRIN capabilities. For instance, proprietary contactless technology, a strong reputation for sustainability, or deep, trust-based relationships with local communities can be difficult for competitors to replicate and can generate superior long-term performance. Investors, recognizing the potential for these strategies to build durable competitive advantages, should reward firms that undertake them.

### *4.2. Hypothesis Development*

Integrating these theoretical perspectives, we formulate a primary hypothesis and several sub-hypotheses related to the specific pillars of adaptation. Our overarching hypothesis posits a generally positive market reception for firms demonstrating proactive adaptation.

**H1:** *Announcements of post-pandemic adaptation strategies by tourism firms are associated with positive abnormal stock returns.*

This general hypothesis is based on the premise that, in the highly uncertain post-pandemic environment, any credible signal of proactive adaptation and resilience-building is valued by investors. Such announcements reduce perceived risk and signal a higher likelihood of survival and long-term profitability, leading to a positive re-pricing of the firm's equity. We decompose this broad hypothesis to examine the distinct market reactions to each of the four strategic pillars.

**H1a:** *Announcements of Sustainability-Driven Initiatives are associated with positive abnormal stock returns.*

Investments in sustainability signal multiple benefits to the market. First, they indicate a long-term orientation and proactive management of physical and transitional risks associated with climate change [4], which is of increasing concern to institutional investors. Second, they can enhance brand reputation and attract a growing segment of environmentally conscious consumers and ESG-focused investors, potentially leading to increased revenues and a lower cost of capital. Third, they can lead to operational efficiencies through resource and energy savings [5]. Under signaling theory, such commitments signal superior management foresight and a commitment to long-term value creation over short-term profit maximization.

**H1b:** *Announcements of Technological Integration are associated with positive abnormal stock returns.*

This hypothesis is perhaps the most intuitive from a financial perspective. Investments in digital transformation, automation, and data analytics signal a direct path to enhanced operational efficiency, reduced labor costs, improved customer experience, and greater agility [6]. From an RBV perspective, a sophisticated and integrated technology stack can become a significant competitive advantage. For investors, the link between these technological upgrades and improved future cash flows is relatively clear and immediate. Furthermore, technology that enhances health and safety (e.g., contactless systems) directly addresses a primary consumer concern in the post-pandemic era, signaling a reduction in operational risk and a potential for market share gains.

**H1c:** *Announcements of Community Empowerment initiatives are associated with positive abnormal stock returns.*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



While the financial case may seem less direct, we hypothesize a positive market reaction based on stakeholder theory and risk management principles. Initiatives that empower local communities and preserve cultural heritage can build a strong "social license to operate," reducing the risk of local opposition, regulatory hurdles, and negative publicity [2,8]. They can also create unique, authentic, and inimitable tourism products, which command a price premium and build brand loyalty [13]. By signaling a commitment to equitable and stable operations, these announcements can be perceived by investors as a form of long-term risk mitigation and a strategy for building a more resilient business model.

**H1d:** *Announcements of formal Crisis Management and Recovery Frameworks are associated with positive abnormal stock returns.*

The formalization of crisis management strategies is a direct signal of enhanced corporate governance and risk management capabilities. By announcing a robust framework for dealing with future shocks, a firm signals to investors that it has learned from the pandemic and is better prepared to navigate future uncertainty [9]. According to modern portfolio theory, a reduction in a firm's idiosyncratic risk should, ceteris paribus, lower its cost of equity and increase its valuation. This hypothesis directly tests whether investors price in the value of managerial foresight and institutionalized resilience.

### *4.3. Comparative Strength of Market Reactions*

While we anticipate positive reactions across all four pillars, the magnitude of these reactions is unlikely to be uniform. The visibility, perceived cost, and immediacy of the expected financial benefits can differ substantially. This leads to our second major hypothesis, which concerns the relative strength of the market signals.

**H2:** *The magnitude of positive abnormal returns will be significantly greater for announcements related to Technological Integration (H1b) and Sustainability-Driven Initiatives (H1a) compared to those for Community Empowerment (H1c) and Crisis Management Frameworks (H1d).*

The rationale for this comparative hypothesis is rooted in the perceived tangibility and timing of the expected returns. The ROI from **technological investments** (e.g., cost savings from automation) is often easier for financial analysts to model and quantify. Similarly, large-scale **sustainability investments**, while costly, are increasingly viewed by capital markets as essential for mitigating clear and present ESG risks and for attracting dedicated pools of capital, making their value proposition clear. In contrast, the financial benefits from **community empowerment**—such as enhanced brand loyalty or reduced long-term political risk—are often "softer," less tangible, and accrue over a much longer time horizon. Likewise, the value of a **crisis management framework** is probabilistic and most apparent only in the event of a future crisis. Investors, who may have shorter investment horizons, are likely to place a higher premium on strategies with more immediate and quantifiable impacts on cash flow and risk. Therefore, we predict a hierarchy in the market's response, reflecting this calculus of tangibility and timing.

## 5. Methodology

This study employs a standard event study methodology to empirically test our hypotheses regarding the financial market's valuation of post-pandemic adaptation strategies. This approach is the most suitable tool for our research question as it is specifically designed to isolate and measure the economic impact of new, firm-specific information on shareholder wealth, grounded in the principles of the Efficient Market Hypothesis [16]. The methodology involves defining the event, establishing a model for normal stock returns, calculating abnormal returns during a specified event window, and performing statistical tests to assess their significance.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



*5.1. Event Definition and Timeline*

The "event" in this study is the first public announcement of a specific, voluntary corporate action related to one of the four strategic pillars: Sustainability-Driven Initiatives, Technological Integration, Community Empowerment, or Crisis Management Frameworks. The event date (denoted as *t*=0) is the day the announcement was published in the Factiva news database.

To conduct the analysis, we define two critical time periods for each of the 588 events in our sample:

**(1) Estimation Window:** This is the period over which we establish a baseline for "normal" stock price behavior for each firm. We define a 205-day estimation window, [t=-250, t=-46], relative to the event date. This period is sufficiently long to yield stable and reliable parameter estimates for our normal return model. By ending the window 46 days before the event, we minimize the risk of the parameter estimates being biased by pre-event information leakage or abnormal trading activity immediately preceding the announcement.

**(2) Event Window:** This is the period over which we measure the impact of the event. Our primary analysis utilizes a 21-day event window, [t=-10, t=+10]. This window is wide enough to capture potential information leakage in the days leading up to the announcement, the immediate market reaction on the event day, and any subsequent price adjustments as the market fully digests the information. Shorter event windows (e.g., [-1, +1,0, +1]) will be used in subsequent analyses to pinpoint the timing of the market reaction and for robustness checks.

*5.2. Modeling Normal Returns*

To measure the "abnormal" return caused by an event, one must first estimate what the "normal" return would have been in the absence of the event. We employ the standard market model for this purpose. The market model is a statistical model that relates the return of a given stock to the return of the overall market portfolio. It is less restrictive than asset pricing models like the CAPM and has been shown to be well-specified for event studies. The model is expressed as:

$$R\_it = \alpha\_i + \beta\_i * R\_mt + \varepsilon\_it$$

where:

- R_it is the continuously compounded return for firm *i* on day *t*.
- R_mt is the continuously compounded return on our market proxy, the MSCI All Country World Index (ACWI), on day *t*.
- $\alpha$_i and $\beta$_i are the firm-specific OLS parameters. $\beta$_i represents the systematic risk of firm *i*'s stock, while $\alpha$_i is the intercept.
- $\varepsilon$_it is the random error term for firm *i* on day *t*, with an expected value of zero.

For each of the 588 events, we estimate the parameters $\alpha$_i and $\beta$_i by running an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression using the daily return data from the 205-day estimation window.

*5.3. Calculation of Abnormal and Cumulative Abnormal Returns*

Using the estimated parameters from the market model, we calculate the abnormal return (AR) for each firm *i* for each day *t* within the event window. The AR is the difference between the actual observed return and the normal return predicted by the model:

$$AR\_it = R\_it - (\hat{\alpha}\_i + \hat{\beta}\_i * R\_mt)$$

where $\hat{\alpha}$_i and $\hat{\beta}$_i are the OLS estimates of the market model parameters.

To assess the total impact of the event over a period, we sum the daily abnormal returns to compute the Cumulative Abnormal Return (CAR) for each firm *i* over a specific interval [t1, t2] within the event window:

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



$$CAR_i(t1, t2) = \Sigma(\text{from } t=t1 \text{ to } t2)\ AR_{it}$$

To analyze the overall effect for our event samples, we average the individual abnormal returns across all N events in a given sample (e.g., all Sustainability announcements) to get the Average Abnormal Return (AAR) for each day *t* in the event window:

$$AAR_t = (1/N) * \Sigma(\text{from } i=1 \text{ to } N)\ AR_{it}$$

Similarly, we calculate the Cumulative Average Abnormal Return (CAAR) by summing the daily AARs over a given interval:

$$CAAR(t1, t2) = \Sigma(\text{from } t=t1 \text{ to } t2)\ AAR_t$$

*5.4. Statistical Significance Testing*

To determine whether the calculated AARs and CAARs are statistically different from zero, we conduct significance tests. Our null hypothesis is that the announcements have no effect on firm value (H0: CAAR = 0). We employ a standardized t-test, which is robust to event-induced increases in return volatility. The test statistic for the AAR on a given day *t* is calculated as:

$$t\_AAR_t = AAR_t / \sigma(AAR_t)$$

where $\sigma(AAR_t)$ is the cross-sectional standard deviation of the abnormal returns, estimated from the estimation window.

For the CAAR over the interval [t1, t2], the test statistic is calculated assuming the independence of daily AARs:

$$t\_CAAR = CAAR(t1, t2) / [\sigma(AAR) * sqrt(L)]$$

where L is the number of days in the event window (t2 - t1 + 1) and $\sigma(AAR)$ is the standard deviation of the time series of AARs during the estimation period. The significance of these t-statistics is evaluated using a standard t-distribution.

*5.5. Cross-Sectional Regression Analysis*

To directly test our second hypothesis (H2) regarding the comparative magnitude of the market reactions across the four strategic pillars, we employ a cross-sectional OLS regression framework. This model allows us to assess the impact of the announcement type on the cumulative abnormal return while controlling for other firm-specific factors that might influence the market's reaction. The model is specified as:

$$CAR_i[-1,+1] = \beta\_0 + \beta\_1 * TECH_i + \beta\_2 * SUSTAIN_i + \beta\_3 * COMMUNITY_i + \beta\_4 * Log(MktCap)_i + \beta\_5 * Leverage_i + \beta\_6 * P/B_i + \varepsilon_i$$

where:

- $CAR_i[-1,+1]$ is the three-day cumulative abnormal return for event *i*. We use this shorter window to focus on the core market reaction and reduce noise.
- TECH_i, SUSTAIN_i, and COMMUNITY_i are dummy variables equal to 1 if the announcement *i* falls into the Technology, Sustainability, or Community pillar, respectively, and 0 otherwise. The Crisis Management pillar serves as the omitted base category. The coefficients $\beta\_1$, $\beta\_2$, and $\beta\_3$ thus measure the differential market reaction for these pillars relative to a crisis management announcement.
- Log(MktCap)_i is the natural logarithm of the firm's market capitalization, controlling for firm size effects.
- Leverage_i is the firm's debt-to-equity ratio, controlling for financial risk.
- P/B_i is the firm's price-to-book ratio, controlling for growth opportunities and valuation.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



- ε_i is the regression error term.

The significance and signs of the coefficients on the dummy variables will provide direct evidence to either support or reject H2. For instance, a positive and significant β_1 would indicate that the market reacts more favorably to technology announcements than to crisis management announcements, controlling for other factors.

## 6. Empirical Results

This section presents the empirical findings from our event study analysis. We begin by examining the aggregate market reaction to all adaptation strategy announcements to test our main hypothesis (H1). Subsequently, we disaggregate the results by the four strategic pillars to test hypotheses H1a through H1d. Finally, we employ a cross-sectional regression model to formally test H2, which posits a differential market reaction based on the type of strategy announced.

### *6.1. Aggregate Market Reaction to Adaptation Strategies*

We first assess the overall impact of strategic adaptation announcements on shareholder wealth by pooling all 588 events. Table 3 presents the Cumulative Average Abnormal Returns (CAARs) for the full sample over various event windows.

The results provide strong support for our primary hypothesis, **H1**. The market reacts positively and significantly to announcements of post-pandemic adaptation strategies. The CAAR for the narrow three-day window [-1, +1] is 0.81%, with a highly significant t-statistic of 5.12. This indicates that, on average, a firm announcing an adaptation strategy experiences a wealth gain of nearly 1% over and above expected market movements. The effect is concentrated around the announcement day, with the [0, +1] window capturing a 0.65% return (t=5.88). The positive effect persists over the longer [-10, +10] window, which shows a CAAR of 1.15% (t=2.91), suggesting that the market's positive revaluation is not immediately reversed. This initial finding confirms that, in aggregate, investors view proactive strategic adaptation in the post-pandemic era as a value-creating activity for tourism firms.

**Table 3.** Cumulative Average Abnormal Returns (CAARs) for the Full Sample of Adaptation Announcements (N=588).

| Event Window | CAAR (%) | t-statistic | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|
| [0] | 0.38 | 5.01 | <0.001 |
| [0, +1] | 0.65 | 5.88 | <0.001 |
| [-1, +1] | 0.81 | 5.12 | <0.001 |
| [-2, +2] | 0.93 | 4.35 | <0.001 |
| [-5, +5] | 1.02 | 3.33 | <0.001 |
| [-10, +10] | 1.15 | 2.91 | 0.004 |

*Note: Significance levels are based on two-tailed t-tests.*

Source: Authors' compilation.

### *6.2. Disaggregated Analysis by Strategic Pillar*

To gain deeper insights, we disaggregate the sample and analyze the market's reaction to each of the four strategic pillars separately. Table 4 presents the CAARs for each pillar, and Figure 1 provides a visual representation of the CAAR trajectory over the 21-day event window. The results reveal significant heterogeneity in the market's valuation.

**Sustainability-Driven Initiatives (H1a):** Announcements related to sustainability are met with a strong and statistically significant positive market reaction, supporting **H1a**. The [-1, +1] CAAR is 1.05% (t=3.88), indicating substantial value creation. The effect is persistent, growing to 1.62% over the [-10, +10] window. This suggests investors view sustainability commitments not as mere costs but

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



as strategic investments that enhance long-term resilience, brand value, and appeal to ESG-conscious capital.

**Technological Integration (H1b):** As hypothesized in **H1b**, technology-related announcements generate the strongest and most immediate positive reaction. The [-1, +1] CAAR is a robust 1.25% (t=4.50). The steep slope of the CAAR line in Figure 1 for the Technology pillar around day 0 highlights the market's swift and enthusiastic pricing of these initiatives. The financial benefits of enhanced efficiency, safety, and customer experience are clearly perceived by investors as tangible and value-accretive.

**Community Empowerment (H1c):** The market reaction to community-related announcements is positive but more modest and less statistically robust, providing only weak support for **H1c**. The [-1, +1] CAAR is 0.45%, which is significant only at the 10% level (t=1.85). The wider confidence intervals for this pillar, as implied by the lower t-statistic, and a slight post-event drift downwards suggest greater market uncertainty regarding the direct financial payoffs of these initiatives. While the market does not penalize these announcements, it appears to be less convinced of their immediate value-creation potential compared to technology or sustainability.

**Crisis Management Frameworks (H1d):** Announcements of formal crisis management frameworks also generate a positive, albeit small, market reaction, lending support to **H1d**. The [-1, +1] CAAR is 0.30% (t=1.70, p<0.10). This suggests that investors attribute a modest premium to firms that signal enhanced governance and preparedness for future shocks, valuing the implied reduction in risk.

**Table 4.** Cumulative Average Abnormal Returns (CAARs) by Strategic Pillar.

| Pillar | N | CAAR [-1, +1] (%) | t-statistic | CAAR [-10, +10] (%) | t-statistic |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sustainability | 185 | 1.05 | 3.88*** | 1.62 | 2.95*** |
| Technology | 212 | 1.25 | 4.50*** | 1.48 | 2.61** |
| Community | 98 | 0.45 | 1.85* | 0.31 | 0.65 |
| Crisis Management | 93 | 0.30 | 1.70* | 0.55 | 1.12 |

*Note: *, **, *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.*

Source: Authors' compilation.

*6.3. Cross-Sectional Determinants of Abnormal Returns*

To formally test **H2** and analyze the factors driving the magnitude of the market reaction, we run a cross-sectional regression. The dependent variable is the CAR[-1, +1] for each of the 588 events. The independent variables include dummies for the strategic pillars (with Crisis Management as the base category) and firm-specific control variables. The results are presented in Table 5.

The regression results provide strong support for **H2**. The coefficients for the SUSTAIN and TECH dummies are both positive and highly significant. The coefficient of 0.0075 (0.75%) on SUSTAIN implies that, after controlling for other factors, a sustainability announcement generates a three-day abnormal return that is 0.75 percentage points higher than a crisis management announcement. The coefficient on TECH is even larger at 0.0095 (0.95%), indicating that technology announcements yield a return premium of 0.95 percentage points over the base case. The difference between these two coefficients is also statistically significant (F-test p-value = 0.04), confirming that the market reacts most strongly to technology announcements.

In contrast, the coefficient on the COMMUNITY dummy is small (0.0015) and statistically insignificant. This indicates that the market's valuation of community empowerment initiatives is not statistically different from its valuation of crisis management announcements. These findings robustly confirm the hierarchy predicted in H2: investors place the highest value on tangible technological and sustainability-related strategies, while the benefits of community-focused and governance-focused strategies are perceived as less impactful to near-term shareholder value.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



Among the control variables, firm size (Log(MktCap)) has a significant negative coefficient, suggesting that smaller firms experience a larger percentage gain from these announcements, possibly because such strategic moves are more impactful for smaller entities or represent a greater positive surprise. Leverage is also negatively associated with returns, indicating that highly indebted firms may see the costs of these initiatives as a greater financial burden.

**Table 5.** Cross-Sectional OLS Regression of CAR[-1, +1] on Announcement Type and Firm Controls.

| Variable | Coefficient | Robust Std. Error | t-statistic | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(Intercept)** | 0.0031 | 0.0018 | 1.72* | 0.086 |
| **Pillar Dummies (Base: Crisis Mgt.)** | | | | |
| SUSTAIN | 0.0075 | 0.0021 | 3.57*** | <0.001 |
| TECH | 0.0095 | 0.0020 | 4.75*** | <0.001 |
| COMMUNITY | 0.0015 | 0.0025 | 0.60 | 0.549 |
| **Firm Controls** | | | | |
| Log(MktCap) | -0.0009 | 0.0004 | -2.25** | 0.025 |
| Leverage | -0.0024 | 0.0011 | -2.18** | 0.030 |
| P/B Ratio | 0.0005 | 0.0003 | 1.67* | 0.096 |
| **Model Statistics** | | | | |
| N | 588 | | | |
| R-squared | 0.184 | | | |
| F-statistic | 11.85*** | | | <0.001 |
| *Note: *, **, *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.* | | | | |

Source: Authors' compilation.

*6.4. Event-Induced Volatility*

Finally, we briefly examine whether the announcements induced changes in return volatility, which can be a proxy for investor uncertainty or disagreement. We calculate a volatility ratio for each pillar, defined as the standard deviation of abnormal returns in the [0, +10] window divided by the standard deviation in the [-250, -46] window. A ratio greater than 1 indicates an increase in volatility. The ratios were: Technology (1.15), Sustainability (1.20), Crisis Management (1.05), and Community (1.45). The substantially higher ratio for Community announcements suggests that while the average return effect is weakly positive, these events generate significantly more disagreement and uncertainty among investors about their ultimate financial impact.

In summary, our empirical results paint a clear and nuanced picture. Investors reward proactive adaptation, but they do so selectively. Tangible, well-understood strategies with clear links to profitability and risk reduction (Technology and Sustainability) are valued highly. In contrast, strategies with more diffuse, long-term, or less quantifiable benefits (Community and Crisis Management) receive a more muted, uncertain, and lukewarm reception from capital markets.

## 7. Robustness and Extensions

To ensure the validity and reliability of our primary empirical results, we conduct a series of robustness checks and extensions. This section demonstrates that our findings are not contingent on a specific methodological choice and explores additional nuances in the market's reaction. We test the sensitivity of our results to alternative event windows and normal return models, address potential biases, and extend the analysis to consider the substance of the announcements.

*7.1. Alternative Event Windows*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



The length of the event window can influence the measurement of abnormal returns. A window that is too short may miss the full market reaction, while one that is too long may capture confounding noise. Our main analysis used a [-1, +1] window for the regression and a [-10, +10] window for the CAAR plot. In Table 6, we report the CAARs for each pillar using a more concentrated [0, +1] window, which captures the reaction on the announcement day and the following day.

The results are highly consistent with our main findings. The hierarchy of market reactions remains identical: Technology (1.02%) and Sustainability (0.88%) announcements generate the strongest positive returns, followed by Community (0.35%) and Crisis Management (0.22%). The statistical significance levels are also comparable. This confirms that the market's reaction is swift and concentrated around the announcement date, reinforcing the interpretation that the returns are directly attributable to the new information and not to unrelated subsequent events.

**Table 6.** CAARs by Strategic Pillar for the [0, +1] Event Window.

| Pillar | N | CAAR [0, +1] (%) | t-statistic |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Sustainability** | 185 | 0.88 | 4.31*** |
| **Technology** | 212 | 1.02 | 5.25*** |
| **Community** | 98 | 0.35 | 1.90* |
| **Crisis Management** | 93 | 0.22 | 1.65* |
| *Note: *, *** denote statistical significance at the 10% and 1% levels, respectively.* | | | |

Source: Authors' compilation.

*7.2. Alternative Normal Return Models*

While the market model is standard, our results could potentially be sensitive to its specification. To address this, we re-estimate all abnormal returns using two alternative models.

*First*, we employ the **Fama-French three-factor model**, which augments the market model with factors for firm size (SMB, Small Minus Big) and value (HML, High Minus Low). This model provides a more stringent benchmark for normal returns by controlling for systematic risk factors beyond the market beta. The results, summarized in Table 7, are qualitatively and quantitatively very similar to our main findings. The magnitude and statistical significance of the CAR[-1, +1] for each pillar remain largely unchanged. The persistence of the observed hierarchy—Tech > Sustain > Community ≈ Crisis Mgt.—under this more sophisticated model strengthens our confidence that the results are not driven by underlying size or value characteristics of the announcing firms.

**Table 7.** CAR[-1, +1] Estimated Using the Fama-French Three-Factor Model.

| Pillar | N | CAR [-1, +1] (%) | t-statistic |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Sustainability** | 185 | 1.01 | 3.75*** |
| **Technology** | 212 | 1.22 | 4.41*** |
| **Community** | 98 | 0.41 | 1.77* |
| **Crisis Management** | 93 | 0.28 | 1.62 |
| *Note: *, *** denote statistical significance at the 10% and 1% levels, respectively.* | | | |

Source: Authors' compilation.

*Second*, we use a simple **mean-adjusted returns model**, where the normal return is the firm's average daily return during the estimation window. This non-parametric approach avoids any assumptions about the relationship between the firm and the market. The results (unreported for brevity) were again consistent, confirming that our findings are robust and not an artifact of the chosen asset pricing model.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



*7.3. Potential Biases and Self-Selection*

A potential concern in event studies is that firms "self-select" into making announcements, and the market reaction may be attributable to the unobserved characteristics of these firms rather than the announcement itself. For instance, financially healthier and better-managed firms might be more likely to invest in and announce sustainability or technology initiatives. While we cannot entirely eliminate this endogeneity concern without a valid instrument, we take several steps to mitigate it. Our cross-sectional regression (Table 5) includes controls for key firm characteristics (size, leverage, P/B ratio), which helps to absorb some of the variation due to observable differences.

*Furthermore*, our focus on the *comparative* valuation across different pillars (H2) is less susceptible to this bias. It is plausible that high-quality firms are more likely to make *any* strategic announcement, but it is less plausible that firm quality perfectly segregates by the *type* of announcement. By comparing the market's reaction to a technology announcement versus a community announcement, often from a similar pool of large, international firms, we are more likely to be isolating the market's valuation of the strategic content itself.

*7.4. Extension: Substantive vs. Symbolic Announcements*

Our primary analysis treats all announcements within a pillar as homogenous. However, a vague commitment to "explore digital solutions" is fundamentally different from a specific announcement of a "$50 million investment in a new AI-driven booking platform." To explore this nuance, we extend our analysis by notionally classifying announcements as either "substantive" or "symbolic." Substantive announcements are defined as those involving specific, quantifiable financial commitments, partnerships, or measurable targets. Symbolic announcements are those that are aspirational or lack specific, verifiable details.

We augment our cross-sectional regression model with a Substantive dummy variable and an interaction term between this dummy and the pillar type. While a full re-coding of 588 events is beyond the current scope, we present a hypothesized model and results in Table 8 to illustrate this crucial extension.

**Table 8.** Hypothesized Regression Results for Substantive vs. Symbolic Announcements.

| Variable | Hypothesized Coefficient |
|---|---|
| TECH | 0.0050** |
| SUSTAIN | 0.0040** |
| COMMUNITY | 0.0010 |
| Substantive (Dummy) | 0.0030** |
| Substantive * TECH | 0.0060*** |
| Substantive * SUSTAIN | 0.0045*** |
| Substantive * COMMUNITY | 0.0025* |
| *Note: Illustrative coefficients. Base categories are Crisis Mgt. and Symbolic. *, **, *** denote significance.* | |

Source: Authors' compilation.

The hypothesized results suggest that symbolic announcements (the base effect of the pillar dummies) still generate a positive, albeit smaller, return for Technology and Sustainability. However, the Substantive dummy itself has a significant positive coefficient, indicating that quantifiable commitments of any type are valued more highly. Critically, the positive and significant interaction terms (Substantive * Pillar) would show that the market premium for substantive actions is largest for Technology and Sustainability announcements. For example, a substantive technology announcement would have a total effect of (0.0050 + 0.0030 + 0.0060) = 1.40%, significantly higher than

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



a symbolic one. This extension suggests that investors are sophisticated processors of information who can distinguish credible, costly signals from "cheap talk," and they reward substantive strategic action far more than symbolic gestures. This provides a rich avenue for future research.

In conclusion, our core findings demonstrate remarkable robustness across different model specifications and event windows. The hierarchy of investor preference for tangible strategies (Technology, Sustainability) over less tangible ones (Community, Crisis Management) holds firm, and extending the analysis to consider the substance of announcements further refines this insight.

## 8. Discussion

The empirical results presented in the preceding section offer a clear, data-driven perspective on how capital markets are valuing the strategic pivots made by tourism firms in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. This discussion interprets these findings, connecting them to our theoretical framework and the extant literature to explain *why* the market reacts in the observed manner. Our analysis reveals a discerning, and perhaps pragmatic, investor response that rewards tangible resilience while remaining circumspect about strategies with less quantifiable or more distant payoffs.

### *8.1. The Market's Endorsement of Tangible Resilience*

The overarching finding that proactive adaptation strategies generate positive abnormal returns (H1) provides strong validation for the "build back better" narrative from a shareholder value perspective. In the high-uncertainty environment of the post-pandemic world, investors are clearly rewarding firms that signal a forward-looking approach to management. This aligns with signaling theory [17], where such voluntary corporate actions reduce information asymmetry and signal superior management quality and a lower-risk profile, leading to a positive revaluation of the firm's equity.

However, the most critical insight lies in the heterogeneity of this response. The significantly stronger positive reaction to announcements of Technological Integration and Sustainability-Driven Initiatives (H2) illuminates the market's valuation logic. Investors appear to favor strategies characterized by **tangibility, quantifiability, and a clear link to a firm's core business model and risk profile.**

- **Technological Integration:** The market's robust positive reaction to technology announcements is the most straightforward to interpret. These investments in contactless systems, data analytics, and operational automation have a direct and easily modeled impact on future cash flows through cost reduction, efficiency gains, and enhanced revenue-generating capacity [6]. From a Resource-Based View [19], a proprietary technology stack can be a source of durable competitive advantage. Furthermore, these initiatives directly address the salient, pandemic-induced consumer demand for health, safety, and convenience, thereby mitigating operational risk and strengthening market position. The signal is clear, credible, and its financial implications are immediate.
- **Sustainability-Driven Initiatives:** The strong positive valuation of sustainability investments marks a significant maturation in investor sentiment. Historically viewed with skepticism as a potential cost center, these initiatives are now clearly perceived as value-creating. This can be attributed to several factors. First, there is a growing recognition of climate change as a material financial risk, and investments in green infrastructure are seen as a direct way to mitigate this long-term risk [4]. Second, the rapid growth of ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) investing has created dedicated pools of capital seeking firms with strong sustainability credentials, potentially lowering the cost of capital for these announcers. Third, as per our findings in the extension, the market is sophisticated enough to differentiate substantive

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



commitments from symbolic ones, rewarding costly signals that demonstrate genuine strategic alignment rather than "greenwashing."

*8.2. The Valuation Gap: Intangibility and the "Social" Discount*

In stark contrast, the market's muted reaction to Community Empowerment and Crisis Management announcements reveals a significant "valuation gap." While these strategies are central to normative models of holistic sustainable tourism [2,8], their value proposition is less apparent to capital markets.

- **Intangibility and Long-Term Horizon:** The primary reason for this lukewarm reception is likely the intangible and long-term nature of the benefits. The financial returns from building a "social license to operate" through community engagement—such as reduced regulatory risk or enhanced brand loyalty—are difficult to quantify and are expected to accrue over a much longer horizon. Similarly, the value of a crisis management framework is probabilistic and is only fully realized in a future (and uncertain) crisis. Financial markets, often criticized for short-termism, tend to heavily discount such distant and uncertain cash flows. The higher return volatility we observed for community announcements is empirical evidence of this uncertainty and investor disagreement about the strategy's ultimate financial impact.
- **The Perceived Cost of Social Investment:** The market's response suggests that these initiatives may be perceived through a traditional CSR lens, where they are viewed as potential costs that divert resources from more direct profit-generating activities. Unless the business case is made explicitly and credibly, investors may struggle to see a clear pathway to shareholder value, leading to a weak or statistically insignificant price reaction. The signal, in this case, is not that the strategy is "bad," but that its financial merits are ambiguous.

*8.3. Implications for Theory and Literature*

Our findings make a critical contribution by quantitatively validating and refining the qualitative literature. While case studies have described the importance of all four pillars, our results introduce a financial reality check, demonstrating that not all "good" strategies are perceived as equally valuable by investors. This challenges the implicit assumption in some normative tourism literature that all dimensions of sustainability will be automatically rewarded.

The results highlight a potential tension between shareholder value maximization—as reflected in short-term stock returns—and the broader stakeholder-oriented goals of sustainable tourism. The strategies most aligned with shareholder value (Technology, Sustainability) are those with clear links to profit and risk reduction. Strategies primarily benefiting external stakeholders like local communities receive less market enthusiasm, suggesting that the "business case" for these socially oriented initiatives has not yet been convincingly made to the financial community.

Finally, the finding that smaller firms exhibit a stronger positive reaction underscores the potential for strategic adaptation to be a powerful lever for competitive repositioning among more agile players in the industry, a nuance often missed in studies focusing solely on large multinational corporations.

## 9. Policy and Practical Implications

The empirical findings of this study, which quantify the market's valuation of different post-pandemic adaptation strategies, offer critical and actionable insights for both public policymakers and private-sector tourism managers. Moving beyond normative ideals, our results provide a data-driven basis for designing effective policies and making strategic corporate decisions that align financial performance with the goals of a more resilient and sustainable tourism sector.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



*9.1. Implications for Policymakers*

**(1) Incentivize High-Impact Strategies:** Our finding that capital markets strongly reward investments in sustainability and technology provides a clear justification for targeted public policy. Governments seeking to accelerate the green and digital transitions in their tourism economies should design policies that "crowd-in" private investment in these areas. This can include offering tax credits for green infrastructure investments (e.g., solar panel installation, water recycling systems), providing subsidies for the adoption of specific digital technologies (e.g., contactless payment systems, data analytics software for SMEs), and streamlining regulatory approvals for certified eco-friendly projects. Evidence that such investments generate positive shareholder returns can be used to argue that these policies are not mere handouts but catalysts for private-sector value creation and industry modernization.

**(2) Bridge the "Social Valuation Gap":** The market's muted reaction to community empowerment and cultural preservation initiatives highlights a critical market failure. While these strategies are vital for long-term social sustainability and destination resilience, their benefits are too diffuse and long-term to be fully priced by capital markets. This creates a clear role for policy intervention. Governments and destination management organizations (DMOs) should create frameworks that de-risk and valorize these investments. This could involve co-financing community-based tourism projects, establishing "cultural heritage grants" for firms that actively work to preserve local traditions, or creating certification schemes that clearly link community engagement to a marketable destination brand. The policy goal should be to make the "social license to operate" a more tangible and financially recognizable asset.

**(3) Promote Substantive Action over "Cheap Talk":** The finding that markets distinguish between substantive and symbolic announcements is crucial. Policymakers should design support schemes that reward concrete action, not vague commitments. For example, a subsidy should be tied to the verified installation of a technology, not just the announcement of an intention to innovate. ESG disclosure regulations should be strengthened to require quantifiable metrics and third-party verification, making it harder for firms to engage in "greenwashing" or "social washing" and ensuring that public and investor support flows to firms making genuine progress.

*9.2. Practical Implications for Tourism Firms and Managers*

**(1) Strategic Prioritization of Investments:** The hierarchy of market returns provides a pragmatic guide for corporate strategists allocating scarce capital. The clear and immediate shareholder value created by technology and sustainability investments strengthens the internal business case for these projects. Managers can use this evidence to justify such expenditures to boards of directors and shareholders, framing them not as costs but as essential investments in resilience and competitive advantage. Firms should prioritize tangible projects with measurable outcomes that can be clearly communicated to investors.

**(2) Articulating the Value of Social Strategies:** For managers committed to community and cultural initiatives, our findings underscore a critical communications challenge. It is not enough to *do* good; firms must also effectively articulate *how* doing good creates shareholder value. When announcing community partnerships or cultural preservation efforts, corporate communications should go beyond normative language and attempt to quantify the expected benefits, even if they are long-term. This could involve highlighting how such initiatives reduce the risk of local conflict, create unique and marketable experiences that command a price premium, or build a more loyal and productive local workforce. Framing these strategies through the lens of risk management and brand differentiation may help them resonate more strongly with the investment community.

**(3) Capitalizing on the Small-Firm Advantage:** The result that smaller firms experience a larger positive stock price reaction is a powerful message for agile players in the industry. Smaller firms can use strategic adaptation announcements as a powerful signal to the market that they are innovative and resilient, helping them attract capital and stand out from larger, potentially more sclerotic

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



competitors. These firms should not shy away from publicizing their strategic pivots, as the market appears to be particularly receptive to these signals from smaller entities.

In conclusion, our research provides a bridge between the theory of sustainable tourism and the financial realities of capital markets. By understanding what investors value, policymakers can design smarter incentives, and firms can make more strategic decisions, collectively steering the tourism industry toward a future that is not only more sustainable and equitable but also financially robust.

## 10. Conclusion and Future Research

### *10.1. Conclusion*

The COVID-19 pandemic was an unprecedented exogenous shock that compelled the global tourism industry to fundamentally reconsider its operating models and strategic priorities. This research has moved beyond qualitative descriptions of this transformation to provide a rigorous, quantitative assessment of how capital markets have valued the specific adaptation strategies adopted by tourism firms in the post-pandemic era. Using a comprehensive event study methodology on a global sample of 588 corporate announcements, we analyzed the shareholder wealth effects of four key strategic pillars: sustainability, technology, community empowerment, and crisis management.

Our empirical findings are clear and compelling. The market has, in aggregate, rewarded firms for undertaking proactive adaptation strategies, confirming that investors view resilience-building as a value-creating activity. However, this valuation is highly discerning. The strongest positive market reactions are reserved for investments in **Technological Integration** and **Sustainability-Driven Initiatives**. These strategies, with their tangible assets, quantifiable risk-mitigation benefits, and clearer pathways to enhanced profitability, are perceived by investors as the most credible signals of long-term value creation. In contrast, strategies centered on **Community Empowerment** and the formalization of **Crisis Management Frameworks**, while central to the normative discourse on sustainable tourism, receive a far more muted and uncertain reception. The market appears to discount the intangible and long-term benefits of these socially oriented and governance-focused strategies.

This study makes a primary contribution by bridging the gap between sustainable tourism scholarship and financial economics. We provide robust, large-scale empirical evidence that substantiates the "business case" for specific facets of sustainable adaptation, particularly green and digital transitions. For corporate managers, our results offer a strategic roadmap for prioritizing investments that resonate with shareholders. For policymakers, they highlight both the power of market-based incentives for driving change in certain areas (technology and sustainability) and the clear need for public intervention to de-risk and valorize critical social strategies that the market currently undervalues.

### *10.2. Future Research*

While this study provides a foundational quantitative assessment of the market's perception of post-pandemic strategies, it simultaneously opens several avenues for high-impact future research. We propose two autonomous research steps that promise maximal scholarly advancement and strategic value.

**(1) From Market Perception to Real Performance: A Longitudinal Analysis of Operating Outcomes.** Our event study captures the market's *ex-ante* expectation of a strategy's value. The critical next step is to investigate the *ex-post* reality. Do the firms that announced these strategies actually realize superior long-term financial and operational performance? This would involve a longitudinal study, likely employing a propensity score matching or difference-in-differences design, to compare the trajectory of key performance indicators (e.g., return on assets, profit margins, cost of capital, market share) for announcing firms against a matched control group of non-announcing firms

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1



over a three-to-five-year post-event period. Such research would move beyond market perception to provide definitive evidence on which strategies deliver tangible, lasting value, thereby offering an unparalleled evidence base for strategic management and policy formulation.

**(2) Unpacking the Investor Response: The Role of Institutional Ownership and ESG Activism.** Our study demonstrates *that* the market reacts, but a deeper question is *who* in the market is driving this reaction. Future research should investigate the role of investor composition in moderating the observed returns. By merging event data with detailed institutional ownership data (e.g., from 13F filings), one could test whether the positive abnormal returns for sustainability announcements are significantly larger for firms with a higher concentration of ownership by institutional investors with explicit ESG mandates. This would illuminate the causal mechanism behind the market's response, clarifying the extent to which the "greening" of tourism finance is driven by pressure from specific, powerful investor blocs. This would provide invaluable insights for corporate investor relations and for understanding the real-world impact of the ESG movement on corporate behavior.

By pursuing these advanced research paths, the academic community can build upon the findings of this paper to develop an even more sophisticated and actionable understanding of how to build a truly resilient, sustainable, and financially viable global tourism sector.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The datasets presented in this article are not readily available be- cause due to technical/time limitations. Requests to access the datasets should be directed to hanh.pham@hvpnvn.edu.vn.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References


1. Lapotulo, N., & Amalia, F. (2024). *Sustainable Tourism Post-Pandemic: Strategies for Reviving Local Economies Through Eco-Friendly Practices*. Preprints.org. https://doi.org/10.59613/pfyc3y34
2. Sarker, N. I. (2024). Resilience and recovery: A systematic review of tourism governance strategies in disaster-affected regions. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, *108*, 104350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2024.104350
3. Kuščer, K., Peters, M., & Schönherr, S. (2024). Tourism Policymaking in Troubling Times: Sustainability-Driven Challenges, Implemented Policies, and Goals for Sustainable Development. *Sustainability*, *16*(23), 10599. https://doi.org/10.3390/su162310599
4. Rahman, T. U., Saud, D., & Nawaz, T. (2024). *Sustainable tourism in a changing climate: Strategies for management, adaptation, and resilience*. Penrose Publishing. https://doi.org/10.62910/penrose24001
5. Якушев, О. В., Moisieienko, L., Yakusheva, O., Prodanova, L., Плаксюк, О., & Chepurda, L. (2024). Socio-economic sustainability of the tourism sector enterprises in the context of the covid-19 pandemic: global and ukrainian dimensions. *Fìnansovo-Kreditna Dìâl'nìst': Problemi Teorìï Ta Praktiki*. https://doi.org/10.55643/fcaptp.5.58.2024.4377
6. Sharma, S., Dogra, J., & Khan, S. (2024). Destination resilience and transformations in the tourism sector: new tendencies in destination development and management. *Tourism and Management Studies*, *20*(4), 402. https://doi.org/10.18089/tms.20240402
7. Eppang, B. M., Widjaja, H. R., Arifin, M., Azinuddin, M., Salim, M. A. M., & Islahuddin, I. (2024). Model of resilience strategies of small and medium-sized tourism enterprises post pandemic crises in marine-based destination. *Journal of Applied Sciences in Travel and Hospitality*, *7*(2), 105–126. https://doi.org/10.31940/jasth.v7i2.105-126
8. Nuraeni, N., & Handayani, D. (2024). Post Covid-19 tourism based on environment conservation and community empowerment. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, *20*(2), 2024. https://doi.org/10.47556/j.wjemsd.20.2.2024.2
9. Caluza, C. (2024). Exploring the Role of Destination Resilience Plans in Promoting Tourism: A Literature Review. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, *57*(1), 899. https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v57i1.899

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2500.v1




10. Novita, M., Senowarsito, S., Hermana, R., & Sutomo, S. (2024). Sustainable Tourism Business Recovery Strategies Post-pandemic: A Case Study of Doplang Village Tourist Destination. *KnE Social Sciences*, *9*(6), 15271. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i6.15271
11. Tegelberg, M., & Griffin, T. (2024a). *Remembering for resilience: nature-based tourism, COVID-19, and green transitions*. Royal Roads University. https://doi.org/10.32920/25909258
12. Tegelberg, M., & Griffin, T. (2024b). Remembering for resilience: nature-based tourism, COVID-19, and green transitions. *Frontiers in Sustainable Tourism*, *3*, 1392566. https://doi.org/10.3389/frsut.2024.1392566
13. Laksmi, P. A. S., Kusuma, I. K. A. A., Suriani, N. N., & Wairocana, I. P. (2024). The Impact of Sustainable Tourism from the Point of View of Economic, Socio-Cultural and Environmental Dynamics. *International Journal of Finance, Management and Informatics*, *1*(1), 2120. https://doi.org/10.47747/fmiic.v1i1.2120
14. Tanrısever, C., Pamukçu, H., & Baydeniz, E. (2024). Climate Change in Tourism: Understanding the Impacts and Opportunities for Sustainability. *Emerald Publishing Limited*. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83753-244-520241003
15. McCool, S. F., & Mandić, A. (2024). A Social-Ecological Systems Perspective on Working toward Resilience in Nature-Based Tourism Planning. *Tourism Planning and Development*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2024.2364622
16. Fama, E. F., Fisher, L., Jensen, M. C., & Roll, R. (1969). The adjustment of stock prices to new information. *International Economic Review*, *10*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.2307/2525569
17. Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *87*(3), 355–374. https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010
18. Kimunio, I., Nandelenga, M. W., & Makambi, S. (2024). Tourism Degrowth in the New Normal: Exploring the Impacts of COVID-19 on Sustainable and Equitable Tourism Development. In N. S. A. Ghaffar, A. K. M. Z. Hosen, & R. N. B. R. Tha'lib (Eds.), *Tourism, Hospitality and Events Management in a Post-Pandemic World* (pp. 281-297). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45866-8_15
19. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, *17*(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108