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ABSTRACT

Tourism during the pandemic became an actual study topic, the majority of which were studied in terms of changes in tourist behaviour. Plethora studies changes in tourist behaviour selfishly view tourism for the benefit of tourists alone. In contrast, this study examines the readiness factors of community hosts in receiving visits and plays a role in the tourism value chain during the pandemic. Using 310 young respondents living in Indonesia’s urban tourism destinations (Greater Bandung), the study confirmed the perceptual factors forming host community readiness. Using Structural Equation Modeling-Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS) the study has found that perceptions of internal conditions by the community have a significant impact on the perception of tourism reactivation and the readiness of community hosts. The research model has been able to moderately predict the readiness of community hosts in tourism during the pandemic. Several recommendations were submitted in this study for tourism stakeholders to prepare community hosts in their efforts to achieve successful tourism reactivation.
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Introduction

Fears of the spread of the Covid-19 outbreak have left cities locked down and people restricted from travelling between regions globally (Açikgöz & Günay, 2020). In Indonesia, the pandemic has impacted the order of people’s lives on economic, cultural, social, and tourism aspects (Purnamasari, 2021). The Indonesian government enacted policies to suppress the chain of the spread of the virus, in the form of a ban on people gathering, restrictions on public service operations and appeals to stay at home (Zaharah et al., 2020). The policy has weakened community activities in tourism activities that have a major impact on the national economy (Suryani et al., 2020). The pressure experienced by tourism corporations and MSMEs disrupts the supply chain over this condition.

As the pandemic progresses, the tourism industry prepares to enter a recovery period. A new problem, tourism reactivation, could cause host-community concerns over the re-spread of the virus in their interactions with tourists (Hacimusalar et al., 2020). In these conditions, the community can have a risk perception that is more sensitive to tourism activities (Lu et al., 2021). Another problem is people’s ability to deal with revenge travel (Adelman, 2021; Vogler, 2022), a condition due to tourists feeling a high collective longing to return to travel. These conditions put pressure on the readiness of the host community, which, if not managed, can stimulate tourism phobia (UNWTO et al., 2018).

The reality of tourism is a tangle of economic and social activities that affect the host community in various ways (Soares et al., 2021). In the systemic approach of sustainable tourism, destination development does not only rest on tourists’ interests, so the involvement of the host community becomes the subject of development attention (Hateftabar & Chapuis, 2020; Saifi et al., 2014). Fatally, involvement is often applied in the presence of host-community in operational tourism activities only (Basile et al., 2021; Ryu et al., 2020; Thetsane, 2019), but not many seriously involve them in the decision of readiness to accept tourist visits.

Regarding the reactivation of tourism in times of crisis, the readiness of the host community rests on aspects of social change to support the restoration of the tourism value chain (Chowdhury & Quaddus, 2016). In the post-crisis recovery effort, Chan et al. (2021) provide a stakeholder approach, Pham et al. (2021) offer a social network approach in tourism destinations, while Steele and Scherrer (2018) use the principal-agent theory. The unexplored thing is the factor behind those approaches appearing in the host community. Many studies only highlight the technique of tourism destination development approaches that selfishly assume the “most understanding party” about
the development area but miss exploring the perceptual factors in the host community.

Contemplating the above conditions, a study Hateftabar and Chapuis (2020) demonstrated that a succession of tourism reactivations relates to the host-community perception that the sector can improve well-being in their environment. While the study Gannon et al. (2021) demonstrates that community hosts’ perceptual support towards tourism reactivation has a linear causal relationship with the perception of economic and social benefits of tourism. Thus, the study of host-community perception is an important foothold in advancing the readiness of tourism destinations, especially in the context of tourism reactivation during the pandemic.

In order to close the gap, the study aims to provide a model of young people’s readiness as an important part of the host community by using an individual’s perceptual approach to the condition of their group. The Greater Bandung area was chosen as a study area because this region is a leading urban tourist destination in Indonesia with community characteristics that have high sensitivity and objectivity to the pandemic. On weekends, Greater Bandung is a family tourist destination and becomes a business destination on other days. Furthermore, the study focused on the perception of young people (ages 18-40 years, who make up 57% of the total population) who live in Greater Bandung to get a better picture of the demographic character.

**Literature Review**

**Communities in Tourism**

Referring to Matarrita-Cascante and Brennan (2012), a community is defined as a resident living in a geographical area; who uses the resources in the region to grow and develop through the interaction and distribution of these resources. In tourism, the group is named host-community, a group of people living in areas with tourism resources, with which they are involved or affected by tourist visitation and banquet activities. Not the entire population being fully involved in tourism activities does not diminish the right of non-tourism activists not to get care. This is then tried to be answered in various practices of community-based tourism development approaches (Afgani et al., 2021; Aminudin et al., 2015; Khalid et al., 2019; Strydom et al., 2017; Sumarmi et al., 2020).

Host-community involvement in decision-making is an integral part of developing tourism destinations, both technically and perceptually (Naku & Afrane, 2013; M. Y. Wu, 2016). Previous studies have found the role of host-community in shaping the face of tourism destinations, where Soares et al. (2021) getting the fact of community involvement influences the travel experience. A study by Aquino et
al. (2021) shows that community involvement influences the travel experience, while Pearce (1980) has long recommended the importance of host-community acceptance consideration of foreign tourists coming to their region.

In different regions, community engagement appears in various forms. Technically, the host community operates in tourist destinations, including tourist activity vendors, local tour guides, accommodation and souvenir providers, which is part of the tourism supply chain (MS, 2020; Roy et al., 2016). Strategically, the host community is known for its role as part of formal and ethical decision making in regional institutions, tourism driving groups, non-governmental organizations and especially in indigenous stakeholder institutions. Recognition of this role has become part of the doctrine of sustainable tourism development (Lin et al., 2021; Movono & Hughes, 2020; Ogorelc & Milfelner, 2017; Saufi et al., 2014).

**Perception of Tourism Advantage for the Economy**

Tourism has the most significant economic impact compared to the socio-cultural and political impact of tourism (H. Wu et al., 2020). Tourism has a positive and significant effect on the development of the economy in the context of territorial and ecological (Hateftabar & Chapuis, 2020). The tourism industry reinvests its resources to generate profits, which multipliers stimulate the local economy and generates benefits for the community (Souza et al., 2019). The host community understands this condition in various tourism development areas as an economic boon for the potential of nature and culture.

Skeptically, the host community perceives that tourism activities become opportunities for life welfare, subjective cost-benefit, financial incentives, and other demographic development (Mensah, 2012; Mira et al., 2019; Mohamed Shaffril et al., 2015). Community hosts perceive that it is important for individuals in their region to be directly involved in tourism activities as workers and business owners. On a city scale, community hosts believe that tourism can encourage inclusive economic growth by creating a tourism supply chain in their cities (Jeyacheya & Hampton, 2020).

In order to operationalize the perception of economic benefits, the study refers to several previous studies. People view tourism reactivation as bringing improvements and benefits to local businesses (Soares et al., 2021; Villacé-Molinero et al., 2021), the community sees the importance of community host involvement in the reactivation of tourism supply chains (Chiappa et al., 2021; Nicola et al., 2020), the community sees the importance of community host involvement in the reactivation of tourism supply chains (Afifi, 2021; Nicola et al., 2020). People with a positive perception of the
benefits of tourism to their economy will tend to support tourism reactivation in times of crisis and affect their readiness for such reactivation (Hateftabar & Chapuis, 2020).

Hypothesis Development:
H1: Perceived economic advantage has a significant effect on perception of tourism reactivation
H3: Perceived tourism economic advantage has a significant effect on host community readiness

Perception of Social Conditions
In times of crisis and pandemic, community hosts can have different social perceptions than in normal times. They look at tourism from two sides; support if perceived to bring more benefits or refusal if it has been considered that social conditions are not ready to bear the risk of tourism development (Villacé-Molinero et al., 2021). The perception of public members regarding the social conditions of their group can be measured through their perception of the benefits of tourism and the capacity of the group to deal with tourism risks in times of crisis (Hateftabar & Chapuis, 2020). It is natural that this perception is measured in two different directions; on the one hand, there are social changes due to tightening regulations, and on the other hand, there is an urgency to maintain social stability in society.

The Covid-19 pandemic has aroused people’s thoughts about the need to protect themselves and others consistently and sustainably (Xu et al., 2021). This perception then provides an understanding that in the reactivation of tourism, the host community will experience the implementation of strict health protocols by the government. Social life in tourist destinations will be in such a way regulated by the new normal, which is different from the region outside the destination (Fischer & Roelofsen, 2022). Resistance to pandemic conditions and the rules surrounding them is a form of social endurance in the face of the pandemic (Adelman, 2021).

Opposite, tourists and the public also believe that this pandemic has been controlled and will no longer have a big impact (Zhu & Deng, 2020). The perception of community members about the importance of social recovery from tourism activities than the perception of the risk of exposure to the virus has encouraged community hosts to support tourism reactivation (S. Pal & Rawal, 2020; Soares et al., 2021). Host-community members have a perception that persistently depressed economic conditions can lead to greater social problems. They see that it is important for the government to reopen tourism businesses in their region immediately. Support for
the promotion of tourism reactivation by the government is important for them (Everingham & Chassagne, 2020). Based on this footing, the social perception of people in destinations is closely related to the reactivation of tourism in times of crisis and host-community readiness (Norris et al., 2008; Villacé-Molinero et al., 2021).

Hypothesis Development:

H2: Perceived social condition has a significant effect on the perception of tourism reactivation

H4: Perceived social condition has a significant effect on host community readiness

Perception of Tourism Reactivation

The tourism sector is currently one of the hardest hit by the COVID-19 outbreak, impacting travel supply and demand (Everingham & Chassagne, 2020). As a direct consequence of Covid-19, World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) has warned that 50 million global travel and tourism jobs may be at risk (Nicola et al., 2020). The COVID-19 pandemic has a major impact on the perception of risks to tourism activities and the behaviour attitudes of tourists and the public in destinations in the form of protective behaviour (Xu et al., 2021).

As an industry that sustains many interests, tourism will be sought to be able to rise immediately or at least experience reactivation in the new normal (Villacé-Molinero et al., 2021). Faced with these conditions, the host-community perception of tourism reactivation during the pandemic can arise in support or rejection (Kour et al., 2020). This is measured by their perception of the efforts made by tourism stakeholders during the pandemic. Negative perceptions appear characterized by the rejection of host-community various stakeholder efforts in the reactivation of tourism, or at least being sceptical of such efforts. Contrary, positive perceptions are shown by the attitude of support for the efforts that occur in the community to make tourism an important part of the socio-economy.

Cheng et. al (2020) understand this phenomenon as a social representation theory where social perception is awakened by direct experiences, social interactions and other information within the community host. Tourism reactivation will be communicated communally with various considerations that ultimately become a consensus. In the context of tourism reactivation during the pandemic, the perception of this agreement can be approached with indicators of collective confidence in the social benefits of tourism (Ogorelc & Milfelner, 2017); view of the importance of tourism
as an important part of the area of residence (Amyan et al., 2011), and the importance of tourism business innovation during the pandemic for inclusive economic benefits (Jeyacheya & Hampton, 2020). Furthermore, the perception of tourism reactivation is believed to influence the readiness of the host community of a tourism destination as part of the social resilience system (Norris et al., 2008).

Hypothesis Development:

H5: Perception of tourism reactivation has a significant effect on host community readiness

Host–Community Readiness

Measuring people’s readiness in tourism is an important factor because differences in readiness indicate what needs to be done. Each community needs to use knowledge of its assets, culture and characteristics, values and beliefs to build policies and programs that fit the characteristics of the community to meet the needs of the community (Thurman et al., 2003). Community readiness is a basic concept for understanding how society is changing and how to change society (Edwards et al., 2000). Community readiness is similar to a medical or psychological diagnosis system; for certain problems, it can be classified that the community is at a certain stage of readiness; that stage is in line with the diagnosis, and each diagnosis indicates that a certain type of treatment is needed (Edwards et al., 2000).

In the context of tourism during the pandemic, the host community’s readiness means the community's capacity and capability in tourism destinations to manage the risks that arise from their interaction with visitors. This readiness can arise in the form of active involvement in the management of the tourism supply-chain (Chowdhury & Quaddus, 2016), the attitude of supporting tourism activities in their residences and strive for good communication with various stakeholders, especially those authorized to control safety and health (R. Pal et al., 2013; Phon-ngam, 2014).

Methods

This study examines factors that affect the host community’s readiness in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic. The community groups studied were members of the young community who lived in the urban area of Bandung Raya, West Java, Indonesia. The Greater Bandung area includes four administrative areas: Bandung City, Bandung Regency, West Bandung Regency, and Cimahi City. This administrative area is not viewed separately in the tourism system but is integrated as a destination.
in the ancient Bandung basin that works as a unitary value chain. Bandung Raya is one of the tourism destinations with the largest number of visits and represents the phenomenon of urban tourist destinations in Indonesia. Measurement items are adapted from the literature and modified for the benefit of this research. Based on these considerations, the research hypothesis has been established and produced a research proposed model as presented in Figure 1. This research framework was formed on 4 (four) variables that reflect 5 (five) Perceived Economic Advantage indicators, 4 (four) Perceived Social Condition indicators, 4 (four) Perception of Tourism Reactivation indicators and 3 (three) Host-Community Readiness indicators. Measurement items are presented in Table 1.

Data collection efforts have been carried out by distributing questionnaires online to targeted residents living in the greater Bandung urban area. Researchers set the respondent’s requirements as a minimum stay in Bandung Raya for at least the last 3 years and age between 17-40 years when filling out the questionnaire. Determination of the profile of young respondents is an effort to close the gap in previous research (Aquino et al., 2021; Herrero Amo et al., 2019; S. Pal & Rawal, 2020), where the generational aspect has not been the main consideration. The population of the young generation (Z and Millennials) in Greater Bandung has the largest proportion of 53.07% of the total population (BPS Provinsi Jawa Barat, 2021). This group is part of the citizens most affected by the pandemic, where their interest in socio-economic activities is at its peak. Millennials (ages 24-39) currently have a position as the backbone of the family economy, working for the Post Gen-Z generation and supporting their parents.

Figure 1. Proposed Research Framework
the Baby Boomer generation. While Generation Z (ages 8-23) is a group of citizens who have a position as children from generations above it. They are affected by the decline in their parents’ economic activity, so their views on economic activity in the area of residence become relevant.

Based on survey activities, 310 responses were obtained in the data analysis process. In order to describe the demographic profile of respondents, descriptive statistics were used, with the following results: 54% of respondents were women, and 47% were men. 93% were aged 17-24 years, and 7% were aged 25-40 years. Based on their work background, 75% of respondents were students, 11% were professionals, 7% were self-employed, and 7% were private employees.

In order to examine the construction of research frameworks, partial least squares (PLS) are utilized. PLS is a well-known technique for determining route coefficients in structural models, and its popularity in social research has grown due to its capacity to represent latent components in non-normal settings with small to medium sample sizes (Hair et al., 2018). The significance levels for the loadings, weights, and route coefficients were determined using the PLS approach, and the hypothesis was developed using the bootstrapping procedure. Finally, blindfolded procedures were used to determine and test the research hypothesis’s validity.

**Results**

**Measurement Model**

As measured by factor loadings, Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability (CR), and average variance explained, reflecting factorial modelling, indicated significant reliability and convergent validity levels of all components of the measurement model (AVE). Each component had a load greater than 0.60; all constructs had Cronbach’s alpha (α) values greater than 0.86; all CR values were greater than 0.91; and all AVEs were greater than 0.72 (Hair et al., 2018). The Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT<sup>0.85</sup>) was used to confirm discriminant validity (Fornell, C., & Larcker, 1981).

Tables 1 and 2 show that all of the computations met the standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HCR</th>
<th>PEA</th>
<th>PSC</th>
<th>PTR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host Community Readiness (HCR)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Economic Advantage (PEA)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Condition (PSC)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Tourism Reactivation (PTR)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The square root of AVE of every multi-item construct (first-order and second-order) is shown on the main diagonal.
Table 1. Validity and reliability for constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs &amp; Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Economic Advantage (PEA)</strong> – Cronbach’s alpha = 0.88</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEA1: Tourism increases people’s income levels.</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEA2: The community feels involved in restoring the economic sector with tourism reactivation.</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEA3: Public perception of tourism reactivation positively impacts local businesses.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEA4: Tourism reopened to boost a declining sector of the economy.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEA5: People want the economy to improve as tourism reactivation.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Social Condition (PSC)</strong> – Cronbach’s alpha = 0.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC1: Tourism reactivation could make the government strict on health protocol policies.</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC2: Tourism reactivation will preserve continuous health protocols in my region.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC3: Local community-owned businesses in my region depend on the number of tourist visits.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC4: Reactivation tourism, then jobs are easier to reach.</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of Tourism Reactivation (PTR)</strong> – Cronbach’s alpha = 0.88</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR1: The people of Greater Bandung have a positive feeling toward the reactivation of tourism.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR2: The community supports reopening tourism and wants to see it become an important part of my region.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR3: Local governments should support the active promotion of tourism in my region.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR4: Local business innovation in tourism reactivation can make people’s economic activities return to how they were.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host Community Readiness (HCR)</strong> – Cronbach’s alpha = 0.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCR1: The people in my region are ready with the arrival of tourists back and accept it as a positive thing.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCR2: With tourism reopening, the community becomes active in tourism development.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCR3: The community further contributed to improving cooperation between the tourism industry and the Covid task force.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Structural Model**

The structural model and assumptions of this inquiry were tested using SmartPLS 3.2.9. Using a bootstrapping approach with 5000 iterations, the statistical significance of the weights of sub-constructs and the path coefficients was explored (Chin et al., 2008). Because PLS does not provide overall goodness-of-fit indices, \( R^2 \) is the key to assessing the model’s explanatory power. The goodness-of-fit (GoF) index was suggested by Tenenhaus et al. (2005) as a diagnostic tool for evaluating model fit. In the GoF measure, the geometric mean of average communality and average \( R^2 \) are utilized (for endogenous constructs). Hoffmann & Birnbrich. (2012) released the following cut-off values to evaluate the GoF study findings: GoF small = 0.1, GoF medium = 0.25, and GoF large = 0.36. For the model used in this study, a GoF value of 0.629 was calculated, suggesting that the model fit was excellent.

The structural model's hypothesized relationships were tested using the measurement model and goodness of fit. The analyses' findings are depicted in Figure 2. The corrected \( R^2 \) refers to the predictor variable's explanatory power (s) on the respective concept. Perceived economic gain and social status account for 51% of perceptions of tourist reactivation. Perceived economic advantage, perceived social condition, and perception of tourism reactivation all predict host community readiness by 63 per cent. Based on \( R^2 \) values of 0.67, 0.33, and 0.19, (Chin et al., 2008) categorized the endogenous latent variables as considerable, moderate, or weak in model validity. As a result, as shown in Table 3, perceptions of tourist reactivation (\( R^2=0.63 \)) and tourism reactivation (\( R^2=0.450 \)) are moderate.

In addition to the size of \( R^2 \), the predictive sample reuse strategy (\( Q^2 \)) was employed as a criterion for predictive significance in this study (Chin et al., 2008). \( Q^2 \) shows how efficiently the provided data can be empirically rebuilt using the model and PLS parameters using the blindfolding technique. To create \( Q^2 \) for this inquiry, the researchers employed cross-validated redundancy processes, as indicated by (Chin et al., 2008). A model with a \( Q^2 \) greater than 0 is predictively meaningful, while one with a \( Q^2 \) less than 0 is not. Table 3 shows that Host Community Readiness and Perception of Tourism Reactivation have predictive relevance of 0.46 and 0.37, respectively, indicating adequate relevance.

The structural model and hypotheses testing results are presented in Table 4 and Figure 2. All hypotheses were supported, indicating that perceived economic advantage significantly influences the perception of tourism reactivation; perceived social condition significantly influences the perception of tourism reactivation, and perceived tourism economic advantage was found significantly affect host community
readiness. The researchers also observed that perceived social conditions significantly influence host community readiness. Finally, perception of tourism reactivation significantly influences host community readiness.

Table 3. Results of R² and Q² values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Q²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host Community Readiness</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Tourism Reactivation</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Structural estimates (hypothesis testing)

| Hypothesis                                      | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values | Results |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|
| H₁ Perceived Economic Advantage → Perception of Tourism Reactivation | 0.42                | 0.42            | 0.08                        | 5.17                        | 0.00      | Supported |
| H₂ Perceived Social Condition → Perception of Tourism Reactivation   | 0.37                | 0.37            | 0.09                        | 4.38                        | 0.00      | Supported |
| H₃ Perceived Tourism Economic Advantage → Host Community Readiness    | 0.33                | 0.33            | 0.09                        | 4.38                        | 0.00      | Supported |
| H₄ Perceived Social Condition → Host Community Readiness              | 0.49                | 0.49            | 0.09                        | 4.38                        | 0.00      | Supported |
| H₅ Perception of Tourism Reactivation → Host Community Readiness      | 0.43                | 0.43            | 0.07                        | 6.09                        | 0.00      | Supported |

*P < 0.05
Discussion

The development of tourism destinations cannot be separated from the community host with various roles and interests. This stakeholder support has been widely identified as a prerequisite to successfully developing sustainable tourism destinations (Adekola & Clelland, 2020; Cheer et al., 2019; Eslami et al., 2019). In urban communities where part of the territory is dedicated to receiving tourism visits, the community has had economic and social attachments with urban tourism activities. Most of them work in the formal and informal sectors, and others see tourism as an effort to improve better social quality (Ramkissoon, 2020).

Related to the Covid-19 pandemic that has hit the whole world and has had a wide impact on the tourism industry, host communities in urban communities have important perceptions to be studied and considered by all parties. This collective perception became one of the main considerations in determining tourism development and reactivation policies during the pandemic. The characteristics of Covid-19, which are transmitted through intra- and trans-regional human movements, give rise to different attitudes towards tourism for the host community. The decision to support the host community for the reactivation of tourism in its territory is based on unprecedented diversity. This then boils down to the readiness of community hosts collectively to receive tourism visits in their region.

This study has revealed the factors forming community readiness in tourism reactivation in urban youth by exploring these conditions. Factor analysis shows conclusively that the readiness of community hosts can be explained through the
model of relationship perception of economic benefits, perception of social conditions and perception of tourism reactivation for urban communities at a young age. People in urban tourism destinations have substantial economic benefits in their regions, so they positively perceive tourism reactivation during the pandemic. Considerations and concerns about health risks for young urban communities seem to be smaller when compared to considerations of economic interests for them. Urban young people seem to have the ability to mitigate the risk of pandemics and argue that limited space conditions cannot defeat economic interests.

On another aspect, this study has revealed that urban people at a young age view the social conditions of the region where they live are closely related to tourism. Tourism reactivation during the pandemic is believed to continue to be implemented according to health protocols and can improve social conditions in their region. Community hosts view that the decline of tourism can degrade the social quality in their region. Security threats and social disparities due to tourism cessation are considered overcome by the reactivation of tourism that complies with health protocols. If it is associated with the study (Koh, 2020), Pandemics can change the face of over-tourism into quality tourism which is socially understood as improving the quality of life in the host community.

Based on the model that has been tested, the readiness of community hosts in urban areas can be predicted moderately through the perception of economic benefits, perception of social conditions and perception of tourism reactivation. The findings suggest that a collective perception of people’s internal conditions may increase readiness to receive visits and participate in tourism. The higher their confidence in social and economic perceptions, the higher the readiness of community hosts to accept the risk of tourist visits during the pandemic.

**Conclusion**

Tourism has been significantly affected by the Covid-19 pandemic as the world’s main industry. To revive this industry, a comprehensive view is needed by stakeholders so that tourism reactivation during the pandemic can be successful. On the destination side, an important element is the host community that is undergoing various collective adjustments. With a focus on young community hosts in urban areas, the study has found that the perception factors of tourism’s benefits to the economy, social conditions and perceptions of tourism reactivation have a significant impact on the readiness of community hosts in urban areas.
The findings of this study provide several recommendations for urban tourism stakeholders to achieve successful tourism reactivation during the pandemic, namely: 1) conducting a social assessment on the economic and social impacts on tourism destinations; 2) increasing community engagement in the process of reactivation of tourism through mapping the role and interests of community hosts in tourism during the pandemic; 3) apply health protocols in tourism activities in the community consistently; and 4) conduct periodic evaluations of the response of community hosts in tourism during the pandemic.

Recognizing the limitations, the model tested in this study has not reflected the entire phenomenon of host community readiness in tourism during the pandemic. This model still leaves many opportunities for developing other community readiness host models, especially those related to external community factors that have not been tested in this study. Similarly, demographically, this study only photographs the perception of urban community hosts at a young age so that it does not reflect the entire phenomenon that exists from various characteristics of society.
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