...::KENT AKADEMİSİ | URBAN ACADEMY
Volume: 15 Issue: 3 - 2022 | Cilt: 15 Sayı 3 - 2022

ARTICLE INFO | MAKALE KÜNYESİ
Research Article | Araştırma Makalesi
Submission Date | Gönderilme Tarihi: 11.06.2022
Admission Date | Kabul Tarihi: 24.09.2022

CITATION INFO | ATIF KÜNYESİ
Karaca, Ş., Tağraf, T, and Baran, Z. (2022). The Effect of Restrictions and Perceived Risk During Covid-19 Pandemic Term on Travel Intention, *Journal of Urban Academy,* Volume 15, Issue 3, Pages: 1132-1144.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.35674/kent.1129403

The Effect of Restrictions and Perceived Risk During Covid-19 Pandemic Term on Travel Intention

Covid-19 Pandemi Sürecinde Seyahat Kısıtlarının ve Algılanan Seyahat Riskinin Seyahat Niyetine Etkisi

Şükran Karaca[1] Tülay Tağraf[2] Züleyhan Baran[3]

Öz

2020 yılının başlarında Covid-19 pandemisi tüm dünyayı etkilemiş ve özellikle turizm endüstrisi üzerinde ciddi bir etki bırakmıştır. Bir pandemi sürecinde seyahat etmek mümkün olduğu kadar riskleri ve komplikasyonları sebebiyle turistlerin yeni koşullara uyum sağlaması gerekmektedir. Bu bağlamda çalışmada, Covid-19'un pandemisinin ortaya çıkardığı seyahat kısıtlarının ve turistlerin algılanan seyahat risklerinin seyahat niyetine etkisinin incelenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Çalışma kapsamında 393 kişiden çevrimiçi anket tekniği ile veriler elde edilmiştir. Elde edilen veriler AMOS programı ile analize tabi tutularak yapısal eşitlik modellemesi kapsamında doğrulayıcı faktör analizi ve yol analizi yapılmıştır. Yapılan analizler sonucunda, seyahat kısıtlarından kişilerarası kısıtın seyahat niyeti üzerinde negatif bir etkisi varken diğer kısıtların (yapısal, içsel ve ilgi) anlamlı bir etkisi tespit edilememiştir. Aynı zamanda algılanan seyahat riskinin de seyahat niyeti üzerinde negatif bir etkisi olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Covid-19, Turist Davranışı, Seyahat Kısıtı, Algılanan Seyahat Riski, Seyahat Niyeti

ABSTRACT

The Covid-19 pandemic affected the whole world and had a serious impact, especially on the tourism industry beginning of 2020. Traveling in a is possible, but its risks and complications are such that it forces tourists to adapt to new conditions. This study is aimed to examine the effect of travel restrictions caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and the perceived travel risks of tourists on travel intention. Within the scope of the study, data were obtained from 393 people by online survey technique. The obtained data were analyzed with the AMOS program, and confirmatory factor analysis and path analysis were performed within the scope of structural equation modeling. As a result of the studies, while the interpersonal constraint, one of the travel constraints, has a negative effect on the travel intention, no significant impact of the other controls (structural, intrinsic, and interest) has been detected. At the same time, it has been revealed that perceived travel risk negatively affects travel intention.

Keywords: Covid-19, Tourist Behavior, Travel Constraint, Perceived Travel Risk, Travel Intention

[1] Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Tourism Faculty Department of Tourism Management, sukrankaraca@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0268-1810

[2] Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Social Science Institue, Tourism Management Department, Master Science Student tagraftulay@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5757-3577

[3] **Corresponded Author:** Duzce University, Akçakoca Vocational School, Department of Tourism and Hotel Management, zuleyhanbaran@duzce.edu.tr. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4804-5622

INTRODUCTION:

The world has been affected by various pandemic attacks, including Spanish flu in 1918, Asian flu in 1957, Hong Kong flu in 1968, SARS in 2003, and more recently H1N1 in 2009 (Teeroovengadum et.al., 2021). The new Covid-19, which causes the disease called Covid-19 was first discovered in China at the end of 2019 and spread rapidly around the world through human-to-human transmission (Rahman et.al., 2021). The Covid-19 is the biggest adverse health event of the 21st century (Abraham et.al., 2020). Covid-19 has created many uncertainties about health. It has affected all economies globally, causing uncertainty in financial markets and especially causing the modern travel industry to enter the greatest recession period it has ever faced. The successive restrictions that many countries have had to apply since the beginning of the pandemic have forced people to stay at home, affecting especially small and medium-sized businesses, thus negatively affecting the economies and GDPs of countries (Teeroovengadum et.al., 2021).

The tourism and hospitality industry are particularly susceptible to various risks such as crime, terrorism, war, disaster and infectious disease due to the nature of human mobility (Simonetti et.al., 2020). The tourism industry has faced an unprecedented crisis accelerated by the Covid-19 pandemic (Shin et al., 2022). Most countries have imposed short-term travel restrictions to stop the spread of the Covid-19 virus worldwide, which has raised the concern that the Covid-19 pandemic has caused the tourism industry (Mertens et.al., 2020). Covid-19 term has severely impacted national economies, including various segments such as meetings or sporting events especially international, regional and local travel restrictions, tourism systems, i.e., international and domestic tourism, all travel of air-cruise or public transport, accommodation, restaurant- cafe places, congresses, festivals (Gössling et.al., 2020). The containment of the Covid-19 pandemic, including curfews and border closures in many countries, have brought tourism to a standstill (Abraham et.al., 2021).

The spread of the Coronavirus, also known as Covid-19, has significantly affected every aspect of human life (Karaca & Kelam, 2020). The field of activity that has suffered the most in Turkey and continues to suffer from this situation is tourism and the entire tourism industry. The decrease in tourism movements; In addition to having objective reasons such as limiting free movement, reducing transportation links between provinces and countries, and closing hotels and entertainment venues, subjective reasons such as uncertainty, fear, and submission to the emerging conditions. All these objective and subjective reasons can negatively affect the decrease in travel and arrivals to destinations where can theoretically be realized tourism.

During the Covid-19 pandemic, while the authorities were trying to respond to this dangerous attack on health, they had to make an effort to solve potential economic losses and social problems before they occurred; They have tried to establish a balance in which both Covid-19 cases do not increase, and people's social lives will not completely freeze. During the Covid-19 pandemic period, almost every individual has had to look for solutions to their way of travel by facing a choice that they have to make every day individually. While there are still countries, cities, or towns open to tourists, the biggest questions of tourists are; "And should he take advantage of them?" "Does it make sense to travel?" has been in the form. This study aims to examine the effect of tourism on tourist behavior and tourist travel intentions. The fact that most participants were in the 18-41 age range and did not have any travel disability in terms of health shows that the participants are active and dynamic in terms of tourism activities. People show the feature of adapting to the situation by changing their behavior or attitudes or by finding different ways of doing what they always do (Cavagnaro et al., 2018).

Travel restrictions refer to various factors that inhibit or reduce an individual's frequency, rate, or pleasure of participating in activities (Lee et al., 2012). Many tourism studies on the concept of leisure restrictions have turned to travel restrictions since 2000. (Fleischer & Pizam, 2002; Chen & Petrick, 2016). Generally, most of the study about travel restrictions has been adopted by Huber et al. (2018) as travel constraints faced by elderly tourists and Daniels et al. (2005) by physically disabled tourists.

Perceived travel risk refers to potential tourists' perceptions of the risk of possible uncertain negative/undesirable consequences from existing travel (Sönmez & Graefe, 1998). Tourists generally base their travel searches on perceived risk rather than reality (Roehl & Fesenmaier, 1992). The perception of safety and security is an important determinant in the decision of tourists to visit a place (Beirman, 2003). Irvine and Anderson (2006) concluded that risk perception influences tourists' behavior to avoid or cancel travel to a particular destination rather than actual risk conditions. Mäser and Weiermair (1998), crimes, natural disasters, and travel-related illnesses, concluded that the perceived risk can be partially used as an explanatory variable and can affect the decision-making processes of tourists. On the other hand, Reichel et al. (2007) revealed that perceived risk to backpacker experiences is a multidimensional phenomenon that varies with individual characteristics such as gender, past backpacking experience, and preference for other travelers.

Many studies in the international literature discuss the interaction between travel restrictions, perceived travel risk, and intention (Godbey et al., 2010; Park et al., 2017; Mei & Lantai, 2018). However, in the national literature, no study examines how tourists affect their travel intentions after a health-related crisis. This study, which aims to investigate the effect of travel restrictions, perceived travel risk, and intention of taking advantage of domestic tourists during the COVID-19 epidemic, is important to fill the knowledge gap in the tourism literature.

1. Conceptual Framework

The Covid-19 pandemic has caused countries around the world to impose travel restrictions. 45% of countries have implemented different travel restrictions, such as the decision to close their borders partially, 30% to suspend international flights, and 18% to close their borders to passengers from specific countries (UNWTO, 2020). In addition, there has been a period where mass events are banned, quarantine periods have begun (Niewiadomski, 2020), and people are forced to social distance (Galvani et al., 2020); tourism has come to a standstill and deeply affected humanity. The concept of travel restrictions; is classified under three main headings as internal, interpersonal, and structural restrictions (Shin et al., 2022).

1.1. Internal Constraints

Internal constraints are related to the individual's psychological state and include personality factors, attitudes, religious beliefs, and moods (Lee et al., 2012). Intrinsic restrictions are those associated with individuals' psychological and cognitive states (e.g., perceived security), which can restrict travel during the pandemic (Nyaupane et.al., 2004).

1.2. Interpersonal constraints

Restrictions from interpersonal interactions may result from any social interaction that may affect travel participation such as members, friends, co-workers, and neighbors (Shin et al., 2022).

1.3.Structural constraints

It includes various physical or operational conditions such as limited financial resources, lack of time and places to visit, and the existence of structural constraints (Nyaupane et al., 2004). According to these constraint theories, tourist behavior encounters internal barriers in the first stage, interpersonal barriers in the second step, and structural barriers in the final stage. It is stated that the travel intention does not depend only on the fulfillment of the conditions of the constraints, but on the successful negotiation of the said constraints respectively (Chen et al., 2013).

Travel restriction in this study; was defined into four categories based on the analysis of Hung, Bai, and Lu (2015). The fourth category, "not an option (interest constraint)", refers to a general lack of interest in travel (Hung et al., 2015). This type of restriction has been described by many previous researchers (Lu & Campbell, 2008; Hung & Petrick, 2012). In addition, travel restrictions have been adopted by many studies in tourism and leisure. A study on the participation of undergraduate students in cruise tourism shows that travel restrictions are considered one of the variables that can affect tourist decisions. The results of the study show that travel restrictions negatively affect tourists' travel intentions (Hung & Petrick, 2012). Moreover; Khan, Chelliah, and Ahmed (2019), in their study on Malaysian university students who want to visit India, found that among the three dimensions of travel restrictions, interpersonal and interpersonal restrictions negatively and significantly affect travel intention; they concluded that structural restrictions had a negative and insignificant impact on travel. On the other hand, Silva and Correia (2008) show in their study that the four determinants that shape the travel decisions of Portuguese southeast residents are companion (personal constraints), time and money (structural constraints), and motivations (unique constraints). The research findings show that individuals do not like to travel alone, and they decide to join the trip only if there is someone they want to travel with, and it is a strong determinant for the decision to travel with a companion. Constraints have been cited as the most significant barrier to visiting museums for both men and women; it is even reported that women pay more attention to interpersonal limitations comparatively (Mulens & Glorieux, 2019). Lack of interest, safety reasons, money and time constraints, long distances, and similarly, the status of restrictions is affected depending on personality traits (Tan, 2020). The hypotheses created in line with this information are as follows:

H_1: Travel constraints negatively affect travel intention.

H_{1a}: Structural constraints negatively affect travel intention.

H_{1b}: Interpersonal constraints negatively affect travel intention.

H_{1c}: Internal constraints negatively affect travel intention.

H_{1d}: Interest constraints negatively affect travel intention.

Perceived travel risk significantly affects travel intention (Henthorne et al., 2013). Tourists have a different alternative if they continue their travel plans; for example, they can change their destination plans or get relevant information (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Seabra et al., 2014). By the way, the result shows that the perceived risk affects not only the destination choice decisions of tourists but also their intention to travel (Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2009). Floyd & Pennington-Gray (2004) analyzed the impact of perceived risk on travel intentions after the September 11 attacks, and the results showed that travel intentions were related to safety. A study by Kourgiantakis et al. (2020) showed that the COVID-19 pandemic has negatively impacted travel intentions. Research findings have confirmed that the pandemic has created anxiety and insecurity in various aspects of tourists' daily lives. The hypothesis revealed in this direction is as follows;

H_2: Perceived travel risk negatively affects travel intention

2. Method

The population of the research consists of domestic tourists, and the sample consists of domestic tourists over the age of 18. There are various suggestions in the literature when determining the sample size. Commonly in determining the sample size, it is recommended to reach at least 300 people (Hair et al., 2010). Within the scope of the study, 393 valid questionnaires were obtained with the online questionnaire technique using the convenience sampling method. Therefore, the number of samples reached supports the literature. In the first part, ten questions about gender, marital status, occupation, age, education level, income status, year of the last vacation, and thoughts of going on vacation before Covid-19 were directed to determine some individual characteristics of the sample group. It has been tried to understand whether it affects the thoughts of going on vacation and whether Covid-19 affects changing the vacation destination preference. In the second part; the Travel Constraint Scale consists of 12 expressions used by Hun, Badi, and Lu (2015) in their studies, presentations for Travel Risk Perception composed of 7 terms used in the studies of Neuburger and Egger (2021), and developed by Pavlou and Gefen (2004) were created by Çetinkaya (2009). The Intention to Travel scale is adapted into Turkish and consists of 3 statements. Five points used the Likert scale to measure the statements in the questionnaire (1: Strongly disagree, 5: Strongly agree). The data was collected between January and March 2022. The most critical constraints are that the study data is carried out in a short time frame and on a small sample.

3. Analyzes

Statistical data on the demographic characteristics of the consumers participating in the research are given in Table 1.

Table.1 Demographic Feature

Gender	**f**	**%**	**Marital status**	**f**	**%**
Female	204	51.9	Married	171	43.5
Male	189	48.1	Single	222	56.5
Age	**f**	**%**	**Avg. Family Income (Monthly)**	**f**	**%**
18-25	129	32.8	3000 TL and below	136	34.6
26-33	129	32.8	3001-5000 TL	134	34.1
34-41	75	19.1	5001-7000 TL	62	15.8
42-49	31	7.9	7001- 9000 TL	36	9.2
50 years and older	29	7.4	9001 TL and above	25	6.4
Education	**f**	**%**	**Occupation**	**f**	**%**
High school or near	90	22.9	Public sector	69	17.6
Associate	93	23.7	Private sector	129	32.8
Undergraduate	156	39.7	Self-employment	23	5.9
Postgraduate	54	13.8	Retired	24	6.1
			Student	120	30.5
			Housewife	21	5.3
			Other	7	1.8
Total	**393**	**100**	**Total**	**393**	**100**

The tourists who participated their gender were females (51.9%) and males (48.1%); their marital status was married 43.5%, single 56.5%; their age was 18-25 (32.8%), 26-33 (32.8%), 34-41 (19.1%), 42-49 (7.9%), 50 or over (7.4%). Considering their income situation; 3000 TL or less (34.6%), 3001-5000 TL (34.1%), 5001-7000 TL (15.8%), 7001-9000 TL (9.2%), 9001 TL or over (6.4%). Considering

their educational degree were undergraduate (39.7%), associate (23.7%), high school or near (22.9%), postgraduate (13.8%). Finally, occupation situation of the participants was private sector employee (32.8%), student (30.5%), public sector employee (17.6%), retired (6.1%), self-employe (5.9%), housewife (5.3%) and other professions (1.8%).

The answers regarding the opinions of the participants about going on vacation during the period of Covid-19 are as follows:

Table 2. Information on the Questions Regarding Going on Vacation

Last Vacation Time	**f**	**%**	**The Thought of Taking a Vacation**	**f**	**%**
2017 and before	75	19.1	Yes	248	63.1
2018	65	16.5	No	145	36.9
2019	71	18.1	**Never think covid is an obstacle to take a vacation**		
2020	47	12	Yes	212	53.9
2021	135	34.4	No	181	46
Did it have an effect on the vacation location change?					
Yes	270	68.7			
No	123	31.3			

According to Table 2 the tourists who respondents participated went on vacation 19.1 in 2017 and before, 16.5% in 2018, 18.1% in 2019, 12% in 2020 and 34.4% in 2021. Considering the rates in 2020 (12%), when Covid-19 showed the greatest impact, it is seen that the intention to take a vacation is lower than in the other years. According to answers about whether Covid-19 affects the tourists' intention to go on vacation, it is understood that it affects 63.1% and does not affect 36.9% of the participants. In addition, participants expressed how it affected their vacation due to Covid-19; they think that Covid-19 prevents (53.9%) and does not prevent (46.1%) of them from going on vacation. Findings had identified the Covid-19 effect on the vacation location change situation of the participants that change of vacation destinations affected 68.7% and not effected 31.3% of the participants.

4. Findings

The research model was first subjected to factor analysis and checked the validity and reliability of the scale. The results of the scale used in this study are shown below in Table 3. There are different opinions in the literature regarding the minimum value of a factor loading when deciding on the lower limit of factor loadings. The most common usage factor load is 0.45 or higher (Büyüköztürk, 2012). Accordingly, a limitation of 0.45 was determined as the minimum factor load value in this study. Since the factor load value of the 2nd item (SC_2) of the structural constraint factor in the scale given is meager (,363) in Table 3, it was not included in the analysis and the calculations were made on the remaining items.

Table 3. Reliability and validity analyses of the scales

Factors	Expressions	Factor Loads	Cronbach Alpha	AVE	CR
Structural Constraint	SC_3	,806	,757	,611	758
	SC_1	,757			
Interpersonal Constraint	IPC_3	,761	,731	,502	,750
	IPC_2	,677			
	IPC_1	,684			
Intrinsic Constraint	IC_3	,709	,785	,553	,787
	IC_2	,806			
	IC_1	,713			
Interest Constraint	ITC_3	,856	,855	,668	,858
	ITC_2	,782			
	ITC_1	,812			
Travel Risk Perceived	TRP_7	,865	,941	,698	,942
	TRP_6	,809			
	TRP_5	,813			
	TRP_4	,903			
	TRP_3	,888			
	TRP_2	,841			
	TRP_1	,718			
Travel Intent	TI_3	,881	,653	,601	,815
	TI_2	,822			
	TI_1	,593			

Using the convergent validity method to test the construct validity in the study. For validity, AVE values should be greater than 0.5, CR values should be higher than 0.7, and CR values should be higher than AVE values (Sermanto & Costa, 2019). In the table, AVE values of all factors are above 0.5, CR values are above 0.7, and CR values are higher than AVE values. In this case, factors were shown to have congruent validity.

For the reliability of the scale, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was checked. The literature uses different classifications to interpret Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The accepted category is as follows: $0.00<\alpha<0.40$ Scale is unreliable, $0.41<\alpha<0.60$ Scale has low reliability, $0.61<\alpha<0.80$ Scale has medium reliability, $0.81<\alpha<1.00$ Scale has high reliability (Özdamar, 2002). Therefore, one of the scales has medium reliability, and the others have high reliability in this study.

Normality Test Results

The normality test was performed about Skewness and Kurtosis values; typically distributed the data to test whether in this study.

Table 4. Skewness and Kurtosis Values

Factors	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min	Maks
Structural Constraint	,409	-1,020	1,00	5,00
Interpersonal Constraint	,715	-,444	1,00	5,00
Inherent Constraint	1,375	1,120	1,00	5,00
Restriction of Interest	,344	-1,219	1,00	5,00
Perceived Travel Risk	-,225	-,1490	1,00	5,00
Intention to Travel	-1,540	2,221	1,00	5,00

For the data to show normal distribution, the Skewness and Kurtosis values should be between -2 and +2 (George & Mallery, 2010). As a result of the data, it has been determined that kurtosis and skewness of the factors are between considered limit values.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Before testing this study model with path analysis, all factor structures in this model should be verified with all Confirmatory Factor Analysis. The goodness-of-fit values obtained as a result of CFA for the factors related to Travel Constraints, Travel Risk Perceived, and Travel Intent are as follows:

Table 5. Confirmatory factor analysis results

Goodness-of-Fit Values	Good Fit	Acceptable Fit	Scales		
			Travel Constraints	Travel Risk Perceived	Travel Intent
X^2 /sd	χ2/ sd ≤ 3	χ2/ sd≤ 5	2,215	2,865	-
GFI	0,90 ≤ GFI	0,85 ≤ GFI	,962	,980	1,000
CFI	0,97 ≤ CFI	0,95≤ CFI	,978	,992	1,000
TLI (NNFI)	0,95 ≤ TLI	0,90 ≤ TLI	,968	,983	-
RMSEA	RMSEA ≤ 0,05	RMSEA ≤ 0,08	,056	,069	-

According to Table 5, considering the goodness-of-fit factors values of the Travel Constraints, Travel Risk Perceived, and Travel Intent, it has been seen that all fit measures well.

Path Analysis Results

Path analysis was used to test the strength and significance of the relationships between the variables in the study model. The results of the path analysis are as bellows in Table 6:

Table 6. Goodness-of-fit values of the study model

Compliance Measures	Good Fit	Acceptable Fit	Study Model
X^2/sd	**≤3**	**≤5**	**2,742**
GFI	**≥0,90**	**≥0,85**	**,981**
CFI	**≥0,97**	**≥0,95**	**,974**
TLI (NNFI)	**≥0,95**	**≥0,90**	**,951**
RMSEA	**≤0,05**	**≤0,08**	**,067**

When the research model is examined, all goodness of fit values is convenient. The parameter estimates of the structural model providing goodness-of-fit values are shown in Table 6.

Table 7. Research model results

Extrinsic Variable	Internal Variable	Standardized Regression Coefficient	Standard error	p Value	Situation
Structural Constraint	→ Travel Intent	-,808	,124	,194	Rejected
Interpersonal Constraint	→ Travel Intent	-,400	,021	,000	Accept
Intrinsic Constraint	→ Travel Intent	-,044	,039	,743	Rejected
Interest Constraint	→ Travel Intent	,950	,105	,087	Rejected
Travel Risk Perceived	→ Travel Intent	-,050	,013	,000	Accept

According to the road analysis results, the interpersonal constraint of travel constraints had a negative effect on travel intention, which found no significant impact on other conditions. At the same time, it has been determined that perceived travel risk negatively affects travel intention. Therefore, the H_{1b} and H_2 hypotheses were accepted.

CONCLUSION:

This study determined the effect of travel restrictions and perceived travel risk of tourists on travel intentions during the Covid-19 pandemic. In the first stage, performing the structural equation modeling, it was examined whether the data showed normal distribution, and it was determined that the data showed normal distribution. Then, the convergent validity method was used to test the construct validity used in the study. Since CR values of all scales used in the study were more significant than 0.7, AVE values of 0.5, and all CR values greater than AVE values; it saw that achieved convergent validity. According to Cronbach Alpha, while the travel intention is moderately reliable, the other values above 0.70 proves that the research is reliable. In the second stage, tested the model with Path Analysis, so it examined the validity of the hypotheses by revealing the relations. Looking at the results of the road analysis, while interpersonal constraints from travel constraints have a negative effect on travel intention, no significant impact of other conditions has been found. At the same time, it has been determined that perceived travel risk negatively affects travel intention. Therefore, the H_{1b} and H_2 hypotheses were accepted. On the other hand, the interpersonal constraint of travel constraints had a negative effect on travel intention; found no significant impact on different conditions. At the same time, it has been determined that the perceived travel risk has a negative effect on travel intention. Therefore, the H_{1b} and H_2 hypotheses were accepted. While interpersonal constraints from travel constraints have a negative effect on travel intention, no significant impact of other conditions has been found. At the same time, it has been determined that perceived travel risk negatively affects travel intention. Therefore, the H_{1b} and H_2 hypotheses were accepted.

The Covid-19 pandemic and disease are new world phenomenon that appear suddenly and unexpectedly. Until today, there has been much uncertainty about how to handle the changing situation brought about by a pandemic. Effective implementation of health services is considered as the only way to reach healthy generations (Karaca, 2015). Many countries, led by WHO and Ministries of Health, are developing more different behaviors of some characteristics of this phenomenon. In such a dangerous scenario, which also poses a health risk, it becomes complicated to understand an individual's judgments and thoughts. It is assumed that each individual reacts in

their own way to such an extraordinary situation and chooses for himself how to act in these circumstances.

The relationship between the Covid-19 pandemic and tourism is an issue of great importance and interest. In principle, the Covid-19 pandemic has affected tourism, and tourism and other industries have reached a complete standstill in most European countries, Asia, and the Americas. It has resulted in many states enforcing strict quarantine principles. In the summer of 2020, the tourism industry made an attack and started recovery efforts within the framework of certain restrictions, especially starting from domestic tourism. At this point, due to the improvements in restrictions and the specific time allowed for tourists' mobility, each individual's decision to travel was guided by their causes.

Considering all of this framework, that is possible to say that many factors affect the physical travel intentions of tourists. However, tourism is evolving into a meta-world where physical and virtual travels are attainable thanks to developing technology (Baran & Baran, 2022). In the context of digital technologies, it seems likely to say that an entirely new digital concept canvas has emerged in virtual reality tourism activities that take place in the virtual space, which is the new reality of touristic trips. Understanding the effect of virtual reality technology on the new concept of tourism travels (Baran & Baran, 2021) will be a significant development in terms of gaining a different futuristic perspective for research to be fiction on measuring the effect of intention on virtual travel in another similar case of a pandemic.

Compliance with the Ethical Standard

Conflict of Interest: *The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.*

Ethics Committee Permission: *Ethical permission required for this study was obtained from Sivas Cumhuriyet University Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Social and Human Sciences Committee on 30.12.2021.*

Financial support: *We do not have financial support.*

Thanks: *We have no thanks.*

REFERENCES:

Abraham, V., Bremser, K., Carreno, M., Crowley-Cyr, L., & Moreno, M. (2020). Exploring the consequences of COVID-19 on tourist behaviors: Perceived travel risk, animosity and intentions to travel. Tourism Review, 76 (4), 701–717.

Baran, Z., & Baran, H. (2021). Dijital teknolojiler bağlamında turistik gezilerin yeni gerçekliği: Sanal uzam, Sivas İnterdisipliner Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi, 4 (2), 175-188

Baran, Z., & Baran, H. (2022). The future of digital tourism alternatives in virtual reality. In Handbook of Research on digital communications, internet of things, and the future of cultural tourism (58-84). IGI Global

Beirman, D. (2003). United States: September 11, 2001 terrorist attack. The impact on American and global tourism. Oxon: CABI Publishing.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012). Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı istatistik, araştırma deseni SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum. Ankara: Pegem Academy.

Cavagnaro, E., Staffieri, S., & Postma, A. (2018). Understanding millennials' tourism experience: values and meaning to travel as a key for identifying target clusters for youth (sustainable) tourism. Journal of Tourism Futures

Chen, H.J., Chen, P.J., & Okumuş, F. (2013). The relationship between travel constraints and destination image: A case study of Brunei, Tourism Management, 35(1), 198-208.

Chen, C., & Petrick, J. (2016). The roles of perceived travel benefits, importance, and constraints in predicting travel behavior. Journal of Travel Research, 55 (4), 509-522.

Çetinkaya, F. Ö. & Şahbaz, R. P. (2019). Sosyal Medyada Gelişmeleri Kaçırma Korkusunun Kişinin Tatil Satın Alma Niyetine Etkisi, Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3(3): 383-402.

Daniels, M., Rodgers, E., & Wiggins, B. (2005). "Travel tales": An interpretive analysis of constraints and negotiations to pleasure travel as experienced by persons with physical disabilities. Tourism Management, 26 (6), 919-930.

Fleischer, A., & Pizam, A. (2002). Tourism constraints among Israeli seniors. Annals of Tourism Research, 29 (1), 106-123.

Floyd, M. F., & Pennington-Gray, L. (2004). Profiling risk perceptions of tourists. Annals of Tourism Research, 31 (4), 1051-1054.

Galvani, A., Lew, A.A. & Sotelo Perez, M. (2020), COVID-19 is expanding global consciousness and the sustainability of travel and tourism, Tourism Geographies, 22(3), 1-10.

George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference. Boston, MA, Pearson.

Godbey, G., Crawford, D.W. & Shen, X. (2010). Assessing Hierarchical Leisure Constraints Theory after Two Decades, Journal of Leisure Research 42(1), 111-134.

Gössling, S., Scottd, D., & Hallf, C. (2020). Pandemics, tourism and global change: a rapid assessment of COVID-19. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 1-20.

Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis. Pearson Education International.

Henthorne, T.L.; George, B.P., & Smith, W.C. (2013). Risk perception and buying behavior: An examination of some relationships in the context of cruise tourism in Jamaica. International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration, 14(1), 66-86.

Huber, D., Milne, S., & Hyde, K. (2018). Constraints and facilitators for senior tourism. Tourism Management Perspectives, 27, 55-67.

Hung, K., & Petrick, J. 2012. Testing the effects of congruity, travel constraints, and self-efficacy on travel intentions: An alternative decision-making model. Tourism Management, 33, 855-867.

Hung,K., Bai, X. & Lu, j. (2015). Understanding Travel Constraints Among the Elderly in Hong Kong: A Comparative Study of the Elderly Living in Private and in Public Housing, Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 33(7), 1-20.

Irvine, W., & Anderson, A. (2006). The effect of disaster on peripheral tourism places and the disaffection of prospective visitors. Oxford: Tourism, security & safety: From theory to practice, Butterworth-Heinemann, Editör: Y. Mansfeld, A. Pizam.

Karaca, Ş. & Kelam, D. (2020). Covid-19 Gölgesinde Uzaktan Eğitim Hizmet Kalitesinin İncelenmesi, SİTA, 5 (1), 7-18.

Karaca, Ş. (2015). Sağlık Hizmetlerinde Pazarlama (Bütünleşik Pazarlama İletişimi Yaklaşımıyla), Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A. Ş

Khan, M., Chelliah, S., & Ahmed, S. (2019). Intention to visit India among potential travellers: Role of travel motivation,perceived travel risks, and travel constraints. Tourism and Hospitality Research, 19(3), 351–367.

Kourgiantakis, M., Apostolakis, A., & Dimou, I. (2020). COVID-19 and holiday intentions: the case of Crete, Greece. Anatolia.

Lee, B. K., Agarwal, S., & Kim, H. J. (2012). Influences of travel constraints on the people with disabilities' intention to travel: An application of Seligman's helplessness theory. Tourism Management Cilt 33, Sayı 3, 569-579.

Lu, J., & Campbell, M. J. (2008). The nature and heterogeneity of perceived constraints of using the trans-Canada trail for hiking/walking. Leisure/Loisir, 32(1),

Mäser, B., Weiermair, K.,(1998). Travel Decision-Making: From the Vantage Point of Perceived Risk and Information Preferences. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing Cilt 7, Sayı 4, 107-121.

Mei , X.Y., Lantai, T.,(2018). Understanding travel constraints: An exploratory study of Mainland Chinese International Students (MCIS) in Norway. Tourism Management Perspectives Cilt 28, 1-9.

Mertens , G., Gerritsen , L., Duijndam , S., Salemink , E., & Engelhard, I. (2020). Fear of the coronavirus (COVID-19): Predictors in an online study conducted in March 2020. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 102258.

Mullens , F., & Glorieux, I. (2019). No interest, no time! Gendered constraints to museum visits in Flanders. Loisir Soc./Soc. Leis., 42 (2) , 244-265.

Neuburger, L. & Egger, R. (2020). Travel risk perception and travel behaviour during the COVID-19 pandemic 2020: a case study of the DACH region. Current Issues in Tourism 24(5), 1-14

Niewiadomski, P. (2020), "COVID-19: from temporary de-globalisation to a re-discovery of tourism? ", Tourism Geographies, 22(3), 1-6

Nyaupane, G., Morais, D., & Graefe, A. (2004). Nature tourism constraints: A cross-activity comparison. Annals of Tourism Research, 31 (3), 540-555.

Özdamar K. (2002) Paket Programlarla İstatistiksel Veri Analizi-1. 4. Baskı. Eskişehir: Kaan Kitabevi,

Park, S. H. , Hsieh, C. M. , & Lee, C. K. (2017). Examining Chinese college students' intention to travel to Japan using the extended theory of planned behavior: Testing destination image and the mediating role of travel constraints. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 34(1), 113–131.

Pavlov , P.A & Gefen, D. (2004). Building Effective Online Marketplaces with Institution-Based Trust, Information Systems Research, 15(1), 37-59

Rahman, M. K., Rahaman, M., Gazi, A., & Bhuiyan, M. (2021). Effect of Covid-19 pandemic on tourist travel risk and management perceptions. Plos One 16(9).

Reichel, A., Fuchs, G., & Uriely, N. (2007). Perceived risk and the non-institutionalized tourist role: The case of Israeli student ex-backpackers. Journal of Travel Research. 46 (2), 217-226.

Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2005). Travel anxiety and intentions to travel internationally: Implications of travel risk perception. Journal ofTravel Research, 43(3), 212-225.

Rittichainuwat, B. N., & Chakraborty, G. (2009). Perceived travel risks regarding terrorism and disease: The case of Thailand.Tourism Management, 30(3), 410-418.

Roehl, W., & Fesenmaier, D. (1992). Risk perceptions and pleasure travel: an exploratory analysis. Journal of Travel Research, 2 (4), 17-26.

Seabra, C., Abrantes, J. L., & Kastenholz, E. (2014). The influence of terrorism risk perception on purchase involvement and safety concern of international travellers. Journal of Marketing Management,30(9-10), 874-903.

Shin, H., Nicolau, J., Kang, J., Sharma, A., & Lee, H. (2022). Travel decision determinants during and after COVID-19: The role of tourist trust, travel constraints, and attitudinal factors. Tourism Management, 88, 104428.

Silva, O., & Correia, A. (2008). Facilitators and constraints in leisure travel participation: The case of the southeast of Portugal. Tourism and Hospitality Research, 2(1), 25-43.

Simonetti, B., Albayrak, T., González-Rodriguez, M., & Caber, M. (2020). Does perceived risk really matter in travel behaviour? Journal of Vacation Marketing 26 (3), 334-353.

Sönmez, S., & Graefe, A. (1998). Determining future travel behavior from past travel experience and perceptions of risk and safety. Journal of Travel Research, 37 (2), 172-177.

Tan W.-K. (2020). Destination selection: influence of tourists' personality on perceived travel constraints. J. Vacat. Mark., 26 (4), 442-456.

Teeroovengadum, V., Seetanah, B., Bindah, E., Pooloo, A., & Veerasawmy, I. (2021). Minimising perceived travel risk in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic to boost travel and tourism. Tourism Review, 910-928.

UNWTO (2020), "Impact assessment of the COVID-19 outbreak on international tourism", www.unwto.org/impact-assessment-of-the-covid-19-outbreak-on-international-tourism (01.06.2022).