

The Influence of Respondents' Residence on their Perception of Sustainable Tourism Issues

Stefania-Rodica Hubel (Anghel)

The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania

anghel.st77@yahoo.com

Elena Condrea

“Ovidius” University of Constanta, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Romania

elenacondrea2003@yahoo.com

Abstract

In the dynamic field of sustainable tourism, numerous factors play a crucial role in shaping public perception and behavior. This study aims to delve into a nuanced aspect of this subject - the impact of respondents' place of residence on their perception of sustainable tourism, with a specific focus on accommodation facilities.

The primary objective of this research is to gain insight into how the domicile of respondents influences their perception of various aspects related to sustainable tourism. To achieve this, the study has set specific objectives to assess the availability and awareness of different tourism facilities such as guesthouses, hotels, and restaurants in the immediate vicinity of the respondents.

By comparing the responses of participants from different localities, the study aims to examine how respondents' place of residence influences their perceptions.

Key words: accommodation facilities, sustainable tourism, social responsibility, respondents' residence, respondents' perception

J.E.L. classification: M10, O18, Q59

1. Introduction

In the rapidly evolving realm of sustainable tourism, a myriad of factors contributes to the public's perception and behavior. This study aims to scrutinize a nuanced dimension of this topic – the role of respondents' residence in shaping their perception of sustainable tourism, focusing on critical elements such as accommodation facilities.

At the core of sustainable tourism lies the concept of accommodation facilities, one of the essential services impacting tourists' experience and overall satisfaction (Väisänen et al., 2023).

Establishments that prioritize sustainability in their operations not only contribute to conserving the environment and supporting local economies but also send a compelling message to tourists. However, this message's interpretation and impact may differ depending on the respondents' residence, yielding a rich tapestry of perspectives on sustainable accommodation facilities.

To analyze this diversity, it is crucial to define 'sustainable tourism'. It encompasses not just the preservation of the environment but also takes into consideration the social and economic dimensions of tourism activities (Blasi et al., 2022). By its very nature, tourism is a geographical activity, spanning across different cultural and social contexts. It would be a gross oversight to presume that perceptions about sustainability remain constant across these myriad contexts. Respondents' residence provides an essential clue about the social and cultural milieu influencing their perceptions, thereby offering invaluable insights about promoting sustainable tourism in a culturally sensitive manner.

The concept of social responsibility, while a relatively new addition to the tourism discourse, has been swiftly gaining prominence. It emphasizes the role of individual and institutional actions in fostering a sustainable tourism ecosystem (Braşoveanu, 2016). However, the interpretation of social responsibility, like most aspects of sustainable tourism, is not culturally neutral.

The role of respondents' residence becomes crucial in understanding the varying interpretations of social responsibility and their subsequent impacts on tourism behavior. Moreover, the dynamic, transformative power of unprecedented global events like pandemics further reshapes these perceptions and behaviors related to sustainable tourism (Miloş, 2022). The COVID-19 pandemic, for instance, has brought a paradigm shift, altering the way individuals view travel and tourism.

As a result, the role of respondents' residence in shaping the perception of sustainable tourism has become even more critical.

To conclude, this study emphasizes the importance of respondents' residence in shaping their perception of sustainable tourism. The variables of interest, namely accommodation facilities, are observed through the lens of this geographical and cultural variable. It is an attempt to go beyond the surface and understand the myriad perceptions related to sustainable tourism in a culturally sensitive and nuanced manner. Future research should continue to delve deeper into these aspects, with a keen eye on evolving global circumstances that further transform these perceptions.

2. Literature review

Sustainable tourism has received significant scholarly attention due to its potential as a remedy for the adverse effects of conventional tourism on the environment and society (Budeanu, 2007). A variety of factors, such as the domicile of respondents, can influence perceptions of sustainable tourism. This review examines the literature on this subject using references from various articles.

Aivaz and Micu (2021) found that the COVID-19 pandemic drastically affected the number of tourists visiting Romania. However, it's not explicit how domicile could affect perception of the impact of such an event.

Similarly, Aivaz, Stan and Ionişiu (2021) looked at coastal tourism in Romania without addressing the question of respondents' domicile and its influence on perceptions of sustainable tourism. While domicile isn't the main focus in Aivaz and Vancea's (2009) study, they highlighted the efficiency of Black Sea tourism companies and indirectly suggested the potential role that stakeholders' location might have on views regarding sustainable tourism. As a majority of these companies are local, their perceptions could be influenced by their unique geographical and cultural experiences.

Budeanu (2007) stressed the need for change in tourist behavior to ensure sustainable tourism. Although domicile was not directly discussed, one can infer that a respondent's residence could influence their behavior and perception towards sustainable tourism, given that local customs and environmental norms often reflect geographical variations.

Carballo and León (2018) proposed an interesting perspective on how artificially recreated nature influences tourism destination images. This research underscores the role of cultural nuances in sustainable tourism, pointing out that residence-related cultural values could shape sustainable tourism perceptions.

The relationship between domicile and sustainable tourism is further underlined by Chandra, Aditya and Nimit (2022) study. They suggested that a transformation in tourist accommodation could influence sustainability and competitiveness in the hospitality industry. The authors, however, didn't explicitly relate the influence of domicile to this transformation.

Hutárová et al. (2021) looked at tourism development options in marginal and less-favored regions, indirectly suggesting that residents from such areas may perceive sustainable tourism differently.

Studies such as that by Kurt Konakoglu et al. (2019) evaluated the sustainable development of tourism in selected cities in Turkey, Poland, and Macau, respectively. Although the influence of domicile wasn't explicitly analyzed, it's suggested that perceptions of sustainable tourism are inherently influenced by an individual's locale and experiences within it. Ghoochani et al. (2020) proposed a composite index for sustainable tourism development performance in wetland areas, indirectly inferring the influence of residence on perceptions of sustainable tourism.

Perceptions of sustainable tourism can be strongly influenced by a multitude of factors, and the respondents' domicile is no exception. In analysing perceptions of sustainable tourism, the geographical location of participants can have a significant impact on their understanding and appreciation of environmental, social and economic issues (Hübel (Anghel), Stan, Tasente, 2023a; 2023b; 2023c).

Aivaz, K.A. and Căpățână, A. (2021) noted in their study of HORECA companies in Constanta County that location may play a role in how these organizations perceive and respond to shocks such as the COVID-19 pandemic. This suggests that location and local circumstances can influence perspectives on sustainable tourism, even in the business sector.

The same argument can be extrapolated to perceptions of sustainable tourism. Munteanu and Aivaz (2017) analysed factor correspondences in tourism services offered to the Romanian population, demonstrating how different factors, including location, can influence interactions with tourism. Similarly, research by Aivaz, K.A., Stan, M.I., Ionitiu, I., (2021) showed that location can have a significant impact on perceptions of underwater tourism and environmental protection, two key components of sustainable tourism.

Also, Stan M.I., Aivaz K.A., Vintilă D.F., Ionițiu I. (2021) examined stakeholder perceptions of the environmental impact of coastal tourism in Romania's Black Sea littoral zone, highlighting how location and local experience can influence attitudes towards sustainable tourism. Respondents' residence may significantly influence their perception of sustainable tourism issues.

Aivaz's (2018a) study, which delineated the tourism profile of EU countries in terms of length of stay using the factor correspondence analysis method, can provide a basis for understanding how domicile influences perceptions. If a respondent's country of residence shows a tendency for longer stays, they may perceive sustainable tourism issues differently compared to someone from a country with shorter stays. For those who stay longer in a tourist location, sustainability issues may become more obvious or relevant. Aivaz (2018b) also conducted a study on the distribution of the number of domestic trips made to EU countries in terms of length of stay.

The results of this study may show differences in perceptions of sustainable tourism depending on the country of residence. For example, respondents who travel frequently to their home country might be more aware of sustainable tourism issues.

The study by Stanciu, Condrea and Racoceanu (2013) on aspects of the implementation of quality management systems in the hospitality industry in the context of sustainable development can provide a concrete example of how sustainability standards are perceived and applied. Indeed, food safety is an important aspect of sustainable tourism and therefore perceptions of these practices may be influenced by the respondent's domicile.

Thus, respondents' domicile may play a key role in how they understand and value different aspects of sustainable tourism, including length of stay, number of domestic trips and food safety. Understanding these dynamics can help develop more effective and sustainable tourism strategies.

In conclusion, the literature implicitly suggests that an individual's domicile could shape their perception of sustainable tourism. However, there is a notable dearth of research explicitly investigating this relationship. As sustainable tourism continues to grow as a field, so should research into the myriad factors influencing its perception, including the significant role domicile appears to play.

3. Research methodology

The general objective of this research is to understand how the domicile of respondents influences their perception of aspects related to sustainable tourism.

The Specific Objectives is to gauge the availability and awareness of various tourism facilities (guesthouses, hotels and restaurants) in the immediate vicinity of the respondents.

The research will primarily rely on a questionnaire as the main tool for gathering data.

The survey included questions on the existence and number of various tourism facilities in the respondents' locality or immediate vicinity. The response options, to specifying of such facilities, were as follows: "I don't know", "None exist", "Yes, but I don't know how many", "Yes, there is one", "Yes, there are two", "Yes, there are three" and "Yes, there are more than three".

The collected data, from 187 respondents, will then be analyzed using Chi-Square test and Likelihood Ratio to fulfill the research objectives. The influence of respondents' domicile on their perceptions will be studied by comparing the responses of participants from different localities.

4. Findings

The table 1 presents data from a survey conducted across various localities asking respondents about the presence of tourist guesthouses in or near their localities. Here is an interpretation of the results:

- In the locality of Casimcea, 32.14% of respondents said they did not know whether there were any tourist guesthouses, while another 32.14% stated that none exist. 14.29% affirmed the presence of guesthouses but were unsure about the number, and so on.

- Most respondents either did not know whether tourist guesthouses exist in their localities (26.20%) or stated that none exist (30.48%). Some confirmed the presence of guesthouses but were unsure about the quantity (25.13%). Fewer respondents could specify the number of guesthouses, with 5.35% saying there is one, 2.14% confirming two, 1.07% indicating three, and 9.63% stating there are more than three.

- From the data, it can be inferred that awareness about the presence and number of tourist guesthouses is quite varied among respondents, possibly due to factors like the actual presence of guesthouses, the respondents' level of engagement with local tourism, and the effectiveness of communication about local tourist amenities. It is notable that in some localities like Seimeni, a significant percentage of respondents (36.36%) confirmed the presence of one guesthouse, suggesting a stronger awareness or a dominant guesthouse in these areas.

- These survey results regarding the presence of tourist guesthouses in various localities may be influenced by several factors:

- Lack of Awareness or Knowledge: The respondents who said "I don't know" may not be aware of the presence of tourist guesthouses in their locality. This could be due to the lack of proper communication or marketing about these establishments in the area, or the respondents themselves may not be engaged with the local tourism sector.

- Absence of Tourist Guesthouses: Many respondents indicated that tourist guesthouses do not exist in their localities. This could be because these areas may not be popular tourist destinations or might lack the infrastructure or attractions that would support such businesses. Uncertainty about the Quantity: Several respondents confirmed the presence of guesthouses but were unsure about the number. This could be due to the respondents not keeping track of the number of guesthouses in their locality, particularly if new ones open frequently or if they don't make use of these facilities themselves.

- Differences in Local Tourism Development: The survey results varied across different localities. For example, in Seimeni, a significant portion of respondents confirmed the presence of one guesthouse, while in Horia, most respondents stated that none exist. These differences could be due to variations in the level of tourism development and activity across these localities.

- Presence of Dominant Guesthouse(s): In some localities where a significant percentage of respondents were able to confirm the presence of one or more guesthouses, this could suggest that there are one or more dominant or well-known guesthouses in those areas.

- Lower Rates of Direct Engagement: The relatively lower percentages of respondents confirming the existence of two or three guesthouses might suggest lower rates of direct engagement with the local tourism industry among the respondents.

To gain a clearer understanding of these results, it might be helpful to obtain more information about the demographics of the respondents, the level of tourism activity and development in each locality, and the communication and marketing efforts of local tourist guesthouses.

Table no. 1 Are there any guesthouses in your locality or in the immediate vicinity?

Localities	I don't know	None exist	Yes, but I don't know how many	Yes, there is one	Yes, there are two	Yes, there are three	Yes, there are more than three	Total
Casimcea	32.14%	32.14%	14.29%	7.14%	3.57%	3.57%	7.14%	100.00%
Ciocărlia	33.33%	25.00%	33.33%		8.33%			100.00%
Crucea	36.36%	54.55%	9.09%					100.00%
Horia		83.33%	16.67%					100.00%

Negru Vodă	40.00%	20.00%	33.33%				6.67%	100.00%
Peștera	23.08%	15.38%	53.85%				7.69%	100.00%
Rasova	37.50%	37.50%	12.50%				12.50%	100.00%
Saligny	60.00%	30.00%	10.00%					100.00%
Saraiu	14.29%	42.86%	42.86%					100.00%
Seimeni	18.18%	18.18%	27.27%	36.36%				100.00%
Tortoman	40.00%	30.00%	20.00%	10.00%				100.00%
Other locality than above	12.50%	26.79%	26.79%	5.36%	3.57%	1.79%	23.21%	100.00%
Total	26.20%	30.48%	25.13%	5.35%	2.14%	1.07%	9.63%	100.00%

Source: Authors' work

In table 2 we have the value of the Pearson Chi-Square statistic (84.777), with 66 degrees of freedom (df). The associated p-value (Asymptotic Significance) is 0.060. Since this value is greater than the typical alpha level of 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, suggesting that we do not have enough evidence to say that there is a significant association between the two variables in question. The Likelihood Ratio is another statistic for testing the independence of the two variables. In this case, the value is 81.518 with 66 degrees of freedom, and the associated p-value is 0.094. This also suggests a lack of statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis of independence. In summary, these statistics suggest that there is no significant association between the two categorical variables in question (according to the Pearson Chi-Square and Likelihood Ratio tests), but there is a significant linear trend in the data.

Table no. 2 Pearson Chi-Square and Likelihood Ratio for guesthouses

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	84,777 ^a	66	0.060
Likelihood Ratio	81.518	66	0.094
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.318	1	0.001
N of Valid Cases	187		

Source: Authors' work

Table 3 presents data collected from a survey asking respondents whether there are hotels in or near their localities. In Casimcea, 25% of respondents said they did not know whether there were any hotels, while 50% stated that none exist. 10.71% confirmed the existence of hotels but were unsure about the number, and 14.29% affirmed there were more than three hotels. In the aggregate data from all localities (last row), most respondents either did not know whether hotels existed in their localities (18.18%) or stated that none exist (44.92%). Some confirmed the presence of hotels but were uncertain about the number (15.51%), while smaller percentages could specify the number of hotels, with 6.42% saying there is one, 1.07% confirming two, 1.07% indicating three, and 12.83% stating there are more than three.

Table no. 3 Are there any hotels in your locality or in the immediate vicinity?

Localities	I don't know	None exist	Yes, but I don't know how many	Yes, there is one	Yes, there are two	Yes, there are three	Yes, there are more than three	Total
Casimcea	25.00%	50.00%	10.71%				14.29%	100.00%
Ciocârlia	16.67%	58.33%	25.00%					100.00%
Crucea	27.27%	54.55%	9.09%	9.09%				100.00%
Horia		100.00%						100.00%
Negru Vodă	53.33%	33.33%	13.33%					100.00%
Peștera	38.46%	46.15%	15.38%					100.00%
Rasova	12.50%	87.50%						100.00%
Saligny	40.00%	50.00%	10.00%					100.00%
Saraiu	14.29%	85.71%						100.00%

Seimeni	9.09%	18.18%	45.45%	27.27%				100.00%
Tortoman	20.00%	70.00%	10.00%					100.00%
Other locality than above		23.21%	19.64%	14.29%	3.57%	3.57%	35.71%	100.00%
Total	18.18%	44.92%	15.51%	6.42%	1.07%	1.07%	12.83%	100.00%

Source: Authors' work

The responses indicate a varied level of awareness about the presence and number of hotels among respondents, which could be influenced by the actual existence of hotels, the respondents' involvement with local tourism, or the level of communication about local tourism facilities. Of note, in certain localities like Seimeni, a substantial percentage of respondents (45.45%) confirmed the presence of hotels but did not specify the number, and 27.27% stated there is one hotel. This could suggest a higher level of engagement with or awareness of the local hotel industry in these areas. Conversely, in Horia, all respondents indicated that no hotels exist, possibly implying a lack of tourism infrastructure or activity in this locality.

A significant percentage of respondents indicated "I don't know" in their responses. This could suggest that there's a gap in communication or information about the presence of hotels in these localities. It could also mean that these respondents may not be closely involved with or attentive to the local tourism industry. In many localities, a substantial percentage of respondents stated that no hotels exist. This could reflect the actual absence of such facilities, perhaps because these areas are not popular tourist destinations, or they might lack the necessary infrastructure, attractions, or investment to support hotels. In several localities, a noteworthy portion of respondents confirmed the existence of hotels but were unsure about the number. This may reflect a lack of engagement or familiarity with the local hotel industry. It could also suggest that the number of hotels in these areas may fluctuate, or that some establishments may not be widely known or recognized as hotels. There is a considerable variation in the survey responses across different localities. For example, Seimeni had a high percentage of respondents confirming the existence of hotels (either without specifying the number or stating there's one), while all respondents in Horia indicated that no hotels exist. These differences could be related to factors such as the level of tourism development, the prevalence and visibility of hotels, and the degree of community engagement with tourism in each locality. In localities where respondents were able to specify the number of hotels, this might suggest the presence of one or more prominent hotels that are well-known among residents. In the "other localities" category, a relatively high percentage of respondents indicated that there are more than three hotels. This could reflect a greater prevalence of hotels in these areas, or it could potentially indicate an overestimation by respondents, particularly if these localities include larger towns or cities where hotels are more likely to be numerous and visible.

To obtain a clearer understanding of these results, further investigation might be helpful, such as gathering more detailed data on the number and visibility of hotels in each locality, the level of tourism activity, and the extent of residents' engagement with local tourism.

Table no. 4 Pearson Chi-Square and Likelihood Ratio for hotels

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Person Chi-Square	126.770 ^a	66	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	141.612	66	0.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	32.363	1	0.000
N of Valid Cases	187		

Source: Authors' work

The Pearson Chi-square value of 126.770 from table 4, with a df (degrees of freedom) of 66 and a two-sided asymptotic significance (p-value) of 0.000 indicates that there is a statistically significant association between the two categorical variables being tested (respondents' residence and visibility of hotels). The p-value of less than 0.05 (often the threshold for statistical significance) suggests that we can reject the null hypothesis that the two variables are independent. The Likelihood Ratio test result is similar to the Pearson Chi-square test. It also suggests a significant relationship between the two variables (with a Chi-square value of 141.612 and a p-value of 0.000). Linear-by-Linear

Association is used to determine if there is a linear trend in the data. A significant result ($p=0.000$) indicates that there is a significant linear relationship between the variables.

In conclusion, all of these tests provide strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis of independence, suggesting that there is a significant association between the two categorical variables (respondents residence and visibility of hotels).

The conclusions from table 5, which represent the respondents' answers to the question of whether there are restaurants in their locality or in the immediate vicinity, are as follows:

- In general, a significant number of respondents (33.69%) confirmed that there are restaurants in their locality or in the immediate vicinity, but they do not know how many.
- There appears to be a lack of knowledge or uncertainty regarding the existence of restaurants in some localities, as a relatively high percentage of respondents (16.04%) indicated that they do not know if there are restaurants in their locality or nearby.
- The locality of Peștera stands out as having the highest percentage of respondents (69.23%) who confirmed the existence of restaurants but do not know how many.
- Horia and Saraiu stand out in that most respondents confirm the existence of restaurants and also know how many there are.
- There is a significant percentage of respondents (18.72%) from "another locality than the ones above" who indicated that there are more than three restaurants in their locality or nearby.
- Compared to other localities, Rasova and Saligny have the highest percentage of respondents who do not know whether there are restaurants in their locality or nearby.

There is considerable variation in the existence of restaurants across different localities, suggesting that access to restaurants may be influenced by geographical, economic, or cultural factors. These conclusions suggest that while the existence of restaurants is confirmed in many localities, the level of knowledge and awareness of the exact number of restaurants can vary significantly.

Table no. 5 Are there any restaurants in your locality or in the immediate vicinity?

Localities:	I don't know	None exist	Yes, but I don't know how many	Yes, there is one	Yes, there are two	Yes, there are three	Yes, there are more than three	Total
Casimcea	17.86%	10.71%	17.86%	14.29%	14.29%		25.00%	100.00%
Ciocârlia	16.67%	16.67%	58.33%				8.33%	100.00%
Crucea	45.45%	18.18%	18.18%	18.18%				100.00%
Horia		66.67%	16.67%	16.67%				100.00%
Negru Vodă	26.67%	13.33%	46.67%			6.67%	6.67%	100.00%
Peștera	15.38%		69.23%			7.69%	7.69%	100.00%
Rasova	25.00%	37.50%	12.50%	25.00%				100.00%
Saligny	50.00%	20.00%	20.00%			10.00%		100.00%
Saraiu		28.57%	71.43%					100.00%
Seimeni	9.09%	9.09%	54.55%	27.27%				100.00%
Tortoman	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	10.00%				100.00%
Other locality than above	1.79%	10.71%	26.79%	7.14%	3.57%	5.36%	44.64%	100.00%
Total	16.04%	16.04%	33.69%	9.09%	3.21%	3.21%	18.72%	100.00%

Source: Authors' work

The Pearson chi-square value is 130.946 (table 6). The degrees of freedom (df), which is calculated based on the number of categories in each variable, is 66. The asymptotic significance (2-sided p-value) is less than 0.001, indicating that the results are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, there is a statistically significant association between the localities and the presence of restaurants. The likelihood ratio chi-square is another measure used to determine the significance of the association. In this case, its value is 137.988. The corresponding p-value is also less than 0.001, again indicating a significant association between the localities and the presence of restaurants.

The linear-by-linear association value is 10.632, and the corresponding p-value is 0.001. This suggests a significant linear trend in the data.

Table no. 6 Pearson Chi-Square and Likelihood Ratio for restaurants

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	130,946 ^a	66	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	137.988	66	0.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.632	1	0.001
N of Valid Cases	187		

Source: Authors' work

So, based on these statistics, we can conclude that there is a significant relationship between the locality and the existence of restaurants. In other words, the probability of having (or not having) restaurants in a locality is not the same across all localities.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, this study has shed light on the influence of respondents' place of residence on their perception of sustainable tourism, with a specific emphasis on accommodation facilities. By examining the availability and awareness of tourism facilities in the immediate vicinity of the participants, the research has provided valuable insights into how respondents' domicile affects their perceptions.

The findings indicate that the place of residence does indeed play a significant role in shaping individuals' attitudes towards sustainable tourism. The varying characteristics and preferences of different regions contribute to distinct perceptions and behaviors related to sustainable tourism practices. This knowledge can be instrumental in developing targeted strategies to promote sustainable tourism in specific localities. Tourism authorities and stakeholders can utilize the insights from this study to tailor their initiatives and campaigns to the needs and expectations of local communities and visitors. By understanding the specific influences of respondents' place of residence, it becomes possible to design and implement sustainable tourism practices that align with the cultural, environmental, and social dynamics of each region. Furthermore, the research underscores the importance of raising awareness and providing information about sustainable tourism facilities in different localities. By enhancing the availability and accessibility of such facilities, individuals are more likely to engage in sustainable tourism practices.

In conclusion, this study contributes to the broader field of sustainable tourism by highlighting the significance of respondents' domicile in shaping their perceptions and behaviors. The knowledge gained from this research can serve as a foundation for fostering sustainable tourism practices that are tailored to specific regions, benefiting both local communities and visitors while preserving the natural and cultural heritage of the destinations (Rus, 2010).

Further research can be conducted to evaluate how the level of education and access to information influence perceptions and behaviors related to sustainable tourism (Rus, 2013). This could provide additional insights into the factors shaping perceptions and contribute to the development of effective awareness and education programs in the field of sustainable tourism. Research could delve further into the specific perceptions and priorities of local communities regarding sustainable tourism. This could involve direct collaboration with local communities and considering their perspectives in the development of policies and strategies for sustainable tourism. Subsequent studies could closely analyze the actual behaviors of tourists and their impact on the environment and local communities. Using behavioral data and monitoring techniques could provide a more concrete perspective on how sustainable tourism can be promoted and implemented in practice. These future research directions could add new information and understanding in the field of sustainable tourism, contributing to the development of more efficient practices and policies in this domain.

6. References

- Aivaz, K.A., Căpățână, A., 2021. An analysis of the Return on Assets of HORECA Companies in Constanța County in the Context of the Recovery Pursuits after the Shock Produced by the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 25(1), pp. 289-303. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v25i1.5096>
- Aivaz, K.A., Stan, M.I., Ionitiu, I., 2021. Drivers for Development Triggered by the Trilogy Tourism-Underwater Cultural Heritage-Environmental Protection, in Maritime Spatial Planning. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, XXI(2), pp. 2-11
- Aivaz, K. A., Vancea, D. P. C., 2009. A study of the Black Sea tourism companies efficiency using envelope techniques. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 8(3), pp. 217-230.
- Aivaz, K.A., Micu, A., 2021. An analysis of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the number of tourists arriving in Romania using the correspondence factor analysis, *Technium Social Sciences Journal: A new decade for social changes*, 24, pp. 324-335. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v24i1>
- Aivaz, K.A., 2018a. Delineating the Tourism Profile of the EU Countries in Terms of Length of Stay using the Correspondence Factor Analysis Method. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, XVIII(1), pp. 65-69
- Aivaz K.A., 2018b. *Survey on the Distribution of the Number of Domestic Trips Taken in the EU countries in Terms of Length of Stay*, Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series, Volume XVIII (1), pp. 123-127
- Blasi, S., Fano, S., Sedita, S. R., & Toschi, G., 2022. A network perspective of cognitive and geographical proximity of sustainable tourism organizations: Evidence from Italy. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, ahead-of-print.
- Brasoveanu, F., 2016. Considerations on the Right to a Healthy Living Environment. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, 16(1), pp. 53-57.
- Budeanu, A., 2007. Sustainable tourist behaviour—a discussion of opportunities for change. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(5), 499–508
- Carballo, R. R., & León, C. J., 2018. The influence of artistically recreated nature on the image of tourist destinations: Lanzarote's art, cultural and tourism visitor centres and their links to sustainable tourism marketing. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(2), pp. 192-204
- Chandra, Shweta, Aditya Ranjan, and Nimit Chowdhary, 2022. "Online hospitality and tourism education-issues and challenges." *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 70, no. 2, pp. 298-316.
- Stanciu, A. C., Condrea, E., & Racocanu, C., 2013. Aspects of the implementation of quality management systems in the hospitality industry in the context of sustainable development. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, 20 (Special II), pp. 406-416.
- M. Ghoochani, O., Ghanian, M., Khosravipour, B., & C. Crotts, J., 2020. Sustainable tourism development performance in the wetland areas: a proposed composite index. *Tourism Review*, 75(5), pp. 745-764.
- Hubel (Anghel), Ș.R., Stan, M.I., Tasește, T., 2023a. Social Responsibility and Local Sustainable Development in Relation to the Perception of Daily Life in the Public and Private Sectors. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 44(1), pp. 1102–1116, <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v44ai1.9070>.
- Hübel (Anghel), Ș.R., Stan, M.I., Tasește, T., 2023b. How respondents' age influence perceptions of socio-economic issues in the context of sustainable local development. *Eximia*, 11(1), pp. 41–56, <https://doi.org/10.47577/eximia.v11i1.277>
- Hübel (Anghel), Ș.R., Stan, M.I., Tasește, T., 2023c. Assessing the Role of Gender in Shaping Perceptions of Socio- Economic Issues in the Context of Sustainable Local Development: A Study on Respondents' Influence. *Technium Sustainability*, 3, pp. 76–90, <https://doi.org/10.47577/sustainability.v3i.9146>.
- Hutárová, D., Kozelová, I., & Špulerová, J., 2021. Tourism development options in marginal and less-favored regions: a case study of Slovakia' s gemer region. *Land*, 10(3), p. 229
- Kurt Konakoglu, S. S., Heldak, M., Kurdoglu, B. C., & Wyszumłek, J., 2019. Evaluation of sustainable development of tourism in selected cities in Turkey and Poland. *Sustainability*, 11(9), p. 2552.
- Miloș, C.-A. (2022). Tourism Behaviour and the Transformative Power of the Pandemic—A Post-Pandemic Perspective. *"Ovidius" University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, XXII (2).
- Munteanu, I. Aivaz, K.A., 2017. Factorial correspondences in the tourism services provided to the population in Romania. *BASIQ International Conference: New Trends in Sustainable Business and Consumption 2017*, pp. 436-444

- Rus, M.I., 2010. The impact of local public finances on a community. *Fiat Iustitia*, Dimitrie Cantemir Faculty of Law Cluj Napoca, Romania, 14(1), pp.181-188.
- Rus, M.I., 2013. "The Knowledge Triangle" In A Knowledge-Based Society. *Annals of the University of Oradea: Economic Science*, ISSN: 1582-5450, 1(1), pp. 942-947.
- Stan M.I., Aivaz K.A., Vintilă D.F., Ionițiu I., 2021. Assessing the Perception of Stakeholders regarding the Impact of Coastal Tourism on the Environment in the Romanian Black Sea Coastal Area. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, 8(4), pp. 628-639, <https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v8i4.695>
- Väisänen, H.-M., Uusitalo, O., & Ryyänen, T., 2023. Towards sustainable services cape–tourists’ perspectives of accommodation service attributes. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 110, 103449.