

UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA
FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
Doctoral School of Economics
Field: Management

PhD candidate: Flaviu Doru NEAGA

PHD THESIS
-SUMMARY-

**STRATEGIC APPROACHES REGARDING THE
TOURISM ACTIVITY IN THE CONTEXT OF
SUSTAINABLE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

PhD supervisor:
Prof. univ. dr. Tudor NISTORESCU

Craiova
2021

Keywords:

- *Sustainable Development*
- *rural tourism*
- *sustainable tourism*
- *tourism management*
- *strategic management*
- *strategic options*
- *agrotourism*
- *ecotourism*
- *tourist objectives*
- *Sălaj county*
- *strategic approaches*
- *Sălaj SWOT analysis*
- *Sălaj PESTEL analysis*
- *TOWS analysis*
- *strategic tools*
- *managerial analysis*
- *empirical study*
- *North-West region*
- *tourist potential*
- *characteristics of tourism management*
- *stakeholder involvement*
- *residents' perception*
- *tourists perception*
- *OMD-SJ*

By elaborating this study we want to make our modest contribution to the research of an important field of economic and social life, such as tourism, both theoretically and empirically. We are confident that improving the strategic management in this field will facilitate the increase of the efficiency regarding the activity of all tourist units.

Our study is focused on researching the current situation of tourism in Sălaj County, with hope of providing recommendations for its improvement in terms of sustainable development management. At the same time, the purpose of this research is to clarify the theoretical background of the sustainable development concept in tourism, as well as to highlight the benefits that the strategic management of sustainable tourism development brings to communities. In addition, this study includes approaches from all stakeholders involved in the sustainable tourism development. To this end, various methods and tools of strategic management used in tourism are analyzed, including ways to apply stakeholder theory. Moreover, the scientific approach aimed to analyze the qualitative side of the tourist offer in Sălaj County based on the opinions of tourists and to highlight the potential for its improvement. Another objective pursued in this paper is to identify all stakeholders (stakeholders) and analyze their perceptions and degree of participation in the development of tourism in Sălaj.

Our research is based on the following: the important role that sustainable development plays in tourism management; the growth of tourism in the contemporary period; the social, economic and environmental implications that are generated by the tourism sector, expressed by increasing the level of economic development, educational progress and cultural diversification; the development potential of the tourism sector, in which rural tourism is an important branch.

Referring to the current state of knowledge, we find that in the years after the Second World War, with the recognized beginning of mass tourism, states, cities and regions begin to actively promote themselves as tourist destinations, allocating funds considerable for the development of tourism. But there are other, more critical and cautious views on tourism. However, it becomes obvious that, along with the positive effects, tourism brings many negative influences to its destinations, often affecting the natural environment and social life of communities.

Concerns about ecological impact and the desire to preserve cultural identities arise as the somewhat uncontrolled growth of tourist facilities and movements threatens the natural environment, burdens the limited resources of some destinations and consequently the economic benefits become seasonal and somehow uncertain. The negative impacts of tourism are primarily attributed to inadequate or non-existent planning frameworks for tourism development. The failure to proactively plan the development of tourism has left many destinations with an unfavorable legacy in terms of the environment and social life of communities. The experience of such destinations shows us that it is often too late to reverse or redirect development, and these

destinations will always suffer from environmental and social problems that are to the detriment of both tourists and residents.

Tourism has a well-defined position in sustainable development, being both an industry that capitalizes on both the physical and human environment. It sells a significant number of resources as a component of its product, but it is also the activity that shares some resources with other categories of beneficiaries, including, or first of all, the local population (Nistoreanu, 2007, p.60). Residents decide whether to support tourism on the basis of the benefits and costs that the industry has brought for themselves and their community. Local community participation in tourism brings more opportunities for locals to benefit from the development of tourism, thus making them eager to benefit sustainably. It is necessary for local stakeholders to be familiar with the concept of sustainable tourism in order to coordinate the development process. The sustainable development of tourism is largely based on the support of the destination residents, their goodwill and participation, because the positive attitude of the residents is very important for the satisfaction of visitors and the repetition of visits. Therefore, tourism development must not progress in an ad-hoc way without a general framework of guidance and predetermined strategies towards development objectives.

All these aspects regarding the tourism activity are closely related to the various approaches to tourism management, which have evolved over the years, tending to focus on specific elements of destination planning and management. The approach to sustainable tourism planning is one of the most comprehensive and accepted approaches. The sustainable concept is a response to broader international concerns about environmental issues, being supported for the tourism sector as a possible solution to environmental and social degradation of resources.

Sustainable development is the subject of constant concern and inevitably debate on various levels, whether we refer to governmental, non-governmental or academic, both nationally and internationally. The angles from which it is viewed are diverse, mainly encountering in the literature approaches of the ecologically sustainable, economically sustainable and social/cultural sustainable type. However, resolving issues related to sustainable development often generates conflicting objectives of an economic, social, or environmental nature. That is why we consider that a strategic vision is welcome, both on a macroeconomic scale and at a microeconomic level, in an attempt to put on a balanced level the need for economic and social development with extremely important elements related to the environment.

In our paper, the approach to sustainable tourism planning is based on the achievement of two preconditions: a long-term strategic orientation in tourism planning and stakeholder participation in the planning process. The first of these preconditions requires strategic planning to replace conventional planning approaches. The strategy of sustainable development of tourism aims to achieve three basic objectives: preserving the values of tourist resources; improved experiences of visitors interacting with tourism resources and maximizing economic, social and environmental profitability for stakeholders in the host community. The second prerequisite identified is the involvement and participation of several stakeholder groups in the planning and decision-making

process. This is considered a key issue in a sustainable approach, as in typical planning processes stakeholders are usually consulted at the end of the process, which leaves little chance for a significant entry into the process. Therefore, authors such as Faulkner (2003) argue that the achievement of sustainable development goals depends on the adoption of a participatory model, through the significant involvement of the community, together with relevant stakeholders and government agencies. Based on these two preconditions identified in the sustainable approach, tourism planning is strategic, meaning is proactive and adopts a long-term planning horizon, while seeking and responding to the needs of stakeholders.

Sustainable tourism development in rural areas is favored by the less man-made nature, as well as by the cultural and historical heritage. It allows the rebirth of rural communities and agricultural production on small farms, preserves local traditions and customs, protects natural landmarks, increases the economic wealth of the community and prevents emigration. Tourism in rural areas shows a growing trend, so that in the last ten years the number of accommodation units in rural areas is constantly growing. The increase in demand in rural tourism is related to changes in society, as well as the perceptions of tourists. In general, people are more educated, which means higher sources of income. Moreover, people have more time to spend their free time, which they do not spend on one vacation a year, but rather divide it into a few shorter vacations. Although not a condition, higher education and income are somehow connected to a better awareness of health, "green" issues, spending time in nature and consuming organic food. The authenticity of the places is more appreciated, and the demand for local gastronomy is growing. People in urban settlements are tired of the stressful lifestyle. Accessibility in rural areas has been improved through the development of transport networks, traffic connections and improved communications. In addition, the number of travel agencies that include rural holidays in their packages is increasing. The number of active elderly people who want to travel to rural destinations has also increased. These are some of the arguments that have determined us to reserve an important space in our work for rural tourism, as an essential part of what sustainable development means.

Sustainable tourism development requires the involvement and awareness of all stakeholders as well as their cooperation. The key role in the mechanism of sustainable tourism development is played by government bodies. Taking the example of Sălaj County, which, although it has some problems related to human resources due to emigration, being rich in natural beauty has a remarkable tourist potential for different types of sustainable tourism, including rural tourism. But, in order to develop sustainable tourism in Sălaj, it is important to identify all the stakeholders involved in its creation and to recognize their perceptions and attitudes. In this sense, we appreciate the need to classify stakeholders according to their priority in order to establish their role in the sustainable development of tourism.

The management of sustainable tourism in Romania is of great interest for researchers in the field, there are many references in this regard. For our case study from the perspective of strategic management of sustainable tourism, we chose Sălaj County which has a complex tourist potential,

but unfortunately without a visibility in other tourist areas such as Maramureș, Northern Bucovina, Mărginimea Sibiului.

The attention paid by tourism researchers in general, and tourism units in particular, in the contemporary period, both nationally and internationally, highlights the importance of the research topic. However, at national level, the empirical studies developed so far, which draw a scientific framework on the topic, are not too numerous. The degree of novelty of the research, aims among others: the application of the research methodology; approaching the strategic management of tourism development in terms of sustainability (elaboration, adoption and implementation of relevant policies); carrying out a research oriented towards the development of sustainable tourism at Sălaj county level.

In accordance with the importance of the research topic, we specify that *the main objective* of our research is to identify the elements that can contribute to the improvement of the strategic management tourist units, in order to obtain a high efficiency. In this sense, we identify the existence of links between sustainable development and tourism, in order to assess the level of management improvement in tourism units. This objective was achieved through a research conducted on tourism in Sălaj County.

The secondary objectives are extracted from the main objective of our study and are divided into two levels: theoretical and applied.

At a theoretical level, we emphasize the following objectives: *clarification of modern concepts and approaches in terms of sustainable tourism; analysis of tourism at international and national level, as a fundamental field in terms of economic and social activity; clarification of the concepts of sustainable development in tourism; clarifying the importance of tourist units for the modern economy; identification of the elements related to the improvement of the strategic management in the tourist units.*

At application level, the following objectives are highlighted: *identification of similar elements between the results of this research study and the results of research undertaken in the field at international level; analysis of links between the perceptions of tourists, stakeholders and the concept of sustainable development in order to improve the management of tourist units.*

Our entire approach represents a challenge regarding the responsible involvement in order to make functional a way of knowledge, scientific and organizational promotion at the level of the entire Sălaj county, a region that benefits from natural potential, but does not have a proper and functional arrangement to practice sustainable tourism.

Our paper followed *five lines of research*: (I) the theoretical study of the literature on the emergence, importance and evolution of the concept of sustainable development; (II) analysis of the impact that tourism has on sustainable development; (III) evaluation of methods and tools for strategic analysis of tourism development in the context of sustainable development; (IV) strategic evaluation of tourism development in Sălaj County area; (V) empirical research on the perception of residents and tourists regarding the development and capitalization of tourism in Sălaj County area,

followed by the development of a strategy with well-defined objectives and actions and a proposal for destination management organization model of Sălaj.

We must make two remarks about our approach before presenting the main aspects of the research. The first observation refers on the one hand to the theoretical-methodological chapters, and on the other hand to those of the case study. In the first three chapters the attitude of the discourse will be one of thematically documented analysis through the assumed bibliography, and in the last chapters we also insert our contributions as an effect of the case study reflections. The second observation refers to the critical attitude regarding the dysfunctional aspects of rural development management through sustainable tourism in Sălaj County. This critical attitude takes into account the management of local administrations (town halls, prefecture), regarding infrastructure projects, carried out in different periods and distant in time, but which bypass the efficient arrangement of roads for the practice of sustainable tourism that we analyze in our case study; an area with many tourist offers, but poorly managed from a managerial point of view.

Based on the bibliographic analysis and the practical field studies, three research hypotheses were formulated. Taking into account the scientific requirements, the hypotheses required an empirical verification, using various methods, in this case opting for an experimental approach by directly relating to the existing reality. In this sense, we resorted to data collection and empirical research based on inductive reasoning. Given the difficult access to certain data, the suspicions generated by the correctness of their provision, the impossibility to correlate the information obtained based on primary research with compatible information obtained from other sources with a high degree of credibility, we will opt for evaluation and qualitative testing of hypotheses.

The general hypotheses on which our scientific approach is based are the following:

Hypothesis 1. In the current context, there is an unequivocal link between sustainable regional development, as desired, and the quality of public policies at the level of national and local authorities;

Hypothesis 2. The current potential of rural tourism in Sălaj County can be exploited in an appropriate manner, if local initiatives supported by a strategic approach that generates performance are associated with the existing natural and anthropic framework;

Hypothesis 3. The development of tourism in Sălaj County is correlated with the current rigors related to sustainable regional development.

During the thesis we formulated a series of derived hypotheses, adapted to specific research, in which we used the statistical program SPSS 20.0 (Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences) and Microsoft Office for data analysis, resulting in different analyzes: frequency analysis; calculation of average and median values; the "hi-square test"; ANOVA analysis; Pearson's correlation coefficient. The theoretical as well as the applicative relevance of the thesis derives, first of all, from an extended bibliographic analysis, including various bibliographical references, from fundamental books in the field, to scientific articles from the current flow of publications, not to be neglected or permanent anchoring in national and European regulations. Secondly, the thesis presents practical

utility for all tourism stakeholders, the results obtained can be a starting point for substantiating strategies and subsequent decisions in order to develop sustainable tourism, not only at the regional level.

The study has certain limitations related to the inherent restraints of the people who completed the questionnaires, in connection with providing one hundred percent objective answers, there is also a subjective nature of the analysis, generated by the author, but also by the opinions expressed by specialists.

The research area of the doctoral thesis included the identification and investigation from a strategic point of view of the factors with major influence in ensuring a sustainable regional development in tourism, having as case study Sălaj county, a county with high potential, but less exploited. An important part of the thesis is allocated to tourism activities, with emphasis on the theory of stakeholders, following the proposal of new sustainable business practices. The general context is the one created by the awareness of the limitation of natural resources, of climate change, of the harmful impact of man on the environment, etc. For all these problems it is necessary to apply sustainable solutions, but not always, the actions taken avoid the occurrence of disparities, gaps or different results. At the level of Romania, regarding the perspective of the sustainable development of tourism, there is an unequal distribution of opportunities, an obvious subjectivism at the level of political decisions and inevitably a different level of economic development.

In our approach to the elaboration of the doctoral thesis we included both the analysis of the current theoretical level of research in the field and extensive practical research based on field analysis, using the survey addressed to various stakeholders in tourism or related to it. (enhancer of tourism activities or its beneficiaries). Thus, we created the opportunity to identify integrated solutions in possible strategies to be applied for the sustainable development of tourism in general and in Sălaj County in particular.

As we mentioned, our scientific approach was based on the verification of some general hypotheses that were more or less validated, as follows:

Hypothesis 1 was fully validated, the qualitative analyzes, but also the quantitative ones carried out during the research unequivocally demonstrating the dependence of the sustainable development of tourism in Sălaj County on the existence of national and European policies regarding the development of rural areas. The reasons are also related to the social and cultural profile of the population in the area, with permanent expectations related to the support of local and national authorities, but also to the global objectives of the tourism sector related to promoting sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth. growth of sustainable tourism, generator of new jobs, tourism that gives priority to local products and producers and that unconditionally promotes local culture.

Hypothesis 2 was validated based on all the conclusions formulated from the analyzes and research performed. The results of the stakeholder analysis, presented in detail in Chapter 4, provide sufficient and clear arguments to validate this hypothesis. By way of example only, the answers, in

their entirety, to the question “Is sustainable development important in your organization? If so, how does your organization promote sustainable development? ” they stressed that sustainable development is important for their organization. Accommodation providers, museums, travel agencies, parks and natural areas, have contributed to the sustainable development of the county by hiring locals, waste management, responsible management of natural resources (parks and natural areas) and by including traditional cuisine and crafts in their tourism offer .

Hypothesis 3 was partially validated, finding an overlap of plans between what the existing regulations mean, the needs perceived by different stakeholders and the reality based on the research conducted. Thus, according to the results of research, at the level of the sample under analysis, 10.5% of tourists say they have never heard of the concept of sustainable development, and 20.9% of tourists mention that sustainable development has not played a major role in choosing for their destination, for 34.5% of tourists, sustainable development has a partial influence in choosing a tourist destination, while for 32.9% of tourists sustainable development plays a major role in choosing their destination.

The paper is conceived in five chapters, distinct in terms of content, but which all revolve around the tourism-specific management approach, starting from the basic concepts of contemporary sustainable development, later sweeping through the peculiarities of tourism in the context of sustainable development and continuing with identifying necessary and useful managerial tools and methods in the field of tourism, in order to finally develop an empirical research, which follows the path from the strategic evaluation of tourism in the area of interest, to identifying the perception of stakeholders in the sustainable development of tourism in Sălaj county.

The first chapter, "***Sustainable development - a requirement of the contemporary world***", realizes an x-ray of the existing situation, and can be considered a diagnostic analysis of sustainable development. The approach is a gradual one, starting from the global dimension and progressively restricting the area of analysis to the rural area and later, with a deeper level of analysis to the Romanian rural area. The proposed analysis is an exhaustive one, capturing diverse opinions and marking, in a critical way, both favorable opinions and ideas belonging to some opponents of the concept.

Conceptually, in the paper, sustainability is seen as an operational principle. *In this sense, at the theoretical-methodological level, a significant contribution of the paper is to clarify the essence of sustainable development, being analyzed several points of view highlighted in the scientific literature on the main coordinates of the concept and its priorities (aspects of nature economic, social and environmental).*

The paper is a credible, well-argued argument that sustainable development goals are always easier to achieve on a smaller scale, given that local ecological cycles can be easier, which makes sustainable development policies much easier. easier to implement.

From the analysis of definitions, concepts and theory of sustainable development in general emerged the idea of the usefulness and necessity of rural development through sustainable tourism, a

development that must be obviously supported by the creative capabilities of local government management, in a sustainable partnership with the community. This framework of collaboration must ensure the harmony between community development and business of all types, but with an emphasis on capitalizing on the existing tourism potential. It was argued that such an approach ensures a good understanding of the complex phenomenon of sustainable development and creates the premises for a correct anticipation of future changes.

The second chapter "*Tourism-a component of sustainable development*" focuses on the main area of interest of the doctoral research. *An important contribution of the paper in this chapter is represented by the analysis of the impact generated by the promotion and development of rural tourism activities in Romania, based on statistical data provided by the National Institute of Statistics and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.* The originality represents the classification of rural regions based on relevant criteria (quality of tourism product and services, variety and tourism product, average price, promotion of tourism products and services, image of the region, variety of identities, marketing and distribution), but also the study of representative elements the basis of the matrix of the main threats to the sustainable development of rural tourism.

Also, in this chapter was analyzed, based on existing statistical data, the economic, social and environmental impact of agritourism pensions on rural areas. The analysis of existing practices and positive experiences from different regions of Romania allowed us to formulate a set of recommendations with direct applicability in the field of rural tourism. The targeted issues are directed towards supporting local entrepreneurs, through legislative measures, but also through a series of initiatives leading to real support from the state, with effect at national and regional level. These refer to the systematization of information related to entrepreneurial activities and the discovery of competitive advantages of certain territories, including their prioritization, stimulating companies to promote rural products and services, and streamlining extension services, consulting and education for the specific needs of rural tourism.

An important part of the paper refers to the study of the existing situation at European level. We performed a retroactive analysis, processing, from the point of view of evolution over time, the relevant data for the development of rural tourism, but also a prospective analysis, anticipating future developments based on strategic directions and the trend in countries recognized as performing in tourism. The main conclusion allowed us to highlight an essential difference between the two models recognized at European level, as follows: the Western European model focuses on promoting alternative sources of income for people in rural areas, while the Eastern European model has as its main goal redirection of tourist flows from traditional tourist centers to rural areas.

A strong point of this chapter is the conceptual clarification of some notions widely used, but which are not always associated with correct elements of definition. Thus, a series of concepts such as sustainable tourism, mass tourism, agrotourism or ecotourism were identified, analyzed and clarified.

Carrying out an introspective research allowed us an exhaustive characterization of agrotourism and offering a simple recipe for developing such a business that would create premises for success. The model to be followed is based on a few simple elements: offering a lower rate than at the hotel, in the same conditions of comfort and quality; the benefit of peace of mind; healthy and natural menus from the traditional cuisine of the area and peasant recipes; proximity to interesting places to visit, such as historical, cultural or geographical objectives.

An important warning signal results as a result of studying the content and implications generated by the concept of ecotourism. Ecotourism is, in our opinion, one of the topics offered by the specific tourism literature, constantly in the attention of researchers, which has been debated, discussed and analyzed at a theoretical level, but which has managed too little to advance in terms of application and implementation. Despite the impressive number of articles that have been written about ecotourism, practical experience indicates an unpredictable fact, namely an early stage in the successful implementation of ecotourism and the mastery of the art of being able to put into practice what is developed from the point of view of theoretical view.

Starting from the general knowledge and from the examples applied in other geographical areas, *some solutions have been identified that can represent an important source of inspiration for various destinations*. The lessons learned are based on successful examples, demonstrating experiences of good practice that ensure efficiency, and show the way forward, respectively how to proceed. These approaches, although they can be treated as incipient measures, have the great advantage of indicating a correct direction towards which tourism is heading.

The third chapter "***Methodological framework for managerial analysis of tourism in the context of sustainable development***" has as support pillars two aspects: on the one hand the specific management tools and methods applicable in the field of tourism, and on the other hand the analysis of stakeholders in sustainable tourism. SWOT analysis, PESTEL analysis, PERT method are identified and justified as utility.

The role of SWOT analysis is well known and does not require extensive argumentation. This has become indispensable in strategic management, allowing the rapid identification of key points associated with a dysfunction, but also the establishment of directions for action to address it.

In the context of increasing the role of tourism for local and regional economies, a managed tourism policy is becoming a priority. Both operational and specific tactical decisions must be based on well-founded strategies. As a result of the research carried out, we are convinced that a complete and complex analysis is needed, so that the strategic options and action plans are formulated and implemented correctly. Also, in our paper were presented as possible variants of application the indicators PEGR (Poverty Equivalent Rate) or PPGI (Pro-Poor Growth-Index), the information system TRINET (Tourism Research Information Network) etc.

The key purpose of the strategic management related to a territorial unit is to maintain it on the market and to consolidate the development opportunities. Using the profile literature, the stages of a management strategy for a tourist destination were defined. Specific operational or tactical activities

must result from strategic plans and, in particular, from local and regional strategies for tourism development. Such strategies must be based on reliable analyzes of the internal potential and environment of a destination using a full SWOT analysis. *On the other hand, the documentary analysis carried out allowed the awareness of the fact that the approach of the stakeholders' theory offers to the different types of organizations, the possibility to develop their own internal models of analysis.* Therefore, in this research, as an example of the practical use of stakeholder theory, we opted to analyze their involvement. The study of their specific needs and expectations can be a useful tool in making the best strategic decision for rural tourism development.

The fourth chapter "***Strategic evaluation of tourism in Sălaj county***" has a high degree of relevance and originality for the topic addressed in the doctoral thesis. Among other things, aspects related to the tourist resources in Sălaj are presented. The research conducted by the case study method addresses the socio-economic reality of Sălaj County in terms of sustainable development and tourism. The research methodology is diverse, using quantitative and qualitative methods, such as statistical research and data collection from the literature (reports, strategies, studies, monographs, questionnaires for local stakeholders and PESTEL and SWOT analysis). The conclusions formulated are diverse and address the issues of sustainable tourism development. For example, the analysis made it possible to identify, in Sălaj County, some weaknesses related to the lack of necessary knowledge about attracting European funds for most entrepreneurs, lack of experience in capitalizing on objectives using modern marketing principles, lack of a clear guidelines in the systematization of rural and urban areas, lack of jobs for young people with higher education. Significant results were also obtained as a result of administering the questionnaire to stakeholders.

An extremely relevant analysis is the one referring to the situation of the tourist offer, materialized in structures of tourist reception, arrivals and overnight stays in them. The conclusion based on the interpretation of statistical data demonstrates the existence of an accommodation capacity superior to the interest shown by tourists for Sălaj County, a fact highlighted by the low occupancy rate. The causes are multiple and attributable to the various actors operating in the field of tourism. From local authorities to investors in the area, from travel agencies to employees in this sector, there is a wide room for maneuver that will lead to increasing the attractiveness of the area, to the superior capitalization of the anthropic and geographical potential.

From a strategic point of view, the research allowed us to identify directions that would lead to a better level of performance. *Within the diversification strategies we proposed the development of the content associated with the promotion programs in the way of introducing more natural attractions and rural architecture, the diversification of tourism services to ensure a higher degree of tourist satisfaction and, consequently, to generate an increase in the number of tourists visiting Sălaj County.*

Significant are also the researches that aimed to create a clearer image of stakeholders role in the development of sustainable tourism in Sălaj. For this purpose, we used a well-established

working tool, namely the two-dimensional grid proposed by Freeman, as an analytical tool in defining stakeholders. This grid takes into account two important attributes of stakeholders: interest and power. Based on the analysis of the answers to the administered questionnaire, we can say that stakeholders in Sălaj County perceive the current tourist offer as being based mainly on natural beauty (96.45%), they consider that the main opportunities for future development of sustainable rural tourism are also natural resources, on the basis of which new tourist products and services can be developed. The challenges they will have to face are: negative demographic trends and the lack of a specialized workforce in the field of tourism. It also turned out that sustainable development is important for all stakeholders, and 82% of respondents said they actively participate in rural tourism.

Taking into account the existing statistical data, but also the results of the research undertaken, we can conclude that, although stakeholders in rural tourism in Sălaj are aware that sustainability is imperative for the development of rural tourism in the region, the latter is not yet based on sustainable development principles. Even if most stakeholders are familiar with the principles of sustainable development of rural tourism, the main postulate of sustainable development, which states that tourism must allow at the same time economic and social development of the region, without excessive use of natural resources, is not met. Although stakeholders claim that they implement principles of sustainable development in their organizations, the population is constantly declining and high unemployment rates persist, we can appreciate that the development of rural tourism is not based on principles of sustainable development at current needs and potential.

A useful analysis and generator of valuable information is the comparative analysis. Based on such an analysis, we came to the conclusion that the villages of rural Sălaj have a rich tourist potential and it would be very useful, from an organizational point of view, to set up associations for tourism development, based on dynamic and functional travel agencies. Thus, there would be the premises of synergistic effects generated by all categories of stakeholders, generating a greater attractiveness and a significantly increased bargaining power in relation to all other entities with which it interacts, either in the public or private sphere. In other words, we consider that it is necessary to establish the Tourist Destination Management Organization of Sălaj, to which we make detailed references at the end of the doctoral thesis.

In the last chapter entitled ***"Empirical research on the perception of residents and tourists regarding the development and capitalization of the tourist potential of Sălaj County. Strategic guidelines."*** we aimed to determine through this research the perception of Sălaj County inhabitants regarding its tourist development. A quantitative research was chosen, which involved the interrogation based on a questionnaire (22 questions), of a representative sample consisting of Sălaj County residents. The study of inhabitants' perception from Sălaj County was analyzed according to three components: the affective component (emotions and feelings); the cognitive component (knowledge and opinions) and the conative component (behavior).

Following the research undertaken on the perception of residents regarding Sălaj County as a tourist destination, it was found that the level of satisfaction of individuals regarding the community in which they live is determined by how they perceive the positive and negative effects of tourism development. Thus, the most favorable opinions are answered by positive evaluations of the tourist impact. Residents' perceptions indicate that tourism planning and development in Sălaj should focus on improving services, public transport and road infrastructure. Regarding the potential personal benefit of residents, the results showed a positive relationship regarding the perception of impact. These results are in line with the "Theory of Social Exchange (SET)". Thus, we can conclude that residents are more likely to react and perceive the impact in a positive way than those who do not benefit from this activity.

The development of the tourist activity must be oriented after a clear consultation with the residents, taking into account the fact that depending on the communities, the needs are different. While some are trying to develop jobs, others are interested in improving infrastructure or recreational areas. In this sense, analyzes can be used that are based on ideas resulting from the application of semi-structured interviews, in the case of associations and institutional leaders, or of the questionnaire in the case of visitors. It is relevant to apply a survey among tourists to understand the dynamics needed for services and products offered in the region.

We consider that it is necessary to carry out longitudinal studies, in order to examine the potential changes regarding the support of the residents for the development of tourism. This is due to the economic changes that occur in the medium and long term and the fact that in the coming years there must be a clear tourist plan for Sălaj County. Therefore, repeating such a study over a period of five or ten years would be imperative to understand what changes occur and what principles should guide future actions.

The second research aimed at the perception of tourists on tourist destinations in Sălaj County, with reference to consumer motivations, learning, attitudes and previous experience. Through this research we wanted to identify the type of tourists who visit Sălaj County (depending on their socio-economic data), what are their travel habits, reasons for visiting the destination and their preferences. The solutions resulting from the statistical data processing refer to: the improvement of the infrastructure; improving the quality of services and accommodation in hotels and boarding houses; the introduction of several local products in the tourist products and services offered; improving gastronomy and food preparation; supplementation of information materials; improving access to tourist information; improving web information, WI-FI. Relevant are also the solutions that take into account ecology aiming at keeping nature clean, preserving authenticity and respecting the environment. Based on a Likert scale, ranging from "1" (very dissatisfied) to "5" (very satisfied), tourists rated the tourist offer in Sălaj, with a fairly high average grade - 4.39.

If we compare the information resulting from the research, seen from the perspective of tourists, with the aspects aimed at evaluating the tourist offer, we notice that they are largely satisfied with the tourist offer and in correlation with their expectations.

In the last subchapter we proposed a strategy for the development of sustainable tourism in Sălaj and we also stressed the importance of destination management by proposing the establishment of the Tourist Destination Management Organization of Sălaj.

The need for the sustainable development of tourism has become a current and pressing issue, in the context of the global tourism industry rapid growth and its effects on social structure, natural resources and cultural values. Sustainable tourism allows us to minimize the impact on the environment and to maximize the socio-economic benefits of tourist destinations. In other words, sustainability is meant to take into account both the development and the conservation of the tourism industry. Within this last subchapter, a strategic approach was presented aiming at the sustainable tourism development of Sălaj county. The main advantages of the method used are the presentation of an integrated perspective that can help to design a strategic planning process and to strengthen the quantitative side of strategic planning.

Sălaj County has the potential to become an adequate destination for the development of types of tourism of special interest, with its cultural richness, forests, depressions and other natural beauties. In addition, it can be concluded that, despite the many weaknesses and threats, Sălaj County has a tourist potential that can be managed in a sustainable way through strategic approaches. *Moreover, we appreciate that the strategies proposed in this paper can contribute on the one hand to the development of tourism as a means of economic diversification, and on the other hand, can ensure a sustainable form of tourism that minimizes the impact on the environment, to provide an improved image of the destination and lead to an increase in the number of tourists.*

Coming in support of the idea of developing sustainable and high-performance tourism in Sălaj County, we proposed a model of Tourism Destination Management Organization in this tourist area of the country.

The accomplishment of the organizations' mission is conditioned by the application of the specific principles and procedures of strategic management.

The entire conception and gradual realization of the tourism development o within the DMO-SJ requires time, financial and administrative support as well as the cooperation of all participants in the tourism market. Experience and results in developed European countries, where destination management is the most complex form of tourism management, prove that the long-term development of tourism cannot be ensured without partnership and cooperation. A well-functioning cooperation and communication are the basis for a good image and promotion of the area on the one hand and economic profits on the other. In the end, this will lead to satisfied visitors who will definitely return to the destination.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

1. Abrudan I., (2005), *Dealurile Sălajului. Studiu de geografie integrat*, Caiete Silvane, Zalău
2. Alecu I., Merce E., Pană D., Sâmbotin L., Ciurea I., Bold I., Dobrescu N., (1997) *Management*, Editura Ceres, București
3. Altman I. (2013) - *Potențialul turistic și valorificarea eficientă în nord-vestul Transilvaniei (jud. Cluj și Sălaj)*, Teza de doctorat, Univ. Babes Bolyai, Cluj Napoca
4. Altman S. I. (2004), *Management și marketing în unități turistice*, Editura Mega, Cluj-Napoca
5. Aubrei D. C. (2007) - *Managementul performanței. Strategii de obținere a rezultatelor maxime de la angajați*, Ed. Polirom, Iași
6. Băcanu B. (2009) - *Management strategic în turism*, Editura Polirom, Iași
7. Băcanu B. (1997) - *Management strategic*, Editura Teora, București
8. Băcanu B. (2007) - *Tehnici de analiză în managementul strategic*, Ed. Polirom, Iași
9. Balaure V., Cățoiu I., Vegheș C. (2005) - *Marketing turistic*, Editura Uranus, București
10. Băloiu L. M. (1995) - *Managementul inovației*, Ed. Eficient, București
11. Băloiu L. M. (1995) - *Managementul inovației*, editura Eficient, București
12. Bârcă A. (2011) - *Biserici de lemn din Sălaj*, Ed. Noi Media, București
13. Benedek J. (2004) - *Amenajarea teritoriului și dezvoltarea regională*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca
14. Bogdan M., (2000) - *Prestari servicii agroturistice (Marketingul serviciilor turistice)*, Editura Universitas, Bucuresti;
15. Bonte Pierre, Izard Michel (1999) – *Dicționar de etnologie și antropologie*, Polirom, Iași.
16. Bornhorst, T., Ritchie B., J.R., Sheehan, L. (2010), "Tourism Management" 31 (2010) 572-589;
17. Boștinăru V. (2012) - *Roșia Montană în dezvoltarea europeană*, Parlamentul European, Bruxelles
18. Bran F. și colaboratorii,(1998)*Economia turismului și mediul înconjurător*, Editura Economica, Bucuresti,;
19. Bran F., Dinu M., Simion T. (1997) - *Turismul rural. Modelul european*, Editura Economică, București
20. Bran F., Simon T., Nistoreanu P., (2000)*Ecoturism*, Editura Economica, Bucuresti;
21. Brătianu C., (2000) *Strategic management, course support for distance education*, Publishing House Bucharest.
22. Budai Gh., Penescu A. (1997) - *Agrotehnica*, Editura Ceres, București
23. Buianu V., (2006)*Economia agroturismului*, Editura Terra Nostra, Iasi; 396 *Swot analysis of the romanian rural areas process of activities for responsible tourism*
24. Burghele C. (2015) - *Șapte zile în Țara Silvaniei*, Ed. Caiete Silvane, Zalău
25. Camilar M. (2006) - *Bucovina, ghid turistic*, Editura AD Libri, București
26. Ciobanu I. (1998) - *Management strategic*, Editura Polirom, Iași
27. Cocean P. (1999) - *Geografia Turismului*, Editura Focul Viu, București
28. Cocean P., Sorin F. (2008) - *Geografia regională a României*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj Napoca
29. Constantinescu M. M. (1998) - *Probleme ale metodologiei de cercetare în știința economică*, Editura Economică, București.
30. Coroș, M.M., (2015), *Managementul cererii și ofertei turistice*, Editura CH Beck.

31. David, F., R., (2009) Strategic Management, 12th Edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
32. Dimitrie G. (1942) - *Enciclopedia României, Vol. II, Țara Românească*, București
33. Dobra - Luca, Mihaela and Nistoreanu P., 2010. Development of rural tourism case study: Neamt area, Journal of Commerce, no. 9, 129.
34. Donoica Ș. (1989) - *Aspecte din activitatea de turism*, Editura Litera, București
35. Drexhage, J. & Murphy, D. (prepared) (2010). *Sustainable development: from Brundtland to Rio 2012*. International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) for UN, New York: UN.
36. Drăguț L. (2000) - *Geografia peisajului*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca
37. Drăguț V. (1978) - *Monumente istorice bisericesti din Eparhia Oradiei*, Ed. Episcopiei Ortodoxe, Oradea
38. EC, 2009. Rural development in the European Union. Statistical and economic information.
39. European Parliament, 2004-2009, Committee on Regional Development, Amendments
40. Filip C., C., Nistor V., D. (2014) - *Târgul de la Fechetău*, Editura Casa Cărții de Știință, Cluj Napoca
41. Galiș P. (2016) - *Jubileu la Măgura Priei. Măsuris- 50*, Ed. Caiete Silvane, Zalău
42. Galiș P., Galiș Z. (2007) - "*Școală veche-n sat străvechi*" , *140 de ani de la atestarea documentară a învățământului Cizerean-(monografie)*, Ed. Școala Noastră, Zalău
43. Garrett B., Dussauge P., Durand R., (2009). *Toute la Stratégie d'entreprise..* Strategy, 5e édition, DUNOD, Paris.
44. Gavrilescu C. (2010) - coordonator, *Managementul economic si ecologic al resurselor de sol*, Editura Academiei Romane, Bucuresti;
45. Gavrilescu C.,- coordonator, Proiectul CEEEX - "*Modelarea raspunsului exploatareilor agricole la integrarea principiilor economice cu cele de mediu prin managementul durabil al resurselor de sol*", Raport de cercetare, Institutul de Economie Agrara, Bucuresti,2008;
46. Gavrilescu D., coordonator, *Economii rurale locale - Dimensiuni si perspective*, Editura Agris, Redactia Revistelor Agricole, Bucuresti, 2000;
47. General for Agriculture and Rural Development, Brussels, http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/agrista/rurdev2009/index_en.htm, accesat 2.12.2018
48. Gheorghe-Moisii M., Tîrziu E., *Managementul strategic al dezvoltării durabile în organizații*, Editura Universitară.
49. Giurescu D., C. (1981) - *Istoria ilustrată a românilor*, Editura Sport-turism, București
50. Glăvan V., *Turism rural, agroturism, turism durabil, ecoturism*, Editura Economica, Bucuresti, 2003;
51. Goia I., A. (1982) - *Zona etnografică Meseș*, Editura Sport Turism, București
52. Goja P. (2006) - *Bistrița Năsăud, ghid turistic*, Ad Libri, p. 4
53. Goja P. (2006) - *Maramureș, ghid turistic*, Editura Ad Libri, București
54. Hammersley, M., (2003). Case Study, Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods, SAGE Publications,http://sageereference.com/socialscience/Article_n92.html, accesat 22.09.2018
55. Holowaty S., 1995, *Marketing-curs introductiv*, Editura Relaxrom, Oradea
56. Hvass, A. K., (2013)"*Too fund or not to fund: A critical look at funding destination marketing campaigns*", "Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 28 May, 2013, Editura Elsevier;
57. Iluț P. (1998) - *Abordarea calitativistă a socioumanului*, Editura Polirom, Iași
58. Ionescu Gh., Gh. (1996) - *Dimensiunile culturale ale managementului*, Editura Economica, București

59. Isac F. L., Rusu S. (2007) - *Management în turism*, ediția a II-a revizuită și adăugită, Editura Mirton, Timișoara
60. Josan I. (2009) - *Țara Silvaniei*, Studiu de geografie regională, Presa Universitară din Oradea, Oradea
61. Kerekes K., et al., 2010., *Dezvoltare rurală. Ocuparea forței de muncă în mediul rural*, Editura Accent, Cluj- Napoca, pp. 33, 127.
62. Knight P. (2005) - *Planul eficace de marketing. O metodă valorificată pentru companiile de orice mărime*, Editura BIC ALL, București
63. Kotler P. (1997) - *Managementul marketingului*, Editura Teora, București
64. Krueger, RA, (2003). Focus Group, *Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*, SAGE Publications, http://sage-ereference.com/socialscience/Article_n345.html, accesat 25.01.2019
65. L.R. Brown, Eco (2001)- *Economy. Creating an economy for our planet*, Bucharest, Technical Publishing House, pg.159.
66. Lazăr I., Marton M., Lazăr P. S., (2000), *Management general*, Curs universitar, UBB Cluj Napoca
67. Lefter V., Deaconu A., Manolescu A., Marinceaș V. C., Marin I., Nica E., Bogdan A., Igreț Ș. (2012) - *Managementul resurselor umane*, Editura Preuniversitaria, București
68. Liviu I., 2008., Basic enterprise economy, course support for Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj- Napoca, Continuing Education Center and teaching at Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Cluj Napoca, p 33.
69. Lupaș I. (1937) - *Istoria unirii românilor*, Fundația Culturală Regală "Principele Carol", București
70. Mac, I., Petrea, Rodica, Peter, D., 1999, Issue of the implications and requirements of the development of rural tourism in Romania, Terra- magazine, Geographical Society of Romania, Bucharest, nr.1-2/1999, p.7 -11.
71. Maghiu P. (2011) - *Peștera de la Cuciulat, unică în Europa Centrală*, în "Adevărul de seară"
72. Maracineanu F., Nistreanu M., Constantin E., *Dezvoltare rurala. Politici si strategii*, Editura Ceres, Bucuresti, 2003;
73. Matei D., *Turismul rural. Teorie si realitate*, Editura Terra Nostra, Iasi, 2005;
74. Mateoc S., Ungureanu, G., 2010. Regional and rural development. Developments and trends, Publisher Mirton, Timisoara, 46.
75. Medve A., Daraczi I., Coste G. (2011) - *Obiective turistice în nord-estul județului Sălaj*, Editura Școala Noastră, Zalău
76. Mihaș I., Pop I., Mastan M., Lungescu D., Lazăr I., Popa M. (2003) - *Management general*, Editura Carpatică, Cluj Napoca
77. Minciu R., (2004). *Tourism Economy*, 3rd Edition, Uranus Publishing House, Bucharest.
78. Minciu, Rodica (1995) - *Amenajarea turistică a teritoriului*, Editura Sylvi, București
79. Mineriu R. (2000) - *Economia turismului*, Editura Uranus, București
80. MINISTERUL AGRICULTURII SI DEZVOLTARII RURALE (MADR), *Programul National de Dezvoltare Rurală (PNDR) 2007 – 2013*, www.madr.ro.
81. Moga T., Rădulescu C., (2004)*Dezvoltarea complexa a spatiului rural*, Editura ASE, Bucuresti;
82. Moise I., Șteiu N., Bara Ș. (2007) - *Fildurile. Frumusețe, istorie și artă populară*. Editura Caiete Silvane, Zalău
83. Morariu T., Sorocovschi F. (1972) - *Județul Sălaj*, Editura Academiei, București
84. Morrison, A., (2012)"*Destination Management and Destination Marketing*", Editura Routledge, New York;
85. Mortan Mar, 2005, *Agroturismul, o alternativă posibilă*, Editura Dacia, Cluj Napoca

86. Neacșu N. (2000) - *Turismul și dezvoltarea durabilă*, Editura Expert, București
87. Neacșu N., *Turismul și dezvoltarea durabilă*, Editura Expert, București, 1999;
88. Neagu V. (2002) - *Managementul turistic și al serviciilor turistice*, Editura Silvi, București
89. Neagu V., Stanciu Gh. (1996) - *România. Charta europeană a spațiului rural*, Editura Ceres, București
90. Neculau A. (2007) - *Dinamica grupului și a echipei*, Editura Polirom, Iași
91. Nicolescu O., Ion V., (1997), *Management*, Editura Economică, Ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită, București
92. Nicolescu, O., (2001). *SMEs management*, Economic Publishing House, Bucharest, p
93. Nicoletta, R., Servidio, R., (2012) "*Tourists' opinions and their selection of tourism destination images: An affective and motivational evaluation*", Articol publicat în "Tourism Management Perspectives 4(2012) 19-27" , Editura Elsevier;
94. Nistoreanu P., (1999) *Turismul rural – o afacere mica cu perspective mari*, Editura Didactica si Pedagogica R. A., Bucuresti;
95. Nistorescu , T., Sitnikov , C., (2009). *Strategic Management*, Editura Sitech, Craiova,
96. Nistorescu T. (2013), *Strategia întreprinderii și avantajul concurențial*, Editura Prouniversitaria, București
97. Oltean V. (2003) - *Marketingul serviciilor, o abordare managerială*, Editura Ecomar, București
98. Oțlea G. (2012) - *Arhimandrit, Mănăstirea Strâmba, loc sfânt de îndreptare a sufletului*, Zalău
99. Oțman P. I., (2006) *Dezvoltarea rurala durabila in Romania*, Editura Academiei Romane, Bucuresti;
100. Pădurean A. (2002) - *Mănăstirea "Adormirea Maicii Domnului" Strâmba, Sat Păduriș, comuna Hida, jud. Sălaj, Zalău*
101. Pascaru M. (2006) - *Valea Prahovei, Ghid turistic*, Editura Ad Libri, București
102. Pender L., Sharpley R., (2005). *The Management of Tourism*, SAGE Publications Ltd., p 187.
103. Petri Mor (1901-1904) - *Szilagyvarmegye Monographyaja*. (Monografia județului Sălaj) Budapesta
104. Pop I. A., Bolovan I. (2013) - *Istoria Transilvaniei*, Editura Eikon, Cluj Napoca
105. Popescu A., (2002) *Dezvoltare rurala*, Editura Universitara, Bucuresti;
106. Posea G. (2006), *Geografia României*, AllEducational, București
107. Postelnicu Gh. (1999) - *Economia Turismului*, Editura a II-a revăzută și adăugită, Universitatea Creștină "Dimitrie Cantemir", Cluj Napoca
108. Prodan D. (1986) - *Iobăgia în Transilvania în sec. al XVIII-lea*, I, Supușii. Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București
109. Pruțeanu Ș., Anastasilii B., Jijie T. (2005) - *Cercetare de marketing. Studiul piețelor pur și simplu*, Ediția a II-a, Editura Polirom, Iași
110. Radu I. (coordonator), Ursăcescu M, Ursăcescu D., Vlădeanu D., Cioc M., Burlacu S. (2005) - *Informatică și management. O cale spre performanță*, Ed. Universitară, București
111. Rădulescu C. Z., (2013), *Decizii multicriterială, metode și aplicații în dezvoltare durabilă*, Editura Printech, București.
112. Report 2009, Commission of the European Communities, Directorate - *Section – Economy and Management*
113. Ritchie, Brent J. R. and Crouch, Geoffrey I. (2003). *The Competitive Destination, A Sustainable Tourism Perspective*. Wallingford, Oxon: CABI Publishing.
114. Ritson, N., 2008. *Strategic Management*. Ventus Publishing, p 44.

115. Rojanschi V., Bran F., Diaconu Gh., Iosif Gh. N., Toderoiu, F., (1997)*Economics and the Environment*, Bucharest, Economic Tribune, pg.109.
116. Rotariu T. (1999) - *Recensământul din 1900, Transilvania*, Editura Staff București, București
117. Rotariu, I., (2009) "*Dezvoltarea Destinației Turistice*", Sibiu, Editura Alma Mater;
118. Rusu S. (2007) - *Turism rural și agroturism*, Editura Mirtan, Timișoara
119. *Sălaj. Monografie*, (1980) - Editura Sport Turism, București
120. Savu A. (1975) - *România. Sinteză Geografică*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București
121. Schase R. (1998) - *Clasele sociale*, Editura Du Style, București
122. Scioșteanu A., CM, (2006), The effects of rural tourism development in Romania, Annals of University of Craiova, Economic Sciences Series no. 34, Vol 1, p 19.
123. Simion C. O., Tănăsescu R., Buianu V., (2002)*Management general, agricol si agroturistic*, Editura Universitas Company, Bucuresti;
124. Snepenger, D., Snepenger, M., Dalbey, M., Wessol, A., (2007)"*Meanings and Consumption Characteristics of Places at a Tourism Destination*" , Journal of Travel Research 2007, 45:310, Editura Sage;
125. Sombory, Claudia (2012) -*Oameni și așezări transilvane*, Editura Eco transilvan, Cluj-Napoca
126. Stăncioiu I., Militaru Gh. (1998) - *Management - elemente fundamentale*, Editura Teora, București
127. Stăncioiu A. (1999) *Dicționar de terminologie turistică*, Editura Economica, București
128. Stănciulescu G. (2003) - *Managementul operațiilor de turism*, Editura Allbeck, București
129. Stănciulescu G. (2004) - *Managementul turismului durabil în centrele urbane*, Editura Economică, București
130. Șteiu N., Bota L., Bota I. (2015) - *Huedinul și împrejurimile lui. Geografie- istorie locală*. Editura Dokia, Cluj Napoca
131. Stoica D., Lazăr I. P. (1908) - *Schița Monografică a Sălajului*, Institutul Tipografic și de Editare, Șimleu Silvaniei
132. Stoica G., Petrescu P. (1997) - *Dicționar de artă populară*, Editura Enciclopedică, București
133. Stoican M., Sonea C.G., Camarda A., (2013), *Managementul calității în turismul rural*, Editura PrimexCom Chișinău.
134. Sharpley, R. (2009). *Tourism Development and the Environment: Beyond Sustainability?*. London, New York: Earthscan.
135. Stugren B. (1994) - *Ecologia teoretică*, Casa de editură "Samus", Cluj Napoca
136. Swedberg R. (1992) - *Max Weber and the idea of Economic Sociology*, Princeton University Press
137. Swarbrooke, J. (1999) *Sustainable Tourism Management*. London: CABI Publishing.
138. Taloș I. (1997) - *Meșterul Manole "Grai și suflet- cultura națională"*, București.
139. Todaro, M.P. & Smith, S.C. (2003). *Economic Development* (8th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education limited
140. Thomas, A (2004). *The Study of Development*. Paper prepared for DSA Annual Conference. London: Church House
141. Tangi, S. (2005). *Introduction to Development Studies*. Scientific network. Academia. edu
142. Turner, R.K. (Eds.) (1993). *Sustainable Environmental Economics and Management. Principles and Practice*. London: Belhaven Press.
143. The Members of ETC Marketing Intelligence Committee (2011) "*Handbook on Tourism Product Development*", World Tourism Organisation, Madrid;
144. Ursan, V., (2010) - Name of person and place names in Sibiu Borders, Riwier Month, Sibiu, Techno Publishing-Media.

145. Vădineanu A., (1999)*Dezvoltare durabila. Mecanisme si instrumente*, Editura Universității, Bucuresti;
146. Veasna, S., Wu, W.I., Huang, C.H., (2013) "*The impact of destination source credeibility on destination satisfaction: The mediating effects of destination attachment and destination image*",
147. Vedinaș T. (2015) - *Proiecte rurale românești*, Editura Volol Press, Timișoara
148. Vincze M., (2000)*Dezvoltarea rurala si regionala. Idei si practici*, Editura Presa Universitara Clujeana, Cluj - Napoca;
149. Vincze, M., Kerekes, K., Pakucs, B. and Veress, E., (2009). Set of Methodologies for collecting data sets from the Reference Areas. Deliverable 3.1. of the EU Framework project 'RuralJobs ', www.ruraljobs.org
150. Wheeler, S.M. (2004) - *Plannig for Sustainability. Creating Livable. Equitable, and Ecological Communities*, Routlege, New York
151. Yin RK, (2003) - Case study research: design and methods, 3rd edition, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London / New Delhi, pp.67 -79.
152. Zaharia M., Zaharia C., Deac A., Vizinteanu F. (1993) - *Management. Teorie și aplicații*, Editura Tehnică, București
153. Zahiu L. și colaboratorii, (2003) -*Structurile agrare si viitorul politicilor agricole*, Editura Economica, Bucuresti;
154. Zecheru V. (2002) - *Management în cultură*, Editura Litera Internațional, București

Articles and studies:

1. Abdul Rauf FH. (2014). *Environmental strategic factor analysis of the tourism industry in the South Coastal Part of Sri Lanka*. J Emerg Trends Econ Manag Sci 5 (5): 426 -434.
2. Andereck, K., and Vogt, C. (2000) *The Relationship between Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Tourism Development Options*. Journal of Travel Research, 39, 27-36.
3. Archer, B., & Cooper C., (1994). *The positive and negative impacts of tourism*. In W. Theobald (Ed.), *Global tourism: The next decade* (pp. 73-91). Oxford, U.K.: Butterworth Heinemann Ltd
4. Archer, B., Cooper, C. & Ruhanen, L. (2005), "*The positive and negative impacts of tourism*", in W. Theobald (ed.), *Global Tourism: The Next Decade*, 3rd edn, pp. 79-102, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
5. Ariefianda R, Hidayat JW, Maryono E. (2019). *Assessment of Tourism Suitability in Natural Tourism Object of Lengkuas Island, Sijuk District, Belitung Regency, Bangka Belitung Province*. E3S Web of Conferences 125: 1-5. DOI: 10.1051/e3sconf/201912501011
6. Arrow, K.J & Fisher, A.C. (2000). *Environmental Preservation, Uncertainty, and Irreversibility*. In C. Gopalakrishnan (Ed.), *Classic Papers in Natural Resource Economics* (pp. 76-84). Hound- mills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
7. Arrow, K.J. & Lind, R.C. (1970). *Uncertainty and the Evaluation of Public Investment Decisions*. The American Economic Review, 60(3), 364-378.
8. Aziz A, Idris NH, Jamaludin M, Mariapan M, Samdin Z. (2017). *The attractiveness of Bukit Nanas recreational forest as an ecotourism destination as perceived by foreign visitors*. Intl J Asian Soc Sci 7 (7): 546-556. DOI: 10.18488/journal.1.2017.77.546.556
9. Barjoc C., (14 iulie 2014) - *Festivalul roman Porolissum este la a X-a ediție*, în "Graiul Sălajului", An XXII, nr. 5627
10. Barjoc C.,(4 iunie 2014) - *Zece ani de la prima ediție. Festivalul roman Zalău Porolissum se va desfășura în 25 și 26 iulie*, în "Graiul Sălajului", an XXII

11. Beck, U. & Wilms, J. (2004). *Conversations with Ulrich Beck*. Cambridge: Polity Press. În Duran, C.D., Gogan, L.M., Artene, A. & Duran, V. (2015). *The components of sustainable development - a possible approach*. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 26, 806-811
12. Bjork, P. (2000). *Ecotourism from a conceptual perspective, an extended definition of a unique tourism form*. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2(3), 189-202
13. Bodea C., (2014), *Rolul turismului în dezvoltarea rurală. Strategie de dezvoltarea turismului în Beliș, județul Cluj, România*, *Revista Transilvană de Științe Administrative*.
14. Boo, E. (1995). *Ecotourism planning for protected areas*. In K. Lindberg, & D. E. Hawkins (Eds.), *Ecotourism: A guide for planners and managers* (pp. 15-31). North Bennington: The Ecotourism Society
15. Bottrill, C., & Pearce, D. (1995). *Ecotourism: Towards a key elements approach to operationalizing the concept*. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 3(1), 45-54
16. Bramwell, B. (1990). *Green tourism in the countryside*. *Tourism Management*, 11(2) 358-360
17. Bramwell, B., Henry, I., Jackson, G., & Van der Straaten. J. (1996). *A framework for understanding sustainable tourism management*. In B. Bramwell, I. Henry, G., Jackson, A. G. Prat, G. Richards, & J. Van der Straaten, (Eds.), *Sustainable tourism management: Principles and practices* (pp. 23-71). Tilburg, NL: Tilburg University Press
18. Brooks, E. (2013). Is “*The Future We Want*” good for business?. Accesat la <http://www.newsustainabilityinc.com/2013/12/04/isthefuturewewantgoodforbusiness/>.
19. Buckley, R. (2009). *Evaluating the net effects of ecotourism on the environment: a framework, first assessment and future research*. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(6), 643-672
20. Butler, R. (1992). *Alternative Tourism: The Thin Edge of the Wedge*. In V. L. Smith, and W. R. Eadington, (Eds.), *Tourism Alternatives* (pp. 31-46). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press
21. Butler, R. (1993). *Interview with Richard Butler*. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(2), 137-142
22. Bulatovic I., Micera R. (2018). Slow Tourism concept and cultural sites: is the town of Kotor (Montenegro) ready for the Cittaslow Movement. In *Proceedings Culture, Heritage and Tourism Development*, 274-280. DOI: 10.15308/Sitcon-2018-274-280.
23. Byrd, E. T. and Gustke, L. D. (2004) *Identifying tourism stakeholder groups based on support for sustainable tourism development and participation in tourism activities*. In F. D. Pineda, & C. A. Brebbia (Eds.), *Sustainable tourism: The sustainable world*, 97-108. London: WIT Press.
24. Byrd, E. T. and Gustke, L. D. (2007) *Using Decision Trees to Identify Tourism Stakeholders: The case of two Eastern North Carolina counties*. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(3/4), 176-193.
25. Byrd, E. T., Bosley, H. E. and Dronberger, M. G. (2009a) *Comparisons of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impacts in rural Eastern North Carolina*. *Tourism Management*, 30(5), 693-703.
26. Byrd, E. T., Cardenas, D. A., and Greenwood, J. B. (2008) *Factors of Stakeholder Understanding of Tourism: The Case of Eastern North Carolina*. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8(3), 192-204.
27. Carreiro, H. (2014). *Sustainable tourism in India*. *USA Today*. Accesat la <http://traveltips.usatoday.com/sustainable-tourism-india-12448.html>

28. Cater, E. (1994). *Ecotourism in the third world – Problems and prospects for sustainability and the environment*. In E. Cater & G. Lowman (Eds.), *Ecotourism: A sustainable option?* (pp. 69-86). London, U.K.: John Wiley & Sons Ltd
29. Cater, E., & Lowman, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Ecotourism: A sustainable option?* Chichester, U.K.: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
30. Cheia, G. (2013). *Ecotourism: Definition and concepts*. *Journal of Tourism*, (15), 56-60
31. Caffyn, A. (2012). Advocating and implementing slow tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 37(1), 77-80. DOI:10.1080/02508281.2012.11081690.
32. Chang, C. L., McAleer, M., and Ramos, V. (2020). A charter for sustainable tourism after COVID-19, *Sustainability*, 12, 3671, 1-4. DOI: 10.3390/su12093671.
33. Chende Gh. R., Petrean P. I. (iunie 2006), - *Folclorul - simbolul național*, în "Sylvania", An V, nr. 1-4, pp.13-16
34. Chiutsi, S., Mukoroverwa, M., Karigambe, P., & Mudzengi, B. K. (2011). *The theory and practice of ecotourism in Southern Africa*. *Journal of Hospitality Management and Tourism*, 2(2), 14-21
35. Clarke J, Godfrey K. (2000). *The Tourism Development Handbook: A Practical Approach to Planning and Marketing*. Continuum, London.
36. Cocean R., Souca L. (2018), *Particularități ale ciclului de viață al destinațiilor turistice rurale*, *Geographia Napocensis Anul XII*, nr. 1.
37. Conway, D., & Timms, B. (2010). Re-branding alternative tourism in the Caribbean: The case for 'slow tourism'. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10(4), 329-344. DOI: 10.1057/thr.2010.12.
38. Cohen, E., & Cohen, S.A. (2012). *Current sociological theories and issues in tourism*. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), 2177-2202
39. Cooper C, Fletcher J, Gilbert D, Wanhill S, Shepherd R. 1998. *Tourism: Principles and Practice*. 2nd ed. Pearson Education Limited. England
40. Costa, C. (2001) *An Emerging Tourism Planning Paradigm? A Comparative Analysis between Town and Tourism Planning*. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3, 425-441.
41. Croall, J. (1995). *Preserve or destroy: Tourism and the environment*. London, U.K.: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation
42. D'Amore, L. J. (1983), "*Guidelines to planning in harmony with host community*", in P. Murphy (ed.), *Tourism in Canada: Selected Issues and Options*, pp. 135-159, University of Victoria, Victoria B. C.
43. Davidescu, A.A.M., Strat, V.A., Grosu, R.M., Zgură, I.D. and Anagnoste, S., (2018). *The Regional Development of the Romanian Rural Tourism Sector*. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 20 (Special No. 12), pp. 854-869.
44. Davies, G.R. (2013). *Appraising Weak and Strong Sustainability: Searching for a Middle Ground*. *Consilience: The Journal of Sustainable Development*, 10(1), 111-124.
45. De Brouwer, P.J.S. (2008). *Maslowian Portfolio Theory: An alternative formulation of the Behavioural Portfolio Theory*. *Journal of Asset Management*, 9(6), 359-365. DOI: 10.1057/jam.2008.35.
46. Dickinson, J., & Lumsdon, L. (2010). *Slow Travel and Tourism*. UK: Earthscan. DOI: 10.1017/S0814062600000203.
47. De Kadt, E. (1992). *Making the alternative sustainable: Lessons from development for tourism*. In V. Smith, & W. Eadington (Eds.). *Tourism alternatives: Potentials and problems in the development of tourism* (pp. 47-75). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press

48. Demonja, D., & Gredicak, T. (2014). *Exploring the cultural tourism-sustainable development' nexus: The case of Croatia*. Scientific Annals of the "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi: Economic Sciences Series, 61(2), 161-179.
49. Dimitriou, C. K. (2000). *Ecotourism: A different approach*. Tourism & Economy, 27(264), 120-124
50. Dobson, A. (1996). *Environmental Sustainabilities: an analysis and a typology*. Environmental Politics, 5, 401-428. In Davies, G. R. (2013). *Appraising Weak and Strong Sustainability: Searching for a Middle Ground*. Consilience: The Journal of Sustainable Development, 10(1), 111-124.
51. Dodds R, Ali A, Galaski K. (2016). *Mobilizing knowledge: determining key elements for success and pitfalls in developing community-based tourism*. Curr Issues Tourism 21 (13): 1547-1568. DOI: 10.1080/13683500.2016.11502
52. Duran, C.D., Gogan, L.M., Artene, A. & Duran, V. (2015). *The components of sustainable development - a possible approach*. Procedia Economics and Finance, 26, 806-811.
53. Dutton, I. & Hall, C. M. 1989, "*Making tourism sustainable: The policy/practice conundrum*", Proceedings of the Environment Institute of Australia Second National Conference, Melbourne, Australia.
54. Dzulyana MA, Irawan EP, Saragih N. (2019). *Semiotic analysis of the message of meaning on Pesona Indonesia Advertisement of Pesona Indonesia 2017 Destination Version*. Intl J Innov Sci Res Technol 4 (10): 476-484.
55. Everingham, P., and Chassagne, N. (2020). Post COVID-19 ecological and social reset: moving away from capitalist growth models towards tourism as Buen Vivir. *Tourism Geographies*, 1-12. DOI 10.1080/14616688.2020.1762119.
56. EEA, European Environment Agency (1999). *Environmental indicators: Typology and overview*.
57. EEA, European Environment Agency (2003). *EEA core set of indicators: Revised version*. Copenhagen: EEA.
58. EEA, European Environment Agency (2005). *EEA core set of indicators: Guide*. Copenhagen: EEA.
59. Elkington, J. (1994). *Towards the Sustainable Corporation: Win-Win-Win Business Strategies for Sustainable Development*. California Management Review, 36(2), 90-100.
60. ESDN, European Sustainable Development Network (2012). *The Rio+20 Conference 2012: Objectives, processes and outcomes*. Accesat la http://www.sd-network.eu/quarterly%20reports/report%20files/pdf/2012-June-The_Rio+20_Conference_2012.pdf.
61. ESDN, European Sustainable Development Network (2013). *Quarterly Reports: Objectives and Indicators of Sustainable Development in Europe – A Comparative Analysis of European Coherence*. Accesat la http://www.sd-network.eu/quarterly%20reports/report%20files/pdf/2007-December-Objectives_and_Indicators_of_Sustainable_Development_in_Europe.pdf.
62. Estevo, G. (2010). Development. In W. Sachs (Ed.), *The Development Dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1-23). London, New York: Zed Books.
63. European Commission (2001a). *Defining, measuring and evaluating carrying capacity in European tourism destinations*. Final report. Accesat la http://ec.europa.eu/environment/iczm/pdf/tcca_en.pdf.
64. European Commission (2001b). *Measuring progress towards a more sustainable Europe: Proposed indicators for sustainable development*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

65. European Commission (2005). *Measuring progress towards a more sustainable Europe: Sustainable development indicators for the European Union*. Data 1990-2005. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
66. European Commission (2007). *Measuring progress towards a more sustainable Europe: 2007 monitoring report of the EU sustainable development strategy*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
67. European Commission (2009). *Sustainable Development Indicators. An Overview of relevant Framework Programme funded research and identification of further needs in view of EU and international activities*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Accesat la http://www.ieep.eu/assets/443/sdi_review.pdf.
68. European Commission (2012). *Life cycle indicators for resources, products and waste*. Report by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
69. Eurostat (2012). *Figures for the future: 20 years of sustainable development in Europe? A guide for citizens*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
70. Eurostat (2013). *Sustainable development in the European Union: 2013 monitoring report of the EU sustainable development strategy*. European Commission. Accesat la http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-02-13-237/EN/KS-02-13-237-EN.PDF.
71. Eurostat (2014). *Getting messages across using indicators. A handbook based on experiences from assessing Sustainable Development Indicators. 2014 edition*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
72. Eurostat (2015a). *Sustainable development indicators*. Accesat la <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/sdi>.
73. Eurostat (2015b). *Sustainable development in the European Union. 2015 monitoring report of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy. 2015 edition*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
74. Farrell, B. H. and Twining-Ward, L. (2004) *Reconceptualizing Tourism*. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 274-295.
75. Foldes, L.P. & Rees, R. (1977). *A Note on the Arrow-Lind Theorem*. *American Economic Review*, 67(2), 188-193.
76. Fullagar, S., Markwell, K., and Wilson, E. (2012). Starting Slow: Thinking Through Slow Mobilities and Experiences In S. Fullagar, K. Markwell, & E. Wilson (Eds.), *Slow Tourism: Experiences and Mobilities*, 1-8. UK: Channel View Publications.
77. Freeman, M. (2014, March, 8). *Sustainable tourism in New Zealand*. USA Today. Accesat la <http://traveltips.usatoday.com/sustainable-tourism-new-zealand-13524.html>
78. Freeman, R. E. (1999), "*Divergent stakeholder theory*", *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 233-236.
79. Gauthier, D. A. (1993). *Sustainable development, tourism and wildlife*. In J.G.. Nelson, R. Butler & G. Wall (Eds.), *Tourism and sustainable development: Monitoring, planning, managing* (pp. 59-82). Ontario, CA: University of Waterloo
80. Georgiev, G. (2010). *Rural and ecotourism development in scope of Bulgarian tourism*. *Scientific Annals of the 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza' University of Iasi: Economic Sciences Series*, 325-339
81. Groenendaal, E. (2012). Slow tourism initiatives: An exploratory study of Dutch lifestyles entrepreneurs in France. *Slow tourism: Experiences and mobilities*, 54, pp. 201.
82. Ghergariu L., Fărcaș A. (1977) - *Țara Silvaniei*, în *Acta Musei Prolissensum*, Zalău

83. Gilbert, D. C., Penda and Friel (1994). *Issues in sustainability and the national parks of Kenya and Cameroon*. In C. P. Cooper, & A. Lockwood (Eds.), *Progress in Tourism, Recreation, and Hospitality Management* (Vol. 16, pp. 30-45). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons
84. Godfrey, K. B. (1998). *Attitudes towards "sustainable tourism" in the UK: A view from local government*. *Tourism Management*, (19)3, 213-224
85. Green, H., Hunter, C., & Moore, B. (1990). *Assessing the environmental impact of tourism development; Use of the Delphi technique*. *Tourism Management*, 11(2), 111-120
86. Guimaraes CRFF, Silva JR. (2016). *Pay gap by gender in the tourism industry of Brazil*. *Tourism Manag* 52: 440-450.
87. Gunn, C. (1977), "*Industry pragmatism vs tourism planning*", *Leisure Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 1. pp. 85-94.
88. Gunn, C. A. (1988), *Tourism Planning*, Taylor & Francis, New York.
89. Gunn, C. A. (1994), *Tourism Planning: Basics, Concepts, Cases*, Taylor & Francis, Philadelphia.
90. Gunn, C. A. (1994). *Tourism planning: Basics, Concepts, Cases*. (3rd ed.). London, U.K.: Taylor & Francis Ltd
91. Gursoy, D. and Rutherford, D. G. (2004) Host Attitudes toward Tourism: An Improved Structural Model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31, 495-516.
92. Gyorfı D. (2012) - *Doi oameni liberi. Baronul și iobagul*, *Revista Silvania*, nr. 3, Zalău
93. Habibah A, Mushrifah I, Hamzah J, et al. (2012). Assessing natural capitals for sustainable ecotourism in Tasik Chini Biosphere Reserve. *Adv Nat Appl Sci* 6 (1): 1-9.
94. Hall, C. M. & McArthur, S. (1998), *Integrated Heritage Management*, The Stationery Office, London.
95. Hall, C. M. (1994), *Tourism and Politics, Power and Place*, Bellhaven Press, London.
96. Hall, C. M. (1998), *Tourism Development, Dimensions and Issues*, 3rd edn, Addison Wesley Longman, South Melbourne.
97. Hall, C. M. (1999), "*Rethinking collaboration and partnership: A public policy perspective*", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, vol. 7, no. 3&4, pp. 274-289.
98. Hall, C. M. (2000), *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships*, Prentice Hall, Harlow.
99. Hall, C. M. (2003), *Introduction to Tourism: Dimensions and Issues*, 4th edn, Pearson Education Australia, Frenchs Forest.
100. Hall, C. M. (2012). The contradictions and paradoxes of slow food: Environmental change, sustainability and the conservation of taste. In Fullagar, S., Markwell, K., & Wilson, E. (2012). *Slow tourism: Experiences and mobilities*, 53-68. *Aspects of Tourism*, 54. Channel View Publications. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781845412821>
101. Hall, C. M., Jenkins, J. & Kearsley, G. (1997), *Tourism Planning and Policy in Australia and New Zealand: Cases, Issues and Practice*, McGraw Hill, Sydney.
102. Harris, R., & Leiper, N. (1995). *Sustainable development and tourism: An overview*. In R. Harris & N. Leiper (Eds.), *Sustainable tourism: An Australian perspective* (p. xviii). Oxford, U.K.: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd
103. Hartwick, J.M. (1977). *Intergenerational Equity and the Investing of Rents from Exhaustible Resources*. *The American Economic Review*, 67(5), 972-974.
104. Harwood, R.R. (1990). *The history of sustainable agriculture*. In C.A. Edwards et al. (Eds.). *Sustainable Farming Systems*, (pp. 3-19). In Duran, C.D., Gogan, L.M., Artene, A. & Duran, V. (2015). The components of sustainable development - a possible approach. *Procedia Eco- nomics and Finance*, 26, 806-811

105. Hawkins, C. (1994). *Ecotourism: Opportunities for developing countries*. In W. Theobald (Ed.), *Global tourism: The next decade* (pp. 261-273). Oxford, U.K.: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd