Article

Specificity of Sustainable Structural Dynamics of Local Economy in Romanian Tourist Resorts

Alexandra Grecu ^{1,2} , Andreea Karina Gruia ^{1,2} , Marian Marin ^{1,2} , Mariana Bănuță ³,
Cosmin Olteanu ⁴, Ionuț Constantin ⁴, Mihaela Gadoiu ³, Camelia Teodorescu ^{1,2},
Răzvan Cătălin Dobrea ⁵ and Cristian Constantin Drăghici ^{1,2,*}

¹ Research Center for Integrated Analysis and Territorial Management, Faculty of Geography, University of Bucharest, 030018 Bucharest, Romania; alexandra.grecu@drd.unibuc.ro (A.G.); andreea.karina.gruia@drd.unibuc.ro (A.K.G.); marian.marin@geo.unibuc.ro (M.M.); camiteo@yahoo.com (C.T.)

² Faculty of Geography, University of Bucharest, 010041 Bucharest, Romania

³ Faculty of Economic Sciences and Law, University of Pitești, 110014 Pitești, Romania; mari.banuta@yahoo.com (M.B.); mihaela_gadoiu@yahoo.com (M.G.)

⁴ Faculty of Administration and Business, University of Bucharest, 4-12, 030018 Bucharest, Romania; olteanu.cosmin@faa.unibuc.ro (C.O.); ionut.constantin@faa.unibuc.ro (I.C.)

⁵ Faculty of Management, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, 010374 Bucharest, Romania; razvan.dobrea@man.ase.ro

* Correspondence: cristian.draghici@geo.unibuc.ro; Tel.: +40-721-818-331

Received: 12 November 2019; Accepted: 4 December 2019; Published: 13 December 2019

Abstract: The lack of sustainable development strategies of the tourist resorts from Romania caused the structural dynamics of their economy to record large fluctuations under the impact of determinants with unpredictable developments. The spectacular dynamics have led to developments difficult to predict, in many situations that generate environmental conflicts, where the economic pressure has exceeded the support capacity of the natural environment. In this study, we aim to analyze the dynamic relationship between tourism and the other components of the economy, from each resort from Romania. The significant growth of tourism in recent years requires new approaches, relevant for understanding the role of tourism in increasing the complexity of the local economy. Measuring the role of tourism in the development of local economy was achieved by building an economic database for all tourist resorts from Romania (according to Government Decision No. 107 of 2018), at the four-digit NACE code level (Classification of National Economy Activities), for the economic indicators considered relevant: number of companies, number of employees, and turnover and profit, for the period 2000–2016, as well as at territorial administrative unit level. Detailed analyses revealed very different structural dynamics, the spectacular dynamics, lacking a coherent strategic framework, led in all situations to the emergence of environmental conflicts. Tourist resorts in which tourism has become an essential component of economic development have based their development on capitalization of local resources, which led to multiplication effects, materialized in a spectacular evolution of the local economy, and an increasing pressure on the natural environment.

Keywords: sustainable development; tourist resorts; local economy; territorial management; Romania

1. Introduction

Analyzing the global economic development of the last decade, it can be noticed that tourism has become an important sector for local, national, and international economic activities [1], and, with its development, there has been a diversification of both tourist products and destinations [2]. Potential economic benefits of tourism, at national or regional level, is a very discussed topic in the literature

where the development of the tourism sector leads to possible direct or indirect positive effects on the economy and on the well-being of communities [3–10]. Tourism, is one of the greatest wealth generators, classified as one of the major economic development factors [11], and is often described as a driver of growth and economic development [12], being approached as a priority sector for the Romanian economy, given the potential contribution of general economic recovery.

Tourism is, at the same time, an economic sector that consumes resources and puts pressure on ecosystems. The development of tourism often requires a strong intervention, in a short time, on the environment, generating a whole chain of negative multiplier effects. The analysis of the dynamic relationship between tourism and the other components of the economic system is a good premise for identifying potential imbalances in the natural environment.

As a result, the debate on the sustainability of tourism has become particularly important lately [13–17]. This fact is due, among other things, to the decision-makers who have become increasingly aware of the limitations of using natural and cultural resources, but also the negative impact that tourism, without adequate measures, can have on the environment, on society, and on people [18].

On the other hand, sustainability was considered a key element in the primary models in the specialty literature on tourism competitiveness [19], and some authors have referred, in particular, to environmental sustainability as a key variable for the competitiveness of long-term tourism destinations or for improving the quality of life of the local population [20]. International or intergovernmental organizations as well as the United Nations Environmental Program and World Tourism Organization, have promoted the concept of sustainable tourism as a “balance” appropriate between economic viability, environmental responsibility, and socio-cultural prosperity [21,22].

The analysis of the dynamic relationship between tourism and the other systemic components is a good premise for identifying potential imbalances in the natural environment. In addition, in order to measure and monitor the sustainability of tourism, researchers have developed different techniques, such as the Sustainable Tourism Index, the Global Sustainable Tourism Council Criteria, the Systematic Indicators System, or the Importance-Performance Analysis [23–25].

The role played by the tourism sector in the development of local economies is a critical issue for geographers [26,27], representing one of the most studied topics in tourism studies. Its role in the development of local economies is important due to the complex economic influences that occur both vertically and horizontally in the local economic system [28–32]. Studying this role, held by tourism in the development of local economies, becomes very important for the design and implementation of sustainable management strategies in the medium and long term. Through a management policy on improving services, along with an appropriate marketing policy, tourism can bring significant economic benefits to these communities [33,34]. Thus, the development of methodologies for modeling the relations patterns with the other components of the territorial system is an important goal for both researchers and decision-makers.

The study aims to develop a methodology for analyzing the role of tourism in the development of local economy, based on relevant indicators of economic complexity for each administrative-territorial unit analyzed from Romania for a statistically relevant period of time. Modeling the complex relationship between tourism and the other components of the local economy (agriculture, industry, trade, etc.), will bring new elements of knowledge regarding one of the most dynamic relationships between the components of a territorial system, and designing in this way, the premises that can generate imbalances in the natural environment.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Area

In this study, all tourist resorts from Romania are analyzed from the point of view of tourism's contribution to the development of the local economy. The Law of Tourism defines the tourist resort as

“the locality or part of a locality, which has a tourist heritage and a tourist infrastructure, in which the economic activities mainly support the achievement of the tourism product and which is attested by Government decision, at the proposal of the authority of the central public administration responsible for tourism, in the situation of cumulative fulfillment of the mandatory minimum certification criteria, approved by Government decision”. According to the Government Decision no. 107 of 2018, approving the attestation of some localities or parts of localities as tourist resorts of national or local interest and on the change of annex no. 5 to the Government Decision no. 852 of 2008, to approve the rules and the attestation criteria of tourist resorts, in Romania are 108 resorts (47 national interest and 61 local interest). To mention that, although Romania has 108 tourist resorts, in cartographic representation there are only 98, since: Băile Felix and 1 Mai; Crivaia and Semenic; North Eforie and South Eforie; Mangalia, Cap Aurora, Jupiter, Neptun-Olimp, Saturn and Venus; Predeal, Pârâul Rece and Timișul de Sus, share the same territorial administrative unit. The cartographic model was developed with the help of open-source software QGIS (Grüt, Switzerland), which represents the spatial distribution of tourist resorts at both, national and regional level (Figure 1).

Figure 1. The distribution of tourist resorts in Romania.

2.2. Data Analysis

The study is based on the development of an economic database, both at the territorial administrative unit level, and four-digit NACE code (Classification of National Economy Activities) with the four economic indicators relevant to tourism development in each resort in Romania, for the period 2000–2016 (number of companies, number of employees, turnover, and profit). Based on this, were made evolution charts for the aforementioned indicators, for analyzing the share of tourism in the total local economy for the tourist resorts, as well as for the evolution of the three sectors of activity (primary, secondary, and tertiary), highlighting the tourism sector, for the same period. The database for the turnover and profit was represented in Romanian currency, Ron, where 1 Ron is equal to 0.28 € (Euro), average course calculated for the period 2000–2016. To identify the structural dynamics of tourist resorts, an analysis of the variation of the ranks held by each resort was made by: the share of the company's number from tourism sector in total number of companies, the share of the employee's number from tourism sector in total number of employees, the share of turnover from tourism sector in total turnover, and the share of the profit from tourism sector in total profit. In the end, we made a matrix with the variation of ranks with the arithmetic mean of the share of the four economic indicators from tourism sector for each resort. For the matrix, each resort has been given a certain color: red for

resorts that showed a declining trend, orange for a relatively constant evolution, i.e., their evolution does not show large fluctuations, and green for those resorts that experienced an increase in rank over the period under review. The analysis of the relationship between the increase of the role of tourism in the local economy and the environmental conflicts was done by creating a database on their number, recorded in official documents. Thus, by associating their number with the evolution trend of this relationship, the direct link between tourism developments has been observed, in most cases in a short period, and also the generation of environmental conflicts.

3. Results

In the territorial systems with touristic functionality from Romania, the total number of companies is showing an upward dynamics from the first year of the analysis, 2000, until 2008, with an increase of about 69%, the tourism sector contributing to this evolution with values between 3% and 3.4% (Figure 2). While the total number of companies declined after 2008, with about 7% due to the global economic crisis, those from the tourism sector have registered an upward trend, from 2668 companies in 2008, to 2742 in the last year of analysis, this growth amounting to 2.7%. The main areas of tourism where the number of companies increased were: hotels and other similar accommodation facilities, tourist agency activities, and tour operator activities, and the main resorts where these rises were produced were Mamaia, Eforie, Păltiniș.

Figure 2. Total number of companies from total economy and from tourism sector in tourist resorts from Romania.

Regarding the number of employees (Figure 3), things are similar to the number of companies, but with few exceptions. Here, the economic crisis has been felt since 2007, with a sharp decline of around 24% by 2010. After this period, the number of active employees in tourist resorts enters a trajectory with small fluctuations. As for the tourism sector, the number of employees is variable throughout the analyzed period, their percentage oscillating from year to year, with the highest value being in 2016, when out of a total of 410,223 employees, 18,371 were active in tourism. As the main areas of tourism activity are: hotels and other similar accommodation facilities, accommodation facilities for holidays and short-term periods, other accommodation services, other reservation and tourist assistance services, and tourism agency activities.

Both the turnover and the profit of tourist resorts (Figures 4 and 5) follow the same well-known growth path until 2008, then they decrease over the next period, that is attributed to the economic crisis and which has made its mark especially in the case of profit, its decrease from 2008 to 2009 being about 24%, and a spectacular recovery for both indicators over the past two years of the analysis that can be attributed to new investments. Additionally, in the last two years of the analysis, 2015 and 2016, there are changes in the share of the tourism sector, so it decreases in the case of turnover and increases for profit.

Figure 3. The number of employees from total economy and from tourism sector in tourist resorts from Romania.

Figure 4. Total turnover from total economy and from tourism sector in tourist resorts from Romania (values represented in Ron, where 1 Ron = 0.28 €, average course calculated for the period 2000–2016).

Figure 5. Evolution of the number of companies by sectors of activity and the evolution of the tourism sector in the tertiary sector in tourist resorts.

Figure 4 Total turnover from total economy and from tourism sector in tourist resorts from Romania (values represented in Ron, where 1 Ron = 0.28 €, average course calculated for the period 2000–2016).

For the number of companies, the tertiary sector, which includes services, water distribution, and electricity production, holds the largest share of the companies at the level of the resorts: 76.8% in 2000, 76.2% in 2008, and 78.5% in 2016 (Figure 5). Tourism, which is part of this sector, makes an economic contribution between 3% and 3.7%. Its contribution throughout the period analyzed is increasing. Of the total number of companies that existed in 2016 in the tertiary sector, 73,118, 2727 were active in tourism. The second sector, which records a significant number of firms, is the secondary one with main areas of activity: manufacture of other outerwear, sawmilling and planning of wood, manufacture of communication equipment, construction of residential and non-residential buildings, plumbing, heat, and air-conditioning installation. On the last place is the primary sector, which brings the lowest economic contribution to resorts, not exceeding the threshold of 2000 firms, accounting for 2.5% of the total local economy. It should be mentioned that during the whole period analyzed, the number of companies in the tourism sector exceeds the number of companies in the primary sector.

Regarding the number of employees (Figure 6), in the first years of analysis, the sector in which most employees were employed was the secondary one. After 2004, the main sector of activity with the largest number of employees becomes the tertiary sector, with about 59% of the total number. Tourism contributes between 6.8% and 10.8% in terms of the number of employees in the tertiary sector. Of the total number of employees in this sector in 2016 (242,973), 18,371 were active in the tourism sector. As for the primary sector, it has the lowest number, its share declining year to year, so in 2016 records show only 9833 employees, mostly in the field of growing of cereals (except rice), leguminous crops, and oil seeds. Starting with 2013, the number of tourism employees exceeded the number of those active in the primary sector.

Figure 6. Evolution of the number of employees by sectors of activity and the evolution of the tourism sector in the tertiary sector in tourist resorts.

Turnover (Figure 7) and profit (Figure 8), present the same ascending trend pattern, with fluctuations, with increases up to 2008 and with a recovery in the next period. The tertiary sector is the one with the highest turnover and profit from tourist resorts with a share of 57% and 63.9% for 2016, followed by the secondary sector, with a lower economic contribution, but significant, of 40% and 31.5%. The contribution of tourism to the two indicators, the turnover and profit, in the tertiary sector is between 3.6% and 6.1%, respectively 3.9% and 13.6%. The sector with the smallest share of the economy of these systems is the primary one, where in any year of the analysis period, does not exceed the value threshold of 4,039,940.47 Ron (847,539.11 €, where 1 Ron = 0.28 €) for the turnover, respectively 499,851,582 Ron for profit (104,863,863.39 €).

Figure 7. Evolution of turnover by sectors of activity and the evolution of the tourism sector in the tertiary sector in tourist resorts (values represented in Ron, where 1 Ron = 0.28 €, average course calculated for the period 2000–2016).

Figure 8. Evolution of profit by sectors of activity and the evolution of the tourism sector in the tertiary sector in tourist resorts (values represented in Ron, where 1 Ron = 0.28 €, average course calculated for the period 2000–2016).

Analysis of the rankings held by the share of the tourism sector in the total number of companies in tourist resorts from Romania (Table 1), shows a predominance of those who, over the 17 years, have a relatively constant trend with a share of 53.1% of the total number of resorts. These resorts did not show large fluctuations in the occupied rank and they have maintained their position throughout the period (Azuga, Covasna, Sinaia, Bran, Breaza, etc.). The second category is occupied by the ones with a general trend of decrease, where tourism is not their main activity, and natural resources can not support their development. They stand out with a fairly high share of about 29.6% (Amara, Mangalia, Eforie, Geoagiu-Băi, Techirghiol, Stâna de Vale, Lacul Sărat, Săcelu, etc.). The last category identified is that of the resorts with a general trend of growth where tourism has led to local economic development: Băile Herculane, Dâmbovicioara, Slănic Moldova, Arieșeni, Crivaia/Semenic, Moieciu, Ocna Șugatag, etc. The share held by these resorts is only 17.3%.

Table 1. Variation of the rankings for the share of number of companies from the tourism sector in the total number of companies.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Amara	62	62	68	73	80	84	87	78	81	84	85	84	76	85	85	82	86	↓
Azuga	32	36	34	34	39	51	38	36	42	45	44	41	38	33	34	37	36	→
Bușteni	13	14	15	15	14	16	18	21	23	26	27	23	23	21	20	23	24	↓
Buziaș	43	47	44	62	55	60	65	74	71	76	74	77	81	79	87	77	78	↓
Băile Govora	28	26	24	32	32	29	39	40	50	60	58	58	59	60	57	94	95	↓
Băile Felix/Imai	39	40	39	44	37	30	27	31	31	29	31	31	32	32	37	38	41	→
Băile Herculane	25	23	26	30	21	19	23	22	18	18	22	20	16	16	14	14	14	↑
Băile Olănești	10	9	7	8	9	13	12	13	13	12	12	11	14	13	15	22	22	↓
Băile Tușnad	3	4	4	3	2	3	3	4	5	6	7	6	4	5	6	3	2	→
Borșa	45	38	38	33	33	34	29	28	32	34	35	35	37	41	49	49	52	↓
Borsec	20	15	11	16	16	17	16	19	26	19	24	17	21	24	22	19	18	→
Câmpulung Moldovenesc	44	44	47	52	53	54	55	52	58	55	50	54	57	57	60	54	56	→
Mangalia	27	25	23	27	25	33	40	39	44	44	41	42	41	40	44	46	45	↓
Călimănești-Căciulata	23	33	28	29	29	28	32	35	36	38	43	40	47	47	46	44	44	↓
Costinești	5	6	10	7	8	9	8	12	14	11	14	15	17	19	18	15	15	↓
Covasna	73	71	78	72	61	61	64	67	66	70	70	70	66	68	66	67	68	→
Dâmbovicioara	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	33	9	4	4	3	5	6	7	6	5	↑
Eforie	6	8	8	9	12	11	14	15	17	16	18	16	15	18	17	17	17	↓
Geoagiu-Băi	19	20	21	22	24	24	25	32	29	28	30	28	31	30	31	31	34	↓
Gura Humorului	41	38	36	42	49	50	50	53	52	54	54	55	58	53	56	52	53	→
Mamaia	52	52	57	57	65	69	70	71	74	75	73	78	74	76	73	72	71	→
Moneasa	9	3	3	4	5	4	4	2	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	→
Poiana Brașov	59	58	64	59	66	66	66	68	73	74	72	72	69	73	71	71	69	→
Predeal/Păraul Rece/Timișul de Sus	2	5	5	5	7	6	6	6	6	9	10	7	9	10	10	9	13	↓
Pucioasa	74	66	71	79	70	74	80	83	84	90	88	88	91	94	93	93	92	↓
Râșnov	46	46	35	45	41	46	47	46	48	47	46	43	39	37	42	47	50	→
Slănic Prahova	53	54	65	70	73	79	60	51	56	52	59	60	62	64	61	48	43	→
Sinaia	21	22	27	23	20	21	19	20	25	23	28	25	27	28	27	27	27	→
Sângeorz-Băi	29	30	31	38	42	52	53	59	64	71	61	62	64	66	65	64	65	↓
Slănic Moldova	53	56	50	35	31	25	21	18	21	27	29	24	28	23	24	24	21	↑
Sovata	18	21	32	31	26	27	26	27	28	31	33	32	33	35	36	34	35	↓
Sucevița	3	1	1	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	8	9	↓
Târgu-Ocna	75	74	79	76	71	75	79	80	80	81	80	82	85	82	79	74	76	→
Târgu-Neamț	57	64	66	66	64	67	75	69	65	69	67	69	67	74	74	66	70	→
Techirghiol	29	24	29	36	38	39	30	34	39	30	34	46	51	42	48	50	49	↓
Vatra Dornei	37	37	41	46	50	40	46	42	41	39	37	44	43	38	43	40	42	→
Voineasa	31	32	42	49	45	52	31	25	22	22	26	27	26	31	33	25	24	↑
Mamaia North Area	70	72	74	81	84	85	84	79	77	80	77	76	70	69	68	60	58	↑
Peștera-Padina Area	33	34	40	28	19	26	35	23	24	20	20	22	22	22	23	28	28	→
Parâng-Petroșani Area	51	53	58	61	69	72	76	75	78	73	69	71	73	70	69	69	72	↓
Tourist Area of Piatra-Neamț	72	73	76	78	79	83	81	85	83	85	86	83	87	83	83	80	81	→
Albăc	15	18	19	12	17	20	17	16	15	8	8	12	12	17	16	18	19	→
Albeștii de Muscel	81	80	85	86	89	31	33	43	45	35	25	26	19	26	28	29	29	↑
Arieșeni	81	10	9	6	4	7	9	9	11	13	6	10	7	4	4	5	3	↑
Balványos	35	19	25	50	43	64	67	57	96	62	60	34	35	29	30	30	31	→
Baia de Fier	47	34	44	41	40	35	42	44	47	33	32	30	29	27	26	32	33	→
Bazna	81	80	85	86	30	36	43	47	54	57	51	52	30	52	31	21	20	↑
Bălfătești	81	80	85	86	62	70	48	49	58	58	56	56	54	50	51	61	75	→
Băile Homorod	48	48	48	54	54	48	57	55	57	50	49	57	52	56	55	55	57	→
Băile Turda	71	70	73	77	78	80	82	86	87	86	83	85	82	86	86	84	84	→
Băile Băița	76	75	80	82	82	86	88	91	93	95	94	91	89	92	90	91	93	→
Boghiș	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	96	35	35	16	13	10	7	5	9	11	↑
Bran	14	17	18	14	11	10	7	7	7	10	11	9	11	11	11	13	12	→
Breaza	60	55	70	60	57	63	71	76	76	79	78	80	75	72	70	94	66	→
Cacica	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	96	37	46	47	66	67	54	58	55	39	↑
Calacea	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	88	90	93	92	94	94	84	97	89	90	→
Cheia	68	51	59	48	45	47	37	41	40	42	42	45	44	43	40	51	54	→

Table 1. Cont.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Colibița	81	80	85	86	89	91	68	77	68	65	64	64	56	55	52	58	40	↑
Crivaia/Semenic	81	80	16	19	28	17	10	8	8	5	8	8	8	9	9	2	7	↑
Dorna Candrenilor	81	80	85	86	45	48	41	60	20	24	23	33	34	50	35	35	32	↑
Durău	8	7	6	11	10	7	11	11	12	15	15	14	12	12	12	12	16	↓
Harghita-Băi	61	57	60	58	67	68	69	73	75	78	76	79	77	80	80	76	79	↓
Horezu	65	68	75	65	63	62	62	66	70	72	71	73	72	71	75	59	59	→
Izvorul Mureșului	81	80	85	37	51	56	61	64	53	56	55	39	42	34	54	41	30	↑
Lacul Roșu	55	50	55	56	60	58	56	58	60	61	62	63	61	61	64	62	61	→
Lacul Sărat	48	49	62	63	74	81	85	90	91	94	93	93	92	78	77	83	85	↓
Lipova	56	60	69	74	81	76	83	87	86	87	92	92	90	93	92	88	89	↓
Moieciu	17	13	13	10	6	5	5	5	4	7	5	5	6	8	8	7	6	↑
Moisei	81	80	85	86	75	65	72	61	61	59	65	67	79	88	88	86	74	→
Negrești-Oaș	80	79	84	85	88	90	92	95	95	97	96	96	96	96	94	85	87	→
Ocna Sibiului	25	28	33	25	43	45	43	38	37	41	39	50	55	65	58	65	63	↓
Ocna Șugatag	22	29	16	18	15	14	20	24	27	25	20	21	20	15	13	11	8	↑
Oncești	81	80	85	86	89	42	52	56	96	66	63	58	59	58	62	63	62	→
Păltiniș	63	59	63	64	68	71	73	70	72	77	75	75	71	75	72	70	67	→
Poiana Stampei	81	80	52	55	89	91	54	72	51	63	79	61	80	61	78	94	95	→
Pojorâta	24	26	22	17	27	15	15	10	10	14	13	18	18	14	19	20	23	→
Praid	7	11	12	12	13	12	13	14	16	17	17	19	25	25	21	26	26	↓
Săcelu	12	16	19	19	22	22	28	29	45	49	45	47	49	44	28	94	95	↓
Sărata-Monteoru	38	31	37	40	48	41	51	54	55	53	48	38	45	46	45	39	38	→
Secu	66	63	67	71	77	78	78	82	82	83	84	86	86	87	82	81	82	→
Snagov	34	42	46	47	52	55	59	62	62	67	66	68	62	67	67	68	64	↓
Solca	36	80	42	25	56	37	48	47	69	68	68	52	53	49	38	33	47	→
Sângeorgiu de Mureș	58	65	61	67	72	77	77	84	85	88	82	81	84	89	89	79	83	↓
Stâna de Vale	11	12	14	19	22	31	34	45	33	32	36	36	40	39	39	35	37	↓
Straja	50	45	54	43	36	43	36	37	34	35	38	48	48	36	41	42	47	→
Soveja	81	80	52	38	34	37	45	65	67	50	51	36	50	48	47	53	51	↑
Tășnad	41	41	48	53	58	57	63	50	49	48	40	51	46	59	53	44	46	→
Tinca	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	96	96	98	97	97	97	97	96	92	94	→
Trei Ape	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	→
Vălenii de Munte	78	77	83	83	86	88	90	92	88	92	89	89	88	90	84	78	80	→
Vața de Jos	40	42	51	51	34	44	22	26	29	43	53	49	36	44	50	43	55	→
Vișeu de Sus	67	61	56	68	59	59	58	63	63	63	57	65	65	61	63	57	60	→
Băile Banffy Area	69	69	77	75	75	73	74	81	79	82	81	74	78	77	76	73	73	→
Băile Ocna Dej Area	79	78	81	80	85	87	89	93	89	91	90	90	93	91	91	87	88	↓
Fântanele Area	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	29	43	40	97	97	97	97	97	94	95	→
Moinești Băi Area	77	76	82	84	87	89	91	94	94	96	95	95	95	95	95	90	91	→
Muntele Băisorii Area	15	80	30	24	18	22	24	17	19	21	19	29	24	20	25	16	10	→
Șuitor - Baia Sprie Area	64	67	72	69	83	82	86	89	92	89	91	87	83	81	81	75	77	→
	↑	General growth trend						→	Relatively constant trend						↓	General decrease trend		

Analyzing the variation of the ranks held by the share of tourism in the number of employees, we have the following situation (Table 2): 31 resorts, i.e., 31.6%, have a general decline trend, 17 resorts, 17.4 % registered an increasing number of employees in the tourism sector (Călimănești-Căciulata, Bran, Ocna Șugatag, Muntele Băisorii Area, etc.), and the highest number and percentage is held by resorts which during the 17 years had a constant trend (58.1%).

Table 2. Variation of the rankings for the share of number of employees from the tourism sector in the total number of employees.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Amara	26	27	32	38	40	40	39	39	40	36	36	71	72	38	36	34	35	↓
Azuga	73	65	68	64	62	61	44	44	48	91	38	51	39	37	41	51	64	→
Bușteni	13	15	14	16	17	17	17	17	22	1	25	28	15	17	19	23	23	↓
Buziaș	25	26	12	24	27	31	21	31	29	29	34	34	35	34	92	37	36	↓
Băile Govora	3	5	2	2	2	4	2	3	2	5	4	4	3	2	2	90	91	↓
Băile Felix/Imai	6	8	6	6	8	7	10	8	6	7	6	7	26	9	9	7	8	→
Băile Herculane	5	6	4	3	4	1	4	6	8	14	18	27	22	18	29	19	18	↓
Băile Olănești	27	13	8	11	9	5	7	7	7	8	8	8	6	6	6	26	34	↓
Băile Tușnad	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	2	3	4	5	9	21	5	5	3	5	→
Borșa	32	31	33	37	36	24	24	35	36	38	56	40	46	63	61	44	53	↓
Borsec	29	73	23	39	44	43	50	84	81	87	90	89	89	89	90	87	87	→
Câmpulung Moldovenesc	33	34	41	46	45	45	48	48	54	56	60	63	65	64	62	63	61	↓
Mangalia	14	16	16	22	18	20	23	26	31	30	35	31	31	32	33	35	32	↓
Călimănești-Căciulata	10	9	7	8	7	8	9	11	17	21	20	19	5	4	4	2	2	↑
Costinești	11	12	10	15	14	12	13	15	11	12	19	18	20	26	40	36	38	↓
Covasna	16	18	17	19	23	27	30	33	24	31	31	30	28	30	27	28	24	→
Dâmbovicioara	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	91	35	39	30	32	33	27	28	11	11	↑
Eforie	12	11	11	12	15	18	18	18	21	22	26	25	23	23	18	17	16	→
Geoagiu-Băi	24	22	26	18	19	16	25	28	9	11	12	12	10	13	12	9	12	→
Gura Humorului	39	35	29	27	32	37	36	38	38	40	43	45	57	58	58	56	57	↓
Mamaia	43	29	44	48	49	57	59	64	62	70	65	65	64	65	63	62	60	→
Moneasa	20	7	5	7	11	13	8	4	4	3	2	2	8	8	8	5	4	→
Poiana Brașov	42	43	48	58	52	52	55	60	63	63	68	66	63	69	66	68	68	↓
Predeal/Păraul Rece/Timișul de Sus	8	10	9	13	13	10	12	10	12	13	11	10	7	11	10	18	20	↓
Pucioasa	36	38	43	57	67	63	67	68	71	72	74	72	76	77	70	88	74	↓
Râșnov	61	52	66	55	56	59	61	55	45	51	53	44	43	42	43	41	37	↑
Slănic Prahova	4	4	3	5	6	6	5	5	5	6	3	3	1	3	3	4	6	→
Sinaia	21	20	21	21	21	19	19	20	20	24	22	21	17	19	20	15	13	↑
Sângeorz-Băi	15	24	20	25	28	25	26	29	30	35	40	36	38	39	38	38	43	↓
Slănic Moldova	23	25	15	34	10	9	6	12	13	18	23	23	27	22	30	30	15	→
Sovata	19	21	22	20	20	21	27	30	25	27	27	22	19	21	21	21	21	→
Sucevița	47	2	35	35	34	30	20	19	14	10	9	14	9	10	11	39	42	→
Târgu-Ocna	35	36	36	36	38	39	42	47	44	42	39	42	44	44	42	40	39	→
Târgu-Neamț	56	54	54	45	53	53	69	69	70	69	73	81	81	78	74	78	76	→
Techirghiol	30	30	25	28	41	41	46	45	49	50	44	43	42	61	48	66	65	↓
Vatra Dornei	34	40	28	31	33	33	28	27	27	26	28	29	24	24	25	29	29	→
Voineasa	40	73	73	81	72	65	57	71	39	49	46	54	69	62	69	48	52	→
Mamaia North Area	74	64	62	73	77	78	79	83	85	85	88	88	74	68	75	71	67	→
Peștera-Padina Area	45	33	38	40	43	44	43	52	50	46	45	39	37	31	26	27	26	↑
Parâng-Petroșani Area	69	67	65	74	79	81	84	86	87	89	85	83	88	81	76	76	75	→
Tourist Area of Piatra-Neamț	52	50	53	59	64	66	65	66	68	68	77	76	75	76	73	72	71	↓
Albac	31	73	73	81	39	35	22	22	28	32	37	38	55	54	54	46	48	→
Albeștii de Muscel	76	73	73	81	86	28	14	13	19	17	17	5	11	7	7	6	3	↑
Arieșeni	76	73	30	29	16	14	16	16	18	20	16	11	12	12	15	22	17	↑
Balvanyos	16	19	18	81	24	87	88	25	90	23	24	24	25	29	31	31	28	→
Baia de Fier	41	59	40	44	57	38	40	40	41	41	47	40	41	46	43	47	47	→
Bazna	76	73	73	81	63	67	49	42	43	55	58	41	50	48	34	24	27	↑
Băltătești	76	73	73	81	80	83	85	79	73	81	64	69	58	56	84	75	91	↓
Băile Homorod	67	61	59	61	60	58	60	62	59	54	55	56	56	51	49	50	55	→
Băile Turda	63	55	63	67	69	72	70	67	69	66	69	64	70	67	51	61	62	→
Băile Băița	72	71	70	78	83	82	82	78	80	82	86	87	85	86	85	81	83	→
Boghiș	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	91	90	64	57	37	33	25	16	33	31	↑
Bran	28	32	27	26	29	28	29	21	16	16	13	16	14	15	13	10	10	↑
Breaza	48	42	45	53	58	62	63	65	67	67	76	74	73	73	81	90	91	↓
Cacica	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	91	90	80	83	79	78	70	57	64	66	→
Calacea	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	91	90	93	93	92	92	92	92	89	88	→
Cheia	57	37	34	41	46	51	54	57	56	52	51	50	41	40	37	54	63	→

Table 2. Cont.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Colibița	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	91	90	78	75	70	61	52	65	65	69	➡
Crivaia/Semenic	76	73	73	10	5	15	11	9	10	9	7	6	2	14	39	20	33	↓
Dorna Candrenilor	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	87	74	74	71	67	59	74	53	52	51	↑
Durău	9	23	24	14	12	11	15	14	15	15	15	13	29	35	35	8	14	➡
Harghita-Băi	62	48	57	60	65	64	68	70	72	71	78	77	79	80	71	74	77	↓
Horezu	22	28	31	33	42	46	51	51	55	48	50	49	54	50	56	57	49	↓
Izvorul Mureșului	76	73	73	65	70	76	77	77	66	76	72	61	68	93	77	90	91	↓
Lacul Roșu	38	62	47	49	59	55	58	58	61	65	62	59	60	66	64	58	54	➡
Lacul Sărat	70	69	69	77	78	75	80	75	79	77	80	80	77	82	78	82	80	➡
Lipova	49	47	50	51	61	54	56	63	65	62	67	68	66	71	68	70	70	↓
Moieciu	51	41	37	32	30	34	32	24	23	25	21	17	18	20	17	13	22	↑
Moisei	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	88	84	45	47	52	49	88	89	85	90	↓
Negresti-Oaş	75	72	71	79	84	85	86	89	89	90	91	93	91	90	91	84	86	➡
Ocna Sibiului	76	73	73	66	75	79	73	81	78	19	10	78	82	75	59	69	58	➡
Ocna Șugatag	76	73	73	72	47	42	38	36	26	28	29	26	16	16	24	16	19	↑
Oncești	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	91	90	93	93	94	93	93	92	90	72	➡
Păltiniș	50	56	46	47	50	50	66	56	57	57	59	57	52	55	55	55	59	➡
Poiana Stampei	76	73	73	81	86	87	45	46	42	61	61	73	93	49	83	90	91	↓
Pojorâta	66	68	51	52	54	49	47	50	47	43	49	46	48	45	47	47	44	↑
Praid	18	17	19	23	22	22	31	23	33	34	33	35	32	33	32	32	30	↓
Săcelu	76	73	73	9	26	23	41	37	46	93	93	94	93	93	92	90	91	↓
Sărata-Monteoru	55	45	52	30	31	36	35	32	32	33	32	33	36	28	23	25	25	↑
Secu	54	49	56	68	76	77	78	80	83	84	87	85	84	84	82	77	81	↓
Snagov	46	58	73	81	86	69	72	61	64	58	63	58	62	60	72	45	40	➡
Solca	76	73	73	56	51	56	37	49	60	59	66	62	93	93	14	14	9	↑
Sângeorgiu de Mureș	37	39	49	63	66	68	62	59	53	47	54	55	51	46	45	42	41	➡
Stâna de Vale	2	14	13	17	25	32	34	42	34	44	42	15	13	36	44	67	78	↓
Straja	58	60	55	71	73	73	83	82	82	86	84	82	80	79	79	73	73	➡
Soveja	76	73	73	54	37	60	64	91	90	93	93	94	71	57	92	90	45	➡
Tășnad	59	44	39	50	55	48	53	54	51	53	52	48	45	47	50	49	50	➡
Tinca	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	91	90	93	93	94	93	93	92	90	91	➡
Trei Ape	7	1	73	4	3	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	➡
Vălenii de Munte	71	70	72	80	85	86	87	90	88	92	92	91	87	87	88	83	85	➡
Vața de Jos	53	53	60	70	74	70	71	74	58	60	70	60	47	53	52	53	84	➡
Vișeu de Sus	60	57	58	62	68	74	76	72	75	73	79	75	67	72	67	60	46	➡
Băile Banffy Area	68	66	67	76	82	84	81	85	86	88	89	90	86	85	87	80	82	➡
Băile Ocna Dej Area	65	63	61	69	71	71	74	76	77	79	81	84	83	83	80	79	79	➡
Fântanele Area	76	73	73	81	86	87	88	34	90	93	93	94	93	93	92	90	91	➡
Moinești Băi Area	44	46	64	75	81	80	75	73	76	83	82	86	90	91	86	86	89	↓
Muntele Băisorii Area	76	73	73	42	35	26	33	41	37	37	14	20	30	43	22	12	7	↑
Șuior - Baia Sprie Area	64	51	42	43	48	47	52	53	52	75	48	53	53	59	60	59	56	➡
			↑	General growth trend				➡	Relatively constant trend				↓	General decrease trend				

Table 3 illustrates the variation of the ranks held by the turnover from tourism sector, which shows a predominance of the resorts that have a relatively constant trend throughout the analyzed period, with a share of 57.1% of the total number of resorts. The second category is that of the resorts with a general downward trend, with a share of 27.6%. These are resorts where tourism is not a major activity, but a complementary one. As examples of downward trending resorts, we can mention Horezu, Lipova, Săcelul, Câmpulung Moldovenesc, Borsec, and Pucioasa. With a share of only 15.3%, there are resorts that registered a general growth trend during the period 2000–2016: Dâmbovicioara, Moneasa, Sinaia, Zona Peștera-Padina, Albeștii de Muscel, Crivaia/Semenic etc.

Table 3. Variation of the rankings for the share of turnover from the tourism sector in the total turnover.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Amara	35	30	35	33	34	30	24	33	30	33	34	45	40	35	31	29	30	→
Azuğa	67	61	76	74	76	64	61	51	63	55	49	34	26	51	56	61	66	→
Bușteni	12	14	16	15	18	18	19	26	28	31	42	33	28	30	37	31	33	↓
Buziaș	17	19	19	29	35	39	40	44	44	46	37	39	37	41	45	47	44	↓
Băile Govora	4	5	6	5	7	5	6	9	17	13	12	12	10	5	4	93	93	↓
Băile Felix/1Mai	10	11	11	11	10	12	11	11	10	11	15	14	32	15	18	16	15	→
Băile Herculane	6	7	5	4	5	2	9	10	14	26	21	24	19	14	21	14	11	↓
Băile Olănești	15	16	9	9	6	6	7	7	8	6	6	7	4	7	8	19	20	↓
Băile Tușnad	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	5	8	6	3	3	3	3	1	→
Borșa	29	29	34	34	32	31	29	32	32	32	39	41	36	46	55	34	43	↓
Borsec	33	33	30	38	36	26	31	36	81	89	86	86	88	86	86	83	87	↓
Câmpulung Moldovenesc	44	44	46	46	42	45	46	52	50	51	50	52	51	59	63	54	62	↓
Mangalia	21	21	23	24	21	24	26	31	35	34	40	37	33	31	32	36	34	↓
Călimănești-Căciulata	5	4	7	3	3	4	5	6	6	7	11	8	5	6	5	4	3	→
Costești	7	9	8	8	8	10	10	14	11	10	18	16	18	21	24	26	28	↓
Covasna	22	22	24	22	26	28	28	28	23	27	26	25	24	24	26	25	27	→
Dâmbovicioara	79	77	81	81	86	87	89	67	71	69	46	36	35	19	25	6	8	↑
Eforie	11	12	14	12	16	23	21	22	25	21	28	28	30	26	15	12	16	→
Geoagiu-Băi	8	8	10	10	12	13	16	13	9	12	17	15	20	20	17	18	19	↓
Gura Humorului	36	34	32	26	27	35	37	37	36	44	41	44	56	53	54	49	50	↓
Mamaia	48	46	51	47	50	50	54	64	64	67	55	56	54	58	53	55	58	→
Moneasa	16	6	2	6	4	11	18	5	4	3	5	5	8	12	6	5	5	↑
Poiana Brașov	50	51	53	52	56	57	51	59	57	60	57	66	64	63	67	67	69	↓
Predeal/Păraul Rece/Timișul de Sus	9	10	15	14	14	16	12	12	12	14	14	10	7	9	7	15	22	↓
Pucioasa	39	39	54	57	61	56	56	68	65	58	59	63	67	72	74	90	76	↓
Râșnov	58	60	58	49	51	52	65	53	45	56	58	43	43	37	61	58	60	→
Slănic Prahova	2	3	3	1	2	3	4	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	→
Sinaia	24	23	22	20	22	19	17	15	16	20	20	17	12	13	11	9	10	↑
Sângeorz-Băi	13	13	13	13	19	14	13	18	26	38	56	62	78	40	41	32	32	↓
Slănic Moldova	27	24	12	25	11	9	8	3	7	16	9	2	11	23	19	24	13	→
Sovata	19	20	21	23	20	22	20	20	20	19	19	18	17	16	16	13	18	→
Sucevița	49	40	38	39	31	29	33	27	13	18	27	27	13	29	27	48	47	→
Târgu-Ocna	25	26	42	40	45	41	42	41	37	36	32	29	31	34	35	33	31	→
Târgu-Neamț	72	63	70	66	73	69	71	75	55	65	77	69	68	83	85	76	80	→
Techirghiol	43	35	44	37	41	40	41	34	33	37	76	79	72	42	44	44	40	→
Vatra Dornei	30	27	26	30	28	32	35	29	29	30	31	31	29	33	40	37	37	↓
Voineasa	63	77	81	81	71	74	43	47	41	42	52	49	71	71	49	40	46	→
Mamaia North Area	76	73	78	77	83	80	83	85	88	95	93	92	87	77	70	87	86	→
Peștera-Padina Area	52	52	60	58	49	63	66	72	70	53	48	50	34	36	33	28	23	↑
Parâng-Petroșani Area	60	47	52	50	65	73	75	81	78	87	85	80	83	79	77	71	67	→
Tourist Area of Piatra-Neamț	55	56	63	63	64	65	67	73	69	70	69	67	57	56	62	56	54	→
Albac	53	77	81	81	39	34	23	19	21	29	30	38	44	50	43	46	45	→
Albeștii de Muscel	79	77	81	81	86	66	39	54	31	9	4	9	14	11	10	11	9	↑
Arieșeni	79	74	18	17	23	21	32	16	19	22	7	4	6	8	12	21	21	↑
Balványos	34	32	41	81	33	87	89	38	95	35	35	40	42	49	46	38	38	→
Baia de Fier	59	59	61	64	69	36	30	35	40	43	43	35	39	28	39	51	56	→
Bazna	79	77	81	81	86	77	81	70	56	62	71	64	60	67	29	23	24	↑
Băltăești	79	77	81	81	86	82	89	88	79	84	87	72	70	76	81	84	88	→
Băile Homorod	73	55	59	60	53	51	59	58	59	54	60	70	69	74	57	65	64	→
Băile Turda	42	43	47	43	40	42	44	48	53	66	53	55	52	52	50	52	52	→
Băile Băița	66	65	66	65	63	53	62	56	49	71	68	68	74	73	73	72	72	→
Boghiș	79	77	81	81	86	87	89	93	92	77	74	81	49	27	23	35	36	↑
Bran	46	37	36	28	37	27	25	23	18	8	10	11	9	10	9	8	6	↑
Breaza	28	28	45	42	46	47	52	66	67	68	72	71	75	68	78	93	93	↓
Cacica	79	77	81	81	86	87	89	93	95	93	88	85	86	64	72	70	71	→
Calacea	79	77	81	81	86	87	89	93	90	94	94	94	94	95	95	92	90	→
Cheia	71	49	50	51	47	59	58	69	51	45	29	20	22	17	14	41	41	→

Table 3. Cont.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Colibița	79	77	81	81	86	87	87	91	82	73	75	77	73	69	69	57	49	↑
Crivaia/Semenic	79	77	33	21	17	8	2	8	5	4	3	3	2	4	28	27	26	↑
Dorna Candrenilor	79	77	81	81	81	85	89	90	84	78	81	84	79	89	76	66	70	→
Durău	20	50	20	18	13	15	15	24	15	15	13	19	15	18	13	10	14	→
Harghita-Băi	65	58	57	59	67	71	74	78	74	79	83	83	81	82	79	77	78	→
Horezu	31	31	37	35	38	43	45	50	47	49	44	51	48	57	66	62	63	↓
Izvorul Mureșului	79	77	81	75	80	81	85	86	91	86	82	74	61	92	84	79	81	→
Lacul Roșu	54	67	64	62	70	60	63	62	68	59	70	61	58	66	64	59	61	→
Lacul Sărat	74	70	73	73	79	78	76	79	83	75	80	82	80	80	82	82	83	↓
Lipova	51	53	56	53	54	54	48	60	60	57	64	75	76	78	80	75	82	↓
Moieciu	62	48	43	32	25	38	34	30	34	25	23	21	23	25	22	17	25	↑
Moisei	79	77	81	81	86	87	89	92	94	90	54	59	77	81	94	91	92	→
Negresti-Oaş	78	75	80	80	82	83	86	87	87	96	95	96	95	94	93	89	91	→
Ocna Sibiului	37	41	48	48	43	61	80	71	62	23	16	32	47	45	48	43	48	→
Ocna Șugatag	79	77	75	67	68	49	27	25	27	28	33	30	25	22	20	20	17	↑
Oncești	79	77	81	81	86	87	84	93	95	92	91	91	92	91	91	88	75	→
Păltiniș	40	38	29	27	29	37	53	39	42	41	36	42	41	47	50	53	51	↓
Poiana Stampei	79	77	81	81	86	87	38	42	43	48	51	53	96	70	95	93	93	→
Pojorâta	68	68	62	61	60	48	50	57	52	64	62	58	59	65	71	63	65	→
Praid	18	17	17	16	15	17	14	17	22	24	25	23	27	32	34	30	29	↓
Săcelu	14	15	25	19	24	25	64	55	76	82	67	87	84	96	30	93	93	↓
Sărata-Monteoru	38	36	39	41	55	46	49	49	46	52	63	60	53	38	38	39	39	→
Secu	69	69	68	69	77	76	79	80	86	85	89	89	89	85	83	74	74	→
Snagov	45	45	77	79	85	84	70	43	39	74	65	65	62	61	60	52	57	→
Solca	79	77	81	81	66	44	55	45	66	81	66	76	63	88	36	7	7	↑
Sângeorgiu de Mureș	56	62	71	72	74	68	68	63	48	47	45	46	46	48	47	45	42	↑
Stâna de Vale	3	18	28	36	57	55	60	76	58	76	24	22	21	44	88	68	59	↓
Straja	70	71	72	70	78	72	69	77	77	83	73	57	66	75	75	81	77	→
Soveja	79	77	49	55	59	87	47	93	89	63	84	90	82	43	59	73	53	→
Tășnad	32	25	27	31	30	33	36	40	38	40	38	47	50	60	68	64	68	↓
Tinca	79	77	81	81	86	87	89	93	95	98	97	97	96	96	95	93	93	→
Trei Ape	23	1	4	7	9	7	3	1	1	1	1	13	16	2	1	1	4	→
Vălenii de Munte	77	76	79	78	84	86	88	89	93	97	96	95	93	93	92	86	84	→
Vața de Jos	64	64	67	68	72	75	82	84	73	72	79	78	65	62	58	69	89	→
Vișeu de Sus	41	42	40	45	48	62	57	61	61	61	61	54	55	54	51	42	35	→
Băile Banffy Area	47	57	69	71	75	79	78	82	80	88	92	93	90	84	87	80	73	→
Băile Ocna Dej Area	61	54	55	56	52	58	77	83	85	91	90	88	91	87	89	78	79	→
Fântanele Area	79	77	81	81	86	87	89	46	75	39	97	97	96	96	95	93	93	→
Moinești Băi Area	57	66	74	76	62	70	72	74	72	80	78	73	85	90	90	85	85	↓
Muntele Băisorii Area	26	77	31	54	44	20	22	21	24	17	22	26	38	39	42	22	12	→
Șuitor-Baia Sprie Area	75	72	65	44	58	67	73	65	54	50	47	48	45	55	65	60	55	→
	↑	General growth trend						→	Relatively constant trend					↓	General decrease trend			

The next variation of the ranks analyzed is the share of the profit from tourism in the total profit of tourist resorts from Romania (Table 4). Most of the resorts, namely 43.9% of the total number of resorts have an evolution where tourism in their local economy is constant, is not the main sector, 36.7% show decreases in rank, being those resorts where the economic crisis has put most of its mark and only 19.4% of the total number of resorts have a growth trend. Examples of growth-trend resorts for the period 2000–2016: Dâmbovicioara, Moneasa, Slănic Prahova, Slănic Moldova (the resort that holds the first place in 2016 in terms of the profit in the tourism sector), Arieșeni, Bran (2nd place in 2016), Trei Ape (3rd place in 2016), Solca, etc.

Table 4. Variation of the rankings for the share of profit from the tourism sector in the total profit.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Amara	33	69	60	51	49	50	26	64	43	17	80	38	37	29	39	25	34	➡
Azuga	38	56	71	58	78	42	78	39	34	73	87	32	15	69	83	48	61	➡
Bușteni	16	16	12	16	18	20	21	11	25	39	50	44	32	32	27	17	33	↓
Buziaș	11	19	25	43	38	41	44	41	44	34	45	34	88	88	92	89	92	↓
Băile Govora	13	21	2	1	29	16	22	5	10	7	14	48	48	40	37	89	92	↓
Băile Felix/IMai	7	8	16	17	7	5	7	8	6	9	11	11	38	15	22	20	25	↓
Băile Herculane	22	24	4	7	15	8	19	16	37	61	65	9	20	21	29	1	13	➡
Băile Olănești	17	30	9	10	2	4	5	9	7	3	3	4	4	2	4	29	27	➡
Băile Tușnad	2	2	1	3	1	1	3	4	2	6	12	2	5	6	18	7	5	➡
Borșa	24	37	32	33	33	31	23	38	45	47	52	57	54	72	53	27	66	↓
Borsec	27	44	6	68	68	38	33	51	35	28	68	28	29	34	49	80	88	↓
Câmpulung Moldovenesc	37	43	35	70	48	62	42	46	57	58	47	63	49	48	57	54	63	↓
Mangalia	20	14	13	29	17	12	15	12	8	24	22	22	21	18	20	23	23	➡
Călimănești-Căciulata	4	7	14	8	6	9	12	14	16	27	15	14	33	19	9	2	6	➡
Costinești	5	6	7	5	21	30	31	13	24	18	25	20	34	20	34	28	17	↓
Covasna	14	28	30	19	14	23	11	17	11	30	23	31	39	31	32	35	38	↓
Dâmbovicioara	68	69	71	74	81	84	84	30	81	49	13	41	3	12	17	11	26	↑
Eforie	6	5	8	9	12	15	17	20	12	16	19	18	28	16	21	12	11	↓
Geoagiu-Băi	3	3	19	26	34	18	16	27	22	23	24	33	52	50	86	26	41	↓
Gura Humorului	18	20	21	20	27	43	34	32	42	40	29	35	47	67	45	44	52	
Mamaia	26	29	29	32	41	49	45	50	56	63	57	58	53	52	59	60	56	↓
Moneasa	46	27	62	39	20	21	35	6	4	22	18	6	10	23	7	5	4	
Poiana Brașov	35	35	40	45	57	54	54	63	58	76	56	69	63	62	66	57	62	↓
Predeal/Păraul Rece/Timișul de Sus	8	9	5	11	10	13	13	19	19	19	16	17	8	11	13	13	21	↓
Pucioasa	42	47	69	74	72	44	47	44	54	51	64	71	76	57	56	89	80	↓
Râșnov	43	61	34	31	37	45	50	52	59	54	38	52	46	54	51	62	70	↓
Slănic Prahova	48	45	42	22	8	3	6	3	3	2	6	5	2	3	3	8	15	➡
Sinaia	12	23	17	13	11	10	9	18	17	38	21	19	18	14	8	9	10	➡
Sângeorz-Băi	25	15	15	6	22	24	27	25	29	35	69	25	14	55	31	31	39	↓
Slănic Moldova	15	69	57	36	9	14	8	7	5	41	9	10	26	28	15	16	1	↑
Sovata	9	12	22	37	26	27	10	23	9	13	10	8	6	10	11	10	9	➡
Sucevița	23	4	26	18	13	6	25	26	27	20	58	40	19	46	19	40	47	↓
Târgu-Ocna	10	18	18	27	25	25	24	21	32	10	8	7	7	8	5	15	12	➡
Târgu-Neamț	57	57	66	57	69	73	66	70	52	33	28	47	35	80	79	67	79	➡
Techirghiol	52	38	37	25	36	34	37	48	21	31	33	26	27	24	28	38	42	➡
Vatra Dornei	29	32	39	49	30	33	32	31	38	52	43	23	22	27	30	47	59	➡
Voineasa	68	69	71	74	47	47	20	22	13	25	88	50	51	71	23	36	28	↑
Mamaia North Area	56	33	71	74	80	75	81	47	76	86	71	61	55	78	71	70	60	➡
Peștera-Padina Area	68	53	41	74	32	84	84	34	47	56	39	56	45	36	35	37	19	↑
Parâng-Petroșani Area	28	31	38	34	45	46	53	62	65	65	62	62	50	53	52	58	55	↓
Tourist Area of Piatra-Neamț	53	39	53	60	61	69	68	84	73	83	73	81	77	63	70	63	76	➡
Albac	60	69	71	74	4	52	55	2	14	21	17	21	23	39	69	84	54	➡
Albeștii de Muscel	68	69	71	74	81	40	2	28	15	12	2	12	36	9	61	43	18	↑
Arieșeni	68	51	3	4	24	22	49	10	31	42	7	13	12	13	26	24	7	↑
Balványos	30	46	50	74	43	84	84	71	86	96	79	37	78	65	62	49	40	➡
Baia de Fier	68	69	71	50	40	28	18	40	33	26	41	16	13	25	24	41	36	➡
Bazna	68	69	71	74	81	84	84	15	23	36	84	36	74	85	73	59	48	➡
Băltătești	68	69	71	74	81	84	82	89	86	69	46	65	17	38	58	89	87	↓
Băile Homorod	55	49	48	69	62	72	74	76	82	68	72	83	81	75	48	78	69	➡
Băile Turda	41	36	47	48	59	51	63	65	69	84	30	46	41	49	50	39	43	➡
Băile Băița	45	50	54	59	73	68	57	55	49	75	60	64	73	74	80	64	78	↓
Boghiș	68	69	71	74	81	84	84	92	86	82	92	91	88	88	46	69	50	➡
Bran	21	17	24	14	31	32	30	24	26	4	4	3	1	5	2	4	2	↑
Breaza	40	64	55	44	77	63	67	91	77	94	85	84	62	83	82	89	92	↓
Cacica	68	69	71	74	81	84	84	92	86	90	92	86	88	51	85	85	82	➡
Calacea	68	69	71	74	81	84	84	92	86	91	78	82	88	88	92	88	89	➡
Cheia	68	41	56	56	60	55	36	37	74	70	61	39	66	45	33	19	32	↑
Colibița	68	69	71	74	81	84	76	87	60	48	42	68	56	44	41	53	35	↑
Crivaia/Semenic	68	69	49	66	67	2	1	29	20	8	1	15	9	4	6	22	16	↑
Dorna Candrenilor	68	69	71	74	76	83	83	90	36	57	26	66	82	88	76	33	31	↑

Table 4. Cont.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Durău	68	60	71	41	23	29	40	53	28	15	49	51	40	37	16	21	53	➡
Harghita-Băi	51	48	58	55	66	71	64	78	67	77	75	76	60	73	72	66	57	➡
Horezu	68	62	51	65	52	48	69	60	62	32	76	53	83	86	67	72	72	➡
Izvorul Mureșului	68	69	71	53	50	53	84	81	86	71	90	88	87	70	54	52	73	➡
Lacul Roșu	34	55	46	46	51	65	51	56	64	55	66	42	30	60	68	65	58	➡
Lacul Sărat	59	54	59	35	44	58	48	49	61	60	44	55	80	77	74	86	71	↓
Lipova	39	40	52	63	55	61	39	61	55	50	54	80	79	87	90	73	90	↓
Moieciu	62	25	28	24	5	17	14	45	30	43	34	27	24	26	12	14	24	↑
Moisei	68	69	71	74	81	84	84	92	86	78	59	75	85	68	92	87	85	➡
Negrești-Oaș	68	69	71	74	74	76	72	86	75	95	92	93	86	88	91	83	86	➡
Ocna Sibiului	68	69	71	23	16	26	79	83	85	46	77	67	88	41	77	51	45	➡
Ocna Șugatag	68	69	67	74	81	64	46	42	41	45	32	45	31	17	14	32	22	↑
Oncești	68	69	71	74	81	84	77	92	86	96	37	59	70	58	60	89	30	➡
Păltiniș	19	26	20	15	28	36	59	54	46	44	31	49	57	42	47	55	64	↓
Poiana Stampei	68	69	71	74	81	84	65	77	53	66	70	85	88	88	92	89	92	↓
Pojorâta	50	69	45	47	58	67	60	58	66	92	67	78	43	76	88	75	77	↓
Praid	54	13	27	28	39	37	28	35	39	37	36	29	44	43	36	34	20	➡
Săcelu	68	10	10	2	3	11	84	43	86	62	53	93	88	88	10	89	92	↓
Sărata-Monteoru	36	22	36	30	35	39	41	36	48	64	27	24	25	33	42	46	51	↓
Secu	58	52	33	40	54	66	62	72	80	72	82	89	84	79	84	61	74	↓
Snagov	65	63	65	72	63	79	58	66	79	59	35	43	61	81	55	68	67	➡
Solca	68	69	71	74	81	59	71	67	86	85	40	93	88	88	40	3	8	↑
Sângeorgiu de Mureș	63	67	64	54	53	56	73	85	70	79	48	74	67	22	38	56	46	➡
Stâna de Vale	1	11	11	21	81	57	84	57	51	5	20	1	16	59	75	30	37	↓
Straja	68	69	44	64	71	70	61	69	68	80	63	54	64	61	65	71	49	➡
Soveja	68	69	71	71	75	84	56	92	86	29	92	70	71	7	43	50	29	↑
Tășnad	32	34	31	42	46	35	52	79	63	89	81	79	69	84	64	82	75	↓
Tinca	68	69	71	74	81	84	84	92	86	96	92	93	88	88	92	89	92	↓
Trei Ape	31	1	23	12	19	7	4	1	1	1	5	30	11	1	1	6	3	↑
Vălenii de Munte	66	69	63	74	81	81	84	75	72	81	89	93	88	88	89	76	81	➡
Vața de Jos	68	42	71	74	81	77	84	74	86	67	92	90	42	30	92	42	91	➡
Vișeu de Sus	64	65	43	62	65	74	43	73	83	74	74	60	59	47	44	45	44	↑
Băile Banffy Area	49	59	71	67	64	82	70	82	71	93	86	92	75	66	78	77	65	➡
Băile Ocna Dej Area	61	58	61	52	56	60	38	80	78	88	83	87	68	82	87	79	83	↓
Fântanele Area	68	69	71	74	81	84	84	59	50	14	92	93	88	88	92	89	92	↓
Moinești Băi Area	47	66	70	73	79	78	75	88	84	87	91	72	65	64	63	74	68	➡
Muntele Băilorii Area	44	69	71	38	42	19	29	33	18	11	55	73	72	35	25	18	14	↑
Șuor - Baia Sprie Area	67	68	68	61	70	80	80	68	40	53	51	77	58	56	81	81	84	➡
	↑	General growth trend						➡	Relatively constant trend					↓	General decrease trend			

An analysis of the ranks on the arithmetic mean of the four economic indicators was done for each tourist resort from Romania (Table 5), which shows a predominance of the resorts that, over the course of 17 years, had a relatively constant trend, did not show large fluctuations, and which, out of the total number of resorts, account for 51% (Băile Herculane, Borsec, Vatra Dornei, Slănic Prahova, Băile Turda, Trei Ape—this being the resort which holds the first place in the last 4 years, whose economic activity is mainly focused on tourism—in 2001, the total number of employees and the profit were 100% in the tourism sector).

With a smaller share of 28.6%, are the resorts whose economic indicators have led to their decline over the whole period under review, this category being represented by resorts whose economic base is not tourist activity, but is supported by economic areas such as trade and industry (examples of resorts with drastic decreases in rank: Băile Govora, where all economic indicators in the tourism sector in the last two years of analysis had values equal to 0, Săcelu, Poiana Stampei, Tășnad, Stâna de Vale, Breaza). Last, is the category of resorts whose natural resources lay the foundations of their local economies where most of the revenue comes from tourism. Compared to the other two categories, it has the lowest number of resorts, the percentage being 19% (Dâmbovicioara, which has shown a relatively constant trend in recent years in terms of tourism, Moneasa, Slănic Moldova, Arieșeni, Bran, Solca, Zona Muntele Băilorii, etc.)

Table 5. Variation of the rankings for the arithmetic mean of the four economic indicators from the tourism sector.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Amara	33	39	46	48	49	47	36	51	49	33	53	59	56	44	47	35	41	→
Azuğa	55	57	57	54	57	51	51	48	40	68	51	44	29	46	48	48	55	→
Bușteni	13	16	14	16	20	20	21	17	28	9	33	34	28	29	28	24	29	↓
Buziaș	17	23	24	32	37	41	38	45	44	42	47	45	52	50	82	55	58	↓
Băile Govora	4	11	2	2	8	7	6	5	9	8	13	18	14	12	9	94	95	↓
Băile Felix/Imai	9	12	12	13	9	9	9	9	7	10	10	13	36	14	17	17	18	↓
Băile Herculane	11	13	3	4	6	3	10	11	16	27	28	15	19	18	26	7	14	→
Băile Olănești	16	19	8	10	2	4	4	7	5	4	5	4	3	4	7	25	27	↓
Băile Tușnad	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	9	3	6	3	3	2	2	→
Borșa	32	35	37	35	34	30	29	36	37	46	48	48	48	54	55	40	57	↓
Borsec	31	36	16	34	39	32	34	47	42	41	54	42	45	48	49	49	48	→
Câmpulung Moldovenesc	40	43	44	57	50	54	49	53	57	59	55	61	59	61	65	56	65	↓
Mangalia	20	20	19	27	22	23	25	21	22	32	34	33	33	30	30	34	32	↓
Călimănești-Căciulata	3	5	6	5	5	8	8	10	11	19	14	16	12	10	5	3	4	→
Costinești	5	4	7	7	10	14	14	15	13	13	18	19	23	23	31	26	25	↓
Covasna	23	24	28	26	27	29	27	28	26	37	32	36	37	34	38	32	34	→
Dâmbovicioara	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	49	36	34	17	26	10	13	18	9	11	↑
Eforie	10	6	10	11	15	18	17	18	18	20	24	25	27	22	21	14	15	→
Geoagiu-Băi	8	9	17	18	25	19	22	26	14	17	20	24	24	24	24	22	23	↓
Gura Humorului	30	29	30	29	30	37	40	39	41	48	42	49	57	60	56	53	56	↓
Mamaia	44	38	45	50	54	57	62	66	67	81	73	73	72	70	69	69	70	↓
Moneasa	22	8	4	9	7	10	13	3	3	6	6	1	8	11	4	4	3	↑
Poiana Brașov	53	51	56	62	64	58	63	67	68	78	72	75	75	75	74	72	73	↓
Predeal/Păraul Rece/Timișul de Sus	6	7	9	12	11	11	12	12	10	14	12	12	7	8	8	13	20	↓
Pucioasa	51	50	68	77	79	64	68	68	77	77	83	81	86	83	80	93	83	↓
Râșnov	60	61	50	44	45	52	54	55	52	57	50	51	47	47	50	52	50	→
Slănic Prahova	7	10	5	6	4	5	5	4	4	2	3	2	1	2	2	5	7	→
Sinaia	18	22	21	19	21	17	15	19	20	28	23	23	15	15	12	10	13	↑
Sângeorz-Băi	19	21	18	15	28	26	28	29	32	44	59	41	34	51	44	42	44	↓
Slănic Moldova	25	32	25	33	13	12	7	6	6	26	11	9	21	27	23	23	6	↑
Sovata	14	18	27	28	26	28	20	23	15	18	16	14	13	17	20	18	16	→
Sucevița	26	3	20	21	19	13	16	16	12	11	15	17	11	16	10	31	33	↓
Târgu-Ocna	24	30	29	39	40	35	41	35	47	25	22	20	22	25	25	33	30	→
Târgu-Neamț	69	71	76	65	71	71	78	75	66	53	56	71	60	84	83	77	80	→
Techirghiol	39	34	35	31	44	40	42	46	31	40	46	46	46	42	46	50	51	↓
Vatra Dornei	35	37	36	38	31	33	33	34	34	39	35	32	30	31	37	38	39	→
Voineasa	48	60	64	74	55	55	35	33	29	36	45	47	51	52	41	41	36	↑
Mamaia North Area	78	68	79	82	85	87	90	78	89	91	89	86	78	76	77	75	72	→
Peștera-Padina Area	50	44	47	43	35	48	52	44	48	47	39	40	38	32	34	29	24	↑
Parâng-Petroșani Area	54	49	61	61	67	69	81	84	85	86	84	80	81	77	75	74	74	↓
Tourist Area of Piatra-Neamț	68	64	74	75	77	79	82	85	83	87	87	87	83	80	79	76	77	→
Albac	38	45	49	42	23	34	30	8	21	22	26	27	31	40	43	43	38	→
Albeștii de Muscel	81	80	85	86	89	36	11	27	25	12	4	11	17	9	15	15	12	↑
Arieșeni	81	33	13	14	16	16	23	14	23	23	8	10	9	7	13	19	8	↑
Balvanyos	28	27	31	76	33	83	87	42	96	45	38	35	44	39	42	36	35	→
Baia de Fier	57	55	53	51	51	31	31	43	39	38	43	29	26	33	36	46	43	→
Bazna	81	80	85	86	56	59	56	30	35	51	67	50	50	59	40	28	28	↑
Bălfătești	81	80	85	86	81	84	69	72	76	79	64	67	41	53	73	78	91	↓
Băile Homorod	71	67	58	64	61	56	65	63	63	60	61	65	63	65	54	65	69	→
Băile Turda	61	56	69	63	66	61	74	71	80	85	57	66	65	72	66	60	63	→
Băile Băița	76	77	80	81	83	81	83	76	71	90	88	89	89	90	89	84	87	→
Boghiș	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	96	70	63	41	38	32	28	22	27	31	↑
Bran	29	26	32	22	29	27	26	20	17	7	7	5	4	6	6	6	5	↑
Breaza	45	46	55	56	65	66	72	77	79	82	85	82	79	81	84	94	88	↓
Cacica	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	96	73	76	77	83	84	63	67	71	67	→
Calacea	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	94	95	96	95	94	95	94	97	91	93	→
Cheia	74	48	52	52	53	53	45	50	54	55	44	39	42	36	32	39	46	→

Table 5. Cont.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Colibița	81	80	85	86	89	91	86	92	82	67	70	77	62	55	58	63	47	↑
Crivaia/Semenic	81	80	39	20	18	6	3	13	8	5	2	6	2	5	14	16	21	↑
Dorna Candrenilor	81	80	85	86	70	75	66	83	43	54	40	54	55	74	53	45	40	↑
Durău	15	25	26	17	14	15	19	22	19	15	19	22	20	26	16	12	22	→
Harghita-Băi	72	65	70	67	75	77	76	82	81	84	86	84	80	85	81	80	76	→
Horezu	36	42	48	46	52	50	59	59	60	49	65	58	68	68	72	70	68	↓
Izvorul Mureșului	81	80	85	55	59	67	79	81	72	73	78	60	61	66	70	62	62	→
Lacul Roșu	49	69	59	58	63	63	58	61	65	64	71	56	53	69	68	66	66	→
Lacul Sărat	73	72	77	66	72	80	80	79	86	83	82	85	88	88	85	87	82	→
Lipova	58	58	67	70	73	68	60	73	74	70	80	88	85	87	86	81	84	↓
Moieciu	43	28	34	25	17	22	18	24	24	24	21	21	16	20	11	11	19	↑
Moisei	81	80	85	86	86	85	89	86	84	65	58	64	73	89	94	90	89	→
Negrești-Oaș	80	79	84	85	87	89	91	95	94	97	96	96	96	96	95	89	92	→
Ocna Sibiului	46	47	51	37	32	43	64	65	62	30	27	52	70	57	63	61	59	→
Ocna Șugatag	56	59	43	47	43	38	37	32	33	35	30	30	25	19	19	21	17	↑
Oncești	81	80	85	86	89	70	73	80	96	89	75	79	82	82	78	83	53	→
Păltiniș	34	41	33	30	41	46	71	57	53	56	49	55	58	56	61	64	71	↓
Poiana Stampei	81	80	75	79	89	91	48	60	50	62	76	76	93	67	90	94	95	↓
Pojorâta	52	52	40	41	48	44	39	37	38	43	36	43	43	41	45	44	45	→
Praid	21	15	22	23	24	25	24	25	30	31	29	28	35	35	35	30	26	→
Săcelu	27	17	23	8	12	21	46	40	58	72	69	78	77	78	27	94	95	↓
Sărata-Monteoru	42	31	41	36	42	39	43	38	45	52	37	37	40	38	39	37	37	→
Secu	70	70	60	68	80	82	84	87	90	88	90	92	91	91	88	79	81	→
Snagov	47	53	71	72	74	76	67	62	61	66	60	57	74	73	71	59	60	→
Solca	64	80	64	49	62	49	47	54	75	80	66	69	76	79	33	8	9	↑
Sângeorgiu de Mureș	62	63	73	73	76	72	77	74	69	69	62	70	64	43	52	58	54	→
Stâna de Vale	2	14	15	24	36	42	44	52	46	21	31	8	18	45	51	47	52	↓
Straja	67	66	62	60	60	62	57	64	64	71	68	62	67	58	64	68	64	→
Soveja	81	80	63	53	46	60	55	88	88	50	81	68	69	21	62	67	42	↑
Tășnad	41	40	38	45	47	45	50	56	51	58	52	53	54	62	57	57	61	↓
Tinca	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	96	96	98	97	97	97	97	96	92	94	→
Trei Ape	12	1	11	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	7	5	1	1	1	1	→
Vălenii de Munte	79	78	83	84	88	90	92	93	93	95	94	95	94	95	93	85	85	→
Vața de Jos	59	54	66	71	58	65	53	58	56	61	74	63	49	49	59	51	78	→
Vișeu de Sus	63	62	54	69	69	74	61	70	78	75	79	74	71	64	60	54	49	↑
Băile Banffy Area	66	75	81	80	82	86	85	90	87	92	91	91	87	86	87	82	79	→
Băile Ocna Dej Area	77	76	78	78	78	78	70	91	92	93	92	93	90	92	92	86	86	→
Fântanele Area	81	80	85	86	89	91	93	41	59	29	97	97	97	97	97	94	95	→
Moinești Băi Area	65	73	82	83	84	88	88	89	91	94	93	90	92	93	91	88	90	→
Muntele Băisorii Area	37	80	42	40	38	24	32	31	27	16	25	31	39	37	29	20	10	↑
Șuior - Baia Sprie Area	75	74	72	59	68	73	75	69	55	74	63	72	66	71	76	73	75	→
	↑	General growth trend						→	Relatively constant trend					↓	General decrease trend			

Environmental conflicts can be defined by several characteristics, whose knowledge is essential for their management to reduce the negative impacts on society, the environment, and the economy [35]. The development of tourist resorts produces a series of negative effects on the environment. In Table 6, we analyzed the number of environmental conflicts that occurred in these tourist destinations in Romania, which are closely correlated with the development of tourism. Most conflicts occur in those resorts where tourism develops and represents its main economic sector (between 20 and 41 environmental conflicts: Moieciu resort, 41). At the opposite pole, with the fewest environmental conflicts, are the poorly developed tourist resorts (between zero and nine conflicts: Borșa, Buziaș, Lipova, Păltiniș, 0).

Table 6. The number of environmental conflicts in the tourist resorts from Romania.

Resort	Environmental Conflict	Resort	Environmental Conflict	Resort	Environmental Conflict
Amara	10	Târgu-Neamț	18	Lipova	0
Azuga	11	Techirghiol	3	Moieciu	41
Bușteni	6	Vatra Dornei	17	Moisei	18
Buziaș	0	Voineasa	31	Negresti-Oaş	19
Băile Govora	1	Mamaia North Area	14	Ocna Sibiului	19
Băile Felix/1Mai	1	Peștera-Padina Area	33	Ocna Șugatag	29
Băile Herculane	13	Parâng-Petroșani Area	5	Oncești	11
Băile Olănești	3	Tourist Area of Piatra-Neamț	11	Păltiniș	0
Băile Tușnad	16	Albac	16	Poiana Stampei	1
Borșa	0	Albeștii de Muscel	23	Pojorâta	8
Borsec	19	Arieșeni	24	Praid	12
Câmpulung Moldovenesc	9	Balványos	19	Săcelu	1
Mangalia	8	Baia de Fier	12	Sărata-Monteoru	8
Călimănești-Căciulata	16	Bazna	21	Secu	7
Costinești	1	Băltătești	1	Snagov	8
Covasna	13	Băile Homorod	9	Solca	26
Dâmbovicioara	21	Băile Turda	12	Sângeorgiu de Mureș	14
Eforie	18	Băile Băița	13	Stâna de Vale	5
Geoagiu-Băi	4	Boghiș	19	Straja	21
Gura Humorului	8	Bran	36	Soveja	18
Mamaia	9	Breaza	3	Tășnad	3
Moneasa	24	Cacica	9	Tinca	11
Poiana Brașov	8	Calacea	10	Trei Ape	19
Predeal/Păraul Rece/Timișul de Sus	11	Cheia	9	Vălenii de Munte	11
Pucioasa	10	Colibița	34	Vața de Jos	11
Râșnov	12	Crivaia/Semenic	37	Vișeu de Sus	36
Slănic Prahova	14	Dorna Candrenilor	28	Băile Banffy Area	13
Sinaia	28	Durău	16	Băile Ocna Dej Area	9
Sângeorz-Băi	4	Harghita-Băi	17	Fântanele Area	8
Slănic Moldova	25	Horezu	1	Moinești Băi Area	9
Sovata	12	Izvorul Mureșului	17	Muntele Băisorii Area	21
Sucevița	3	Lacul Roșu	19	Șuioara - Baia Sprie Area	11
Târgu-Ocna	16	Lacul Sărat	19		
Between 0 and 9 environmental conflicts		Between 10 and 19 environmental conflicts		Between 20 and 41 environmental conflicts	

4. Discussion and Conclusions

The results obtained from the analyzes at the level of administrative-territorial unit, show the oscillating dynamics of the analyzed indicators and for the tourist resorts in Romania. A significant number of resorts in Romania have a paradoxical dynamic. Although, they are declared tourist resorts, the specific values of tourism have a low share, tourism being a complementary economic activity, whose dynamics are in a strong relationship with the general economic profile or almost do not interfere with the economic system, its contribution being reduced in their local economy, having other main fields of activity that support the revenues of these systems (Băile Herculane, retail). Thus, out of the total number of Romanian resorts, only 20% of them have as a predominant economic activity tourism, where the main income profile comes from the tourist activities (Trei Ape, Băile Tușnad, Costinești, Bran—resorts where the share of tourism in the main economic indicators is between 20% and 50%). The obtained results confirm the relevance of the methodology used, because we obtained new elements regarding the specific dynamics of the local economies from the local economies with basic tourist function. The analyzes showed that the status of the tourist resort is not necessarily conditioned by the high share of tourist activities, but by a combination of factors, among them, the presence of tourist activities and the desire of the local authorities certified by the central authorities [36].

Detailed analyses of the relationship between tourism and the other economic activities of the local economy have highlighted a number of particular aspects in the resorts that have seen spectacular increases in the hierarchy. The most important aspect is the pressure on the environment to expand the accommodation spaces and, in particular, the leisure activities that require the availability of important land areas. This increasing pressure on the environment has been observed in numerous studies on

deforestation in Romania [37,38], as well as in research on the impact of deforestation on the occurrence and development of imbalances in natural ecosystems [39–41]. Thus, it is necessary in future studies to carry out a detailed analysis of the deforestation areas for increasing the complexity of the tourist function in the tourist resorts in Romania.

The results obtained can contribute to the development of methodologies dedicated to the analysis of the role of tourism in the development of local economies, contributing to increasing the relevance of design models that measure the contribution of tourism to sustainable development at the local and regional level.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.G., C.C.D., and R.C.D.; methodology, A.G., A.K.G., and M.M.; software, C.O. and I.C.; validation, A.G. and C.T.; formal analysis, M.B. and M.G.; investigation, M.M.; resources, C.C.D. and M.M.; data curation, C.C.D.; writing—Original draft preparation, A.G., A.K.G., and M.M.; writing—Review and editing, A.G., M.M., C.C.D., and R.C.D.; visualization, A.G., C.O., M.G., and M.B.; supervision, M.M.; project administration C.C.D.; All authors have equal contribution to the preparation of this scientific paper.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

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

References

1. Kapera, I. Tourism in Poland following EU entry. *Bull. Geogr. Socio-Econ. Ser.* **2013**, *22*, 55–63. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
2. Eagles, P.F.J.; McCool, S.F.; Haynes, C.D. *Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas: Guidelines for Planning and Management*; IUCN Gland: Gland, Switzerland; Cambridge, UK, 2002; p. 183.
3. Briedenhann, J.; Wickens, E. Tourism routes as a tool for the economic development of rural areas: Vibrant hope or impossible dream? *Tour. Manag.* **2004**, *25*, 71–79. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
4. Chen, C.F.; Chiou-Wei, S. Tourism expansion, tourism uncertainty and economic growth: New evidence from Taiwan and Korea. *Tour. Manag.* **2009**, *30*, 812–818. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
5. Croes, R.; Venegas, M. Cointegration and causality between tourism and poverty reduction. *J. Travel Res.* **2008**, *47*, 94–103. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
6. Holzner, M. Tourism and economic development: The beach disease? *Tour. Manag.* **2011**, *32*, 922–993. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
7. Ma, M.; Hassink, R. An evolutionary perspective on tourism area development. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2013**, *41*, 89–109. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
8. Matarrita-Cascante, D. Changing communities, community satisfaction, and quality of life: A view of multiple perceived indicators. *Soc. Indic. Res.* **2010**, *98*, 105–127. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
9. Tang, C.; Tan, E. Does tourism effectively stimulate Malaysia's economic growth? *Tour. Manag.* **2015**, *46*, 158–163. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
10. Tugcu, C.T. Tourism and economic growth nexus revisited: A panel causality analysis for the case of the Mediterranean region. *Tour. Manag.* **2014**, *42*, 207–212. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
11. Garau-Vadell, J.B.; Gutierrez-Taño, D.; Diaz-Armas, R. Economic crisis and residents' perception of the impacts of tourism in mass tourism destinations. *J. Destin. Mark. Manag.* **2018**, *7*, 68–75. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
12. World Travel & Tourism Council. Available online: <https://www.wttc.org/> (accessed on 2 April 2019).
13. Buckley, R. Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2012**, *39*, 528–546. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
14. Ruhanen, L.; Weiler, B.; Moyle, B.D.; McLennan, C.J. Trends and patterns in sustainable tourism research: A 25-year bibliometric analysis. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2015**, *23*, 517–535. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
15. Molina-Azorín, J.F.; Font, X. Mixed methods in sustainable tourism research: an analysis of prevalence, designs and application in JOST (2005–2014). *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2016**, *24*, 549–573. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
16. Higgins-Desbiolles, F. Sustainable tourism: Sustaining tourism or something more? *Tour. Manag. Perspect.* **2018**, *25*, 157–160. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
17. Lee, T.H.; Jan, F.H. Can community-based tourism contribute to sustainable development? Evidence from residents' perceptions of the sustainability. *Tour. Manag.* **2019**, *70*, 368–380. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
18. Amado, R.; Picininik, M.; Jasmim, M. Sustainability and hotel business: criteria for holistic, integrated and participative development. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2017**, *142*, 217–224.

19. Pulido-Fernández, J.I.; Andrades-Caldito, L.; Sánchez-Rivero, M. Is sustainable tourism an obstacle to the economic performance of the tourism industry? Evidence from an international empirical study. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2015**, *23*, 47–64. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
20. Farsari, Y.; Butler, R.; Prastacos, P. Sustainable tourism policy for Mediterranean destinations: Issues and interrelationships. *IJTP* **2007**, *1*, 58–78. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
21. Hall, C.M. A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2011**, *19*, 437–457. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
22. Gkoumas, A. Evaluating a standard for sustainable tourism through the lenses of local industry. *Heliyon* **2019**, *5*, e02707. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
23. Council, Global Sustainable Tourism. Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria. 2013. Available online: <https://www.gstcouncil.org/gstc-criteria/> (accessed on 25 June 2019).
24. Fernandez, J.I.P.; Rivero, M.S. Measuring tourism sustainability: proposal for a composite index. *Tour. Econ.* **2009**, *15*, 277–296. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
25. Schianetz, K.; Kavanagh, L. Sustainability indicators for tourism destinations: a complex adaptive systems approach using systemic indicator systems. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2008**, *16*, 601–628. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Rogerson, M.C.; Rogerson, J.M. Agritourism and local economic development in South Africa. *Bull. Geogr. Socio-Econ. Ser.* **2014**, *26*, 93–106. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
27. Faith, L.; Rogerson, C.M. Local economic development agencies and place-based development: Evidence from South Africa. *Bull. Geogr. Socio-Econ. Ser.* **2018**, *41*, 29–43.
28. Hall, C.M.; Campos, M.J.Z. Public Administration and Tourism—International and Nordic Perspectives. *Scand. J. Public Adm.* **2014**, *18*, 3–17.
29. Ianoș, I.; Peptenatu, D.; Pintilii, R.D.; Drăghici, C.C. About sustainable development of the territorial emergent structures from the metropolitan area of Bucharest. *Environ. Eng. Manag. J.* **2012**, *11*, 1535–1545. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
30. Peptenatu, D.; Merciu, C.; Drăghici, C. Characteristics of entrepreneurial profile in some emergent territorial structures in Romania. *Actual Probl. Econ.* **2012**, *12*, 448–458.
31. Peptenatu, D.; Pintilii, R.; Drăghici, C.; Saghin, I.; Stoian, D.R. Management of Environment Risk within Emergency Territorial Systems. Case Study—the Influence Area of the Bucharest City. *J. Environ. Prot. Ecol.* **2012**, *4*, 2360–2370.
32. Rodríguez-Pose, A.; Palavicini-Corona, E.I. Does local economic development really work? Assessing LED across Mexican municipalities. *Geoforum* **2013**, *44*, 303–315. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
33. Christian, M.; Rogerson, C.M. Reframing place-based economic development in South Africa: The example of local economic development. *Bull. Geogr. Socio-Econ. Ser.* **2014**, *24*, 203–218.
34. Mueller, H.; Kaufmann, E.L. Wellness tourism: Market analysis of a special health tourism segment and implications for the hotel industry. *J. Vacat. Mark.* **2001**, *7*, 15–17. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
35. Ioja, C.I.; Niță, M.R.; Vânău, G.O.; Onose, D.A.; Gavrilidis, A.A.; Hossu, C.A. *Managementul Conflictelor de Mediu*, 1st ed.; University Publishing House: Bucharest, Romania, 2015; p. 14.
36. Drăghici, C.C.; Pintilii, R.D.; Peptenatu, D.; Comănescu, L.G.; Sirodoev, I. The Role of SPA Tourism in the Development of Local Economies from Romania. In Proceedings of the 2nd Global Conference on Business, Economics, Management and Tourism, Prague, Czech Republic, 30–31 October 2014; pp. 1573–1577.
37. Pintilii, R.D.; Peptenatu, D.; Grecu, A.; Ilie, A.M.; Simion, A.G. Tourism, basic functionality versus complementary component of the territorial systems in Romania. In Proceedings of the International Conference—Environment at a Crossroads: SMART Approches for a Sustainable Future, Bucharest, Romania, 12–15 November 2015; pp. 364–372.
38. Drăghici, C.C.; Andronache, I.; Ahammer, H.; Peptenatu, D.; Pintilii, R.D.; Ciobotaru, A.M.; Simion, A.G.; Dobrea, R.C.; Diaconu, D.C.; Vișan, M.C. Spatial evolution of forest areas in the northern Carpathian Mountains of Romania. *Acta Montan. Slovaca* **2017**, *22*, 95–106.
39. Diaconu, D.C.; Andronache, I.; Pintilii, R.D.; Brețcan, P.; Simion, A.G.; Drăghici, C.C.; Gruia, A.K.; Grecu, A.; Marin, M.; Peptenatu, D. Using fractal fragmentation and compaction index in analysis of the deforestation process in Bucegi Mountains Group, Romania. *Carpathian J. Earth Environ.* **2019**, *14*, 431–438.

40. Pintilii, R.D.; Andronache, I.; Diaconu, D.C.; Dobrea, R.C.; Zelenakova, M.; Fensholt, R.; Peptenatu, D.; Drăghici, C.C.; Ciobotaru, A.M. Using Fractal Analysis in Modeling the Dynamics of Forest Areas and Economic Impact Assessment: Maramureş County, Romania as a Case Study. *Forests* **2017**, *8*, 25. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Andronache, I.; Fensholt, R.; Ahammer, H.; Ciobotaru, A.M.; Pintilii, R.D.; Peptenatu, D.; Drăghici, C.C.; Diaconu, D.C.; Radulovic, M.; Pulighe, G.; et al. Assessment of Textural Differentiations in Forest Resources in Romania Using Fractal Analysis. *Forests* **2017**, *8*, 54. [[CrossRef](#)]

© 2019 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).