

## THE STRUCTURAL DYNAMICS OF THE ENTREPRENEURIAL PROFILE IN THE SPA RESORTS FROM ROMANIA

**Alexandra GRECU, Andreea-Karina GRUIA, Adrian-Gabriel SIMION, Roxana-Andreea RADU**  
University of Bucharest – Faculty of Geography & Research Center for Integrate Analysis and Territorial Management, 1, Nicolae. Bălcescu Blvd., Bucharest, 010041, Romania *alexandra.grecu@drd.unibuc.ro, karina.gruia@yahoo.com, simion.adrian14@gmail.com, radu88roxana@yahoo.com*

### Abstract

The entrepreneurial sector is one of the main economic development factors at the level of each territorial system. Through the present study, we intend to follow the dynamics of the entrepreneurial profile in the territorial systems with spa resources in Romania and the importance of the spa tourism in the development of the local economy. Quantification of this dynamics was possible by creating a database at the territorial administrative unit level for the period 2000-2016 for the main economic indicators: number of companies, number of employees, turnover and profit. After, the data were analyzed and used for the development of trend matrices and on the evolution of the ranks for each territorial administrative unit in part, on the four economic indicators mentioned above. The detailed analysis of the entrepreneurial profile of the territorial systems with spa tourism functionality shows the importance of the entrepreneurial profile in structuring the function of the resort and the dynamics of the local business sector, where the spa resources increase the functional complexity of the analyzed territorial systems.

**Keywords:** Entrepreneurship, Economic development, Spa tourism, Spa resorts, Mineral waters.

## INTRODUCTION

Academic studies highlight with a high frequency, the importance of the territorial dimension of the development of the entrepreneurial sector, which is considered to be the engine of economic development of the territorial systems (Krueger and Brazeal 1994; Koellinger et al., 2007; Segal et al., 2005; Carree and Thurik 2003, Audretsch and Keilbach 2004; Luthje and Franke 2003; Reynolds 1997; Rotefoss and Kolvereid 2005).

Nowadays, tourism has become an economic engine that generates increased functionality in territorial systems based on the exploitation of tourism resources (Drăghici et al., 2016; Pintilii et al., 2016) and also leads to the development of other economic sectors (Draghici et al., 2015). The influence of spa tourism on the development of local economies has an important goal, due to the influences of great economic complexity, which manifests both vertically and horizontally in the economic system of the localities (Lee and Hung 2010; Košić et al., 2011; Nikezić et al., 2012). Also, by the economic contribution made by this sector to local economies, can be a viable alternative to areas that have such resources. Romania is one of the European countries with significant mineral resources which is highlighted by both quantity and quality. To this mineral resources are added other natural factors cure, which come to emphasize the potential and high value of spa tourism as a major form of tourism that can stimulate the economic development of those localities that have such resources.

## METHODS


Quantification of this study was possible through the development of an economic database at the level of the territorial administrative unit (TAU) and at the 4-digit NACE code level on four economic indicators considered relevant to our study (number of companies, number of employees, turnover and profit) for a period of 17 years, 2000-2016. The data were analyzed and used to generate graphs for the dynamics of the four indicators mentioned above by sectors of activity, primary, secondary and tertiary and for trend matrices that shows the variation of the rankings for the share of number of employees and turnover from the spa tourism sector for the entire analysis period, but also for the post-crisis period.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 1 presents the dynamics of two important economic indicators for the entrepreneurial profile of spa resorts in Romania, the number of companies (a) and the number of employees (b).


The evolution of the number of companies shows a well-known trend, increasing from the first year of analysis to 2008, followed by a decrease due to the economic crisis. The largest number of companies is brought by the tertiary sector (sector that includes also the tourism), 6462 in 2000 and reaches 18813 companies in 2016, the maximum being reached in 2008, with 19510 companies. The second sector with a significant number of companies is the secondary one, which includes the manufacturing and construction industry and which is holding in 2016, 17.3% of the total number of active companies.

The number of employees working in the companies from spa resorts is presented with a fluctuating dynamics, after 2008 the decreases caused by the crisis are significant, from 152535 employees at 125300 in 2016, the percentage being about 18%.



**Figure 1.** Evolution of companies number by sectors of activity (A) and of employees number by sectors of activity (B) from spa resorts

The turnover and the profit (Figure 2a,b) of the spa resorts are presented with a situation slightly different from the two previously analyzed indicators. With a fluctuating dynamics, the turnover has an increase of 86% between 2000-2008, growth given by the secondary and tertiary sector (Figure 2a). After this period, the fall is imminent, given by the economic crisis, with a drop of 7%. Starting with 2014, the turnover has a spectacular growth of 39%, mainly due to the tertiary sector which includes also the tourism (during this period, holiday requests in spa resorts started to increase after the investments made in accommodation facilities). Profit increases were 91.5% for the 2000-2008 period and 40% for 2014-2016 (Figure 2b), where the main activity sector, which brings the greatest profit to spa resorts is the tertiary one, followed by the secondary one, and the sector that brings the lowest economic contribution to all the indicators analyzed is the primary one, which includes agriculture, forestry, fish farming and extractive industries.



**Figure 2.** Evolution of turnover by sectors of activity (A) and of profit by sectors of activity (B) from spa resorts (/1000)

The variation of the rankings for the share of number of employees from the tourism sector for 2000-2016 (Table 1), shows that a number of 7 resorts, meaning 21.9% of the total spa resorts had a general growth trend, 5 resorts (15,6%) a general decrease trend, while the remaining of 62.5% (20 resorts), showed a relatively constant evolution over the period.

**Table 1.** Variation of the rankings for the share of number of employees from the tourism sector in the total number of employees – 2000-2016

Resort/Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<i>Amara</i>	16	17	19	21	20	20	20	20	20	21	20	24	24	19	19	17	18
<i>Baile Felix/IMai</i>	5	6	6	5	6	6	9	7	5	5	5	4	13	7	7	5	5
<i>Baile Govora</i>	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	2	1	1	29	29
<i>Baile Herculane</i>	4	4	4	3	3	1	3	5	7	8	9	13	10	10	15	9	9
<i>Baile Olanesti</i>	17	9	8	8	7	4	6	6	6	6	6	5	4	5	5	13	17
<i>Baile Turda</i>	23	23	24	24	25	25	25	24	24	25	25	23	23	24	23	22	23
<i>Baile Tusnad</i>	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	4	6	9	4	4	2	3
<i>Bala</i>	26	26	26	28	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	28	29	29
<i>Bazna</i>	26	26	26	28	23	24	23	21	21	24	24	20	22	22	18	11	14
<i>Bizusa</i>	26	26	26	28	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	28	29	29
<i>Buzias</i>	15	16	10	14	15	16	11	16	16	16	18	18	16	17	28	19	19
<i>Calacea</i>	26	26	26	28	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	28	28	28
<i>Calimanești-Căciulata</i>	6	7	7	7	5	7	8	8	10	11	10	8	3	3	3	1	1
<i>Covasna</i>	10	11	13	11	14	15	17	18	12	18	16	15	15	16	14	14	12
<i>Eforie (North and South)</i>	7	8	9	9	10	11	10	10	11	12	12	11	11	13	9	8	8
<i>Geoagiu-Bai</i>	14	13	17	10	12	10	13	13	8	7	8	7	6	8	8	6	6
<i>Mangalia (Cap Aurora, Jupiter, Neptun-Olimp, Saturn, Venus)</i>	8	10	12	13	11	12	12	11	18	17	19	16	19	18	17	18	16
<i>Moneasa</i>	12	5	5	6	9	9	7	3	3	1	1	1	5	6	6	4	2
<i>Nicolina</i>	24	25	25	25	27	26	26	26	27	27	27	27	27	28	27	26	27
<i>Ocna Sibiului</i>	26	26	26	23	26	28	27	27	26	10	7	26	28	26	24	24	22
<i>Ocna Șugatag</i>	26	26	26	26	22	22	19	19	14	15	15	12	7	9	12	7	10
<i>Pucioasa</i>	21	20	21	22	24	23	24	25	25	26	26	25	26	27	25	27	26
<i>Sangeorz-Bai</i>	9	14	14	15	16	14	14	14	17	20	22	19	18	20	20	20	21
<i>Sărata-Monteoru</i>	22	22	22	17	17	18	18	17	19	19	17	17	17	15	11	12	13
<i>Slanic (Prahova)</i>	3	2	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	2	2	1	2	2	3	4
<i>Slanic Moldova</i>	13	15	11	19	8	8	5	9	9	9	11	10	14	12	16	16	7
<i>Sovata</i>	11	12	15	12	13	13	15	15	13	14	13	9	8	11	10	10	11
<i>Targu-Ocna</i>	20	19	20	20	19	19	21	23	22	22	21	21	21	21	21	21	20
<i>Techirghiol</i>	18	18	16	16	21	21	22	22	23	23	23	22	20	23	22	23	24
<i>Tinca</i>	26	26	26	28	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	28	29	29
<i>Vatra Dornei</i>	19	21	18	18	18	17	16	12	15	13	14	14	12	14	13	15	15
<i>North Mamaia Area</i>	25	24	23	27	28	27	28	28	28	28	28	28	25	25	26	25	25
	General growth trend				Relatively constant trend				General decrease trend								

For a more depth analysis, we analyzed the variation of the rankings for the same indicator from the tourism sector for the period 2009-2016, period after the economic crisis. Thus, the resorts with a general growth dynamics were Amara, Bazna, Călimănești-Căciulata, Covasna, Eforie, Ocna Șugatag, Sărata-Monteoru, Slănic Moldova and Sovata with a share of 28,1%.

With a share of 62,5% there are resorts that for the entire period 2009-2016, have not registered significant increases or decreases, had a relatively constant dynamics.

Băile Govora, Băile Olănești and Ocna Sibiului, were the resorts on which the economic crisis put its mark on and recorded a general downward trend over the period under review (9,4%) (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Variation of the rankings for the share of number of employees from the tourism sector in the total number of employees – 2009-2016

Resort/Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<i>Amara</i>	16	17	19	21	20	20	20	20	20	21	20	24	24	19	19	17	18
<i>Baile Felix/IMai</i>	5	6	6	5	6	6	9	7	5	5	5	4	13	7	7	5	5
<i>Baile Govora</i>	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	2	1	1	29	29
<i>Baile Herculane</i>	4	4	4	3	3	1	3	5	7	8	9	13	10	10	15	9	9
<i>Baile Olanesti</i>	17	9	8	8	7	4	6	6	6	6	6	5	4	5	5	13	17
<i>Baile Turda</i>	23	23	24	24	25	25	25	24	24	25	25	23	23	24	23	22	23
<i>Baile Tusnad</i>	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	4	6	9	4	4	2	3
<i>Bala</i>	26	26	26	28	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	28	29	29
<i>Bazna</i>	26	26	26	28	23	24	23	21	21	24	24	20	22	22	18	11	14
<i>Bizusa</i>	26	26	26	28	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	28	29	29
<i>Buzias</i>	15	16	10	14	15	16	11	16	16	16	18	18	16	17	28	19	19
<i>Calacea</i>	26	26	26	28	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	28	28	28
<i>Calimanești-Caciulata</i>	6	7	7	7	5	7	8	8	10	11	10	8	3	3	3	1	1
<i>Covasna</i>	10	11	13	11	14	15	17	18	12	18	16	15	15	16	14	14	12
<i>Eforie (North and South)</i>	7	8	9	9	10	11	10	10	11	12	12	11	11	13	9	8	8
<i>Geoagiu-Bai</i>	14	13	17	10	12	10	13	13	8	7	8	7	6	8	8	6	6
<i>Mangalia (Cap Aurora, Jupiter, Neptun-Olimp, Saturn, Venus)</i>	8	10	12	13	11	12	12	11	18	17	19	16	19	18	17	18	16
<i>Moneasa</i>	12	5	5	6	9	9	7	3	3	1	1	1	5	6	6	4	2
<i>Nicolina</i>	24	25	25	25	27	26	26	26	27	27	27	27	27	28	27	26	27
<i>Ocna Sibiului</i>	26	26	26	23	26	28	27	27	26	10	7	26	28	26	24	24	22
<i>Ocna Șugatag</i>	26	26	26	26	22	22	19	19	14	15	15	12	7	9	12	7	10
<i>Pucioasa</i>	21	20	21	22	24	23	24	25	25	26	26	25	26	27	25	27	26
<i>Sangeorz-Bai</i>	9	14	14	15	16	14	14	14	17	20	22	19	18	20	20	20	21
<i>Sarata-Monteoru</i>	22	22	22	17	17	18	18	17	19	19	17	17	17	15	11	12	13
<i>Slanic (Prahova)</i>	3	2	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	2	2	1	2	2	3	4
<i>Slanic Moldova</i>	13	15	11	19	8	8	5	9	9	9	11	10	14	12	16	16	7
<i>Sovata</i>	11	12	15	12	13	13	15	15	13	14	13	9	8	11	10	10	11
<i>Targu-Ocna</i>	20	19	20	20	19	19	21	23	22	22	21	21	21	21	21	21	20
<i>Techirghiol</i>	18	18	16	16	21	21	22	22	23	23	23	22	20	23	22	23	24
<i>Tinca</i>	26	26	26	28	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	28	29	29
<i>Vatra Dornei</i>	19	21	18	18	18	17	16	12	15	13	14	14	12	14	13	15	15
<i>North Mamaia Area</i>	25	24	23	27	28	27	28	28	28	28	28	28	25	25	26	25	25
	General growth trend							Relatively constant trend				General decrease trend					

In the case of of the rankings for the share of turnover from the tourism sector (Table 3), of total local economy, we have the following situation of the spa resorts: most of the resorts registered a relatively constant trend over this period (75%), 5 resorts had a general decrease trend and only 3 resorts, Bazna, Ocna Șugatag and Slănic Moldova, had a general trend of growth (9,4%).

**Table 3.** Variation of the rankings for the share of turnover from the tourism sector in the total turnover – 2000-2016

Resort/Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<i>Amara</i>	19	19	18	18	17	16	14	18	17	17	18	20	19	18	16	15	15
<i>Baile Felix/IMai</i>	7	8	9	9	8	9	8	9	8	6	8	8	16	8	10	8	7
<i>Baile Govora</i>	3	4	5	5	7	5	4	7	10	8	7	7	6	3	3	29	29
<i>Baile Herculane</i>	5	6	4	4	5	2	7	8	9	13	12	11	9	7	13	7	5
<i>Baile Olanesti</i>	10	11	7	7	6	6	5	6	6	4	3	5	3	5	6	10	12
<i>Baile Turda</i>	23	24	22	22	19	21	22	22	23	26	21	21	21	24	25	24	24
<i>Baile Tusnad</i>	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	4	4	2	2	2	2	1
<i>Bala</i>	27	27	28	28	28	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	29	29
<i>Bazna</i>	27	27	28	28	28	27	27	25	24	25	25	25	23	25	15	12	13
<i>Bizusa</i>	27	27	28	28	28	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	29	29
<i>Buzias</i>	12	12	13	16	18	18	19	21	21	22	19	19	18	21	23	23	22
<i>Calacea</i>	27	27	28	28	28	29	29	29	29	28	29	29	29	29	29	28	28

<i>Calimanești-Căciulata</i>	4	3	6	3	3	4	3	5	4	5	6	6	4	4	4	3	3	
<i>Covasna</i>	15	15	16	12	15	15	17	15	12	14	13	12	11	13	14	14	14	
<i>Eforie (North and South)</i>	8	9	12	10	11	13	13	13	13	11	14	13	14	14	7	5	8	
<i>Geoagiu-Bai</i>	6	7	8	8	10	10	10	10	7	7	10	9	10	10	9	9	11	
<i>Mangalia (Cap Aurora, Jupiter, Neptun-Olimp, Saturn, Venus)</i>	14	14	15	14	14	14	15	17	19	18	20	18	17	15	17	18	18	
<i>Moneasa</i>	11	5	2	6	4	8	11	4	3	2	2	3	5	6	5	4	4	
<i>Nicolina</i>	25	25	25	25	26	26	25	27	27	27	27	26	25	27	27	25	25	
<i>Ocna Sibiului</i>	20	23	23	23	21	25	26	26	25	12	9	17	20	23	24	21	23	
<i>Ocna Șugatag</i>	27	27	26	26	25	23	16	14	15	15	17	15	12	11	12	11	9	
<i>Pucioasa</i>	22	22	24	24	24	24	24	24	26	24	23	24	24	26	28	27	26	
<i>Sangeorz-Bai</i>	9	10	11	11	12	11	9	11	14	21	22	23	27	20	21	16	17	
<i>Sarata-Monteoru</i>	21	21	19	21	23	22	23	23	22	23	24	22	22	19	19	20	20	
<i>Slanic (Prahova)</i>	2	2	3	1	2	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	
<i>Slanic Moldova</i>	17	16	10	15	9	7	6	2	5	9	5	2	7	12	11	13	6	
<i>Sovata</i>	13	13	14	13	13	12	12	12	11	10	11	10	8	9	8	6	10	
<i>Targu-Ocna</i>	16	17	20	20	22	20	21	20	20	19	16	14	15	17	18	17	16	
<i>Techirghiol</i>	24	20	21	19	20	19	20	19	18	20	26	27	26	22	22	22	21	
<i>Tinca</i>	27	27	28	28	28	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	29	29	
<i>Vatra Dornei</i>	18	18	17	17	16	17	18	16	16	16	15	16	13	16	20	19	19	
<i>North Mamaia Area</i>	26	26	27	27	27	28	28	28	28	29	28	28	28	28	26	26	27	
	General growth trend						Relatively constant trend						General decrease trend					

For the period 2009-2016, the variation of the rankings for the share of turnover from the tourism sector is presented in a way already known from the analysis of the variations discussed above, the largest share being held by the resorts with a relatively constant trend – 62,5%, followed by the resorts that had an upward trend in the post-crisis period, 25% of the total number of resorts (Amara, Băile Herculane, Băile Tușnad, Bazna, Călimănești-Căciulata, Eforie, Ocna Șugatag, Slănic Moldova) and 4 of the resorts, meaning 12.5%, had a general downward trend.

**Table 4.** Variation of the rankings for the share of turnover from the tourism sector in the total turnover – 2009-2016

<i>Resort/Year</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<i>Amara</i>	19	19	18	18	17	16	14	18	17	17	18	20	19	18	16	15	15
<i>Băile Felix/IMai</i>	7	8	9	9	8	9	8	9	8	6	8	8	16	8	10	8	7
<i>Băile Govora</i>	3	4	5	5	7	5	4	7	10	8	7	7	6	3	3	29	29
<i>Băile Herculane</i>	5	6	4	4	5	2	7	8	9	13	12	11	9	7	13	7	5
<i>Băile Olanesti</i>	10	11	7	7	6	6	5	6	6	4	3	5	3	5	6	10	12
<i>Băile Turda</i>	23	24	22	22	19	21	22	22	23	26	21	21	21	24	25	24	24
<i>Băile Tușnad</i>	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	4	4	2	2	2	2	1
<i>Bala</i>	27	27	28	28	28	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	29	29
<i>Bazna</i>	27	27	28	28	28	27	27	25	24	25	25	25	23	25	15	12	13
<i>Bizusa</i>	27	27	28	28	28	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	29	29
<i>Buzias</i>	12	12	13	16	18	18	19	21	21	22	19	19	18	21	23	23	22
<i>Calacea</i>	27	27	28	28	28	29	29	29	29	28	29	29	29	29	29	28	28
<i>Calimanești-Căciulata</i>	4	3	6	3	3	4	3	5	4	5	6	6	4	4	4	3	3
<i>Covasna</i>	15	15	16	12	15	15	17	15	12	14	13	12	11	13	14	14	14
<i>Eforie (North and South)</i>	8	9	12	10	11	13	13	13	13	11	14	13	14	14	7	5	8
<i>Geoagiu-Bai</i>	6	7	8	8	10	10	10	10	7	7	10	9	10	10	9	9	11
<i>Mangalia (Cap Aurora, Jupiter, Neptun-Olimp, Saturn, Venus)</i>	14	14	15	14	14	14	15	17	19	18	20	18	17	15	17	18	18
<i>Moneasa</i>	11	5	2	6	4	8	11	4	3	2	2	3	5	6	5	4	4
<i>Nicolina</i>	25	25	25	25	26	26	25	27	27	27	27	26	25	27	27	25	25
<i>Ocna Sibiului</i>	20	23	23	23	21	25	26	26	25	12	9	17	20	23	24	21	23

<i>Ocna Sugatag</i>	27	27	26	26	25	23	16	14	15	15	17	15	12	11	12	11	9
<i>Pucioasa</i>	22	22	24	24	24	24	24	24	26	24	23	24	24	26	28	27	26
<i>Sangeorz-Bai</i>	9	10	11	11	12	11	9	11	14	21	22	23	27	20	21	16	17
<i>Sarata-Monteoru</i>	21	21	19	21	23	22	23	23	22	23	24	22	22	19	19	20	20
<i>Slanic (Prahova)</i>	2	2	3	1	2	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
<i>Slanic Moldova</i>	17	16	10	15	9	7	6	2	5	9	5	2	7	12	11	13	6
<i>Sovata</i>	13	13	14	13	13	12	12	12	11	10	11	10	8	9	8	6	10
<i>Targu-Ocna</i>	16	17	20	20	22	20	21	20	20	19	16	14	15	17	18	17	16
<i>Techirghiol</i>	24	20	21	19	20	19	20	19	18	20	26	27	26	22	22	22	21
<i>Tinca</i>	27	27	28	28	28	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	29	29
<i>Vatra Dornei</i>	18	18	17	17	16	17	18	16	16	16	15	16	13	16	20	19	19
<i>North Mamaia Area</i>	26	26	27	27	27	28	28	28	28	29	28	28	28	28	26	26	27
	General growth trend				Relatively constant trend				General decrease trend								

Detailed analysis of the entrepreneurial profile of spa resorts indicates its importance in structuring the function of each spa resort and the dynamics of the local business sector, where the existing spa resources lead to the development of the functional complexity of the analyzed territorial systems (Peptenatu et al., 2012).

## CONCLUSIONS

From the study of the four economic indicators, it has resulted that the sector with the highest economic contribution to these systems with tourism functionality is the tertiary sector, which also includes tourism. Also, some evolutionary typologies for these spa resorts have been identified, based on the analysis of the variation of the ranks. Thus, there are systems where their adaptive capacity is superior compare to other resorts, these being the systems that during the entire analyzed period, including the period 2009-2016, had a general trend of growth, where the spa resources supported their development (Slănic Moldova, Ocna Șugatag, Călimănești Căciulata). The second category is held by the resorts that have registered relatively constant trends, representing over 60% of the total spa resorts, and the last category is that where the trend of evolution was not favorable to the resorts, the tourism sector being a complementary sector and not a main one.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research and Innovation, CNCS - UEFISCDI, project UB 1407/2018.

## REFERENCES

- Audretsch, D.B. and Keilbach, M. (2004). Entrepreneurship capital and economic performance, *Regional Studies*, **38**(8), 949-959.
- Carree, M.A. and Thurik, A.R. (2003). The impact of entrepreneurship on economic growth, in: D.B. Audretsch & ZJ Acs (Eds), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research* (pp. 437-471). Boston/Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Drăghici, C.C., Diaconu, D., Teodorescu, C., Pintilii R.D., and Ciobotaru, A.M. (2016). Health tourism contribution to the structural dynamics of the territorial systems with tourism functionality, *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, **32**, 386-393.
- Draghici, C.C., Pintilii, R.D., Peptenatu, D., Comanescu, L.G. and Sirodoev I. (2015). The Role of SPA Tourism in the Development of Local Economies from Romania, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, **23**, 1573-1577.
- Koellinger, P., Minniti, M., and Schade, C. (2007). I think I can, I think I can: Overconfidence and entrepreneurial behavior, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, **28**(4), 502-527.
- Kozić, K., Pivac, T., Romelić, J., Lazić, L. and Stojanović, V. (2011). 'Characteristics of thermal-mineral waters in Backa region (Vojvodina) and their exploitation in spa tourism', *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **15**(1).
- Krueger, N. and Brazeal, D.V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **18**(3), 91-104.

- Lee, C.G. and Hung, W.T. (2010). 'Tourism, Health and Income in Singapore', *International Journal of Tourism Research*, **12**(4).
- Luthje, C. and Franke, N. (2003). The 'making' of an entrepreneur: testing a model of entrepreneurial intent among engineering students at MIT, *R&D Management*, **33**(2), 135-147.
- Nikezic, S., Djordjevic, M., Bataveljic, D. (2012). 'Improvement of spa tourism in the Republic of Serbia as a pattern of positive impact on ecology and regional development', *Technics Technologies Education Management*, **7**(2).
- Peptenatu D., Draghici C. and Merciu C. (2012). Characteristics of entrepreneurial profile in some emergent territorial structures in Romania, *Actual problems of economics*, **138**, 448-458.
- Pintilii, R.D., Peptenatu, D., Grecu, A., Ilie, A.M. and Simion, A.G. (2016). Tourism, basic functionality versus complementary component of the territorial systems in Romania, *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, **32**, 364-372.
- Reynolds, P.D. (1997). Who starts new firms? Preliminary explorations of firms\_in\_gestation, *Small Business Economics*, **9**(5), 449-462.
- Rotefoss, B. and Kolvereid, L. (2005). Aspiring, nascent and fledgling entrepreneurs: an investigation of the business start\_up process, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **17**(2), 109-127.