

# Ramsar Site Labudovo Okno for Sustainable Tourism

Subjects: Green & Sustainable Science & Technology

Contributor: Igor Trišić, Eldin Brđanin, Nevena Majstorović, Adina Nicoleta Candrea, Snežana Štetić, Florin Nechita, Jelena Premović

The Ramsar Site Labudovo Okno (LO) is located in Serbia, AP Vojvodina, on the left bank of the Danube. It covers an area of 3733 ha. This wet habitat is valuable for different ecosystems, among which the most important are those inhabited by rare bird species.

Keywords: Ramsar site ; nature-based tourism ; wetlands

---

## 1. Introduction

The Ramsar Site Labudovo Okno (LO) lies in the southern region of the Pannonian Plain, in southeastern Vojvodina, near the border with Romania. This locality is part of the Deliblato Sands Special Nature Reserve (DS), which represents a large floodplain of the Danube River, on its left bank. Many marsh terrains and wetlands, river banks, and canals make up this protected area. LO covers an area of 3733 ha. The settlements of Bela Crkva, Vračev Gaj, Banatska Palanka, Gaj, Šumarak, Dubovac, and Kovin are in its immediate vicinity <sup>[1][2]</sup>. Good traffic and geographic positioning as well as close proximity to important cities around define LO. The Danube and Romania are near the most notable features. The complementary natural tourist value of LO is the DS, the only sands in this part of Europe. LO has international protection status: it is an important area for birds (IBA), plants (IPA), and butterflies (PBA). In 2006, The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands states that it is an internationally important wetland. In addition to the fauna of birds, reptiles, fish, and mammals, this area is characterized by very rare examples of flora <sup>[3][4][5]</sup>.

The population that inhabits this area of southern Banat has a rich cultural heritage. Besides Serbs, the ethnic structure consists of Romanians, Hungarians, Roma, Slovaks, and other peoples <sup>[6]</sup>. This kind of information is extremely important for the development of cultural tourism forms, in which the local population should have clearly defined roles <sup>[7]</sup>.

To examine the tourism development level and the conditions for its further growth, the research included the study of ST using 37 indicators and the technique of surveying respondents. The study model was conceived using the Prism of Sustainability model (PS) <sup>[8][9][10][11][12][13]</sup>. The polling was conducted with a written and online questionnaire. The research used a random sample method, and a total of 625 respondents (370 locals and 255 guests) were surveyed.

Respondents expressed their attitudes with the help of a five-point Likert scale with the statements from the questionnaire related to ST state, the possibilities for its development, and the affect of ST on respondents' contentment.

## 2. Ramsar Site Labudovo Okno for Sustainable Tourism

Today, ST development is an important point of all development goals of numerous tourism subjects <sup>[14][15][16][17]</sup> and it includes a wide range of planning benefits for all interested parties in tourism <sup>[18][19][20]</sup>. The growth of this kind of tourism includes the establishment of travel companies aligned with ecological principles, the preservation of nature, and the development of specific tourism forms to preserve natural values, strengthening the role of the local community and creating economic profit without negative consequences for all participants in it <sup>[21][22][23][24]</sup>. The sustainability of tourism implies the improvement of existing capacities but in a high-quality way. This would mean that the expansion of the tourism sector must have ecological, economic, and sociocultural benefits <sup>[25]</sup>, which cannot be planned without a clear role of the local community and tourists. Tourism consumption is a significant source of funds <sup>[26]</sup>, and ST development involves minimizing planning, development, and control costs, and maximizing benefits (e.g., environmental, economic, and sociocultural). In addition, there is the involvement of the local community and the creation of positive experiences with tourists <sup>[27][28]</sup>. The paradigm of ST development includes economic, sociocultural, and ecological dimensions <sup>[29]</sup>. It is difficult to achieve a balance between these three classical dimensions of ST without the institutional dimension of sustainability, which describes the oversight, management, and facilitation of the growth of tourism <sup>[30][31]</sup>.

Within the tourist market, nature-based and responsible tourism has the fastest development, because this type of tourist movement—returning to nature—is constantly increasing in the 21st century [32][33][34]. Eco-destinations, protected areas, maritime areas, nature parks, rural areas and ethnic villages, mountain lodges, and eco-resorts are increasingly the subject of tourist demand [35][36].

The ST generates numerous activities aimed at achieving different results, such as economic development, strengthening tourist consumption, improving awareness about the preservation of environmental resources, and applying numerous ethical principles [37][38]. Reducing the negative impacts of tourism is one of the primary objectives of environmentally responsible travel [39]. The results of certain research indicate that “responsible tourists” show a high level of understanding the concept of environmental protection, which is a basic criterion when choosing a tourist destination. Such tourists prefer all activities aimed at ST improvement in the destination [40].

Proper monitoring of tourism development in conservation areas can contribute to the tourist attendance rate, which further affects income from tourist consumption [41][42]. Precisely, part of such income can be directed to the ecological development of the destination, which is one of the basic objectives of ST improvement, as well as the determination of the function of preserved areas in the tourism offer.

In the research by Maksin et al. [43], Sanchez et al. [44], and Stojanović [45], the control of wastewater and exhaust gases, zoning, carrying capacity, limit of acceptable changes, planned construction of infrastructure, and other measures, are specified as significant for space protection. These pieces of research are based on the fact that tourism should be developed in a planned manner in all destinations, with special emphasis on preserved areas, where tourism development should be especially controlled, with a clearly defined role of residents, visitors, and stakeholders.

Tourism growth in preserved areas is affected by various elements like the preservation of the area, the level of space utilization, occupancy capacities, the role of the locals, sociocultural variables, the tourism influence on the community's economy, trash management, growth control, etc. [25][36][46][47][48][49][50][51][52]. Potential threats can include over-tourism, an increased number of tourists and residents within the restricted region and the area's surrounding safe zone. In addition, there are other threats to the ecological, economic, and sociocultural environment, such as air and water pollution, detrimental anthropogenic activities for the ecosystem, costs associated with reconstruction and protection, adverse social effects, economic inefficiency brought on by the emergence of uncontrolled tourism forms, and others. Precisely, it is ST that can be used as a stabilizer for numerous potential negative implications of unplanned tourism development [8][53][54][55][56][57].

Hussain et al. [11] studied ST in two conserved areas in India, Gharana Wetland, and Ramnagar Wildlife Sanctuary. The study employed the PS model. Using a questionnaire, four aspects of sustainability were utilized to evaluate the residents' attitudes: institutional, social, ecological, and economic. Four research hypotheses were tested by applying SEM statistical analysis. The study's findings suggest all hypotheses have been confirmed, i.e., each of the four sustainability dimensions affects residents' satisfaction with ST.

Trišić et al. [8] examined the tourism in the Nature Park “Rusanda” and how it affects the extent to which locals and tourists become satisfied. By applying the PoS model in the research, 840 respondents (both local and guests) were contacted in total using the polling technique. The outcomes of the study show that the factors that most significantly affect the condition of ST are the ecological and social aspects of sustainability. The economic and institutional dimensions of sustainability are based on indicators that point to certain interventions needed during tourism planning and development in this protected area. In addition, the main objective was to examine whether ST has an impact on the satisfaction of respondents, which this research confirmed. The most important factors in tourism evolution in protected areas are those related to the natural and social elements of the destination and the economic, ecological, and cultural aspects of tourism [58][59][60]. The completion of destination construction, the impact of the natural world and space on the rise in tourism, the contribution by locals to ST, and the implementation of regulatory safeguards have all received special attention. Possibilities for various specific nature-based tourism forms, enhancement of regional customs, carrying capacity, utilization of resources, and other factors are also highlighted [61][62].

Jeelani et al. [13] examined the state and perspectives of environmentally conscious tourism in the Himalayan Pahalgam, a sensitive ecosystem with a fragile resource base and limited capacities for the local population. Structured questionnaires were used to collect data, and the SUS-TAS model was used to analyze the opinions of the local community towards ST development. The results of the research indicate that representatives of the local community agree with six constructions of ST development, out of the seven surveyed. The local population expressed their understanding of ST, which has its benefits when segmenting management priorities while respecting the needs and

rights of the local population <sup>[63][64]</sup>. The acceptance and tolerance of the local population towards tourists are the basic prerequisites for ST development <sup>[65][66][67]</sup>.

---

## References

1. Nikolić, V.; Nedić, Z.; Škraba Jurlina, D.; Djikanović, V.; Kanjuh, T.; Marić, A.; Simonović, P. Status and perspectives of the ichthyofauna of the Labudovo Okno Ramsar Site: An analysis of 14 years of data. *Sustainability* 2023, 15, 9303.
2. Stojanović, V.; Lazić, L.; Dunjić, J. Nature protection and sustainable tourism interaction in selected Ramsar Sites in Vojvodina (Northern Serbia). *Geogr. Pannonica* 2018, 22, 201–207.
3. Lazić, L.; Pavić, D.; Stojanović, V.; Tomić, P.; Romelić, J.; Pivac, T.; Košić, K.; Besermenji, S.; Kicošev, S. Protected Natural Resources and Ecotourism in Vojvodina; Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Prirodno-Matematički Fakultet, Departman za Geografiju, Turizam i Hotelijerstvo: Novi Sad, Serbia, 2008. (In Serbian)
4. Stanković, V.; Kuzmanović, N.; Kabaš, E.; Vukojičić, S.; Lakušić, D.; Jovanović, S. Established stands of the highly invasive *Echinocystis lobata* on the Ramsar sites of the southern part of the Pannonian Plain. *Bot. Serbica* 2022, 46, 197–207.
5. Boškov, J.; Kotrla, S.; Tomić, N.; Jovanović, M.; Rvović, J. Perspectives for geotourism development in the Bela Crkva municipality (Serbia). *Acta Geoturistica* 2015, 6, 1–10.
6. Trišić, I.; Privitera, D.; Ristić, V.; Štetić, S.; Milojković, D.; Maksin, M. Protected areas in the function of sustainable tourism development—A case of Deliblato Sands Special Nature Reserve, Vojvodina Province. *Land* 2023, 12, 487.
7. Stojanović, V.; Đorđević, J.; Lazić, L.; Stamenković, I.; Pavluković, V. The principles of sustainable development of tourism in the special nature reserve “Gornje Podunavlje” and their impact on the local communities. *Acta Geogr. Slov.* 2014, 54, 391–400.
8. Trišić, I.; Privitera, D.; Ristić, V.; Štetić, S.; Stanić Jovanović, S.; Nechita, F. Measuring residents’ and visitors’ satisfaction with sustainable tourism—The case of “Rusanda” Nature Park, Vojvodina Province. *Sustainability* 2023, 15, 16243.
9. Cottrell, S.P.; Vaske, J.J.; Roemer, J.M. Resident satisfaction with sustainable tourism: The case of Frankenwald Nature Park, Germany. *Tour. Manag. Perspect.* 2013, 8, 42–48.
10. Cottrell, S.P.; Cutumisu, N. Sustainable tourism development strategy in WWF Pan Parks: Case of a Swedish and Romanian national park. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* 2006, 6, 150–167.
11. Hussain, K.; Ali, F.; Ragavan, N.A.; Manhas, P.S. Sustainable tourism and resulting resident satisfaction at Jammu and Kashmir, India. *Worldw. Hosp. Tour. Themes* 2015, 7, 486–499.
12. Huayhuaca, C.; Cottrell, S.; Raadik, J.; Gradl, S. Resident perceptions of sustainable tourism development: Frankenwald Nature Park, Germany. *Int. J. Tour. Policy* 2010, 3, 125–141.
13. Jeelani, P.; Shah, S.A.; Dar, S.N.; Rashid, H. Sustainability constructs of mountain tourism development: The evaluation of stakeholders’ perception using SUS-TAS. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* 2023, 25, 8299–8317.
14. Buckley, R. Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Ann. Tour. Res.* 2012, 39, 528–546.
15. Graci, S. Collaboration and partnership development for sustainable tourism. *Tour. Geogr.* 2013, 15, 25–42.
16. Hanqin, Q.; Daisy, X.F.F.; Jiaying, L.; Pearl, M.C.; Carson, L.J. Analyzing the economic sustainability of tourism development: Evidence from Hong Kong. *J. Hosp. Tour. Res.* 2018, 4, 226–248.
17. Helmy, E. Towards integration of sustainability into tourism planning in developing countries: Egypt as a case study. *Curr. Issues Tour.* 2004, 7, 478–501.
18. Liu, Z. Sustainable tourism development: A critique. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2003, 11, 459–475.
19. Tosun, C. Challenges of sustainable tourism development in developing world—The case of Turkey. *Tour. Manag.* 2001, 22, 289–303.
20. Sharpley, R. Tourism, sustainable development and the theoretical divide: 20 years on. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2020, 28, 1932–1946.
21. Gong, J.; Shapovalova, A.; Lan, W.; Knight, D.W. Resident support in China’s new national parks: An extension of the Prism of Sustainability. *Curr. Issues Tour.* 2023, 26, 1731–1747.
22. Fallon, D.L.; Kriwoken, L.K. Community involvement in tourism infrastructure: The case of the Strahan visitor centre, Tasmania. *Tour. Manag.* 2003, 24, 289–308.

23. Ruhanen, L. Local government: Facilitator or inhibitor of sustainable tourism development? *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2013, 21, 80–98.
24. Buckley, R. Ecological indicators of tourist impacts in parks. *J. Ecotourism* 2003, 2, 54–66.
25. Choi, H.C.; Sirakaya, E. Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism. *Tour. Manag.* 2006, 27, 1274–1289.
26. Hall, C.M.; Gössling, S.; Scott, D. The evolution of sustainable development and sustainable tourism. In *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism and Sustainability*; Hall, C.M., Gössling, S., Scott, D., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2015.
27. Choi, H.S.; Sirakaya, E. Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: Development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *J. Travel Res.* 2005, 43, 380–394.
28. Cottrell, S.P.; Vaske, J.J.; Shen, F.; Ritter, P. Resident perceptions of sustainable tourism in Chongdugou, China. *Soc. Nat. Resour.* 2007, 20, 511–525.
29. Shen, F.; Cottrell, S.P.; Hughey, K.F.D.; Morrison, K. Agritourism sustainability in rural mountain areas of China: A community perspective. *Int. J. Bus. Glob.* 2009, 3, 123–145.
30. Cottrell, S.P.; Raadik, J. Socio-cultural benefits of PAN Parks at Bieszczady National Park, Poland. *Matkailututkimus* 2008, 1, 56–67.
31. Holden, A.; Sparrowhawk, J. Understanding the motivations of ecotourists: The case of trekkers in Annapurna, Nepal. *Int. J. Tour. Res.* 2002, 4, 435–446.
32. Fennell, D.A.; Malloy, D.C. Measuring the ethical nature of tourism operators. *Ann. Tour. Res.* 1999, 26, 928–943.
33. Eagles, P.F.J.; McCool, S.F.; Haynes, C.D. *Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas, Guidelines for Planning and Management*; IUCN: Gland, Switzerland; Cambridge, UK, 2002.
34. Sharpley, R. Responsible tourism. In *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism and the Environment*; Holden, A., Fennell, D., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2015.
35. Kruger, M.; Viljoen, A.; Saayman, M. Who visits the Kruger National Park and why? Identifying target markets. *J. Travel Tour. Mark.* 2017, 34, 312–340.
36. Queiroz, R.E.; Guerreiro, J.; Ventura, M.A. Demand of the tourists visiting protected areas in small oceanic islands: The Azores case-study (Portugal). *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* 2014, 16, 1119–1135.
37. Rio, D.; Nunes, L.M. Monitoring and evaluation tool for tourism destinations. *Tour. Manag. Perspect.* 2012, 4, 64–66.
38. Carr, A.; Ruhanen, L.; Whitford, M. Indigenous peoples and tourism: The challenges and opportunities for sustainable tourism. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2016, 24, 1067–1079.
39. 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.
40. Kerstetter, D.L.; Hou, J.S.; Lin, C.H. Profiling Taiwanese ecotourists using a behavioral approach. *Tour. Manag.* 2004, 25, 491–498.
41. Pérez, V.; Guerrero, F.; González, M.; Pérez, F.; Caballero, R. Composite indicator for the assessment of sustainability: The case of Cuban nature-based tourism destinations. *Ecol. Indic.* 2013, 29, 316–324.
42. Higham, J.; Miller, G. Transforming societies and transforming tourism: Sustainable tourism in times of change. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2018, 26, 1–8.
43. Maksin, M.; Ristić, V.; Nenковиć-Riznić, M.; Mičić, S. The role of zoning in the strategic planning of protected areas: Lessons learnt from EU Countries and Serbia. *Eur. Plan. Stud.* 2018, 26, 838–872.
44. Sanchez, M.L.; Cabrera, A.T.; Gomez del Pulgar, M.L. The potential role of cultural ecosystem services in heritage research through a set of indicators. *Ecol. Indic.* 2020, 117, 106670.
45. Stojanović, V. *Turizam i Održivi Razvoj (Tourism and Sustainable Development)*; Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Prirodno-Matematički Fakultet, Departman za Geografiju, Turizam i Hotelijerstvo: Novi Sad, Serbia, 2023.
46. Chin, C.L.M.; Moore, S.A.; Wallington, T.J.; Dowling, R. Ecotourism in Bako National Park, Borneo: Visitors' perspectives on environmental impacts and their management. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2000, 8, 20–35.
47. McCool, S.F.; Moisey, R.N.; Nickerson, N.P. What should tourism sustain? The disconnect with industry perceptions of useful indicators. *J. Travel Res.* 2001, 40, 124–131.
48. Sharpley, R. Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tour. Manag.* 2014, 42, 37–49.
49. 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.

50. Chávez-Cortés, M.; Maya, J.A.A. Identifying and structuring values to guide the choice of sustainability indicators for tourism development. *Sustainability* 2010, 2, 3074–3099.
51. Tanguay, G.A.; Rajaonson, J.; Therrien, M.C. Sustainable tourism indicators: Selection criteria for policy implementation and scientific recognition. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2013, 21, 862–879.
52. Font, X.; Sanabria, R.; Skinner, E. Sustainable tourism and ecotourism certification: Raising standards and benefits. *J. Ecotourism* 2003, 2, 213–218.
53. Rasoolimanesh, S.M.; Ramakrishna, S.; Hall, C.M.; Esfandiar, K.; Seyfi, S. A systematic scoping review of sustainable tourism indicators in relation to the sustainable development goals. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2023, 31, 1497–1517.
54. Sirakaya, E.; Teye, V.; Sonmez, S. Understanding residents' support for tourism development in the Central region of Ghana. *J. Travel Res.* 2002, 41, 57–67.
55. Baldacchino, G.; Helgadóttir, G.; Mykletun, R.J. Rural tourism: Insights from the North Atlantic. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* 2015, 15, 1–7.
56. Jones, P.; Hillier, D.; Comfort, D. Sustainability in the global hotel industry. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.* 2014, 26, 5–17.
57. Eagles, P.F.J.; Romagosab, F.; Buteau-Duitschaevers, W.C.; Havitza, M.; Glover, T.D.; McCutcheon, B. Good governance in protected areas: An evaluation of stakeholders' perceptions in British Columbia and Ontario Provincial Parks. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2013, 21, 60–79.
58. Han, S.; Ramkissoon, H.; You, E.; Kim, M. Support of residents for sustainable tourism development in nature-based destinations: Applying theories of social exchange and bottom-up spillover. *J. Outdoor Recreat. Tour.* 2023, 43, 100643.
59. Gautam, V.; Bhalla, S. Exploring the relationships among tourism involvement, residents' empowerment, quality of life and their support for sustainable tourism development. *J. Clean. Prod.* 2024, 434, 139770.
60. Gautam, V. Understanding interplay between destination psychological ownership and community citizenship behavior to support sustainable tourism development. *Asia Pac. J. Tour. Res.* 2023, 28, 1345–1362.
61. Gutierrez, E.L.M. Re-examining the participation and empowerment nexus: Applications to community-based tourism. *World Dev. Perspect.* 2023, 31, 100518.
62. Ravikumar, A.; Al Subhi, S.; Meesala, K.M. Community Perception and Attitude towards Sustainable Tourism and Environmental Protection Measures: An Exploratory Study in Muscat, Oman. *Economies* 2022, 10, 29.
63. Wani, M.D.; Dada, Z.A.; Shah, S.A. The impact of community empowerment on sustainable tourism development and the mediation effect of local support: A structural equation Modeling approach. *Community Dev.* 2024, 55, 50–66.
64. Stojanović, T.; Trišić, I.; Brđanin, E.; Štetić, S.; Nechita, F.; Candrea, A.N. Natural and sociocultural values of a tourism destination in the function of sustainable tourism development—An example of a protected area. *Sustainability* 2024, 16, 759.
65. Strzelecka, M.; Prince, S.; Boley, B.B. Resident connection to nature and attitudes towards tourism: Findings from three different rural nature tourism destinations in Poland. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2023, 31, 664–687.
66. Magadán-Díaz, M.; Rivas-García, J.I. Residents' perception of sustainable tourism in protected mountain areas: The case of Asturias. *J. Mt. Sci.* 2022, 19, 3597–3617.
67. Gautam, V. Why local residents support sustainable tourism development? *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2023, 31, 877–893.

---

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/125255>