# Gender inequalities in Transylvania's largest peri-urban forest usage

Romulus Oprica<sup>1</sup>, Nicu Constantin Tudose<sup>2</sup>, Serban Octavian Davidescu<sup>2</sup>, Mihai Zup<sup>3</sup>, Mirabela Marin<sup>2</sup>, Adina Nicoleta Comanici<sup>3</sup>, Maria Nicoleta Crit<sup>3</sup>, Diana Pitar<sup>2</sup>

Oprica R., Tudose N., Davidescu S.O., Zup M., Marin M., Comanici A., Crit M.N., Pitar D., 2022. Gender inequalities in Transylvania's largest peri-urban forest usage. Ann. For. Res. 65(2): 57-69.

Abstract Urban green spaces (public gardens, parks, urban and peri-urban forests) offer multiple-use opportunities and spaces for recreational activities and played a key role in supporting mental and physical health of dwellers during Covid-19 pandemic, being ones of few places where outdoor and social activities where allowed. This study was conducted in Brasov city (also known as Kronstadt, by its German name), the second largest metropolitan area of Romania and surrounded by a significant area of peri-urban forests in Transylvania. Brasov city own just 5.62 sqm of urban green space/inhabitant, one of the lowest in the country, so the presence of a large peri-urban forest area become very valuable for locals and tourists visiting the area. Due to its importance and because understanding visitors' expectations and perceptions is a key element to support decision-makers and ensure proper management of these forests, the Brasov's forests administrator (Kronstadt Local Public Forest District - RPLPK) decided to investigate how dwellers generally interact with the peri-urban forests and to identify opportunities for improving the capacity of forests in providing social and recreational services. Data were collected through the administration of CAWI (computer assisted web interview) to 314 respondents at beginning of 2021, at exactly one year distance after the pandemic lockdown was imposed all around the country. Analyzing the participants responses, a surprising fact become evident: the use of peri-urban forest is not gender equal, women being less able than men to access these green natural spaces and, therefore, to uptake the benefits provided by the peri-urban forests

Keywords: peri-urban forest, gender, social values, recreational value, health.

Addresses: <sup>1</sup>BrandBerry srl, Brasov, www.brandberry.ro, Romania.| <sup>2</sup>National Institute for Research and Development in Forestry (INCDS) "Marin Dracea", Closca 13, Braşov, 50040, Romania.| <sup>3</sup>Kronstadt Local Public Forest District – RPLPK, Panselelor 23E, Braşov, Romania.

Corresponding Author: Romulus Oprica (ro@romulusoprica.ro).

**Manuscript:** November 28, 2022; revised December 10, 2022; accepted December 28, 2022.

## Introduction

Even before Covid-19 pandemic period, the role of urban green spaces (UGS) and urban and peri-urban forests in providing of major public health benefits has been carefully documented. Loss of UGS and trees is related to cardiovascular and lower-respiratory-tract illnesses (Donovan et al. 2013), while evidence shows that doing activities in the presence of nature it leads to positive short and longterm health outcomes, achieving good mental health, achieving potential, and coping well with stress and adversity (Barton & Pretty 2010). Psychology studies showed that simple and brief interactions with nature can produce marked increases in cognitive control and demonstrate the restorative value of nature as a pathway for improving cognitive functioning, concluding that nature must be recognized as fundamental for achieving effective cognitive functioning (Berman et al. 2009).

Nature must not be considered as merely an amenity and evaluated solely by its economic functionality, but also by the social value it provides. The social value of forests can be defined as the value created by people's experiences of forests, connected to the framework of cultural ecosystems and which incorporates good health and well-being, good living environment, outdoor recreation and tourism, aesthetical values, outdoor education and knowledge about forests and environment, intellectual and spiritual inspiration, identity and cultural heritage (Plieningera et al. 2013, Tu et al. 2016, Guan et al. 2017, Bjarstig and Stens 2018, Gafta et al. 2021, Alessandro et al. 2022, Birks et al. 2022, Hegetschweiler et al. 2022). Social value of forests is a vague concept and is mainly associated with recreation and tourism, but also with silence or the feeling of privacy and solitude, which is highly valuable since environments providing silence and solitude are more often lacking in largely urbanized societies (Bjarstig & Stens 2018, Bjärstig et al. 2018, Pieratti et al. 2019, Pelleri et al. 2021, Oviedo et al. 2022, Wang et al. 2022).

During Covid-19, governmental restrictions and concerns about infection determined a drastic change in the way people use UGS as places of recreation, encounter or physical activity, that provide heat and noise mitigation and air filtration, and promote social networking and inclusion. In this respect, the 2030 EU Biodiversity Strategy foresees a larger role for UGS and urban forestry to restore biodiversity and strengthen physical and mental well-being supporting a green recovery after the COVID-19 pandemic (da Schio et al. 2021, De Meo et al. 2022, Park & Chang 2022). Covid-19 pandemic had a strong influence on how people relate to nature, a significant increase of nature base activities and visits to UGS, urban and periurban forests being noticed especially due to its capacity to reduce stress for citizens (Wubbelt et al. 2021, Scarneci-Domnisoru & Csesznek 2022, Su et al. 2022).

Like elsewhere, evidence of behavioral changes has been highlighted also in Romania, in general, and in Braşov city, in particular. Brasov is located in the historic region of Transylvania and is the second largest metropolitan area of Romania (Tudose et al. 2021). It is the 8th largest city in Romania and the biggest in its region. Brasov city is ringed by the Carpathian Mountains, has an elevation of 538 meters and a population of 290,000 dwellers (Brasov Metropolitan Agency for Sustainable Development 2022). According to Google Community Mobility Report (Google, May 2022), during the Covid-19 pandemic period mobile data tracking shows a 65% increase in visits to parks in Romania and 51% increase in visits to parks in Brasov city. The lower number of visits to parks measured in Brasov compared to Romania may be explained by two factors:

(1) Braşov is surrounded by a significant area of peri-urban forest in Transylvania and

(2) the mean surface of all UGS inside the city is just 5.62 sqm/inhabitant (EC 2022), less than 25% of the UGS surface recommended

by European Commission. If accounting just the surface of public parks, the surface of green space drops to less than 1 sqm/ inhabitant (Corbu 2020). As an anecdotic comparison, European cities similar as size and landscape have almost double UGS surface per inhabitant: Karlsruhe (Germany) – 16.15 sqm, Brno (Czech Republic) – 14 sqm, Ljubljana (Slovenia) – 10.73 sqm or Plovdiv (Bulgaria) – 9.7 sqm (EC 2022).

This combination of factors generated high pressure on the peri-urban forest of Braşov, those areas becoming increasingly valuable for dwellers and tourists visiting Braşov. Between  $11^{\text{th}}$  of January –  $8^{\text{th}}$  of February 2021, at one year distance after the pandemic lockdown was imposed all around the country, the Braşov's forest administrator (Kronstadt Local Public Forest District – RPLPK) conducted a survey to find out how dwellers generally interact with the peri-urban forests and identify opportunities for improving the capacity of forests in providing recreational services.

Analyzing the participants responses (n=314), we found a surprising fact: the use of peri-urban forest is not gender democratic, women being less able than men to access these green natural spaces and, therefore, to uptake the benefits provided by peri-urban forests. The aim of this paper is to i) highlight the differences in between men and women behavior in using peri-urban forests services, ii) analyze the factors that are generating those differences, and iii) suggest measures to facilitate a more gender democratic access to peri-urban forests. We will present the main findings in the Results, will compare and discuss our findings with other similar studies in the Discussion and will propose a set of measurements, campaigns and strategies in the Conclusions.

# Materials and Methods

## Study area

Brașov is the "entry gate" to Transylvania, the 8<sup>th</sup> largest city in Romania and the biggest

in its region (region 7 Center: Alba, Braşov, Covasna, Harghita, Mures and Sibiu). It is strategically located in the center of Romania, at a point where three major highways will meet (Fig. 1), close to Bucharest and to several other large urban centers in Romania (Ploiesti, Sibiu, Târgu Mures) (Rise Consortium 2018). Brasov was the second city in terms of attractiveness in the 1960s and 1970s, when it was a symbol of the industrialization policy applied by the Communist Party. Nowadays we are witnessing a "new industrialization", determined by foreign investments in the city, which determines a constant and intense migratory flow to Brasov. Of the 256 largest cities in the EU, Brasov has registered one of the fastest growth rates between 2000 and 2015. According to The World Bank Brasov is in top 3 most attractive cities in Romania, both for people and business (Cristea et al. 2017).



Figure 1 General Master Transport Plan (Sources of background map: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA FSA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community).

Population of Braşov city by 1<sup>st</sup> of July 2021 was 289,122 dwellers but, out of 638,369 inhabitants in Braşov County (at 2020, July 1<sup>st</sup>, according to National Institute of Statistics, Braşov County Statistics Institute), Braşov Metropolitan Area (Fig. 2) gather 469,865 inhabitants (73% of the total inhabitants of the county). Braşov Metropolitan Area (BMA) is composed out of 7 cities (Braşov, Săcele, Codlea, Râşnov, Ghimbav, Predeal and Zărneşti) and 10 rural areas (Sânpetru, Hărman, Prejmer, Tărlungeni, Bod, Hălchiu, Cristian, Feldioara, Vulcan and Budila). Săcele, Codlea, Râșnov, Ghimbav, Sânpetru and Cristian are the main residential satellites of Brașov, playing the role of large dorms for the city. The highest population density is in Brașov city, at 1,321.7 inhabitants per square kilometer.



Figure 2 Braşov Metropolitan Area (Sources of background map: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA FSA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community).

The size and population density of Brasov are comparable with most of middle-sized cities and their surrounding peri-urban forests across Europe in similar climate zones, so the results of this study are valuable beyond the study area. Brasov is also a leading tourism destination in Romania, adding, in the past pandemic years, more than a million tourists every year to those about half a million dwellings living in the metropolitan area. "For leisure tourism, Brasov is the main destination. Young people and those with high incomes are more attracted to Brasov" (Cristea et al. 2017). Brasov is the absolute leader in the Central Region with a percentage of 45% of the total number of tourists coming to the area, being visited in 2019 by 1.4 million tourists. The Covid-19 pandemic had a significant impact over tourism sector 012 (National Statistics Institute). A large proportion of the tourists visiting the city are attracted by the natural surroundings, especially by the peri-urban forests of Braşov. No official statistical data about the number of locals or tourists visiting the peri-urban forests of Braşov are available, but public information is highlighting a high interest for the forests both in the pre-pandemic and pandemic period.

The study area is represented by the periurban forests of Braşov and border forests administrated by Kronstadt Local Public Forest District-RPLPK (Fig. 3), located east to Făgăraş mountains and including Tâmpa, Postăvaru Massif, Piatra Mare Massif, Piatra Craiului and the northern part of Bucegi mountains.



Figure 3 Braşov Metropolitan Area (Sources of background map: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA FSA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community).

## Methods

The study general objective was to identify how non-specific stakeholders (represented by the general population of BMA) interact with nature, in general, and with the peri-urban forests of Braşov in particular. It aimed to sociodemographic profile the dwellers who visit the peri-urban forests around Braşov (occasionally and unorganized, individually or in small groups, for recreational purposes), estimate the frequency and motivation they access periurban services, evaluate perceptions on periurban functionalities, identify the need sand expectations of visitors and opportunities to improve the capacity of peri-urban forests to provide recreational services.

Due to Covid-19 pandemic governmental restrictions and concerns about infection the methodology followed for interviewing the subjects was CAWI (computer web assisted interview). To this end, invitations to dwellers were sent through e-mail distribution lists, newsletters, social-media and local massmedia press releases. Due to the limitations of using this solely method in reaching elderly respondents, we included in the panel participants aged 18 to 75, who can manifest a more proactive approach to the peri-urban forests then the general population.

Data was collected between 11<sup>th</sup> of January – 8<sup>th</sup> of February 2021, only fully answered surveys being included in the present analysis. The validated sample was weighted according to official data of the National Institute of Statistics and statistically and qualitatively analyzed.

Out of the 475 validated questionnaires, 314 subjects come from the Braşov city and BMA and they have been fully answered to the interview. For an easy-to-read, only the findings with a Pearson Chi-Square significance level lower than 0.05 will be highlighted in this paper, whereas the decimals will be excluded.

**Table 1** Socio-demographic information of respondents (n=314)

Variable         Values         Frequency         Valid Percent           Sex         Male         151         47.9           Female         163         52.1           Age         18 - 25         35         11.2           26 - 35         64         20.5         36 - 45         61         19.5           46 - 55         55         65         20.6         66 - 75         34         10.7           Education         10 classes         3         0.9         12 classes         30         9.5           Post-secondary         35         11.1         College (university)         15         4.7           Faculty         125         39.8         Master         87         27.7           Doctorate         16         5.2         Employed         3         1.0           Mussing         1         0.4         2.4         Missing         1           Occupation         Student         16         5.2         Employee, without         136         43.2           Employee, with         1         0.4         4         1.2         Employee, with         10.4         43.2           Master         70         22.2         <	(1	n=314)		
Sex         Male Female         151         47.9 (163)           Age         18 - 25 26 - 35         35 64         11.2 26           Age         18 - 25 36 - 45         35 64         11.2 26           Age         18 - 25 36 - 45         35 64         11.2 26           Age         18 - 25 36 - 45         35 64         11.2 20.5           Ade - 55 55         55 17.6         17.6           56 - 65         65 20.6         20.6           66 - 75         34         10.7           Education         10 classes         3         0.9           12 classes         30         9.9           Post-secondary         35         11.1           College (university)         15         4.7           Faculty         125         39.8           Master         87         27.7           Doctorate         16         5.0           MBA         4         1.2           Missing         1         0.4           Retired         70         22.2           Employee, with coordination function         136         43.2           Employee, with coordination function         19         6.2           Mid-Manager <th>Variable</th> <th>Values</th> <th>Frequency</th> <th>Valid Percent</th>	Variable	Values	Frequency	Valid Percent
Female         163         52.1           Age         18 - 25         35         11.2           26 - 35         64         20.5         36 - 45         61         19.5           46 - 55         55         17.6         56 - 65         20.6         66 - 75         34         10.7           Education         10 classes         3         0.9         12 classes         30         9.5           Post-secondary         35         11.1         College (university)         15         4.7           Faculty         125         39.8         Master         87         27.7           Doctorate         16         5.0         10.4         10.4           Master         87         27.7         Doctorate         16         5.0           Master         87         27.7         Doctorate         16         5.2           Mussing         1         0.4         Retired         70         22.2           Unemployed         3         1.0         4.3         2.2           Employee, with out management position         136         43.2         4.3         2.2           Employee, with coordination function         19         6.2         <	Sex	Male	151	47.9
Age $18 - 25$ $35$ $11.2$ $26 - 35$ $64$ $20.5$ $36 - 45$ $61$ $19.5$ $46 - 55$ $55$ $17.6$ $56 - 65$ $65$ $20.5$ $66 - 75$ $34$ $10.7$ Education $10$ classes $3$ $0.9$ $12$ classes $30$ $9.5$ Post-secondary $35$ $11.1$ College (university) $15$ $3.7$ Past-secondary $35$ $11.1$ College (university) $15$ $3.9.8$ Master $87$ $27.7$ Doctorate $16$ $5.0$ MBA $4$ $1.2$ Missing $1$ $0.4$ Muse- wife - man $1$ $0.4$ Retired $70$ $22.2$ Employee, with out $136$ $43.2$ Employee, with $19$ $6.2$ Mid-Manager $13$ $4.0$ Top-M		Female	163	52.1
Age         18 - 25         35         11.2 $26 - 35$ $64$ 20.5 $36 - 45$ $61$ 19.5 $46 - 55$ $55$ 17.6 $56 - 65$ $65$ 20.6 $66 - 75$ $34$ 10.7           Education         10 classes         3         0.9           12 classes $30$ 9.5         Post-secondary $35$ 11.1           College (university)         15 $4.7$ Faculty         125 $39.8$ Master $87$ $27.7$ Doctorate         16 $5.0$ MBA         4         1.2         Missing         1 $10$ Nouse -wife -man         1 $0.4$ Retired $70$ $22.2$ Employee, without         136 $43.2$ $20.9$ $40.3$ $20.9$ Employee, with         19 $6.2$ $20.9$ $40.9$ $5.9$ $10.0$ Mouse -wife -man         1 $0.4$ $31.0$ $0.4$ $32.2$ $20.2$ $20.2$				
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age	18 - 25	35	11.2
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		26 - 35	64	20.5
$\begin{array}{cccc} 46 - 55 & 55 & 17.6 \\ 56 - 65 & 65 & 20.6 \\ 66 - 75 & 34 & 10.7 \\ \hline edit{bmatrix} \\ \hline edit{b$		36 - 45	61	19.5
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		46 - 55	55	17.6
66 - 75         34         10.7           Education         10 classes         3         0.9           12 classes         30         9.5           Post-secondary         35         11.1           College (university)         15         4.7           Faculty         125         39.8           Master         87         27.7           Doctorate         16         5.0           MBA         4         1.2           Missing         1         -           Occupation         Student         16         5.2           Unemployed         3         1.0         -           house - wife - man         1         0.4         Retired         70         22.2           Employee, without         136         43.2         -         -           Employee, with         19         6.2         -         -           Mid-Manager         13         4.0         -         -           Top-Manager         3         0.8         -         -           Entrepreneur (own business)         19         5.9         -         -           I don't want to answer         19         6.2		56 - 65	65	20.6
Education         10 classes         3         0.9           12 classes         30         9.5           Post-secondary         35         11.1           College (university)         15         4.7           Faculty         125         39.8           Master         87         27.7           Doctorate         16         5.0           MBA         4         1.2           Missing         1         1           Occupation         Student         16         5.2           Unemployed         3         1.0         0.4           Nouse -wife -man         1         0.4         Retired         70         22.2           Employee, without         136         43.2         Employee, with         19         6.2           Cordination function         19         6.2         0.2         Entrop-Manager         3         0.8           Freelance         16         4.9         5.9         1 don't want to answer         19         6.2		66 - 75	34	10.7
Education         10 classes         3         0.9           12 classes         30         9.5           Post-secondary         35         11.1           College (university)         15         4.7           Faculty         125         39.8           Master         87         27.7           Doctorate         16         5.0           MBA         4         1.2           Missing         1         1           Occupation         Student         16         5.2           Unemployed         3         1.0         house - wife -man         1         0.4           Retired         70         22.2         Employee, without         136         43.2           Employee, with eman         1         0.4         4.3         2.2           Employee, with eman         136         43.2         4.3           Mid-Manager         13         4.0         70         2.2           Employee, with eman         1         0.4         4.3         2           Mid-Manager         13         4.0         70         5.9         1         0.01         Top-Manager         3         0.0           Freela				
12 classes       30       9.5         Post-secondary       35       11.1         College (university)       15       4.7         Faculty       125       39.8         Master       87       27.7         Doctorate       16       5.0         MBA       4       1.2         Missing       1       1         Occupation       Student       16       5.2         Unemployed       3       1.0         house -wife -man       1       0.4         Retired       70       22.2         Employee, without       136       43.2         Employee, with       136       43.2         Employee, with       13       4.0         Top-Manager       13       4.0         Top-Manager       16       4.9         Entrepreneur (own business)       19       5.9         I don't want to answer       19       6.2         Residence       Brasov       260       82.9	Education	10 classes	3	0.9
Post-secondary         35         11.1           College (university)         15         4.7           Faculty         125         39.8           Master         87         27.7           Doctorate         16         5.0           MBA         4         1.2           More and the end of		12 classes	30	9.5
College (university)         15         4.7           Faculty         125         39.8           Master         87         27.7           Doctorate         16         5.0           MBA         4         1.2           Missing         1         1           Occupation         Student         16         5.2           Unemployed         3         1.0           house -wife -man         1         0.4           Retired         70         22.2           Employee, without         136         43.2           Employee, with         19         6.2           Mid-Manager         13         4.0           Top-Manager         3         0.8           Freelance         16         4.9           Entrepreneur (own business)         19         5.9           I don't want to answer         19         6.2           Residence         Bragov         260         82.9		Post-secondary	35	11.1
Faculty     125     39.8       Master     87     27.7       Doctorate     16     5.0       MBA     4     1.2       Missing     1       Occupation Student       16     5.2       Unemployed     3       10     10.4       Retired     70       22.2     Employee, without       management position     136       Employee, with     136       coordination function     19       Mid-Manager     13       4.0     Top-Manager       Freelance     16       4.9     Entrepreneur (own business)       19     5.9       I don't want to answer     19       6.2     82.9		College (university)	15	4.7
Master8727.7Doctorate165.0MBA41.2Missing11Occupation StudentUnemployed31.0house -wife -man10.4Retired7022.2Employee, without13643.2Employee, with196.2Coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9		Faculty	125	39.8
Doctorate165.0MBA41.2Missing1OccupationStudent165.2Unemployed31.0house-wife-man10.4Retired7022.2Employee, without13643.2Employee, with196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9		Master	87	27.7
MBA Missing41.2OccupationStudent165.2Unemployed31.0house -wife -man10.4Retired7022.2Employee, without management position13643.2Employee, with coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9		Doctorate	16	5.0
Missing1OccupationStudent165.2Unemployed31.0house -wife -man10.4Retired7022.2Employee, without13643.2Employee, with196.2coordination function134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9KesidenceBragov26082.9		MBA	4	1.2
Occupation     Student     16     5.2       Unemployed     3     1.0       house -wife -man     1     0.4       Retired     70     22.2       Employee, without     136     43.2       Employee, with     19     6.2       coordination function     19     6.2       Mid-Manager     13     4.0       Top-Manager     3     0.8       Freelance     16     4.9       Entrepreneur (own business)     19     5.9       I don't want to answer     19     6.2		Missing	1	
OccupationStudent165.2Unemployed31.0house -wife -man10.4Retired7022.2Employee, without13643.2Employee, with196.2Coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9		8		
Unemployed31.0house - wife - man10.4Retired7022.2Employee, without13643.2Employee, with196.2coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9	Occupation	Student	16	5.2
house -wife -man10.4Retired7022.2Employee, without13643.2Employee, with196.2coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBrasov26082.9		Unemployed	3	1.0
Retired7022.2Employee, without management position13643.2Employee, with coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9		house -wife -man	1	0.4
Employee, without management position13643.2Employee, with coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBrasov26082.9		Retired	70	22.2
management position13643.2Employee, with coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9		Employee, without	10.0	12.2
Employee, with coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9		management position	136	43.2
coordination function196.2Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9		Employee, with	10	6.0
Mid-Manager134.0Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBragov26082.9Lon Vie26182.9		coordination function	19	6.2
Top-Manager30.8Freelance164.9Entrepreneur (own business)195.9I don't want to answer196.2ResidenceBrasov26082.9		Mid-Manager	13	4.0
Freelance     16     4.9       Entrepreneur (own business)     19     5.9       I don't want to answer     19     6.2       Residence       Braşov     260     82.9		Top-Manager	3	0.8
Entrepreneur (own business)     19     5.9       I don't want to answer     19     6.2       Residence     Brasov     260     82.9		Freelance	16	4.9
I don't want to answer         19         6.2           Residence         Brasov         260         82.9		Entrepreneur (own business)	19	59
Residence         Braşov         260         82.9		I don't want to answer	19	6.2
Residence Braşov 260 82.9		a don't want to unower	17	0.2
	Residence	Brasov	260	82.9
Metropolitan area 54 17.1		Metropolitan area	54	17.1

Out of the 314 participants (Table 1) 151 were male and 163 females, 2/3 of total being either employee without management position (43%), either retired (22%). 68% of respondents had a university degree, 5% own a Ph.D diploma and 1% own MBA diploma. One participant refused to declare his/her education status. 83% are Braşov residents and 17% are living in the so-called Braşov's bedrooms localities (Table 1).

#### Results

The vast majority of the respondents (79%) states that are interacting with the peri-urban forests at least bi-monthly (28% more than once a week and 50% at least once a week), 9% are interacting at least monthly while 13% less than once a month. Regarding the number of days since the last visit to Brasov's peri-urban forests (Fig. 4), more than half of the participants (53%) declared a maximum of 7 days, and a quarter of respondents stated a maximum of 30 days passed. 21% of respondents appreciated that it's been over 6 months since the last visit of Braşov's periurban forests, 7% declared a period between6 and 12 months, 2% claims more than 12 months, and only 1% of respondents states that they never visited Braşov's peri-urban forests.



Figure 4 Number of days since the last visit to Braşov's peri-urban forests.

Using SPSS crosstabulation and Chi-Square significance test we have investigated correlations between the variables to understand which of the socio-demographics are responsible for behavioral differences in interactions with the peri-urban forests of Braşov. The result indicates that gender is the only significant covariate strongly and continuously correlating with most of the behavioral patterns and perceptions differences.

The first question asked to be answered was "What are the first three thoughts that come to mind when you hear the word "forest"?" and both men and women mentioned as first word (top of mind association) words like oxygen and *relaxation*. The Figures 5 and 6 have been produced using NVivo12 and highlights that top-of-mind associations for men are oxvgen (most present), walk and health, while for women are relaxation (most present), trees and oxygen.



Figure 5 Men top of mind (1st Figure 6 Women top of mind word) associations

(1st word) associations

When analyzing all the words used to describe the associated thoughts with the forest, results show that both men and women use, fairly equal, associations with the idea of clean air, relaxation and quietness. Since those most visible associations are most common associations, we decided to eliminate the first layer in order to find if there are any unexpected associations or any relevant perceptions differences between men and women. Results shows that, although the mental picture of the forest described by both men and women respondents contain about the same elements, priorities are different for men and women. The only four different words are included in top



Research article







Top 10 words, Second layer, Women's perception on forest



Figure 10 Women - top 10 words associations with forest second layer.

10 associations to the forest by men and women namely recreation and cool (used by men) and birds and freedom (used by women), the rest of eight words being the same both for men and women but used in different order (Fig. 7-10). This result corresponds to different interests and functions of forest to men and women, although both men and women perceive the peri-urban forests of Brasov as contributor to their health and well-being (words used: relaxation, health, oxygen, peace, freedom).

Sports opportunities as services facilitated by the cultural ecosystems of the Brasov periurban forests are being prioritized for men compared to women, while women associate

peri-urban forest with a potential danger (animals). These first qualitative results are being confirmed further by the quantitative analysis, that reveals significant differences between the way men and women interact (Table 2) and perceives the cultural ecosystems services provided by the periurban forests of Brasov.

How often do you go to the forests around Brasov?	you several at least sts times a twice a w? week month		monthly	less often than once a month	
Men	35.6%	50.0%	7.5%	6.8%	
Women		50.3%	10.1%	18.2%	
Total	28.2%	50.2%	8.9%	12.8%	

 Table 3 Time passed since last visit into a peri-urban forest of Braşov (n=314).

How long has it been since you last visited the forest (for whatever reason)?	Men	Women
Mariana 7 daga	57 (0/	40.00/
Maximum / days	J/.0%	48.8%
1-2 weeks	15.9%	17.1%
2-4 weeks	6.0%	10.4%
1-2 months	4.0%	7.9%
3-6 months	9.9%	3.7%
More than 6 months	4.0%	9.1%
More than 12 months	2.6%	1.2%
Never		1.8%

Time passed since last visit into a peri-urban forest being also significantly associated by the respondents' sex (Table 3). Therefore, men are 66% more often interacting weekly with the peri-urban forests than women, whiles the proportion of women visiting the peri-urban forests less often than once a month is 3 time higher than men's'.

The *fear of wild animals* and the *reduced accessibility* significantly corelate with the sex of respondents at significant level (Table 4). The participants that responded they haven't been into Braşov' peri-urban forests more than six months have been asked to select from a series of predefined answers a possible reasons that stopped them from visiting the forests or to freely write their own. The only reason indicated by men was the lack of time, while women indicated besides the lack of time and the fear of animals and reduced accessibility.

 Table 4 Reasons not to visit the peri-urban forests for more than six months (n=314).

What keeps you from going into the peri-urban forests?	Men	Women
[I do not like it]	0.0%	0.0%
[Too many people]	0.0%	0.0%
[I'm afraid of wild animals]	0.0%	64.3%
[Accessibility is reduced]	0.0%	100.0%
[Lack of time]	100.0%	100.0%
[Dirt and garbage]	0.0%	0.0%

Activities in the peri-urban forests of Braşov are mainly social activities, the vast majority of participants to the study declaring they are accompanied by friends (53%), spouse/ partner (43%) or the extended family (40%) when visiting the peri-urban forests (Fig. 11). Nevertheless, we found significant differences in visiting peri-urban forests of Braşov patterns when the data were analyzed in relation to the sex of respondents (Table 5). The proportion of men' traveling alone in the forests of Braşov is nearly six times higher than women' and four time higher when travelling with the colleagues. Data showed that women are travelling in the peri-urban forests of Braşov mostly accompanied by husbands and friends.





Figure 11 Peri-urban forests visiting partners.

Table 5 Peri-urban forests visiting partners (n=314).

Who usually accompanies you in the activities in the forests of Braşov?	Men	Women
[I walk alone]	36.7%	6.8%
[Pets]	20.5%	8.2%
[The family]	36.8%	42.0%
[Spouse / partner]	36.3%	49.3%
[Friends]	47.3%	58.0%
[The kids]	16.7%	21.1%
[Colleagues]	20.9%	5.6%

Most used starting points by all respondents in walking/hiking through the peri-urban forests of Braşov are the ones close to mount Tâmpa (in the old city center or in Răcădău neighborhood) or the old road to Poiana Braşov at Pietrele lui Solomon. All these starting points are inside the city or close to the city and easily accessible through urban public transport, aspects that strongly influence the ranking of the most visited areas by dwellers.

In Table 6 the colored cells represent the starting points with statistically significant differences by sex, results showing that women prefer those inside the city or close to the city and easily accessible starting points more than men, while men prefer more remote starting points (Fig. 12).

Table	6 Mos	st used	starting	noints	hv	gender	(n=314)	١
iubic	0 1010	si uscu	starting	pomis	Uy	genuer	-1C 11	,

Usually, from which areas do you start your walk / hike in the forests around Braşov? (choose up to 3)	Men	Women
[Răcădău]	29.5%	37.2%
[Schei neighborhood]	20.5%	20.1%
[lepure]	9.1%	21.6%
[Noua]	24.6%	24.3%
[Solomon's stones]	40.4%	54.4%
[Poiana Brasov]	25.1%	23.9%
[Râșnov]	20.2%	10.6%
[Dobrogeanu Gherea street]	13.5%	14.2%
[Fântâniței street]	1.2%	1.7%
[Timişul de Jos]	21.4%	10.9%
[Warthe]	6.2%	7.4%
[Tâmpa Gondola area (The alley under Tâmpa)]	27.9%	28.4%



Figure 12 Most attractive peri-urban forests areas (Sources of background map: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA FSA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community).

Postăvaru massif (that includes Poiana Brașov and the skiing resort area) and Tâmpa are, overall, the most attractive peri-urban forest areas. Attractiveness of a certain periurban forest area (Table 7) is strongly and significantly influenced by sex of respondents. Men prefer more difficult areas, selected by four time more men' then women' while women prefer easier to walk and more accessible with the public transportation area.

**Table 7** Most attractive peri-urban forests areas by gender (n=314).

Which area of the forests around Brasov attracts you the most?	Men	Women
Crucurul	12.0%	3.1%
Postăvaru Massif	31.3%	23.3%
Noua	6.7%	6.7%
Schei	8.0%	11.7%
Stejerişul Mare	3.3%	2.5%
Tâmpa	19.3%	33.7%
Timișul Sec	2.0%	
Valea Cetății	5.3%	6.1%
Valea cu Apă	6.0%	4.9%
other	6.0%	8.0%

Both men and women are practicing leisure and recreational sports activities in the periurban forests of Braşov. However, data shows a significant difference in the pattern of women and men that are using the services provided by forests. Women are using the forest particularly for leisure (walking, sightseeing, admiring the landscape), while men are using the forest for recreational sports activities (running, cycling, skiing, etc.) at a higher degree than women (43% of men declared they practice sports activities compared with only 21% of women).

Relating to the activities type, we noticed significant differences between men and women in practicing different activities. Men are mainly practicing biking (only 15% of men declaring they never been biking into the peri-urban forest of Brasov compared to 41% of women), cable-trail adventure sports or photo hunting, while women are more oriented to activities that implies landscape admiring, picnic, leisure walk, artistic photography, artistic and arts events participations or educative activities coordination. Men declared they are most disturbed/stressed while interacting with the peri-urban forests by people traveling motorcycles (enduro) or ATV at a higher degree than women and by the high tourist density, while women are most stressed by a possible encounter with wild animals.

Perception on cultural ecosystem services and the attributes or products provided by peri-urban forests of Braşov are significantly Oprica et al.

influenced by respondents' sex. Men are perceiving peri-urban forests as a natural resource that can and may be sustainably exploited for wood in a higher extent than women, while women are perceiving forests as providers of a wide range of intangible services like recreational purpose or strengthening the feeling of belonging to a place in a higher extent than men (Tables 8-10).

 Table
 8
 Perception on cultural ecosystem services peri-urban forest offers, by sex.

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means "strongly disagree" and 5 "strongly agree" please let us Men Women sig. know to what extent you agree with the following statements:

4.71

4.37

4.11

4.10

4.88

3.98

4.05

3.67

4.13

4.86

4.64

4.67

2.54

4.36

4.81

4.90

4.24

4.30

4.08

4.46

0.001

0.001

0.000

0.05

0.009

0.271

0.008

0.045

0.008

0.008

0.008

The forest around Braşov offers visitors joy, recreational pleasure The forest around Braşov forms and strengthens the feeling of belonging to a space, to a generous forest ecosystem

The forest around Braşov must be strictly preserved for future generations

The forest around Braşov must be exploited sustainably as a timber resource

The forest around Braşov has an educational role, through awareness of spiritual values, cultural services and historical information specific to the area.

The forest around Brasov must be 4.88 protected

The forest around Braşov is essential in maintaining 4.72 4.73 0.078 biodiversity

Walking in the woods (whether for walking, hiking or sports) has a positive effect on people's mood and well-being.

The forest around Braşov has a special cultural significance The forest around Braşov has a special historical significance The forest around Braşov is a proof of the multiculturalism of the area

The forest around Braşov is a source of artistic inspiration

The forest around Braşov is a space where sports activities can 4.50 4.25 0.070 take place

However, women seem to perceive peri-urban forests in an eco-friendlier manner than men and devote more attention to the educational role of forests or to its capacity to provide food in a sustainable way (Tables 8-10). Gender inequalities in Transylvania's largest peri-urban...

 Table
 9
 Perceived importance of peri-urban forests attributes, by sex.

What do you think are the essential attributes of spending your free time in the woods?	Men	Women	sig. Level
Forest health and forest cleanliness	4.65	4.74	0.007
Recreational infrastructure and safe use of infrastructure	4.25	4.51	0.020
Accessibility (ease of access to trails, including for people with disabilities)	4.23	4.32	0.006
Citizen safety	4.45	4.63	0.147
Ability to organize cultural activities	3.38	3.73	0.013
Biodiversity	4.69	4.71	0.019
Sights (e.g. crosses) and / or natural monuments	4.00	4.09	0.002
Intangible heritage (customs / traditions - June, legends, stories)	3.99	4.07	0.125

able	10	Perceived	importance	of	peri-urban	forests
		CHEVILLES STO	1/1 1/1/1/1/1/10	11/ 5	HV	

services and products, e	<i>y</i> sen.		
Imagine that you are the manager of the forests around Braşov and decide which activities are the most important for maintaining and improving the services and products provided by these forests and for increasing the attractiveness of the forests. How would you divide / prioritize the following activities? Allow each one a percentage so that you get 100%.	Men	Women	sig. Level
sports	10.75	10.24	0.011
Tourism	14.23	14.35	0.001
Cultural and historical	6.07	6.39	0.087
Educational	7.87	10.61	0.009
scientifically	7.45	7.18	0.086
Supply of wood for industry and energy	7.45	4.95	0.006
Utilization of non-wood products (mushrooms, berries, plants, etc.)	4.46	6.04	0.027
Hunting	3.50	2.63	0.318
Air quality control	14.48	17.68	0.003
Noise reduction	8.06	8.82	0.057

# Discussion

Through this study, we found that dwellers of Braşov city and BMA are highly interacting with peri-urban forest for different activities (79% are interacting with the peri-urban forests at least bi-monthly). Although we do not have a pre-Covid-19 baseline data to comparison of the number of dwellers visiting the periurban forest, the mobile data tracking (Google Community Mobility Report May 2022) showed a 51% increase of visits into the city parks, behavior quite similar to dwellers around the world during Covid-19 pandemic (Grima et al. 2020, Beckmann-Wübbelt et al. 2021, da Schio et al. 2021, Park and Chang 2022, Uchiyama & Kohsaka 2022). Therefore, we can estimate a significant increase of dwellers within the peri-urban forests of Braşov.

Most used starting points in interacting with peri-urban forests of Brasov are the ones inside the city or close to the city and easily accessible through urban public transport, that highlight that vicinity and easily accessible roads are the most important factors in interacting with periurban forests. These findings are in line with previous studies that reported the proximity of forests and a well-developed road network as the most important factors that influences the frequency of visits in the urban and peri-urban green spaces (Zhou et al. 2018, Beckmann-Wübbelt et al. 2021, Elbakidze et al. 2022, Kovács et al. 2022). We also found significant differences by sex, results showing that men access more remote starting points in a higher extent than women.

Respondents are spontaneous associating peri-urban forests with oxygen, health, relaxation, recreation or bird watching, similar associations being found by previous studies that showed that most frequently associations with the peri-urban forests are related to health, wellbeing and a good living, tourism, along with nature-centered experiences such as bird watching (Bjarstig & Stens 2018, Grima et al. 2020, Beckmann-Wübbelt et al. 2021, Baumeister et al. 2022).

Our data shows there is a significant difference in the pattern of women and men in using the services provided by forests (women using the forest preferably for leisure, while men are using the forest for recreational sports activities). Regarding the perception on cultural ecosystem services provided by peri-urban forests, men are perceiving periurban forests in a higher extent than women as being a natural resource that can and may be sustainably exploited for wood, while women are perceiving them in a higher extent as having a wider range of intangible services, such as offering recreational pleasure or strengthening the feeling of belonging to a place.

Our data shows that women seem to perceive peri-urban forests in an eco-friendlier manner than men and offer a greater importance to the educational role of forests or to its capacity to provide food in a sustainable way, findings that are highlighted in previous studies (Plieninger et al. 2013, Beckmann-Wübbelt et al. 2021). Scores calculated for all the immaterial and intangible cultural ecosystem services periurban forests offers are significant higher when were given by women than ones given by men, showing that peri-urban forests may be perceive as more important by women than by men. Similar findings were reported by other authors that state that nature is a priority mainly for women than for men (Lin et al. 2014, Schipperijn et al. 2010, da Schio et al. 2021, Nitya et al. 2022).

Despite the important role perceives by women, we found significant differences between the way that men and women are using the cultural ecosystems services offered by the peri-urban forests of Brasov. Men interacting weekly with the peri-urban forests, 66% more often than women and the proportion of women visiting the periurban forests less often than once a month being 3 time higher than men's', while time passed since last visit into a peri-urban forest being also significantly associated by the respondents' sex. The proportion of men' traveling alone in the forests of Braşov is nearly six times higher than women' and four time higher when travelling with the colleagues, while women are travelling in the peri-urban forests of Brasov mostly accompanied by husbands and friends. The main reasons indicated by women included in our study for less interactions with Brasov's peri-urban forests are the fear of wild animals and the reduced accessibility, reasons significantly corelating with the sex of respondents.

These findings are in contrast with the results of some previous studies that showed that women are more likely to visit the urban green spaces than men (da Schio et al. 2021), but are confirmed by other studies (Morris et al. 2011, O'Brien et al. 2017) that states the women concerns about safety, and often visit woodlands in the company of family, friends or when walking the dog, rather than alone.

# Conclusions

The aim of this study was to investigate the Brasov city and BMA inhabitants' behavior in relation to the visits of the peri-urban forest by analyzing various factors, and to identify measures that ensure a more demographic access to these forests. As we stated at the beginning, this study had limited access to population due to Covid-19 pandemic governmental restrictions and concerns about infection, so the method we chose to interview the subjects was CAWI. We recognize the limitations of using this single method in reaching elderly respondents and, also, that individuals included in the final panel may manifest a more proactive approach to the peri-urban forests than the general population. Nevertheless, findings highlighted in this paper are supported by results reported by other studies, showing that population included in the sample manifest similar behavior and perceptions with other subjects researched around the world living in similar characteristics area, in proximity of the forest.

Activities in the peri-urban forests of Braşov are mainly social, the majority of participants declared that they are usually accompanied by friends, spouse/partner or the extended family when visiting the peri-urban forests.

Considering that previous studies found that lack of access to green spaces increase by 2.2 times the perceived importance of the urban and peri-urban forests in offering wellbeing during pandemic (Beckmann-Wübbelt et al. 2021, da Schio et al. 2021, De Meo et al. 2022, Park & Chang 2022) and that Braşov's dwellers have limited access to urban green space (UGS) inside the city of Braşov, at just 5.62 sqm/inhabitant, we can appreciate that peri-urban forest of Braşov are playing a

Gender inequalities in Transylvania's largest peri-urban...

highly important role in supplying social and cultural services (incorporating good health and well-being, silence, the feeling of privacy and solitude, good living environment, outdoor recreation and tourism, aesthetical values, outdoor education and knowledge about forests and environment, intellectual and spiritual inspiration, identity and cultural heritage).

Considering, also, that women perceive peri-urban forests in an eco-friendlier manner than men and offer a greater importance to the educational role of forests or to its capacity to provide food in a sustainable way but are interacting with the peri-urban forests significantly less than men, we concluded that rapid measurements should be taken by policy makers to democratize women's access to forest services. Practical measurements may include. without being limited, introduction of public transportation (at least in weekends) to more remote peri-urban forest areas, development of new trails close to the city, installation of monitoring cameras and panic buttons along the trails.

Urban and peri-urban forests are playing an important role in offering services not only during crisis periods, such as Covid-19 pandemic, and are determinant infrastructure for the population's health, wellbeing, identity and cultural heritage. The results of this study can serve as a powerful argument to policy makers and forests managers to develop strategies and plans to assure easier, secure and gender equal access to the urban and peri-urban forests.

# Acknowledgements

The research was conducted for the Kronstadt Local Public Forest District, as part of the sociological study on the perception of the population about the recreational, cultural and social value of forests, funded through the project "Increasing the economic competitiveness of the forestry sector and quality of life through knowledge transfer, technology and RDI competencies (CRESFORLIFE)". ID / My SMIS: P\_40\_380 / 105506.

# References

- Alessandro P., De Meo I., Grilli G., Notaro S., 2022. Valuing nature-based recreation in forest areas in Italy: An application of Travel Cost Method (TCM). Journal of Leisure Research, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/0022 2216.2022.2115328
- Barton J., Pretty J., 2010. What is the best dose of nature and green exercise for improving mental health? A multi-study analysis. Environmental Science and Technology, 44: 3947–3955. https://doi.org/10.1021/ es903183r
- Baumeister C.F., Gerstenberg T., Plieninger T., & Schraml U., 2022. Geography of disservices in urban forests: public participation mapping for closing the loop. Ecosystems and People, 18(1): 44-63. https://doi.org/10.1080/26395916.2021.2021289
- Berman M.G., Jonides J., Kaplan S., 2009. The Cognitive Benefits of Interacting with Nature. Psychological Science 19(12): 1207-1212. https://doi.org/10.1111/ j.1467-9280.2008.02225.x
- Beckmann-Wübbelt A.B., Fricke A., Sebesvari Z., Yakouchenkova I.A., Frohlich K., Saha S., 2021. High public appreciation for the cultural ecosystem services of urban and peri-urban forests during the COVID-19 pandemic. Sustainable Cities and Society 74, 103240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.103240
- Birks C., Féménias D., Machemehl C., 2022. Citizen participation in urban forests: Analysis of a consultation process in the metropolitan area of Rouen Normandy. Urban Planning, 7(2): 174-185. https://doi. org/10.17645/up.v7i2.4997
- Bjärstig T., Sténs A., 2018. Social values of forests and production of new goods and services: the views of Swedish family forest owners. Small-scale Forestry 17:125–146. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11842-017-9379-9
- Brasov Metropolitan Agency for Sustainable Development, 2019. www.metropolabrasov.ro/despreamb/zona-metropolitana-brasov/
- Corbu I., 2020. Braşov Parks surface, 2020, Braşovul verde: https://www.facebook.com/notes/usr-bra%C8%99ov/ bra%C8%99ovul-verde-o-analiz%C4%83-de-ioancorbu/2495800130680901/
- Cristea M., Mare C., Moldovan C., Farole T, Vințan A, Park J, Garrett K P, Ionescu-Heroiu M, 2017. Magnet cities: Migration and commuting in Romania. World Bank, 2017, Bucharest. http://localhost:4000//entities/ publication/f87062f1-6d6d-52d7-9a2c-d90ef4433b03
- da Schio N., Phillips A., Fransen K., Wolff M., Haase D., Ostoic S. K., Zivojinovic I., Vuletic D., Derks J., Davies C., Lafortezza R., Roitsch D., Winkel G., De Vreese R., 2021. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the use of and attitudes towards urban forests and green spaces: Exploring the instigators of change in Belgium. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening 65, 127305. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2021.127305
- De Meo I., Becagli C., Cantiani M.G., Casagli A., & Paletto A., 2022. Citizens' use of public urban green

spaces at the time of the COVID-19 pandemic in Italy. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening 77, 127739. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2022.127739

- Donovan G.H., Butry D.T., Michael Y.L., Prestemon J. P., Liebhold A.M., Gatziolis D., Mao M.Y., 2013. The Relationship Between Trees and Human Health. American Journal of Preventive Medicine 44(2):139–145. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2012.09.066
- Elbakidze M., Dawson L., Milberg P., Mikusiński G., Hedblom M., Kruhlov I., Yamelynets T., Schaffer C., Johansson K.E., Grodzynskyi M., 2022. Multiple factors shape the interaction of people with urban greenspace: Sweden as a case study. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 74, 127672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ufug.2022.127672
- European Commission, 2022. The available public green in European cities per inhabitant: https://urban.jrc.ec.europa.eu/thefutureofcities/space-and-the-city#the-chapter
- Gafta D., Schnitzler A., Closset-Kopp D., Cristea V., 2021. Neighborhood-based evidence of tree diversity promotion by beech in an old-growth deciduousconiferous mixed forest (Eastern Carpathians). Annals of Forest Research 64(1): 13-30. https://doi. org/10.15287/afr.2020.2143
- Google, 2022. www.gstatic.com/covid19/mobility/2022-05-08\_ RO Bra%C8%99ov County Mobility Report ro.pdf
- Grima N., Corcoran W., Hill-James C., Langton B., Sommer H., Fisher B., 2020. The importance of urban natural areas and urban ecosystem services during the COVID-19 pandemic. PLoS ONE 15(12): e0243344. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0243344
- Guan H., Wei H., He X., Ren Z., An B., 2017. The treespecies-specific effect of forest bathing on perceived anxiety alleviation of young-adults in urban forests. Annals of Forest Research, 60(2): 327-341. https://doi. org/10.15287/afr.2017.897
- Hegetschweiler K.T., Wartmann F.M., Dubernet I., Fischer C., Hunziker M., 2022. Urban forest usage and perception of ecosystem services–A comparison between teenagers and adults. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening 74, 127624. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ufug.2022.127624
- Kovács B., Uchiyama Y., Miyake Y., Quevedo J.M.D., Kohsaka R., 2022. Capturing landscape values in peri-urban Satoyama forests: Diversity of visitors' perceptions and implications for future value assessments. Trees, Forests and People 10, 100339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tfp.2022.100339
- Lin B., Fuller R., Bush R., Gaston K., Shanahan D., 2014. Opportunity or orientation? Who uses urban parks and why. PLoS One 9(1), e87422. https://doi.org/10.1371/ journal.pone.0087422
- Morris J., O'Brien L., Ambrose-Oji B., Lawrence A., Carter C., 2011. Access for all? Barriers to accessing woodlands and forests in Britain. Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability 16(4): 375-396. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2011.576662
- Nitya R.A.O., Patil S., Singh C., Parama R.O.Y., Pryor C.,

Gender inequalities in Transylvania's largest peri-urban...

Poonacha P., Genes M., 2022. Cultivating sustainable and healthy cities: A systematic literature review of the outcomes of urban and peri-urban agriculture. Sustainable Cities and Society 85, 104063. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.scs.2022.104063

- O'Brien L., De Vreese L., Atmiş E., Olafsson A.S., Sievänen T., Brennan M., Sánchez M., Panagopoulos T., de Vries S., Kern M., Gentin S., Saraiva G., Almeida A., 2017. Social and Environmental Justice: Diversity in Access to and Benefits from Urban Green Infrastructure – Examples from Europe, The Urban Forest, Future City book series 7: 153–190. https://doi. org/10.1007/978-3-319-50280-9 15
- Oviedo M., Drescher M., Dean J., 2022. Urban greenspace access, uses, and values: A case study of user perceptions in metropolitan ravine parks. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening,70, 127522. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.ufug.2022.127522
- Park S.H., Chang C., 2022. Impact of changes in forest use caused by the COVID-19 pandemic on the perception of forest ecosystem services in the Republic of Korea. Sustainability 14(17), 10914. https://doi.org/10.3390/ su141710914
- Pelleri F., Becagli C., Sansone D., Bianchetto E., Bidini C., & Manetti M.C., 2021. New silvicultural approaches for multipurpose management in beech forests. Annals of Forest Research, 64(2): 87-103. https://doi. org/10.15287/afr.2021.2226
- Pieratti E., Paletto A., De Meo, I., Fagarazzi C., Migliorini M.G.R., 2019. Assessing the forest-wood chain at local level: A Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) based on the circular bioeconomy principles. Annals of Forest Research 62(2): 123-138. https://doi. org/10.15287/afr.2018.1238
- Plieningera T., Dijksb S., Oteros-Rozasc E., Bielingd C., 2013. Assessing, mapping, and quantifying cultural ecosystem services at community level. Land Use Policy 33: 118–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. landusepol.2012.12.013
- Rise Consortium 2018. www.riseconsortium.com/10reasons-why-you-should-invest-in-brasov/
- Scarneci-Domnisoru F., Csesznek C., 2022. The importance of the environment during the isolation

caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. A visual essay. 2022. Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov 15(64)(1):31-44. https://doi.org/10.31926/but. ssl.2021.15.64.1.3

- Schipperijn J., Ekholm O., Stigsdotter U.K., Toftager M., Bentsen P., Kamper-Jørgensen F., Randrup T.B., 2010. Factors influencing the use of green space: Results from a Danish national representative survey. Landscape and Urban Planning 95(3): 130-137. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2009.12.010
- Su K., Ordóñez C., Regier K., & Conway T.M., 2022. Values and beliefs about urban forests from diverse urban contexts and populations in the Greater Toronto area. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening 72, 127589. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urfug.2022.127589
- Tu G., Abildtrup J., & Garcia S., 2016. Preferences for urban green spaces and peri-urban forests: An analysis of stated residential choices. Landscape and Urban Planning 148: 120-131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. landurbplan.2015.12.013
- Tudose N.C., Marin M., Cheval S., Ungurean C., Davidescu S.O., Tudose O.N., Mihalache A.L., Davidescu A.A., 2021. SWAT Model adaptability to a small mountainous forested watershed in Central Romania. Forests. 12(7): 860. https://doi.org/10.3390/f12070860
- Uchiyama Y., Kohsaka R., 2022. Visiting peri-urban forestlands and mountains during the COVID-19 pandemic: Empirical analysis on effects of land use and awareness of visitors. Land 11(8), 1194. https://doi. org/10.3390/land11081194
- Wang Y., Niemelä J., Kotze D.J., 2022. The delivery of Cultural Ecosystem Services in urban forests of different landscape features and land use contexts. People and Nature 4(5), 1369-1386. https://doi. org/10.1002/pan3.10394
- Zhou T., Koomen E., van Leeuwen ES., 2018. Residents' preferences for cultural services of the landscape along the urban–rural gradient. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening 29: 131–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ufug.2017.11.011