

Technium.

44/2023

2023
A new decade for social changes

Technium
Social Sciences

Powered by

PLUS
COMMUNICATION



International
Communication & PR



Social Responsibility and Local Sustainable Development in Relation to the Perception of Daily Life in the Public and Private Sectors

Ștefania-Rodica Hübel (Anghel)

Business Administration Doctoral School, Bucharest University of Economic Studies

anghel.st77@yahoo.com

Mari-Isabella Stan

"Ovidius" University of Constanța, Faculty of Law and Administrative Sciences

stanisabella@yahoo.com

Tănase Tasențe

"Ovidius" University of Constanța, Faculty of Law and Administrative Sciences

tanase.tasente@365.univ-ovidius.ro

Abstract. This research investigates the intersection of social responsibility and local sustainable development in relation to the perception of daily life in the public and private sectors. It uses data from brandBerry SRL to explore participants' perceptions of their daily lives, their lives in relation to the pre-pandemic period, their future outlook, their income sufficiency, and their food procurement sources. The study uncovers intriguing differences between public and private sector employees, such as varying levels of job satisfaction, pandemic impact, and future uncertainty. However, statistical analyses suggest these differences are not always significant, indicating the need for further research. Interestingly, self-produced food represents a notable proportion of food sources, suggesting a potential trend towards sustainability. This study contributes to understanding how individuals in different sectors perceive their daily lives and future prospects, providing insights into social responsibility and sustainable local development.

Keywords: Social Responsibility, Sustainable Development, Daily Life Perception, Public and Private Sectors, Statistical Analysis

1. Introduction

Social responsibility and sustainable development have in recent times been underpinning principles in the discourse of societal advancement. There has been an increasing global awareness of the urgent need to incorporate these principles in the daily operations of

both the public and private sectors. Social responsibility, in essence, refers to the ethical framework asserting that an entity, be it an organization or an individual, bears an obligation to act for the benefit of society at large (Shaikh and Usmani, 2020). On the other hand, sustainable development refers to the organized principle for meeting human development goals while maintaining the ability of natural systems to continue providing the natural resources and ecosystem services on which the economy and society depend (Petrișor, 2017).

This research focuses on the delicate interface between social responsibility and local sustainable development, taking a closer look at the implications these concepts have on the perception of daily life within public and private sectors. Understanding these elements and their interplay is critical to fostering societal advancement and economic growth. It can provide key insights into the role that institutions – public, private, and non-profit alike – play in society's larger trajectory toward sustainability and social equity.

The concept of social responsibility, at first glance, seems like a clear-cut notion. However, it encapsulates a broad spectrum of ethical and sustainable initiatives and activities. Within a business context, it goes beyond compliance with laws and regulations – it's about companies taking accountable actions to impact society positively. These actions can range from investing in community development projects, prioritizing employee welfare, contributing to educational initiatives, to making strides in environmental conservation. For the public sector, social responsibility often implies the judicious exercise of power, policy-making in the best interest of citizens, and ensuring the provision of public goods and services in an equitable and accessible manner.

Sustainable development is another complex concept, consisting of three interconnected pillars: economic, social, and environmental sustainability (Stan and Cortel, 2022). Economically, sustainable development implies the efficient use of resources to enable long-term economic growth. Social sustainability necessitates the provision of social services, empowerment of communities, reduction of poverty, and achievement of social cohesion. Environmental sustainability seeks to protect natural resources and promote biodiversity. It is important to note that sustainable development goes beyond mere environmental conservation; it recognizes the interconnectedness of our society, economy, and environment, advocating for a holistic approach to development that accounts for these three dimensions (Vintilă et al., 2017).

A significant area of exploration lies in the private sector's relationship with social responsibility and sustainable development. Given the enormous influence and economic power wielded by corporations, their actions invariably shape the global sustainability landscape. Recent decades have witnessed a transformation in the corporate world's approach towards sustainability and social responsibility. Today, companies are more accountable to their stakeholders – shareholders, employees, customers, and the communities they operate in. They are also increasingly recognizing that sustainable and socially responsible practices can bring about a multitude of benefits – including improved corporate reputation, increased customer loyalty, risk mitigation, and long-term financial success.

Within the public sector, understanding the dimensions of social responsibility and sustainable development is equally, if not more, essential. Government institutions have a fundamental role in setting the stage for sustainable development through the formulation and implementation of policies that drive social equity and environmental preservation. They also have the capacity to create an enabling environment that encourages private sector participation in sustainable practices.

This research aims to provide a comprehensive exploration of the role of social responsibility and sustainable development in shaping daily life within the public and private sectors. To accomplish this, it will draw from a diverse array of academic sources, industry reports, case studies, and experiential accounts that illuminate the practical aspects and theoretical underpinnings of these crucial concepts.

In other words, the intersection of social responsibility and sustainable development forms a vital area of exploration in the quest for a more equitable and sustainable future. Both public and private sectors play integral roles in this journey, and their actions significantly impact the perception and realization of sustainable development and social responsibility in daily life. It is hoped that this research will not only shed light on this dynamic interplay but also provide valuable insights that can inform organizational strategies, policy development, and societal attitudes towards sustainability and social responsibility.

2. Literature review

Social responsibility has become a key driver in sustainable development, establishing itself as a crucial consideration in both public and private sectors. Svrydenko, Krokmal, and Chervona (2023) argue that social responsibility serves as the foundation for sustainable development goals, especially amidst crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. It's clear that recognizing and integrating social responsibility principles is critical for sustainable development progress.

Delving into specific sectoral considerations, Ahmed et al. (2021) examine the leadership roles in fostering sustainable development, using a green hotel in Malaysia as a case study. They highlight how effective leadership can inspire environmentally-friendly practices and behaviors within the organization, contributing to broader sustainability goals. Meanwhile, Anh et al. (2022) discuss the sustainable development of social entrepreneurship in Vietnam, demonstrating the private sector's ability to incorporate sustainability into their operational and strategic frameworks.

The role of the private sector in advancing sustainable development is a topic of growing interest. Rashed and Shah (2021) provide a comprehensive overview of the private sector's role in the implementation of sustainable development goals, indicating the increasing responsibility and potential of businesses in sustainability initiatives. Similarly, Kumi et al. (2020) discuss the private sector's experiences in advancing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Ghana, specifically within the mining and telecommunications sectors. Their research points to the opportunities and challenges inherent in integrating sustainability objectives into diverse industry contexts.

CSR, as a strategy for companies to address their social responsibility, has been a significant focus. Khuong, Truong An, and Thanh Hang (2021) explore how stakeholders and CSR programs can bolster sustainable development strategies and enhance corporate reputation in Vietnam. Their work underscores the importance of robust stakeholder engagement and CSR initiatives in promoting sustainable practices and corporate success. On the other hand, Shaikh and Usmani (2020) delve into the role of CSR in sustainable development, emphasizing how CSR can drive sustainability efforts and contribute positively to societal development.

Further, Voronkova et al. (2020) examine CSR as a factor of regional development, indicating how businesses can contribute to their local communities' sustainable development. Their research highlights the importance of businesses recognizing their societal obligations and leveraging their capabilities to promote regional sustainability.

Taking into account the Romanian context, Stan (2014) emphasizes the importance of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) as a solution for sustainable urban development. This approach combines the efforts of both public and private sectors, leveraging their unique resources and capabilities to achieve common sustainability goals. Furthermore, Stan, Tasețe, and Rus (2023) note the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic on urban mobility in Constanta, Romania. Their research underscores the importance of resilience and adaptability in sustainable development strategies, especially in light of unprecedented crises.

Considering the environmental impacts of urban development and tourism, Nguyen et al. (2020) discuss their effects on coastal areas in various continents, including Europe, Asia, and Africa. They highlight the necessity of sustainable practices in urbanization and tourism to prevent detrimental impacts on these vulnerable regions. Meanwhile, Aivaz (2020) focuses on the Dobrogea region in Romania, examining asset management and turnover correlations as factors influencing sustainable development.

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has significantly affected tourism, as highlighted by Aivaz and Micu (2021). They assess the pandemic's impact on tourist arrivals in Romania, underlining the tourism industry's role and resilience in promoting sustainable development. Moreover, Aivaz (2021a) discusses the impact of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) on education and living standards in Constanta County, Romania, suggesting that digitalization can be a pivotal factor in driving sustainability.

Further investigating the private sector's role in sustainable development, Mirea and Aivaz (2016) provide insights into workforce cost and net nominal earnings in principal economic activities. Their research emphasizes the role of economic sustainability in driving overall sustainable development. Similarly, Chiriac, Munteanu, and Aivaz (2022) discuss the financial implications of non-compliance in the transportation business, further underlining the private sector's role in sustainable development.

Aivaz (2021b) delves into the intersection of health and sustainability, examining infrastructure, medical staff, and financial indicators of companies operating in health and social care services in Constanta County, Romania. Meanwhile, Aivaz and Tofan (2022) explore the synergy between digitalization and research and business development allocations at the European Union (EU) level, suggesting potential directions for sustainable development strategies.

Moving into the hospitality sector, Aivaz and Căpățână (2021) examine the recovery pursuits of HORECA companies in Constanta County post the COVID-19 pandemic shock. Their work provides insights into the resilience of this sector and its contribution to local sustainable development.

Stan et al. (2021a, 2021b) emphasize the importance of stakeholder perceptions in coastal tourism development within the Romanian Black Sea coastal area. Their research indicates the critical role of community engagement and local input in the successful implementation of sustainable tourism initiatives.

On the topic of urbanization, Stan (2022a) explores the impact of the pandemic crisis on employment, while Stan (2022b) questions the potential of passenger transport for the sustainable development of Constanta County. Both studies underline the complexity and interconnectedness of various factors in urban sustainable development.

From a broader perspective, Wijaya et al. (2021) delve into labor force and economic growth in the context of demographic pressures, happiness, and human development, providing a comprehensive perspective on sustainable development. Finally, Luchenciuc, Rus, and Tasețe (2020) highlight the interplay between organizational communication and corporate

social responsibility in Romanian and international contexts, underlining the vital role of effective communication in CSR initiatives.

In other words, the literature on social responsibility and sustainable development in both the public and private sectors is extensive and growing. However, more research is needed to understand these concepts' implications in diverse geographical contexts, industries, and organizational types. This study's foundation is grounded in the interaction of these concepts, with the aim of deepening understanding of their implications across different societal and organizational contexts.

3. Methodology and data

This research employs data collected via the platform provided by brandBerry SRL, a company registered in Romania under the number RO 18020876. Importantly, brandBerry SRL is recorded in the General Register of the National Authority for Supervision of Personal Data Processing, under the number 31317.

The provision of any identifying data is entirely voluntary. By offering personal data, the respondents give their explicit consent for brandBerry SRL to process their communicated personal data for the explicit purpose of conducting statistical analyses. It is important to note that the analytical processes and resultant reports generated in this research study will not include any personal identifying information of the participants.

The consent provided by the participants for the data usage can be withdrawn at any time, with subsequent effect, by sending a simple email notification. In terms of data storage and disposal, brandBerry SRL is committed to deleting its database of personal information within 15 days following the completion of the study, thereby further safeguarding the privacy and confidentiality of the participants.

The study was active until the 31st of May 2021. The use of such a comprehensive and carefully managed data source adds credibility to the research methodology, ensuring that the study adheres to the highest ethical standards, respects the privacy of participants, and yields valid, reliable results that contribute to understanding the research questions.

The chosen methodology, which is based on rigorous data collection, thorough statistical analysis, and strict adherence to ethical standards, promises a robust investigation into the intersections of social responsibility and local sustainable development in the public and private sectors.

4. Results and discussion

The data presented captures the responses of participants concerning their predominant or permanent work environment, categorized as either 'Private' or 'State' (referring to state-owned enterprises, institutions, or agencies).

According to the data, 42.22% of the respondents work predominantly or permanently in the private sector, whereas the majority, 57.78%, are employed within the public sector (state-owned enterprise, institution, or agency). This signifies that over half of the surveyed participants are directly engaged in the public sector, which could have implications for their perspectives on social responsibility and local sustainable development due to the inherent differences in the operation, mission, and mandates of public and private organizations.

In a typical public sector setting, social responsibility is often directly built into the fabric of their mandate as they are tasked with serving the public interest. On the other hand, private sector organizations may have greater flexibility and different motivations for implementing socially responsible and sustainable practices. This could potentially shape

different attitudes, perceptions, and experiences regarding social responsibility and sustainable development across these sectors.

This balance between public and private sector representation in the study offers a comprehensive view of the perception and enactment of social responsibility and sustainable development in daily life. It allows for an analysis that accounts for the inherent differences and unique aspects of both sectors.

A first question on the questionnaire was: *How do you value your daily life?*

Table 1. How do you value your daily life

Work in the environment	Bad	Neither good nor bad	Good	Very good	Total
Privat	10.71%	35.71%	46.43%	7.14%	100.00%
State	1.28%	29.49%	62.82%	6.41%	100.00%
Total	5.22%	32.09%	55.97%	6.72%	100.00%

(Source: Authors' work)

In the private sector, 10.71% of participants perceive their daily life as poor, 35.71% see it as neither good nor bad, 46.43% see it as good, and a relatively small fraction of 7.14% perceive their daily life as very good. In contrast, in the public sector, only 1.28% of respondents perceive their daily life as poor, 29.49% see it as neither good nor bad, a considerable majority of 62.82% perceive it as good, and 6.41% view it as very good (Table 1).

Notably, a substantial number of respondents in both sectors perceive their daily life as good, with the public sector's proportion being higher. However, the percentage of respondents indicating a very good perception is relatively low in both sectors. This observation may reflect a moderate level of satisfaction with the conditions of daily life among the respondents.

However, it is also worth noting that a significantly larger proportion of private sector respondents perceive their daily life as poor compared to those in the public sector. This might suggest potential differences in job satisfaction, work-life balance, or general life satisfaction between the two sectors, although the data does not provide specifics to determine the exact cause.

A statistical analysis was also conducted using Pearson's Chi-Square test, Likelihood Ratio, and Linear-by-Linear Association, all with the degrees of freedom (df) given (Table 2). These tests are utilized to determine whether there is a significant association between the participants' work environment (private vs. public sector) and their perception of daily life.

Table 2. Pearson's Chi-Square test

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.536 ^a	3	0.050
Likelihood Ratio	7.823	3	0.050
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.096	1	0.043
N of Valid Cases	134		

(Source: Authors' work)

The Pearson Chi-Square and Likelihood Ratio tests, both with a p-value of 0.05, suggest that there is a statistically significant association between the work environment and the

perception of daily life at the 5% significance level. This indicates that the sector in which participants are employed (public vs. private) may have an impact on their daily life perception.

Additionally, the Linear-by-Linear Association test, with a p-value of 0.043, also suggests a significant association. This test is specifically used to determine whether there is a linear trend between the two variables, suggesting that the perception of daily life may systematically increase or decrease as we move from one sector to the other.

However, while these tests suggest statistical significance, the interpretation of these results should be approached with caution. The p-values are just below the standard 0.05 cut-off, suggesting that while the relationship is statistically significant, it may not be robust.

To conclude, these results highlight potential differences in daily life perceptions between those predominantly or permanently working in the private versus public sectors. However, further research would be necessary to understand the specific factors contributing to these differences and to explore potential methods for improving daily life perception, particularly in sectors where it appears to be poorer.

The second question on the questionnaire was: *How do you rate your life compared to before the pandemic?*

Table 3. How do you rate your life compared to before the pandemic?

Work in the environment	Unsure	Worse	Same	Better	Total
Privat		21.05%	68.42%	10.53%	100.00%
State	2.60%	16.88%	74.03%	6.49%	100.00%
Total	1.49%	18.66%	71.64%	8.21%	100.00%

(Source: Authors' work)

Among private sector respondents, 21.05% feel their life is worse compared to the period before the pandemic, while a significant majority of 68.42% perceive their life as being about the same, and 10.53% feel their life is better. In the public sector, 2.60% of respondents are unsure, 16.88% perceive their life as worse, 74.03% view their life as about the same, and 6.49% see their life as better. Notably, the data reveals a striking majority of respondents in both sectors (68.42% in the private and 74.03% in the public) perceive their current life as about the same as the pre-pandemic period (Table 3). This could suggest a resilience and adaptability among the respondents, with the pandemic having little perceived impact on their quality of life. However, it could also indicate that any positive or negative changes brought about by the pandemic might have canceled each other out, leading to a perceived maintenance of the status quo.

It is worth noting that a higher proportion of private sector respondents perceive their life as worse compared to the pre-pandemic period relative to public sector respondents. This could suggest differential impacts of the pandemic across these sectors, potentially due to variations in job stability, work conditions, or other pandemic-related factors.

To examine the statistical relationship between the work environment (private or public) and the perception of life relative to the pre-pandemic period, several tests were conducted, including Pearson's Chi-Square test, Likelihood Ratio, and Linear-by-Linear Association, with given degrees of freedom (df).

In all three tests, the p-values are notably above the standard significance level of 0.05 (p=0.461 for Pearson Chi-Square, p=0.347 for Likelihood Ratio, and p=0.605 for Linear-by-Linear Association) (Table 4). This suggests that there is no statistically significant association between the work environment and the perception of life relative to the pre-pandemic period.

In other words, whether one works in the private or public sector does not seem to systematically influence how one perceives their life compared to the pre-pandemic period.

Table 4. Pearson's Chi-Square test

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2,578 ^a	3	0.461
Likelihood Ratio	3.302	3	0.347
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.268	1	0.605
N of Valid Cases	134		

(Source: Authors' work)

In summary, the majority of respondents across both sectors perceive their current life as being about the same as the pre-pandemic period. Although there are some differences in responses across sectors, these differences are not statistically significant based on the results of the tests conducted. This suggests that further research might be needed to understand the specific factors influencing these perceptions and how they may vary across different sectors.

Answers to question 3: *How do you think you will live in a year's time?* are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. How do you think you will live in a year's time

Work in the environment	Unsure	Worse	Same	Better	Total
Privat	3.51%	22.81%	52.63%	21.05%	100.00%
State	17.11%	14.47%	47.37%	21.05%	100.00%
Total	11.28%	18.05%	49.62%	21.05%	100.00%

(Source: Authors' work)

Among private sector respondents, 3.51% are unsure, 22.81% think their life will be worse, 52.63% expect their life to remain about the same, and 21.05% believe their life will be better. In the public sector, 17.11% are unsure, 14.47% anticipate their life will be worse, 47.37% think their life will be about the same, and 21.05% expect their life to be better (Table 5).

A noteworthy observation is that the majority of respondents in both sectors expect their life to be about the same a year from now. This could suggest a degree of stability in their life circumstances or perhaps a perception that the factors affecting their lives are unlikely to change significantly within the next year.

However, there is a distinct difference in the proportion of respondents who are unsure about their future in the private versus public sectors, with a substantially higher percentage in the public sector. This may suggest a higher degree of uncertainty or variability in future expectations among public sector workers, potentially due to factors such as changes in government policy, public sentiment, or economic conditions.

The percentage of respondents who think their life will be worse is higher in the private sector than in the public sector, whereas the percentage who expect their life to be better is the same in both sectors. These observations may hint at differences in optimism or concerns about the future between the two sectors, although the data does not provide specific information about the reasons behind these perceptions.

To determine if there is a statistically significant relationship between the type of work environment (private or public) and the expectations for the future, several tests were

performed, including the Pearson Chi-Square test, Likelihood Ratio, and Linear-by-Linear Association, all with the given degrees of freedom (df).

Table 6. Pearson Chi-Square test

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6,774 ^a	3	0.079
Likelihood Ratio	7.577	3	0.056
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.430	1	0.232
N of Valid Cases	133		

(Source: Authors' work)

The Pearson Chi-Square test and Likelihood Ratio show p-values of 0.079 and 0.056 respectively, slightly above the standard significance level of 0.05, suggesting that there might not be a significant association between the work environment and expectations for the future. The Linear-by-Linear Association test, with a p-value of 0.232, further supports this (Table 6).

In conclusion, while the majority of respondents in both sectors expect their life to be about the same one year from now, there are some differences in future expectations between the two sectors. However, based on the statistical tests conducted, these differences do not appear to be statistically significant. This suggests that further research might be needed to understand the specific factors influencing these future expectations and how they may vary across different sectors.

The 4th question of the questionnaire was: *How do you rate your family's income in relation to needs?* (Table 7).

Table 7. How do you rate your family's income in relation to needs?

Work in the environment	We don't even have enough for the bare necessities	We only have enough for the bare necessities	It's enough for a decent living but we can no longer afford to buy more expensive goods	We manage to buy some more expensive goods, but with restrictions in other areas	We manage to have everything we need, no strings attached	Total
Privat	8.77%	31.58%	29.82%	19.30%	10.53%	100.00%
State	3.95%	31.58%	34.21%	27.63%	2.63%	100.00%
Total	6.02%	31.58%	32.33%	24.06%	6.02%	100.00%

(Source: Authors' work)

In the private sector, 8.77% of respondents indicated their income does not meet their basic needs, 31.58% said it is enough for the bare essentials, 29.82% stated that it provides for a decent living but does not allow for the purchase of more expensive goods, 19.30% revealed they could buy some costly goods but with restrictions in other areas, and 10.53% claimed they could afford everything they need without constraints.

In the public sector, 3.95% of respondents mentioned their income does not meet their basic needs, 31.58% stated it covers only the strict necessities, 34.21% indicated it allows for a decent life but not for purchasing more expensive items, 27.63% stated they could buy some

expensive goods with constraints in other areas, and only 2.63% mentioned they can afford everything they need.

A key observation is the shared percentage (31.58%) in both sectors for those whose income suffices only for the strict necessities. This reflects a significant portion of respondents from both sectors who are just able to meet their basic needs with their current income.

Differences can be noted between the two sectors in terms of the extremities. In the private sector, more respondents indicate that their income does not meet even the basic needs and that they can afford everything they need without constraints, compared to the public sector. These variations could suggest a greater income disparity in the private sector compared to the public sector.

The Pearson Chi-Square, Likelihood Ratio, and Linear-by-Linear Association tests were employed to determine if there's a significant association between the work environment (private vs. public) and the perception of income sufficiency. With p-values of 0.217, 0.214, and 0.902, respectively, these results suggest that there's no statistically significant association between the type of sector and income sufficiency (Table 8).

Table 8. Pearson Chi-Square test

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5,769 ^a	4	0.217
Likelihood Ratio	5.811	4	0.214
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.015	1	0.902
N of Valid Cases	133		

(Source: Authors' work)

In conclusion, while there are noticeable differences in the distribution of income sufficiency across the private and public sectors, these differences are not statistically significant according to the conducted tests. Therefore, it might be necessary to conduct further research to delve into the underlying factors influencing these perceptions, especially in the context of sustainable local development. The income sufficiency of families in relation to their needs plays a crucial role in their quality of life and social responsibility, thereby impacting sustainable development on a larger scale.

Another question on the questionnaire was: *Where do you get most of your daily food needs?* (Table 9).

Table 9. Where do you get most of your daily food needs?

Work in the environment	From a department store in the nearest town	From a local store	Most of them are produced by us or our neighbours	Other	Total
Private	56.60%	33.96%	9.43%		100.00%
State	39.39%	53.03%	6.06%	1.52%	100.00%
Total	47.06%	44.54%	7.56%	0.84%	100.00%

(Source: Authors' work)

In the private sector, 56.60% of respondents get their food predominantly from a large store in the nearest city, 33.96% from a local shop, 9.43% produce it themselves or with the help of their neighbors, and none selected the 'other' category.

Conversely, in the public sector, 39.39% of respondents get most of their food from a big store in the closest city, 53.03% from a local store, 6.06% produce most of it themselves or their neighbors, while 1.52% selected 'other' as their source of food.

From these data, it can be noted that a large store in the nearest city is the primary source of food products for the majority of participants in the private sector, while local stores are more popular among public sector employees. This pattern could potentially be attributed to a variety of factors, such as differences in accessibility, locality, transport availability, work schedules, or personal preferences between the two sectors.

Nevertheless, self-production or neighborly cooperation also serves as a substantial food source, especially in the private sector, which could signify a trend towards self-sustainability or preference for locally sourced produce.

Table 10. Pearson Chi-Square test

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5,495 ^a	3	0.139
Likelihood Ratio	5.911	3	0.116
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.803	1	0.370
N of Valid Cases	119		

(Source: Authors' work)

The Pearson Chi-Square, Likelihood Ratio, and Linear-by-Linear Association tests were applied to ascertain whether there is a significant association between the working environment (private vs. public) and the preferred sources of food products. However, with the p-values being 0.139, 0.116, and 0.370, respectively, these tests do not indicate a statistically significant association between the sector of work and where people procure their food (Table 10).

In conclusion, while there are observable differences between the preferred food procurement sources in the private and public sectors, these differences are not statistically significant. Understanding food procurement habits could provide insights into local development trends and contribute to strategies for promoting sustainable consumption and production patterns in line with the Sustainable Development Goals.

5. Conclusions

The analysis presented provides several key insights into perceptions of daily life, changes brought about by the pandemic, future expectations, income sufficiency, and food procurement preferences in the private and public sectors.

In both sectors, a significant number of participants perceive their daily life as good, indicating a moderate level of satisfaction with current living conditions. However, the proportion of those who consider their daily life to be poor is larger in the private sector, suggesting potential differences in job satisfaction, work-life balance, or general life contentment. The conducted statistical tests reveal a statistically significant association between the sector of work and perception of daily life, which is a valuable starting point for further research.

Regarding life relative to the pre-pandemic period, the majority of respondents in both sectors view their current life as similar to the pre-pandemic period. Although some differences between sectors exist, these differences are not statistically significant, suggesting that the impact of the pandemic on life perception might not be heavily influenced by the sector of work.

In terms of future expectations, most respondents from both sectors believe their life will remain about the same a year from now. Again, differences exist between the sectors, with a higher degree of uncertainty among public sector respondents. Yet, the statistical tests do not indicate a significant association between the sector of work and future life expectations.

When it comes to income sufficiency, a notable portion of respondents from both sectors indicated that their income covers only the bare necessities. Here, private sector respondents show a wider spread, with more respondents experiencing insufficient income and more able to afford everything they need without constraints. Nonetheless, the statistical tests reveal no significant association between the sector of work and the perception of income sufficiency.

Finally, food procurement preferences display some differences between the sectors, with the majority of private sector respondents sourcing their food from a large city store, while public sector respondents prefer local shops. Self-production or neighborly cooperation also features, especially in the private sector. Despite these differences, no statistically significant association is detected between the work sector and food procurement sources.

Overall, these findings underline the need for further research to better understand the specific factors influencing daily life perception, future expectations, income sufficiency, and food procurement preferences across different sectors. Understanding these factors can inform strategies for promoting social responsibility, improving quality of life, and fostering sustainable development at the local level.

It is also important to consider the wider societal implications of these findings. For instance, significant numbers of people living just above their basic needs and future life expectations being largely unchanged could reflect economic stagnation, inequality, or social immobility. Such conditions can challenge local sustainable development by inhibiting individual and community capacity to invest in sustainable practices or to adapt to change (Condrea et al., 2012).

Moreover, the varying food procurement preferences between sectors could relate to accessibility, locality, transport availability, and personal preferences, which all tie into broader issues of urban planning, rural development, transportation policies, and food security.

By understanding and addressing these issues, governments, businesses, and communities can better align their actions with social responsibility principles and sustainable development goals, ultimately contributing to healthier, happier, and more sustainable societies. This requires a holistic approach, considering economic, social, and environmental factors together, and fostering cooperation between the public and private sectors.

References

- [1] M.F. AHMED, M.B. MOKHTAR, C.K. LIM, A.W.K. HOOI, K.E. LEE: Leadership roles for sustainable development: The case of a Malaysian green hotel. *Sustainability*, **13**(18), 10260 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810260>.
- [2] K.A. AIVAZ: The Impact of ICT on Education and Living Standards. Case Study in Constanta County, Romania. *Monograph „Under the pressure of digitalization: challenges and solutions at organizational and industrial level”*, First Edition July 2021a, ISBN 979-12-80225-27-6, Filodiritto International Proceedings, pp. 8-16.
- [3] K.A. AIVAZ: Considerations on Asset Management and Turnover Factorial Correlations: The Case of Dobrogea Region, Romania. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, ISSN: 2393-3127, ISSN-L: 2393-3119, **XX**(2), 68-74 (2020).
- [4] K.A. AIVAZ: Correlations Between Infrastructure, Medical Staff and Financial Indicators of Companies Operating in the Field of Health and Social Care Services.

- The Case of Constanta County, Romania. *Monograph „Under the pressure of digitalization: challenges and solutions at organizational and industrial level”*, First Edition July 2021b, ISBN 979-12-80225-27-6, Filodiritto International Proceedings, pp. 17-25.
- [5] K.A. AIVAZ, A. CĂPĂȚÂNĂ: An analysis of the Return on Assets of HORECA Companies in Constanța County in the Context of the Recovery Pursuits after the Shock Produced by the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, ISSN: 2668-7798, **25**(1), 289-303 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v25i1.5096>.
- [6] K.A. AIVAZ, A. MICU: An analysis of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the number of tourists arriving in Romania using the correspondence factor analysis, in *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, ISSN: 2668-7798, **24**(1), 324–335 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v24i1.4843>.
- [7] K.A. AIVAZ, I. TOFAN: The Synergy Between Digitalization and the Level of Research and Business Development Allocations at EU Level. *Studies in Business and Economics*, **17**(3), 5-17 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.2478/sbe-2022-0042>.
- [8] D.B.H. ANH, L.D.M. DUC, N.T.H. YEN, N.T. HUNG, N.H. TIEN: Sustainable development of social entrepreneurship: Evidence from Vietnam. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, **45**(1), 62-76 (2022).
- [9] A. CHIRIAC, I. MUNTEANU, K.A. AIVAZ: The Financial Implications of Non-Compliance in the Transportation Business. In: R. Pamfilie, V. Dinu, C. Vasiliu, D. Pleșea, L. Tăchiciu eds. 2022. *8th BASIQ International Conference on New Trends in Sustainable Business and Consumption*, ISSN: 2457-483X, Bucharest, RO: ASE, 298-305 (2022), DOI: 10.24818/BASIQ/2022/08/039.
- [10] E. CONDREA, M. MIREA, K.A. AIVAZ, O. NITU (OPRISAN): Risk analysis-Important activity in the food safety management. Hazards and risks identified in the milk processing industry. *Journal of Environmental Protection and Ecology*, **13**(4), 2151-2160 (2012).
- [11] M.N. KHUONG, N.K. TRUONG AN, T.T THANH HANG: Stakeholders and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programme as key sustainable development strategies to promote corporate reputation-Evidence from Vietnam. *Cogent Business & Management*, **8**(1), 1917333 (2021).
- [12] E. KUMI, T. YEBOAH, Y.A. KUMI: Private sector participation in advancing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Ghana: Experiences from the mining and telecommunications sectors. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, **7**(1), 181-190 (2020).
- [13] E.G. LUCHENCIUC, M. RUS, T. TASENȚE: Organizational communication and corporate social responsibility. Case study: Romanian vs. International CSR. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, ISSN: 2668-7798, **3**(1), 76–81 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v3i1.62>.
- [14] M. MIREA, K.A. AIVAZ: Analyzing "the workforce cost" and "the net nominal earnings" in the main economic activities, by principal component analysis. In Pamfilie, R. et al. (Eds.), *BASIQ International Conference: New Trends in Sustainable Business and Consumption*, ISSN: 2457-483X, Bucharest, RO: ASE, 201-209 (2016).
- [15] H.D. NGUYEN, W. HAMMA, M.I. STAN, V.T. TRAN, R. AȘTEFĂNOAIEI, Q.T. BUI, D.F. VINTILĂ, Q.T. PHAM, C. LIXĂNDROIU, Q.H. TRUONG, D.D. ȚENEĂ, I. IANOȘ: Impacts of urbanization and tourism on the erosion and accretion of European, Asian and African coastal areas and possible solutions. *Urbanism. Architecture.*

- Constructions*, ISSN: 2069-6469, **11**(2), 123-156 (2020).
- [16] A.-I. PETRIȘOR: A diversity-based approach to the spatial development of socioecological systems. *Urbanism Architecture Constructions*, ISSN: 2069-6469, **8**(2), 143-162 (2017).
- [17] A. H. RASHED, A. SHAH: The role of private sector in the implementation of sustainable development goals. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, **23**, 2931-2948 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-020-00718-w>.
- [18] M.I. STAN, K.A. AIVAZ, D.F. VINTILĂ, I. IONIȚIU: Synergistic Perceptions on the Regulations Oriented Towards the Development of Romanian Coastal Tourism in the Context of Maritime Spatial Planning. In Pamfilie, R. et al. (Eds.), *BASIQ International Conference: New Trends in Sustainable Business and Consumption*, ISSN: 2457-483X, Bucharest, RO: ASE, 135-141 (2021a), DOI: 10.24818/BASIQ/2021/07/017.
- [19] M.I. STAN, K.A. AIVAZ, D.F. VINTILĂ, I. IONIȚIU: Assessing the perception of stakeholders regarding the impact of coastal tourism on the environment in the Romanian Black Sea coastal area. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, **8**(4), 628-639 (2021b), <https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v8i4.695>.
- [20] M.I. STAN, T. TASENȚE, M. RUS: Challenges and opportunities regarding the COVID-19 pandemic on urban mobility in Constanta, Romania. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, ISSN: 2668-7798, **42**(1), 1-14 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v42i1.8755>.
- [21] M.I. STAN: The impact of the pandemic crisis on employment in the context of urbanization. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, ISSN: 2668-7798, **33**(1), 492-505 (2022a), <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v33i1.6977>.
- [22] M.I. STAN: Does the activity of passenger transport have growth potential for the sustainable development of Constanța County?. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, ISSN: 2668-7798, **29**(1), 509-522 (2022b), <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v29i1.6183>.
- [23] M.I. STAN: Public-Private Partnership-a solution for sustainable urban development of cities. *Curentul Juridic*, ISSN: 1224-9173, **56**(1), 139-147 (2014).
- [24] M.I. STAN, E.-M. CORTEL: Sustainable rural development: an assessment of citizens' perception regarding the role of the planning framework within the Romanian local communities. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, ISSN: 2668-7798, **35**(1), 1-17 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v35i1.7351>.
- [25] A. A., SHAIKH, G. USMANI: Role of Corporate Social Responsibility in Sustainable Development. *JournalNX*, ISSN: 2581-4230, 102-105 (2020).
- [26] D. SVYRYDENKO, N. KROKHMAL, L. CHERVONA: Social Responsibility as a Basis for Implementing the Goals of Sustainable Development in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, ISSN: 2518-1866, **30**, 77-87 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/7>.
- [27] D.F. VINTILĂ, C. FILIP, M.I. STAN, D.D. ȚENEĂ: A Political, Economic, Social, Technology, Legal and Environmental (PESTLE) Approach for Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) in the Romanian Black Sea. *The 8th International Conference of Management and Industrial Engineering "Management in the Innovation Society" ICMIE 2017*, **8**, Niculescu Publishing House, Bucharest, Romania, 653-666 (2017).
- [28] O.Y. VORONKOVA, M.V. MELNIK, Y.V. NIKITOKHINA, N.M. TCHUYKOVA, A.A. DAVIDYANTS, S.V. TITOVA: Corporate social responsibility of business as a factor of regional development. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, **7**(3),

- 2170-2180 (2020), [https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2020.7.3\(47\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2020.7.3(47)).
- [29] A. WIJAYA, J. KASUMA, T. TASENTE, D.C. DARMA: Labor force and economic growth based on demographic pressures, happiness, and human development. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, **8**(1), 40-50 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v8i1.571>.