

ROMANIAN RURAL TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

CORNELIA POP¹, MONICA MARIA COROS², CRISTINA BALINT³

ABSTRACT. The modern type of rural tourism emerged during the 1970s and the 1980s (Lane & Kastenholz 2015). The rural tourism concept amalgamates different types of tourism that overlap and intertwine. It is largely agreed that rural tourism can assist the rural areas' restructuring path mainly if its introduction rather complement the existing activities and is incorporated in the local economies and social structures. Since 1995 rural tourism was identified by Romanian authorities also as a major growth area that can address social and cultural inequalities. The present paper shows the growth of rural accommodation facilities over a decade (2005 and 2016). The survey also presents the spatial distribution of rural accommodations pointing toward a decrease in the uneven geographical distribution of rural lodgings through the entry on the rural tourist market of new localities. Furthermore, this research study reveals the diversification of rural accommodation portfolio regarding the type of accommodation, the ranking/classification of the respective lodgings and the lodging capacity. In addition, the paper draws the profile of rural accommodation facilities at national and regional levels, presenting the dominant type of accommodation units, the dominant classification and the dominant lodging capacity. The information is completed by the growth rate of lodgings and rooms and by the standing of rural accommodation in each county and region. Romania's rural tourism reached this growth phase, thus it is difficult to evaluate how advanced the growth phase is. There is still an unexploited potential that can support further expansion. While the further development is expected to bring an increase in the number of localities reporting accommodation, it is also expected that an increase in quality of services and facilities along with a wider range of entertainment activities based on innovation should occur.

¹ Professor Dr., Department of Business, Faculty of Business, Babes-Bolyai University Cluj-Napoca, Romania, cornelia.pop@tbs.ubbcluj.ro

² Lecturer Dr., Department of Hospitality Services, Faculty of Business, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, monica.coros@tbs.ubbcluj.ro

³ Lecturer Dr., Department of Business, Faculty of Business, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, cristina.balint@tbs.ubbcluj.ro

Key words: rural tourism, lodging, growth, Romania

JEL classification: L83

Recommended citation: Pop, C., Coros, M.M., Balint, C., *Romanian Rural Tourism: a Survey of Accommodation Facilities*, Studia UBB Negotia, vol. 62, issue 2 (June), 2017, pp. 71-126, doi:10.24193/subbnegotia.2017.2.05.

Introduction

The modern type of rural tourism emerged during the 1970s and the 1980s mainly across the European rural areas under the European Commission plan of restructuring rural Europe (Lane & Kastenholtz 2015). The last decade of the 20th century witnessed the growth of rural tourism and the related academic discussion at global level (Lane & Kastenholtz 2015). The main feature of the modern rural tourism is represented by its diversity, rural tourism including a wide range of (niche) types of tourism (Lane & Kastenholtz 2015; Frochot 2005, Aref & Gill 2009).

One of the most recognized definition of rural tourism, though considered too broad and inadequate (Frochot 2005), is that of Lane (1994): 'tourism that takes place in the countryside'. Thus, over the past two decades no consensus has been reached regarding the definition of rural tourism⁴. Currently, rural tourism became an umbrella concept, including and accepting many forms of tourism related to country side/rural areas (Lane & Kastenholtz 2015). The diversity of rural tourism led to its versatility, this type of tourism providing services on a complex market for a broad variety of tourists: from different age-groups, backgrounds, education level, to special needs, interests and expectations (Frochot 2005, Panyik et al., 2011). Rural tourism concept amalgamates farm tourism/ agritourism, ecotourism, green tourism, nature tourism and wildlife tourism (e.g. animal and birdwatching), wellness tourism, spa tourism, health tourism, activity tourism (e.g. equestrian tourism, cycling tourism),

⁴The paper of Ayazlar & Ayazlar (2015) presents an interesting review of rural tourism definitions presented by the academic literature.

adventure tourism (e.g. hiking and climbing) and sport tourism (e.g. golf), cultural tourism and heritage tourism, food and wine tourism/gastronomic tourism, root/diasporic tourism, ethnic tourism, folklore tourism (Frochot 2005, Nistoreanu & Dorobanțu 2012, Corsale & Iorio 2014, Iorio & Corsale 2013a, Lane & Kastenholtz 2015, Millan-Vazquez de la Torre et al., 2017, Ohe et al., 2017), and more and more educational tourism becomes a part of the rural experience (Petroman et al., 2016). The aforementioned types of tourism overlap and intertwine depending on the rural areas where tourism is developing.

Tourism in general is a cross-sectoral industry (Saner et al., 2015, Wang & Ap 2013) based on highly fragmented suppliers (Borodako & Kozic 2016, Panyik et al., 2011, Bregoli 2012). Therefore, rural tourism development triggers the growth of other tourism related activities in the country side, given the relatively low entry barriers (Brouder & Eriksson 2013) and is considered to contribute to the social and economic regeneration, improvement and development of rural areas (Naghiu et al., 2005, Lachov et al., 2006, Iorio & Corsale 2013b). Consequently, it was largely agreed that rural tourism can assist the rural areas' restructuring path by: a) creating jobs and increasing income therefore improving the living standards; b) reducing migration; c) supporting the protection of natural landscapes and environment; d) preserving cultural and architectural identities, crafts, traditional lifestyles; e) increasing and spreading the social contacts and the exchange of knowledge and experiences (Turnock 1999, Hall 2004, Aref & Gill 2009, Iorio & Corsale 2013b). In fact, the most significant benefit of rural tourism is the diversification it brings to the rural economy, reducing the dependence or over-dependence on agricultural income, while helping small exploitations to exist (Panyik et al., 2011, Sharpley & Vass 2006).

Nonetheless, tourism development has also negative effects. However, rural tourism, due to its rather smaller scale by serving various niches, is expected to have lesser negative effects upon the environment and natural landscape. Thus, rural tourism will impact on the social profile of the local communities (Rathore 2012, Stylidis et al., 2014). Once a rural area becomes a tourist destination, the lives of the residents will be forever changed by their (direct, indirect or induced) involvement with the tourists and in tourism activities (Kim et al., 2013). Therefore, through this interactions,

the rural tourism might destroy or pervert the very authenticity, traditional lifestyle and cultural heritage that constituted one of the main tourist attractions, in the attempt to adapt to modern times and to meet the demands of tourists (Hall 2004, Pina & Delfa 2005, Sharpley & Vass 2006, Cipollari 2010, Klimaszewski et al., 2010, Iorio & Corsale 2013b).

As a consequence, rural communities should approach their involvement in tourism only after careful evaluation and understanding of the existing resources (natural, human, cultural) and an assessment, on their own terms, of the tourism impact and the desire to be involved with this risky activity (Tao & Wall 2009). The introduction of tourism in rural communities should rather complement the existing activities and should be incorporated in the local economies and social structures aiming at enriching and diversifying the life of local residents (Hall 2004, Tao & Wall 2009). Hence, there is a need for an integrated rural tourism at local level as discussed by Gao & Wu (2017). Within this approach, the role of local community on a successful and sustainable tourism development is essential and is based on the local networks, formal and informal relationships and trust (Lee, 2013, Stylidis et al., 2014, Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012).

Rural Tourism in Romania: a Brief Literature Review

The post-communist debate regarding rural tourism development in Romania started as early as the beginning of the 1990s with the studies of Turnock (1991 and 1996) discussing Romania's complex rural area problems still under the influence of the communist period and the rural tourism as a potential solution to those problems⁵. These were followed by the studies on South-Eastern Europe, including Romania, of Hall (1998) and Turnock (1998). The studies of Bordanc & Turnock (1997), Turnock (1999), and Borto (2002) discuss the early post-communist

⁵ While Romanian researchers wrote a series of studies on these topics during the 1990s, they were published in Romanian only and mainly in journals or reviews that are not available on-line and therefore difficult to find and to access. Moreover, during the 1990s and until the mid 2000s book writing was more popular in Romania and most of the books on the subject had limited editions and can be barely found in academic libraries.

initiatives, steps and projects for rural tourism development in Romania, including the establishment in 1994 of ANTREC (Asociatia Nationala de Turism Rural, Economic si Cultural) as a consortium for rural tourism promotion.

According to Turnock (1999), as early as 1992, the Romanian Ministry of Tourism suggested a range of criteria for the identification of tourist villages and Borto (2002) offers a list of the selected villages based on these criteria⁶. These projects of the early 1990s were related to a short-lived communist initiative of the 1970s (1972-1973) regarding the establishment of tourist villages⁷.

Following the 1992 initiative, in 1995 the Romanian Ministry of Tourism identified rural tourism as a major growth area that can address social and cultural inequalities (Hall 2000). Despite a promising start full

⁶ According to Turnock (1999), the selection criteria were: a) picturesque and non-polluted countryside/environment; b) traditional culture with respect to (traditional) costumes, handicrafts, folklore, along with traditional culture and occupations; c) diverse/varied tourist potential; d) good accessibility; e) a good general living standard, f) qualified people to implement a local tourist program. The selected villages, based on these criteria, were (Borto 2002): Leresti (Arges county), Bran (Brasov county), Marga (Caras-Severin county), Calinesti (Maramures county), Rasinari (Sibiu county) and Vaideeni (Valcea county). Criteria d), e) and f) could be discussed at length for a period when Romania was notorious for a poor road infrastructure and relatively low living standard at national level.

⁷ The Ministry of Tourism Order no.744/1973 declared a number of rural localities as experimental tourist villages. In the absence of the original order, the number and the content of the list differ depending on the cited sources. According to Glavan (2003), the 1973 order names 13 villages: Leresti and Rucar (Arges county), Halmagiu (Arad county), Fundata and Sirnea (Brasov county), Tismana (Gorj county), Bogdan Voda (Maramures county), Rasinari and Sibiel (Sibiu county), Vatra Moldovitei (Suceava county), Murighiol and Sf.Gheorghe (Tulcea county), and Vaideeni (Valcea county). Nistoreanu (2003) offers a slightly different list of 14 villages, based on the same order: Leresti and Rucar (Arges county), Poiana Sarata (Bacau county), Fundata and Sirnea (Brasov county), Tismana (Gorj county), Bogdan Voda (Maramures county), Sibiel (Sibiu county), Vatra Moldovitei (Suceava county), Recas (Timis county), Crisan, Murighiol and Sf.Gheorghe (Tulcea county) and Vaideeni (Valcea county). Note that Recas appears as Racos, though no rural settlement named Racos existed in Timis county. The initiative, mainly aimed at attracting foreign tourists, was canceled in 1974 by Decree no. 225/1974 which prohibited the accommodation of foreigners in private dwellings (Glavan 2003, Nistoreanu 2003). No data or information is available regarding the domestic tourism within rural areas during the communist period, except for those localities which were considered resorts and where hotels and villas were available for tourists.

of initiatives and programs, 'rural tourism flourished rather despite of government actions' (Hall 2004), many intended programs and initiatives being abandoned due to political instability, changes of interests and focus, the lack of administrative transparency, and the constant drought of financial resources. Hall (2004) notes that in Bulgaria and Romania, the patterns of tourism development do not show improvements in providing quality services compared to the former communist neighboring countries that accessed the European Union (EU) in 2004. Furthermore, the contribution of tourism to rural development remained limited mainly due to spatially concentration in several areas (Hall 2004, Nistoreanu 2005).

The 2000s and the first half of 2010s witnessed an increase of mainly domestic studies on Romanian rural tourism. Thus, most of these studies are rather general (Arion 2008, Nistoreanu et al., 2011, Soare et al., 2011) or discussing a specific region, county or village (Turnock 2002, Ancuta & Olaru 2010, Iorio & Corsale 2010, Corsale & Iorio 2014, Merciu et al. (2011), Nistoreanu & Dorobanțu 2012, Gavrilă-Paven et al., 2015, Gica & Coros 2016).

Nonetheless, the majority of the papers provide only a partial picture since they rely on the data provided by the National Institute of Statistics which discards the accommodation facilities with less than 5 rooms. Furthermore, most papers prefer to concentrate only on rural pensions, often called boarding houses or bed & breakfast, (Arion 2008, Soare et al., 2011, Zaharia & Ghita 2014, Mureșan et al., 2016) considered to be the emblematic type of accommodation for Romanian countryside. Thus, several studies (Ilies et al., 2008, Ilies et al., 2011, Klimaszewski et al., 2010, Popescu et al., 2014) discuss the preservation of rural cultural and architectural heritage and the deterioration of the authentic features into non-authentic and kitsch due to the lack of appropriate knowledge among the accommodation owners and developers groups and further enhanced by the absence of an adequate and functional institutional framework for the protection of authenticity. These problems are related to the early identified factors that hindered an integrated rural tourism development (Bordanc & Turnock 1997, Turnock 1998, Hall 2004): a) the lack of or limited knowledge regarding tourism, the related activities and risks, b) limited entrepreneurship skills and managerial training, further confirmed by Iorio & Corsale (2010) and Popescu et al. (2014).

It is interesting to note the findings of Lachov et al. (2006) based on an investigation of rural business related to tourism in Bulgaria and Romania. The paper shows that while Bulgarian entrepreneurs followed more closely the Western model, Romanian entrepreneurs have their 'original' way to deal with various problems, rather divergent from the Western model. Lachov et al. (2006) findings can be better understood in connection with the investigations of Radan-Gorska (2013) which touched the sensible topic of rural unclassified accommodations and the related informal practices in Romanian rural tourism. Radan-Gorska (2013) highlights various problems mainly related to overlapping, varied and ever changing regulations⁸ and the lack of integrated information which bring up unintended informality. Badulescu et al. (2015) also showed that Romania seems to be different from other EU countries when the behavior and the involvement of local institutions are under scrutiny, mainly concerning the education and training in tourism and also regarding the support to accessing the EU grants.

Romania's accession to the EU came with two central documents regarding rural tourism: a) the 2007-2026 Master Plan for National Tourism Development where rural tourism is one of the five sub-priorities aimed to balance the development of country's regions (Sima 2016); b) the National Rural Development Program 2007-2013 followed by the National Rural Development Program 2014-2020. Despite being considered a priority, rural tourism has been granted only a small space in the 2007-2016 Master Plan stating the need for improving the quality of tourist services and related accommodation and increasing the level of education of tourist service providers functioning in rural areas (Arion 2008). ANTREC's role as a marketing consortium is also briefly mentioned. The 2007-2026 Master Plan seems to have a simplistic approach mainly toward heritage and cultural tourism which is, up to a point, complemented by the National Rural Development Program or NRDP (Soare et al., 2011). The NRDP is the one providing funding, indirectly supporting the diversification through non-agricultural activities of rural space (Sima 2016, Mureșan et al., 2016).

⁸ Coros & Lupu (2015) investigated the ever changing regulations related to tourism. Furthermore, one must note that when it comes to financial reporting and taxation, new changes (adjustments) are made almost every month.

Furthermore, under the NRDP evaluations of tourism potential of rural areas were provided⁹. Thus, these evaluations should have been made at least in cooperation with the central authorities in charge of tourism¹⁰. While much can be said about the omissions regarding rural tourism development in the 2007-2026 Master Plan, as of 2016 (almost at the mid of the period) the Romanian central authority for tourism had not yet issued a clear strategy for preserving the authenticity of rural areas, neither created a range of criteria for tourist villages to differentiate them from the resorts of local interest or to recognize some of the villages special status as hosts of World (UNESCO) Heritage Sites or WHS.

Given the important role rural tourism can play in the sustainable development of Romania's rural areas, it is worth assessing the rural tourism growth by surveying the offer of lodgings. The current paper discusses the evolution of rural tourism accommodation facilities within Romania's rural areas between 2005 and 2016 at national and region level. The present paper differs from the existing academic studies on Romanian rural lodgings by considering all the officially registered lodgings, as they appear within the official database offered by the central authority for tourism, and by including 40 counties and 7 development regions. This complete picture of rural tourism evolution, over a decade, can constitute the base for more in depth research in order to better understand, apart from the tourist attractions, the factors that promoted or hindered the development of rural tourism within specific counties and/or regions. Furthermore, the survey includes all the types of accommodation facilities registered in the rural areas and the whole range of lodging capacities, including those with 1 to 4 rooms not taken into consideration by the National Institute of Statistics (NIS). The present study also includes, for the first time, the number of communes with registered lodgings and the number of communes concentrating 10 lodgings or more.

⁹ Măsura 313, Încurajarea activităților turistice, https://portal.afir.info/informatii_generale_pndr_pndr_2007_2013_masura_313_incurajarea_activitatilor_turistice

¹⁰ The central authorities for tourism are represented either by the Ministry of Tourism or by the National Authority for Tourism (NAT). Due to frequent administrative changes between 2005 and 2016 it was chosen to use the generic term of 'central authorities for tourism'.

Data and Methodology

The present paper is based on the data provided by the official database offered by the central authority for tourism as of the end of 2005 and respectively 2016¹¹. This database is continually updated, therefore there is no archive that would permit a longitudinal study. Moreover, there are no information available before 2005. Nonetheless, the surveyed period encompasses a decade which witnessed Romania's accession to the EU and all the subsequent developments.

All the types of accommodation facilities located in rural areas were selected for the present study and considered at commune¹² level. Thus, the villages and the communes which are administrated by towns and municipalities, therefore without independent administrative standing, were not included.

It was chosen to eliminate the county of Ilfov from the present study, as it is the county surrounding Bucharest and having most of the administrative institutions located in Bucharest. It was also considered that Bucharest proximity influenced the development of Ilfov's accommodation facilities. Therefore, the county of Ilfov situation was considered unique and its addition to the present survey would have distorted the entire picture.

Within the paper both the number of lodgings and the lodging capacity (number of rooms) were considered. It was chosen to express the lodging capacity as number of rooms (information available only in the official database) and not as number of bed places (information offered by NIS) to provide a comparative base for the countries where the rooms are reported. Thus, for those interested in bed places, a roughly approximation can be made by multiplying the number of rooms with 2 (two). The paper uses mainly descriptive statistics and the critical interpretation of the survey data to construct the accommodation profile of rural areas in Romania.

Findings and Discussions

While slowly improving, the situation of Romanian rural areas remains complex as shown by Burja et al. (2008), Iorio & Corsale (2010), Merciu et al. (2011), Popescu et al. (2014), Gavrilă-Păven et al. (2015).

¹¹ <http://turism.gov.ro/web/autorizare-turism/>

¹² The commune is the lowest administrative unit in Romania. A commune might include one or several villages.

As of the end of 2016, about 46% of the Romanian population was living in rural areas in 2,825 communes. The number of rural localities connected to the drinking water distribution systems has grown from 1,620 in 2005 to 2,157 in 2015¹³. Similarly, the number of rural localities with public sewerage systems has grown from 386 in 2005 to 809 in 2015, thus negligible when the total of rural localities is considered. The same situation exists for the natural gas distribution networks covering 525 localities in 2005 and respectively 663 in 2015.

The Growth of Rural Lodging Facilities

Overall, rural accommodation facilities has grown between 2005 and 2016. The number of rural lodgings increased 1.75 times (at a slower pace than the 1.85 times for the total lodgings), while the lodging capacity increased 2.15 times (at a higher pace than the 1.56 times for the total rooms). The growth is supported by the descriptive statistics in Table 1 showing an advance in mean and median for both lodgings and rooms. Similar to Spain, where the increase of rural accommodation was due to investment assisted mainly by EU aids (Pina & Delfa 2005), Romanian rural lodging growth was based on EU programs including financial assistance like SAPARD program available during the pre-accession period (Iorio & Corsale 2010, Popescu et al., 2014, Sima 2016) and to the dedicated financial framework (providing grants) for rural development after the 2007 accession to the EU, assisted by local banks (Badulescu et al., 2015, Gavrila-Paven et al., 2015).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of rural lodgings and rooms based on the 40 counties

Descriptive statistics	Rural lodgings		Rural rooms	
	2005	2016	2005	2016
Mean	76	134	636	1,370
Median	41	88	409	892
First quartile	8	28	94	415
Third quartile	94	231	710	1,694
Minimum	0	3	0	19
Maximum	645	587	4,223	8,469
Observations	40	40	40	40

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

¹³ NIS does not provide such data for 2016. This observation stands for the other data mentioned within the paragraph.

Appendix 1 presents the detailed situation by counties and development regions¹⁴. The information includes the number of localities declared resorts of national and local interest¹⁵, based on a range of criteria, by the central authority for tourism. It is considered that these resorts enhance the attractiveness of the respective counties/regions.

Nonetheless, not all the counties registered an advance in rural accommodation facilities. Harghita and Maramureş counties are the two cases reporting a decrease. Harghita county recorded the steepest diminution of rural lodgings of 53.02% (from 645 in 2005 to 303 in 2016), while for Maramureş county the decrement was far lower, of 2.39% (from 251 in 2005 to 245 in 2016). Though, both counties show an increase in rooms (14.37% Harghita and 80.34% Maramureş), data pointing out towards an increase of the respective lodgings' capacity. This finding is confirmed by the data in Appendix 5 recording a decrease of the percentage of lodgings with 1-4 rooms capacity in both counties. It is worth noting that in 2005 two counties (Olt and Teleorman) did not report lodgings in rural areas, while in 2016 all the counties reported rural lodgings.

Table 2 presents the top 5 and the last 5 counties based on the lodging and respectively room growth rate. Olt and Teleorman counties rural lodgings grew from none to the level of 2016; their growth rate could not be calculated, therefore they were not included in Table 2. It is interesting to mention that four of the top five counties had a small accommodation offer of less than 10 lodgings and less than 100 rooms as of 2005 (Giurgiu, Salaj, Satu-Mare, Vaslui). The growth seems not to be related to the existence of resorts either of national or local interest or of other famous tourist attractions like the WHS (Appendix 2). At the other end of the spectrum, the counties included in the last 5 category host between 1 and 4 resorts located in rural areas and, in the cases of Maramureş and Harghita counties, the added advantage of WHS in rural areas. The low or negative growth rates indicate an already existing portfolio of rural lodgings, a crowded supply market and, indirectly, economic inefficiencies of the rural lodgings' operators.

¹⁴ A map of Romania's counties and regions is available in Appendix 8.

¹⁵ Appendix 7a and 7b offer the list of these resorts as of 2002 (unchanged as of 2005) and as of 2012 (unchanged as of 2016).

Table 2. The top 5 and the last 5 counties based on the growth rate between 2005 and 2016

Top 5			
County	Rural lodging growth rate (%)	County	Rural room growth rate (%)
Salaj	716.67	Vaslui	577.27
Gorj	638.46	Salaj	406.90
Vaslui	325.00	Iasi	336.79
Satu-Mare	271.43	Gorj	314.74
Giurgiu	233.33	Satu-Mare	314.01
Last 5			
County	Rural lodging growth rate (%)	County	Rural room growth rate (%)
Harghita	-53.02	Vrancea	0.41
Maramureş	-2.39	Vâlcea	9.71
Vrancea	11.11	Harghita	14.37
Prahova	24.69	Bihor	23.37
Covasna	48.44	Brăila	47.61

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

The Spatial Distribution of Rural Lodgings

The discrepancies between rural lodging distributions were already discussed by Hall (2004), Nistoreanu (2005) and more recently by Iorio & Corsale (2010). Additionally to these discussions, Appendix 2 presents the distribution of rural lodgings and rooms in relation with the resorts of national and local interest located in rural areas, and with the WHS from the rural areas. The data in Appendix 2 confirm the majority of the rural accommodation concentrations and the lack of it as documented by the aforementioned studies.

The distribution of rural lodgings and rooms by counties and by regions reveals a decrease in the concentration as of 2016 compared to 2005. This situation is highlighted in Table 3 through the decrease of maximum values. Furthermore, this is confirmed by the following figures: as of 2005 the top 5 (respectively top 20) counties concentrated 50.13% of the rural lodgings and 46.89% of the rural rooms (respectively 90.50% of the rural lodgings and 88.85% of the rural rooms), while as of 2016 the top 5 (respectively top 20) counties accumulate 38.13% of the rural

lodgings and 44.90% of the rural rooms (respectively 86.01% of the rural lodgings and 86.00% of the rural rooms). This evolution indicates that other counties started to emerge as rural destinations by developing lodgings in rural areas, a finding confirmed by the top 5 counties growth rates presented in Table 2.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of rural lodgings and room distribution based on the 40 counties

Descriptive statistics	% of county rural lodgings of total rural lodgings		% of county rural rooms of total rural rooms	
	2005	2016	2005	2016
Mean	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Median	1.34	1.63	1.61	1.63
First quartile	0.26	0.53	0.37	0.76
Third quartile	3.09	3.97	2.79	3.09
Minimum	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.03
Maximum	21.12	10.97	16.61	15.45
Observations	40	40	40	40

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Table 4 presents the top 5 and the last 5 counties as of 2005 and 2016 respectively, based on the lodging and room distribution. Regarding lodgings, in 2005 there is an important difference between Harghita county and the other four counties in top 5, while 2016 shows a more balanced distribution. When the rooms are concerned, in 2005 there is an important gap between the first two counties and the remaining three. As of 2016, the gap between the first ranked county and the remaining four became larger. This is due to Constanța county, the host of the Romanian littoral. The popularity of this area remains high as the increase in lodgings and rooms indicate. The counties ranked top 5 in 2005 and 2016 owe their position to a concentration of well known tourist attractions in rural areas, of which for the present paper only the resorts and WHS were considered. Based on this information (Appendix 2), the top 5 counties can be split into three categories:

- a) counties which include only rural resorts of national and local interest (Constanța with Costinești, Bihor with Băile Felix and Băile 1 Mai);
- b) counties which include WHS (Suceava with the painted churches, Tulcea with the Danube Delta);

c) counties which concentrate rural resorts of local interest and WHS (Braşov, Harghita and Maramureş) as Appendix 2 also shows.

It must be noted that within the counties of Constanţa, Bihor and Braşov an over-concentration of accommodation facilities exists in a small number of communes, as it will be presented in an upcoming paragraph.

To the other end of the spectrum, in the last 5 counties, four of them remain in the same group in 2016 as in 2005: Călăraşi, Ialomiţa, Olt and Teleorman. Neither of these counties hosts rural resorts of national or local interest nor WHS. Thus, it is worth noting that all these four counties are located along the Danube which could become an important tourist attraction. The rank of these counties indicates the absence of interesting small rural touristic ports, known tourist attractions and, probably, a lack of local initiative, these four counties being dominated by large agricultural exploitations.

Table 4. The top 5 and the last 5 counties based on lodging and room distribution

2005 - Top 5					
County	Rural lodgings	% of total rural lodgings	County	Rural rooms	% of total rural rooms
Harghita	645	21.12	Bihor	4,223	16.61
Braşov	294	9.63	Constanţa	3,209	12.62
Maramureş	251	8.22	Harghita	1,747	6.87
Suceava	176	5.76	Braşov	1,474	5.80
Constanţa	165	5.40	Tulcea	1,269	4.99
2005 - Last 5					
County	Rural lodgings	% of total rural lodgings	County	Rural rooms	% of total rural rooms
Vaslui	4	0.13	Călăraşi	26	0.10
Călăraşi	3	0.10	Vaslui	22	0.09
Ialomiţa	1	0.03	Ialomiţa	5	0.02
Olt	0	0.00	Olt	0	0.00
Teleorman	0	0.00	Teleorman	0	0.00
2016 - Top 5					
County	Rural lodgings	% of total rural lodgings	County	Rural rooms	% of total rural rooms
Braşov	587	10.97	Constanţa	8,469	15.45
Constanţa	454	8.48	Bihor	5,210	9.50
Suceava	391	7.30	Braşov	5,155	9.40
Tulcea	306	5.72	Suceava	2,892	5.28
Harghita	303	5.66	Tulcea	2,889	5.27

2016 - Last 5					
County	Rural lodgings	% of total rural lodgings	County	Rural rooms	% of total rural rooms
Galați	9	0.17	Galați	95	0.17
Călărași	8	0.15	Călărași	75	0.14
Olt	7	0.13	Teleorman	56	0.10
Teleorman	7	0.13	Olt	47	0.09
Ialomița	3	0.06	Ialomița	19	0.03

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

When the rural lodging and room distribution is considered at regional level, the Center and North-West development regions (constituting Macro-region 1) concentrate over 40% of the total rural lodgings and rooms. This position is related to the fact that Macro-region 1 also concentrates the highest number of rural resorts and the majority of Romania's WHS (Appendix 2). Furthermore, the relation with these tourist attractions is confirmed by the dominant positions held by Harghita county and Brașov county within the Center region and by Maramureș county and Bihor county within the North-West region. Also one must note a more balanced distribution of lodgings and rooms among the counties of these two regions compared to other four development regions (Appendix 2).

South-East and North-East development regions (constituting Macro-region 2) concentrate more than 30% of the total rural lodgings and rooms. In the case South-East region this is due to the presence of Constanța county (hosting the Romanian littoral) with its related high offer of accommodations and Tulcea county hosting the Danube Delta which also induced an increased lodging offer. Within the North-East region, Suceava county has the leading position mainly due to the WHS, followed closely by Neamț county which hosts a range of religious and historic tourist attractions. Thus, it must be noted that the lodging and room distribution in Macro-region 2 is less balanced (Appendix 2).

In the South-Muntenia region (overlapping with Macro-region 3 due to the exclusion of Bucharest and of Ilfov county) there is a clear concentration of rural lodgings and rooms within Argeș county and Prahova county. In the case of Prahova county, well known for its mountain areas, the second position comes from the fact that the majority of its popular tourist resorts are either municipalities or towns and the rural areas have to compete with them in terms of tourist attractions.

Within the Macro-region 4, the West region presents the most balanced distribution of lodgings and rooms, while the South-West region is dominated by Vâlcea county due to Voineasa mountain resort of national interest. Nonetheless, South-West region registers the lowest concentration of rural lodgings.

Related to the distribution of rural lodging and rooms, Appendix 3 presents the number of communes where lodgings are registered versus the total number of communes and versus the number of communes identified to have tourist potential by NRDP. It also includes the number of communes which concentrate at least 10 accommodation units. Rural tourism is a small scale type of tourism, a high concentration of accommodation facilities in one or few localities would have an undesired impact on the environment and on the traditional culture. The number of 10 lodgings was considered appropriate to provide for small groups of tourists, while the communes with less than 10 lodgings might experience only sporadic tourist activity.

Data in Appendix 3 show that as of 2005 less than one fifth of the communes have officially registered lodgings. As the growth trend of rural accommodation increased, so did the number of communes reporting lodgings by 1.75, raising their number at about one third of the total communes as of 2016. Only in one county, namely Harghita, 75% of the total communes report lodgings, while in other 5 counties (Cluj, Maramureş, Braşov, Covasna, Suceava) between 55% and 67% of the communes have registered lodgings. Of these six counties, four are in the top 5 bases on lodgings and room distribution (Table 4).

By regions, the rural lodging and room distribution (Appendix 2) can be related to the distribution of communes considered to have tourist potential (Appendix 3). At a closer look, it is interesting to note that within three regions (North-West, North-East and West) the number of communes with recorded lodging activity equals or overpasses the number of communes with tourist potential (last two columns of Appendix 3) as of 2016. This is translated at national level in 19 of 40 counties with a higher number of communes reporting lodgings than the communes with tourist potential. Further, it is also interesting to point out that South-Muntenia region gathers the majority of these counties, while being the region ranking next to last based on lodging and room distribution. These findings suggest that while tourist attractions are important, as overall data indicate, there are a range of other reasons that determine the development

of lodgings in rural areas that need to be closely investigated (e.g. the proximity to towns or municipalities or the opportunity provided by the availability of funding sources).

Considering only the communes with 10 lodgings or more, their number is significantly lower. These localities represented less than 15% in 2005 and barely 11% in 2016 of the communes reporting lodgings despite their general increase in number between 2005 and 2016. By counties, the data in Appendix 3 reveal the following:

a) 11 counties exhibit a negligible presence of rural accommodation, neither of the respective communes concentrating at least 10 lodgings; this group includes the counties ranked the last 5 as of 2005 and respectively 2016 based on lodging and room distribution (Table 4);

b) 3 counties (Harghita, Maramureş and Timiş) registered a decrease in the number of communes with at least 10 lodgings, Harghita's decline being the steepest, from 18 to 6 localities suggesting the need for more in depth investigations of this particular case;

c) 6 counties witnessed an increase from 0 communes with at least 10 lodgings in 2005 to at least 1 such locality; within this group two cases are worth noticing: Brăila county where 1 locality (Chiscani-Lacu Sărat resort of local interest) concentrates more than half of the rural lodgings and about a quarter of the rural rooms, and Gorj county where 3 communes concentrate more than 60% of the lodgings and the rooms, with Baia de Fier in the leading position;

d) 15 counties, already hosting localities with at least 10 lodgings in 2005, show an increase of such communes; these counties have the best position in developing sustainable tourism by hosting a range of communes able to receive small tourist groups; nonetheless, the case of Braşov county should be considered separately since it already shows an over-concentration of lodgings in Bran and Moieciu;

e) 5 counties exhibit an unchanged situation with 1 or 2 localities concentrating an important percentage of rural lodgings and rooms within the respective county. It is worth mentioning that only in the case of Arad and Bihor the concentration is related to spa resorts of local and national interest, where the development of accommodation facilities had the input of the communist period.

The findings presented above indicate a slight decrease in the concentration of rural accommodations (at county and region level) with new communes entering the market. This suggests a more balanced

future distribution of lodgings and rooms as half of the counties still have the potential for further development in rural areas since the number of communes hosting lodgings being still lower than that of communes identified with tourist potential.

Thus, one should not ignore the high level of concentration within four localities as Table 5 shows. All these communes concentrate more than 1,000 rooms as of 2016, representing about a quarter of the rooms in rural areas. In three cases, the agglomeration of lodgings is related with resorts of national and local interest, while the fourth case is related to the popularity of the Romanian littoral mainly for domestic tourists. In the cases of Sânmartin (Bihor county) and Costinești (Constanța county) should be highlighted that the upgrade of those localities to the rank of national resorts took place mainly during the communist period, including the construction of large hotels, especially in Sânmartin – Băile Felix¹⁶. Nonetheless, this overcrowding almost annihilated the traditional country area (Sânmartin-Băile Felix¹⁷ and Costinești) and had a negative influence on the traditional country side in Bran-Moieciu (Brașov county). Also, the natural resources might be stretched almost to the limit in these areas. These localities might already have reached a critical crossroad regarding their development as a tourist destination and poor management might lead to a decline despite their current popularity.

Table 5. Communes with more than 1,000 rooms

Communes and their component localities	2005		2016	
	Lodgings	Rooms	Lodgings	Rooms
Sânmartin (Băile Felix and Băile 1 Mai), Bihor county Note: Băile Felix is a resort of national interest; Băile 1 Mai is a resort of local interest	51	3,579	201	4,245
Costinești, Constanța county Note: Costinești is a resort of national interest at the Black Seaside	128	2,658	313	6,063

¹⁶ According to Pop et al. (2007), Baile Felix still had, as of 2005, the largest hotel in Romania comprising 728 rooms (Hotel Padis).

¹⁷ Some media sources suggested that a project of integrating Sânmartin commune in the municipality of Oradea (the residence city of Bihor county) has been proposed in 2013. A referendum was organized in 2015 and the proposal was rejected by the local population (<http://www.ebihoreanul.ro/stiri/ultima-or-31-6/adio-referendum-aproape-sigur-referendumul-pentru-oradea-mare-nu-se-va-mai-organiza-126994.html>).

Communes and their component localities	2005		2016	
	Lodgings	Rooms	Lodgings	Rooms
Bran-Moieciu, Braşov county Note: both communes were declared resorts of local interest in 2012; thus they are counted jointly given their proximity; their popularity is based mainly on Bran Castle (also called Dracula Castle by foreigners)	198	1,095	373	2,284
Limanu (Vama Veche and 2 Mai), Constanţa county Note: both component villages are well known tourist destinations at Black Seaside, but they did not fulfill the conditions to be declared resorts of local or national interest	< 1,000 rooms	< 1,000 rooms	95	1,482
Total	377	7,332	982	14,074
% of rural accommodation (national level)	12.34	28.84	18.34	25.67

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

The Classification of Rural Lodgings

Romania embraced the classification system from 1 to 5 stars since 1993 (for more details see Pop et al., 2007). When the pensions for rural areas (with a distinct type: agri-pensions) were introduced in 1995, their classification was proposed to be changed from stars to flowers (or daisies) in an attempt to differentiate these dwellings from their urban peers. Thus, no similar decision was taken regarding the other types of lodgings developed and authorized to function in rural areas. Moreover, the classification rules for any type of accommodation facilities were not adapted to include more suitable criteria for rural space, mainly for the smaller accommodations of less than 5 rooms¹⁸. Furthermore, no specific requirements regarding the preservation of traditional features were

¹⁸ This problem could be discussed at length, but some details can be found in Radan-Gorska (2013). When the rural pensions were first introduced, one of the requirements was that they could offer in-house/farm made products without the obligation to provide the meals. Nonetheless, the requirements for the kitchen and food-serving areas were similar to those for urban hotels and restaurants. While these requirements are intended to protect the guest well-being and food safety, for sure better adapted rules to Romanian rural space would have increase the offer of traditional meals at a larger scale.

included (e.g. the preservation of architectural authenticity) supporting the findings of Ilies et al. (2008) and Ilies et al. (2011).

The present survey took into consideration all the pensions registered in rural areas since the in depth analysis of 2005 and 2016 databases revealed rural pensions registered in urban areas and tourist pensions registered in rural areas, while the former were supposed to be found only in urban spaces. While no distinction exists between the flower/daisy classification and star classification and since other type of accommodation classified by stars exists in rural areas, the general classification of stars is used hereafter.

As Appendix 4 reveals, between 2005 and 2016, the accommodation in rural areas shifted from a dominant 2 star classification to a dominant 3 star classification. This trend follows the trend of all Romanian accommodation (see Pop, 2014). The change from budget/economy to mid-market is not always triggered by the real tourist demand but also by the owners' aspiration to be associated with a higher level of quality of offered services and sometimes by the wish to develop a trophy or vanity property (Pop & Coros, 2011). This change may also have been determined by subtle changes in the classification regulations (of 2011 and 2013) that made the 3 star classification easier and more permissive.

This shift from 2 to 3 star classification is followed by all the regions. Thus, the situation at county level shows that while the majority of the counties (22) followed the same trend, 6 counties stagnated at the same level of classification and the remaining 12 exhibit various particular situations that can be noticed in Appendix 4.

Over a decade, between 2005 and 2016, rural accommodations grew not only in number, their portfolio also diversified from the classification point of view. As of 2005 only 5 counties offered rural lodgings ranked from 1 to 5 stars (Alba, Braşov, Sibiu, Tulcea and Vrancea). As of 2016 half of the counties (20) offered the entire range of classified lodgings (1 to 5 stars); most of these counties (9) added 5 star lodgings to the already existing range of 1 to 4 stars. Also the number of counties offering lodgings ranked from 1 star to 4 stars grew from 11 in 2005 to 15 in 2016. The growth within this category seems insignificant, thus it must be considered under the transfer of 9 counties in the previously mentioned category, while other 10 counties added 4 star lodgings to the existing 1 to 3 star

lodgings. This phenomenon is confirmed by the decrease of counties with only 1 to 3 star ranked lodgings: these counties decreased from 16 in 2005 to 5 in 2016. Furthermore, while as of 2005 there were 5 counties offering only 1 and 2 star accommodation, this category disappeared completely as of 2016. It is interesting to note that, aside the 5 counties that already offered the complete range of classified lodgings since 2005 and, therefore, could not diversify further, only other 5 counties remained at the same level of classified accommodation as of 2005: Arad, Buzau, Constanța with 1 to 4 star lodgings; Brăila and Călărași with 1 to 3 star lodgings. It seems that the classification of lodgings within a county has little or no connection with the rank of the respective county when the lodging distribution is considered.

The Rural Accommodation Lodging Capacity

Appendix 5 presents the structure of rural accommodation units by lodging capacity (number of rooms). While the general trend of accommodation facilities at national level shows a decrease in lodging capacity due to the development of smaller accommodation units (Pop 2014), the general trend in rural areas shows a slight increase of lodging capacity. As of 2005, the dominant lodging capacity was of 1-4 rooms, while a decade later the dominant lodging capacity became 5-9 rooms. This increase of the lodging capacity seems to be triggered by two factors: a growing demand for rural accommodation¹⁹ and the availability of European funds for rural development, including rural tourism. At county level, 12 counties followed the trend observed at national level for the rural areas

¹⁹ Overall, according to NIS data, the number of tourist arrivals at accommodation facilities grew from 5.81 million as of 2005 to 11.00 million as of 2016. While the majority of the tourists prefer Bucharest, the county residences, the littoral, the spa and mountain resorts, it is assumed that some of this growth also reached the rural areas. For the present paper the calculation of tourists arrivals within rural areas was not performed since it needs to take into consideration every commune in each county. NIS does not provide ready available information in this respect since some of the rural areas overlap with the spa resorts, mountain resorts, Danube Delta and the category called 'other destinations'. Furthermore, the data concerning tourist arrivals offered by NIS are restricted to the lodging facilities with at least 5 rooms, therefore the information is relevant only considering this limitation.

(the dominant lodging capacity shifting from 1-4 rooms to 5-9 rooms). In 7 counties the dominant lodging capacity became 10-49 rooms evolving either from 1-4 rooms (4 counties) or 5-9 rooms (3 counties). For 15 counties, the dominant lodging capacity remained the same. In 4 counties the lodging capacity registered a decrease. Within this last group the most interesting case is that of Tulcea county (hosting the natural WHS Danube Delta) where the dominant lodging capacity became 1-4 rooms as of 2016, a drop from 5-9 rooms as of 2005. While further investigations are needed to understand this evolution, an educated deduction points towards the fact that, in such a destination, smaller lodgings are more appropriate for small scale tourism.

It is worth pointing out that as of 2016 a more balanced portfolio of lodging capacities was developed in rural areas at national and regional level versus the high concentration of 1-4 room capacity as of 2005. It is interesting to mention that the only two counties exhibiting lodging capacities over 500 rooms are: i) Bihor, as of 2005, due to the Argeş hotel in the country at that time as mentioned in footnote 16; by 2016 the hotel reduced its lodging capacity; ii) Constanţa, as of 2016, due to a complex of rooms for rent. Further, several counties hosted lodging capacities larger than 100 rooms in 2005 and maintained at similar levels in 2016. In all of these cases the situation is generated by the presence of spa or mountain resorts in rural areas, as follows: Moneasa, spa resort of national interest in Arad county; Chiscani - Lacu Sărat, spa resort of local interest in Brăila county; Bala, spa resort in Mehedinţi county; Băltăţeşti, spa resort of local interest in Neamţ county; Voineasa, mountain resort of national interest, in Vâlcea county. Timiş county and Vrancea county lost their larger lodging capacities either due to closing or by not being registered with the 2016 official accommodation database.

A Brief Profile of Counties and Regions Based on Rural Accommodation Facilities

Appendix 6 presents the profile of each county and region by showing how many types of rural accommodation facilities each county/region hosts, the dominant type of lodgings and rooms, the dominant classification rank for the respective lodgings/rooms, and the dominant lodging capacity.

Furthermore, Appendix 6 includes the growth rate of rural lodgings and rooms and also the importance of rural lodgings in the total lodgings of the respective counties/regions.

While the dominant classification and lodging capacity were discussed in the previous paragraphs, the topics of dominant type of accommodation and the position of rural accommodation at county/region level are yet to be covered.

As of 2005, the official database reported 16 types of accommodation units²⁰. Their number increased at 17 by 2016. As Appendix 6 shows, neither county hosted all types of accommodations, thus all counties diversified these types over the 2005-2016 period. As of 2005, only 3 counties (Constanța, Neamț and Tulcea) offered a portfolio of 10 or more types of accommodation facilities. As of 2016, the number of these counties grew to 20.

The most diversified portfolio by types of accommodation structures is offered by Suceava county (14), followed by Brașov, Constanța and Tulcea, each with 13 types of accommodation units. The dominant type of accommodation facility in rural area is the pension²¹. The pensions are dominant both in terms of number and rooms. Thus, at county and regional level, specific situations can arise due to particular conditions. In 25 counties, pensions remained dominant for the decade under survey (2005-2016), though their dominance slightly decreased due to the diversification of other types of accommodations.

The two counties which registered no rural accommodations as of 2005, Ilt and Teleorman, also joinen this group of counties. It is interesting to mention that only in one case (Ialomița) the dominance of pensions as of 2005 was overcome by another accommodation type, the rooms for rent, by 2016. In the case of 6 counties, even though pensions

²⁰ The types of units are: apartments for rent; rooms for rent; bungalows; lodges; camping; cabins (houselet-type units); hostels; hotels; apartment-hotels; motels; pensions (rural and urban); dwellings in rest areas; holiday villages; villas; moored river vessels; moored pontoons (floating structures). In 2016 a 17th type was registered: spaces/locations for camps/camping. The apartments and rooms for rent by tourists need to be authorized in order to be registered with the official accommodation database.

²¹ As mentioned before, the present study considered all the pensions registered in rural areas.

held the dominant position over the decade, hotels were dominant in terms of rooms as of 2005 only to be over-passed by pensions lodging capacity by 2016. This situation was due to the existence in the rural areas of those counties (Salaj, Neamț, Buzau, Gorj, Mehedinți, Vâlcea) of spa or mountain resorts²², some recognized as resorts of national or local interest, others well known locally for their cure benefits.

Within these resorts, hotels were developed mainly during the communist period and currently they either are closed or reduced their lodging capacity and therefore lost their dominant position by 2016. Bihor and Arad counties are similarly dominated by pensions from number viewpoint, though the hotels kept their dominant position in terms of rooms. These two counties owed their situation to the high level of accommodation concentration within the spa resorts Sânmartin-Băile Felix and Moneasa where a range of medium to large hotels were built during the communist period. Due to the popularity of these rural resorts (both of national interest) these hotels continued to operate, although with a reduced capacity in some cases. Only two counties are dominated by other types of accommodation facilities both in 2005 and 2016: Brăila county where the hotels are the most important due to Chiscani - Lacu Sărat resort of local interest and Constanța county dominated by villas in 2005 and by rooms for rent in 2016 given the influence of the sea side tourist demand. These particular situations also influence the dominant accommodation at regional level mainly when rooms are taken into consideration. For the North-West region (given the influence of Bihor county), West region (given the influence of Arad county), and South-West region (given the influence of Gorj, Vâlcea and Mehedinți counties), hotel rooms were dominant as of 2005 only to be replaced by pensions by 2016. South-Muntenia, under the influence of Constanța and Brăila county, is the only region where pensions are not dominant in terms of lodging capacity neither in 2005 nor in 2016.

It is worth noting that not all the accommodation types are appropriate for encouraging the preservation of rural areas' specific features and ensuring their sustainability. Nonetheless, since there is no coherent strategy for the preservation of the architectural characteristics

²² These resorts are: Sarata Monteoru (Buzau), Sacelu (Gorj), Bala (Mehedinti), Baltatesti (Neamt), Bizusa (Salaj), and Voineasa (Valcea).

of rural areas and no correlation with sustainable development, the selection of accommodation type is left at the owners' choice, not always well informed and documented, as pointed out by Ilies et al. (2008) and Ilies et al. (2011). The dominance of pensions was generated mainly by the financing opportunities provided through the SAPARD program before 2007 and by the European grants for rural development after Romania's accession to the EU which seemed to favor this type of accommodation to the less invasive and more flexible rooms for rent and bungalows.

Appendix 6 presents detailed information regarding the standing of rural accommodation in each county and region showing how much of the lodgings and rooms are concentrated within the respective rural areas. Table 6 contains the descriptive statistics for the respective percentages and it is interesting to note that the average indicates a relatively high number of lodgings in rural areas, slightly less than half of the total accommodation units being registered there. Nonetheless, the average data indirectly show the relatively small lodging capacity of these rural accommodations since they concentrated only about one third of the total rooms.

The data in Table 6 confirm several of the findings presented above: a) the growth of accommodation facilities in rural areas reflected by the increase of the mean and median as of 2016; b) the smaller lodging capacity of rural accommodations confirmed by the lower mean and median for the rooms; c) the decrease in rural lodging concentration due to the entry of new communes on the tourist market through the decrease of the maximum values and by the increase of minimum values.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics for the rural lodging and room concentration within a county/region

Descriptive statistics	% of rural lodgings of county lodgings		% of county rural rooms of county rooms	
	2005	2016	2005	2016
Mean	45.53	47.04	28.33	33.93
Median	42.06	47.40	21.47	33.14
First quartile	30.72	31.54	13.75	19.25
Third quartile	62.77	60.54	40.13	44.87
Minimum	0.00	10.71	0.00	2.04
Maximum	85.71	77.66	85.30	73.93
Observations	40	40	40	40

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Table 7 presents the top 5 and the last 5 counties as of 2005, respectively 2016 from the viewpoint of lodging and room concentration. The constant presence of Bihor county and Buzau county in top 5 is due to the rural resorts of national and local interest, Băile Felix and 1 Mai (Bihor), respectively Sărata Monteoru (Buzau), while the presence of Tulcea county in top 5 from the rooms viewpoint is determined by the natural WHS Danube Delta. The entry in top 5 of Argeş and Neamţ counties as of 2016 points out toward important development of the respective counties rural accommodations. The presence among the last 5 of Prahova county (and Constanţa county in 2005) can be explained by the high number of cities and municipalities that cover the most popular tourist resorts of the respective county/counties.

Table 7. Top 5 and last 5 counties based on lodging and room concentration within a county

2005 - Top 5			
County	% of rural lodgings of county lodgings	County	% of county rural rooms of county rooms
Vrancea	85.71	Bihor	85.30
Alba	85.16	Vrancea	67.55
Harghita	83.66	Buzau	67.10
Buzau	76.47	Tulcea	63.90
Bihor	76.40	Alba	57.78
2005 - Last 5			
County	% of rural lodgings of county lodgings	County	% of county rural rooms of county rooms
Galaţi	21.43	Vaslui	8.06
Prahova	15.76	Constanţa	7.25
Ialomiţa	5.26	Ialomiţa	0.40
Olt	0.00	Olt	0.00
Teleorman	0.00	Teleorman	0.00
2016 - Top 5			
County	% of rural lodgings of county lodgings	County	% of county rural rooms of county rooms
Tulcea	77.66	Bihor	73.93
Buzau	77.44	Buzau	68.80
Argeş	76.38	Tulcea	68.56
Bihor	75.77	Neamţ	64.94
Neamţ	75.15	Argeş	59.60

2016 - Last 5			
County	% of rural lodgings of county lodgings	County	% of county rural rooms of county rooms
Satu-Mare	25.24	Prahova	14.64
Olt	17.95	Teleorman	13.86
Galați	16.98	Galați	9.29
Prahova	15.61	Olt	7.67
Ialomița	10.71	Ialomița	2.04

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Thus, while the general trend shows an increase of rural area accommodation facility concentration, eight counties (Bihor, Cluj, Maramureș, Alba Harghita, Mureș, Galați, and Vrancea) witnessed a decreased of this concentration between 2005 and 2016, though Bihor manage to keep its position within top 5. This decrease in concentration can be linked to the downward trend in rural accommodation in Maramureș county and Harghita county, discussed in a previous paragraph. Further investigations are needed to explain this phenomenon within the remaining counties, thus the preference of urban accommodation development is the most obvious one. Nonetheless, the administrative transformation of some communes into towns can provide another explanation worth to be considered.

At regional level, of the seven regions considered, five show an increase of rural lodging and room concentration, while two (North-West and Center) show a decrease under the influence of the component counties similar trend: Bihor, Cluj, Maramureș in the North-West region and Alba Harghita, Mureș in the Center region. Thus, these last two regions are the most prominent when rural lodging and room distribution is concerned. More investigations are needed in order to better understand these contradictory developments.

Conclusions

The present paper shows the growth of rural accommodation facilities over a decade (2005 and 2016). This growth is partly confirmed by Zaharia & Ghita (2014) study which investigated the 2000-2012 period,

while only based on NIS data for boarding houses (probably rural pensions). Nonetheless, further investigations are needed in order to establish how much of this growth can be credited to central and regional initiatives (2007-2026 Master Plan for National Tourism Development and to the NRDPs of 2007-2013 and 2014-2020), to county and local initiatives (e.g. counties and/or communes which present a strategy for rural tourism development or the leadership of small groups like the case of Viscri documented by Iorio & Corsale 2010, Iorio & Corsale 2013b) and/or to the individual/family initiatives. The survey also shows the spatial distribution of rural accommodations pointing toward a decrease in the uneven geographical dispersal of rural lodgings (highlighted in the past by Hall 2004, and Iorio & Corsale 2010) through the entry on the rural tourist market of new localities, as Appendix 3 shows. Thus, the combined North-West and Center regions (which cover the historic Transylvania and Maramureș) show a higher concentration of rural lodgings. This top position of North-West and Center regions is also confirmed by Zaharia & Ghita (2014). Nonetheless, by 2016, the gap between these two regions and the remaining regions diminished (Appendix 2).

The spatial distribution is completed by the detailed information of Appendix 3 which presents (for the first time) the number of communes where lodgings are reported in correlation with the total number of communes and with those communes identified through NRDP 2007-2013 to have tourist potential. Furthermore, the study reveals the diversification of rural accommodation portfolio regarding the type of accommodation, the ranking or classification of the respective lodgings and the lodging capacity. By offering a broader range of lodging types most of them classified between 1 and 4 stars, and with a lodging capacity varying between 1 and 49 rooms, the accommodation supply side for rural tourism can be considered to have the diversity needed to attract a wide range of tourists and to meet the demands and expectations of various niches, as suggested by Pina & Delfa (2005). In addition, the paper also draws the profile of rural accommodation at county and regional level, presenting the dominant types of accommodation, the dominant classification and the dominant lodging capacity. The information is completed by the growth rate of lodgings and rooms and by the standing of rural accommodation within each county and region.

Lane & Kastenholtz (2015) suggest three phases to assess the evolution of modern rural tourism a) the first phase – the emergence of rural tourism; b) the second phase – the (consolidated) growth; c) the third phase – the maturity which can lead to decline or regeneration through innovation. Applying these phases to Romania's rural tourism situation it can be safely stated that it has reached the second phase, that of growth. The data presented in this paper (mainly in Appendix 3 and Appendix 6) indirectly imply that this phase is poorly coordinated at central and regional level in Romania (also highlighted by Iorio & Corsale 2010), similar to the features suggested for the phase of growth by Lane & Kastenholtz (2015).

Nonetheless, some of the counties can be considered to be in the first phase, of emergence, still having a small number of rural localities with registered lodgings, while having an important number of communes with tourist potential (Gorj and Mureş). Furthermore, as shown by Pop & Coros (2016) some communes seem to ignore or are not willing to be involved in rural tourism while hosting or being part of WHS. To the other extreme, some rural destinations might reach the third phase, of maturity.

These are rural destinations that overlap resorts of national or local interest where previous accommodations were built during the communist period and further witnessed an overcrowding of accommodations (e.g. Băile Felix – Sânmartin, Bihor county) or where a specific tourist attraction generated an increased flow of tourists and the related accommodation offer followed the trend, ending in overcrowding (Bran Castle for Bran-Moieciu – Bran county, Black Seaside for Costineşti – Constanţa county). While still popular, these destinations already face a degradation of natural landscape, environmental problems and the loss of their traditional rural features. They will have to face the choice between decline and rejuvenation, although not on a short term horizon.

Given the mix of phases that can be found in Romania's rural tourism, it is difficult to evaluate how advanced the growth phase is. Thus, there is still an unexploited potential that can support more expansion. While the further development is expected to bring an increase in the number of communes reporting accommodation, it is also expected that an increase in the quality of services and facilities along with a wider

range of entertainment activities based on innovation should occur. Despite the fact that innovation has a modest presence in Romania's rural enterprises (Iorio & Corsale 2010) and is often related to a low level of investments, largely based on the EU grants/funds (Toader & Gica 2014). Furthermore, the recent study of Mureşan et al. (2016) suggests that 90% of the 2005-2010 growth was due to the EU funds supporting rural development. Additionally, Mureşan et al. (2016) and Ioan et al. (2014) reveal that most of the Romanian rural lodgings offer mainly basic services: accommodation and breakfast, optional other meals and that they largely lack additional services for guest (e.g. in- and outdoor recreation activities). As Iorio & Corsale (2010) showed, these basic services do not guarantee the demand.

The economic impacts of rural tourism on Romanian rural communities remain largely unstudied due to the difficulties associated with data collection for such an ambitious attempt. Based on data collected for the North-West region, Mureşan et al. (2016) revealed a lack of knowledge regarding rural residents' perception on tourism impacts. Nonetheless, the same study (Mureşan et al., 2016) also showed that the residents of rural areas are willing to support sustainable rural tourism when seen as an opportunity to enhance their personal benefit and to improve the well-being of their community. These findings complete the results of Iorio & Corsale (2010) study on Viscri (Braşov county, Center region) where tourism has been firmly integrated into the families' existing situations as a complementary activity, contributing to economic diversification and enriching social interactions.

The future development of Romanian rural tourism should be based on quality and innovation. Addressing small groups on various niches, the rural tourism sector can be fragile even under favorable conditions (Hall, 2004). Therefore, rural tourism should not to be considered a *panacea* for the complex problems of Romanian rural areas but, rather, a potential activity that can lead to diversification of the livelihood options (Iorio & Corsale 2010). Furthermore, the progress of rural tourism should consider and integrate the difficult balance between the 21st Century standards, the tourists' expectations in terms of authenticity and the preservation of rural patrimony, traditions and natural charm of villages (Ilieş et al., 2008, Cipollari 2010, Klimaszewski et al., 2010, Iorio & Corsale 2013b). Some of the further steps require the involvement of central

authorities mainly regarding the heritage and environment protection. Moreover, central authorities could help the future of rural tourism development by categorizing the villages based on their resources²³, as proposed by Bran et al. (1997) and Merciu et al. (2011) by helping to build a specialization of rural localities based on these resources.

The experiences of Austria and France in rural tourism development might become good examples to be adapted (not imported) by Romanian rural areas. Nonetheless, the involvement of the local community should play a central role within any further advances in rural tourism. The understanding of risks and the changes rural tourism will bring along in a community represents the key for the respective community's acceptance of and participation to a phenomenon that is life changing but that can also help preserving and improving the community sustenance. If handled in an integrated, appropriate and flexible manner, rural tourism can, in the end, become an alternative to emigration and urbanization.

REFERENCES

- Ancuta, C., Olaru, M., (2010), The Prospection of Local Specificity from the Perspective of Rural Tourism Development. Case study: Sasca Romana, Sasca Montana commune, Caraş-Severin county, *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 1(5), 24-32
- Aref, F., Gill, S.S., (2009), Rural Tourism Development Through Rural Cooperatives, *Nature and Science* 7(10), 68-73
- Arion, F., (2008), Survey of Romanian Rural Tourism as an Internal Product, *Proceedings. 43rd Croatian and 3rd International Symposium on Agriculture, Opatija, Croatia*, 225-228
- Ayazlar, G., & Ayazlar, R., (2015), Rural Tourism: a Conceptual Approach, in Avcikurt, C., Dinu, M., Hacıoglu, N., Efe, R., Soykan, A. (eds.), *Tourism, Environment and Sustainability*, St. Kliment Ohridsky University Press, Bulgaria, Sofia, 2015
- Badulescu, D., Giurgiu, A., Istudor, N., Badulescu, A., (2015), Rural Tourism Development and Financing in Romania: a Supply-side Analysis, *Agric.Econ.*, 61(2), 72-80
- Bordanc, F., Turnock, D., (1997), Ecotourism and the Small Family Farms of the Romanian Carpathians, *Geographica Pannonica*, 1, 32-36

²³ Not only should the resources be considered but the tourist profile also. To the best of our knowledge, the only study on Romanian rural tourist profile is that of Naghiu et al. (2005).

- Borodako, K., & Kozic, I. (2016), Cooperation Patterns in the Tourism Businesses: The case of Poland. *Prague Economic Papers*, 25(2), 160-174
- Borto, G., (2002), Rural tourism in Romania – characteristics and trends, *Turizam* 6 (2002), 111-113
- Bran, F., Marin, D., Simon, T., 1997, *Turismul rural. Modelul european*, Editura Economica, Bucuresti
- Bregoli, I. (2012), Effects of DMO Coordination on Destination Brand Identity: A Mixed-method Study on the City of Edinburgh. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(2), 212-224
- Brouder, P., & Eriksson, R.H. (2013), Staying Power: What Influences Micro-firm Survival in Tourism? *Tourism Geographies*, 15(1), 124-143
- Burja V., Moraru C., Rusu O., (2008), Sustainable Development of the Romanian Rural Areas, *Annales Universitatis Apulensis Series Oeconomica*, 2, 645-650
- Cipollari, C., (2010), Can Tourists Purchase the Past? The Past as a Commodity Tourist Sites, *Anthropological Notebooks*, 16(1), 23-35
- Coros, M.M., Lupu, M., (2015), Is the Legal Framework of Tourism a Supporting or a Hindering Factor in the Case of Romania?, in Barkovic Bojanic, I. & Lulic, M. (eds.), *Contemporary Legal and Economic Issues V*, Edition: 5, Publisher: Faculty of Law Osijek, Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, 395-446.
- Corsale, A., Iorio, M., (2014), Transylvanian Saxon Culture as Heritage: Insights from Viscri, Romania, *Geoforum* 52, 22-31
- Frochot, I., (2005), A Benefit Segmentation of Tourists in Rural Areas: a Scottish Perspective, *Tourism Management*, 26(3), 335-346
- Gao, J., Wu, B., (2017), Revitalizing Traditional Villages Through Rural Tourism: A Case Study of Yuanjia Village, Shaanxi province, China, *Tourism Management*, 63, 223-233
- Gica, O.A., Coros, M.M., (2016), A Comparative Analysis of Two Rural Destinations from the Perspective of Sustainable Tourism, *Proceedings of the International Conference ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY*, fourth edition, Sustainable Hospitality October 14th-15th, 2016, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, 185-198, Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309593071_A_Comparative_Analysis_of_Two_Rural_Destinations_from_the_Perspective_of_Sustainable_Tourism [accessed Aug 29, 2017]
- Glavan, V., (2003), *Turism rural, agroturism, turism durabil, ecoturism*, Editura Economica, Bucuresti
- Hall, D.R., (1998), Tourism Development and Sustainability Issues in Central and South-eastern Europe, *Tourism Management* 19(5), 423-431
- Hall, D., (2000), Sustainable Tourism Development and Transformation in Central and Eastern Europe, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(6), 441-457

- Hall, D., (2004), Rural Tourism Development in Southeastern Europe: Transition and the Search for Sustainability, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6, 165-176
- Ilies, A., Ilies, D.C., Josan, I., Grama, V., Gozner, M., (2008), *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 2(2), 140-148
- Ilies, A., Wendt, J., Ilies, D., Josan, I., Herman, G., (2011), The Romanian Rural Architectural Heritage from Maramureş Land. Personality, Distinctiveness and Protection, *Studia UBB Geographia*, 56(2), 187-196
- Ioan, I., Radulescu, C.V., Bran, F., (2014), Romanian Rural Tourism: Status and Prospects by Innovative Organizational Approaches, *Journal of Tourism – Studies and Research in Tourism*, 17, 15-21
- Iorio, M., Corsale, A., (2010), Rural Tourism and Livelihood Strategies in Romania, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26(2), 152-162
- Iorio, M., Corsale, A., (2013a), Diaspora and Tourism: Transylvanian Saxon Visiting the Homeland, *Tourism Geographies*, 15(2), 198-232
- Iorio, M., Corsale, A., (2013b), Community-based Tourism and Networking: Viscri, Romania, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(2), 234-255
- Klimaszewski, C., Bader, G.E., Nyce, J.M., Beasley, B.E., 2010, Who Wins? Who loses? Representation and "restoration" of the past in a rural Romanian community, *Library Staff Research and Scholarship*, Bryn Mawr College, http://repository.brynmawr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=lib_pubs
- Kim, K., Uysal, M., Sirgy, M.J., (2013), How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents?, *Tourism Management*, 36, 527-540
- Lachov, G., Stoycheva, I., Georgiev, I., (2006), Comparative analysis of rural tourism development in some selected European countries, *Trakia Journal of Sciences*, 4(4), 44-51
- Lane, B., (1994), What is rural tourism?, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(1-2), 7-21
- Lane, B., Kastenholz, E., (2015), Rural tourism: the evolution of practice and research approaches – toward a new generation concept?, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(8-9), 1133-1156
- Lee, T.H. (2013), Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 34, 37-46
- Merciu C., Cercleux, L., Peptenatu, D., Vaidianu, N., Draghici, C., Pintilii, R., (2011), Tourism - an opportunity for the economic invigoration of rural areas in Romania?, *Annals of the University of Bucharest, Series Geography* 2011, available at: <http://www.annalsreview.geo.unibuc.ro/2011.html>
- Millan-Vazquez de la Torre, M.G., Arjona-Fuentes, J.M., Amador-Hidalgo, L., (2017), Olive oil tourism: Promoting rural development in Andalusia (Spain), *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 21, 100-108

- Mureșan, I.C., Oroian, C.F., Harun, R., Arion, F.H., Porutiu, A., Chiciudean, G.O., Todea, A., Lile, R., (2016), Local Residents' Attitude toward Sustainable Rural Tourism Development, *Sustainability*, 8(1), 100
- Naghiu, A., Vazquez, J.L., Georgiev, I., (2005), Rural development strategies through rural activities in Romania: chance for an internal demand?, *International Review on Public and Non Profit Marketing*, 2(1), 85-95
- Nistoreanu, P., (2003), *Ecoturism si turism rural*, Editura ASE, Bucuresti
- Nistoreanu, P., (2005), The ecotourism – element of the sustainable development of the local rural communities in Romania, *Amfiteatru Economic*, 7(18), 42-47
- Nistoreanu, P., Dorobanțu, R.M., Tuclea, E.C., (2011), Strategic directions in sustainable tourism development through rural tourism activities, *Forum Ware International – Special Issue 1*, 116-122
- Nistoreanu, P., Dorobanțu, R.M., (2012), Ethnofolklore – vector of rural tourism revitalization in Vâlcea county, *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 2(3), 109-118
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012), Residents' support for tourism: an identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243-268
- Ohe, Y., Ikei, H., Song, C., Miyazaki, Y., (2017), Evaluating the relaxation effects of emerging forest-therapy tourism: A multidisciplinary approach, *Tourism Management* 62, 322-334
- Panyik, E., Costa, C., & Ratz, T. (2011), Implementing integrated rural tourism: An event-based approach. *Tourism Management*, 32(6), 1352-1363
- Petroman, C., Mirea, A., Lozici, A., Constantin, E.C., Marin, D., Merce, I., (2016), The rural educational tourism at the farm, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39, 88-93
- Pina, I.P.A., Delfa, M.T.D., (2005), Rural tourism demand by type of accommodation, *Tourism Management*, 26(6), 951-959
- Pop, C. (2014), The current profile of Romanian hotel industry: does it enhance the attractiveness of Romania as a tourist destination? *Studia UBB Negotia* 59(3), 35-78
- Pop, C., Cosma, S., Negrusa, A., Marinescu, N. and Ionescu, C., (2007), *Romania as a tourist destination and the Romanian hotel industry*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, UK.
- Pop, C., & Coros, M.M., (2011), Romanian accommodation establishments – an investigation regarding the reasons for their development, *Studia UBB Negotia*, 56(1), 5-28
- Pop, C., & Coros, M.M., (2016), Romanian Rural Tourism and the UNESCO Heritage Sites, In T. Paduraru & G. Tacu (eds), *Romanian Rural Tourism in the Context of Sustainable Development. Present and Prospects*, Performantica, Iasi, Romania, 67-81
- Popescu, L., Badita, A., Mazilu, M., (2014), Can rural tourism foster local development? Perspectives on the future of rural tourism in Romania, *Journal of Tourism Challenges and Trends*, 7(1), 69-88

- Radan-Gorska, M.M., (2013), Destinations without regulations: informal practices in Romanian rural tourism, *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology*, 4(2), 195-225
- Rathore, N., (2012), Rural tourism impact: challenges and opportunities, *International Journal of Business Economics and Management Research*, 2(2), 252-260
- Saner, R., Yiu, L., & Filardo, M. (2015), Tourism development in least developed countries: challenges and opportunities. In A.A. Camillo (ed). *Handbook of Research on Global Hospitality and Tourism Management*. (pp234-261). Hershey: IGI Global
- Sharpley, R., Vass, A., (2006), Tourism, farming and diversification: an attitudinal study, *Tourism Management* 27(5), 1040-1052
- Sima, E., (2016), Rural tourism potential as part of sustainable development in Romania, in Boldea, I. (coord.), *Globalization and National Identity. Studies on the Strategies of Intercultural Dialogue*. Social Science Section, Arhipelag XXI Press, Tg.Mureș, Romania, 381-387
- Soare, I., Zugravu, A., Costache, S., (2011), Rural tourism in Romania – evolutions and discontinuities, *Journal of Tourism*, 12, 66-71
- Stylidis, D., Biran, A., Sti, J., & Szivas, E. (2014), Residents' support for tourism development: the role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts. *Tourism Management* 45, 260-271
- Tao, T.C.H., Wall, G., (2009), Tourism as a sustainable livelihood strategy, *Tourism Management*, 30(1), 90-98
- Toader, V., Gica, O.A., (2014), Innovation in rural tourism – evidence from Cluj county, *Studia UBB Negotia*, 59(2), 57-73
- Turnock, D., (1991), Romanian villages: rural planning under communism, *Rural History*, 2(1), 81-112
- Turnock, D., (1996), The rural transition in Romania, *Eastern European Countryside*, 2, 45-57, available at: http://www.home.umk.pl/~eec/wp-content/uploads/1996_6_Turnock.pdf
- Turnock, D., (1998), Rural diversification in Eastern Europe, *GeoJournal*, 46 (3), 171-181
- Turnock, D., (1999), Sustainable rural tourism in the Romanian Carpathians, *The Geographical Journal*, 165(2), 192-199
- Turnock, D., (2002), Prospects of sustainable rural cultural tourism in Maramureș, Romania, *Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment*, 4(1), 62-94
- Wang, D., & Ap, J. (2013), Factors affecting tourism policy implementation: A conceptual framework and a case study in China. *Tourism Management*, 36, 221-233
- Zaharia, M., Ghita, S., (2014), Territorial structural changes of the supply in Romanian rural tourism accommodation, *Economic Insights – Trends and challenges*, 3(1), 63-73

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Comparative evolution of lodgings by counties and regions

County	Total lodgings		Total rooms		Rural lodgings		Rural rooms		Resorts of national interest		Resorts of local interest	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Bihor	161	392	4,951	7,047	123	297	4,223	5,210	1	1	3	3
Bistrita-Nasaud	51	120	1,289	1,860	32	77	221	681	1	1	0	0
Cluj	218	465	2,887	5,737	137	226	1,025	1,890	0	0	2	4
Maramureş	340	424	2,037	3,693	251	245	880	1,587	0	0	2	4
Salaj	12	77	198	872	6	49	87	441	0	0	0	0
Satu-Mare	28	103	526	1,513	7	26	78	323	0	0	0	1
North-West	810	1,581	11,888	20,722	556	920	6,514	10,132	2	2	7	12
Alba	155	289	1,009	3,117	132	208	583	1,628	0	0	0	2
Braşov	649	1,256	7,004	15,306	294	587	1,474	5,155	1	3	2	4
Covasna	114	168	1,767	2,690	64	95	324	956	1	1	1	1
Harghita	771	522	3,374	4,907	645	303	1,747	1,998	1	1	6	6
Mureş	119	362	2,233	5,252	50	101	319	1,019	1	1	0	0
Sibiu	267	493	2,364	5,858	83	208	535	1,953	0	0	2	3
Center	2,075	3,090	17,751	37,130	1,268	1,502	4,982	12,709	4	6	11	16
Macro-region 1	2,885	4,671	29,639	57,852	1,824	2,422	11,496	22,841	6	8	18	28
Bacau	84	213	1,695	2,792	34	75	316	667	2	2	0	0
Botosani	19	34	374	491	8	16	57	112	0	0	0	0
Iasi	55	141	1,172	2,577	17	46	106	463	0	0	0	0
Neamţ	140	334	1,875	3,537	104	251	1,083	2,297	0	2	2	2
Suceava	309	657	3,364	6,750	176	391	1,082	2,892	0	3	1	0
Vaslui	11	35	273	507	4	17	22	149	0	0	0	0
North-East	618	1,414	8,753	16,654	343	796	2,666	6,580	2	7	3	2
Brăila	22	47	815	1,110	8	20	397	586	0	0	1	1
Buzau	51	133	933	1,686	39	103	626	1,160	0	0	1	1
Constanţa	745	1,502	44,279	52,587	165	454	3,209	8,469	11	11	0	0
Galaţi	28	53	590	1,023	6	9	58	95	0	0	0	0
Tulcea	154	394	1,986	4,214	108	306	1,269	2,889	0	0	0	0
Vrancea	63	90	715	886	54	60	483	485	0	0	1	1
South-East	1,063	2,219	49,318	61,506	380	952	6,042	13,684	11	11	3	3
Macro-region 2	1,681	3,633	58,071	78,160	723	1,748	8,708	20,264	13	18	6	5
Argeş	128	343	1,670	4,079	91	262	653	2,431	0	0	1	1
Călăraşi	11	23	287	475	3	8	26	75	0	0	0	0
Dambovita	47	103	826	1,652	28	67	267	841	0	1	0	0
Giurgiu	14	36	279	642	6	20	58	163	0	0	0	0
Ialomiţa	19	28	1,254	931	1	3	5	19	1	1	0	0
Prahova	514	647	5,420	7,549	81	101	543	1,105	2	4	1	3
Teleorman	3	23	110	404	0	7	0	56	0	0	0	0

ROMANIAN RURAL TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County	Total lodgings		Total rooms		Rural lodgings		Rural rooms		Resorts of national interest		Resorts of local interest	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
<i>South-Muntenia</i>	736	1,203	9,846	15,732	210	468	1,552	4,690	3	6	2	4
<i>Macro-region 3**</i>	736	1,203	9,846	15,732	210	468	1,552	4,690	3	6	2	4
Arad	96	180	1,744	2,867	40	75	620	1,022	1	1	1	1
Caras-Severin	109	266	3,375	4,343	51	127	493	1,263	1	1	4	4
Hunedoara	172	361	2,193	3,979	53	113	480	942	1	2	2	2
Timiș	138	253	2,993	4,562	42	80	421	841	1	1	1	1
West	515	1,060	10,305	15,751	186	395	2,014	4,068	4	5	8	8
Dolj	31	94	751	1,792	11	29	96	337	0	0	0	0
Gorj	37	196	525	2,114	13	96	190	788	0	0	1	1
Mehedinți	44	101	665	1,298	27	58	207	504	0	0	0	0
Olt	9	39	253	613	0	7	0	47	0	0	0	0
Vâlcea	199	348	4,825	6,383	60	130	1,164	1,277	3	4	0	1
South-West	320	778	7,019	12,200	111	320	1,657	2,953	3	4	1	2
<i>Macro-region 4</i>	<i>835</i>	<i>1,838</i>	<i>17,324</i>	<i>27,951</i>	<i>297</i>	<i>715</i>	<i>3,671</i>	<i>7,021</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10</i>
Total	6,137	11,345	114,880	179,695	3,054	5,353	25,427	54,816	29	41	*35	*47

Note*: The total does not include the local resort Snagov, Ilfov County

Note:** Macro-region 3 does not include Bucharest and Ilfov county

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Appendix 2. Lodgings and rooms distribution by counties and regions

County/Region	% of total rural lodgings		% of total rural rooms		Rural resorts of national interest		Rural resorts of local interest		World (UNESCO) heritage sites in rural areas
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	
Bihor	4.03	5.55	16.61	9.50	1	1	3	3	
Bistrita-Nasaud	1.05	1.44	0.87	1.24	0	0	0	0	
Cluj	4.49	4.22	4.03	3.45	0	0	0	2	
Maramureș	8.22	4.58	3.46	2.90	0	0	1	1	7 wooden churches
Salaj	0.20	0.92	0.34	0.80	0	0	0	0	
Satu-Mare	0.23	0.49	0.31	0.59	0	0	0	0	
North-West	18.22	17.20	25.62	18.48	1	1	4	6	
Alba	4.32	3.89	2.29	2.97	0	0	0	2	1 fortified church; 1 Dacian fortress
Brașov	9.63	10.97	5.80	9.40	0	0	0	2	2 fortified churches
Covasna	2.10	1.77	1.27	1.74	0	0	1	1	
Harghita	21.12	5.66	6.87	3.64	0	0	2	2	1 fortified church
Mureș	1.64	1.89	1.25	1.86	0	0	0	0	1 fortified church
Sibiu	2.72	3.89	2.10	3.56	0	0	1	1	2 fortified churches
Center	41.52	28.07	19.58	23.18	0	0	4	8	
<i>Macro-region 1</i>	<i>59.74</i>	<i>45.27</i>	<i>45.20</i>	<i>41.66</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>14</i>	

County/Region	% of total rural lodgings		% of total rural rooms		Rural resorts of national interest		Rural resorts of local interest		World (UNESCO) heritage sites in rural areas
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	
Bacau	1.11	1.40	1.24	1.22	0	0	0	0	
Botosani	0.26	0.30	0.22	0.20	0	0	0	0	
Iasi	0.56	0.86	0.42	0.84	0	0	0	0	
Neamț	3.41	4.69	4.26	4.19	0	0	2	2	
Suceava	5.76	7.30	4.26	5.28	0	0	0	0	5 painted churches
Vaslui	0.13	0.32	0.09	0.27	0	0	0	0	
North-East	11.23	14.87	10.49	12.00	0	0	2	2	
Brăila	0.26	0.37	1.56	1.07	0	0	1	1	
Buzau	1.28	1.92	2.46	2.12	0	0	1	1	
Constanța	5.40	8.48	12.62	15.45	1	1	0	0	
Galați	0.20	0.17	0.23	0.17	0	0	0	0	
Tulcea	3.54	5.72	4.99	5.27	0	0	0	0	the Danube Delta – natural World heritage
Vrancea	1.77	1.12	1.90	0.88	0	0	1	1	
South-East	12.44	17.78	23.76	24.97	1	1	3	3	
Macro-region 2	23.67	32.65	34.24	36.97	1	1	5	5	
Argeș	2.98	4.89	2.57	4.43	0	0	1	1	
Călărași	0.10	0.15	0.10	0.14	0	0	0	0	
Dambovita	0.92	1.25	1.05	1.53	0	0	0	0	
Giurgiu	0.20	0.37	0.23	0.30	0	0	0	0	
Ialomița	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.03	0	0	0	0	
Prahova	2.65	1.89	2.14	2.02	0	0	0	1	
Teleorman	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.10	0	0	0	0	
South-Muntenia	6.87	8.74	6.11	8.56	0	0	1	2	
Macro-region 3	6.87	8.74	6.11	8.56	0	0	1	2	
Arad	1.31	1.40	2.44	1.86	1	1	0	0	
Caraș-Severin	1.67	2.37	1.94	2.30	0	0	3	3	
Hunedoara	1.74	2.11	1.89	1.72	0	0	1	1	5 Dacian fortresses
Timiș	1.38	1.49	1.66	1.53	0	0	1	1	
West	6.10	7.37	7.93	7.42	1	1	5	5	
Dolj	0.36	0.54	0.38	0.61	0	0	0	0	
Gorj	0.43	1.79	0.75	1.44	0	0	1	1	
Mehedinți	0.88	1.08	0.81	0.92	0	0	0	0	
Olt	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.09	0	0	0	0	
Vâlcea	1.96	2.43	4.58	2.33	1	1	0	0	
South-West	3.62	5.97	6.52	5.39	1	1	1	1	
Macro-region 4	9.72	13.34	14.45	12.81	2	2	6	6	
National level (rural)	100	100	100	100	4	4	20	27	

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

**Appendix 3. Number of communes reporting lodgings,
number of communes concentrating 10 lodgings or more,
number of communes with tourist potential**

County/ Region	Communes (INSSE)		Communes reporting lodgings		Concentration 2005 (10 or more lodgings)			Concentration 2016 (10 or more lodgings)			Communes with tourist potential* (NRDP 2007-2013)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	com- munes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	com- munes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	High tourist resources concentra- tion	Very high tourist resources concentration
Bihor	90	91	25	38	2	51.22	87.24	2	71.38	83.09	23	3
Bistrita- Nasaud	58	58	9	28	0	0	0	2	31.17	37.30	30	7
Cluj	75	75	26	41	3	52.55	30.63	6	56.64	50.63	27	0
Maramureş	63	63	34	39	11	76.49	71.02	8	60.41	58.22	44	10
Salaj	57	57	5	23	0	0	0	1	20.41	20.86	31	0
Satu-Mare	59	59	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
North-West	402	403	105	186	16	58.81	70.97	19	56.74	64.71	165	20
Alba	66	67	19	33	4	64.39	60.03	5	60.58	61.98	34	11
Braşov	48	48	20	32	4	85.03	83.31	8	87.90	69.85	29	4
Covasna	40	40	18	26	1	40.63	18.83	2	27.37	28.35	20	7
Harghita	58	58	37	44	18	94.26	90.38	6	66.67	62.81	35	1
Mureş	91	91	20	36	0	0	0	1	10.89	13.05	57	2
Sibiu	53	53	16	24	2	36.14	21.87	7	67.79	70.35	27	8
Center	356	357	130	195	29	78.79	66.94	29	68.04	60.14	202	33
Macro- region 1	758	760	235	381	45	72.70	69.22	48	63.75	62.16	367	53
Bacau	85	85	16	25	0	0	0	1	20.00	13.04	14	0
Botosani	71	71	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
Iasi	93	93	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0
Neamţ	78	78	22	36	2	47.12	33.89	6	66.14	61.73	36	7
Suceava	97	98	32	54	6	57.95	52.59	13	73.15	74.93	34	7
Vaslui	81	81	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
North-East	505	506	87	152	8	44.02	35.11	20	58.67	55.81	116	14
Brăila	40	40	2	6	0	0	0	1	55.00	25.94	14	0
Buzau	82	82	13	28	1	46.15	69.17	2	45.63	54.40	15	1
Constanţa	58	58	7	14	2	91.57	94.61	3	93.61	96.34	19	6
Galaţi	60	61	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0
Tulcea	46	46	13	18	5	77.78	81.17	6	83.99	82.94	21	3
Vrancea	68	68	18	21	1	57.41	40.79	1	53.33	57.32	19	0
South-East	354	355	55	93	9	74.74	77.72	13	81.09	84.89	103	10
Macro- region 2	859	861	142	245	17	60.17	64.68	33	70.88	75.44	219	24

County/ Region	Communes (INSSE)		Communes reporting lodgings		Concentration 2005 (10 or more lodgings)			Concentration 2016 (10 or more lodgings)			Communes with tourist potential* (NRDP 2007-2013)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	com- munes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	com- munes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	High tourist resources concentra- tion	Very high tourist resources concentration
Argeş	95	95	20	41	3	57.14	50.69	5	59.54	61.83	49	1
Călăraşi	49	50	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dambovita	82	82	11	25	1	57.14	66.67	1	41.79	54.58	18	1
Giurgiu	51	51	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
Ialomiţa	58	59	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Prahova	90	90	17	20	1	48.15	52.67	2	47.52	49.05	18	0
Teleorman	92	92	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
South- Muntenia	517	519	56	110	5	50.95	51.22	8	49.97	53.39	95	3
<i>Macro- region 3</i>	<i>517</i>	<i>519</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>50.95</i>	<i>51.22</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>49.97</i>	<i>53.39</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>3</i>
Arad	68	68	15	20	1	37.50	66.13	1	34.67	50.88	12	2
Caraş- Severin	69	69	11	33	2	41.18	19.88	5	56.69	63.10	26	5
Hunedoara	55	55	16	30	1	24.53	12.08	1	21.24	23.14	33	5
Timiş	85	85	8	28	2	50.00	30.40	1	13.75	2.50	9	0
West	277	277	50	111	6	37.63	34.46	8	33.67	38.25	80	12
Dolj	104	104	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0
Gorj	61	61	8	18	0	0	0	3	62.50	63.96	27	3
Mehedinţi	61	61	8	12	1	37.04	17.39	2	65.52	55.16	16	1
Olt	104	104	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Vâlcea	78	78	19	23	1	36.67	80.58	3	63.08	74.00	27	2
South-West	408	408	43	74	2	28.83	58.78	8	56.25	58.48	84	6
<i>Macro- region 4</i>	<i>685</i>	<i>685</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>185</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>34.34</i>	<i>45.44</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>43.78</i>	<i>46.76</i>	<i>164</i>	<i>18</i>
National level (rural)	2,819	2,825	526	921	75	64.51	63.13	105	62.17	64.25	845	98

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database, on NIS data and on the NRDP data (footnote 8)

Appendix 4. Structure of accommodation facilities by classification (%)

County/Region & year	1* No	1*Rooms	2* No	2*Rooms	3* No	3*Rooms	4* No	4*Rooms	5* No	5*Rooms	
Bihor	2005	23.58	8.10	37.40	69.15	32.52	21.31	6.50	1.44	0	0
	2016	9.09	2.32	28.62	40.15	58.59	46.41	3.37	7.81	0.33	3.31
Bistrita-Nasaud	2005	21.87	14.48	71.88	47.51	6.25	38.01	0	0	0	0
	2016	1.30	0.59	38.96	29.81	53.25	64.90	6.49	4.70	0	0
Cluj	2005	6.57	12.10	78.83	69.27	13.87	17.76	0	0	0.73	0.87
	2016	5.31	4.55	41.15	23.07	46.02	55.82	6.64	12.49	0.88	4.07
Maramureş	2005	4.78	2.73	88.05	81.47	7.17	15.80	0	0	0	0
	2016	5.71	4.22	48.57	41.40	42.45	49.02	2.86	4.73	0.41	0.63
Salaj	2005	33.33	73.56	50.00	22.99	16.67	3.45	0	0	0	0
	2016	4.08	3.85	30.61	25.62	59.18	63.04	4.08	5.67	2.05	1.82
Satu-Mare	2005	0	0	85.71	93.59	14.29	6.41	0	0	0	0
	2016	0	0	30.77	28.17	61.54	67.49	7.69	4.34	0	0
North-West	2005	10.61	9.00	73.20	69.77	14.57	20.16	1.44	0.94	0.18	0.13
	2016	6.09	2.91	38.04	35.45	50.87	51.21	4.46	7.79	0.54	2.64
Alba	2005	26.52	19.38	62.12	59.35	9.09	18.18	0.76	1.72	1.51	1.37
	2016	9.62	6.94	38.46	30.04	43.75	49.14	7.69	13.33	0.48	0.55
Braşov	2005	23.13	19.88	54.08	52.78	17.35	20.15	3.74	5.43	1.70	1.76
	2016	2.39	1.90	21.81	18.31	65.25	67.82	9.37	10.38	1.18	1.59
Covasna	2005	54.69	32.72	39.06	37.96	4.69	28.40	1.56	0.92	0	0
	2016	25.27	29.81	32.63	24.79	35.79	30.02	5.26	13.81	1.05	1.57
Harghita	2005	16.43	13.80	79.53	80.94	4.04	5.26	0	0	0	0
	2016	6.60	7.01	44.22	38.24	48.51	53.95	0.67	0.80	0	0
Mureş	2005	16.00	11.29	68.00	58.31	16.00	30.40	0	0	0	0
	2016	1.98	1.28	35.64	33.85	53.47	52.80	6.93	10.60	1.98	1.47
Sibiu	2005	12.05	11.40	67.47	52.90	16.87	30.47	2.41	3.36	1.20	1.87
	2016	6.25	8.24	30.29	23.35	51.92	55.97	10.10	10.75	1.44	1.69
Center	2005	20.66	17.06	68.53	62.83	8.99	17.00	1.18	2.23	0.64	0.88
	2016	6.19	6.37	31.42	25.45	54.39	57.38	7.06	9.58	0.94	1.22
Macro-region 1	2005	17.60	12.49	69.96	66.76	10.69	18.79	1.26	1.50	0.49	0.46
	2016	6.15	4.84	33.94	29.89	53.06	54.64	6.07	8.79	0.78	1.84
Bacau	2005	35.29	39.24	52.94	38.61	11.77	22.15	0	0	0	0
	2016	8.00	5.40	41.33	30.28	48.00	57.57	2.67	6.75	0	0
Botosani	2005	12.50	8.77	87.50	91.23	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	6.25	3.57	31.25	52.68	37.50	25.89	25.00	17.86	0	0
Iasi	2005	17.65	19.81	82.35	80.19	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	8.70	5.40	19.57	14.90	65.22	73.87	6.51	5.83	0	0
Neamţ	2005	11.54	13.21	50.96	47.92	35.58	37.12	1.92	1.75	0	0
	2016	3.19	2.74	28.29	28.78	58.96	57.73	9.16	10.36	0.40	0.39
Suceava	2005	10.80	10.91	69.89	61.55	15.34	20.06	3.97	7.48	0	0
	2016	3.84	2.84	28.13	25.48	52.94	50.59	14.07	19.54	1.02	1.55
Vaslui	2005	50.00	31.82	25.00	45.45	25.00	22.73	0	0	0	0
	2016	5.88	6.71	35.29	33.56	52.94	51.68	5.89	8.05	0	0

CORNELIA POP, MONICA MARIA COROS, CRISTINA BALINT

County/Region & year	1* No	1*Rooms	2* No	2*Rooms	3* No	3*Rooms	4* No	4*Rooms	5* No	5*Rooms	
North-East	2005	14.29	15.68	62.97	54.54	20.12	26.03	2.62	3.75	0	0
	2016	4.40	3.34	29.15	27.02	54.77	55.03	11.06	13.78	0.62	0.83
Brăila	2005	0	0	87.50	98.49	12.50	1.51	0	0	0	0
	2016	10.00	2.21	50.00	75.09	40.00	22.70	0	0	0	0
Buzau	2005	41.02	41.53	48.72	49.20	5.13	4.47	5.13	4.79	0	0
	2016	6.80	4.22	40.78	43.71	44.65	45.60	7.77	6.47	0	0
Constanța	2005	37.58	39.14	36.36	37.33	25.45	23.28	0.61	0.25	0	0
	2016	29.07	21.86	37.44	36.43	32.82	39.33	0.67	2.38	0	0
Galați	2005	50.00	46.55	50.00	53.45	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	11.11	23.16	11.12	32.63	44.44	32.63	11.11	5.26	22.22	6.32
Tulcea	2005	8.33	23.48	30.56	15.76	41.67	36.41	17.59	21.51	1.85	2.84
	2016	2.29	7.10	14.38	13.12	45.42	42.68	25.82	32.95	12.09	4.15
Vrancea	2005	22.22	41.40	61.11	43.69	14.82	12.84	1.85	2.07	0	0
	2016	10.00	11.96	30.00	32.16	51.67	46.60	6.67	6.60	1.66	2.68
South-East	2005	26.84	33.78	40.79	38.71	25.79	21.60	6.05	5.31	0.52	0.60
	2016	16.28	16.06	29.94	33.60	39.60	40.07	9.98	9.25	4.20	1.02
Macro-region 2	2005	20.89	28.24	51.31	43.56	23.10	22.96	4.43	4.83	0.27	0.41
	2016	10.87	11.93	29.58	31.46	46.51	44.93	10.47	10.73	2.57	0.95
Argeș	2005	17.58	20.37	70.33	64.78	9.89	10.87	2.20	3.98	0	0
	2016	2.67	2.59	38.17	33.44	50.76	51.25	8.02	12.59	0.38	0.13
Călărași	2005	33.33	30.77	0	0	66.67	69.23	0	0	0	0
	2016	0	0	25.00	24.00	75.00	76.00	0	0	0	0
Dambovita	2005	25.00	17.98	53.57	44.19	21.43	37.83	0	0	0	0
	2016	13.43	20.21	25.37	22.47	49.25	42.81	11.95	14.51	0	0
Giurgiu	2005	0	0	50.00	37.93	50.00	62.07	0	0	0	0
	2016	15.00	8.58	30.00	29.45	35.00	31.29	10.00	15.34	10.00	15.34
Ialomița	2005	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	66.67	57.89	0	0	33.33	42.11	0	0	0	0
Prahova	2005	11.11	10.68	67.90	67.59	18.52	18.05	2.47	3.68	0	0
	2016	3.96	3.44	31.68	30.68	50.50	50.23	10.89	11.22	2.97	4.43
Teleorman	2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	0	0	14.29	12.50	57.14	62.50	28.57	25.00	0	0
South-Muntenia	2005	16.19	16.24	65.24	59.92	16.67	20.88	1.90	2.96	0	0
	2016	5.34	6.31	33.76	30.15	50.21	49.30	9.40	12.60	1.29	1.64
Macro-region 3	2005	16.19	16.24	65.24	59.92	16.67	20.88	1.90	2.96	0	0
	2016	5.34	6.31	33.76	30.15	50.21	49.30	9.40	12.60	1.29	1.64
Arad	2005	27.50	41.61	55.00	35.97	15.00	21.61	2.50	0.81	0	0
	2016	21.33	27.30	36.00	34.44	38.67	35.13	4.00	3.13	0	0
Caraș-Severin	2005	39.22	37.73	50.98	52.13	9.80	10.14	0	0	0	0
	2016	16.54	13.94	24.41	23.27	57.48	60.89	1.57	1.90	0	0
Hunedoara	2005	15.09	29.58	56.60	35.83	22.64	25.21	5.67	9.38	0	0
	2016	10.62	6.90	26.55	21.02	59.29	65.71	2.65	6.05	0.89	0.32
Timiș	2005	59.52	14.25	35.71	73.87	4.76	11.88	0	0	0	0
	2016	2.50	1.78	21.25	25.92	61.25	57.79	15.00	14.51	0	0
West	2005	34.41	32.08	50.00	47.82	13.44	17.63	2.15	2.47	0	0
	2016	12.91	13.15	26.58	26.11	55.19	54.89	5.07	5.78	0.25	0.07

ROMANIAN RURAL TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region & year	1* No	1*Rooms	2* No	2*Rooms	3* No	3*Rooms	4* No	4*Rooms	5* No	5*Rooms	
Dolj	2005	9.09	4.17	72.73	84.38	9.09	8.33	9.09	3.12	0	0
	2016	6.90	7.72	31.03	29.08	41.38	40.65	17.24	21.07	3.45	1.48
Gorj	2005	15.39	51.05	69.23	38.42	15.38	10.53	0	0	0	0
	2016	3.13	10.03	26.04	24.75	62.50	56.47	8.33	8.75	0	0
Mehedinți	2005	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	1.73	0.59	24.14	31.35	60.34	52.98	13.79	15.08	0	0
Olt	2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	14.29	25.53	57.14	46.81	28.57	27.66	0	0	0	0
Vâlcea	2005	15.00	38.14	71.67	57.56	13.33	4.30	0	0	0	0
	2016	4.62	16.52	50.00	49.49	35.38	25.92	9.23	7.75	0.77	0.32
South-West	2005	10.81	32.89	78.38	62.22	9.91	4.71	0.90	0.18	0	0
	2016	4.06	11.21	36.56	37.42	48.44	40.40	10.31	10.67	0.63	0.30
Macro-region 4	2005	25.59	32.44	60.61	54.32	12.12	11.80	1.68	1.44	0	0
	2016	8.95	12.33	31.05	30.86	52.17	48.80	7.41	7.83	0.42	0.18
National level (rural)	2005	19.06	20.99	64.31	56.60	14.18	19.33	2.10	2.73	0.35	0.35
	2016	8.00	8.55	32.11	30.62	50.55	49.84	7.98	9.71	1.36	1.28

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Appendix 5. Structure of accommodation facilities by lodging capacity [number of rooms (%)]

County/Region & year	1-4 rooms	5-9 rooms	10-49 rooms	50-99 rooms	100-199 rooms	200-499 rooms	≥500 rooms	
Bihor	2005	37.40	30.08	19.51	4.07	4.07	4.07	0.80
	2016	24.92	36.03	34.01	1.68	1.68	1.68	0
Bistrita-Nasaud	2005	46.88	37.50	12.50	3.12	0	0	0
	2016	28.57	48.05	22.08	1.30	0	0	0
Cluj	2005	58.39	20.44	20.44	0.73	0	0	0
	2016	38.94	33.63	26.55	0.44	0.44	0	0
Maramureș	2005	87.25	10.36	1.59	0.80	0	0	0
	2016	45.31	39.18	15.10	0.41	0	0	0
Salaj	2005	16.67	33.33	50.00	0	0	0	0
	2016	26.53	46.94	26.53	0	0	0	0
Satu-Mare	2005	14.29	42.85	42.86	0	0	0	0
	2016	15.38	34.62	50.00	0	0	0	0
North-West	2005	65.11	19.42	11.87	1.62	0.90	0.90	0.18
	2016	33.91	37.83	26.20	0.87	0.65	0.54	0
Alba	2005	59.85	31.82	8.33	0	0	0	0
	2016	28.37	41.83	29.80	0	0	0	0
Brașov	2005	57.14	32.65	10.21	0	0	0	0
	2016	22.66	47.36	28.79	0.85	0.34	0	0
Covasna	2005	75.00	17.19	6.25	1.56	0	0	0
	2016	32.63	41.05	24.21	0	2.11	0	0

County/Region & year		1-4 rooms	5-9 rooms	10-49 rooms	50-99 rooms	100-199 rooms	200-499 rooms	≥500 rooms
Harghita	2005	91.63	6.35	2.02	0	0	0	0
	2016	43.57	33.33	23.10	0	0	0	0
Mureș	2005	64.00	20.00	16.00	0	0	0	0
	2016	15.85	39.60	44.55	0	0	0	0
Sibiu	2005	63.86	16.87	19.27	0	0	0	0
	2016	25.00	39.42	35.10	0.48	0	0	0
Center	2005	76.58	16.88	6.47	0.07	0	0	0
	2016	28.16	41.74	29.43	0.40	0.27	0	0
Macro-region 1	2005	73.08	17.65	8.11	0.55	0.28	0.28	0.05
	2016	30.35	40.26	28.20	0.54	0.41	0.20	0
Bacau	2005	38.23	23.53	38.24	0	0	0	0
	2016	33.33	30.67	36.00	0	0	0	0
Botosani	2005	50.00	25.00	25.00	0	0	0	0
	2016	43.75	37.50	18.75	0	0	0	0
Iasi	2005	35.29	35.30	29.41	0	0	0	0
	2016	28.26	26.09	43.48	2.17	0	0	0
Neamț	2005	42.31	25.96	28.85	1.92	0.96	0	0
	2016	26.69	43.43	28.28	1.20	0.40	0	0
Suceava	2005	48.30	35.80	15.90	0	0	0	0
	2016	34.78	40.92	24.30	0	0	0	0
Vaslui	2005	50.00	25.00	25.00	0	0	0	0
	2016	23.53	23.53	52.94	0	0	0	0
North-East	2005	44.90	31.20	23.03	0.58	0.29	0	0
	2016	31.66	39.45	28.27	0.50	0.12	0	0
Brăila	2005	0	12.50	37.50	37.50	12.50	0	0
	2016	10.00	15.00	55.00	15.00	5.00	0	0
Buzau	2005	17.95	41.03	35.90	5.12	0	0	0
	2016	12.62	43.69	42.72	0.97	0	0	0
Constanța	2005	4.24	33.33	53.94	6.67	1.82	0	0
	2016	8.59	25.33	61.23	3.52	1.10	0	0.23
Galați	2005	33.33	0	66.67	0	0	0	0
	2016	33.33	33.33	33.34	0	0	0	0
Tulcea	2005	25.00	39.81	30.56	4.63	0	0	0
	2016	33.99	33.33	29.74	2.61	0.33	0	0
Vrancea	2005	38.89	44.44	14.82	0	1.85	0	0
	2016	23.33	43.34	33.33	0	0	0	0
South-East	2005	16.84	36.58	39.73	5.53	1.32	0	0
	2016	18.38	30.88	46.95	2.94	0.74	0	0.11
Macro-region 2	2005	30.15	34.02	31.81	3.18	0.84	0	0
	2016	24.43	34.78	38.44	1.83	0.46	0	0.06
Argeș	2005	43.96	31.87	24.17	0	0	0	0
	2016	23.66	41.22	33.97	1.15	0	0	0
Călărași	2005	0	66.67	33.33	0	0	0	0
	2016	12.50	25.00	62.50	0	0	0	0

ROMANIAN RURAL TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region & year	1-4 rooms	5-9 rooms	10-49 rooms	50-99 rooms	100-199 rooms	200-499 rooms	≥500 rooms	
Dambovita	2005	28.57	32.14	35.71	3.58	0	0	0
	2016	14.93	25.37	59.70	0	0	0	0
Giurgiu	2005	16.67	33.33	50.00	0	0	0	0
	2016	20.00	35.00	45.00	0	0	0	0
Ialomița	2005	0	100	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	0	100	0	0	0	0	0
Prahova	2005	41.98	39.51	17.28	1.23	0	0	0
	2016	12.87	37.63	49.50	0	0	0	0
Teleorman	2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	14.29	57.14	28.57	0	0	0	0
South-Muntenia	2005	39.52	35.71	23.82	0.95	0	0	0
	2016	19.44	38.25	41.67	0.64	0	0	0
Macro-region 3	2005	39.52	35.71	23.82	0.95	0	0	0
	2016	19.44	38.25	41.67	0.64	0	0	0
Arad	2005	20.00	37.50	35.00	5.00	2.50	0	0
	2016	25.33	30.67	40.00	2.67	1.33	0	0
Caraș-Severin	2005	33.33	29.42	37.25	0	0	0	0
	2016	18.11	42.52	39.37	0	0	0	0
Hunedoara	2005	45.28	26.42	26.42	1.88	0	0	0
	2016	33.63	38.05	28.32	0	0	0	0
Timiș	2005	59.52	14.29	21.43	2.38	2.38	0	0
	2016	31.25	22.50	46.25	0	0	0	0
West	2005	39.78	26.88	30.11	2.15	1.08	0	0
	2016	26.58	34.94	37.72	0.51	0.25	0	0
Dolj	2005	36.36	27.27	36.37	0	0	0	0
	2016	17.24	37.93	41.38	3.45	0	0	0
Gorj	2005	30.77	23.08	38.46	7.69	0	0	0
	2016	22.92	51.04	25.00	1.04	0	0	0
Mehedinți	2005	70.37	18.52	7.41	0	3.70	0	0
	2016	27.59	46.55	24.14	0	1.72	0	0
Olt	2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2016	42.86	28.57	28.57	0	0	0	0
Vâlcea	2005	58.33	21.67	11.67	0	8.33	0	0
	2016	32.31	44.62	20.77	0.77	1.53	0	0
South-West	2005	55.86	21.62	16.22	0.90	5.40	0	0
	2016	27.50	45.94	24.68	0.94	0.94	0	0
Macro-region 4	2005	45.79	24.92	24.92	1.68	2.69	0	0
	2016	26.99	39.86	31.89	0.70	0.56	0	0
National level (rural)	2005	57.96	23.48	16.44	1.31	0.62	0.16	0.03
	2016	27.01	38.24	33.22	1.01	0.41	0.09	0.02

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Appendix 6. The profile of counties and regions based on available lodgings and rooms

County/Region 1) Growth rate of rural lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of rural lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Bihor 1) 2.41 (no.) / 1.23 (rooms) 2a) 76.40 % / 85.30% (2005) 2b) 75.77% / 73.93% (2016)	9	11	Pensions (no.) 62.60%	Pensions (no.) 56.23%	2 stars (no.) 37.40%	3 stars (no.) 58.59%	1-4 rooms (no.) 37.40%	5-9 rooms (no.) 36.03%
			Hotels (rooms) 83.09%	Hotels (rooms) 58.45%	2 stars (rooms) 69.15%	3 stars (rooms) 46.41%		
Bistrita-Nasaud 1) 2.41 (no.) / 3.08 (rooms) 2a) 62.75 % / 17.15% (2005) 2b) 64.17% / 36.61% (2016)	4	7	Pensions (no.) 87.50%	Pensions (no.) 79.22%	2 stars (no.) 71.88%	3 stars (no.) 53.25%	1-4 rooms (no.) 46.88%	5-9 rooms (no.) 48.05%
			Pensions (rooms) 66.97%	Pensions (rooms) 59.32%	2 stars (rooms) 47.51%	3 stars (rooms) 64.90%		
Cluj 1) 1.65 (no.) / 1.84 (rooms) 2a) 62.84 % / 35.50% (2005) 2b) 48.60% / 32.94% (2016)	7	12	Pensions (no.) 83.21%	Pensions (no.) 69.47%	2 stars (no.) 78.83%	3 stars (no.) 46.02%	1-4 rooms (no.) 58.39%	1-4 rooms (no.) 38.94%
			Pensions (rooms) 44.00%	Pensions (rooms) 53.55%	2 stars (rooms) 69.27%	3 stars (rooms) 55.82%		
Maramureş 1) 0.98 (no.) / 1.80 (rooms) 2a) 73.82 % / 43.20% (2005) 2b) 57.78% / 42.97% (2016)	3	10	Pensions (no.) 98.41%	Pensions (no.) 78.77%	2 stars (no.) 88.05%	2 stars (no.) 48.57%	1-4 rooms (no.) 87.25%	1-4 rooms (no.) 45.31%
			Pensions (rooms) 78.98%	Pensions (rooms) 67.67%	2 stars (rooms) 81.47%	3 stars (rooms) 49.02%		
Salaj 1) 8.17 (no.) / 5.07 (rooms) 2a) 50.00 % / 43.94% (2005) 2b) 63.64% / 50.57% (2016)	3	6	Pensions (no.) 66.67%	Pensions (no.) 79.59%	2 stars (no.) 50.00%	3 stars (no.) 59.18%	10-49 rooms (no.) 50.00%	5-9 rooms (no.) 46.94%
			Hotels (rooms) 44.83%	Pensions (rooms) 59.64%	1 star (rooms) 73.56%	3 stars (rooms) 63.04%		
Satu-Mare 1) 3.71 (no.) / 4.14 (rooms) 2a) 25.00 % / 14.83% (2005) 2b) 25.24% / 21.35% (2016)	3	5	Pensions (no.) 71.43%	Pensions (no.) 69.24%	2 stars (no.) 85.71%	3 stars (no.) 61.54%	10-49 rooms (no.) 42.86%	10-49 rooms (no.) 50.00%
			Pensions (rooms) 46.15%	Pensions (rooms) 43.65%	2 stars (rooms) 93.59%	3 stars (rooms) 67.49%		

ROMANIAN RURAL TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region 1) Growth rate of rural lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of rural lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
North-West 1) 1.65 (no.) / 1.55 (rooms) 2a) 68.64 % / 54.79% (2005) 2b) 58.19% / 48.89% (2016)	10	13	Pensions (no.) 85.43%	Pensions (no.) 69.02%	2 stars (no.) 73.20%	3 stars (no.) 50.87%	1-4 rooms (no.) 65.11%	5-9 rooms (no.) 37.83%
			Hotels (rooms) 62.43%	Pensions (rooms) 42.16%	2 stars (rooms) 69.77%	3 stars (rooms) 51.21%		
Alba 1) 1.58 (no.) / 2.79 (rooms) 2a) 85.16 % / 57.78% (2005) 2b) 71.97% / 52.23% (2016)	5	11	Pensions (no.) 93.94%	Pensions (no.) 69.23%	2 stars (no.) 62.12%	3 stars (no.) 43.75%	1-4 rooms (no.) 59.85%	5-9 rooms (no.) 41.83%
			Pensions (rooms) 84.91%	Pensions (rooms) 64.93%	2 stars (rooms) 59.35%	3 stars (rooms) 49.14%		
Braşov 1) 1.99 (no.) / 3.50 (rooms) 2a) 45.30 % / 21.05% (2005) 2b) 46.74% / 33.68% (2016)	8	13	Pensions (no.) 92.86%	Pensions (no.) 77.34%	2 stars (no.) 54.08%	3 stars (no.) 65.25%	1-4 rooms (no.) 57.14%	5-9 rooms (no.) 47.36%
			Pensions (rooms) 77.20%	Pensions (rooms) 67.13%	2 stars (rooms) 52.78%	3 stars (rooms) 67.82%		
Covasna 1) 1.48 (no.) / 2.95 (rooms) 2a) 56.14 % / 18.34% (2005) 2b) 56.55% / 35.54% (2016)	5	11	Pensions (no.) 87.50%	Pensions (no.) 66.31%	1 stars (no.) 54.69%	3 stars (no.) 35.79%	1-4 rooms (no.) 75.00%	5-9 rooms (no.) 41.05%
			Pensions (rooms) 51.85%	Pensions (rooms) 41.73%	2 stars (rooms) 37.96%	3 stars (rooms) 30.02%		
Harghita 1) 0.47 (no.) / 1.14 (rooms) 2a) 83.66 % / 51.78% (2005) 2b) 58.05% / 40.72% (2016)	7	8	Pensions (no.) 98.45%	Pensions (no.) 81.52%	2 stars (no.) 79.53%	3 stars (no.) 48.51%	1-4 rooms (no.) 91.63%	1-4 rooms (no.) 43.57%
			Pensions (rooms) 91.59%	Pensions (rooms) 76.68%	2 stars (rooms) 80.94%	3 stars (rooms) 53.95%		
Mureş 1) 2.02 (no.) / 3.19 (rooms) 2a) 42.02 % / 14.29% (2005) 2b) 27.90% / 19.40% (2016)	4	12	Pensions (no.) 82.00%	Pensions (no.) 67.33%	2 stars (no.) 68.00%	3 stars (no.) 53.47%	1-4 rooms (no.) 64.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 44.55%
			Pensions (rooms) 52.04%	Pensions (rooms) 55.64%	2 stars (rooms) 58.31%	3 stars (rooms) 52.80%		
Sibiu 1) 2.51 (no.) / 3.65 (rooms) 2a) 31.09 % / 22.63% (2005) 2b) 42.19% / 33.34% (2016)	7	10	Pensions (no.) 80.72%	Pensions (no.) 68.75%	2 stars (no.) 67.47%	3 stars (no.) 51.92%	1-4 rooms (no.) 63.86%	5-9 rooms (no.) 39.42%
			Pensions (rooms) 47.85%	Pensions (rooms) 58.52%	2 stars (rooms) 52.90%	3 stars (rooms) 55.97%		

County/Region 1) Growth rate of rural lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of rural lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Center 1) 1.18 (no.) / 2.55 (rooms) 2a) 61.11 % / 28.07% (2005) 2b) 48.61% / 34.23% (2016)	11	15	Pensions (no.) 94.32%	Pensions (no.) 74.50%	2 stars (no.) 68.53%	3 stars (no.) 54.39%	1-4 rooms (no.) 76.58%	5-9 rooms (no.) 41.74%
			Pensions (rooms) 76.74%	Pensions (rooms) 64.20%	2 stars (rooms) 62.83%	3 stars (rooms) 57.38%		
Macro-region 1 1) 1.33 (no.) / 1.99 (rooms) 2a) 63.22 % / 38.79% (2005) 2b) 51.85% / 39.48% (2016)	12	15	Pensions (no.) 91.61%	Pensions (no.) 72.42%	2 stars (no.) 69.96%	3 stars (no.) 53.06%	1-4 rooms (no.) 73.08%	5-9 rooms (no.) 40.26%
			Pensions (rooms) 48.27%	Pensions (rooms) 54.42%	2 stars (rooms) 66.76%	3 stars (rooms) 54.64%		
Bacau 1) 2.21 (no.) / 2.11 (rooms) 2a) 40.48 % / 18.64% (2005) 2b) 35.21% / 23.89% (2016)	6	8	Pensions (no.) 64.71%	Pensions (no.) 57.33%	2 stars (no.) 52.94%	3 stars (no.) 48.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 38.24%	10-49 rooms (no.) 36.00%
			Pensions (rooms) 40.19%	Pensions (rooms) 49.18%	1 star (rooms) 39.24%	3 stars (rooms) 57.57%		
Botosani 1) 2.00 (no.) / 1.96 (rooms) 2a) 42.11 % / 15.24% (2005) 2b) 47.06% / 22.81% (2016)	2	6	Pensions (no.) 75.00%	Pensions (no.) 62.50%	2 stars (no.) 87.50%	3 stars (no.) 37.50%	1-4 rooms (no.) 50.00%	1-4 rooms (no.) 43.75%
			Pensions (rooms) 59.65%	Pensions (rooms) 42.85%	2 stars (rooms) 91.23%	2 stars (rooms) 52.68%		
Iasi 1) 2.71 (no.) / 4.37 (rooms) 2a) 30.91 % / 9.04% (2005) 2b) 32.62% / 17.97% (2016)	3	11	Pensions (no.) 82.35%	Pensions (no.) 56.52%	2 stars (no.) 82.35%	3 stars (no.) 65.22%	5-9 rooms (no.) 35.30%	10-49 rooms (no.) 43.48%
			Pensions (rooms) 77.36%	Pensions (rooms) 39.96%	2 stars (rooms) 39.96%	3 stars (rooms) 73.87%		
Neamț 1) 2.41 (no.) / 2.12 (rooms) 2a) 74.29 % / 57.76% (2005) 2b) 75.15% / 64.94% (2016)	10	11	Pensions (no.) 73.08%	Pensions (no.) 70.12%	2 stars (no.) 50.96%	3 stars (no.) 58.96%	1-4 rooms (no.) 42.31%	5-9 rooms (no.) 43.43%
			Hotels (rooms) 41.55%	Pensions (rooms) 56.03%	2 stars (rooms) 47.92%	3 stars (rooms) 57.73%		
Suceava 1) 2.22 (no.) / 2.67 (rooms) 2a) 56.96 % / 32.16% (2005) 2b) 59.51% / 42.84% (2016)	9	14	Pensions (no.) 90.34%	Pensions (no.) 75.96%	2 stars (no.) 69.89%	3 stars (no.) 52.94%	1-4 rooms (no.) 48.30%	5-9 rooms (no.) 40.92%
			Pensions (rooms) 70.70%	Pensions (rooms) 68.36%	2 stars (rooms) 61.55%	3 stars (rooms) 50.59%		

ROMANIAN RURAL TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region 1) Growth rate of rural lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of rural lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Vaslui 1) 4.25 (no.) / 6.67 (rooms) 2a) 36.36 % / 8.06% (2005) 2b) 48.57% / 29.39% (2016)	1	3	Pensions (no.) 100.00%	Pensions (no.) 82.35%	1 star (no.) 50.00%	3 stars (no.) 52.94%	1-4 rooms (no.) 50.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 52.94%
			Pensions (rooms) 100.00%	Pensions (rooms) 81.88%	2 stars (rooms) 45.45%	3 stars (rooms) 51.68%		
North-East 1) 2.32 (no.) / 2.47 (rooms) 2a) 55.50 % / 30.46% (2005) 2b) 56.29% / 39.51% (2016)	11	14	Pensions (no.) 81.92%	Pensions (no.) 71.11%	2 stars (no.) 62.97%	3 stars (no.) 54.77%	1-4 rooms (no.) 44.90%	5-9 rooms (no.) 39.45%
			Pensions (rooms) 53.94%	Pensions (rooms) 59.99%	2 stars (rooms) 54.54%	3 stars (rooms) 55.03%		
Brăila 1) 2.50 (no.) / 1.48 (rooms) 2a) 36.36 % / 48.71% (2005) 2b) 42.55% / 52.79% (2016)	4	9	Hotels (rooms) 62.50%	Hotels (rooms) 40.00%	2 stars (no.) 87.50%	2 stars (no.) 50.00%	10-49 rooms (no.)	10-49 rooms (no.)
			Hotels (rooms) 87.91%	Hotels (rooms) 76.96%	2 stars (rooms) 98.49%	2 stars (rooms) 75.09%	37.50%	55.00%
Buzau 1) 2.64 (no.) / 1.85 (rooms) 2a) 76.47 % / 67.10% (2005) 2b) 77.44% / 68.80% (2016)	7	9	Pensions (no.) 56.41%	Pensions (no.) 61.17%	2 stars (no.) 48.72%	3 stars (no.) 44.65%	5-9 rooms (no.) 41.03%	5-9 rooms (no.) 43.69%
			Hotels (rooms) 51.76%	Pensions (rooms) 45.00%	2 stars (rooms) 49.20%	3 stars (rooms) 45.60%		
Constanța 1) 2.75 (no.) / 2.64 (rooms) 2a) 22.15 % / 7.25% (2005) 2b) 30.23% / 16.10% (2016)	10	13	Villas (no.) 33.94%	Rented rooms (no.) 42.95%	1 stars (no.) 37.58%	2 stars (no.) 37.44%	10-49 rooms (no.)	10-49 rooms (no.)
			Villas (rooms) 27.02%	Rented rooms (rooms) 36.17%	1 stars (rooms) 39.14%	3 stars (rooms) 39.33%	53.94%	61.23%
Galați 1) 1.50 (no.) / 1.64 (rooms) 2a) 21.43 % / 9.83% (2005) 2b) 16.98% / 9.29% (2016)	3	6	Motels (no.) 50.00%	Pensions (no.) 44.44%	1star & 2 stars (no.) 50.00%	3 stars (no.) 44.44%	10-49 rooms (no.)	10-49 rooms (no.)
			Motels (rooms) 70.69%	Dwellings (rooms) 32.63%	2 stars (rooms) 53.45%	3 stars (rooms) 32.63%	66.67%	33.34%
Tulcea 1) 2.83 (no.) / 2.28 (rooms) 2a) 70.13 % / 63.90% (2005) 2b) 77.66% / 68.56% (2016)	12	13	Pensions (no.) 44.44%	Pensions (no.) 42.15%	3 stars (no.) 41.67%	3 stars (no.) 45.42%	5-9 rooms (no.) 39.81%	1-4 rooms (no.) 33.99%
			Pensions (rooms) 23.25%	Pensions (rooms) 42.92%	3 stars (rooms) 36.41%	3 stars (rooms) 42.68%		

County/Region 1) Growth rate of rural lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of rural lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Vrancea 1) 1.11 (no.) / 1.00 (rooms) 2a) 85.71 % / 67.55% (2005) 2b) 66.67% / 54.74% (2016)	5	10	Pensions (no.) 85.19%	Pensions (no.) 70.00%	2 stars (no.) 61.11%	3 stars (no.) 51.67%	5-9 rooms (no.) 44.44%	5-9 rooms (no.) 43.44%
			Pensions (rooms) 45.34%	Pensions (rooms) 60.83%	2 stars (rooms) 43.69%	3 stars (rooms) 46.60%		
South-East 1) 2.51 (no.) / 2.26 (rooms) 2a) 35.75 % / 12.25% (2005) 2b) 42.90% / 22.25% (2016)	12	16	Pensions (no.) 41.58%	Pensions (no.) 30.57%	2 stars (no.) 40.79%	3 stars (no.) 39.60%	10-49 rooms (no.) 39.74%	10-49 rooms (no.) 46.95%
			Hotels (rooms) 31.74%	Rooms for rent (rooms) 24.68%	2 stars (rooms) 38.71%	3 stars (rooms) 40.07%		
Macro-region 2 1) 2.42 (no.) / 2.33 (rooms) 2a) 43.01 % / 15.00% (2005) 2b) 48.11% / 25.93% (2016)	13	16	Pensions (no.) 60.72%	Pensions (no.) 49.03%	2 stars (no.) 51.31%	3 stars (no.) 46.51%	5-9 rooms (no.) 34.02%	10-49 rooms (no.) 38.44%
			Pensions (rooms) 28.35%	Pensions (rooms) 32.66%	2 stars (rooms) 43.56%	3 stars (rooms) 44.93%		
Argeş 1) 2.88 (no.) / 3.72 (rooms) 2a) 71.09 % / 39.10% (2005) 2b) 76.38% / 59.60% (2016)	6	10	Pensions (no.) 79.12%	Pensions (no.) 60.69%	2 stars (no.) 70.33%	3 stars (no.) 50.76%	1-4 rooms (no.) 43.96%	5-9 rooms (no.) 41.22%
			Pensions (rooms) 53.45%	Pensions (rooms) 49.17%	2 stars (rooms) 64.78%	3 stars (rooms) 51.25%		
Călăraşi 1) 2.67 (no.) / 2.88 (rooms) 2a) 27.27 % / 9.06% (2005) 2b) 34.78% / 15.79% (2016)	3	4	Pensions (no.) 33.34%	Pensions & rented rooms (no.) 37.50%	3 stars (no.) 66.67%	3 stars (no.) 75.00%	5-9 rooms (no.) 66.67%	10-49 rooms (no.) 62.50%
			Pensions (rooms) 38.46%	Pensions (rooms) 36.00%	3 stars (rooms) 69.23%	3 stars (rooms) 76.00%		
Dambovita 1) 2.39 (no.) / 3.15 (rooms) 2a) 59.57 % / 32.32% (2005) 2b) 65.05% / 50.91% (2016)	4	9	Pensions (no.) 64.29%	Pensions (no.) 59.70%	2 stars (no.) 53.57%	3 stars (no.) 49.25%	10-49 rooms (no.) 35.71%	10-49 rooms (no.) 59.70%
			Pensions (rooms) 39.33%	Pensions (rooms) 38.16%	2 stars (rooms) 44.19%	3 stars (rooms) 42.81%		
Giurgiu 1) 3.33 (no.) / 2.81 (rooms) 2a) 42.86 % / 20.79% (2005)	2	8	Motels & Pensions (no.) 50.00%	Pensions (no.) 35.00%	2 stars & 3 stars (no.) 50.00%	3 stars (no.) 35.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 50.00%	10-49 rooms (no.) 45.00%

ROMANIAN RURAL TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region 1) Growth rate of rural lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of rural lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
2b) 55.56% / 25.39% (2016)			Motels (rooms) 70.69%	Pensions (rooms) 38.03%	3 stars (rooms) 62.07%	3 stars (rooms) 31.29%		
Ialomița 1) 3.00 (no.) / 3.80 (rooms) 2a) 5.26 % / 0.40% (2005) 2b) 10.71% / 2.04% (2016)	1	2	Pensions (no.) 100.00%	Rented rooms (no.) 66.67%	1 star (no.) 100.00%	1 star (no.) 66.67%	5-9 rooms (no.) 100.00%	5-9 rooms (no.) 100.00%
			Pensions (rooms) 100.00%	Rented rooms (rooms) 57.89%	1 star (rooms) 100.00%	1 star (rooms) 57.89%		
Prahova 1) 1.25 (no.) / 2.04 (rooms) 2a) 15.76 % / 10.02% (2005) 2b) 15.61% / 14.64% (2016)	6	11	Pensions (no.) 85.19%	Pensions (no.) 60.40%	2 stars (no.) 67.90%	3 stars (no.) 50.50%	1-4 rooms (no.) 41.98%	10-49 rooms (no.) 49.50%
			Pensions (rooms) 59.30%	Pensions (rooms) 45.88%	2 stars (rooms) 67.59%	3 stars (rooms) 50.23%		
Teleorman 1) n/a (no.) / n/a (rooms) 2a) 0.00 % / 0.00% (2005) 2b) 30.43% / 13.86% (2016)	0	2	0	Pensions (no.) 85.71%	0	3 stars (no.) 57.14%	0	5-9 rooms (no.) 57.14%
			0	Pensions (rooms) 87.50%	0	3 stars (rooms) 62.50%		
South-Muntenia 1) 2.23 (no.) / 3.02 (rooms) 2a) 28.53 % / 15.76% (2005) 2b) 38.90% / 29.81% (2016)	8	12	Pensions (no.) 78.10%	Pensions (no.) 58.98%	2 stars (no.) 65.24%	3 stars (no.) 50.21%	1-4 rooms (no.) 39.52%	10-49 rooms (no.) 41.67%
			Pensions (rooms) 52.06%	Pensions (rooms) 46.03%	2 stars (rooms) 59.92%	3 stars (rooms) 49.30%		
Macro-region 3 1) 2.23 (no.) / 3.02 (rooms) 2a) 28.53 % / 15.76% (2005) 2b) 38.90% / 29.81% (2016)	8	12	Pensions (no.) 78.10%	Pensions (no.) 58.98%	2 stars (no.) 65.24%	3 stars (no.) 50.21%	1-4 rooms (no.) 39.52%	10-49 rooms (no.) 41.67%
			Pensions (rooms) 52.06%	Pensions (rooms) 46.03%	2 stars (rooms) 59.92%	3 stars (rooms) 49.30%		
Arad 1) 1.88 (no.) / 1.65 (rooms) 2a) 41.67 % / 35.55% (2005) 2b) 41.67% / 35.65% (2016)	8	12	Pensions (no.) 52.50%	Pensions (no.) 44.00%	2 stars (no.) 55.00%	3 stars (no.) 38.67%	5-9 rooms (no.) 37.50%	10-49 rooms (no.) 40.00%
			Hotels (rooms) 47.90%	Hotels (rooms) 34.34%	1 star (rooms) 41.61%	3 stars (rooms) 35.13%		

County/Region 1) Growth rate of rural lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of rural lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Caraş-Severin 1) 2.49 (no.) / 2.56 (rooms) 2a) 46.79 % / 14.61% (2005) 2b) 47.74% / 29.08% (2016)	9	12	Pensions (no.) 64.71%	Pensions (no.) 62.21%	2 stars (no.) 50.98%	3 stars (no.) 57.48%	10-49 rooms (no.) 37.25%	5-9 rooms (no.) 42.52%
			Pensions (rooms) 36.31%	Pensions (rooms) 52.49%	2 stars (rooms) 52.13%	3 stars (rooms) 60.89%		
Hunedoara 1) 2.13 (no.) / 1.96 (rooms) 2a) 30.81 % / 21.89% (2005) 2b) 31.30% / 23.67% (2016)	8	9	Pensions (no.) 58.49%	Pensions (no.) 53.98%	2 stars (no.) 56.60%	3 stars (no.) 59.29%	1-4 rooms (no.) 45.28%	5-9 rooms (no.) 38.05%
			Pensions (rooms) 27.29%	Pensions (rooms) 45.44%	2 stars (rooms) 35.83%	3 stars (rooms) 65.71%		
Timiş 1) 1.90 (no.) / 1.99 (rooms) 2a) 30.43 % / 14.07% (2005) 2b) 31.62% / 18.43% (2016)	7	10	Pensions (no.) 71.43%	Pensions (no.) 55.00%	1 star (no.) 59.52%	3 stars (no.) 61.25%	1-4 rooms (no.) 59.52%	10-49 rooms (no.) 46.25%
			Pensions (rooms) 19.00%	Pensions (rooms) 40.90%	2 stars (rooms) 73.87%	3 stars (rooms) 57.79%		
West 1) 2.12 (no.) / 2.02 (rooms) 2a) 36.12 % / 19.54% (2005) 2b) 37.26% / 25.83% (2016)	12	13	Pensions (no.) 61.83%	Pensions (no.) 54.94%	2 stars (no.) 50.00%	3 stars (no.) 55.19%	1-4 rooms (no.) 39.78%	10-49 rooms (no.) 37.72%
			Hotels (rooms) 26.56%	Pensions (rooms) 41.59%	2 stars (rooms) 47.82%	3 stars (rooms) 54.89%		
Dolj 1) 2.64 (no.) / 3.51 (rooms) 2a) 35.48 % / 12.78% (2005) 2b) 30.85% / 18.81% (2016)	4	8	Pensions (no.) 63.64%	Pensions (no.) 58.62%	2 stars (no.) 72.73%	3 stars (no.) 41.38%	10-49 rooms (no.) 36.37%	10-49 rooms (no.) 41.38%
			Pensions (rooms) 39.58%	Pensions (rooms) 38.27%	2 stars (rooms) 84.38%	3 stars (rooms) 40.65%		
Gorj 1) 7.38 (no.) / 4.15 (rooms) 2a) 35.14 % / 36.19% (2005) 2b) 48.98% / 37.28% (2016)	5	9	Pensions (no.) 69.23%	Pensions (no.) 75.01%	2 stars (no.) 69.23%	3 stars (no.) 62.50%	10-49 rooms (no.) 38.46%	5-9 rooms (no.) 51.04%
			Hotels (rooms) 35.26%	Pensions (rooms) 66.49%	1 star (rooms) 51.05%	3 stars (rooms) 56.47%		
Mehedinţi 1) 2.15 (no.) / 2.43 (rooms) 2a) 61.36 % / 31.13% (2005) 2b) 57.43% / 38.83% (2016)	2	6	Pensions (no.) 96.30%	Pensions (no.) 77.59%	2 stars (no.) 100.00%	3 stars (no.) 60.34%	1-4 rooms (no.) 70.37%	5-9 rooms (no.) 46.55%
			Hotels (rooms) 50.24%	Pensions (rooms) 62.10%	2 stars (rooms) 100.00%	3 stars (rooms) 52.98%		

ROMANIAN RURAL TOURISM: A SURVEY OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

County/Region 1) Growth rate of rural lodgings/rooms 2) Percentage of rural lodgings/rooms at county level 2005 (a), 2016 (b)	Types of lodgings (no.)		Dominant type of lodging		Dominant classification		Dominant capacity (% of no.)	
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Olt 1) n/a (no.) / n/a (rooms) 2a) 0.00 % / 0.00% (2005) 2b) 17.95% / 7.67% (2016)	0	3	0	Pensions (no.) 71.43%	0	2 stars (no.) 57.14%	0	1-4 rooms (no.) 42.86%
			0	Pensions (rooms) 59.58%	0	2 stars (rooms) 46.81%		
Vâlcea 1) 2.17 (no.) / 1.10 (rooms) 2a) 30.15 % / 24.12% (2005) 2b) 37.36% / 20.01% (2016)	7	11	Pensions (no.) 70.00%	Pensions (no.) 70.00%	2 stars (no.) 71.67%	2 stars (no.) 50.00%	1-4 rooms (no.) 58.33%	5-9 rooms (no.) 44.62%
			Hotels (rooms) 74.91%	Pensions (rooms) 45.26%	2 stars (rooms) 57.56%	2 stars (rooms) 49.49%		
South-West 1) 2.88 (no.) / 1.78 (rooms) 2a) 34.69 % / 23.61% (2005) 2b) 41.13% / 24.20% (2016)	7	11	Pensions (no.) 75.68%	Pensions (no.) 71.88%	2 stars (no.) 78.38%	3 stars (no.) 48.44%	1-4 rooms (no.) 55.86%	5-9 rooms (no.) 45.94
			Hotels (rooms) 63.91%	Pensions (rooms) 53.24%	2 stars (rooms) 62.22%	3 stars (rooms) 40.40%		
Macro-region 4 1) 2.41 (no.) / 1.91 (rooms) 2a) 35.57 % / 21.19% (2005) 2b) 38.90% / 25.12% (2016)	12	13	Pensions (no.) 67.00%	Pensions (no.) 62.52%	2 stars (no.) 60.61%	3 stars (no.) 52.17%	1-4 rooms (no.) 45.79%	5-9 rooms (no.) 39.86
			Hotels (rooms) 43.42%	Pensions (rooms) 46.49%	2 stars (rooms) 54.32%	3 stars (rooms) 48.80%		
National level (rural) 1) 1.75 (no.) / 2.16 (rooms) 2a) 49.76 % / 22.13% (2005) 2b) 47.76% / 30.51% (2016)	16	17	Pensions (no.) 80.98%	Pensions (no.) 62.28%	2 stars (no.) 64.31%	3 stars (no.) 50.55%	1-4 rooms (no.) 57.96%	5-9 rooms (no.) 38.24%
			Pensions (rooms) 38.14%	Pensions (rooms) 44.64%	2 stars (rooms) 56.60%	3 stars (rooms) 49.84%		

Source: authors' calculations based on the official authority for tourism database

Appendix 7A: Resorts of national interest

2002	2016	County
1. Amara	1. Amara	Ialomița
	2. Azuga	Prahova
2. Busteni	3. Busteni	Prahova
3. Buzias	4. Buzias	Timiș
	5. Băile Govora	Vâlcea
4. Băile Felix	6. Băile Felix	Bihor
5. Băile Herculane	7. Băile Herculane	Caras-Severin
6. Băile Olanesti	8. Băile Olanesti	Vâlcea
7. Băile Tusnad	9. Băile Tusnad	Harghita
	10. Câmpulung Moldovenesc	Suceava
8. Cap Aurora	11. Cap Aurora	Constanța
9. Calimanesti-Caciulata	12. Calimanesti-Caciulata	Vâlcea
10. Costinești	13. Costinești	Constanța
11. Covasna	14. Covasna	Covasna
12. Eforie Nord	15. Eforie Nord	Constanța
13. Eforie Sud	16. Eforie Sud	Constanța
14. Geoagiu Bai	17. Geoagiu Bai	Hunedoara
	18. Gura Humorului	Suceava
15. Jupiter	19. Jupiter	Constanța
16. Mamaia	20. Mamaia	Constanța
17. Mangalia	21. Mangalia	Constanța
18. Moneasa	22. Moneasa	Arad
19. Neptun-Olimp	23. Neptun-Olimp	Constanța
	24. Poiana Brașov	Brașov
20. Predeal	25. Predeal	Brașov
	26. Pucioasa	Dambovita
	27. Slanic	Prahova
21. Saturn	28. Saturn	Constanța
22. Sinaia	29. Sinaia	Prahova
23. Singeorz Bai	30. Sangeorz Bai	Bistrita-Nasaud
24. Slanic Moldova	31. Slanic Moldova	Bacau
25. SoVăța	32. SoVăța	Mureș
26. Tirgu Ocna	33. Targu Ocna	Bacau
27. Techirghiol	34. Techirghiol	Constanța
	35. Vatra Dornei	Suceava
28. Venus	36. Venus	Constanța
29. Voineasa	37. Voinesa	Vâlcea
	38. Petrosani-Parang	Hunedoara
	39. Targu Neamț	Neamț
	40. Piatra Neamț	Neamț
	41. Rasnov	Brașov

Sources: [https://lege5.ro/Gratuit/gm4dkmbz/hotararea-nr-1122-2002-pentru-aprobarea-conditiilor-si-a-procedurii-de-atestare-a-statiunilor-turistice-precum-si-pentru-declararea-unor-localitati-ca-statiuni-turistice-de-interes-national-respectiv-;](https://lege5.ro/Gratuit/gm4dkmbz/hotararea-nr-1122-2002-pentru-aprobarea-conditiilor-si-a-procedurii-de-atestare-a-statiunilor-turistice-precum-si-pentru-declararea-unor-localitati-ca-statiuni-turistice-de-interes-national-respectiv-)
<http://turism.gov.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Staiuni-atestare.pdf>

Appendix 7B: Resorts of local interest

2002	2016	County
1. (Băile) 1 Mai	1. (Băile) 1 Mai	Bihor
	2. Albac	Alba
2. Albeștii de Muscel	3. Albeștii de Muscel (Bughea de Sus)	Argeș
	4. Arieșeni	Alba
3. Balványos	5. Balványos	Covasna
4. Bazna	6. Bazna	Sibiu
5. Băltățești	7. Băltățești	Neamț
6. Băile Homorod	8. Băile Homorod	Harghita
7. Băile Turda	9. Băile Turda	Cluj
8. Băile Baita	10. Băile Baita	Cluj
9. Borsec	11. Borsec	Harghita
10. Borșa	12. Borșa	Maramureș
	13. Bran	Brașov
11. Breaza	14. Breaza	Prahova
12. Calacea	15. Calacea	Timiș
13. Câmpulung Moldovenesc		Suceava
	16. Cheia	Prahova
14. Crivaia	17. Crivaia	Caraș-Severin
15. Durău	18. Durău	Neamț
16. Harghita Bai	19. Harghita Bai	Harghita
	20. Horezu	Vâlcea
17. Izvorul Mureșului	21. Izvorul Mureșului	Harghita
18. Lacu Rosu	22. Lacu Rosu	Harghita
19. Lacu Sărat	23. Lacu Sărat	Brăila
20. Lipova	24. Lipova	Arad
	25. Moieciu	Brașov
	26. Ocna Sibiului	Sibiu
21. Ocna Șugatag	27. Ocna Șugatag	Maramureș
22. Păltiniș	28. Păltiniș	Sibiu
23. Piriul Rece	29. Pârâul Rece	Brașov
24. Paid	30. Praid	Harghita
25. Săcelu	31. Săcelu	Gorj
26. Sărata Monteoru	32. Sărata Monteoru	Buzau
27. Secu	33. Secu	Caraș-Severin
28. Semenic	34. Semenic	Caraș-Severin
29. Snagov	35. Snagov	Ilfov
30. Stina de Vale	36. Stana de Vale	Bihor
31. Straja	37. Straja	Hunedoara
32. Soveja	38. Soveja	Vrancea

2002	2016	County
	39. Tășnad	Satu-Mare
33. Timișu de Sus	40. Timișu de Sus	Brașov
34. Tinca	41. Tinca	Bihor
35. Trei Ape	42. Trei Ape	Caraș-Severin
	43. Vălenii de Munte	Prahova
36. Vața de Jos	44. Vața de Jos	Hunedoara
	45. Zona Fântânele	Cluj
	46. Zona Muntele Băișorii	Cluj
	47. Vișeu	Maramureș
	48. Baia Sprie	Maramureș

Sources: <https://lege5.ro/Gratuit/gm4dkmbz/hotararea-nr-1122-2002-pentru-approbarea-conditiilor-si-a-procedurii-de-atestare-a-statiunilor-turistice-precum-si-pentru-declararea-unor-localitati-ca-statiuni-turistice-de-interes-national-respectiv-;http://turism.gov.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Staiuni-atestare.pdf>

Appendix 8. The map representing the counties and the regions of Romania



(Source: <https://gandeste.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/regiuni-de-dezvoltare-si-judete-300x212.jpg>).