

# ROMANIAN RURAL LODGINGS: HOW MANY SURVIVED OVER A DECADE? A PRELIMINARY STUDY FOCUSED ON THE RURAL LOCALITIES HOSTING 10 OR MORE ACCOMMODATION UNITS

CORNELIA POP<sup>1</sup>, CRISTINA BALINT<sup>2</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** To the best of our knowledge, no previous study exists on the survival of tourist accommodation units and/or on the economic entities related to these accommodations in Romania. Therefore no such study exists in relation with the rural accommodation units. Through the present study we try to make a small step in filling the research gap regarding the survival of extant rural accommodation units in a developing country, Romania. The findings show an overall simple survival rate (SSR) of 38.21%. The existence of tourist attractions (spa/mountain resorts and World Heritage Sites) improve the extant lodgings SSR, while exceptions exist in the counties of Sibiu, Neamt, Suceava, Cluj and Harghita. The dominant surviving accommodation units are the rural pensions. The owners/operators of the survivor lodgings are mainly individual enterprises, though between 2005 and 2016 the number of operators registered as LLCs increased. Indirectly, the findings also imply that most of the survivor lodgings can be considered lifestyle enterprises.

**Key words:** rural lodging, survival rate, Romania

**JEL classification:** L83, R11

---

<sup>1</sup> Prof. dr., Department of Business, Faculty of Business, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, cornelia.pop@tbs.ubbcluj.ro

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer dr., Department of Business, Faculty of Business, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, cristina.balint@tbs.ubbcluj.ro

**Recommended citation:** Pop, C., Balint, C., *Romanian rural lodgings: how many survived over a decade? A preliminary study focused on the rural localities hosting 10 or more accommodation units*, Studia UBB Negotia vol. 62, issue 3 (September), 2017, pp. 69-96.

## **Introduction and literature review**

The literature on the survival of economic entities is relatively recent and mostly focused on developed countries. Various aspects and factors influencing the likelihood of economic entities survival were under investigation. Generating legitimacy (establishing a legal entity and providing a business plan) influences the survival of the firms (Delmar & Shane, 2004). The conditions under which the firms are born (Geroski et al., 2010), the size and the age of a venture (Cefis & Marsili, 2006; Geroski et al., 2010; Wennberg et al., 2016) have an important and lasting influence on the economic entities survival rates. The venture's capacity to be different and to master its costs (Naidoo, 2010), to built-in unique knowledge assets and to develop distinct capabilities (Denicolai et al., 2014; Esteve-Perez & Manez-Castillejo, 2008) enhance its abilities to identify and exploit new opportunities and to adapt to an ever changing and competitive business environment (Acs et al., 2009; Esteve-Perez & Manez-Castillejo, 2008). These abilities are further augmented by the conscientiousness (being hardworking and persevering) and by the entrepreneurial bricolage, both related to higher surviving likelihood and to longer life span for the respective firms (Ciavarella et al., 2004; Stenholm & Renko, 2016).

The few studies that can be found on the ventures' survival in developing countries cover diverse topics. Konings & Xavier (2002) investigate the determinants of firm survival in Slovenia and confirms that the size of the new ventures increase the survival likelihood. Aidis & Adachi (2007) present the difficult situation of Russian new ventures

under a wide range of informal impediments. Hansen et al. (2009) highlight the factors influencing the firms' growth and survival in Vietnam, one factor being the state sector as main customer for the respective firms. Bah et al. (2011) discuss the impact of external aid on Macedonian firms. Marchetta (2012) presents the relationship between return migrants and the survival of entrepreneurial activities in Egypt.

The papers on Romanian firms' survival likelihood are scarce. Brown & Earle (2010) included the probability of survival for small Romanian firms among the research topics. The study shows that the USAID loans had no significant effect on survival, while they increased employment and sales. The importance of loans for Romanian small firm growth is in line with the previous findings of Brown et al. (2005). Among the most recent, Robu et al. (2013) focuses on the Bucharest Stock Exchange listed companies, investigating the risk of financial failure using the survival analysis approach. Stanciu (2015) only peripherally discusses the idea of surviving strategies for the Romanian retail food companies under the international retail chains pressure. While other studies might exist on the survival likelihood of Romanian firms, these are not available through internet search and therefore difficult to find.

Few studies focus on the survival rate of tourism businesses. Thomas et al. (2011) discussing the research trends on tourism businesses mention no study concerning the survival rate of tourism firms. The study of Knaup (2005), which includes the leisure & hospitality sector, speaks about survival rates of 65% and 44% for 2 years and respectively 4 years, considered below average despite the inclusion of restaurants among the surviving leisure & hospitality entities. Also, Knaup (2005) comments that leisure & hospitality establishments are less successful compared to other sectors. More recently, Brouder & Eriksson (2013), focused on Swedish tourism firms in peripheral areas. The survival rate for the extant tourism firms is of 84% for 2 years, 77% for 4 years and 58% for 7 years. The study also suggests that the entrepreneur's experience related to the activity of the new firms, increased their likelihood of survival.

Furthermore, the surviving tourism firms enhance the role of tourism in regional development mainly through small and constant employment gains.

To the best of our knowledge, no previous study exists on the survival of tourist accommodation units and/or on the economic entities related to these accommodations in Romania. Therefore no such study exists in relation with the rural accommodation units. Through the present study we try to make a small step in filling the research gap regarding the survival of extant rural accommodation units in a developing country: Romania. The focus of this study on rural accommodations is motivated by the complementary role tourism can play in the economic regeneration, improvement and development of rural areas (Naghiu et al., 2005; Lachov et al., 2006; Iorio & Corsale, 2013b). Furthermore, the survival of the extant accommodation units within a rural locality or region/area might indirectly indicate the sustainability of tourism development in the respective locality/region/area. Hence, this preliminary study opens the door to a wide range of research regarding the survival rate, along with the influencing factors, of both the Romanian rural accommodation units and the economic entities that own and/or operate them.

### **Data, research methodology and hypotheses**

Similar to the study of Pop et al. (2017), the official databases for tourist accommodation provided by the Romanian authority for tourism for 2005 and 2016 were used. The aforementioned official databases are not archived and therefore a longitudinal evolution based on annual observations is not possible. The first publicly available database is for 2005, while the post-communist development of rural accommodations can be traced back to the 1992-1994 period.

The information structure of these databases include both the accommodation unit's name and the respective owner/operator, though does not include the entry year for the respective accommodation units.

The focus on the accommodation units rather than the owners/operators is motivated by the fact that the same accommodation unit might be owned/operated by a different economic entity over the years and by the fact that the name and the location of the respective accommodation unit are less likely to be changed, once the lodging gained some notoriety among the tourists.

Based on the data provided by the official databases, the rural localities which registered at least 10 accommodation units were first identified and included in the present study. The focus on these communes with at least 10 lodgings is based on the findings of Pop et al. (2107), which show that the respective rural localities concentrate more than 60% of the rural accommodation units and rooms of the total rural lodging capacity. Details regarding these localities are available in Appendices (1 and 2).

For each locality which registered at least 10 accommodation units either in 2005 and/or 2016, there were identified the extant lodging facilities still 'alive' in 2016 compared with 2005. The identification of surviving lodgings was based on at least two of the following three criteria: i) the accommodation unit's name; ii) the accommodation unit's address; iii) the owner/operator<sup>3</sup>. Though, the combination of these 3 criteria did not allow the identification of those accommodation units that changed both the name and the owner between 2005 and 2016. Therefore, the number of surviving lodging facilities might be slightly (but not significantly) higher than the reported figures of this study.

Further, the rural localities were grouped, as suggested by Pop et al. (2017), in: resorts of national interest, resorts of local interest, communes hosting World Heritage Sites (WHSs) and 'other' rural localities which include various (less known) local tourist attractions.

---

<sup>3</sup> In Romania, in general, and at rural level, in particular, most of the time the entity registered as the operator of one accommodation unit is also the owner of the respective facility. This situation has multiple roots: a) the propensity toward the ownership of a real estate property of Romanians in general; b) the tendency of an accommodation unit's owner to be in control of its operations; c) the highly fragmented structure of the Romanian lodging industry.

The first part of the survival analysis was used further. A simple survival rate (SSR) was calculated similar to the medical investigation: how many accommodation units were still alive (registered by the official database) in 2016 compared to the accommodation units existing in 2005 (registered by the respective official database) within the same rural locality or commune. This ratio is expressed in percentage points.

In order to estimate the level of fragmentation of rural accommodations ownership, the ratio of accommodation units per owner (operator) was also introduced. This ratio is expressed as coefficient. This information was also associated with the structure of surviving accommodation units and the structure of the respective owners/operators for 2005 and 2016. These could represent some of the factors that might explain the SSR. Though, Appendix 4 includes only pensions, hotels and villas since they represent the dominant lodging facilities, respectively only individual enterprises and LLCs (Limited Liability Companies) since they are the dominant forms for the legal entities under which the owners/operators exist.

Taken into consideration a relatively difficult Romanian business environment<sup>4</sup>, similar with other developing countries as highlighted by Marchetta (2012) and Aidis & Adachi (2007), and based on the findings of Radan-Gorska (2013) regarding the informal practices in Romanian rural tourism, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: the simple survival rate (SSR) for the localities with more than 10 lodgings is around 30%.

H2: the status of the rural locality (resort of national or local interest, hosting WHSs) might have a positive influence on the SSR; in other words: SSR is expected to be higher in the rural localities associated with recognized tourist attractions (mainly spa and/or mountain resorts).

---

<sup>4</sup> World Economic Forum through the Global Competitiveness Reports and Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Reports constantly ranks Romania around 70<sup>th</sup> position of about 124-137 countries, with the main problems related to taxation, bureaucracy, ever changing regulations, corruption and access to traditional financial resources.

H3: the majority of surviving accommodation units are pensions and the majority of the respective owners/operators are individual enterprises.

## **Findings and discussions**

As stated previously, based on the study of Pop et al. (2017) regarding rural accommodation units, the present study is focused on the rural localities (communes), which reported at least 10 lodging facilities in 2005 and/or 2016. These localities concentrated over 60% of the number of accommodations and of the lodging capacity in 2005 and 2016 respectively. Moreover, Pop et al. (2017) consider that at least 10 lodgings within a commune can provide accommodation for small groups of tourists, while the other communes might experience only sporadic tourist activity. Details regarding the number of these communes are presented in Appendices 1 and 2.

It is worth mentioning that 51 out of 123 rural localities (or 41.46%) continued to concentrate at least 10 lodging facilities between 2005 and 2016 and the majority of these communes come from the category of 'other localities' or localities with no renowned tourist attractions. Also, the number of communes with at least 10 lodgings grew in 2016 versus 2005 indicating a rise in the respective population awareness of the tourism potential. Furthermore, only 18 communes (14.63%) registered a SSR of zero, suggesting that once a lodging facility was established, despite the difficulties, it has the potential to survive. Only one of these communes with zero SSR was a resort of local interests. This situation indicates that the rural localities considered resorts of national, respectively local interest and those hosting a WHS provide better chances for the extant lodging facilities to survive.

Appendix 3 presents the SSR by counties, regions and macro-regions<sup>5</sup>. The SSR at national level for the rural localities with at least 10 accommodation units is 38.21%. The SSR decreases at 27.75% when the resorts of national/local interest and WHSs are eliminated.

Some details are worth to be highlighted. Table 1 presents the top 5 and the last 5 counties based on SSR. All the top 5 counties include resorts of national or of local interest, while within the last 5 counties only one includes resorts of local interest. Table 2 presents a different situation when the resorts and WHSs are excluded. Within the new top 5 counties, only Neamt and Sibiu kept their previous top 5 status suggesting the ability of the extant accommodation units' owners to use the available, though less known, tourist attractions in order to draw further tourist inflows. The last 5 counties registered a slight alteration, Vrancea county being replaced by Brasov county, with a lower SSR.

It is interesting to mention that after the elimination of the resorts of national/local interest and WHS, the following situations were identified: a) for 11 counties the SSR remains unchanged since these counties did not host rural resorts<sup>6</sup> or WHSs; b) for 11 counties the SSR decreased<sup>7</sup>; c) for 2 counties (Cluj and Suceava) the SSR increased in the absence of resorts and WHSs; d) one county (Valcea) shows the same SSR either with or without the national resort included. Further investigations are needed in order to understand mainly the situation of the last three mentioned counties (Cluj, Suceava and Valcea) and also to understand the case of Harghita county low SSR despite the presence of two resorts of local interest.

---

<sup>5</sup> The map of counties, regions and macro-regions is available in Appendix 5

<sup>6</sup> These counties are: Arges, Bacau, Bistrita-Nasaud, Caras-Severin, Dambovita, Hunedoara, Gorj, Mehedinti, Mures, Timis, Vrancea.

<sup>7</sup> These counties are: Alba, Bihor, Brasov, Buzau, Constanta, Covasna, Harghita, Maramures, Neamt, Prahova, and Sibiu.



**Table 1. The top 5 and the last 5 counties based on the simple survival rate of accommodation units between 2005 and 2016**

<b>Top 5</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Simple survival rate (%)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Braila	100.00	Only one locality, the resort of local interest (Chiscani-Lacu Sarat)
Bihor	60.29	Includes one resort of national interest and one of local interest (Baile Felix and respectively Baile 1 Mai)
Constanta	60.13	Includes one resort of national interest at Black Seaside (Costinesti)
Neamt	57.38	Includes one resort of local interest (Ceahlau-Durau)
Sibiu	56.52	Includes one resort of local interest (Bazna)
<b>Last 5</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Simple survival rate (%)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Vrancea	29.03	No resorts or WHS
Harghita	17.61	Includes 2 resorts of local interest (Praid and Voslabeni-Izvoru Muresului)
Mehedinti	16.67	No resorts or WHS
Timis	14.29	No resorts or WHS
Mures	0.00	No resorts or WHS. Only one locality with more than 10 lodgings.

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

**Table 2. The top 5 and the last 5 counties based on the simple survival rate of accommodation units between 2005 and 2016: resorts (of national and local interest) and WHS excluded**

<b>Top 5</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Simple survival rate (%)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Cluj	57.89	Includes one commune in the mountain area with a SSR of about 80% and two communes near Cluj-Napoca (county residence) with SSR of 50% to 60%.
Neamt	56.00	Beautiful mountain areas and monasteries which attract leisure and religious tourism.

<b>Top 5</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Simple survival rate (%)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Suceava	54.84	Beautiful mountain areas and monasteries (others than WHS) which attract leisure and religious tourism.
Valcea	50.00	Leisure tourism in the mountain areas mainly influenced by the proximity of the resort of national interest (Voineasa).
Sibiu	50.00	Beautiful mountain areas leisure tourism
<b>Last 5</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Simple survival rate (%)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Brasov	20.31	Less known tourist attractions. Influenced by the high concentration of accommodation units in Predeal (municipality) and Bran-Moeciu
Mehedinti	16.67	Less known tourist attractions
Timis	14.29	Less known tourist attractions
Harghita	11.11	Less known tourist attractions
Mures	0.00	Only one locality with more than 10 lodgings. Less known tourist attraction

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

As Appendix 3 shows, Macro-region 1 presents the lowest SSR, under the influence of Center region, which also has the lowest SSR among the 8 regions. This situation seems to be influenced by the low survival rate of Harghita county (which needs further and in depth investigations), but also by the fact that the Center region, respectively Macro-region 1, concentrate the highest number of 'other' rural localities, associated with a low SSR.

Macro-region 4 exhibits only a slightly higher SSR and this position seems also to be under the influence of 'other' rural localities, which are dominant within this macro-region. Though in a similar situation as Macro-region 4, Macro-region 3 presents a higher SSR suggesting the need for further investigations.

Macro-region 2 presents the highest SSR and this situation is explained by the existence of resorts of national and local interest at the Black Seaside, but also by a more balanced distribution of the rural localities between those hosting WHSs and 'other'.

**Based on these findings, H1 is partly confirmed.** The general SSR (including all selected rural localities) is about 8% higher than the expected 30%. Though, when the national/local resorts and WHSs are excluded, the SSR decreases at 27.75%, about 2% under the expected value. These results for H1 suggest that H2 can be considered to be confirmed. This evidence is further supported by the results for Macro-regions 1, 4, and 2 and by the data in Table 3 which also indicate a link between the type of rural locality and the SSR. However, the data for Macro-region 3 is not in line with these findings, although it might be considered an exception. **Therefore, H2 is confirmed.**

Table 3 and Appendix 4 present the structure of the surviving accommodation units and the respective owners. The dominant type of surviving accommodation is represented by pensions and this finding is in line with the findings of Pop et al. (2017)<sup>8</sup>. Also, the dominant type of the respective owners/operators is represented by individual enterprises. It must be highlighted that between 2005 and 2016, the dominance of pensions registered a slight decrease at national level, and mainly within macro-regions 1 and 3. For the same period, the individual enterprises registered a decline by changing to LLCs. This shift in the case of owners' legal status might have been triggered by various factors (i.e. the access to financing sources or the change in ownership) that call for further investigations. The dominance of pensions and individual enterprises is

---

<sup>8</sup> At county level (Appendix 4), three counties (Gorj, Hunedoara, and Mehedinti) have only surviving pensions, while in other six countries (all from Macro-region 1) the surviving pensions represent about or more than 90%. The counties where the surviving pensions are least represented are Arad and Braila (both including only one resort of national interest each).

also confirmed within the resorts of local interests, WHSs, and ‘other’ rural localities (Table 3). Furthermore, at these rural localities’ level the decreasing trend of pensions and individual enterprises is confirmed (Table 3). These three subcategories of localities (resorts of local interest, WHSs and ‘others’) represent the majority of rural localities under investigation. ***Based on these findings, H3 is confirmed.***

**Table 3. Centralized information regarding SSR and the structure of surviving accommodation units and the respective owners**

Types of localities	SSR (%)	Accommodation to owner ratio		Structure of survivor accommodation units and the respective owners									
				Pensions (%)		Hotels (%)		Villas (%)		Individual enterprises (%)		LLCs (%)	
		2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
National (rural) level	<b>38.21</b>	1.10	1.11	76.06	72.67	8.79	8.84	7.17	7.53	63.51	56.26	30.41	39.20
Resorts of national interest	<b>63.47</b>	1.51	1.56	32.37	28.06	20.14	20.14	29.50	17.99	48.91	37.08	44.57	56.18
Resorts of local interest	<b>48.43</b>	1.05	1.08	79.27	76.02	9.35	9.35	5.28	4.88	65.38	55.51	29.49	41.41
WHS	<b>46.46</b>	1.39	1.40	61.96	58.24	3.26	2.20	25.00	27.47	62.12	53.85	33.33	43.08
Other localities	<b>27.75</b>	1.02	1.02	85.80	81.16	2.72	2.13	3.63	3.95	65.02	60.87	23.84	30.12

Note 1: what it is included in ‘individual enterprises’

Note 2: LLCs is used for Romanian SRLs (societati cu raspundere limitata)

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

Nonetheless, within the rural resorts of national interest, the overall structure of surviving lodgings and the respective owners is different: here one can notice a more balanced spread between pensions,

hotels and villas. Though, the counties that host the resorts of national interest exhibit either a clear dominance of hotels (Arad, Braila), or a dominance of villas (Constanta), or although pensions are dominant, hotels represent an important proportion of the surviving lodgings (Bihor). Additionally, the overall structure of the respective owners/operators shows a balanced distribution between the individual enterprises and LLCs. However, when considered individually, within the counties of Arad, Braila and Constanta, the surviving LLCs are dominant. Though, the peculiar situation of the rural resorts of national interest can be considered an exception, since there are only 4 localities out of the 123 included in the study, hence with a small influence on the general findings.

An additional information extracted from the available data presents the accommodation to owner ratio (Table 3 and Appendix 4). This ratio describes a high level of fragmentation of rural accommodation units: almost each accommodation unit is owned by a different entity<sup>9</sup>. This ratio shows a slight upward tendency except for 'other' rural localities. The accommodation to owner ratio is the highest within the resorts of national interest since there at least part of the hotels are owned by the same economic entity. It is followed by the localities hosting WHSs. Though, here the most important influence comes from Tulcea county which exhibits a ratio of about 2 for 2005 and respectively 2016, mainly due to the concentration of the majority villas by just two economic entities. A brief glance at Table 3 suggests a link between the SSR and the

---

<sup>9</sup> This information should be considered under the following observation: the Romanians involved in business have the tendency to be involved in more than one economic entity, creating a network of such entities sometimes to avoid the personal link with a given business or company or to have an 'escape' alternative if one legal entity goes bankrupt. This pattern is common among the top 500 Romanians as presented by Forbes and also among the business people located in the cities. It is not clear how widespread this pattern is at rural level, but given the lower level of financial resources and up to a point a lower level of 'business sophistication', an educated guess implies the spread of this pattern to a lesser extent. Therefore, the fragmentation level presented above might be lower but not significantly.

accommodation to owner ratio, therefore this ratio could be considered an explanatory factor for SSR in future research.

The observed overall tendency of pensions to decrease between 2005 and 2016 raised the question if there is a preferred type of lodging they are transformed into. Therefore, the conversions that occurred within the 805 accommodation units were investigated and the findings revealed the followings: i) only 56 lodgings changed their type between 2005 and 2016; ii) for 20 cases no clear transformation pattern could be identified; iii) 3 villas became pensions; iv) 33 pensions were converted in 19 rooms for rent, 1 apartment for rent, 4 villas, 4 lodges, 1 hotel, 1 motel, 2 hostels and 1 camping. Therefore, the main tendency for pensions was given by their transformation in rooms or apartments for rent. This transformation needs further investigations though the most obvious reason might be cost related since such a lodging type offers less services (i.e. breakfast and other meals) and less interaction with the accommodated tourists.

Other lodging transformations that occurred between 2005 and 2016 refer to splits and amalgamations. The few identified splits are related mainly to villas: i) 1 extant villa from 2005 became 11 villas in 2016, with the same lodging capacity as in 2005, being part of a holiday village (Brasov county); ii) 1 registered villa of 29 rooms from 2005, became 29 villas of one room each (Tulcea county); iii) 1 villa from 2005 was registered as 3 bungalows in 2016, with a similar lodging capacity (Constanta county). The amalgamations were also few, Constanta county leading with 1 bungalow merging 6 former bungalows, 1 hostel uniting 4 former bungalows, 1 hotel merging 3 former hotels, and 1 hotel uniting 21 former villas. The other three amalgamations occurred as such: i) 1 room for rent united 1 former pension and 1 former cabin (Arges county); ii) 1 villa united 2 former villas (Tulcea county); iii) 1 pension merged 2 former pensions (Harghita county). For counting reasons the aforementioned transformations were considered one to one, otherwise the SSR could

not be calculated in a uniform manner. The low number of splits and amalgamations indicate that they are rather formal transformations and not an indication of a further fragmentation or a concentration process.

## Conclusions

The present paper investigated the simple survival rate (SSR) of the extant lodging facilities within the rural localities concentrating at least 10 accommodation units. SSR was calculated based on the data available for 2005 and 2016. This period includes years of economic growth, the financial and economic crisis of 2007-2011 and the recovery period that followed. Therefore, the results presented in this research should be considered under the aforementioned economic conditions.

Without any previous reference point to compare the results with neither for all Romanian sectors nor for lodging industry it is difficult to state if the overall SSR of 38.21% is high or low<sup>10</sup>. Nonetheless, given the relative difficult business environment for Romanian firms (see footnote 4), this SSR can be considered reasonable. The existence of tourist attractions (spa/mountain resorts and WHSs) improve the extant lodgings overall SSR, while exceptions exist in the counties of Sibiu, Neamt, Suceava, Cluj and Harghita. The dominant surviving accommodation units are the rural pensions, a finding in line with the results presented by Pop et al. (2017) for the rural lodging sector. Nonetheless, the rural resorts of national interest present a slightly different structure for the survivor lodgings: a more balanced distribution between pensions, hotels and villas, partly influenced by an important number of hotels built within these resorts during the communist period. Few transformations were identified, the most frequent indicating the conversion of pensions in rooms/apartments for rent.

---

<sup>10</sup> While some comparisons might be made with the results of Knaup (2005) and Brouder & Eriksson (2013), those data refer to shorter time spans and to tourism firms active in different economic environments.

The owners/operators of the survivor lodgings are mainly individual enterprises, though between 2005 and 2016 the number of operators registered as LLCs increased. Overall, there is a high level of fragmentation of survivor rural lodgings, the accommodation units per owner ratio being slightly over 1. However, the rural resorts of national interest and WHSs seems to have a higher such ratio due to the concentrations of some hotels (mainly in Bihor county) and some villas (mainly in Tulcea county) under the same owners. Nonetheless, the slight increase of this ratio between 2005 and 2016 does not indicate an important process of lodging concentration.

The preliminary results presented by this research seem to confirm the idea that the age of the venture (Geroski et al., 2010; Wennberg et al., 2016) might have an influence on the survival rate since the 2005 extant rural accommodation units were either established before or during 2005. Furthermore, the hardworking and persevering attitudes, as suggested by Ciavarella et al., 2004, of rural lodgings' owners appear to have an influence on the survival rate. The dominance of individual enterprises imply that the aforementioned attitudes might be related to the fact that most of these rural lodgings can be included in the category of lifestyle enterprises. All these implied findings open as many new research avenues that might prove important for a better understanding of tourism role in local and/or regional development.

## REFERENCES

- Acs, Z.J., Braunerhjelm, P., Audretsch, D.B., Carlsson, B. (2009), The knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship, *Small Business Economics*, 32, 15-30.
- Aidis, R., Adachi, Y. (2007), Russia: firm entry and survival barriers, *Economic Systems*, 31(4), 391-411.



- Bah, E., Brada, J., Yigit, T. (2011), With a little help from our friends: the effect of USAID assistance on SME growth in a transition economy, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 39(2), 205-220.
- Brouder, P., Eriksson, R.H. (2013), Staying power: What influences micro-firm survival in tourism? *Tourism Geographies*, 15(1), 124-143.
- Brown, J.D., Earle, J.S., Lup, D. (2005), What makes small firm grow? Finance, human capital, technical assistance, and the business environment in Romania, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 54(1), 33-70.
- Brown, J.D., Earle, J.S. (2010), Firm-level growth effect of small loan programs: estimates using universal panel data from Romania, JDI-The John Deutsch Institute for the Study of Economic Policy, Queen's University, Canada, retrieved at: [http://www.jdi.econ.queensu.ca/sites/default/files/Matching%20SMEs%2010\\_0.pdf](http://www.jdi.econ.queensu.ca/sites/default/files/Matching%20SMEs%2010_0.pdf)
- Cefis, E., Marsili, O. (2006), Survivor: the role of innovation in firms' survival, *Research Policy*, 35(5), 626-641.
- Ciavarella, M.A., Buchholtz, A.K., Riordan, C.M., Gatewood, R.D., Stokes, G.S. (2004), The Big Five and venture survival: is there a linkage?, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(4), 465-483.
- Delmar, F., Shane, S. (2004), Legitimizing first: organizing activities and the survival of new ventures, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(3), 385-410.
- Denicolai, S., Ramirez, M., Tidd, J. (2014), Creating and capturing value from external knowledge: the moderating role of knowledge intensity, *R&D Management*, 44(3), 248-264.
- Esteve-Perez, S., Manez-Castillejo, J.A. (2008), The resource-based theory of the firm and firm survival, *Small Business Economics*, 30, 231-249.
- Geroski, P.A., Mata, J., Portugal, P. (2010), Founding conditions and the survival of new firms, *Strategic Management Journal*, 31, 510-529.
- Hansen, H., Rand, J., Tarp, F. (2009), Enterprise growth and survival in Vietnam: Does the government support the matter?, *Journal of Development Studies*, 45(7), 1048-1069.
- Iorio, M., Corsale, A. (2013b), Community-based tourism and networking: Viscri, Romania, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(2), 234-255.
- Knaup, A.E. (2005), Survival and longevity in the business employment dynamics data, *Monthly Labor Review*, May 2005, 50-56.

- Konings, J., Xavier, A. (2002), Firm growth and survival in a transition country: micro evidence from Slovenia, Discussion paper 114/2002, LICOS Discussion Papers, LICOS Centre for Transition Economics, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium.
- 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.
- Marchetta, F. (2012), Return migration and the survival of entrepreneurial activities in Egypt, *World Development*, 40(10), 1999-2013.
- 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.
- Naidoo, V. (2010), Firm survival through a crisis: the influence of market orientation, marketing innovation and business strategy, *Industrial Marketing Management* 39(8), 1311-1320.
- Pop, C., Coros, M.M., Balint, C. (2017), Romanian rural tourism: a survey of accommodation facilities, *Studia UBB Negotia*, 62(2), 71-126.
- 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.
- Robu, M-A., Robu, I-B., Mironiuc, M. (2013), Risk assessment of financial failure for Romanian quoted companies based on the survival analysis, in *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference Accounting and Management Information Systems, AMIS*, Editura ASE, 51-65, available at: <http://www.cig.ase.ro/amis2013/fisiere/amis2013.pdf>
- Stanciu, S. (2015), The Romania retail food market – survival or success for domestic companies, *Procedia Economics and Finance* 23(2015), 1584-1589.
- Stenholm, P., Renko, M. (2016), Passionate bricoleurs and new venture survival, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(5), 595-611.
- Thomas, R., Shaw, G., Page, S.J. (2011), Understanding small firms in tourism, a perspective on research trends and challenges, *Tourism Management* 32(5), 963-976.
- Wennberg, K., Delmar, F., McKelvie, A. (2016), Variable risk preferences and the new firm growth and survival, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(5), 408-427.

### Appendix 1: Localities hosting at least 10 accommodation units by counties and by regions

County/ Region/ Macro- 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	communes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	communes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	High tourist resources concentration	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
Maramures	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
<b>North-West</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>58.81</b>	<b>70.97</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>56.74</b>	<b>64.71</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>20</b>
Alba	66	67	19	33	4	64.39	60.03	5	60.58	61.98	34	11
Brasov	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
Mures	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
<b>Center</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>78.79</b>	<b>66.94</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>68.04</b>	<b>60.14</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Macroregion 1</b>	<b>758</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>72.70</b>	<b>69.22</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>63.75</b>	<b>62.16</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>53</b>
Bacau	85	85	16	25	0	0	0	1	20.00	13.04	14	0

CORNELIA POP, CRISTINA BALINT

County/ Region/ Macro- 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	communes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	communes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	High tourist resources concentration	Very high tourist resources concentration
Neamt	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
<b>North-East</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>44.02</b>	<b>35.11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>58.67</b>	<b>55.81</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>14</b>
Braila	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
Constanta	58	58	7	14	2	91.52	94.61	3	93.61	96.34	19	6
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
<b>South-East</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>74.74</b>	<b>77.72</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>81.09</b>	<b>84.89</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Macroregion 2</b>	<b>859</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>60.17</b>	<b>64.68</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>70.88</b>	<b>75.44</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>24</b>
Arges	95	95	20	41	3	57.14	50.69	5	59.54	61.83	49	1
Dambovita	82	82	11	25	1	57.14	66.67	1	41.79	54.58	18	1
Prahova	90	90	17	20	1	48.15	52.67	2	47.52	49.05	18	0
<b>South-Muntenia</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>50.95</b>	<b>51.22</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>49.97</b>	<b>53.39</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Macroregion 3</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>50.95</b>	<b>51.22</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>49.97</b>	<b>53.39</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>3</b>
Arad	68	68	15	20	1	37.50	66.13	1	34.67	50.88	12	2
Caras-Severin	69	69	11	33	2	41.18	19.88	5	56.69	63.10	26	5

## ROMANIAN RURAL LODGINGS: HOW MANY SURVIVED OVER A DECADE? ...

County/ Region/ Macro- 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	communes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	communes	% of lodgings	% of rooms	High tourist resources concentration	Very high tourist resources concentration
Hunedoara	55	55	16	30	1	24.53	12.08	1	21.24	23.14	33	5
Timis	85	85	8	28	2	50.00	30.40	1	13.75	2.50	9	0
<b>West</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>37.63</b>	<b>34.46</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33.67</b>	<b>38.25</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>12</b>
Gorj	61	61	8	18	0	0	0	3	62.50	63.96	27	3
Mehedinti	61	61	8	12	1	37.04	17.39	2	65.52	55.16	16	1
Valcea	78	78	19	23	1	36.67	80.58	3	63.08	74.00	27	2
<b>South-West</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>28.83</b>	<b>58.78</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>56.25</b>	<b>58.48</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Macroregion 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>
<b>National level (rural)</b>	<b>2819</b>	<b>2825</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>921</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>64.51</b>	<b>63.13</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>62.17</b>	<b>64.25</b>	<b>845</b>	<b>98</b>

Note: The totals by regions, macro-regions and at national level for columns 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, and 12 includes also the communes for the counties not included in this table due to the absence of localities with at least 10 lodging facilities.

Source: Extracted from Appendix 3 of Pop et al. (2017)

**Appendix 2: The number of rural localities included in the study  
based on their status**

County/ Region/ Macro-region	Number of localities concentrating at least 10 lodging facilities	Of which concentrated at least 10 lodging facilities			Localities with zero SSR
		Only in 2005	Only in 2016	In 2005 and 2016	
Bihor	3	1	1	1	1
Bistrita- Nasaud	2	0	2	0	0
Cluj	7	1	4	2	1
Maramures	13	5	2	6	1
<b>North-West</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>
Alba	5	0	1	4	1
Brasov	9	1	5	3	3
Covasna	2	0	1	1	0
Harghita	18	13	0	5	5
Mures	1	0	1	0	1
Sibiu	6	0	4	2	1
<b>Center</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Macroregion 1</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14</b>
Bacau	1	0	1	0	0
Neamt	6	0	4	2	0
Suceava	13	1	7	5	1
<b>North-East</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>
Braila	1	0	1	0	0
Buzau	1	0	0	1	0
Constanta	3	0	1	2	0
Tulcea	7	1	1	5	0
Vrancea	1	0	0	1	0
<b>South-East</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Macroregion 2</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>
Arges	5	0	2	3	0
Dambovita	1	0	0	1	0
Prahova	2	0	1	1	0
<b>South- Muntenia</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Macroregion 3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
Arad	1	0	0	1	0
Caras-Severin	5	0	3	2	0
Hunedoara	1	0	0	1	0

ROMANIAN RURAL LODGINGS: HOW MANY SURVIVED OVER A DECADE? ...

County/ Region/ Macro-region	Number of localities concentrating at least 10 lodging facilities	Of which concentrated at least 10 lodging facilities			Localities with zero SSR
		Only in 2005	Only in 2016	In 2005 and 2016	
Timis	2	2	0	0	1
<b>West</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
Gorj	2	0	2	0	1
Mehedinti	2	0	1	1	1
Valcea	3	0	2	1	0
<b>South-West</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Macroregion 4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>National level (rural)</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>of which</b>					
<b>Resorts of national interest</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Resorts of local interest</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>WHS</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Other localities</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>17</b>

Note 1: Five localities were eliminated from the study due to the absence of lodging facilities in 2005, one locality in each of these counties Gorj, Salaj, Sibiu, Suceava, and Timis.

Note 2: Sanmartin commune (Bihor county) includes one resort of national interest (Baile Felix) and one resort of local interest (Baile 1 Mai). Since Baile Felix has a higher importance, Sanmartin was counted only once within 'resort of national interest' category.

Note 3: The only resort of local interest with zero simple survival rate was Budureasa-Stana de Vale (Bihor county). The tourism development (or rather the lack of it) is related to the dominance in the area of the controversial figures of Micula brothers and their intricate web of their numerous businesses. Informal sources suggest that this situation hinders the development of private initiative not related to Micula's network.

Source: authors' calculations

### Appendix 3: The simple survival rate and the type of rural localities

County/ Region/ Macro-region	Simple survival rate (%)	Simple survival rate (%) [resorts and WHS excluded]	Localities concentrated at least 10 lodging facilities			
			Resorts of national interest	Resorts of local interest	WHS	Other
Bihor	60.29	40.00	1	1	0	1
Bistrita-Nasaud	30.00	30.00	0	0	0	2
Cluj	54.55	57.89	0	2	0	5
Maramures	31.72	28.57	0	1	4	8
<b>North-West</b>	<b>42.90</b>	<b>39.17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>
Alba	37.93	29.79	0	2	0	3
Brasov	43.54	20.31	0	1	1	7
Covasna	45.16	42.31	0	1	0	1
Harghita	17.61	11.11	0	2	0	15
Mures	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1
Sibiu	56.52	50.00	0	1	0	5
<b>Center</b>	<b>28.98</b>	<b>17.11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Macroregion 1</b>	<b>32.60</b>	<b>22.72</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>48</b>
Bacau	33.33	33.33	0	0	0	1
Neamt	57.38	56.00	0	1	0	5
Suceava	49.61	54.84	0	0	4	9
<b>North-East</b>	<b>51.81</b>	<b>54.44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>
Braila	100.00	n/a	0	1	0	0
Buzau	52.17	40.00	0	1	0	1
Constanta	60.13	45.45	1	0	0	2
Tulcea	52.27	n/a	0	0	7	0
Vrancea	29.03	29.03	0	0	0	1
<b>South-East</b>	<b>54.97</b>	<b>36.21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Macroregion 2</b>	<b>53.74</b>	<b>47.30</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>19</b>
Arges	46.97	46.97	0	0	0	5
Dambovit	43.75	43.75	0	0	0	1
Prahova	35.42	22.22	0	1	0	1
<b>South-Muntenia</b>	<b>42.31</b>	<b>43.96</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Macroregion 3</b>	<b>42.31</b>	<b>43.96</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>
Arad	46.67	n/a	1	0	0	0
Caras-Severin	31.25	31.25	0	0	0	5



## ROMANIAN RURAL LODGINGS: HOW MANY SURVIVED OVER A DECADE? ...

County/ Region/ Macro-region	Simple survival rate (%)	Simple survival rate (%) [resorts and WHS excluded]	Localities concentrated at least 10 lodging facilities			
			Resorts of national interest	Resorts of local interest	WHS	Other
Hunedoara	30.77	30.77	0	0	0	1
Timis	14.29	14.29	0	0	0	2
<b>West</b>	<b>29.63</b>	<b>25.76</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>
Gorj	33.33	33.33	0	0	0	2
Mehedinti	16.67	16.67	0	0	0	2
Valcea	50.00	50.00	1	0	0	2
<b>South-West</b>	<b>40.00</b>	<b>30.43</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Macroregion 4</i>	<i>33.33</i>	<i>26.97</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>14</i>
<b>National level (rural)</b>	<b>38.21</b>	<b>27.75</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>of which</b>						
<b>Resorts of national interest</b>	<b>63.47</b>	-	<b>4</b>	-	-	-
<b>Resorts of local interest</b>	<b>48.43</b>	-	-	<b>15</b>	-	-
<b>WHS</b>	<b>46.46</b>	-	-	-	<b>16</b>	-
<b>Other localities</b>	<b>27.75</b>	<b>27.75</b>	-	-	-	<b>88</b>

Note: The simple survival rate at region, macro-region, and national level was calculated based on the number of surviving accommodation units and not as an average based on the localities and counties simple survival rates.

Source: authors' calculations

**Appendix 4: The structure of rural survivor accommodation units  
and the respective owners/operators and the concentration  
of accommodation units per owner**

County/ Region/ Macro- region	Survivor accommodations						Owners/operators				Accommodation units per owner/ operator (ratio)	
	Pensions (%)		Hotels (%)		Villas (%)		Individual enterprises (%)		LLCs (%)		2005	2016
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016		
Bihor	60.98	56.10	31.71	31.71	2.44	4.88	67.65	50.00	26.47	41.18	1.21	1.21
Bistrita- Nasaud	66.67	33.33	33.33	33.33	0	0	0	0	100	100	1	1
Cluj	91.67	91.67	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.08	80.85	78.72	17.02	21.28	1.02	1.02
Maramures	94.92	89.83	3.39	3.39	0	0	87.93	80.70	12.07	19.30	1.02	1.04
<b>North-West</b>	<b>84.11</b>	<b>80.13</b>	<b>11.26</b>	<b>11.26</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>78.87</b>	<b>70.92</b>	<b>19.01</b>	<b>26.95</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>1.07</b>
Alba	90.91	87.88	0	0	6.06	6.06	75.00	68.75	21.88	25.00	1.03	1.03
Brasov	91.53	89.83	2.54	3.39	4.24	4.24	74.58	66.07	25.42	33.93	1	1.05
Covasna	92.86	92.86	7.14	7.14	0	0	85.71	71.43	14.29	28.57	1	1
Harghita	93.00	86.87	2.00	2.02	1.00	0	86.00	76.77	12.00	23.33	1	1
Mures	100	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	1	0
Sibiu	76.92	76.92	3.85	3.85	11.54	7.69	54.17	60.87	33.33	30.43	1.08	1.13
<b>Center</b>	<b>89.58</b>	<b>87.96</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>5.21</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>73.02</b>	<b>66.30</b>	<b>24.87</b>	<b>31.49</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.06</b>
<b>Macroregion 1</b>	<b>87.17</b>	<b>84.50</b>	<b>6.14</b>	<b>6.73</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>75.53</b>	<b>68.32</b>	<b>22.36</b>	<b>29.50</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>1.06</b>
Bacau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	1	1
Neamt	68.57	68.57	11.43	11.43	8.57	5.71	50.00	46.67	43.33	46.67	1.17	1.17
Suceava	89.06	79.69	0	0	6.25	4.69	65.57	59.02	34.43	40.98	1.05	1.05
<b>North-East</b>	<b>81.00</b>	<b>75.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>59.78</b>	<b>54.35</b>	<b>38.04</b>	<b>43.48</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.09</b>
Braila	14.29	14.29	71.43	71.73	0	0	0	0	40.00	60.00	1.40	1.40
Buzau	41.67	33.33	16.67	16.67	8.33	16.67	27.27	18.18	45.45	54.55	1.09	1.09
Constanta	17.39	17.19	10.87	15.63	43.48	35.94	33.33	23.53	61.11	68.63	1.70	1.25
Tulcea	32.61	31.11	6.52	4.44	45.65	51.11	21.74	17.39	65.22	73.91	2	1.96
Vrancea	77.78	66.67	11.11	11.11	0	0	50.00	37.50	37.50	50.00	1.13	1.13
<b>South-East</b>	<b>37.84</b>	<b>34.25</b>	<b>14.86</b>	<b>13.70</b>	<b>29.73</b>	<b>34.25</b>	<b>25.53</b>	<b>19.15</b>	<b>53.19</b>	<b>63.83</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>1.55</b>
<b>Macroregion 2</b>	<b>62.64</b>	<b>67.80</b>	<b>8.62</b>	<b>8.09</b>	<b>16.67</b>	<b>17.34</b>	<b>48.20</b>	<b>42.45</b>	<b>43.17</b>	<b>50.39</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>1.24</b>
Arges	70.97	60.00	12.90	20.00	3.23	3.33	44.83	36.67	34.48	43.33	1.07	1

## ROMANIAN RURAL LODGINGS: HOW MANY SURVIVED OVER A DECADE? ...

County/ Region/ Macro- region	Survivor accommodations						Owners/operators				Accommodation units per owner/ operator (ratio)	
	Pensions (%)		Hotels (%)		Villas (%)		Individual enterprises (%)		LLCs (%)			
	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016	2005	2016
Dambovita	28.57	28.57	42.86	42.86	0	0	0	0	71.43	85.71	1	1
Prahova	52.94	52.94	17.65	11.76	0	5.88	62.50	52.94	25.00	41.18	1.06	1
<b>South- Muntenia</b>	<b>60.00</b>	<b>53.70</b>	<b>18.18</b>	<b>18.52</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>44.23</b>	<b>37.04</b>	<b>36.54</b>	<b>48.15</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Macroregion 3</i>	<i>60.00</i>	<i>53.70</i>	<i>18.18</i>	<i>18.52</i>	<i>1.82</i>	<i>3.70</i>	<i>44.23</i>	<i>37.04</i>	<i>36.54</i>	<i>48.15</i>	<i>1.06</i>	<i>1</i>
Arad	14.29	14.29	57.14	57.14	14.29	14.29	14.29	14.29	57.14	85.71	1	1
Caras- Severin	60.00	60.00	0	0	10.00	10.00	50.00	37.50	37.50	62.50	1.25	1.25
Hunedoara	100	100	0	0	0	0	50.00	25.00	50.00	75.00	1	1
Timis	33.33	33.33	0	0	0	0	0	0	50.00	100	1.50	1.50
<b>West</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>16.67</b>	<b>16.67</b>	<b>8.33</b>	<b>8.33</b>	<b>33.33</b>	<b>23.81</b>	<b>47.62</b>	<b>76.19</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.14</b>
Gorj	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	1	1
Mehedinti	100	100	0	0	0	0	50.00	0	50.00	100	1	2
Valcea	73.33	73.33	20.00	20.00	0	0	53.85	46.15	38.46	53.85	1.15	1.15
<b>South-West</b>	<b>77.78</b>	<b>77.78</b>	<b>16.67</b>	<b>16.67</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>40.00</b>	<b>43.75</b>	<b>60.00</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>1.20</b>
<i>Macroregion 4</i>	<i>61.90</i>	<i>61.90</i>	<i>16.67</i>	<i>16.67</i>	<i>4.76</i>	<i>4.76</i>	<i>40.54</i>	<i>30.56</i>	<i>45.95</i>	<i>69.44</i>	<i>1.14</i>	<i>1.17</i>
<b>National level (rural)</b>	<b>76.06</b>	<b>72.67</b>	<b>8.79</b>	<b>8.84</b>	<b>7.17</b>	<b>7.53</b>	<b>63.51</b>	<b>56.26</b>	<b>30.41</b>	<b>39.20</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>1.11</b>
<b>of which</b>												
<b>Resorts of national interest</b>	<b>32.37</b>	<b>28.06</b>	<b>20.14</b>	<b>20.14</b>	<b>29.50</b>	<b>17.99</b>	<b>48.91</b>	<b>37.08</b>	<b>44.57</b>	<b>56.18</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>1.56</b>
<b>Resorts of local interest</b>	<b>79.27</b>	<b>76.02</b>	<b>9.35</b>	<b>9.35</b>	<b>5.28</b>	<b>4.88</b>	<b>65.38</b>	<b>55.51</b>	<b>29.49</b>	<b>41.41</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1.08</b>
<b>WHS</b>	<b>61.96</b>	<b>58.24</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>27.47</b>	<b>62.12</b>	<b>53.85</b>	<b>33.33</b>	<b>43.08</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>1.40</b>
<b>Other localities</b>	<b>85.80</b>	<b>81.16</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>2.13</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>65.02</b>	<b>60.87</b>	<b>23.84</b>	<b>30.12</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.02</b>

Source: authors' calculations

**Appendix 5: 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>)