ABSTRACT: After 1990 all economic aspects saw new trends in Romania, completely different compared to the previous period based on economic centralized economy. Nowadays, we face challenges strictly related to globalization and some circumstances of economic uncertainty. The Romanian tourism faces such issues too, but it continues to be seen as a lifebuoy of the Romanian economy, in terms of a proper revaluation of its valuable inheritance and of a more aggressive and a more focused promotion on these segments of consumers that must correspond to elements offered in various tourist regions. Balanced development of tourism throughout the country contributes to economic and social growth, mitigating imbalances emerged between different areas and representing an important source for increasing population’s income. This work seeks to analyze the state of existing accommodation capacity for the eight regions of Romania in the last 22 years and to determine which are the factors that led to these developments, but also their specific effects on each region. For this purpose, we used data on accommodation capacity during 1990 - 2011, being the last official data available and we used appropriate statistical methods trying to determine the place of each region in the national assembly for every year and for the entire period. We also determined differences / advances in absolute size for a correct position of each region in terms of accommodation capacity.
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1. THE ROLE OF TOURISM IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

In general, tourism development plays an important role and regional development becomes crucial for all economies of the world and their development strategies, because most countries promote development of this sector, in areas lagging behind economically and socially, to improve regional economic structure. A literature review shows that there are regional imbalances caused by a differential allocation of natural and human resources, by different, specific evolutionary environments (economic, technological, demographic, social, political and cultural).

Tourism represents a decisive factor for general economic progress, contributing to GDP growth, countervailing external balance of payments and improving the quality of life. This sector may be the most important generator of jobs, being a main source of economic recovery of those areas that have tourist resources and exploit them properly.

Diversity of activities giving content to tourism and the presence of some of them in the structure of other branches and sectors of the economy provides an industry interference character for tourism, with complex and extensive links with other economic sectors, links to be considered when drawing a sustainable regional strategy for tourism development. Tourism contributes to a higher capitalization of resources, stimulating economic development, improving social structures and living conditions, acting as a stimulating element of the global socio-economic system.

Although Romania's tourism potential was and is considered to be promising, both by Romanian and foreign researchers, Romanian tourism is still in a stage of development and rehabilitation. The number of foreign tourists visiting Romania suffered a decline in recent years. While in Romania effects of mass tourism development are not yet as strong as in the Mediterranean or Latin American countries, we can already think of possible future implications of increased flow of foreign tourists. We will try to express several recommendations in accordance with the following analysis, taking into account the main trends presented, which would contribute to improving the state of Romanian tourism and to increasing its competitiveness at international level.

Regional development of tourism is based on the principles of regional development policy which aims mainly at: reducing existing regional disparities, with emphasis on fostering the balanced development and revitalization of
disadvantaged areas (delayed development), preventing the production of new imbalances; fulfilling integration criteria in EU structures and access to financial instruments to support countries.

The contribution of tourism to economic and social life is different from one country to another, from one region to another and from one county to another depending on the level of development and of the policy promoted in connection with these activities.

As part of an economy, tourism shows itself as a means to diversify its structures by creating specific activities as the hotel industry which takes into account not only housing and creating the conditions and comfort for leisure, but also a number of additional benefits, whose range is very large, from tourists’ information to business services or non-specific services. Economic effects of tourism are present in the plan of economic efficiency of the other branches of activities: their quantitative and qualitative development is stimulated, dismissed labour force is drawn from other industries and new jobs in adjacent sectors are created. Surveys undertaken in this regard show that jobs created in tourism determine another 60-80 new jobs in agriculture and construction. Direct contribution of tourism on employment is particularly significant for economies with intensive tourism.

International tourism plays an important role in increasing and diversifying exports, but it can only be achieved in tourist areas properly promoted and supported by an appropriate accommodation infrastructure. International tourism has a remarkable impact on the balance of payments through balance of foreign exchange of tourism that can compensate, reduce or aggravate a deficit of balance of payments. International tourism gives rise to activities that are part of current transactions and capital transactions.

Regional development strategy, drawn especially for regions that include objectives of certain value in their areas, must take into consideration that increasing tourist influx, of any origin, positively influences regional economy:

- directly, by total returns from tourism consumption (house, meals, taxes, shopping);
- indirectly, through bilateral contacts and local cultural influences, becoming familiar with local economic values and potential business opportunities, employment in services, creating a favourable image, civilizing infrastructure involved.
- The prosperity of a region as a result of tourism development appears in several stages:
- immediately, as a result of direct consumption of tourism product;
- in the short run, by a continuous absorption of labour and encouraging greeting trade (“aggressive”);
- in the long run, through capital concentration for investment in general infrastructure and tourism, in establishments of tourists’ reception and for development of urban services.

2. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF ROMANIA’S TOURISM CAPACITY

For a complete and complex analysis of tourism in Romania, in terms of accommodation capacity during 1990-2011, we resorted to various representative statistical data, taking into consideration indicators which can characterize territorial tourism activity, at the level of the eight regions of the country. We refer here to:

- existing accommodation capacity;
- accommodation capacity in use;
- number of arrivals (tourists stay);
- number of overnight stays;
- net use index of capacity of tourists’ accommodation.

2.1. The analysis of existing tourists’ accommodation capacity in Romania from 1990 to 2011

Existing (provided) tourists’ accommodation capacity represents the number of beds used for the tourists’ accommodation, registered in the last reception, homologation or classification document of tourists’ accommodation establishment, the extra-beds which can be provided, if necessary, excluded. The number of beds is determined for the number of additional benefits, whose range is very large, from tourists’ information to business services or non-specific services.

In Romania, the existing tourists’ accommodation capacity a downward trend in the last 21 years, from 353236 thousand places in 1990 to 278503 places in 2011. The average level of available accommodation offer was 291,387.41 thousand places yearly, which corresponds to an absolute decline of 3558.71 thousand per year and a decreasing rate of 1.13%, after a period of continuous decline until 2002 and a revival of accommodation offer at country level.

Table 1 – Evolution of existing tourists’ accommodation capacity (number of places) at region and country level during 1990-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>North - West</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>North-East</th>
<th>South-East</th>
<th>South - Muntenia</th>
<th>Bucharest – Ilfov</th>
<th>South-West Oltenia</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>353236</td>
<td>29102</td>
<td>44241</td>
<td>24896</td>
<td>162599</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>12826</td>
<td>26376</td>
<td>26006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>312407</td>
<td>24732</td>
<td>38600</td>
<td>23321</td>
<td>146527</td>
<td>25955</td>
<td>10006</td>
<td>22230</td>
<td>21036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>302533</td>
<td>24270</td>
<td>37632</td>
<td>25647</td>
<td>141917</td>
<td>23398</td>
<td>10190</td>
<td>18766</td>
<td>23713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>295036</td>
<td>25357</td>
<td>35244</td>
<td>21134</td>
<td>139281</td>
<td>23506</td>
<td>9133</td>
<td>18046</td>
<td>23335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>292479</td>
<td>26359</td>
<td>38794</td>
<td>21779</td>
<td>132505</td>
<td>23583</td>
<td>6388</td>
<td>17817</td>
<td>23096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A survey conducted over the period 1990–2011, at regional level, shows that the evolution of accommodation capacity is extremely interesting, given that there are regions that follow the same trend as accommodation capacity at national level, but also regions out of this pattern.

When referring to the Bucharest - Ilfov Region we can see that it is the only region showing a negative growth rate of 2.40%, corresponding to an average level of available accommodation supply of 12057.14 thousand places annually. A concrete situation existing in South-East Region interesting to be followed, where the highest decline rate of 2.50% is recorded, much above the average achieved at country level. This can be explained by an almost continuously decrease of existing accommodation capacity in the region, with small oscillations in 2007, after which the downward trend is resumed. A mid-level of available accommodation supply is 134063.27 thousand places per year, much above the average level, but also regions out of this pattern.

A survey conducted over the period 1990–2011, at regional level, shows that the evolution of accommodation capacity is extremely interesting, given that there are regions that follow the same trend as accommodation capacity at national level, but also regions out of this pattern.

When referring to the Bucharest - Ilfov Region we can see that it is the only region showing a negative growth rate of 2.40%, corresponding to an average level of available accommodation supply of 12057.14 thousand places annually. A concrete situation existing in South-East Region interesting to be followed, where the highest decline rate of 2.50% is recorded, much above the average achieved at country level. This can be explained by an almost continuously decrease of existing accommodation capacity in the region, with small oscillations in 2007, after which the downward trend is resumed. A mid-level of available accommodation supply is 134063.27 thousand places per year, much above the average level, but also regions out of this pattern.

A concrete situation existing in South-East Region interesting to be followed, where the highest decline rate of 2.50% is recorded, much above the average achieved at country level. This can be explained by an almost continuously decrease of existing accommodation capacity in the region, with small oscillations in 2007, after which the downward trend is resumed. A mid-level of available accommodation supply is 134063.27 thousand places per year, much above the average level, but also regions out of this pattern.

For a better image of the real state of existing accommodation capacity in the Romanian regions, we present the figure 1.

Analyzing the existing accommodation capacity, its delimitation in two broad areas is required, that is: an accommodation capacity in use and a non-functional one (closed temporarily for lack of tourists or due to necessary repair). This classification can bring us new information about the evolution of Romanian tourism at regional level, given that during the period analyzed there were repeated attempts to reclassify existing establishments and to close a number of establishments of accommodation which do not correspond in terms of comfort required by the new regulations for the classification.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>North-West</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>South-Muntenia</th>
<th>Bucharest-Ilfov</th>
<th>South-West Oltenia</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>North-East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>289539</td>
<td>26044</td>
<td>37584</td>
<td>20250</td>
<td>133739</td>
<td>23082</td>
<td>8459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>288656</td>
<td>20943</td>
<td>36513</td>
<td>18814</td>
<td>134484</td>
<td>23641</td>
<td>9223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>287943</td>
<td>26472</td>
<td>36997</td>
<td>19006</td>
<td>132296</td>
<td>23744</td>
<td>8916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>287268</td>
<td>27231</td>
<td>36915</td>
<td>19131</td>
<td>133006</td>
<td>23139</td>
<td>8668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>282806</td>
<td>26382</td>
<td>36026</td>
<td>18832</td>
<td>133548</td>
<td>22347</td>
<td>9002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>280005</td>
<td>25547</td>
<td>35235</td>
<td>17745</td>
<td>134061</td>
<td>22433</td>
<td>7929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>277047</td>
<td>25197</td>
<td>34648</td>
<td>16971</td>
<td>132983</td>
<td>21321</td>
<td>9233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>275906</td>
<td>24561</td>
<td>33823</td>
<td>17269</td>
<td>130111</td>
<td>21456</td>
<td>10331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>273614</td>
<td>24320</td>
<td>32759</td>
<td>17965</td>
<td>130991</td>
<td>21729</td>
<td>10025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>272941</td>
<td>24576</td>
<td>34363</td>
<td>17183</td>
<td>130854</td>
<td>22494</td>
<td>11467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>282661</td>
<td>26019</td>
<td>35479</td>
<td>18718</td>
<td>132965</td>
<td>22292</td>
<td>11225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>281758</td>
<td>26816</td>
<td>37025</td>
<td>19868</td>
<td>134569</td>
<td>20827</td>
<td>12723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>283701</td>
<td>26805</td>
<td>35380</td>
<td>18441</td>
<td>132922</td>
<td>20767</td>
<td>13747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>294210</td>
<td>26484</td>
<td>39302</td>
<td>18986</td>
<td>132668</td>
<td>21464</td>
<td>18937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>303486</td>
<td>27886</td>
<td>38451</td>
<td>21122</td>
<td>134623</td>
<td>21590</td>
<td>20423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>311698</td>
<td>26103</td>
<td>42029</td>
<td>21279</td>
<td>136875</td>
<td>22625</td>
<td>23120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>278503</td>
<td>28439</td>
<td>45388</td>
<td>21927</td>
<td>95587</td>
<td>24131</td>
<td>21086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>291387.41</td>
<td>26070.23</td>
<td>37383.27</td>
<td>19842.55</td>
<td>134063.27</td>
<td>22837.45</td>
<td>12057.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>19842.55</td>
<td>21927</td>
<td>21122</td>
<td>21590</td>
<td>20423</td>
<td>16349</td>
<td>23041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>16926.05</td>
<td>19096</td>
<td>18814</td>
<td>14567</td>
<td>385.81</td>
<td>22207.45</td>
<td>23671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>133548</td>
<td>18397</td>
<td>18986</td>
<td>14567</td>
<td>385.81</td>
<td>22207.45</td>
<td>23671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>133548</td>
<td>18397</td>
<td>18986</td>
<td>14567</td>
<td>385.81</td>
<td>22207.45</td>
<td>23671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.insse.ro
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2.2. The analysis of the evolution of tourists’ accommodation capacity in use in Romania between 1990-2011

The tourists’ accommodation capacity in use represents the number of accommodation beds put at the disposal of tourists by the establishments of tourists’ reception, taking into account the number of days they are opened in that period, that is the number of days when tourists’ accommodation was possible. It is expressed in places-days (number of places x number of days). The beds from the rooms or establishments temporarily closed, due to lack of tourists, for capital repairs or for other reasons, are excluded.

The average level of tourists’ accommodation capacity in use at national level was 56826.52 thousand places - day yearly, which corresponds to an absolute decline of 409.75 annually and an average rate of decrease of 0.56%, given that after a period of steady decline until 2005, tourist accommodation capacity in use at national level has returned to an upward trend.

Continuing this regional analysis, we should emphasize that the only region where we find an average increase rate of 2.94% is Bucharest-IIfov where the average level of accommodation capacity in use is 4167.10 thousand places - day, which corresponds to an annual absolute increase of 165.73 thousand places.

A significant advance of this region is observed in the last years of analysis, which increased the number of places-day which corresponds to an average level of tourist accommodation capacity in use of 14853.38 thousand places annually.

A high rate of decrease we see at the level of South-West Oltenia, -1.68%.

Table 2. – Evolution of tourists’ accommodation capacity in use (thousand places - days) at regional and country level during 1990-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North - West</td>
<td>Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>77022</td>
<td>7860.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>64124</td>
<td>7078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>58870.3</td>
<td>6102.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>57434.2</td>
<td>7117.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>53254.6</td>
<td>6938.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>53539.8</td>
<td>6786.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>53638.5</td>
<td>6852.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>52026.3</td>
<td>6579.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>53163.9</td>
<td>6720.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>51275.2</td>
<td>6691.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>50197.1</td>
<td>6561.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>51182</td>
<td>6647.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50752</td>
<td>6495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>51632</td>
<td>6342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>53937.3</td>
<td>6699.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>54978.8</td>
<td>7103.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>56499.9</td>
<td>7371.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>57137.6</td>
<td>7486.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>59188</td>
<td>7760.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>61044.4</td>
<td>7757.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>63808.3</td>
<td>8105.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>68417.3</td>
<td>8626.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>56826.52</td>
<td>8077.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>-409.75</td>
<td>46.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.insse.ro

As a general perspective, the year 2002 is the year with the smallest number of beds in use, an year when the Romanian tourism has experienced a continuous growth, due to almost complete privatization of tourist establishments, to an increase of investments for upgrading accommodations and restaurants and of "green-field" investments. Despite the increased interest for the Romanian tourism after 2000, the sector's contribution to national economic growth is still small. In terms of tourism potential, there are differences between regions, given their historical, natural and geographical peculiarities. Due to the lack of an organized planning, promotion and coordination at national level, tourist establishments have developed in an unpredictable way, touching different quality levels. The general lack of infrastructure and the low accessibility represent important barriers to domestic and international markets.
Figure 2 shows us a linear evolution of accommodation capacity in use in most Romanian regions. South-East region, where oscillations are more important along the analyzed period, is an exception, with a sharp drop from 1990 to 1992 and a substantial increase since 2007, due to the private establishments emerged in all counties circumscribed to these regions, mainly in Tulcea and Constanța.

2.3. Analysis of the number of tourists in Romania at regional level during 1990-2011

Given these aspects related to the existing accommodation capacity, in use and the coefficient of use of accommodation capacity, we present statistics on the number of arrivals during the period 1990-2011 at national and regional levels, all indicators giving us a conclusive picture over regional and national accommodation capacity. A tourist’s arrival in an establishment of tourists’ reception with tourists’ accommodation functions occurs when a person is written in the register of the establishment to be hosted for one or more continuous nights. Only one arrival per tourist is counted for each establishment, regardless of the number of overnight stays. Tourists recorded in previous month are not included in the reported number of arrivals. For families housed in accommodation establishment, each family member is counted for the number of arrivals, if at least one place is paid.

Table 4 - Number of arrivals (accommodated tourists) for the eight regions of the country and at country level (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>North - West</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>North-East</th>
<th>South-East</th>
<th>South - Muntenia</th>
<th>Bucharest – Ilfov</th>
<th>South-West Oltenia</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>12297</td>
<td>1305.8</td>
<td>2001.7</td>
<td>1558.7</td>
<td>2343.2</td>
<td>1368.1</td>
<td>1119.5</td>
<td>1024.5</td>
<td>1375.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>9603</td>
<td>1099.6</td>
<td>1494.5</td>
<td>1389.8</td>
<td>1789.2</td>
<td>1184.9</td>
<td>928.9</td>
<td>793.2</td>
<td>923.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8015</td>
<td>910.3</td>
<td>1287.1</td>
<td>1120.1</td>
<td>1517.2</td>
<td>1045.8</td>
<td>918.5</td>
<td>642.5</td>
<td>783.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7566</td>
<td>1053.8</td>
<td>1177.9</td>
<td>923.9</td>
<td>1400.0</td>
<td>903.7</td>
<td>825.0</td>
<td>576.0</td>
<td>705.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7005</td>
<td>850.2</td>
<td>1114.8</td>
<td>846.4</td>
<td>1283.9</td>
<td>763.7</td>
<td>955.1</td>
<td>495.4</td>
<td>695.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7070</td>
<td>805.6</td>
<td>1172.9</td>
<td>820.0</td>
<td>1395.4</td>
<td>816.5</td>
<td>867.1</td>
<td>544.6</td>
<td>648.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>6595</td>
<td>781.0</td>
<td>1234.7</td>
<td>780.8</td>
<td>1293.8</td>
<td>729.5</td>
<td>649.9</td>
<td>506.2</td>
<td>619.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5327</td>
<td>619.2</td>
<td>980.3</td>
<td>662.8</td>
<td>1128.7</td>
<td>666.9</td>
<td>719.3</td>
<td>433.8</td>
<td>513.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5552</td>
<td>605.4</td>
<td>927.6</td>
<td>636.0</td>
<td>1170.7</td>
<td>641.7</td>
<td>675.2</td>
<td>374.4</td>
<td>520.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5109</td>
<td>601.1</td>
<td>855.7</td>
<td>568.7</td>
<td>1007.4</td>
<td>569.7</td>
<td>624.4</td>
<td>343.1</td>
<td>539.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4920.1</td>
<td>559.6</td>
<td>868.0</td>
<td>543.0</td>
<td>980.8</td>
<td>552.6</td>
<td>520.0</td>
<td>327.1</td>
<td>568.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4875.0</td>
<td>596.0</td>
<td>837.0</td>
<td>535.0</td>
<td>994.0</td>
<td>546.0</td>
<td>488.0</td>
<td>338.0</td>
<td>541.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4847.0</td>
<td>629.0</td>
<td>783.0</td>
<td>535.0</td>
<td>984.0</td>
<td>549.0</td>
<td>554.0</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>493.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5057.0</td>
<td>637.0</td>
<td>847.0</td>
<td>553.0</td>
<td>1019.0</td>
<td>572.0</td>
<td>585.0</td>
<td>324.0</td>
<td>520.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5638.5</td>
<td>698.2</td>
<td>986.2</td>
<td>618.4</td>
<td>1133.1</td>
<td>575.7</td>
<td>729.9</td>
<td>361.5</td>
<td>535.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5805.1</td>
<td>733.4</td>
<td>1067.9</td>
<td>621.6</td>
<td>1108.0</td>
<td>573.5</td>
<td>831.3</td>
<td>334.2</td>
<td>552.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6216.0</td>
<td>780.6</td>
<td>1184.0</td>
<td>678.3</td>
<td>1080.7</td>
<td>627.3</td>
<td>900.5</td>
<td>378.8</td>
<td>613.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6971.9</td>
<td>889.7</td>
<td>1330.1</td>
<td>717.6</td>
<td>1231.1</td>
<td>729.2</td>
<td>996.7</td>
<td>403.0</td>
<td>674.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7125.1</td>
<td>908.1</td>
<td>1291.5</td>
<td>725.6</td>
<td>1308.6</td>
<td>750.2</td>
<td>1059.0</td>
<td>492.4</td>
<td>673.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6141.1</td>
<td>732.5</td>
<td>1072.8</td>
<td>656.5</td>
<td>1157.1</td>
<td>591.2</td>
<td>989.8</td>
<td>366.1</td>
<td>575.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6072.8</td>
<td>702.9</td>
<td>1126.9</td>
<td>620.9</td>
<td>1044.0</td>
<td>572.9</td>
<td>1125.2</td>
<td>337.1</td>
<td>542.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7031.1</td>
<td>799.3</td>
<td>1435.8</td>
<td>696.2</td>
<td>1134.8</td>
<td>616.4</td>
<td>1282.6</td>
<td>426.9</td>
<td>639.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6601.81</td>
<td>795.38</td>
<td>1137.00</td>
<td>764.02</td>
<td>1256.21</td>
<td>724.84</td>
<td>823.35</td>
<td>459.75</td>
<td>647.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-250.76</td>
<td>-33.64</td>
<td>-26.93</td>
<td>-41.07</td>
<td>-57.34</td>
<td>-35.80</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>-28.46</td>
<td>-35.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.insse.ro
Data presented in the table above shows us that, if in 1990 in Romania 12297 thousand arrivals were registered, in 2002 when a minimum point is achieved, we have three times fewer arrivals and in 2008 we may consider a resurgence in the number of arrivals, which count 7125 thousand tourists, a trend denied by the values of the next year when a new decline is observed, registering two times fewer arrivals than in the first year of our analysis. This latter decrease is due to economic instability period started in 2008 which has clear effects on Romanian tourism. 2011 seems to be a year that has brought the number of arrivals (accommodated tourists) on an upward trend for all the Romanian regions. All regions have the same evolution, recording bigger or smaller decreases, issues clarified by applying statistical methods to calculate the average arrivals, the absolute regress and the average rate.

The average level of arrivals at national level was 6601.81 thousand tourists accommodated, which corresponds to an absolute annual regres of 250.79 thousand arrivals and an average decrease rate of 2.63% down. This real state is eloquent to describe a general image of arrivals in the Romanian regions.

A similar position is noticed in the South-East (-3.77%), South (-3.73%) regions or West region (-3.58%). Figure 3 is eloquent to describe a general image of arrivals in the Romanian regions.

Table 5 - Number of overnight stays for the eight regions and at the country level (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>North - West</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>North-East</th>
<th>South-East</th>
<th>South - Muntenia</th>
<th>Bucharest - Ilfov</th>
<th>South-West Oltenia</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>44551.8</td>
<td>4009.9</td>
<td>6341.5</td>
<td>3824.5</td>
<td>14115.6</td>
<td>4205.8</td>
<td>3028.9</td>
<td>2392.6</td>
<td>4089.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>45478.1</td>
<td>5063.5</td>
<td>6982.3</td>
<td>3530.8</td>
<td>14040.8</td>
<td>4252.3</td>
<td>3028.9</td>
<td>2392.6</td>
<td>4340.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>26076.0</td>
<td>2557.0</td>
<td>3798.0</td>
<td>2520.0</td>
<td>7642.0</td>
<td>2864.0</td>
<td>1982.0</td>
<td>2369.0</td>
<td>2344.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>24768.6</td>
<td>2714.1</td>
<td>3517.2</td>
<td>2176.1</td>
<td>7655.9</td>
<td>2614.1</td>
<td>1919.6</td>
<td>2069.9</td>
<td>2101.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>23295.7</td>
<td>2518.3</td>
<td>3495.5</td>
<td>2052.9</td>
<td>6926.7</td>
<td>2385.5</td>
<td>1721.8</td>
<td>1974.9</td>
<td>2220.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>24111.2</td>
<td>2542.2</td>
<td>3582.0</td>
<td>1987.3</td>
<td>7333.7</td>
<td>2386.2</td>
<td>1626.2</td>
<td>2044.1</td>
<td>2239.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>21837.9</td>
<td>2194.3</td>
<td>3337.7</td>
<td>1894.9</td>
<td>7114.1</td>
<td>2207.3</td>
<td>1405.7</td>
<td>1791.9</td>
<td>1891.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>19611.5</td>
<td>1951.2</td>
<td>3020.2</td>
<td>1615.8</td>
<td>6697.5</td>
<td>2135.2</td>
<td>1397.2</td>
<td>1682.1</td>
<td>1712.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>19183.2</td>
<td>1920.5</td>
<td>2831.2</td>
<td>1642.1</td>
<td>6205.5</td>
<td>1961.1</td>
<td>1253.9</td>
<td>1618.9</td>
<td>1749.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>17669.8</td>
<td>1937.6</td>
<td>2627.7</td>
<td>1440.4</td>
<td>5335.1</td>
<td>1789.1</td>
<td>1142.2</td>
<td>1569.8</td>
<td>1827.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. – Evolution of arrivals (accommodated tourists) for the eight regions of the country and at country level (thousands)

An issue closely related to aspects previously analyzed is the number of overnight stays. The overnight stay represents a 24 hour period, starting with the hotel hour, when a person is recorded in the accommodation establishment and receives accommodation in the account of the tariff paid, even if effective residence time is less than the period already mentioned. Additional beds for overnight stays are also considered (paid by customers).

2.4. The analysis of the number of overnight stays in Romania during 1990-2011 at regional level

The number of overnight stays in Romania has an interesting development at national level and beyond, following the same pattern as other indicators discussed above, that is a continuous and significant decrease until 2002 that we can call the watershed year of Romanian tourism, and an oscillating evolution in the next period, with similar downward trend in 2005 and in 2011. The average level of overnight stays at national level was 22091.55 thousands, which corresponds to an absolute decline per year of 1265.35 thousand overnight stays and an average decrease rate of 4.23%. The average decrease rate is recorded in all regions of Romania in line with the national trend.
Some more pronounced decreases can be noticed in the South-East and South-West Oltenia regions. A moderate decrease was recorded in the Bucharest - Ilfov region which generally was located in a favourable position compared to other regions for most indicators analyzed.

Figure 4 is self-evident for the presentation of the evolution of number of overnight stays. Sharp falls until 2002 and maintained insignificant fluctuations between 1000-3000 thousand overnight stays are noteworthy.

2.5. Evolution of net use index of capacity of tourists’ accommodation

The net use index of capacity of tourists’ accommodation expresses the relationship between accommodation capacity in use and its effective use by tourists, for a given period of time. It follows from the calculation, by dividing the total number of overnight stays with the tourists’ accommodation capacity in use, for the given period. In table 6 we presented the national and regional evolution of net use index during 1990-2011, according to official data provided by the National Statistics Institute of Romania.

Table 6. – Net use indices of capacity of tourists’ accommodation in use (%)
It may be noticed that, if in 1990 the net use index of accommodation capacity was 57.8%, in 2011 it registered a half value, namely 26.3%, with almost 1% less than in 2010. Thus, we can say that the average net use index at national level was 37.5%, a level found in the regions analyzed. Below this level we find the index for the North-West, North-East and South-Muntenia, Bucharest-Ilfov regions and West at the same level. Higher level we found in the South-East, and South-West Oltenia and Centre. This value corresponds to a absolute national annual decline of 1.5% and an average rate of 3.7% decrease, The most important decrease recorded for the region Bucharest - Ilfov, namely 4.4%, is corresponding to an annual decline of 2.1 which is also the highest compared with other regions. Below, we present the schematic evolution of net use index of accommodation capacity:

![Graph showing the evolution of net use indices of capacity of tourists' accommodation in use (%)](image)

**Figure 5 – Evolution of net use indices of capacity of tourists’ accommodation in use (%)**

Given the circumstances presented in each index separately, we tried also an aggregate analysis, taking into account all indices that allow us to settle the ranks each region holds in the first year of analysis and in the last year.

### 3. ROMANIAN REGIONS’ MULTICRITERIAL RANKING FROM THE ACCOMMODATION CAPACITY PERSPECTIVE

Real final rank of each region was determined beginning with the region with the lowest average rank, indicating a maximum performance (1st rank) to the region with the highest average rank, which indicates the minimum performance (rank „n”).

---

Source: www.insse.ro
In accordance with results obtained by the ranking method, one can observe that the South-East region has primacy in accommodation capacity, situation supported by existing accommodation places especially in Constanta County, at the Romanian seaside, otherwise supporting the whole region, This region is closely followed by the central region, sustained by Sibiu, the Europe's cultural capital in 2009, and by highly developed mountain tourism in Brasov County, In third place, we find North-West region with Iasi, Botosani and Vrancea counties as important areas for tourists, and only in 4th place is found Bucharest-Ilfiov where Bucharest hardly supports this rank since it is a pole of power terms of accommodation capacity extremely necessary for business tourism segment, Thus, it can be found that a region can be supported by a single county or a small number of counties that put the region on a leading position, but if it benefited from well placed counties in terms of accommodation capacity, they would leave behind the others,

Table 6 - Tourists’ accommodation capacity and activity in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development region</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>In use</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>Overnight stays</th>
<th>Indices of capacity of tourists’ accommodation in use</th>
<th>Relative distances to better performances</th>
<th>Mediu in rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>places</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>thousands of places/day</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>thousands of tourists’ accommodation</td>
<td>in use</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North - West</td>
<td>28439,00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8826,30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>799,30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2083,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>45388,00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12867,40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1435,80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3311,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South - East</td>
<td>21927,00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6423,50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>696,20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1556,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South - East</td>
<td>95587,00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14336,20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1134,80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4050,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South – Muntenia</td>
<td>24311,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7204,10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>616,40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1678,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucharest - Ilfov</td>
<td>21086,00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7644,10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1282,60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2129,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West Oltenia</td>
<td>18274,01</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4761,20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>426,90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1486,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>23671,00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6354,50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>639,70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1682,80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By calculating regions’ ranking in 1990, we found that the hierarchy was not strictly modified along the analyzed period, meaning that first and the second were kept by the same regions, led by the South-East region. The surprise is provided by West and South-West Oltenia regions which have advanced from 7th and 8th places in 1990 to 6th and 4th in 2011, penalizing North-East, Nord-West and South regions, issues summarized in the table below:

Table 7 - Tourists’ accommodation capacity and activity in 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development region</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>In use</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>Overnight stays</th>
<th>Indices of capacity of tourists’ accommodation in use</th>
<th>Relative distances to better performances</th>
<th>Mediu in rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>places</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>thousands of places/day</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>thousands of tourists’ accommodation</td>
<td>in use</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North - West</td>
<td>29102,00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7860,00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1505,80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4909,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>44242,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11645,40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2001,72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6341,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North - East</td>
<td>24969,00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6233,97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1557,83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3824,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South - East</td>
<td>162799,00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26260,21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2343,21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14115,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South – Muntenia</td>
<td>26900,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7149,10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1368,57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4205,84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucharest - Ilfov</td>
<td>12824,00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4163,75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1119,75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3019,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West Oltenia</td>
<td>26376,00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6790,25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1052,45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4045,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>26604,00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6919,50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1375,32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4092,95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. CONCLUSIONS
Tourism is a sector that can contribute in significant proportion to economic growth and development, in Romania, as in many other countries of the world, if it were supported by investments in infrastructure facilities. It is clearly recognized that the picturesqueness of various natural areas of Romania, supplemented by real treasures of culture - sometimes of universal interest - are as many motivations for tourism. The influx of tourists and visitors in different
regions is, of course, determined by the attractiveness, value, number and quality of objectives of these areas, by available transport infrastructure, food, accommodation and entertainment and by the level of knowledge and presentation through ingenious advertising. We found within the study conducted that distribution of accommodation capacity in Romania is differentiated by regions and counties inside the region. At the same, it can be observed that, in some cases, even if the share of number of beds in total is reduced, however the net use index has a significant value. Thus, after the application of several statistical methods we have achieved a ranking of the regions by using several criteria. There are regions in the top supported by a single county, which does not seem very easy, which leads us to conclude that those counties could be considered a model for the surrounding areas to develop a whole region. The slow process of privatization combined with the lack of investment in infrastructure during the '90s, as Romania was readjusted to life after communism, resulted in a tourist industry in a growing pain. However, the new-found freedom and a developing middle class determined an increase of travels abroad, encouraged by low prices in Greece and Turkey. Tourism development will be achieved by upgrading infrastructure and tourism services, diversification of tourism supply and development of ecological, spa, cultural and historical tourism. A complementary development of road infrastructure, connected to the national transport network capable of providing access to tourist areas, of social services infrastructure, that would increase living standards in the region, is essential to ensure the country's tourism development. Tourism development must take into account the principle of sustainable development, in order to preserve natural and cultural heritage and to minimize the "human pressure" over environment. Investment in tourism and culture will allow regions to use the benefits of tourism and cultural heritage to enhance competitive advantage in performing sectors, of high cognitive and quality level, both on traditional and emerging markets,
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