Diversification of economy and the development of infrastructure: Vectors of development for the rural area and for improving the quality of life of rural population

~ **Neculai Cristina** *(National Institute for Economic Research)*

Abstract: *The purpose of the paper is the analysis of socio-economical structures which are: rural economy and rural infrastructure, regarding their contribution to the development of the rural area and to the improvement of the quality of life for the rural population.*

We emphasize the diversification and the economical development in the Romanian and European rural area, by analyzing employment and gross value added. Also, we emphasize the development of rural infrastructure through the analysis of tourism and Internet infrastructures, as well as social infrastructure (through education).

Key words: predominantly rural regions, intermediate regions, predominantly urban regions, diversification of rural economy, rural infrastructure

Introduction

The economical and social development of rural area and the improvement of the quality of life of rural population, through the diversification of rural economy and the development (through modernization and expansion) of the infrastructure in rural area.

For a society to aim for economical and social balance and to reach a sustainable socio-economical development throughout the national territory, efforts must be carried out to maintain and develop sustainable and dynamic rural communities. In Romania, the maintenance and development of sustainable and dynamic rural communities involves the diminishing of socio-economical differences between rural and urban communities, which can be done mainly through economical diversification and infrastructure development in rural area (we consider the physical, social, financial, market specific infrastructure).

The integration of the Romanian rural area in the European one, requires, on the one hand, the modernization of Romanian agriculture and, on the other hand, making compatible the social, economical and environmental Romanian structures and processes with the European ones. This process assumes, inter alia, the diversification and development of rural economy and infrastructure.

Today, agriculture is the defining activity of the Romanian rural area. To have a positive contribution to the national economic balance and to have an important role in ensuring an income for farmers, that is comparable with other socio-economical categories, it is necessary to enhance the competitiveness of agriculture (especially through investments), in the context of solving the structural problems the Romanian rural area is facing.

The need to make compatible the social and economical Romanian structures and processes with the European ones, including through methods of diversifying the rural economy, comes from the economical reality of the Romanian rural area, namely from the predominance of agricultural activities in the rural economy, because the modernization of agriculture cannot provide enough possibilities of employment and income for the entire population living in the rural area, which will provide a wealthy life and from the European rural area which is represented by a strong development of secondary and tertiary sectors.

Because there is a direct relationship between the degree of diversification and development of the rural economy and the employment structure by sectors of rural economy activities, namely the income level of farmers, we believe that the modernization of agriculture (the primary sector) simultaneously with the diversification of rural economy (development of secondary and tertiary sectors) creates the conditions for a better rate of employment, which allows the diversification and improvement of income sources for the population, this being guarantors of better living conditions in the rural area.

As the income is the basis of the living standard and, therefore, of the quality of life, we consider that, for the diversification and increase of the source of income, it is necessary, on the one hand, the diversification of rural economy, namely the development of secondary and tertiary sectors, which „takes" people from the population employed in the primary sector and contributes to the increase of the gross value added and, on the other hand, it is necessary for the modernization of the Romanian agriculture.

After the income of the population (household), the quality of life in rural areas is influenced by the existing infrastructure (the physical, social, financial, market specific infrastructure) and its quality. In the context of the present economical crisis, social infrastructure (social services), especially education and health, are undergoing profound „changes" in the Romanian rural area.

As training is a resource for the quality of labor, as a result of the relationship between education level and occupation, we consider that it is necessary to correlate both the modernization of the agricultural sector and the development of the non-agriculture sector in the rural area with the development of the human potential.

A key factor of the economic and social development in Romanian rural area and of the improvement of living conditions of rural population is the modernization of tourism and Internet infrastructures, by attracting

tourists and investors, increasing the employment level and, hence, the income of population.

The analysis of rural economy and rural infrastructure allows the identification of the positive and negative structural conditions existing at the macro economical level, which affects the development/breaking of the Romanian rural area and, therefore, the national and the European area and, on the other hand, allows people to identify the possibilities to have a higher level of the quality of life. Diversification and development of the economy and the development of infrastructure in rural area are essential for both the economical, social and environmental development of rural area, as well as for a balanced regional development.

We are researching the development of the rural area and the quality of life of rural population by analyzing the economical and social infrastructure (education), as well as by analyzing the tourism and Internet infrastructure. Therefore, we will analyze: the diversification of rural economy (based on the gross value added and employment by sector of activity and by types of regions, and the relationship between these indicators), the development of the rural economy and the standard of living of rural population (based on the gross domestic product per capita and disposable income of households per capita), social infrastructure (based on the participation of population to education and training) and the tourism and Internet infrastructures.

The analysis of the structures represented by the rural economy infrastructure and of the social and economical processes represented by the diversification and the development of these structures is carried out in rural regions compared with those in urban regions and intermediate regions, in Romania and in other Member States. This comparative analysis allows, on the one hand, highlighting the gaps which our country recorded regarding some economical and social indicators, in rural area compared to urban area, as well as those registered by our country compared to other EU-27 Member States and, on the other hand, allows highlighting the efforts that need to be done to reduce the difference of development between the analyzed regions, at national and European scale, and the compatibility of Romanian structures and processes with the European ones.

In this research, we have done a comparative analysis of indicators in Romania and other EU-27 Member States, at NUTS 3 county level, by types of regions ("predominantly rural regions" - PR, "intermediate regions" - IR and "predominantly urban regions" - PU), which are based on a revised urban-rural typology. In 2010, the European Commission agreed on a new European Union typology of predominantly rural, intermediate and predominantly urban regions, thus "the new typology builds on a simple two-step approach to identify population in urban areas: a population density threshold (300 inhabitants per km2) applied to grid cells of 1 km2 and a minimum size threshold (5000 inhabitants) applied to grouped grid cells above the density threshold. The population living in rural areas is the population living outside the urban areas identified through the method described above. To determine the population size, the grid cells are grouped based on contiguity (including the diagonals)" A revised urban-rural typology. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010 (Eurostat, 2010).

The research theme represented by the diversification of the economy and the development of infrastructure in rural area

can be found in documents, reports, studies and analysis of the specialized bodies from Romania and the European Union and in the specialized literature regarding rural development and the quality of life.

One of the two pillars of the Common Agricultural Policy is the quality of life in rural areas and promoting diversification of economic activities through measures which target the agricultural sector and other sectors in rural areas, and one of the principles of the Common Agricultural Policy refers to guaranteeing an equitable level of life for the population in rural area. The Treaty of Lisbon also supports the new opportunities for the diversification of rural economy and the new sources of income for the rural population.

The improvement of the quality of life in the Romanian rural area is provided under the National Rural Development Programme 2007 - 2013 Axis III: „Improving the quality of life in rural areas and diversification of rural economy".

The necessity for the diversification of rural economy is emphasized, on the one hand, by the overall situation of the quality of life in the Romanian rural area (characterized by: poor infrastructure, poor services, undiversified economy, the need for retraining and improvement of employment, potential for rural tourism) and, on the other hand, the reality of the European rural economy, which shows that the industry and the services have replaced agriculture as dominant activity in rural areas.

Literature review

Starting with the EU accession, Romania follows, regarding agriculture and rural development, the principles of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), one of these principles being represented by ensuring an equitable standard of living for the rural population.

At the EU level three major objectives of the rural policy development (Pillar 2 of CAP) have been established, one of which is represented by the „improvement of the quality of life in rural areas and encouraging diversification of economic activities through measures, which target the agriculture and other sectors in rural areas"; another objective aims at „increasing the competitiveness of the agricultural sector through support for restructuring" and the third objective is „improving the environment and the rural areas through support for land management" European Union Council, Regulation no. 1698 on support for rural development by European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (Brussels, 2005).

In the context of the Lisbon and Göteborg agenda, the European Union provides that a strong economy will lead to the creation of jobs alongside the social and environmental priorities, to ensure the sustainable development and social inclusion. In this regard, a key element is the exploitation of the opportunities for growth and job creation in the rural area. Since June 2001, at Göteborg, the European Council concluded that the rural development policy will increase less the marketing aspects of agriculture and support will be more focused on ensuring the welfare of people, animals and plants, environmental preservation, the care for nature and the insurance of a healthy nutrition.

Art. 39 of the Treaty of Lisbon sustains creating new opportunities of diversification for the rural economy and for the new sources of income of the rural population through a different argument represented by the

specificity of the agricultural sector, which suffers from long production cycle and different types of risk (from the exposure to natural disasters to market risks).

The most important national document that refers to improving the quality of life in the Romanian rural area is the National Rural Development Programme 2007-2013. In this document, the „picture" of the Romanian rural area is outlined by the following aspects: economical dependence to agriculture of the rural population, rising unemployment as a cause for the structural problems of agricultural farms, low diversification of the activities in small enterprises and their orientation to the primary sector, low income, low employment rate among women, social instability caused by migration, untapped potential of rural tourism, poor infrastructure at all levels, poor entrepreneurship.

The efforts that need to be made for the diversification of the Romanian rural economy and for infrastructure development, leading to the improvement of the quality of life is also reflected in the studies conducted by the European Commission through the Romanian representatives. Thus, the Romanian rural area is characterized by „poor infrastructure (33% water, 10% sewage, 10% adequate roads), poor services (health, education, finance, social), undiversified economy (64% of rural employment in agriculture), the need for retraining and improving employment, potential for rural tourism" Dumitru Mihail, Rural Development in Romania (Bruxelles, 2009).

The necessity of development of the non-agricultural economy in Romanian rural area, through the development of the secondary and tertiary sectors, in such a way as to increase their contribution to providing of the gross value added and of employment is emphasized by the model of development of the European village. Today, „in European countries, industry, and more particularly, services have replaced agriculture and livestock as the long dominant activities" and the „European village model is far from the traditional rural once represented" Voicu M. and Voicu B., The Romanian village on the road to Europe (Bucharest, 2006).

In the developed societies, „closeness of the village to the city, in terms of comfort and housing, has become so great that the traditional perception of the rural area as an underdeveloped area has lost its significance" Mărginean Ioan, Living conditions in the rural area (Bucharest, 2005).

Improving the quality of life of rural population is a result of the effort to develop and modernize the rural area, as only „a developed society is characterized by a high quality of life" Mărginean I. and Precupeţu I. Quality of life and sustainable development. Policies of strengthening the social cohesion (Bucharest, 2008). In this context, improving the quality of life in rural area is strongly connected to the diversification and development of the economy in terms of economic efficiency, mainly through the generated effects of these regarding employment and income.

In this statement, we consider the positive effects of employment on the quality of life, which are highlighted through the work factor as a major source of income, thus "work is fundamentally important as a source of income, as a mechanism of social integration, and as a basis for structuring workers' lives (the unemployment, the involuntary lack of work, has been shown to have extremely negative effects on a number of dimensions

of well-being (poverty, deprivation, social exclusion, and dissatisfaction with life)" Alber J. and Fahey T., Perceptions of living conditions in an enlarged Europe (Berlin, 2004).

The development of infrastructure (in all its aspects: physical, social, financial, market specific) is a key factor in improving the quality of life in rural area, through the generated effects for the population and for the community (attraction of investors, creation of entrepreneurships).

The necessity of developing the Romanian rural area, through economical development in terms of economic efficiency and through the development of infrastructure, is determined, on the one hand, by the causal relationship between the development potential of the rural area and the level of quality of life in this area and, on the other hand, the recovery of the economic and the social gaps which our country has compared to other EU Member States.

The causality relationship between the development potential of the rural area and the level of quality of life in this area is determined by the past, present and future level of development and the distribution model of direct access (through their own work) of the population to goods and services, namely the mechanism of distribution of generated income, which transform the macroeconomic output into household income. Thus, "by comparing the macro (GDP per capita) and micro (household income) data (between the two acceding countries and six low income EU countries) an interesting finding emerges (Bulgaria and Romania differ less from the six low income EU countries in relation to GDP per capita, than they do with regard to household income)" Mărginean I. and Beleva I., First European Quality of Life Survey: quality of life in Bulgaria and Romania (Luxembourg, 2006).

Regarding the development of rural area, it can be boosted by an integrated approach of structures and economical and social processes: solving the structural problems, modernizing the agricultural sector, diversifying and increase in the economic efficiency conditions of the rural economy, development (through modernization and expansion) of infrastructure (physical, social, financial, market specific).

Paper Content

1. The diversification and development of rural economy

The analysis of socio-economical processes in the rural area, represented by the diversification and development of rural economy, allows us to see to what extent these processes offer the possibility of development of the rural area and creates opportunities for the rural population to reach a level of quality of life comparable to that in the urban area.

The causality relationship between these processes and the quality of life in rural area is subdued to the requirements of the correlation between the efforts that need to be made and the social and economic effects generated in the Romanian rural area and, by extension, in the national and European area. To highlight this relationship, we analyze the structure of the gross value added and employment by sectors of activity, as there is a direct relationship between them and the degree of diversification and development of non-agricultural rural economy and the income levels of the rural population.

a. gross value adeed and employment in the primary sector

The comparative analysis of the gross value added and employment as well as of the report between these indicators, in the primary sector, highlights the following aspects: the share of employment (30%) has a considerably higher percentage than the share of gross value added (7%), which means a report gross value added/employment, in terms of economic efficiency, unfavorable (subunit) (Table no. 1).

This report shows that the high level of employment in the primary sector is not reflected properly in the level of gross value added, consequently the report of gross value added/employment is sub unitary, which equals to a lower level of efficiency compared to the other Member States EU. In these conditions, the gross added value produced is distributed to a larger number of people, increases the share of production for own consumption and reduces the share for the market, which influences the money income and capacity to invest.

From an economic perspective, a greater share of employment than that of the gross value added in the primary sector (a report in favor of the workforce) is a situation that proves, in terms of economic efficiency, poor productivity in the agricultural sector which effects the national productivity. From a social perspective, such a gap warns us of the likelihood to appear differences in income and consequently, in quality of life between farmers and other social categories. In this statement we see an „economic truth", namely: there is a close connection between the contribution from a sector of activity to the formation of gross value added and the distributed part for consumption to those who operate within this sector.

Table no. 1 *Gross value adeed şi employment of the primary sector*, in Romania, 2007 year*

Indicators	Value
1.Share of employment in the primary sector	*30%*
2.Share of gross value added in the primary sector	*6,5%*
3.Report gross value added/employment in the primary sector	*2533 (eur/person)*
- gross value added in the primary sector	*7193.4 (million euro)*
- employment in the primary sector	*2840 (thousands persons)*

Source: European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information, Report 2010.

* primary sector covers the branches A (agriculture, hunting and forestry) & B (fishing)

The comparative analysis of the share of employment and the share of gross value added in the primary sector, in Romania and in other Member States EU-27, highlights the following aspects (Annex no 1):

- Romania has the highest share of gross value added and the highest share of employment in the primary sector of the EU-27. Thus, we see that in EU-27, the share of employment in the primary sector varies: from 1.6% in Luxembourg to 30.3% in Romania and the gross value in the primary sector added varies from 0.4% in Luxembourg to 6.5% % in Romania;

- the gross value added/employment report, in terms of economic efficiency, is in Romania one of the lowest in the EU-27 (2533 eur/person), only Bulgaria has a lower value.

Romania has the highest share of gross value added and employment in the primary sector of the EU-27. This situation has economical and social effects (at the level and structure of farms' and farmers' income) and is necessary to reduce the share of gross value added and employment in the primary sector and their development in the non-agricultural sector.

What distinguishes us fundamentally from other EU countries is, on the one hand, the high percentage of population employed in the primary sector and, on the other hand, the much lower report of the gross value added/employment. Such a gap, in terms of economic efficiency, expresses a poorly modernized agriculture and a poorly diversified and developed economy, a situation that is a handicap, in terms of productivity, for farmers in our country compared to the European ones. Therefore, we consider that the reduction of people employed in the primary sector and their involvement in non-agricultural activities, concurrent with modernization of the agricultural sector, are decisive factors for increasing the efficiency of economic activity in this sector and, this way, for the reduction of the economical and social disparities compared to other Member States.

b. gross value added and employment in the non-agricultural sector

In Romania, the share of gross value added in the non-agricultural sector (expressed as percentage of total GVA) is higher than the share of employment in the non-agricultural sector (expressed as percentage of total employment) in all types of regions (PR, IR and PU), which expresses a favorable situation from an economically viewpoint (the report gross value added/employment in non-agricultural sector, expressed in relative terms, ranges from 1.5 in predominantly rural regions (PR) to 1 in predominantly urban regions (PU)).

Although, in all types of regions (PR, IR and PU), the gross value added is higher than the employment in the non-agricultural sector, the gross value added/employment report, expressed in absolute terms (11.025 thousand euro per person), is one of the lowest values of the EU-27 (only Bulgaria has a lower value, respectively 6.524 thousand euro per person) (Table no 2).

The comparative analysis of the share of employment and the share of gross value added in the non-agricultural sector, in Romania and in other Member States, by types of regions, highlights the following aspects: Romania has one of the lowest share of the gross value added in the non-agricultural sector of the EU-27 (the gross value added in the Romanian non-agricultural sector varies from 89% in PR and 94% in IR to 100% in PU); for this indicator only Bulgaria records

a lower level compared to that in our country, in predominantly rural regions (PR) and Bulgaria and Latvia in intermediate regions (IR). Also, our country records the lowest share of employment in the non-agricultural sector of the EU-27 in predominantly rural regions (PR) and in predominantly urban regions (PU) (the employment in Romanian non-agricultural sector varies from 61% in PR and 70% in IR to 99% in PU) (Annex no 2).

Table no 2. *Gross value adeed şi employment of the non-agricultural sector* in Romania, 2007 year*

Indicators/Types of regions	PR	IR	PU
1. Share of gross value adeed of the non-agricultural sector (% total GVA)	*88.8%*	*93.9%*	*99.7%*
2. Share of employment of the non-agricultural sector (% total Employment)	*61.1%*	*70.4%*	*98.9%*
3. Report gross value adeed/employment of the non-agricultural sector	*11.025 (EUR/person)*		
- gross value adeed of the non-agricultural sector	*103.248 (million EUR)*		
- employment of the non-agricultural sector	*9.365 (thousands persons)*		

Source:

- European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, (2010). Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2010;

- Eurostat, (2010). A revised urban-rural typology. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010.

*non-agricultural sector = secondary sector and tertiary sector

Note:

- Types of regions are: PR - Predominantly Rural Regions, IR - Intermediate Regions, PU - Predominantly Urban Regions;

- Statistical data are appropriate to NUTS 3 (county level) and are determined on the basis of a revised typology rural - urban area.

Romania has, in EU-27, one of the lowest shares of gross value added and the lowest share of employment in the non-agricultural sector (in PR and in PU), therefore, our country registered one of the smallest values of the report of gross value added/employment (expressed in relative and absolute terms). In this context, we consider that, for the development of the rural area, the improvement of the report of gross value added/employment and of the report work offer and actual employment possibilities is needed, in conditions of marginally acceptable productivity, the economical processes which involve the

coexistence of secondary and tertiary sectors with the primary sector in rural areas.

c. gross value added and employment by branch (primary sector, secondary sector and tertiary sector)

Also, the comparative analysis of the gross value added and employment by branch (primary sector, secondary sector and tertiary sector) in Romania, shows that, the report of gross value added/employment in the primary sector is lower in comparison to the non-agricultural sector (the secondary sector and the tertiary sector) one in all types of regions (PR, IR and PU). The largest share of gross added value is in the tertiary sector, in all regions (PR, IR, PU) and the highest share of employment is recorded in the primary sector, in predominantly rural regions (PR) (Table 3).

Table no 3. *Gross value adeed şi employment by branch and types of regions in Romania, 2007 year*

Types of regions	**PR**			**IR**			**PU**		
Indicators/Branch	*P*	*S*	*T*	*P*	*S*	*T*	*P*	*S*	*T*
Gross Value Adeed	*11.2*	*37.7*	*51.0*	*6.1*	*41.7*	*52.2*	*0.3*	*30.5*	*69.2*
Employment	*38.9*	*29.0*	*32.1*	*29.6*	*32.9*	*37.5*	*1.1*	*29.6*	*69.2*
Report: gross value adeed/employment	*0.3*	*1.3*	*1.6*	*0.2*	*1.3*	*1.4*	*0.3*	*1.0*	*1.0*

Source:

- European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, (2010). Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2010;

- Eurostat, (2010). A revised urban-rural typology. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010.

Note:

- Types of regions are: PR - Predominantly Rural Regions, IR - Intermediate Regions, PU - Predominantly Urban Regions;

- Branch are: P – Primary sector (covers the branches A (agriculture, hunting and forestry) & B (fishing)); S - Secondary sector (covers the branches C to F (Mining and quarrying, Manufacturing, Electricity, gas and water supply, Construction)); T - Tertiary sector (covers the branches G to P (private and public services)).

- Statistical data are appropriate to NUTS 3 (county level) and are determined on the basis of a revised typology rural - urban area.

The comparative analysis of the gross value added and employment in rural area, by branch, in Romania and in other EU-27 Member States, according to the data from Annex no. 3, allows us the following assessments:

- in the national rural regions (predominantly rural regions - PR): the tertiary sector has one of the lowest share of gross value added of the EU-27 and the primary sector has one of the largest share of the gross value added of the EU-27 (only Bulgaria has a higher share); in the tertiary sector, our country has the lowest share of rural employment and in the rural primary sector it has the largest share of employment of the

EU-27. Consequently, in terms of economic efficiency, the primary sector is characterized by the sub unitary report gross value added/employment (the largest share of employment (39%) and the lowest share of gross value added (11%) in the EU-27), and the secondary and tertiary sectors are characterized by the supraunitary report gross value added/employment, but significantly lower than the EU-27 Member States;

- in the European rural regions (predominantly rural regions - PR): the share of employment is the highest in the tertiary sector (it varies from 32% in Romania to 73% in Belgium) and it is the lowest in the primary sector (it varies from 4% in Sweden to 39% in Romania) and the share of gross value added is the highest in the tertiary sector (it varies from 46% in Netherlands to 71% in Belgium) and it is the lowest in the primary sector (it varies from 2% in Denmark to 13% in Bulgaria).

The analysis of gross value added and employment in rural area (predominantly rural regions - PR) reveals the following conclusions: Romania records, in the tertiary sector, the lowest share of employment and one of the lowest shares of gross value added of the EU-27 and in the primary sector it recorded the highest share of employment and one of the lowest shares of gross value added of EU-27. This situation signifies a poorly diversified economy and a poorly modernized agriculture, both aspects reflecting the dependence of the development of rural area and of the population by the agriculture (primary sector) and expressed the necessity of growing of the employment and the gross value added in the non-agricultural sector.

Considering the important contribution of the tertiary sector to the formation of gross value added and to the provision of employment in most Member States and the important contribution of the primary sector to the formation of gross value added and to the provision of employment in Romanian rural area (predominantly rural regions - PR), we consider that the balanced development of the rural area through development of secondary and tertiary sectors and through modernization of the primary sector is necessary.

d. gross domestic product/capita (GDP/capita) and income of households/ capita

We analyze the development of rural economy, at macroeconomic level, based on the „gross domestic product per capita" (GDP/capita) indicator and the standard of living of the population, at the household level, based on the „real adjusted gross disposable income of household /capita" indicator , as there is a strong correlation, on the one hand, between the diversification and the development of rural economy, and, on the other hand, between the development of rural economy and the level of quality of life for people in rural areas.

Romania (with Bulgaria) records in the rural area (predominantly rural regions - PR), the lowest level of GDP per capita, respectively 28% of the EU average. Also, Romania (with Bulgaria) records the lowest level of real adjusted gross disposable income of households per capita of the EU (Romania records 44% for this indicator and Bulgaria only 30% of the EU).

The „GDP per capita" indicator records the highest values in the Netherlands, Ireland, Denmark, Sweden, Finland Germany, Finland, Austria, Italy, France, Spain and the lowest values in Romania,

Bulgaria, Latvia, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Portugal. The „real adjusted gross disposable income of households per capita" indicator records the highest values in Germany, Austria, France, United Kingdom, Belgium, Netherlands, Sweden, Finland, Ireland, Italy and the lowest values in Romania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Portugal. Therefore, we see that the highest values of "GDP per capita" correspond to the highest values of the "real adjusted gross disposable income of households per capita" and that the lowest values of "GDP per capita" correspond to the lowest values of the "real adjusted gross disposable income of households per capita" indicator (except for Denmark and the United Kingdom, Belgium, Spain) (Annex no 4).

Romania and Bulgaria have in the rural area (predominantly rural regions (PR)), in terms of development of the economy, the lowest level of GDP per capita of the EU-27 and record, in terms of living standards, the lowest level of real adjusted gross disposable income of households per capita in the EU.

2. The rural infrastructure

After the income of population (household), the quality of life in the rural area is influenced by the existing infrastructure (physical, social, financial, market specific infrastructure) and its quality. From this perspective, we analyze the social infrastructure (by the dimension of education) and tourism and Internet infrastructure, in the rural area. Also, we analyze the internet take-up by the population.

a. tourism and internet infrastructure

We believe that, the tourism and internet infrastructure and the Internet take-up may be factors in the development of the non-agricultural sector (by attracting tourists and investors) and in improving the quality of life of the rural population (by better living conditions and by better possibilities of employment and income).

In Romania, the tourism and Internet infrastructure, the Internet take-up, by types of regions, presents the following aspects.

- tourism infrastructure (the number of bed places in hotels, camping, holiday dwelling) ranges between 26% in predominantly rural regions (PR) and 68% in intermediate regions (IR) to 6% in predominantly urban regions (PU);
- the broadband internet infrastructure (DSL coverage) ranges between 45% in rural regions (R) to 97% in urban regions (U) and the Internet take-up (the population having subscribed to DSL Internet) ranges between 2,8% in rural regions (R) to 3,9% in urban regions (U).

The comparative analysis of tourism and internet infrastructure, the internet take-up in Romania and in other Member States reveals the important differences, according to the data mentioned in the Annex no 5. Thus, Romania presents the following aspects:

- has one of the lowest shares of tourism infrastructure of the EU-27 in predominantly rural regions (PR) and in predominantly urban regions (PU) (this indicator records shares lower than our country in six countries in (PR) and one country in (PU));
- has one of the lowest shares of broadband Internet infrastructure of the EU-27 in rural regions (R) and in urban regions (U) (this indicator records shares lower than Bulgaria and Romania only in Cyprus in

rural regions (R) and in Poland, in urban regions (U));

➤has the lowest shares of population having subscribed to DSL internet of the EU-27 in rural regions (R) (3%) and in suburban regions (S) (4%) (in rural regions, only Bulgaria, Cyprus and Lithuania register a lower value than the Romanian ones).

Given that, in the rural area, on a scale from the lowest to the highest value, our country has the seventh rank from EU-27, regarding tourism infrastructure, we consider that, this space has a untapped potential of economical and social development. In our country, the broadband Internet infrastructure, in rural regions, is significantly lower than that in urban regions and the share of population having subscribed to DSL has a significantly lower rate than that of other Member States in the rural regions, aspect which reflects unfavorably upon the living conditions of the population.

b. the social infrastructure – educational dimension

We analyze the social infrastructure because, in social terms, its' degree of development (we refer mainly to health services and education) influences people's decision to stay or to migrate from rural areas. In economical terms, we think that both the modernization of agricultural sector and the diversification and the development of the non-agricultural sector, in rural area, must be related to social infrastructure, including through education. In this context, we analyze the „educational attainment" and the „life-long learning „indicators by types of regions in Romania and in other European countries.

In Romania, the share of adults with high or medium educational attainment has the lowest share (73%) in predominantly rural regions (PR) and the highest share (87%) in predominantly urban regions (PU); the share of adults who participate in education and training records only 1% in all types of regions (PR, IR, PU). If in our country the share of adults with high or medium educational attainment has a good share in comparison with other Member States, the share of adults which participate in education and training records the lowest share of the EU-27, in all types of regions (Annex no. 6).

Even though the acquisition of knowledge, skills and competencies is a key to economic and social progress, as it allows gaining better skills and, therefore, the possibilities to obtain a better income, in our country, the adults who participate in education and training records the lowest share of the EU-27.

Conclusions

1. The necessity of diversification of rural economy, through the development of the non-agricultural sector is highlighted, on the one hand, by the gaps of economical and social development by types of regions (PR, IR and PU) and, on the other hand, by the gaps between Romania and other EU-27 Member States. Romania records in the rural tertiary sector the lowest share of employment and one of the lowest shares of gross value added of the EU-27 and, in the primary sector, our country records the largest share of employment and one of the smallest share of gross value added in EU-27. This situation signifies a poorly diversified economy and a poorly modernized agriculture, both aspects reflecting the dependence of the population from the rural area to agriculture and expresses

the necessity to increase the gross value added and employment in the non-agricultural sector.

2. We consider that in the Romanian rural area a transfer of employment from agriculture in the non-agricultural sector is necessary on the basis of the acceleration of the modernization of agriculture and development of the secondary and tertiary sectors, due to the following aspects:

- the important contribution of the tertiary sector to the formation of gross value added and to the provision of employment in most European countries and the important contribution of the primary sector to the formation of gross value added and to the provision of employment in our country;
- the occupational structure in our country, by branch (sector of activity), is asymmetric compared with that of the EC countries (we refer to the modest capacity of the secondary sector and the tertiary sector to create jobs and a high share of number of people employed in the primary sector).

The mentioned aspects induce the increased necessity of employment in non-agricultural activities, by creating economical opportunities, so that the rural areas can become attractive, including for women and the younger generations. In this context, we must find ways to attract young people in rural areas and to stimulate them to develop activities of agricultural and non-agricultural production profile (e.g. granting loans on favorable terms for production and investment, the acquisition of land in favorable terms, training courses to complement the skills and professional competence, granting financial and fiscal facilities).

The dynamics of the development of the activities with agricultural and non-agricultural profile can be realized through the acceleration of the implementation of the measures from the the "National Program of Rural Development".

3. Considering the modest position that our country has in terms of rural tourism infrastructure, we consider that the rural area has an untapped potential of economical and social development. Also, the significantly lower level of the broadband Internet infrastructure in the rural area than in the urban area and the significantly lower proportion of the population having subscribed to DSL in our country compared to that recorded in other Member States in rural regions, great efforts are necessary to reduce the disparities between regions and those existing between our country and other Member States.

4. Even though the acquisition of knowledge, skills and competencies is a key to economical and social progress, as it allows improving skills and, therefore, the possibilities to obtain a better income, in our country, the adults who participate in education and training records the lowest share of the EU-27, making necessary the concentration of the efforts to reduce the gaps registered by our country in comparison to EU countries.

We consider that, the acquisition of knowledge, skills and competencies by adults, which may consist of continuous education is necessary to represent, on the one hand, a landmark of economical and social policies and, on the other hand, it is necessary to be a target for those who participate in the labor market and those who wish to enter on this market. In other words, for the training to become a resource of quality of work life, the educational policies which stimulate it must account not only for already trained people, but for all the participants in the

labor market (we consider the relationship between the level of education, on the one hand and employment, on the other hand).

5. The belated application of the mechanisms that encourage the diversification and the development of the non-agricultural rural economy generates effects in the rate of employment and in the level of income of rural population and in the level of national productivity. Also, an underdeveloped infrastructure affects the development of the non-agricultural sector (the lack of attractiveness for tourists and investors) and the quality of life for rural population (living conditions and the possibilities for employment and income).

6. A non-modernized agricultural sector and a poorly developed non-agricultural sector is reflected in the Romanian trade deficit, in the quality and prices of food products and in the lower level of quality of life in the rural area compared to the one in the urban area. Only through the diminishing of the economic and social gaps to the EU-27 Member States and through sustainable efforts of economic development, our country can become competitive in the EU market and can ensure an improvement of the living conditions of the population.

Annex no 1. *Gross value adeed şi employment of the primary sector*, 2007 year*

Indicators Countries/	Employment		Gross value added		Raport VAB/Employment	
	thousands persons	%	million euro	%	eur/person	%
Romania	*2.840*	*30.3*	*7.193.4*	*6.5*	*2.533*	*0.2*
Austria	*218*	*5.4*	*4.332.5*	*1.8*	*19.847*	*0.3*
Belgium	*81*	*1.9*	*2.637.7*	*0.9*	*32.484*	*0.5*
Bulgaria	*729*	*19.6*	*1.547.5*	*6.0*	*2.122*	*0.3*
Cyprus	*18*	*4.5*	*309.0*	*2.2*	*17.657*	*0.5*
Czech Republic	*188*	*3.6*	*2.819.6*	*2.5*	*15.030*	*0.7*
Denmark	*81*	*2.8*	*2.255.5*	*1.2*	*27.846*	*0.4*
Estonia	*30*	*4.7*	*439.4*	*3.2*	*14.647*	*0.7*
Finland	*123*	*4.9*	*4.723.0*	*3.0*	*38.398*	*0.6*
France	*855*	*3.3*	*37.476.0*	*2.2*	*43.857*	*0.7*
Germany	*850*	*2.1*	*20.940.0*	*1.0*	*24.635*	*0.4*
Greece	*542*	*11.3*	*6.871.1*	*3.5*	*12.682*	*0.3*
Hungary	*316*	*7.6*	*3.425.3*	*4.0*	*10.846*	*0.5*
Ireland	*117*	*5.5*	*2.380.7*	*1.4*	*20.348*	*0.3*
Italy	*1.014*	*4.0*	*28.480.6*	*2.1*	*28.093*	*0.5*
Latvia	*109*	*9.7*	*667.9*	*3.6*	*6.156*	*0.4*
Lithuania	*158*	*10.3*	*1.009.0*	*3.9*	*6.394*	*0.4*
Luxembourg	*5*	*1.6*	*134.9*	*0.4*	*25.942*	*0.3*

Indicators Countries/	Employment		Gross value added		Raport VAB/Employment	
	thousands persons	%	million euro	%	eur/person	%
Malta	*4*	*2.4*	*116.6*	*2.5*	*30.684*	*1.0*
Netherlands	*259*	*3.0*	*10.548.0*	*2.1*	*40.757*	*0.7*
Poland	*2.236*	*14.7*	*11.775.0*	*4.3*	*5.265*	*0.3*
Portugal	*575*	*11.2*	*3.583.3*	*2.6*	*6.231*	*0.2*
Slovakia	*80*	*3.7*	*1.741.1*	*3.5*	*21.818*	*1.0*
Slovenia	*87*	*9.0*	*760.7*	*2.5*	*8.744*	*0.3*
Spain	*925*	*4.5*	*27.201.0*	*2.9*	*29.397*	*0.6*
Sweden	*95*	*2.1*	*5.078.5*	*1.7*	*53.290*	*0.8*
United Kingdom	*487*	*1.7*	*13.598.6*	*0.8*	*27.923*	*0.5*

Source:

- European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, (2010). RuralDevelopment in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2010;

-Eurostat, (2010). A revised urban-rural typology. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010.

*primary sector covers the branches A (agriculture. hunting and forestry) & B (fishing).

Note:

- the statistical data refers to the share of employment in primary sector and to the share of gross value added in primary sector.

Annex no 2. *Employment and Gross value adeed of the non-agricultural sector*, 2007 year*

Indicators	Employment** (%)			Gross value adeed*** (%)			Raport Gross value adeed/ Employment (eur /person)
Types of regions/ Countries	PR	IR	PU	PR	IR	PU	
Romania	*61.1*	*70.4*	*98.9*	*88.8*	*93.9*	*99.7*	*11.025*
Austria	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*96.0*	*98.8*	*99.5*	*59.754*
Belgium	*94.5*	*97.0*	*98.8*	*96.8*	*98.4*	*99.5*	*67.567*
Bulgaria	*71.2*	*78.5*	*97.7*	*87.3*	*92.6*	*99.7*	*6.524*
Cyprus	*n.a.*	*95.5*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*97.8*	*n.a.*	*36.008*
Czech Republic	*94.4*	*96.8*	*98.1*	*95.5*	*97.7*	*98.9*	*21.371*
Denmark	*95.5*	*97.2*	*99.6*	*97.9*	*98.8*	*99.9*	*65.202*
Estonia	*90.9*	*98.7*	*n.a.*	*91.8*	*99.0*	*n.a.*	*20.896*

Indicators	Employment** (%)			Gross value adeed*** (%)			Raport Gross value adeed/ Employment (eur /person)
Types of regions/ Countries	PR	IR	PU	PR	IR	PU	
Finland	*91.4*	*95.5*	*99.4*	*93.8*	*97.0*	*99.6*	*61.234*
France	*93.9*	*96.7*	*98.8*	*95.5*	*97.1*	*99.4*	*64.555*
Germany	*95.4*	*97.4*	*99.1*	*97.8*	*98.8*	*99.7*	*54.370*
Greece	*76.4*	*86.8*	*98.9*	*90.8*	*94.4*	*99.4*	*40.060*
Hungary	*88.8*	*91.2*	*99.4*	*92.8*	*95.1*	*99.8*	*19.875*
Ireland	*92.1*	*n.a.*	*99.5*	*97.5*	*n.a.*	*99.9*	*77.207*
Italy	*92.1*	*95.4*	*98.7*	*96.3*	*97.4*	*99.3*	*53.772*
Latvia	*83.8*	*85.6*	*95.9*	*90.8*	*93.5*	*98.8*	*16.097*
Lithuania	*83.0*	*92.3*	*96.7*	*92.1*	*96.6*	*98.7*	*16.089*
Luxembourg	*n.a.*	*98.3*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*99.6*	*n.a.*	*101.119*
Malta	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*97.7*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*97.5*	*29.001*
Netherlands	*94.8*	*94.7*	*97.7*	*97.0*	*96.6*	*98.4*	*57.764*
Poland	*72.6*	*88.0*	*96.2*	*90.2*	*96.2*	*99.0*	*17.154*
Portugal	*76.8*	*86.7*	*97.3*	*94.6*	*96.4*	*99.3*	*27.736*
Slovakia	*94.6*	*97.0*	*99.0*	*94.2*	*97.2*	*99.1*	*21.934*
Slovenia	*86.5*	*93.9*	*n.a.*	*95.9*	*98.4*	*n.a.*	*30.740*
Spain	*88.1*	*94.1*	*98.3*	*91.7*	*96.3*	*99.0*	*44.483*
Sweden	*96.2*	*97.6*	*99.6*	*96.9*	*98.5*	*99.9*	*64.222*
United Kingdom	*92.9*	*97.6*	*99.3*	*95.2*	*98.2*	*99.6*	*62.148*

Source:

- European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, (2010). Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2010;

- Eurostat, (2010). A revised urban-rural typology. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010.

*non-agricultural sector = secondary and tertiary sector;

**share of employment in secondary and tertiary sectors (% total employment);

*** share of GVA in secondary and tertiary sectors (% total GVA).

Note:

- Types of regions are: PR - Predominantly Rural Regions, IR - Intermediate Regions, PU - Predominantly Urban Regions;

- Statistical data are appropriate to NUTS 3 (county level) and are determined on the basis of a revised typology rural - urban area;

- n.a. – not available data

Annex no 3. *Gross value adeed and employment by branch in rural regions, 2007 year*

Indicators	Employment* (%)			Gross Value Adeed**(%)		
Branch / Countries	P	S	T	P	S	T
Romania	38.9	29.0	32.1	11.2	37.7	51.0
Austria	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	4.0	37.2	58.8
Belgium	5.6	21.6	72.7	3.2	25.6	71.2
Bulgaria	28.8	29.7	41.4	12.7	39.0	48.3
Cyprus	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Czech Republic	5.6	43.7	50.7	4.5	45.3	50.2
Denmark	4.6	26.8	68.6	2.1	30.3	67.7
Estonia	9.0	34.7	56.2	8.2	33.3	58.5
Finland	8.6	27.8	63.6	6.2	36.6	57.1
France	6.1	25.5	68.5	4.5	24.9	70.6
Germany	4.6	31.7	63.7	2.2	35.0	62.8
Greece	23.6	18.9	57.4	9.2	24.7	66.0
Hungary	11.2	35.9	52.9	7.2	36.8	56.0
Ireland	7.9	31.1	61.0	2.5	41.9	55.6
Italy	7.9	29.2	62.8	3.7	27.9	68.4
Latvia	16.2	27.6	56.1	9.2	24.8	66.0
Lithuania	17.0	30.9	52.1	7.9	38.2	53.9
Luxembourg	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Malta	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Netherlands	5.3	27.3	67.5	3.1	50.9	46.0
Poland	27.4	28.7	43.9	9.8	32.8	57.4
Portugal	23.2	24.3	52.4	5.4	26.1	68.4
Slovakia	5.4	36.1	58.5	5.8	44.2	50.0
Slovenia	13.4	41.8	44.8	4.1	44.7	51.2
Spain	11.9	28.8	59.3	8.3	29.2	62.6
Sweden	3.8	25.9	70.3	3.1	34.1	62.8
United Kingdom	7.1	21.6	71.3	4.8	28.4	66.8

Source:

- European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, (2010). Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2010;

-Eurostat, (2010). A revised urban-rural typology. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010.

* employment = the share of employment by branch;

**gross value adeed = the share of gross value adeed by branch.

Note:

- rural regions are predominantly rural regions (PR) as according a revised typology rural - urban area; Statistical data are appropriate to NUTS 3 (county level);

- branch are: P - Primary sector covers the branches A (Agriculture, hunting and forestry) & B (fishing); S - Secondary sector covers the branches C to F (Mining and quarrying, Manufacturing, Electricity, gas and water supply, Construction); T - Tertiary sector covers the branches G to P (private and public services);

- n.a. – not available data.

Annex no 4. *Gross domestic product/capita and Gross disposable income of households/capita, 2009 year*

Indicators/ Countries	**Gross domestic product per capita (GDP pc) in rural regions GDP(pps) / capita (EU27=100) - "2006"**	**Adjusted gross disposable income in pps per capita***	**Adjusted gross disposable income in pps per capita* (EU=100)**
Romania	*28*	*8500*	*44*
Austria	*96*	*22200*	*117*
Belgium	*74*	*21100*	*111*
Bulgaria	*28*	*5600*	*30*
Cyprus	*n.a.*	*19000*	*100*
Czech Republic	*65*	*13300*	*70*
Denmark	*111*	*18800*	*99*
Estonia	*44*	*10600*	*56*
Finland	*96*	*20200*	*106*
France	*87*	*22100*	*116*
Germany	*97*	*22700*	*120*
Greece	*70*	*18200*	*96*
Hungary	*46*	*11000*	*58*
Ireland	*120*	*19700*	*104*
Italy	*93*	*19400*	*102*
Latvia	*29*	*9100*	*48*
Lithuania	*39*	*11400*	*60*
Luxembourg	*:*	*:*	*:*
Malta	*:*	*:*	*:*
Netherlands	*153*	*20900*	*110*
Poland	*38*	*11500*	*61*

Indicators/ Countries	Gross domestic product per capita (GDP pc) in rural regions GDP(pps) / capita (EU27=100) - "2006"	Adjusted gross disposable income in pps per capita*	Adjusted gross disposable income in pps per capita* (EU=100)
Portugal	*67*	*15600*	*82*
Slovakia	*51*	*13000*	*68*
Slovenia	*74*	*16000*	*85*
Spain	*83*	*19100*	*101*
Sweden	*108*	*20800*	*110*
United Kingdom	*81*	*21800*	*115*

Source:

- European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, (2010). Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2010;

- Eurostat, (2010). A revised urban-rural typology. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010;

- Eurostat, (2011). Economy and finance population and social conditions, Statistics in focus 16/2011, p. 4.

Note:

- rural regions are predominantly rural regions (PR) as according a revised typology rural - urban area; Statistical data are appropriate to NUTS 3 (county level);

- Pps - Purchasing power standards;

- "2006" – refers to the average of the years 2005, 2006, 2007;

- statistical data refers to 2009 year, for Bulgaria is 2007 year and for Romania is 2008 year;

: missing data;

- n.a. – not available data;

- Gross disposable income reflects the net resources, earned during the period, which are available for consumption and/or saving and is the result of all current transactions before consumption (it excludes exceptional resources/uses such as capital transfers, holding gains/losses and the consequences of natural disasters);

- Adjusted gross disposable income additionally includes the flows corresponding to the use of individual services which households receive free of charge from the government (it excludes collective services that are provided simultaneously to all members of the community, such as security and defence, legislation and regulation).These services, called "social transfers in kind", mainly include education, health and social security services, although other kind of services such as housing, cultural and recreational services are also frequently provided;

- Adjusted gross disposable income (AGDI) of households in PPS per capita is calculated by dividing AGDI at current prices by the purchasing power parities (PPP) of the actual individual consumption of households and by the total resident population . Purchasing power standard (PPS) is an artificial currency unit that would allow the purchase of the same basket of goods and services in different countries (PPS offsets differences in price levels across countries and thus allows "real" income to be compared).

Annex no 5. *Tourism's and internet's infrastructure and internet take- up, by types of regions*

Indicators	**Tourism Infrastructure* 2008 year**			**Internet Infrastructure** 2009 year**			**Internet take- up*** 2009 year**		
Countries /Types of regions (areas)	*PR*	*IR*	*PU*	*R*	*S*	*U*	*R*	*S*	*U*
Romania	*26.1*	*67.5*	*6.4*	*45.0*	*0.0*	*97.0*	*2.8*	*n.a.*	*3.9*
Austria	*68.4*	*17.9*	*13.7*	*83.0*	*99.2*	*100.0*	*13.6*	*15.9*	*16.6*
Belgium	*24.5*	*31.4*	*44.1*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*30.3*	*14.3*	*18.6*
Bulgaria	*20.8*	*75.9*	*3.3*	*18.0*	*73.0*	*100.0*	*0.9*	*n.a.*	*5.6*
Cyprus		*100.0*		*30.0*	*96.0*	*100.0*	*2.0*	*12.9*	*24.9*
Czech Republic	*33.9*	*41.9*	*24.3*	*85.0*	*93.0*	*99.0*	*7.2*	*5.4*	*12.4*
Denmark	*64.9*	*27.2*	*7.9*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*11.2*	*26.5*	*29.2*
Estonia	*55.6*	*44.4*		*80.0*	*n.a.*	*100.0*	*10.2*	*n.a.*	*10.0*
Finland	*63.0*	*21.8*	*15.2*	*90.0*	*98.0*	*99.0*	*20.8*	*22.7*	*22.9*
France	*47.5*	*35.0*	*17.5*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*26.2*	*27.5*	*30.3*
Germany	*27.5*	*48.1*	*24.4*	*89.9*	*95.9*	*99.4*	*18.5*	*29.1*	*27.7*
Greece	*72.5*	*17.2*	*10.3*	*60.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*11.6*	*12.9*	*19.9*
Hungary	*61.5*	*25.2*	*13.3*	*82.2*	*98.6*	*100.0*	*6.9*	*7.2*	*10.6*
Ireland	*79.1*		*20.9*	*82.0*	*99.0*	*100.0*	*11.3*	*18.5*	*19.3*
Italy	*32.1*	*48.3*	*19.6*	*85.0*	*95.0*	*99.0*	*17.4*	*17.9*	*21.9*
Latvia	*19.6*	*15.0*	*65.5*	*67.0*	*85.0*	*99.3*	*9.4*	*6.7*	*7.9*
Lithuania	*26.8*	*43.1*	*30.1*	*68.5*	*96.7*	*99.0*	*2.8*	*10.2*	*8.8*
Luxembourg		*100.0*		*100.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*27.8*	*27.9*	*26.5*
Malta			*100.0*			*99.0*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*12.9*
Netherlands	*2.4*	*49.4*	*48.2*	*99.0*	*99.0*	*99.0*	*20.5*	*20.5*	*21.0*
Poland	*32.7*	*50.3*	*17.0*	*52.2*	*76.8*	*94.1*	*2.8*	*20.0*	*9.4*
Portugal	*57.5*	*8.7*	*33.8*	*89.0*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*6.3*	*7.8*	*14.3*
Slovakia	*45.0*	*43.0*	*12.0*	*53.6*	*88.0*	*99.8*	*4.3*	*7.2*	*8.5*
Slovenia	*39.8*	*60.2*		*83.0*	*97.0*	*99.0*	*15.9*	*13.3*	*12.5*
Spain	*13.1*	*58.6*	*28.3*	*99.0*	*99.0*	*99.0*	*15.0*	*15.8*	*17.5*
Sweden	*41.0*	*49.5*	*9.4*	*91.0*	*99.0*	*100.0*	*15.8*	*12.0*	*25.0*
United Kingdom	*12.7*	*40.5*	*46.8*	*99.6*	*100.0*	*100.0*	*24.3*	*25.0*	*22.6*

Source:

- European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, (2010). Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2010;

-Eurostat, (2010). A revised urban-rural typology. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010.

*total number of bedplaces (in hotels, campings, holiday dwelling);

** DSL coverage (Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) is a family of technologies that provides digital data transmission over the wires of a local telephone network);

*** % population having subscribed to DSL Internet.

Note:

- Types of regions are: PR - Predominantly Rural Regions, IR - Intermediate Regions, PU - Predominantly Urban Regions;

- Typologies of areas are: R - Rural (< 100 hab./km²), S - Suburban (100 to 500 hab./km²) and U - Urban (> 500 hab./km²);

- n.a. – not available data;

- Statistical data are appropriate to NUTS 3 (county level) and are determined on the basis of a revised typology rural - urban area.

Annex no 6. *Educational attainment and life-long learning by types of regions, 2009 year*

Indicators	**Educational attainment***			**Life-long learning ****		
Countries/ Types of regions	**PR**	**IR**	**PU**	**PR**	**IR**	**PU**
Romania	*73.3*	*72.9*	*86.9*	*1.4*	*1.4*	*1.5*
Austria	*83.4*	*84.7*	*82.1*	*12.2*	*14.0*	*16.6*
Belgium	*69.1*	*70.7*	*70.9*	*5.5*	*5.9*	*7.6*
Bulgaria	*75.4*	*78.7*	*89.6*	*1.0*	*1.5*	*3.1*
Cyprus	*n.a.*	*73.3*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*7.8*	*n.a.*
Czech Republic	*92.2*	*89.2*	*94.1*	*6.3*	*6.1*	*8.7*
Denmark	*74.4*	*73.0*	*79.7*	*30.4*	*29.9*	*35.5*
Estonia	*90.3*	*87.0*	*n.a.*	*11.6*	*9.2*	*n.a.*
Finland	*81.3*	*82.7*	*82.9*	*20.6*	*23.6*	*23.7*
France	*69.4*	*70.2*	*71.8*	*5.5*	*6.4*	*6.2*
Germany	*86.9*	*86.6*	*82.8*	*7.7*	*7.7*	*8.2*
Greece	*57.3*	*60.1*	*73.6*	*2.6*	*2.6*	*4.3*
Hungary	*77.6*	*84.8*	*77.7*	*2.2*	*3.5*	*2.2*
Ireland	*69.4*	*n.a.*	*70.6*	*6.4*	*n.a.*	*6.2*
Italy	*55.6*	*53.5*	*56.9*	*6.2*	*5.8*	*6.0*
Latvia	*87.1*	*94.1*	*83.3*	*5.3*	*6.1*	*5.0*

Indicators	Educational attainment*			Life-long learning **		
Countries/ Types of regions	PR	IR	PU	PR	IR	PU
Lithuania	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*
Luxembourg	*n.a.*	*81.6*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*13.4*	*n.a.*
Malta	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*28.2*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*5.8*
Netherlands	*69.9*	*71.8*	*70.8*	*16.0*	*16.0*	*16.6*
Poland	*87.0*	*87.9*	*89.8*	*4.3*	*5.2*	*4.7*
Portugal	*25.8*	*21.9*	*36.6*	*6.5*	*6.5*	*5.7*
Slovakia	*91.3*	*89.6*	*94.2*	*2.2*	*2.1*	*7.4*
Slovenia	*82.3*	*84.7*	*n.a.*	*14.2*	*15.2*	*n.a.*
Spain	*48.3*	*49.9*	*57.6*	*10.3*	*10.2*	*10.9*
Sweden	*84.6*	*84.1*	*88.5*	*20.0*	*23.5*	*22.6*
United Kingdom	*83.0*	*87.6*	*85.6*	*18.0*	*19.6*	*20.4*

Source:

- European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, (2010). Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2010;

-Eurostat, (2010). A revised urban-rural typology. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010.

*% of adults with medium or high educational attainment

**% of adults participating in education and training

Note:

- Types of regions are: PR - Predominantly Rural Regions, IR - Intermediate Regions, PU - Predominantly Urban Regions;

- Statistical data are appropriate to NUTS 3 (county level) and are determined on the basis of a revised typology rural - urban area;

- n.a. – not available data.

Acknowledgements

„This paper is suported by the Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development (SOP HRD), financed from the European Social Fund and by the Romanian Government under the contract number SOP HRD/89/1.5/S/62988". Titles and intellectual and industrial property rights on the results of the post-doctoral research programme belong to The National Institute of Economic Research "Costin C. Kirițescu of the Romanian Academy.

REFERENCES:

1. **Alber J. and Fahey T**., *Perceptions of living conditions in an enlarged Europe* (Berlin, 2004): 51 paper
2. **Dumitru Mihail**, *Rural development in Romania* (Bruxelles, 2009): 33 paper
3. European Commission Directorate – General for Agriculture and Rural Development, (2010). Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2010
4. European Union Council (2005). Regulation no. 1698 on support for rural development by European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development
5. Eurostat, (2010). *A revised urban-rural typology*. Eurostat regional yearbook 2010
6. Eurostat, (2011). E*conomy and finance population and social conditions*, Statistics in focus 16/2011: 4 paper
7. **Mărginean I. and Beleva I**., *First European Quality of Life Survey: quality of life in Bulgaria and Romania* (Luxembourg, 2006): 9 paper
8. **Mărginean I. and Precupeţu I.**, *Quality of life and sustainable development. Policies of strengthening the social cohesion* (Bucharest, 2008): 12
9. **Mărginean Ioan**, *Living conditions in rural areas* (Bucharest, 2005):1 paper
10. **Voicu M. and Voicu B.**, *The Romanian village on the road to Europe* (Bucharest, 2006): 16