

Crețu, Daniela; Iova, Radu Andrei; Lascăr, Elena

**Conference Paper**

## Researches on social infrastructure development, in South Muntenia development region

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

The Research Institute for Agriculture Economy and Rural Development (ICEADR), Bucharest

*Suggested Citation:* Crețu, Daniela; Iova, Radu Andrei; Lascăr, Elena (2013) : Researches on social infrastructure development, in South Muntenia development region, In: Agrarian Economy and Rural Development - Realities and Perspectives for Romania. 4th Edition of the International Symposium, November 2013, Bucharest, The Research Institute for Agricultural Economy and Rural Development (ICEADR), Bucharest, pp. 212-217

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/111589>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

## RESEARCHES ON SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT, IN SOUTH MUNTENIA DEVELOPMENT REGION.

DANIELA CREȚU, RADU ANDREI IOVA, ELENA LASCĂR<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** *The infrastructure constitutes a support element, with particular importance for supporting all economic and socio- cultural activities. The infrastructure covers both structural field, giving unity to the system unit and the spatial field, thus achieving a viable or not territorial configuration , which is reflected by different levels of accessibility in the physical, technical, economic or socio –cultural area. An important aspect for the development of the region, including the rural area, is the social infrastructure with reference to houses, education and health system. In this respect, in the present paper we propose the analysis of the social infrastructure, namely, house building , education and the health infrastructure, using as research methods, documenting, analyzing and processing the secondary analysis. The ascending dynamics of new house building in the rural area, can be combined with the dynamics of the population mobility and increasing economic importance of agricultural activities at social levels. The infrastructure for education is well represented in the region and thus it can support the development in good conditions of the educational act. From the analysed data, it results a deficiency of providing health infrastructure in the rural area, this situation requiring major investments made with projects funded under various development programs.*

**Key words:** regional development, social infrastructure, houses fund, development potential

### INTRODUCTION

South Region is characterized by a well defined infrastructure due to its advantageous geographical position. Its location in a peripheral area of Romania favoured the emergence of some major communication ways, which allowed not only the development of its relations with the neighbouring national regions, but also with the neighbouring state of Bulgaria. Its situation around Bucharest-Ilfov Development Region, resulted in the creation of a dense transport and communication infrastructure, an extension of that developed in Bucharest municipality, the most important city and administrative centre. The physical infrastructure as a specific form both for the development of South - Muntenia rural area and for the urban area includes transport infrastructure and means of communication, technical infrastructure which includes the distribution of drinking water supply, sewerage system and gas network, house building. The physical infrastructure includes post and fixed / mobile network.

In the wider context of the regional infrastructure development strategy, its specific objectives are: to improve the road access within the region, by modernising the county and commune roads and utilities, including increasing their territorial density; to orient investments to the less developed areas, increasing the quality of life especially in the areas with social and economic problems by connecting them to the regional and national infrastructure; to eliminate the problems caused by the traffic conditions in the community; to eliminate the factors that restrict the development potential of the region; to stop the migration of the active population migration from the rural communities. [4].

### MATERIAL AND METHODS

As research methods, we used documenting, the analysis and data processing from a secondary analysis. These methods are based on the synthesis processes, induction and deduction, analogy and comparative analysis. Once the information was defined, known and interpreted, the next step was the detailed documenting of the interest field. In the analysis activity, the study of the documentation available for the field or for the analysed system is a starting point. This allows in the analysis to obtain the first knowledge and information. The documentation implied also the analysis of the legislation or the compared analysis of the various specialised sources.

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD Associate Professor Daniela CREȚU, PhD University Assistant Radu Andrei IOVA, PhD University assistant Elena LASCAR, University of Agronomical Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Bucharest, Calarasi subsidiary

The documenting, the analysis and the data processing and the information obtained from the following sources: The Statistical Yearbook; The socio – economic profile of South Muntenia Region; The economic pre-accessing plan of Romania; Statistical data of the County Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the County Agency for labour Force Training and Employment; Statistical data of the Department for Agriculture and Rural Development; The development strategy of the counties, elaborated by the county councils; the Publications of the National Statistics Institute.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The *houses fund* consists of residential construction (residences for population) and residential buildings for communities. The house building in the rural area, include also some of the household annexes, which have the double roles of housing and / or employment. The houses fund is privately owned or state majority.

The houses dynamics in the period 2004-2011 both at national and regional level, on property forms and residence areas, is described in table no. 1

**Table .1 Dynamics of houses fund, on property forms and residence areas, in South-Muntenia Region**

Property forms	2004		2008		2010		2011	
Residence areas	number	%	number	%	Number	%	number	%
TOTAL ROMANIA								
TOTAL Romania of which:	8.176.487	100,0	8.328.663	100,0	8.427.941	100,0	8.467.832	100,0
Urban	4.445.260	54,4	4.519.179	54,3	4.607.796	54,7	4.585.420	54,2
Rural	3.731.227	45,6	3.809.484	45,7	3.820.145	45,3	3.882.412	45,8
Total South-Muntenia Region of which:	1.267.177	100,0	1.283.639	100,0	1295755	100,0	1.301.029	100,0
Urban	507.521	40,1	512.109	39,9	515.970	39,8	517.359	39,8
Rural	759.656	59,9	771.530	60,1	779.785	60,2	783.670	60,2
State Property								
TOTAL Romania of which:	199.617	100,0	190.776	100,0	185.231	100,0	195.830	100,0
Urban	156.518	78,4	145.535	76,3	140.593	75,9	149.594	76,4
Rural	43.099	21,6	45.241	23,7	44.638	24,1	46.236	23,6
Total South-Muntenia Region of which:	20.807	100,0	19.203	100,0	18926	100,0	19.419	100,0
Urban	14.835	71,3	13.805	71,9	13.763	72,7	14.070	72,5
Rural	5.972	28,7	5.398	28,1	5.163	27,3	5.349	27,5
Private property								
TOTAL Romania of which:	7.976.870	100,0	8.137.887	100,0	8.242.710	100,0	8.272.002	100,0
Urban	4.288.742	53,8	4.373.644	53,7	4.425.511	53,7	4.435.826	53,6
Rural	3.688.128	46,2	3.764.243	46,3	3.817.199	46,3	3.836.176	46,4
Total South-Muntenia Region of which:	1.246.370	100,0	1.264.436	100,0	1276647	100,0	1.281.610	100,0
Urban	492.686	39,5	498.304	39,4	501.467	39,3	503.289	39,3
Rural	753.684	60,5	766.132	60,6	775.180	60,7	778.321	60,7

Processed according to: *Romania Statistical Yearbook, time series 2005-2012*, INS [1]

The data highlights a viable dynamics in the analysed period, but in an extremely low percent, both at national level and at South-Muntenia Region level. In 2008, 2010 and 2011 the houses fund increases with a percent of 1.86%, 3% and respectively 3.56% compared to the reference year 2004. It is worth remarking the fact that in South-Muntenia Region, compared to the national level, in the analysed period, the share of the houses in the rural area is higher than that in the urban area, being for 2004 of 59.95%, in 2010 of 60.18% and in 2011 of 60.23% in the rural area, compared to the urban area of 40.05% in 2004, 39.82% in 2010, and respectively 39.77% in 2011. From this analysis it is remarked a decreasing trend of the number of houses in the urban area and an increasing trend in the rural area. At national level, in 2011 the share is of 45.84% for the rural area, compared to 54.16% for the urban area.

Depending on the type of property, the most numerous houses, in 2011, both at national level and in the region, belong to the private property, namely, from 8,467,832 houses at national level, 8,272,002 houses belong to the private property (97.67%), and in South-Muntenia Region, from 1,301,029 houses, 1,281,610 houses belong to the private property (98.51%).

**Table 2. Evolution of the number of houses, on counties and total region**

Specification	MU	2000	2005	2007	2009	2011
Total country	thousand houses	352.5	379.2	384	390.5	393.2
	%	100.0	107.6	108.9	110.8	111.5
South-Muntenia Region	thousand houses	355	382	387.2	394.4	395.6
	%	100.0	107.6	109.1	111.1	111.4
Argeş	thousand houses	376	401	405.9	414	418
	%	100.0	106.6	108.0	110.1	111.2
Călăraşi	thousand houses	339	366	368.6	374.7	377.1
	%	100.0	108.0	108.7	110.5	111.2
Dâmboviţa	thousand houses	344	371	377	383.5	386.1
	%	100.0	107.8	109.6	111.5	112.2
Giurgiu	thousand houses	369	387	391.4	397.2	400.3
	%	100.0	104.9	106.1	107.6	108.5
Ialomiţa	thousand houses	340	369	373.6	381.2	384
	%	100.0	108.5	109.9	112.1	112.9
Prahova	thousand houses	348	376	381	386.4	389.5
	%	100.0	108.0	109.5	111.0	111.9
Teleorman	thousand houses	367	397	404.5	416.4	414
	%	100.0	108.2	110.2	113.5	112.8

Processed according to: Romania Statistical Yearbook, time series 2001-2012, INS [1]

From the data presented in table 2 . it is remarked that this indicator had, both at the country level, and in South-Muntenia Region, a continuous increase in the analysed period, respectively in 2011 being higher with 11.5% and respectively 11.4%, than at the beginning of the period. The counties with the highest increases were Ialomiţa (12.9%), Dâmboviţa (12.2%) and Teleorman (12.8%), the lowest increase being recorded in Giurgiu county (8.5%).

The development of the houses fund, in the period 2004-2011, both at the country level, and at South-Muntenia Region level, as regards the number of newly built houses, expressed by the number of authorisations issued for the building of new houses, is described in dynamics, in table no. 3.

**Table .3. Dynamics of building authorisations of the residences in South-Muntenia Region**

Residence areas	2004			2008			2011		
	Number	%	thousand square meters useful surface	number	%	square meters useful surface	Number	%	square meters useful surface
TOTAL Romania									
Urban	13.813	40,2	2.805	23.045	37,7	8.397	26.778	38,9	10.017
Rural	20.533	59,8	2.672	38.047	62,3	6.554	42.068	61,1	7.485
Total	34.346	100,0	5.477	61.092	100,0	14.951	68.846	100,0	17.502
South-Muntenia Region									
Urban	1.820	33,7	306	3.070	27,8	688	3.607	28,7	820
Rural	3.583	66,3	405	7.971	72,2	1.052	8.943	71,3	1.211
Total	5.403	100,0	711	11.041	100,0	1.740	12.550	100,0	2.031

Processed according to: *Romania Statistical Yearbook, time series 2005-2012*, INS [1]

The data in the table highlight the ascending dynamics of the number of building authorisations of the residences in the rural area, both at national level, and at South-Muntenia Region level. Thus, if in 2004 20,533 building authorisations were issued at the country level in the rural area, in 2011 the number of authorisations issued was of 42,068 authorisations (an increase of 104.88%).

At South-Muntenia Region level, for the rural area, in 2004, 3,583 authorisations were issued (namely 17.44% of the total country), and in 2011, 8,943 authorisations were issued, (namely 21.25% of total country). Compared to the rural area, the number of authorisations issued for new buildings in the urban area is constant as percent, having values of 13.17% in 2004, 13.32% in 2008 and 13.47% in 2011.

**Infrastructure for education.** It is represented by the buildings in which the educational act takes place, respectively kindergartens, schools, high schools, faculties and locations for professional and special education. It can be mentioned that the school infrastructure is well represented in the region and thus it can support the development of the educational act in good conditions, except that in the rural area, this type of social infrastructure may be considered inappropriate for the rural development process, requiring a restructuring of school structures and investment projects correlated to the local needs and requirements [5].

The data on infrastructure for education at national level and in South-Muntenia Region in 2011, for various levels of education in a cumulative way on the two urban and rural areas are described in table no. 4.

**Table 4. Structure, on counties, of the education units in South-Muntenia Region, in 2011**

Development region/County	Kindergartens		Schools		Vocational schools		High schools		Post high school units		Faculties	
	No	%	no	%	No	%	no	%	No	%	No	%
Romania	1367	100,0	4022	100,0	6	100,0	1615	100,0	86	100,0	108	100,0
South – Muntenia	145	10,6	684	17,0	1	16,7	210	13,0	12	14,0	4	3,7
Argeş	25	1,8	128	3,2	-	-	45	2,8	2	2,3	2	1,9
Călăraşi	16	1,2	65	1,6	-	-	17	1,1	1	1,2	-	-
Dâmboviţa	18	1,3	106	2,6	-	-	31	1,9	-	-	1	0,9
Giurgiu	6	0,4	66	1,6	-	-	13	0,8	1	1,2	-	-
Ialomiţa	20	1,5	75	1,9	-	-	27	1,7	1	1,2	-	-
Prahova	41	3,0	137	3,4	1	16,7	54	3,3	6	7,0	1	0,9
Teleorman	19	1,4	107	2,7	-	-	23	1,4	1	1,2	-	-

Processed according to: *Romania Statistical Yearbook, 2012*, INS [1]

The percent of schools at the region level is represented as follows: 0.15% for primary education and 99.85% for secondary education compared to the national level where the percent was of 1.29% respectively 98.71%; Prahova county is remarked with: the highest number of kindergartens 41 units, the most secondary education schools - 137 schools, as well as the most high schools in total region, respectively 54 high schools and 6 post high schools units in 2011; Argeş county is remarked by the highest number of faculties, respectively 2 high education units.

**Medical infrastructure.** It is represented by care and medical assistance units, respectively hospitals, policlinics, diagnosis and treatment centres, medical offices and rural clinics, as well other public and private medical entities (table no. 5).

The infrastructure for medical assistance providing, recorded at South-Muntenia Region level, in 2008, a percent of 14.19% in the national level for hospital equipping and a percent of 16.65% for medical offices of general medicine, while, for policlinics the percent was only 7.06%, respectively a relatively reduced percent of 10.55%, recorded for other medical units [2]. The highest values regarding the number of medical units on counties, were recorded in the counties in the North part of the region, Prahova, Argeş, Dâmboviţa. South Muntenia Region had the lowest developed medical system (4.8 hospital beds to 1,000 inhabitants at the end of 2008 compared to 6.4 hospital beds to 1,000 inhabitants – average at national level), recording high variations from one county to another [2].

Thus, while in Argeş county, 6 beds were for 1,000 inhabitants, in Ialomiţa and Giurgiu counties were recorded only 3.1 and 3 beds to 1,000 inhabitants [3]. From the data presented, in 2008, it results implicitly, a sinuous deficiency to provide the medical infrastructure in the rural area, this situation implying major investments made with projects funded under various development programs.

**Table 5. Structure of medical units in South Muntenia Region, in 2011**

Development region/ County	Hospitals		Policlinics		Medical offices of general medicine		Family medical offices		Dental offices		Pharmacies and pharmaceutical points		Other medical units <sup>1)</sup>	
	no	%	no	%	no	%	No	%	No	%	no	%	No	%
Romania	458	100,0	269	100,0	1.033	100,0	11.279	100,0	11.025	100,0	7.215	100,0	17.379	100,0
South – Muntenia	65	14,2	19	7,1	172	16,7	1.571	13,9	1.017	9,2	919	12,7	1.834	10,6
Argeş	19	4,1	1	0,4	57	5,5	374	3,3	295	2,7	184	2,6	361	2,1
Călăraşi	6	1,3	0	0,0	20	1,9	118	1,0	62	0,6	61	0,8	145	0,8
Dâmboviţa	7	1,5	14	5,2	18	1,7	249	2,2	205	1,9	171	2,4	350	2,0
Giurgiu	5	1,1	0	0,0	15	1,5	122	1,1	57	0,5	96	1,3	113	0,7
Ialomiţa	4	0,9	3	1,1	0	0,0	122	1,1	51	0,5	83	1,2	94	0,5
Prahova	16	3,5	1	0,4	62	6,0	365	3,2	307	2,8	235	3,3	581	3,3
Teleorman	8	1,7	0	0,0	0	0,0	221	2,0	40	0,4	89	1,2	190	1,1

Processed according to: *Romania Statistical Yearbook, 2012*, INS [1]

Unfortunately, for 2011, the data reflect a worst situation. The infrastructure for providing medical assistance at the level of South-Muntenia Region recorded a percent of 12.29% in the national level for hospital equipping and 17.68% for medical offices in general medicine, for policlinics the percent was of 0.77%, and for other medical units a percent of 13.37%. The highest number of medical units was recorded in Argeş and Prahova counties, of 17 respectively 16 hospitals, with 64 respectively 63 medical offices of general medicine, and 418 respectively 588 other medical units.

## CONCLUSIONS

From the brief presentation of the state of the social infrastructure results the conclusion that from the point of view of rural utilities equipping is low, the level of equipment is much lower than in the urban area. The public utility networks are far from secure urban needs of the rural population, being undersized in relation to the population number.

The education and learning are key factors in accelerating the economic and social progress, in terms of high performance in all social areas, including the rural communities. Unfortunately, there are obvious discrepancies in the social infrastructure in the rural area compared to the urban area and obviously compared to EU member countries.

In the field of rural education, the material equipping in quantity seems to be acceptable. In many rural areas, the education units (or the number of classrooms) in relation to the number of inhabitants in the rural area (or the number of pupils) are surplus due to the decreasing number of young people. But, a qualitative analysis reveals severe deterioration of the rural education, an obvious discrepancy between the services provided in this field, in the rural and urban areas, due to the large differences existing between the infrastructure of education system and skill level of the teaching staff [6] .

Compared to the urban area, the medical care and health in the villages is far behind. In most rural localities, only primary health services are provided, the population using the services of specialized medical facilities in the cities. The medical staff serving the health units in the rural area is characterized by a low quality of care, situation explained by poor equipping of buildings, specialized equipment, usually obsolete or nonexistent equipment. In relation to the number of residents in the rural area, the qualified personnel have an insignificant percent, the number of doctors being reduced, which also affects the quality of health care [5]. Compared to an average of 378 urban residents per one doctor in the rural area, this social indicator is, in the rural area, of 1417 inhabitants, namely 3.7 times higher.

## REFERENCES

- [1] \*\*\* INS -Romania Statistical Yearbook 2001 -2012
- [2] \*\*\*Calarasi county-economic profile, 2012, <http://cartiere.ro/129913-judetul-calarasi-profilul-economic>
- [3] Iova Radu Andrei, Daniela Cretu -, „*Perception of the life quality in the rural communities in Romania* case study- Călărași county , LAMBERT ACADEMIC Publishing, Germany
- [4]\*\*\* Regional Development Agency, DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF MUNTENIA REGION, [http://www.adrmuntenia.ro/documente/1195475713\\_1.pdf](http://www.adrmuntenia.ro/documente/1195475713_1.pdf)
- [5] Analysis of current situation NDP 2007-2013, General Direction of Rural Development, management Authority for NPRD [http://www.madr.ro/pages/dezvoltare\\_rurala/](http://www.madr.ro/pages/dezvoltare_rurala/)
- [6] Council Conclusions on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training ("ET 2020"), <http://www.edu.ro/index.php/articles/12044>