ANALYSIS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF RURAL COMMUNITIES DEVELOPMENT AND THE DEGREE OF STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVEMENT. CASE STUDY, CĂLĂRAŞI COUNTY, ROMANIA

Daniela CREŢU, Radu Andrei IOVA, Oana Roberta CREŢU, Elena LASCĂR

University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, 59 Marasti Blvd, District 1, 011464, Bucharest, Romania. E-mails: cretu.daniela@managusamv.ro; iova.andrei@managusamv.ro; oanaroberta.cretu@gmail.com; lascar.elena@managusamv.ro

Corresponding author: cretu.daniela@managusamv.ro

Abstract

The citizen participation in decision-making is a basic democratic process. We live in an open society, where we have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process and the good developing of the community. Although the process is long, the civil society participation strengthens the democratic system, as the key component of a democracy is public participation, which ensures the transparency of the decision-making process and the efficiency of the governing act. Based on these considerations, we carried out a survey in 24 rural localities in Călăraşi county to see the respondents satisfaction on the achievements in the commune, assessments on the interest of local elected officials in the development of the commune, economic implications of lack of specialists, active involvement of the inhabitants of the commune in making decisions for the development of the community in which they live. The research was based on the survey method based on questionnaire and the data were processed by the method of analysis and comparison, using also χ^2 test. The questionnaire covered a number of 8 items, to which a number of 762 persons answered. The questions were structured on 2 levels, respectively, 4 filter questions and 4 grid questions, with 3 or 4 predefined answers. These questions were analyzed according to 5 criteria, namely: by the locality size according to the number of inhabitants, by the respondents' age, by the level of education, by gender and by social status. Analyzing the degree of respondents' satisfaction with the achievements of the commune, it is found that the answers differ significantly depending on the commune size according to the number of inhabitants, age, education, gender, social status. The most satisfied are those in communes with a population of over 6000 inhabitants (86%), men (81.6%), those with higher education (83.1%).

Key words: community, decision, rural development, citizen participation

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary specialized literature, in research centers, in university centers of the world, valuable theories were developed regarding the modeling of rural communities through co-participatory actions and self-organization actions. The model is given by the study of Kenneth P. Wilkinson, entitled "Phases and roles in community action" [cited in 2] and which is rich in the issues addressed and its bibliographical references. It starts with the "power structure" identified by: "community leaders"; "Social forces" and "group performance" and briefly analyzes the concept of social process as "relationships between stakeholders and their activities", which materializes through action program,

events, etc. and how the community evolves. [2 and 23].

The development of rural communities does not aim exclusively on decision-makers at central, regional or national level [1]. In order to ensure the rural areas development, it is necessary to mobilize all stakeholders (local authorities, organizations and civil society representatives) and, implicitly, to form a strong partnership between them. The role of the partnership is to set out the main challenges at the local level, set priorities, identify development solutions and implement integrated measures and strategies [9], [20].

The strategies are based on the links between the participating stakeholders, with multiple effects on local development and general programs at regional, national and community level. They must be designed to capitalize the

social, environment and economic strengths or "strengths" of the community. The local communities differ as regards capacity, cooperation and/or conflict experiences, and institutional culture [10]. Therefore, it is very important that the partnership is designed according to the realities of the local context. Civil society was recognized as the "third" key sector as regards the positive influence on the state, but also on the market. Therefore, it is seen as a more and more important agent for promoting good governance through transparency, efficiency, opening, responsiveness and respnsibility [8]. In our country, the citizen participation in the socio-political life of the local community as a whole is quite low.

The main cause would be the conception according to which the state is obliged to do everything for the good of its citizens [4 and 16]. At the same time, it takes time for them to learn the rules and regulations specific to active and responsible social behavior. The evolution of the civil society, in the world, and in Romania, proves that, in the future, it will know an important increase of its own role, both in the community in which it exists and at international level [14 and 15]. Thus, the role of civil society in rural development will become much more important, its organizations participating actively in everything that is undertaken at the local, national, regional and international levels. Due to the fact that, through civil society organizations, citizens have the opportunity to express their agreement and commitment to the economic and social development of their community, we can say that they play a key role in creating a democratic European model. [5 and 19].

In the rural areas of our country live the vast majority of those who are at risk of social exclusion due to poverty, which is highlighted by poverty in small villages, which have an aging population, to large communities, which are characterized by low human capital, poor employment and improper houses [17 and 6].

The citizen participation in decision-making is a basic democratic process. We live in an open society, where we have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process and the good developing of the community. [15]. Although the process is long, the civil society participation strengthens the democratic system, as the key component of a democracy is public participation, which ensures the transparency of the decision-making process and the efficiency of the governing act. It is essential that the mechanisms and tools for participation and influence in the decision-making process are well known, accepted and used by both parties: authorities and civil society [21].

The citizen participation policies must reflect the priorities of the local public administration and the interest of the community, with the general aims of: To encourage citizens to play an active role in the welfare of the community; To ensure the best possible living area for citizens, ensuring full and timely public access to public policy and decision-making, and ensuring that they can be influenced through full opening and immediate access to public information; To ensure the representation of all interests in the decision-making process, balancing different values and needs; To encourage trust between citizens, local elected officials and the local public administration executive; Development of a new approach to local government management, focused on citizens [7], [3] and [13].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In order to see the degree of stakeholders participation/ involvement in the rural development decisions at the level of the community in which they live, the research was based on the survey method, based on questionnaire and χ^2.test. The concordance test $\chi 2$ ("hi-square") is a general test, which can be applied to any statistical distribution to which we can calculate the cumulative distribution function. The $\chi 2$ test is applied to grouped data (or frequency data) and aims to associate the columns and rows of a table with two inputs, cross frequencies concerning discrete or discretized variables and is calculated after making contingency tables, in which the data are classified according to one,

two, or more segmentation variables [12 and 22].

The steps taken in evaluating the results of the questionnaire using the χ2 method are the following: *formulating the null hypothesis H0,* which states that there is no causal link or association between the two variables-questions; *choosing the level or threshold of significance* α and calculating the number of degrees of freedom of the table, according to the formula (r-1)*(c-1); based on which, its value is taken from the distribution table χ2, χ2 theoretical; *comparison of the obtained results* [11] for which there are the following situations: if the null hypothesis is rejected and therefore there is an association or potential relationship between the variables or if the existence of a null hypothesis is admitted and therefore there is no association or potential relationship between the studied variables; *calculation of the contingency coefficient C*, which has the role of measuring the degree of association between the variables of the contingency table.

It is compared χ2calculated with χ2theoretical for different probability thresholds. Pearson coefficient is calculated regardless of the nature of the variables (continuous or discrete) and regardless of the nature of their distribution (normal or not), in the research population, according to the mathematical model proposed by statistician Karl Pearson. [2, 4]. The closer the value of C is to 1, the more closely the variables are correlated. The survey was used to survey the opinion of the population - a questionnaire with a number of 4 items, to which a number of 762 persons answered. The questions were structured on 2 levels, respectively, 4 filter questions and 4 grid questions, with 3 or 4 predefined answers. These questions were analyzed according to 5 criteria, namely: by the size of the locality according to the number of inhabitants, by the age of the respondents, by the level of education, by gender and by social status.

The 762 respondents were distributed as following: **according to the size of the locality:** over 6,000 inhabitants - Borcea, Chirnogi, Dragalina, Modelu, Dor Marunt, Roseti - 200 respondents; between 4,000-6,000 inhabitants - Ciocanesti, Curcani, Cuza Voda, Frumusani, Perisoru, Jegalia -202 respondents; between 2,000-4,000 inhabitants - Chiselet, Dorobantu, Ileana, Independenta, Nana, Unirea -200 respondents; less than 2,000 inhabitants - Ulmu, N. Balcescu, Gurbanesti, Frasinet, Dichiseni, Căscioarele. **By age**: up to 30 years 112 respondents, between 31-40 years 216 respondents, between 41-50 years 206 respondents, between 51-60 years 104 respondents, over 61 years 104 respondents; **by level of education**: 26 respondents with primary school, 166 respondents with secondary school, 404 respondents with high school and 166 respondents with higher education; **by gender**: men 458 respondents and women 304 respondents; **by social status**: farmer 106 respondents; employee 424 respondents; registered unemployed 28 respondents; unregistered unemployed 26 respondents; without status 108 respondents, retired 70 respondents.

The respondents were asked to make assessments on the degree of satisfaction with the achievements of the commune, assessments on the interest of local elected officials in the development of the commune, lack of specialists, active involvement of commune residents in making decisions that could influence achievements in the commune.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The population of Călărași county decreased from 343 thousand inhabitants in 1992 to 314 thousand inhabitants in 2019, respectively by 5.4 thousand inhabitants, considered statistically very significant negative. From the total population in 2019, 126 thousand inhabitants live in urban area (40.01%) and 188 thousand inhabitants live in rural area (60.99%) [18]. The population of Călărași county is organized into communes and villages, respectively 48 communes with 158 villages in 1990 and 50 communes with 160 villages in 2019 [18].

Our study included the population of 24 localities of Calarasi county, grouped in 4 categories, depending on the number of population in the commune.

At question: *Are you satisfied with the achievements in your commune ?,* the analysis of the degree of satisfaction of the respondents with the achievements in the commune shows that there are very significant differences between the studied communes.

Table 1. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the degree of satisfaction of the respondents and the achievements in the commune

Size of commune according to no of inhabitants	UM	Are you satisfied with the achievements in the commune ?				Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	Not at all	no	%
over 6,000	No	172	28	0	0	200	26.2
between 4,000-6000	No.	16	76	102	6	200	26.2
between 2000-4,000	No.	44	120	34	4	202	26.6
under 2,000	No	16	84	50	10	160	21.0
Total	No	248	308	186	20	762	100
	%	32.55	40.42	24.41	2.62	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	12.24	14.68	16.92	21.67	27.9	
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	215.8					***	

Source: Own calculations.

Thus, 86% of the respondents from communes with a population of over 6,000 inhabitants and 22% from communes with a number of inhabitants between 2,000 and 4,000 inhabitants are very satisfied, as seen in Table 1. Satisfied are the inhabitants of communes with a population between 2,000 and 4,000 inhabitants, 60% and in communes with a population of up to 2,000 inhabitants, 42%. Little and not at all satisfied are those in communes with a population between 4,000 and 6,000 inhabitants, 54% and those in communes with up to 2,000 inhabitants, 50% (Table 1).

Analyzing the degree of satisfaction according to age, it is found that the differences in appreciation are distinctly significant. Thus, those who are very and much satisfied are 83% in the 31-40 age category and 78% in the 41-50 age category (Table 2).

Table 2. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the degree of satisfaction of the respondents and the achievements in the commune according to the age of the respondents

Age	UM	Are you satisfied with the achievements in the commune?				Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	Not at all	No	%
Up to 30 years	No	30	54	44	4	132	17.3
Between 31-40 years	No	94	72	46	4	216	28.3
Between 41-50 years	No	60	96	50	0	206	27.0
Between 51-60 years	No	36	38	22	8	104	13.7
Over 61 years	No	28	48	24	4	104	13.7
Total	No	248	308	186	20	762	100
	%	32,6	40.4	24.4	2.6	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	20.5	23.5	26.3	32.0	39.3	
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	26.32			**			

Source: Own calculations.

Depending on the level of training, the degree of satisfaction is different. The most satisfied are those with secondary education (83.1%), followed by those with higher education (75.9%) and those with secondary education (69.3%) (Table 3).

Table 3. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the degree of satisfaction of the respondents and the achievements in the commune depending on the training level of the respondents

Training level	UM	Are you satisfied with the achievements inn the commune?				Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	Not at all	no	%
Primary	No.	6	6	10	4	26	3.4
Secondary	No.	32	94	38	4	166	21.8
High school	No.	122	158	112	12	404	53.0
Higher education	No.	88	50	28	0	166	21.8
Total	No.	248	308	186	20	762	100
	%	32.55	40.4	24.4	2.6	100	X
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	12.2	14.6	16.9	21.7	27.9	
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	38.9					***	

Source: Own calculations.

Analyzing the degree of satisfaction according to gender, it is found that there are distinctly significant differences. Thus, women respondents are very, much satisfied, 81.6%, while men respondents 67.2% (Table 4).

Table 4. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the degree of satisfaction of the respondents and the achievements in the commune, depending on the gender of the respondents

Distribution on gender	UM	Are you satisfied with the achievements in the commune?				Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	Not at all	No	%
Masculine	No	130	178	136	14	458	60.1
Feminine	No	118	130	50	6	304	39.9
Total	No	248	308	186	20	762	100
	%	32.5	40.4	24.4	2.6	100	*
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	4.6	6.3	7.8	11.3	16.27	
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	10,4			**			

Source: Own calculations.

Those who are dissatisfied, at all, are 3% for men respondents and 2% for women respondents (Table 4.).

Depending on the professional status, the differences in the degree of satisfaction are distinctly significant. The most satisfied, respectively very much, are employees (76.9%) and the unregistered unemployed (76.9%), followed by farmers (75.5%) (Table 5).

At the questions if there is a link between the disinterest of local elected officials, the lack of specialists or the active involvement of the commune inhabitants and the achievements of the commune, the answers are significantly differentiated according to the status of the respondents.

At question about the disinterest of local elected officials at the locality level, the respondents assessments are very different. Thus, it is considered that it is influenced 97% in communes with a population between 4,000 and 6,000 inhabitants, 73% in smaller communes with a population between 2,000 and 4,000 inhabitants and only 29% in communes with more than 6,000 inhabitants (Table 6).

Table 5. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the degree of satisfaction of the respondents and the achievements in the commune according to the professional status of the respondents

Professional status	UM	Are you satisfied with the achievements in the commune ?				Total	
		Very much	Much	little	Not at all	no	%
Farmer	No	32	48	26	0	106	13.9
Employee	No	166	160	92	6	424	55.6
Registered unemployed	No	0	12	16	0	28	3.67
Unregistered unemployed	No	8	12	4	2	26	3.4
Without status	No	24	46	32	6	108	14.2
Retired	No	18	30	16	6	70	9.2
Total	No	248	308	186	20	762	100
	%	32.6	40.4	24.4	2.6	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	19.3	22.3	25.0	30.6	37.7	
CHIINV (Chi calculated	29.3			**			

Source: Own calculations.

Table 6. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the disinterest of the local elected officials and the achievements in the commune

Size of commune accoding to no of inhabitants	UM	Dissinterest of local officials:			Total	
		Very much	Much	little	no	%
Over 6000	no	2	56	142	200	26.2
between 4000- 6000	no	116	78	6	200	26.2
between 2000-4000	no	96	50	56	202	26.6
under 2000	no	70	54	36	160	21.0
Total	no	284	238	240	762	100
	%	37.3	31.2	31.5	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	8.6	10.6	12.6	16.8	22.5
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	132.2					***

Source: Own calculations.

These answers show the capacity of the local communities to have achievements, even if, perhaps appearantly, the local elected official do not demonstrate a visible involvement. The evaluation of the disinterest of the local officials depending on age is not significantly different depending on the respondents age, in the sense that the appreciation very much, much and little are relatively equal appreciations of over 60%.

However, the appreciation of very much and much has together 68.4%, thus demonstrating that the local elected officials are evaluated as ineffective due to lack of interest (Table 7).

Table 7. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the disinterest of the local elected officials and the achievements in the commune, depending on the age of the respondents

Age	UM	Disinterest of local elected officials			Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	no	%
Up to 30 years	No	46	46	40	132	17.4
Between 31-40 years	No	70	60	86	216	28.4
Between 41-50 years	No	76	66	64	206	27.0
Between 51-60 yeras	No	36	32	36	104	13.6
Over 61 years	No	52	34	14	104	13.6
Total	No	284	238	240	762	100
	%	37.3	31.2	31.5	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	11.0	13.4	15.5	20.0	26.1
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	13.4		*			

Source: Own calculations.

The evaluation of the disinterest of the local elected officials according to the degree of professional training is significantly different appreciated by the respondents. Thus, it considers that disinterest is a cause of failures in the commune 142 respondents with high school education, namely 70.2%, 63 respondents with high school education respectively 75.9% and 44 with higher education, representing 53% (Table 8).

Table 8. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the disinterest of the local elected officials and the achievements in the commune, according to the training level of the respondents

Training level	UM	Disinterest of local elected officials			Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	No	%
Primary	No	14	10	2	26	3.4
Secondary	No	78	48	40	166	21.8
High school	No	144	130	120	404	53.0
Higher education	No	38	50	78	166	21.8
Total	No	284	238	240	762	100
	%	37.3	31.2	31.5	100	X
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	11.0	13.4	15.5	20.1	26.1
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	21.87				**	

Source: Own calculations.

The evaluation of the disinterest of local elected officials in the commune according to gender is also significant. Thus, the appreciations of much and very much as disinterest are 73% for men and 61% for women (Table 9).

Table 9. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the disinterest of the local elected officials and the achievements in the commune, depending on the gender of the respondents

Distribution on gender	UM	Disinterest of local elected officials			Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	No.	%
Masculine	No	186	150	122	458	60,1
Feminine	No	98	88	118	304	39.9
Total	No	284	238	240	762	100
	%	37.3	31.2	31.5	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	3.2	4.6	5.9	9.2	13.8
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	6.4			*		

Source: Own calculations.

The evaluation of disinterest of local elected officials depending on the professional status is very different. Thus, appreciations very much and much are at farmers 77.3%, 91% at retired and 60.8%% at employees (Table 10).
We find that the disinterest of local elected officials in local achievements is differentiated from the commune, depending on education, gender function and professional status and undifferentiated depending on the degree of vocational training.
Knowing the important role of the specialists in the development activities of the commune, the answers of the respondents were analyzed according to the studied criteria.
The respondents appreciation regarding the correlation between the lack of specialists and the development of the commune, depending on the domicile, is found to be very significant.

Table 10. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the disinterest of the local elected officials and the achievements in the commune, depending on the social status of the respondents

Professional status	UM	Disinterest of the local elected officials			Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	No	%
Farmer	no	42	40	24	106	13.9
Employee	no	126	132	166	424	55.6
Registered unemployed	no	20	6	2	28	3.7
Unregistered unemployed	no	10	10	6	26	3.4
Without status	no	42	30	36	108	14.2
Retired	no	44	20	6	70	9.2
Total	no	284	238	240	762	100
	%	37.3	31.2	31.5	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	13.4	15.9	18.3	23.2	29.6
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	29.6					***

Source: Own calculations.

Thus, the evaluation is very much 99% in communes with a population between 4,000 and 6,000 inhabitants, 91% in communes with a population between 2,000 and 4,000 inhabitants and 79% in communes with over 6,000 inhabitants. In communes with a population of up to 2,000 inhabitants, the respondents who complain about the lack of specialists reach 82% (Table 11).

The appreciation of little, almost does not exist in the studied communes being of 2% in the communes with population between 4,000 -6,000 inhabitants, of 8.9% in the communes with population between 2,000 and 4,000 inhabitants, of 21% in the communes with over 6,000 inhabitants and 0.05% in small communes, below 2,000 inhabitants (Table 11).

Table 11. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the lack of specialists and the achievements in the commune depending on the respondents' domicile

Size of commune according to no of inhabitants	UM	Lack of specialists			Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	no	%
Over 6,000	No	74	84	42	200	26.2
Between 4,000-6,000	No	148	50	2	200	26.2
Between 2,000-4,000	No	96	88	18	202	26.6
Under 2,000	No	64	68	28	160	21.0
Total	No	382	290	90	762	100
	%	50.1	38.1	11.8	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	8.6	10.6	12.6	16.8	22.5
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	42.6					***

Source: Own calculations.

From the respondents' appreciation regarding the correlation between the lack of specialists and the development of the commune according to age, it is found that they appreciate very much and much their lack, being over 85% of the respondents. Thus, in the age group under 30, it is 86%, in the age category of 31-40 years it is 88%, in the age category of over 61 years of 94.2%, and those of in the age category of 41-50 years being

88%. Regarding the correlation between the lack of specialists and the development of the commune depending on the level of education, it is found that 88% of those with high school education, 90.3% of those with secondary education and 83% of those with higher education appreciate very much the lack of specialists.
From the respondents appreciation regarding the correlation between the lack of specialists

and the development of the commune according to the respondents gender, it can be seen that 88.7% of men and 88.8% of women appreciate this lack very much. The appreciation of little being 12% for men and 11% for women. Regarding the correlation between the lack of specialists and the development of the commune depending on the professional status of the respondents, it is found that 91% appreciate this lack, retired, farmers and those without professional status by 90%, employees by 87%.

One of the success factors of the achievements at the level of rural communities is the degree of active involvement of the inhabitants of the commune. The analysis shows that at the level of communes there are very significant differences of appreciation, being appreciated by very much and much of 89.1% of respondents from communes with a population between 2,000 and 4,000 inhabitants, 82% of communes with over 6,000 inhabitants and 64% of those in communes with a population between 4,000 and 6,000 inhabitants (Table 12).

From the analysis of the correlation between the active involvement of the inhabitants and the achievements in the commune, depending on the respondents age, it is found that there are no differences between the different age categories. Thus, in all categories the answers are very much between 76% in the age category 41-50 years and 82% in the category over 61 years, thus proving the same appreciation.

Table 12. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the active involvement of the inhabitants and the achievements in the commune

Size of commune according to no of inhabitants	UM	Active involvement of commune inhabitants			Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	No	%
Over 6,000	No	16	66	18	100	26.2
Between 4,000-6,000	No	46	82	72	200	26.2
between 2,000-4,000	No	138	42	22	202	26.6
Under 2,000	No	76	56	28	160	2.,0
Total	No	292	312	158	762	100
	%	38.3	40.9	20.7	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	8.6	10.6	12.6	16.8	22.5
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	87.4					***

Source: Own calculations.

Table 13. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the active involvement of the inhabitants and the achievements in the commune, depending on the training level of the respondents

Education level	UM	Active involvement of commune inhabitants			Total	
		Very much	Much	little	no	%
Primary	No	10	16	0	26	3.4
Secondary	No	80	50	36	166	21.8
High school	No	150	168	86	404	53.0
Higher education	No	50	78	38	188	21.8
Total	No	290	312	160	762	100
	%	38.1	40.9	21.0	100	x
Indicators	Test χ2, significance threshold					
	≤	0.2	0.1	0ţ05	0.01	0.001
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	11.03	13.4	15.5	20.1	26.12
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	13.8		*			
Coefficient Pearson	0.187					

Source: Own calculations.

Table 14. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the active involvement of the inhabitants and the achievements in the commune, depending on the gender of the respondents

Distribution on gender	UM	Active involvement of the commune inhabitants			Total	
		Very much	Much	little	no	%
Masculine	No	180	170	108	458	60.1
Feminine	No	110	142	52	304	39.9
Total	No	290	312	160	762	100
	%	38.1	40.9	21.0	100	x
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	3.2	4.6	5.9	9.2	13.8
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	4.1	*				

Source: Own calculations.

Table 15. Analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the active invovement of the commune inhabitans and the achievements in the commune, depending on the profesional statute of the respondents

Professional status	UM	Active involvement of the commune inhabitants			Total	
		Very much	Much	Little	no	%
Farmer	no	46	38	22	106	13.9
Employee	no	158	174	92	424	55.6
Registered unemployed	no	14	14	0	28	3.7
Unregistered unemployed	no	12	12	2	26	3.4
Without status	no	38	46	24	108	14.2
Retired	no	22	28	20	70	9.2
CHIINV (Chi theoretical)	≥	13.4	15.9	18.3	23.2	29.6
CHIINV (Chi calculated)	7.5					

Source: Own calculations.

From the analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the active involvement of the inhabitants and the achievements in the commune, depending on the respondents gender, it is found that there are no differences between the answers. The answers, very much and much, are between 76% for men and 82% for women (Table 14).

From the analysis of the evaluation of the correlation between the active involvement of the inhabitants and the achievements in the commune, depending on the professional status of the respondents, it was also found that there is no significant difference between the respondents answers. The answers of very much and much, have a share of 71.4% for retired, 77% for those without status, 78% for employees, 79% for farmers and 92% for the unemployed (Table 15).

The opportunity must be given to all persons to participate fully in the economic, social, political and cultural life of the society in which they live and to enjoy the benefits of such participation. Ensuring equal opportunities means eliminating the undesirable effects of circumstances beyond the control of individuals on their quality of life [21].

CONCLUSIONS

The correlation between the level of development of the rural communities in Călărași county and the level of involvement of the factors responsible for the development of these communities was analyzed through the answers to the questions: Are you satisfied with the achievements in the commune ?; How do you appreciate the involvement of local elected officials ?; Do you consider the lack of specialists to be an impediment to development ?; Are you actively involved in the problems of the commune?

Analyzing the degree of satisfaction of the respondents with the achievements of the commune, it is found that the answers differ significantly depending on the size of the commune according to the number of inhabitants, age, education, gender, social status. The most satisfied are those in communes with a population of over 6,000 inhabitants (86%), men (81.6%), those with higher education (83.1%). It should be noted

that over 72% of respondents say they are satisfied with the achievements of the commune in which they live.

Analyzing the question regarding the evaluation of the involvement of local elected officials in the development activities of the commune, it is found that disinterest is evaluated very significantly by categories of communes and social status and significantly different depending on education and significant gender and age. The activity of the elected officials is considered as disinterest with the appreciation of very much and much, of over 68% of the respondents, which represents a lack of communication, because over 72% of the respondents are satisfied with the achievements of the commune.

Analyzing the appreciation regarding the lack of specialists in the achievements of the commune, it is found that there are very significant differences of answers between the communes. There are no significant differences of appreciation between the groups of gender, age, education and social status, showing that 50.13% appreciate *very much* and 38.06% appreciate *much* the lack of specialists in the expected achievements in the commune.

The evaluation of the active involvement of the inhabitants in the achievements of the commune, presents significant differences at the level of communes, where communes with a number of inhabitants between 2000 -4000, have 90% of respondents, with appreciations of *very much and much*, while in communes with a population between 4000-6000 inhabitants is 44%. On the studied groups there is a high involvement with V*ery much and Much*, of 71.4% for retired, of 77% for those without status, of 78% for employees, of 79% for farmers and of 92% for the unemployed.

Analyzing the collected data shows that there is a significant difference in the degree of appreciation of strongly organized communities, regarding the influence they can have in the community development at the level of communes, studies and social status. It is found that the appreciations *very much and much* are more, as the level of education increases: from 38% in primary education, to

56% in secondary education, to 63% in high school and 79% in higher education.

Analyzing the answers to the question according to the degree of vocational training, we find that there is also a very significant difference between the answers at the level of the categories of communes, at the level of the degree of training, at the level of the social status. It was found also that those who belong to non-working categories are not consulted in very large proportions: 74% of the non-working status, 71% of the registered unemployed, 69% of the unregistered unemployed and 66% of the retired.

REFERENCES

[1]Barna C., Vameşu, A., 2015, Financial inclusion through the social economy, Bucharest, Wolters Kluwer.
[2]Bleahu, A., 2019, Rural Development in the European Union, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237527540_DEZVOLTAREA_RURALA_IN_UNIUNEA_EUROPEANA/link/00b7d53bfab52e2467000000/download Accessed on 03.12.2021.
[3]Book no. 14, Citizen participation, http://www.contaconta.ro/miscellaneous/533_miscellaneous_contabilitate_files%20533_.pdf, Accessed on 11.11.2021.
[4]Burean, T., 2017, Romania 2017 Non-governmental sector. Profiles, trends, challenges, p.149. www.fondong.fdsc.ro, Accessed on 13.12.2021.
[5]Cabra de Luna, M. A., 2017, The external dimension of the social economy (Own innitiative opinion), Oficial Journal UE, 2017, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52017IE0181&from=ES, Accessed on 07.11. 2021.
[6]Center for Not-for-profit Law, Civil Participation in Decision-Making Processes. An Overview of Standards and Practices in Council of Europe Member States European (2016), https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/EqualParticipation/DraftGuidelines/ECNL.pdf, Accessed on 11.11, 2021.
[7]Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe, Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision Making Process (2017), https://www.coe.int/en/web/ingo/civil-participation, Accessed on 03.12, 2021.
[8]Cretu, D., Iova R.A., 2016, The impact of corporate social responsibility on the community, Scientific Papers Series Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development Vol. 16(2), 117 - 122 .
[9]Cretu, D., Iova R.A., Cretu, O.R., Lascar, E., 2021, Analysis of the degree of the rural population

involvement in the decision making act. Case study, Călăraşi County, Romania, Scientific Papers Series Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development Vol. 21(1), 133-140.

[10]Iova, R.A, Cretu, D., 2013, Perception of the life quality in the rural communities in Romania. Case study. Călăraşi County, Lambert Academic Publishing, p.87.

[11]Merce, E., Merce, C.C., Dumitraş, D.E., 2010, Statistical data processing, AcademicPres Publishing House, Cluj-Napoca, România.

[12]Mihăiţă, N. V., Stancu Capota, R., 2003,Strong, Hiden, false and illusory statistical relationships, http://www.biblioteca-digitala.ase.ro/biblioteca/carte2.asp?id=388&idb=, Accessed on 11.01, 2022.

[13]OSCE-ODIHR – Venice Commission, Guidelines on Freedom of Association, 2015, https://www.osce.org/odihr/143886, Accessed on 13.12.2021.

[14]Răduţ-Selişte, D., 2010, Networking for community development- establishment and management of an intervention network and local level, intercultural methods, University of Craiova.

[15]Sandu, D., 2011, community of regional development, University of Bucharesti, Faculty of Sociology and Social Work, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dumitru_Sandu/publication/242654602_Dezvoltare_comunitara_si_regionala/links/55314b250cf27acb0dea93b8. pdf, Accessed on 16.12, 2021.

[16]Tănăsoiu, O., Iacob, A., 2017, Econometric Models Volume I, Second Edition, Course Notes, ASE Publishing House, Chapter 2, p. 127.

[17]Teşliuc, E., Grigoras, V., Stanculescu, M.S., 2016, Atlas of Marginalized Rural Areas and Local Human Development in Romania, The World Bank, http://www.mmuncii.ro/ Accessed on 11.11, 2021.

[18]The County Directorate of Statistics, Călăraşi, series 2000 la 2020.

[19]The European Commission, 2013, Rural development 2014-2020, https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rural-development-2014-2020_ro, Accessed on 11.11, 2021

[20]The European Commission, 2019, Country report of 2019 on Romania, including a consolidated review of prevention and correction of economic imbalances, Brussels https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file_import/2019-european-semester-country-report-romania_ro.pdf, Accessed on 5.10, 2021

[21]UE, 2017, Social economy in the EU, https://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/social-economy_en, Accessed on 5.10, 2021.

[22]Wikia.org. Statistics, Caracterization of frecuency distributions, http://ro.math.wikia.com/wiki/Statistică, Accessed on 23.11.2021.

[23]Zamfir, C., Stoica, L., 2017, A new challenge: Social development, Polirom Publishing House, www.polirom.ro, Accessed on 05.12, 2021.