



**HAL**  
open science

## Regional analysis on subjective welfare. Romanians' major concerns on developing regions

Calina Ana Butiu

► **To cite this version:**

Calina Ana Butiu. Regional analysis on subjective welfare. Romanians' major concerns on developing regions. International Conference of Territorial Intelligence, Alba Iulia 2006., Sep 2006, Alba Iulia, Romania. p71. halshs-00999771

**HAL Id: halshs-00999771**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00999771v1>**

Submitted on 4 Jun 2014

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

*REGIONAL ANALYSIS ON SUBJECTIVE WELFARE.  
ROMANIANS' MAJOR CONCERNS ON DEVELOPING REGIONS*

---

**Călina Ana Buțiu**

Lecturer, University "1 Decembrie 1918" Alba Iulia  
bcalina@yahoo.co.uk  
tel. 0744 792 174

**Summary:** Through the new developing regions created in Romania must bring into account the compensation of the population needs and the differentiated territorial expectations. According to Public Opinion Barometer (Oct. 2004), diseases, firstly, prices and the children's future, are the main concerns of the Romanians, with territorial (regional) differences. The sustainable development strategies may be more successful taking into consideration a psychosocial profile of the regions.

**Rezumat:** Prin regiunile de dezvoltare nou create în România trebuie să se ia în calcul compensarea nevoilor populației și așteptările diferențiate teritorial. Conform Barometrului de Opinie Publică (oct. 2004), boala mai întâi, apoi prețurile și viitorul copiilor, sunt principalele temeri ale românilor, cu deferențieri teritoriale (regionale). Strategiile de dezvoltare durabilă pot avea mai mult succes luând în considerare un profil psihosocial al regiunilor.

**Key words:** regional analysis, developing region, subjective welfare, development strategies.

**Cuvinte cheie:** analiză regională, regiune de dezvoltare, bunăstare subiectivă, strategii de dezvoltare

## 1. TRANSITION AND WELFARE IN ROMANIA

Welfare is a multidimensional concept whose defining has powerful implications in social politics maintained after a time. Turning the public politics towards increasing the prosperity or the satisfaction of the people represents a general imperative of well being, N. Barry asserted (1998). On the other side, the set of social indicators that measure the welfare of individuals and collectivities is continuously diversifying and refining because, E. Zamfir noticed, these are not a simple measurement *a posteriori*, ascertaining the progress made, but they are a *feed-back* necessary for the development. The evolution of the society determines an increase of the social indicators number but also a modification of their function, from administration functions to planning and adjusting functions (Zamfir, 1989, p. 149). Regional development, preceded by *regionning* (see Pascaru, 2005), is based on diagnosis grounded both theoretically and empirically. The territorial statistics based on acknowledged indicators offer a diagrammatic image of the social reality but which is enriching by combining multiple types of indicators.

We will further analyse the relation between the development level of the regions in Romania (relatively new constituted) and the fear as a social indicator of welfare, in the national social-political context, using three important data sources: Human Development Report for Romania 2003 – 2005, regional data supplied by the National Institute of Statistics and the data base of the Public Opinion Barometer, October 2004.

### 1.1 Transition and Institutional Hesitations

In an analysis of transition in Romania, Cătălin Zamfir (2005) shows that the process itself, as a transformation of a socialist organization in a capitalist one, is a new one, yet not experienced in the history, so it is natural to turn up a series of problems connected to the ample social construction that implies. The lack of a coherent transition strategy is thus accountable, notices the author, by its explorer nature but also by the fact that the changes from the former socialist countries pursue, firstly, a supranational logic.

One of the aspects of this logic can be considered also the developing regions creation, a political-economical fact, called *regionning*, which stands out by *regionalizing*, as a socio-historical fact (Pascaru, 2005). Dumitru Sandu (1999, p. 168) specifies that the delimitation of the eight developing regions in Romania was made by experts in order to “*allow the elaboration and implementation of politics for reducing the*

*developing disparities and maximizing the competition of the regions*”. We can conclude, even without an explicit wording, that regarding the disparities and the competition increase we are talking about a double reporting, a national and a European one. The Law 151/1998, the first legal document by which the *regionning* of Romania becomes statutory, repealed in 2004 by the Law 315/2004 (which keeps a significant part from the content of the first law), are the main rules on which basis new institutions were created (Regional Council for Regional Developing and Regional Developing Agencies). Regional developing strategies and projects are elaborated, aiming a multiple level impact: local, regional and national.

### 1.2. The Problems of Governing in Romania

Regarding the decentralization of political administrative responsibilities, Human Development Report in Romania 2003-2004, remarks the progresses made by adopting a set of legal documents and measures through which function reallotting takes place between the local, county and central level of the administration. The report also underlines the fact that ambiguities and confusions still persist especially regarding the responsibilities on county and local level (regarding the medical protection and assistance, services for elderly and persons having special needs, water supplies and sewerage, secondary school education etc.). Financing investments on local level contains aspects which haven't been solved yet: the lack of political will often generated by the opinion divergences between mayors and local councillor, the poor use of external loans, the lack of a legal frame for the reglementation of bankruptcy of local governments dissolution, solving current issues etc.

On the other hand, by the transfer towards public local authorities of the responsibilities regarding income taxes and public expenses, regional disparities increase, the richer areas (which also have higher pressure potential) managing to reduce the intra-regional inequalities.

For Romania, national statistics and analysis presented in Human Development Report 2003-2005 show different schemes of the main developing indicators tendencies that compose the human development index (HDI), respectively, income (expressed in Gross Domestic Product), education and longevity (life hope). Although the progresses made in the last transition decade on the economic and government plan are obvious, one can ascertain the persistence of two major issues: *poverty* and *regional disparities*. The regional and local approach of needs seems to have been neglected until now by the central institutions in Romania.

Comparatively to the other states in Central and Eastern Europe, after HDI, Romania was situated on the 14th position in a hierarchy of 15 countries in this region (0,786 compared to a maximum of 0,848 registered by Hungary and a minimum of 0,751, for Turkey)<sup>1</sup>.

Disparities regarding HDI on developing regions (Table 1) are obvious and mirrored in components of the index. From these, the economic component, expressed in GDP has the biggest contribution to regional differentiation.

Regarding GDP per inhabitant, only the regions in Bucharest and West are situated over the national average (Bucharest registering double value compared to the average) and North-East Region has the most little GDP value, situated at one third from the country average.

The poverty has the same regional distribution, maximum poverty rates being registered in the North-East Region where HDI has minimum values. According to the data supplied by World Bank Report (2003), in the North-East Region there is the highest risk of poverty, the national average being exceeded with 47%. The same Report shows that after 1996, the regional differences regarding poverty slightly reduced but the incidence of poverty in Romania seems to be correlated to the education and the occupational statute of the household chief, affiliation to gipsy ethny, residence in the rural area and in the North-East Region.

## **2. FEAR – INDICATOR OF SUBJECTIVE WELFARE**

The interest of governors for the subjective dimensions of welfare don't seem to be so big, at least in Romania, that the one of the scientific community, in whose studies these are surprised clearly or in relation to other dimensions. So justified interrogations appeared regarding the efficiency of governing programmes, whose evaluation is based almost exclusively on quantitative data.

In the social politics and programmes the normative needs are taken into consideration and less the feel ones, which contain powerful subjective components, even if they are constituted also by general legitimate elements. And, generally, the welfare of the individual can be defined as a situation of satisfying his needs. But further, let's see a few of the theoretical distinctions of subjective welfare, as they are approached by the social sciences.

---

<sup>1</sup> At the level of the year 2002, according to Human Development Report 2003 – 2005, UNDP

The psychologists define the fear as negative emotion, implying insecurity, anxiety, alarm, excitement and tendency to avoid an imminent or distant danger (Popescu-Neveanu, 1978). But fear, between certain limits, has also indisputable virtues, as justifying factor, of adaptation and preservation and as a cohesive force for human groups. A human need, like security, generates a certain type of behaviour. Complex mechanisms of social support (emotional, instrumental, informational etc.) start to function, more or less efficiently, in order to reduce stress factors, such as fears, as it is shown in a series of studies, which were the object of the relation between psychological welfare and the social support network. (see Turner, 1981; House, 1987; Cooke, Martin Rossmann, McCubbin, Patterson, 1988; Diener, Sapyta, Suh, 1998). The bright side of fears is that they enhance sociability, as a factor of group cohesion, and the bad part manifests only when the support provided by the social network is missing.

Public institutions have also a significant part in the creation of the formal dimension of social support system, by achieving a larger objective, the one of *social cohesion*, as relation that facilitates the collaboration and the fair distribution of resources on family and community level. When the connections between groups that assure security and reduce power asymmetries are weakened, trust in public institutions diminishes and social fragmentation increases.

Bradburn (1969), in the monograph dedicated to the psychological structure of welfare, includes the fear on the list of negative emotion which diminish psychological welfare and finds, on practical basis, that there are correlations between material welfare, social-professional statute, marriage satisfaction and psychological welfare. But he also admits the limits of a simple determination between the enumerated dimensions and psychological welfare, which he metaphorically represents as a forest or a jungle having a scheme which is diverse, complex and almost unrepeatable from an individual to another. Seen as opposite of mental illness, psychological welfare is measured by the author through indicators of general life satisfaction, of main fears, of somatic symptoms and anxiety. These are analogous to few of the significant "trees" which compose "the forest" called psychological welfare. The location (the territory) and the context (variable in time and space) are the ground on which are developing situations more or less particular. The difficulties of life are dependent on the individuals' specific features, considerable differences regarding their degree and duration being registered. But living the life difficulties are not simple function of individuals' specific

features, the features of the environment being also meaningful.

In a sociological approach of fears, Ozana Cucu-Oancea (2005, p. 169) makes the distinction between *particular* fears, which change every day and from an individual to another, according to the life events each lives, and *general* fears (called by the author also *community* fears) which affect a large number of individuals, becoming specific for some groups, communities and societies. Having a relative stability, general fears are the ones, which get *social issues* statute.

We can affirm that fears have an objective basis, where some components are inherent and inevitable, specific to the entire humanity, and others are determined by psychosocial factors, economical and political, and also a subjective basis, as ground where a likely representation is forming as prior to a certain general fear. If this is so, the analysis of general fears is a necessary indicator but not necessarily sufficient in identifying and analysing social issues. That is why it deserves attention, besides other social indicators.

### 3. ROMANIANS' FEARS FROM REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE

In the series of Public Opinion Barometers, as periodical survey (sustained by the Foundation for an Opened Society, starting 1994, on representative samples on national level) we are given a rich material for analysis and reflection regarding the multiple aspects of social life in Romania. Intensely exploited by sociologists (thanks to the access to the data basis), with results which are in the attention of the media and, most likely, of politicians and governors, each barometer contributes to finding the social realities in Romania. The questionnaire contains questions having a contextual character (connected to public events) but also a significant number of items, which are maintained from a Barometer to another. Their constant presence allows longitudinal analysis, on certain themes, showing the dynamics and the tendencies of the public opinions (as opinions, attitudes, evaluations etc., see Rotariu, Iluț, 1999), centred on the subjective aspect of the social reality. It is also the case of the question referring to general fears (*"Which are the thing that you most fear of at the present moment?"*), accompanied by the presentation of a predefined list and an opened answer variant, from which the subject selects (or formulates, for the free choice) the fears situated on the first and second position.

An analysis of the evolution of Romanians' fears in the period March 1995 - May 2004 (from the data basis of 19 Barometers and a CURS survey), made

by O. Cucu-Oancea (2005) on the basis of the answers regarding the first fear, reflects stressed concerns regarding fear for war and illness, which occupies the most different positions in the general hierarchy of fears (from the first to the fifth position), compared to other fears which have a relative stability in the hierarchy. The fear for prices constantly occupies prominent positions (the first place, except the barometers in November 1998, May 1999 and May 2001), because *"... represents not only an indicator of the general frame of mind, but also a significant measure of the general economic situation."* (Cucu-Oancea, 2005, p.177). The disparities regarding fears, pointed out by the author varying with the residence environment, from the data base of the CURS survey - May 2003, are the following: the urban inhabitants fear most of the prices than the rural ones. In the rural area, men, aged between 46 and 65, having maximum 10 grades, with no occupation, day-labourers or which work only in their own household, inhabitants of historical regions Crișana, Maramureș and Banat, are the ones that most fear prices. Regarding disease, as a danger hardly to control, not only by the individual but also by social, political and administrative measures, differences varying with the residence environment are mitigating. But, by the criterion of the location in a certain region (historical), age, education level, health state and income (variables taken into calculation in the mentioned study), significant differences appear. Thus, the fear for disease is registered more between the ones in Moldova, the elderly, the ones having a low education level, (maximum 7 grades), with income under the minimum income per economy.

Having as a starting point the data above and considering useful pencilling a psychosocial profile of the developing regions in Romania, we have resorted to an analysis of the main fears on territorial criteria. We used information from the statistics of developing regions (presented on the sites [www.insee.ro](http://www.insee.ro)) and from the data base of the last available Public Opinion Barometer, respectively from October 2004 ([www.osf.ro](http://www.osf.ro)).

*Disease fear* occupies the first place in the regional distribution picture (Table 2) and it dues mostly to the fact that disease is almost part of the human existence and, even more, as K. Riesler showed (1944), it contains the fear for death, which is absolutely inherent, it isolates the individual but also has a powerful social dimension. Besides the objective aspects (the health state, the quality of medical services etc.) there are also a series of subjective factors which lead to expressing the fear for disease and the regional distribution of expressed fears, in relation to other indicators, can reveal likely new dimensions components of fear.

To what extent the disease fear can point out a social problem? We suppose that in expressing the fear there are also factors which contain the representations of the subjects regarding the opportunities and costs for treatment in comparison to the incomes, an objective dimension on which the state has unquestionable responsibilities.

From the data supplied by the National Institute of Statistics results the decreasing evolution of sanitary units having mostly state propriety in all the developing regions, (Table 4). The most significant decrease is registered for the number of polyclinics and health units, as an effect of the creation of private societies politics of these medical institutions. The medical services whose costs are being supported through the state insurance health system (compulsory for all employees in Romania), are different from public institutions in comparison to the private ones from the point of view of satisfying the care/treatment needs but also regarding the quality. So, massive particularization of health units should reduce the Romanians' fears for disease if we take into consideration only the new opportunities for treatment created by the reform in the health system. We can observe, from Table 4, that the regions where the most stressed particularization took place are București-Ilfov and West, these being also the ones that occupy the first two positions as regards to the degree of urbanization (Table 3), of GDP/one inhabitant (Table 1), of beds number in hospitals and of medical staff (Table 4). But the maximum disease fears are registered rather here than in other regions. An explanation, having hypothetical nature, would be the one of more intense preoccupation that the inhabitants of this region have, clearly more developed from an economic point of view and where poverty rates are the lowest, for health care, in terms of the existence of some new treatment opportunities but which also implies high costs.

*Fear for prices*, one of the most stable fears, which is always in the top of the hierarchy, contains mostly relations to the stressed prices increase, which was constant starting from 1990, and which was not compensated by proportional income increases. But it can also contain the distance between aspirations (often transformed in needs) and the power to buy products or services necessary to satisfy these aspirations. An argument to these could be the maximum frequency of price fear encountered in the North-West Region (Table 2), where the average calculated on national level is outrun by over 10%, without being registered very high values of poverty rate and where human development indicators register medium values (Table 1).

*Children's future* worries the most the inhabitants in the South-East Region (18,7%) and, very close as percentage, the ones in the North-West Region (17,8%). Deciphering the reasons of these fears can be searched in the traditional preoccupation of the family for assuring the education, the work place and a home for their children, which are all more problematical now than in the former system. In the absence of some variables that could explain this type of fear, we have tried to identify a relation between the number of children in the household of the subjects that answered the questionnaires and expressing fear, but the results were not enough relevant. In the North-East Region, with the highest medium number of children in the household (0,97), the fear manifests less than in other regions<sup>2</sup>.

*Fear for war* in the area, the last from the group of fears with frequency over 10%, has had sinuous evolutions, but has always occupied one of the first positions in the hierarchy of Romanians' fears. Alternatively, it was surpassed only by the fear for prices, disease and children's future (*see Cucu-Oancea, 2005*). We consider that on the grounds of no chances that the common citizen has to control the beginning of a war, the feeding of this fear was made firstly by the armed conflicts in the neighbouring countries. It is interesting the fact that the inhabitants of the North-East Region most fear war (15,8%), which have as neighbouring countries Moldavia Republic and Ukraine and the ones in the North-West Region fear war less (7%), having the borders with Ukraine and Hungary. The geopolitical context and the events intensely made known but differently incorporated in the social conscience are, very likely, factors that determine expressing not only this type of fear but also the one regarding a terrorist attack.

*Unemployment* doesn't represent a fear anymore for most Romanians, its' importance being less, almost constant since March '95 (when it was on the third position, after fear for prices and for war). The explanation lies in the relatively constant decrease of unemployment rate, from the explosive increase registered between 1991 (3%) and 1993 (10,4%). The situation of unemployment rate "boom" in that period was otherwise specific to central and European south-east countries, among which Poland and Bulgaria were from this point of view in the most dramatic situation, with unemployment rates which surpassed 16% in 1993 (Popescu, 2004, p.158). The picture of the unemployment rate evolution in Romania for the last years (Table 5) justifies, at least partially, the minimum frequency

---

<sup>2</sup> Average calculated on total households, including the ones with no children (approximately 50%). For the other regions, the values obtained were the following: South-East: 0,65; South: 0,67; South-West: 0,7; West: 0,67; North-West: 0,91; Centre: 0,67; Bucharest-Ilfov: 0,44.

of unemployment fear (1,3%) for the inhabitants of the North-Western Region, where the percentage of unemployed workers is the lowest (except the Bucharest-Ilfov Region), but we notice that in regions with unemployment rates situated over the national average, other fears occupy more important positions. The North-East Region strikes again by the discrepancy between the constantly very high unemployment rate and the temperate frequency of expressing fear.

We consider useful a more detailed analysis of fears on these territories, trying to point out the common and especially the specific elements of expressed fears, varying with the residence environment, age, gender, educational level and declared trust in the main institutions and in people, generally<sup>3</sup>. For the analysis, we also appeal to data supplied by the National Institute of Statistics, reference year 2003.

### 3.1. North-East Region

Comparatively to the other developing regions, it is the region with the most numerous population (17,22% from the population of Romania), having a big percentage (almost maximum) of the inhabitants in the rural area (59,22%) and the most balanced age group distribution: this is the only region where the percentage of children is higher than the one of the elderly (Table 3). Still here were constantly registered maximum rates of poverty and unemployment. The minimum developing degree is mirrored also in the human development index that, of all regions, registered here the most little value (Table 1).

Here people most fear disease, as in the other regions, but before the fear for prices and children's future, the fear for a war in the area is more often met. Inhabitants in the rural fear less for disease than the ones living in the towns, with a difference in the expressed fear percentage,  $\Delta = 10,3\%$ . In exchange, in the rural areas, the percentage of the ones who fear for war overtakes the one registered in towns ( $\Delta = 13\%$ ). Other fears prevalently met in the rural areas in comparison to the towns are the ones for terrorist attack ( $\Delta = 2\%$ ) and children's future ( $\Delta = 1,4\%$ ). Varying with age, we can establish that fear for disease is approximately equally registered in the case of youth, adults and

elderly<sup>5</sup>. Most young people fear more for prices and unemployment and most of the adults fear for children's future and terrorist attack. Elderly offer the greatest number of responses to the opened variant ("*something else*"). The more stressed differences between the fears of men and women in the region are regarding disease (women fear more,  $\Delta = 7\%$ ), and war (men fear more,  $\Delta = 10,8\%$ ). According to the level of training, it was registered that for war and disease fear most of the ones who have at the most lower studies (0-8 grades) and the ones having medium studies most fear for prices and children's future. The university graduates (10,9% from the total of respondents in the region) have fears like the ones regarding delinquency and offences.

The vertical level trust (in institutions) seems to be here more powerful than the horizontal level one (in people), as region where it is expressed in the greatest percentage a very big trust in the Church (58,7%) and the Government (8,3%) and regarding trust in the Army, it is outrun only by the South-West Region (Table 6).

### 3.2. South-East Region

It includes 13,5% of the population of Romania, from which 55,19% live in towns. It is the second region in the hierarchy of family poverty although, after GDP/one inhabitant is placed in a medium position (see Table 1).

Comparatively to the other regions, it points out by maximum percentages of fears for the children's future (18,7%) and terrorist attack (7,8%) and disease fear is much more reduced here than in the neighbouring region, from north. After the residence environment, it registers a relative homogeneity regarding the fear for prices, unemployment and delinquency/offences. But in the rural area, the people fears more for war ( $\Delta = 10\%$ ) and disease ( $\Delta = 8\%$ ) than those living in urban. In turn, the towns people fear most for terrorist attack ( $\Delta = 10,2\%$ ) and children's future ( $\Delta = 3,6\%$ ). Naturally, the elderly fear for disease more, and for them other fears (like the fear for war or social troubles) are greater than for the youth and adults. The young ones fear more for children's future and prices, and adults for delinquency/offences. Regarding the gender differences, women more fear for the children's future ( $\Delta = 11,8\%$ ) and men for prices ( $\Delta = 10,8\%$ ). Disease and prices fear decreases with the training level. The ones having lower studies fear for war and delinquency/offences, while the ones having

<sup>3</sup> We considered three of the institutions which have a certain role in forming the most frequently expressed fears, the Church, the Army and the Government, by analyzing the answers to the question "*How much do you trust in...*" and for trust in people, the answers to the question "*Do you think you can trust most of the people?*".

<sup>4</sup>  $\Delta$  represents the difference calculated between two values which result from the crosstabulation tables.

<sup>5</sup> For the analysis, we have built the variable *age\_c*, with three categories: young people: 18-40 years; adults: 41-59 years; seniors: 60 years and more.

medium studies are more preoccupied by children's future and terrorist attack. For the ones with university degrees the fears are distributed, in almost all predefined types, according to medium values.

As it concerns trust in institutions, it is the region which clearly stands out by the big percentage of the ones who don't trust the Government at all, as institution of the central power (31,7% of the respondents, compared to the following region in the hierarchy of not trusting the Government, București-Ilfov, with 14% choices of the variant "at all" at the question regarding the degree of trust in the Government).

### 3.3. South Region (Muntenia)

It is the second region as percentage in the total population of Romania (15,37%) and which registers the biggest percentage of inhabitants in the rural (59,28%) and elderly (21,26 %, Table 1), which is specific to the rural environment in Romania, characterized by demographic ageing. In conclusion it does not come as a surprise the fact that here are the lowest teaching rates and combined raw schooling rates (Table 1), comparatively to the values for developing regions of these indicators.

After the criterion of expressed fear, it doesn't point out by occupying a front position, on the contrary, it is placed on middle positions for almost all types of predefined fears. Intraregional reports, varying with the residence environment, show a higher frequency in the case of fear for war and disease in the rural area compared to the towns (\* = 8%, respectively 7,8%). After the age criterion, the young people especially fear for the children's future and prices, the adults fear for unemployment and terrorist attack, and for the senior's disease and war, in this order, are the main fears. The gender differences seem less stressed here, the figures indicating that disease alone is a fear which manifests more frequently on women than on men (\* = 8,3%) and that among men, most fear for prices (\* = 7%).

The ones with no education only fear disease and war and as educational level grows, the fears diversify. For the ones having at the most lower school, disease is prevalent as fear, and for the ones having secondary studies the fears for unemployment (78,6% of the total) and for children's future (68,4%) appear more frequently. The university graduates fear for prices and delinquency/offences. For terrorist attack don't fear the ones with no school, nor the ones with high studies but the ones which are on a lower and medium educational level. *Table 6*, from a

comparison to the results on questions regarding trust in Church, Army, Government and people, generally, shows that the inhabitants of this region also express themselves temperately regarding this issue.

### 3.4. South-West Region (Oltenia)

Inhabited by 10,71% from the population of Romania, in this region prevails the rural population (54,66%) but in a more reduced percentage than in the North-East Region and South Region. It is placed on the second position regarding the percentage of elderly (20,87%), right after South Region (Table 3) and on the third position regarding poverty rate and human developing index (Table 1). The unemployment rate had here, in 2003, the highest value (9,1%). And given all these, the fear for unemployment didn't registered values more high than in other regions (Table 2) as otherwise there are not big disparities in region regarding the majority of expressed fears. We only signal the following differences: in the rural environment the fear for disease and prices is more often registered than in towns (\* = 10,5%, respectively 7,5%), the fear for prices is more often registered on young people than on adults, and on adults is more often registered than on elderly (\* = 10%). The significant gender differences only appear in the case of war fear that manifests more often on women than on men (\* = 12,6%). Taking into consideration the educational level, we find here, as well, that the ones with lower studies at the most fear especially for disease and prices and the ones with middle studies fear most for unemployment, children's future and terrorist attack. For war fear most of the university graduates (12,6% of the total respondents in the region).

Trust in institutions, including Church, and in people, is generally more reduced, but an exception is the Army, which is given the maximum trust by the ones who answered to the questions in the questionnaire (Table 6).

### 3.5. West Region

It is the region with the most reduced number of inhabitants (8,92% from the total of the population in Romania) and, besides the Bucharest-Ilfov Region, it is the only one where the majority of the population lives in towns (61,67%). It registers on all indicators that reflect the developing level values higher than the other regions (excluding the region which includes the capital of Romania), so it can be considered as the most developed. But here are expressed the most frequent fears for unemployment (although the unemployment rate is under the national average, respectively 7%) and



the most rare fears for a terrorist attack (in spite of the fact that this is a typical fear for the urban environment). The townspeople here fear in a higher percentage for their children's future (\* = 12,2%) and disease (\* = 7,6%). The ones living in rural areas fear more for prices and unemployment (\* = 17,5%, respectively 6,7%). For the young people, prices and a war in the area are greater fears than for adults and elderly. Adults are here more concerned by the children's future (more men express this fear) and among the ones with ages over 60 years, 59% fear for disease (the majority are women). After the educational level, for disease fear less among the ones having lower studies but which represent the majority in the group of the ones who fear unemployment and children's future.

As regards trust, we notice the fact that here we can register the most reduced percentage of the ones who trust people (15,7%) but the institutions are not trusted here either compared to the regions described until now (see Table 6).

### 3.6. North-West Region

It includes 12,62% from the population of the country, relatively equally distributed in rural areas and towns (see Table 3) and has a better situation regarding the percentage of children in comparison to the other regions (with an exception, the North-East Region). After the human development index calculated for the year 2002, it occupied the fourth place and regarding GDP/one inhabitant was situated under the national average (Table 1). The registration of a low unemployment rate (5,4% compared to 7,4%, the average for Romania in 2003) is confirmed also subjectively by the fear less expressed here (only 1,3% of the respondents place this fear as prior). Here there are also the most few people who declare that firstly fear disease (26,1%) but there are also registered maximum values, in comparison to other regions, regarding the fear for prices (27,8%, with approximately 10% over the average value of fear, see Table 2). War is also a worry reason less encountered here.

The ones who fear children's future are more in towns compared to the rural areas (\* = 12,8%). In exchange, in the rural area the ones that fear disease are more numerous (\* = 9,7%). Here, children's future represents a fear for the most of the ones middle-aged (41-59 years). For none of the fears are registered differences higher than 10% between men and women, the most significant experience being registered regarding war (women fear in a higher percentage than men with \* = 7,3%). In accordance to educational level, fears regarding disease decrease with the years of teaching, and the ones regarding children's future register maximum values between the ones having secondary studies.

The values registered for the variables regarding vertical level trust (very much and a lot) (in institutions) have here bigger variations varying with the institution that the question refers to. The Church and the Government are given trust just like the one in the less developed regions and the Army is credited with the less trust (closer to the percentages registered by the developed regions).

### 3.7. Centre Region

Placed on the fifth position regarding the percentage of population from the total population of the country (11,71%), on the third place regarding the percentage of inhabitants in the urban environment and of hierarchy after the human development index (Table 1), it is the region where, after the fears expressed in comparison to the other regions, unemployment is a more frequently registered reason to worry (see Table 2). Submitted to restructuring in industry, lots of the towns in the region (especially the ones monoindustrial) hardly cope with passing to market economy. Having an unemployment rate of 8,3% in 2003 (Table 5), from this point of view it is close to the group of less developed regions, although for other development indicators has a medium or even good situation.

It does not point out by big differences between the fears expressed by the townspeople in comparison to the ones of the inhabitants in the rural area. But it is yet significant the fact for unemployment fear most of the inhabitants of the rural area (\* = 3%) and, as in the other regions, for children's future fear most of the townspeople (\* = 5,5%). The prices are bigger worrying reasons for the young people, followed by adults and then by elderly. Disease, not surprising, is a fear, which manifests in bigger proportions once one grows older. The gender differences regarding fears are lower here, too, under 10% for all fears, but we notice great percentages of fear for disease on women (\* = 7,4%) and for war (\* = 5,2%) and more men fear unemployment (\* = 7,9%). Children' future preoccupies almost equally men and women. Educational level doesn't reveal great differences regarding main fears.

The lack of trust in people clearly expressed knows here minimum percentages (50%) but we can find a greater reticence in firm answers regarding trust in people, through the high rate of non-responses (14,5 %). The Church is invested in the lowest percentage with very much trust, but nor other institutions are better credited.

### 3.8. Bucharest-Ilfov Region

It is the region whose analysis is the most difficult, firstly because of its false image which can be

conferred by the gathering of some figures that contain data referring to the capital of the country with the ones of the surrounding area, Ilfov county. Otherwise, in some of the reports and analysis of sociologists, even when they are performed under the title of regional analysis, Bucharest is treated distinctively from Ilfov county but the effects of the neighbourhood on the capital of the country can't be neglected, but rather the likely disparities between regions must be identify.

Generally, the region is the best quoted on all development indicators, less regarding trust (as an indicator of social capital) estimated by the questions from the Barometer (Table 5). But regarding the fears important differences appear varying with the residence environment. And actually we will make the comparison only on the basis of this criterion, because of the total respondents in the region, 90% are inhabitants of the capital. The greatest difference is registered regarding the fear for war (in rural areas is higher than in the towns with 15%), followed by the fear for children's future, bigger in the urban areas by 11,1%. Prices worry more the ones living in towns (\* = 7,9%) whose majority also fear disease (\* = 6,1%).

## Conclusions

Welfare, a concept more and more disputed in the academic society, keeps the same sense, that of the opposite of poverty, which not by far more simple to define. If poverty is discussed more and more under two aspects, objective and subjective, it shouldn't surprise not even a similar approach of its opposite. The significances of subjective well being can be watched by the tensional states represented by the general fears and by the expectations that the citizen has from the welfare suppliers. The role of the state is to respond to those expectations that are in accordance to the development objectives, established through strategies, but these objectives are not formulated independently of what the people wish to accomplish for themselves.

From the analysis of fears, combined to other indicators, territorial profiles more rich in information can shape up and which can serve to elaborating territorial development strategies. The fears signal social problems, as people, their delimiting nature thus decreasing, feel them. They are in the same time indicators for weaknesses of the social support system (formal and informal), as long as the social support is built on the basis of normative needs but also on the felt ones.

The creation of developing needs in Romania through an act of political and administrative nature was also accompanied by the elaboration of the

territorial profiles based preponderantly on economical and demographic indicators. Most of the regional analysis realised by sociologists still refer to the historical regions that only partially overlap with the developing regions (an exception is the South-West Region – Oltenia). The standard-profile of the inhabitant of a historical region (Wallachian, Oltenian, Moldavian etc.) was formed and deeply rooted a long time ago in the common knowledge even if it is often a bad stereotype; it also has positive valences, as nucleus of territorial identity. If one can't say now when and if such a profile on developing regions will be created, the scientific knowledge has the role to supply data useful to the social intervention. As far as the regional development is an intervention form, and social intervention always considers the features of the target-population, the elaboration of a psycho-social profile is useful to the extent in which the developing programmes want to be the more specific and more applied to the region itself.

Until now, we notice that the inhabitants of the North-East Region, the poorest region of all, have differently distributed fears (after residence environment, age and education) in comparison to the ones from the developed regions but not in the sense of the terms poor/developed, but rather in the sense of life satisfaction, a dimension purely subjective of poverty/development. Food for the mind for the specialists in regional strategies can be developed, starting from the subjective dimension of well being. This can contribute to a more intense local participation in developing projects.

## Bibliography

- Barry, N. (1998), *Bunăstarea*, București, Editura DU Style.
- Bradburn, N.M. (1969), *The Structure of Psychological Well-Being*, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company.
- Cooke, B.D.; Martin Rossmann, M.; McCubbin, H.I.; Patterson, J.M. (1988), "Examining the Definition and Assesment of Social Support: A Resource for Individuals and Families", în *Family Relations*, Vol. 37, No.2, pp. 211-216.
- Cucu-Oancea, O. (2005), "Disparități regionale privind temerile românilor", în M. Pascaru (coord.), *Catalyse. Cunoaștere, participare și dezvoltare în spațiul comunitar*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Argonaut, pp. 169-190.
- Diener, E.; Sapyta, J.J.; Suh, E.(1998), "Subjective Well-Being Is Essential to Well-Being", în *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 33-37.

House, J.S. (1987), "Social Support and Social Structure", în *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 135-146.

Pascaru, M. (2005), *Introducere în sociologia regională*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Argonaut.

Popescu, L. (2004), *Politici sociale est-europene între paternalism de stat și responsabilitate individuală*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Popescu-Neveanu, P. (1978), *Dicționar de psihologie*, București, Editura Albatros.

Riesler, K. (1944), "The social Psychology of Fear" în *The American Journal of Sociology*, pp.489-498.

Rotariu, T; Iluț, P. (1999), *Ancheta sociologică și sondajul de opinie. Teorie și practică*, Iași, Editura Polirom.

Sandu, D. (1999), *Spațiul social al tranziției*, Iași, Editura Polirom.

Turner, R.J. (1981), "Social Support as a Contingency in Psychological Well-Being", în *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, Vol.22, No. 4, pp. 357-367.

Zamfir, C. (2004), *O analiză critică a tranziției. Ce va fi "după"*, Iași, Editura Polirom.

\*\*\* *Raportul Dezvoltării Umane din România 2003 – 2005*, www.pnud.ro (consultat în iunie 2006).

\*\*\* *România: evaluarea sărăciei*, Raport Nr.26169-RO, Volumul I. Raportul principal. Octombrie 2003, Document al Băncii Mondiale

Table 1: Regional Disparities at the Main Human Development Indicators

Developing regions	GDP per inhabitant USD PPS 2002	Life hope at birth 2000-2002	Teaching rate (%) 2002	Combined raw schooling rate 2002-2003	Poverty rate 2001	HDI 2002
<b>ROMANIA</b>	<b>6,560</b>	<b>71,2</b>	<b>97,3</b>	<b>70,2</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0,786</b>
North-East Region	4.466	71,2	97,5	64,1	40,7	0,756
South-East Region	5.365	70,8	97,2	63,3	33,2	0,762
South Region	4.945	71,1	95,7	63,0	30,4	0,756
South-West Region	5.232	71,4	96,5	67,8	32,4	0,768
West Region	6.598	70,7	97,9	71,8	24,5	0,784
North-West Region	5.749	70,2	97,4	68,5	26,6	0,769
Centre Region	6.531	71,7	98,0	65,7	24,8	0,783
Bucharest Region	13.179	73,1	99,0	93,0	15,2	0,862

Source: National Institute of Statistics (according to Human Development Report 2003 – 2005, PNUD, p.31)

Table 2: Regional Distribution of the Main Romanians' Fears (%)

Fear for ...	Region North-East	Region South-East	Region South	Region South-West	Region West	Region North-West	Region Centre	Region Bucharest-II.	AVERAGE
Disease	37,0	28,7	36,9	34,0	38,4	26,1	31,0	35,5	33,5
Prices	13,2	13,9	16,8	19,4	19,2	27,8	16,0	13,0	17,2
Children's future	12,2	18,7	13,9	14,1	10,5	17,8	13,0	15,0	14,4
War in the area	15,8	13,5	14,2	14,7	7,6	7,0	9,5	11,5	12,1
Terrorist attack	5,3	7,8	3,3	4,2	1,7	2,6	6,0	6,5	4,7
Unemployment	3,0	2,6	5,1	5,2	8,7	1,3	7,0	3,5	4,3
<b>Number of subjects in the sample</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>1800</b>

Source: Database of the Public Opinion Barometer, October 2004

Note: From the list of predefined categories (prices, a war in the area, disease, unemployment, delinquency/offences, social troubles, children's future, terrorist attack, something else – specify what?, I fear nothing, I don't know, I don't answer) we have analysed only the choices situated on the first six positions in the hierarchy.

Table 3. Main Demographic Indicators on Development Regions: 2003 (%)

Development Region	North-East	South-East	South	South-West	West	North-West	Centre	Bucharest-Ilfov	
<b>Total population</b>	17,22	13,15	15,37	10,71	8,92	12,62	11,71	10,15	
Women	50,50	50,84	51,13	50,92	51,73	51,11	50,95	53,11	
Men	49,49	49,15	48,86	49,07	48,26	48,88	49,04	46,88	
Age group	0 - 14 years	19,46	16,56	16,34	16,67	16,09	17,24	16,75	12,67
	15 - 59 years	62,02	64,62	62,38	62,44	64,92	64,55	65,22	68,45
	60+ years	18,50	18,86	21,26	20,87	18,97	18,20	18,01	18,87
Residence	Urban	40,77	55,19	40,71	45,33	61,67	51,17	59,23	88,80
	Rural	59,22	44,80	59,28	54,66	38,32	48,82	40,76	11,19

Source: www.insee.ro

Table 4: Number of Beds in Hospitals and Medical staff for 1000 Inhabitants (2003)

Development region	North-East	South-East	South	South-West	West	North-West	Centre	Bucharest-Ilfov
Beds in hospitals	5,76	5,51	4,84	5,91	7,31	8,43	7,12	10,50
Physicians	1,57	1,41	1,22	1,84	2,41	2,19	1,98	3,73
Middle sanitary staff	4,55	4,61	3,97	4,84	5,08	5,57	5,19	7,79

Source: www. insee.ro

Table 5: Evolution of Unemployment Rate (2000 – 2003)

Development region	North-East	South-East	South	South-West	West	North-West	Centre	Bucharest*	Romania
2000	13,2	11,4	10,4	11,6	10,4	8,6	10,3	6,7	10,5
2001	10,6	9,8	8,9	10,4	9,5	8,5	8,6	5,5	8,8
2002	10,8	10,0	9,2	9,4	6,6	6,8	9,0	3,9	8,4
2003	9,0	8,1	8,3	9,1	7,0	5,4	8,3	-	7,4

Source: www. insee.ro

\* The data only refer to Bucharest city

Table 6: The Regional Variation of Institutional and Generalized Trust\* (%)

Level of Trust in ...		North-East Region	South-East Region	South Region	South-West Region	West Region	North-West Region	Centre Region	Bucharest-Ilfov Region
<b>Church</b>	Very much	58,7	51,3	55,5	50,3	37,8	42,6	30,5	38,0
	A lot	34,7	36,5	35,8	44,0	48,8	47,4	45,0	40,0
	A little	5,6	7,0	4,7	3,7	7,6	5,7	12,0	10,5
	Very little	1,0	2,2	0,7	0,5	2,9	1,7	2,5	5,0
	At all	0	2,6	1,5	1,0	1,7	2,2	3,0	5,5
<b>Army</b>	Very much	22,1	16,5	18,2	22,5	15,1	8,3	12,0	15,5
	A lot	49,2	47,8	55,5	51,3	52,9	51,7	47,5	56,5
	A little	21,8	19,1	16,1	18,8	22,7	22,6	16,5	19,5
	Very little	1,7	5,7	3,3	3,7	2,3	8,3	2,5	4,5
	At all	2,0	8,3	0,7	1,6	3,5	4,8	7,5	2,0
<b>Government</b>	Very much	8,3	2,6	2,9	1,6	1,7	2,2	2,0	3,5
	A lot	31,7	24,3	23,0	22,0	20,3	17,0	20,5	26,0
	A little	36,0	28,3	48,2	55,5	46,5	45,2	40,0	45,5
	Very little	10,9	9,1	12,8	9,9	16,9	20,4	12,5	9,5
	At all	9,6	31,7	7,7	7,3	12,8	11,3	15,0	14,0
<b>People</b>	YES	28,4	32,2	35,4	26,7	15,7	35,2	35,5	41,5
	NO	58,7	60,9	59,5	64,4	69,2	57,8	50,0	54,0

Source: Data base of the Public Opinion Barometer, October 2004

\* The difference up to 100% represents the choice "I don't know" and/or not-answers