

THE ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF SANOVITA VILLAGE FROM TIMIS COUNTY

Cosmina-Simona Toader

Abstract

In this study we present the economic evaluation of Sanovita village, specifying the main problems that locals are confronted with and some possibilities of economical re-organization.

The economical part of this study is based on information received from the Ghizela commune Town hall. This information refers to the structure of agricultural area and its utilization; the farms size structure, their technical equipment, the population occupation for different activity domains, the age categories of the population, etc.

Keywords: economy, exploitation, equipment, village, commune, agriculture

The Sanovita village is located on the West Side of the country and the North – East Side of Timis County. The soil of this region is mostly brown – reddish, this type of soil is poor so that the agricultural works should be done in time, any delay would make this works harder to accomplish and to obtain satisfactory productions even using fertilizers. Administratively speaking, Sanovita village belongs to Ghizela commune.

From economical point of view, as in the whole Romanian rural area, in Sanovita village the agriculture is the main activity for most of the locals, this is their way of living. The agriculture practiced in this area is a mean of subsistence. The age of the locals, their financial possibilities, the poor technical equipment, and the poor fertility of the soil, are only some of the characteristics that determine the practice of subsistence agriculture.

Even if the soil was not so generous considering the fertility, it is not the same situation of the sub soil. In the sub soil from the North – East part of the village there is granite and basalt. There is also a surface quarry for the extraction and reevaluation of those materials but it is unused in our days and it could be a mean of economical re-organization of this village and even of the area.

As majority villages, Sanovita is confronted with problems like: the aging of the population, the poor technical equipment, the lack of

information, the excessive separation of the land, etc. (All these problems have consequential effects on the economical situation).

In this study, we will present some aspects of the economical situation of Sanovita village.

Table 1. The population structure according to activity sectors

| Active population | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|-------|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | | 1 st Sector Agriculture | | | 2 nd Sector Ind/cons | 3 rd Sector Serv/com |
| | | | Total | Total time | Partial time | | |
| Total Active population | No. | 150 | 100 | 40 | 60 | 30 | 20 |
| | % | 100 | 66.5 | 40 | 60 | 20 | 13.3 |
| M | No. | 64 | 45 | 17 | 28 | 10 | 9 |
| | % | 42.66 | 70.31 | 37.77 | 62.2 | 15.62 | 14.06 |
| F | No. | 86 | 55 | 23 | 32 | 20 | 11 |
| | % | 57.33 | 63.95 | 41.81 | 58.18 | 23.25 | 12.79 |

Source: Information received from the town hall

Table 1 presents the structure of the active population according to activity sectors; the active population is 150 persons and represents 27.7% of the total population. From this number of 150 persons, 100 work in the agriculture (40% with partial time and 60% whole time). The occupied population in agriculture represents the highest percentage, 66.5% of the total active population. Also, a great number of the population occupied in agriculture, work partial time, not permitting the practice of a performing agriculture regarding both time and technical and financial equipment, so that the practiced agriculture equals the subsistence agriculture. To practice a performing agriculture it implies both financial and technical equipment and agricultural knowledge, at least basic knowledge in this domain.

After getting back their agricultural areas, some owners have chosen the selling alternative, others the buying alternative or neglected them. For the majority of the villagers, the land is the only income source, the only way of making a living. In the village, there isn't any kind of exploiting the land in association, being worked by each owner separately.

Table 2. The agricultural exploitation potential

| Private farms according to their size | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------|---------------|--------|----------------------|--------|
| Farms | No. | | Total surface | | Average surface/Farm | |
| | Agricultural | Arable | Agricultural | Arable | Agricultural | Arable |
| Total | 198 | 198 | 928.83 | 815.33 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|--------|--------|-------|------|
| < 1 ha | 16 | 17 | 9.65 | 9.36 | 0.60 | 0.55 |
| 1-3 ha | 39 | 46 | 81.61 | 97.98 | 2.09 | 2.13 |
| 3-5 ha | 63 | 71 | 252.27 | 273.41 | 4 | 3.8 |
| 5-7 ha | 43 | 38 | 252.34 | 223.82 | 5.86 | 5.89 |
| 7-10 ha | 24 | 26 | 201.25 | 210.76 | 8.38 | 8.1 |
| 10-20 ha | 13 | - | 131.71 | - | 10.13 | - |

Source: information received from the town hall

According to different measurements, the agricultural surface that belongs to an inhabitant is 2.69 ha.

As far as technical equipment of the farms is concerned, we can notice a slight increase of its number in the private sector, which compared to the number of farms and to the arable area are insufficient, so that the only solution of the villagers is the mechanized department of the village, which can not cover the needs of the inhabitants.

Table 3. Technical equipment

| | | 1990 | 1994 | 1998 | 2004 |
|-------------------------------|---------|------|------|------|------|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Tractors | Total | 14 | 22 | 26 | 27 |
| | Private | 2 | 14 | 18 | 23 |
| Plough tractor | Total | 14 | 22 | 26 | 27 |
| | Private | 2 | 14 | 18 | 23 |
| Animal traction plough | Total | 6 | 7 | 11 | 23 |
| | Private | 6 | 7 | 11 | 23 |
| Universal tractor | Total | 6 | 7 | 8 | 5 |
| | Private | 2 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| Animal traction cultivator | Total | 9 | 11 | 15 | 15 |
| | Private | 9 | 11 | 15 | 15 |
| Seeder | Total | 6 | 12 | 12 | 22 |
| | Private | 1 | 8 | 9 | 18 |
| Combine for maize harvesting | Total | 5 | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| Combine for cereal harvesting | Total | 5 | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| | Private | - | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Combine for fodder harvesting | Total | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Pressing machines | Total | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| | Private | - | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Carts | Private | 8 | 16 | 20 | 22 |
| Harrow with disc | Total | 10 | 8 | 10 | 21 |
| | Private | - | 4 | 8 | 17 |
| Weeding machine | Total | - | - | - | 15 |
| | Private | - | - | - | 12 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| MA | Total | - | - | - | 7 |
| | Private | - | - | - | 5 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|---|---|---|----|
| MIG | Total | - | - | - | 5 |
| | Private | - | - | - | 3 |
| Installations for herbicide | Total | - | - | - | 7 |
| | Private | - | - | - | 5 |
| Trailers | Total | - | - | - | 16 |
| | Private | - | - | - | 11 |

Source: information received from the town hall

In the following table (table 4) we present the technical equipment of the mechanized department of the village (S.C. AGROMECC S.A. Șanovița).

Table 4. Technical equipment of S.C. AGROMECC S.A. Șanovița

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Tractors | 4 |
| Plough tractor | 4 |
| Universal tractor | 2 |
| Cereal seeders | 2 |
| Maize seeders | 2 |
| Combine for maize harvesting | 1 |
| Combine for cereal harvesting | 3 |
| Combine for fodder harvesting | 1 |
| Pressing machines for baling | 1 |
| Harrow with disc | 4 |
| Weeding machine | 3 |
| MA | 2 |
| MIG | 2 |
| Installation for herbicide | 2 |
| Trailers | 5 |

Source: information received from the town hall

The agricultural surface according to the usage method. From the total area of 1445 ha, 1050 ha (72.16%) is in the possession of the private sector, their usage method being represented in the following table.

Table 5. Agricultural surface according to the usage method

| | | Agricultural | Arable | Pasture | Hayfield | Forest | Other surfaces |
|----------------|----|--------------|--------|---------|----------|--------|----------------|
| Total | ha | 1455 | 800 | 405 | 250 | - | - |
| | % | 100 | 54.98 | 27.83 | 17.18 | - | - |
| Private sector | ha | 1050 | 800 | - | 250 | - | - |
| | % | 72.16 | 76.19 | - | 23.81 | - | - |

Source: information received from the town hall

A remarkable thing related to the agriculture practice in Sanovita is the project of Timotei – Ionel Ursu, authorized personality, which was finalized at the end of September 2004. This project was contracted with SAPARD agency according to Measure 3.1 – “Investments for agricultural exploitations” in May 2004. The project had an eligible value of 2 billion lei and was placed in commune Ghizela, Sanovita village. The main objectives were the improvement of the production technologies, the reduction of production costs, the increase of the agricultural exploitation efficiency, the guarantee of improvement and preservation of the soil.

Using the purchased equipment from Italy, a tractor, a plough and a milling machine, the beneficiary manages to apply technologies as in countries with advanced agriculture, being possible the appropriate preparation of the soil for seeding and the uniform distribution of the seeds. The ploughing of the soil will be done only once at two years, saving fuel and labor, minimizing the equipment damage and improving biological quality of the soil. The seeder, a component of the equipment, will insure an economic administration of the chemical fertilizing material, the fertilization being done exactly at the root of the plants.

In Şanoviţa, there are not touristic objectives but we have to mention the historical and cultural background. For example, Nicolae Ursu memorial house, “Nicolae Ursu” National house, the Orthodox Church, and the quarry of basalt.

The first two objectives are related to the great composer and ethno-musician, Nicolae Ursu, born in Sanovita in a peasant family, at 05.06.1905 and died in 1969. The memorial house Nicolae Ursu was the house of his parents, built by the composer’s father, “Mos Cola a lu Pranzu”, with the real name Nicolae Ursu. This was the composer’s childhood place. Starting with 2001, the cultural club is named “Nicolae Ursu National house”. On 5th June 2005, the centenary Nicolae Ursu was celebrated.

The quarry is 150 years old basalt exploitation. The basalt was worked manually; it was a source of income for the commune inhabitants. In the present it is no longer worked, although it could represent a re-launching of the village economy.

Further, we will present a local situation analysis, regarding 2005, from the perspective of the potential investor in the local economy of Sanovita village. The local economy, the main power of the local development, is almost absent in this area. To bring investors in different domains will generate professional occupation, increase of inhabitant’s income, a better usage of the local resources, the emergence of financial

resources necessary for starting some projects of restoration/extension of physical and social infrastructure, of environment protection, of touristic development, for the promotion of the area, etc. The analysis proposes to present the strong and weak points, the opportunities and threats for Sanovita village.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <i>Strong points</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proximity of the European road E70 (3.6 km) - Moderate continental climate; - Agricultural surface sufficient for future development; - The proximity of some urban attractions: Lugoj, Timisoara, with positive impact for the changes between the local community and the exterior (goods, education, jobs); - Old traditions for the animal breeding; - The existence of the main gas pipe line; - The improvement of the telecommunication equipment and the presence of the mobile telephony. - Electric energy distribution systems on the entire surface of the commune |
| <i>Weak points</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient local financial resources for supporting/promoting some investments. - Inappropriate infrastructure, the absence of the water supply and sewerage system; - Old equipment and technologies; - The parceling of the land – low productivity. |
| <i>Opportunities</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The availability of supplementary resources, with the possibility of accessing them by using the European Union financing programs; - The presence of spaces and fields for enterprising activities; - The local authorities availability to realize partnership relations with local and foreign investors; - Low level of professional occupation, thus an important potential of the local human resource; |
| <i>Threats</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lack of receptivity and flexibility of the local population with regard to the needs of the market, resulting the great deficiencies of the economy, which are hard to recover; - The reduction of the active population rate; - The increase of the illegal work with negative effects on the labour market, the local economy and the future social assistance. |

In most cases, the existent problems can be solved in different ways at regional or local level. As the Romanian saying tells “God gives you but He does not put it in your bag”, the implication of the villagers is very important. Some of the measures that could be taken are: guidance for the villagers toward other activities different from agriculture, modernization of the substructure, supporting investments, assuring the minimum conveniences in their homes, informing, supporting and consulting them through local promoters.

In developing Sanovita village, we must take into consideration the following aspects:

- organizing qualification and re-qualification courses for the young people of the town;
- supporting and encouraging people in opening businesses (IMM) in the second and third sector;
- specializing in other activities beside agriculture;
- encouraging teenagers in forming clubs and gathering with others in order to exchange opinions.

Conclusions that are very obvious from my research are many, but the most important are: lack of current water, old equipment and technology, absence of necessary services like human and veterinary pharmacy, bakery, transport and others.

As a final conclusion we may say that it is necessary to re-establish the whole Romanian rural area from all points of view. More precisely it must gain new aspects like economical, ecological, social and cultural and even residential and recreativ one.

Bibliography

Mateoc-Sîrb, Nicoleta – *Dezvoltarea rurală și regională în România*, Ed. Agroprint, Timișoara, 2002

xxx – Information received from Ghizela Town hall