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Rezumat: Distribuţia teritorială a forţei de muncă în Moldova, expresie a atractivităţii urbane. Articolul îşi propune să analizeze fenomenul de navetism ţinând cont şi de rolul pe care îl joacă oraşele în individualizarea şi dezvoltarea fluxurilor de navetişti. Deplasările zilnice pentru muncă spre centrele economice urbane cunosc oscilaţii în raport cu perioadele de creştere sau declin economic, cu transformările care pot avea loc la nivelul sistemului de aşezări. Articolul de faţă foloseşte datele puse la dispoziţie de recensământul din anul 2002, la nivel de unitate administrativă.
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1. Introduction

One of the negative effects of de-industrialization is the diminution of industrial commuting, which facilitated the contact of the inhabitants in the rural environment with those in the urban environment, which had as a result the permeabilization of rural spaces’ frontiers in front of the inventions and innovations. (Groza, 2002). Through tradition, the inhabitants in the Moldavian rural environment have a reduced spatial mobility, that is why the industrial commuting is a manner of ensuring a rhythmical and constant relation between the village and the town (we are not only referring to the financial relations but also to certain urban behaviours and mentalities). The diminution of commuting fluxes of industrial employees as a result of the reduction of work places in the secondary sector seemed to condemn the rural environment to a considerable regress (in the conditions of an already rudimentary life standard), but this type of flux was replaced by work international migration, fully developed in the rural environment in Moldavia.

The only data we dispose of in order to appreciate the phenomenon of commuting at the level of the last years is that collected at the census in 2002 regarding the work place of employees: if they are in the same locality as their residence, in a different locality (of the same county), in a different county or in a different country. Our choice of focusing on the analysis of the repartition of employees according to their work place, with the purpose of emphasizing the attraction of cities, is justified both through the difficulty of having statistics at
the communal level regarding the commuters, and also through the role that they have played in the local rural economies.

2. The distribution of the working force

The drawn up carto-diagrams offers us nevertheless an idea regarding the commuting phenomenon, with the specification that we do not have concrete data concerning the travels for work (daily, weekly, for a longer period of time).
We can only take into account the distance the work place is found from the current residence and the economic profile of polarizing centres (we know the fact that the travels for work in the field of industry or services do not include a very large area and the daily travels predominate, while in constructions those who travel at weekly intervals or even more seldom are the predominant ones).

Figure no. 2: The employees who work in a different locality than their town of residence, but in the same county
a) The employees who work in the same locality as their residence

The highest percentage of those who work in the same locality as their residence (figure 1) is registered, on the one hand, in the more isolated localities, where the possibility of commuting is reduced – the north of the Hilly Field of Jijia and the Prut valley, the Mounds of Tutova, the Hills of Falciu, the mountain part of Bucovina; on the other hand, the cities are those registering high percentages, because of the fact that the working places are concentrated, most of the times, in the urban area ( Galaţi – 96%, Iaşi – 94%, Bacău – 91%, Botoşani – 94%, Paşcani – 90%, Roman – 87% etc.). At the opposite pole are situated the communes in the periurban areas of big towns (Letea Veche, Rediu, Gura Văii, Horia etc.), where the proportion of employees who work in the same locality as their residence is reduced (15-20%).

b) The employees working in a different locality in the same county

The carto-diagram that represents the repartition of employees who work in a different locality than their town of residence, but in the same county (figure 2), emphasizes very well the existence of two distinct types: on the one hand, the punctual areas, developed in the periurban areas, expanding up to a distance of 30 km from the city (Iaşi, Galaţi, Focşani, Vaslui, Bârlad etc.), and on the other hand the industrial development axis, of which the Suceava – Paşcani – Roman, Piatra Neamţ – Bacău, Moineşti – Comăneşti – Oneşti alignments are emphasized.

When the towns are situated at smaller distances, the attraction areas quickly interfere and only reduced surfaces remain outside those areas, as we can notice to the west of Siret. On the contrary, in the east, where the towns are becoming fewer and fewer, the polarization area of the working force has a circular form and leaves between them unpolarized spaces from this point of view. Once more, two major territorial structures are differentiated: on the one hand the west Moldavia, with a more diversified economy, with an urban network more dense and also with sufficient rural industrial localities, and on the other side, east Moldavia, rural and profoundly agricultural, divided in two by Iasi- Pascani axis and where only the Bârlad axis is punctually contoured. Their periurban towns and spaces are very well contoured, which can be explained through a massive concentration of tertiary activities in the urban centres and the departure of budget employees from the urban spaces.

c) The wage earner working in other counties. In what concerns the personnel working in another county than the one they live in (picture 3), this phenomenon is especially specific to the villages situated on the verge of the city, which are, traditionally under the influence of an urban centre situated in the neighbouring county; the most conclusive examples are offered by the city of Roman, which attracts working force even form the villages found to the west of
Iasi, Buhusi (it polarizes the south of the Neamt county), Siret (its area of influence is extended on the north-west extremity of the Botosani county). In the Neamt county, the village of Români is noticed because 49% of the personnel work in another county (that is Bacau, more exactly Buhusi, situated nearby). Dagâţa, Iaşi county (38% of the workers go to another county, most probably in Roman, Neamţ county), the villages Răuseni and Hlipiceni from Botoşani county, but which are situated in the influence area of Iaşi etc.

Figure no. 3: The employees who work in other counties
3. The typologies of the distributions

A. The typology of the administrative units according to the number of personnel going to other cities than to the one they live in. Based on the three types of behaviour of the work force described above, there has been made an ascending hierarchal classification, first of the cities, then of the rural administrative units. Those results obtained, correlated to the distance of the rural units from the neighbouring cities, offer us an image on the urban influence on the mobility of the work force, element relevant in the determination of the areas of urban polarization.

a) The typology of cities according to share of wage earners working in the city, in another city or in the county. Picture 4: the profiles of the urban types (classification according to the personnel work place)

Figure no. 4: The profiles of the urban types

– type 1- includes two small towns, Bereşti and Mărăşeşti, characterized by a geographical position which favours the temporary commuting, both to the neighbouring cities, and to the neighbouring county, especially the city of Beresti participating in this differentiation (4.7% of the personnel working in the neighbouring county – Vaslui);

- type 2 – Bacău, Oneşti, Botoşani, Dorohoi, Galaţi, Iaşi, Suceava, Vaslui, Bârlad, Huşi; is the category of the residence cities and of the industrial cities, with an obvious predominance of the wage earners working in the same city where they live (the average of the category being 93%);
- *type 3* – Buhuşi, Darabani, Săveni, Tecuci, Hârlău, Paşcani, Roman, Negreşti, Adjud; similar to type 2, but it is noticed a slight increase of the share of those working in other cities of the county, situation determined by the process of de-industrialization undergone in the last years, as well as to the reduction of the working places;

- *type 4* – Comăneşti, Dărmăneşti, Târgu Bujor, Piatra Neamţ, Bicaz, Gura Humorului; what highlights this group is the high ratio of personnel
working in another city (almost 19%, being the average of the group); it is about
the personnel working in the extractive industry (Comăneşti, Dărmăneşti, Gura
Humorului) or in the hydro-energetic industry (Piatra Neamţ, Bicaz);

- **type 5** – Moineşti, Slănic Moldova, Târgu Ocna, Solca, Odobeşti;
similar to the previous one, with a high share of the personnel working in
another city (the average of this type being of 27.7%); it is either about the
presence of the extractive industry in the neighbouring cities, situation which
attracts working force (Moineşti, Târgu Ocna), or about agricultural cities, with
an underdeveloped industry (Odobeşti – 35.7% of the personnel work in another
city than the one they live in) or almost inexistent (Solca);

- **type 6** – Târgu Frumos, Târgu Neamţ, C-lung. Moldovenesc, Fălticeni,
Rădăuţi, Siret, Vatra Dornei, Focşani, Panciu; this category groups small and
middle cities, but also a residence city; it is similar to the 3rd type, with a share of
almost 80% of those working in the same city.

**B)** The typology of *rural units* according to the work place of the employees.

- **type 1** – includes 89 villages, relatively uniformly spread, with an
average number of 507 employees; the villages are averagely polarized by the
urban centres, and the fact that 30% of employees work in other places than
those of residence may indicate a commuting movement over distances greater
than the urban centres;

- **type 2** – 121 villages are included, with an average of almost 700
employees; the number of those working in another place exceeds that of those
left in the place of residence, which indicates a very good urban polarization.
This type is representative for the areas of urban influence before 1989;
although affected by the transformations in urban economies within recent
years, this type is still very visible in big cities, extending along the (road and
railway) communication networks;

- **type 3** – numbers 32 villages situated on the outskirts of counties, which
is why their dominant characteristic is the great number of those working in
other counties than that of residence; the average is quite low – 398 employees;

- **type 4** – 131 localities, an average of 400 employees, those who work in
their place of residence dominate; they are isolated villages under a low urban
influence, with limited possibilities of commuting: the Central Moldavian
Plateau, the hilly Plain of Jijia, the Hills of Tutova, the Hills of Fălciu and
Bereşti; this type highlights the fact that despite socialist industrialization and
urbanization the fundamental economic structure of Moldavia has been modified
in a very small degree and only along some more developed axes (Suceava –
Bacău – Focşani and Iaşi – Paşcani – Piatra Neamţ\textsuperscript{27}; since employees working in the same locality are over-represented, we can conclude that most employees in these villages work within an agricultural subsistence economy;

- **type 5** – includes 80 villages with an average of 340 employees, therefore quite low compared with the other types; they are juxtaposed to villages of type 4 but have a more balanced profile, also the number of those working in a different county is greater;

- **type 6** – 125 villages with an average of 818.5 employees; there is an evident predominance of those working in different places (over 60% of employees work in other places than those of residence), due to the possibility of commuting from the place of residence to the near urban centres; they are among the very well polarized administrative units, and are located in the neighbourhood of cities (Iaşi, Galați, Suceava, Focşani, Oneşti, Bacău etc).

The analyses above must be correlated to the fact that daily working journeys to the powerful economic centres may vary depending on the periods of economic increase or decrease and on the transformations occurring at the level of the system of settlements. As we have seen, the fluxes of commuters are the result of the concentration to a great extent of work places in cities, which determines oscillating movements between the place of residence and that where

\textsuperscript{27} O. Groza (2002) – \textit{Variații spațiale ale potențialului forței de muncă salariate din Moldova}, in Geographica Timisiensis, Universitatea de Vest, Timișoara.
the work place is. These fluxes are clearly oriented, from the influence area
towards the centre (although movements in the opposite direction are not
excluded), and are practically the most typical relationships between cities and
the surrounding rural space.
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