

## An Analysis of Infrastructure – Services' Development Level in Rural Settlements of Central District of Koohdasht County

Jaffar Tavakkoli<sup>\*1</sup>, Aliasghar Mirakzadeh<sup>2</sup>, Morad Ebrahimi<sup>3</sup>

*1. Assistant Prof. in Geography and Rural Planning, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran*

*2. Assistant Prof. of extension and rural development, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran*

*3. MSc. in Geography and Rural Planning, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran*

*Received: 20 Jan 2014    Accepted: 10 Apr 2014*

### Extended Abstract

#### 1. Introduction

One of the major challenges of the country's (Iran) rural development is inequality in local levels and between rural settlements. The gap among villages of the country is so noticeable that many of them absorb more services and convert to city or small towns while some others lose their population and become uninhabited or are on the verge of depopulation. Hence local development planning requires identifying development level of rural settlements. This research; meanwhile, measures village's infrastructure - services development level in central district of Koohdasht county, analyses the relation between development level of villages and rural districts with natural condition, population, distance from county center and villages with nomadic characteristic.

#### 2. Theoretical Framework

From 1970s, failure of traditional development strategies in mitigation inequalities and bringing about balanced regional development caused to changing developments priorities to meet basic needs, reducing economic disparities of regions and increasing unprivileged classes to governmental services (Shabbir Cheema and Rondinelli, 1983, p.6). To this end, diverse approaches such as integrated, participatory, down-top development and so on put forwarded. For instance Misra (1978, p.31) with offering a hierarchical model, tried to introduce a convenience pattern for rural development in third world countries. But sectoral, concentrated and uncoordinated quality of planning and administrative system in mentioned countries caused to intensifying spatial and regional inequalities. Literature review of the issue indicates that this disparity is more apparent in regard to rural development (Ebrahimi, 1996, Kalantari et al, 2004, Rezvani, 2007, Amininejad et al, 2009).

#### 3. Methodology

The present research is an applied and descriptive-analytical one. The sample size consists of 131 inhabited villages of Koohdasht County's central district. On the basis of literature review 18 indicators was defined. Required data gathered via referring to district offices and also completing rural questionnaire by local key informants. After releasing indicators from various scales with dividing by average and weighting to them on the basis of factor analysis (first principle component) method the infrastructure - services development level composite indicator (CI) was determined. Statistics like mean, standard deviation, variance, coefficient of variation, coefficient of correlation, independent samples T test, ANOVA (variance analysis) and Tukey's test were utilized for data description and analyzing. To this end SPSS and Excel software were used.

#### 4. Discussion

Coefficient of variation for composite indicator (CI) of infrastructure - services development that equals 0.57 indicates that except the few studied villages that are in the top of ranking in regard to infrastructure - services development level, most of them are placed at less developed or underdeveloped position. In the other words, considering the average of CI that are about 8.13 in compare with its maximum (about 22), this implies that CI is low in the most of rural settlements of the area.

The finding indicates that amongst 131 studied villages 26 percent ranked in developed and relatively developed groups and 74 percent are less developed and under developed. This number for north Koohdasht rural district is about 84.5 percent implies its worst condition between 3 sub districts. Also ANOVA test approved significance (less than 0.001) of difference between three sub districts and Tukey's test implies that real variance can be seen

\*. Corresponding Author: J.Tavakkoli@gmail.com

Tel: +989144433312

between north Koohdasht and two other rural districts (significance less than 0.001). Furthermore villages' natural positions affected their infrastructure - services development level (significance less than 0.001). The Tukey's test indicate that real variance can be seen between mountainous- forestall villages with the other types (plain and mountainous- plain villages).

Pearson's Coefficient of correlation between villages' development level and their distance to county center approved negative and significant relation between two variables (correlation = - 0.457, significance less than 0.001). In the other words with increasing the distance to county center, development level of villages will decrease. The same test between villages' population and development level confirm the relation between two variables (correlation = 0.499, significance less than 0.001), so that with increasing the population size of the settlement, the development level will increase. Moreover, comparing the means between nomadic and non-nomadic villages indicate that there is significance difference among two types in regard to development level (T test value = 3.878, significance = 0.000).

### 5. Conclusion & Suggestions

Research results approved inequality between studied villages and rural districts infrastructure - services development level. Therefore adopting ment, Regional Planning, First Principal component, Koohdasht County.

decentralized strategies and balanced allocation of resources and investments is necessary for reducing mentioned inequalities. To this end down-top approaches emphasizing on peoples participation in the process of need assessment, identifying development priorities, planning, implementing an evaluating of local development plans and projects can be useful. Hence considering north Koohdasht villages' low development level, it is recommended that these villages put in the priority in regard to planning and action for infrastructure - services investments. In line with the research results that approved the low development level of the nomadic rural settlements of the area, these kinds of villages must be in the priority in local development plans and it is necessary that decision making, planning and implementing efforts must be harmonized with the nomadic characteristic of these settlements. Moreover, selecting appropriate service delivery systems in the framework of rural settlements hierarchical position can be useful. Furthermore, in order to improve the infrastructure - services indicators, encouragement and reinforcing governmental and private investments are necessary.

**Key words:** infrastructure – services Development, Rural Develop

### References (in Persian)

1. Amininejad, Gh., Beikmohammadi, H. & Hoseini Abari, S. H. (2008). Analyzing the level of development in subdistricts of south pars installations region in bushehr province of Iran. *Journal of Rural development studies*, 11(3), 172-143. [In Persian]
2. Barrios, S., & Strobl, E. (2005). The dynamics of regional inequalities. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 39(5), 575-591.
3. Dabrowska, A., & Lukomska, J. (2011). Sub regional growth poles in the competition for development factors. *Journal of Miscellanea Geographica*, 15(2), 133-151
4. DHV consultants from Netherland. (1992). *Guidelines for rural center planning*, ESCAP, Tehran, Roosta & Towsee publication. [In Persian]
5. Ebrahimi Noorali, A. (1995). *Determining development level of rural areas in Lorestan province* (Unpublished Master thesis). Alame Tabatabai University, Iran. [In Persian]
6. Hilhorst, J. (1991). *Regional Planning- System perception* (first edition). Tehran: Publication of planning and budget organization. [In Persian]
7. Hosseinzadeh Dalir, K. (2001). *Regional Planning*. Tehran: SAMT Publication.
8. Kalantari, Kh. (2009). *Planning and regional development* (third edition). Tehran: Gitashenasi Publications. [In Persian]
9. Kalantari, Kh., Irvani, h. & Vafaenejad, Sh. (2003). Measuring rural development level in Torbat Heydarie County 1987-2001. *Journal of Geographic Research*, 35(44), 41- 54. [In Persian]
10. Misra, R. P. (1978). *Regional Planning in Iran: Problems and Prospects*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

11. Mosalanejad, GH.A. (2005). *Government and economic development in Iran* (first edition). Tehran: Ghomes Publication. [In Persian]
12. Parr, J. B. (1999). Growth-pole strategies in regional economic planning: A retrospective view: Part 1. Origins and advocacy. *Journal of Urban Studies*, 36(7), 1195- 1215
13. Rahnama, M.R. & Zabihi, J. (2011). Analysis of urban public facilities in direction of spatial justice by the integrated model of access in Mashhad. *Journal of Geography and Development*, 9(23), 5-26. [In Persian]
14. Rezvani, M. R. (2006). Determining and analyzing enjoyment level of rural areas in Zanjan province. *Journal of Geographic Research*, 36(50), 75-86. [In Persian]
15. Saeedi, A. (1998). *Principles of rural geography* (second edition). Tehran: SAMT publication. [In Persian]
16. Samarjit, D., Gouranga, S., & Mitra, T. K. (2010). Regional convergence of growth, inequality and poverty in India-An empirical study. *Journal of Economic Modeling*, 27(5), 1054–1060
17. Shabbir Cheema, G., & Rondinelli, D. A. (1983). *Implementing Decentralization Programmes in Asia-Local Capacity for Rural Development*. United Nations Centre for Regional Development (UNCRD), Nagoya, Japan.
18. Shakuie, H. (2003). *Environmental Philosophies and Geographical schools* (first edition). Tehran: Gitashenasi Publications. [In Persian]
19. Statistical center of Iran (2006). *Population and housing census 2007, Identification of Villages–Lorestan province*. Retrieved May 17, 2011, from <http://www.amar.org.ir/Default.aspx?tabid=1042>. [In Persian]
20. Taleshi, M. & Amirfakhrian, M. (2012). Utilizing quantitative patterns for spatial analyzing of population in spatial planning of rural settlements, case study: Khorasan Razavi Province. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 3(12), 105-128. [In Persian]

**How to cite this article:**

Tavakkoli, J., Mirakzadeh, A. A. & Ebrahimi, M. (2014). An analysis of infrastructure – services' development level in rural settlements of Central District of Koohdasht County. *Journal of Research & Rural Planning*, 3(7), 75-84.

URL <http://jrpp.um.ac.ir/index.php/RRP/article/view/31193>

ISSN: 2322-2514 eISSN: 2383-2495