



## ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES

Shaymuhammadieva Xurshida Ibodulla qizi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Master of Tashkent Institute of Architecture and Construction

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5136434>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 15<sup>th</sup> July 2021

Accepted: 20<sup>th</sup> July 2021

Online: 25<sup>th</sup> July 2021

### KEY WORDS

*infrastructure,  
classification,  
innovation, corporate  
economy, integration.*

### ABSTRACT

*The article describes step by step the process of organizing the activities of the social infrastructure. It also examines the role of social infrastructure in modern housing construction.*

Introduction. The sources of economic growth are one of the most popular areas of economic science research. In the modern economy, particular attention goes to public infrastructure, which is commonly addressed as bridges, roads, airports, irrigation systems and water mains, as well as other structures that provide economic growth (Eberts, 1990). However, this approach limits the scope of infrastructure to only those areas that directly affect the production process, leaving a significant part of activities that indirectly affect production intact.

Frischmann (2013) identifies four areas of infrastructure: transportation systems, communication systems, management systems (including government and the judiciary), and basic public services such as schools, sewers and water mains. Biktemirova et al. (2015) considered such infrastructure indicators as the water system, sewerage, heating network, school building, preschool

institution, vocational education. The health of the population is influenced not only by the development of the medical care system but also by the infrastructure that allows maintaining a healthy lifestyle and physical activity (Gan et al., 2019). Medvedev (2016) defines education and health care as the essential infrastructural factors for developing the country. In (Yushkova et al., 2019), it is proposed to expand the concept of the regional system's spatial development based on the set of indicators describing the dynamics of changes in the quality of life in comparative assessments.[1]

Despite a number of studies related to the importance of social infrastructure, there is a problem of evaluation of the social infrastructure impact on regional development. This work aims to identify the impact of social infrastructure on the dynamics of the gross regional product and to find the causes of the ambiguous impact of infrastructure factors on the economy. There are a number of Russian and Foreign



studies assessing the impact of infrastructure on economic growth. Popov (2009) offers a three-factor production function, but his approach reflects participation in the production of a predominantly “solid” infrastructure, but cannot be applied in the analysis of soft and, especially, social infrastructure. Martin-Utrillas et al. (2014) present a model for the selection of infrastructure factors that are drivers for the sustainable development of regions. Liu et al. (2019) analyzed the development of infrastructure across Australian regions, using an error-corrected panel model. Goryainova et al. (2017) note that countries with a high level of economic development have an advanced growth at the health and education sectors, while in developing countries, these areas are given less importance. We believe that we can extrapolate this point of view to the region level.

By the term of social infrastructure, we assume a set of activities aimed at creating conditions for the economy's functioning and which are mostly nontradable. Those are activities related to the public goods production, regulation of activity between economic agents.[4]

As a classification of the social infrastructure, we can set out seven groups of factors which are:

- ☐ public administration;
- ☐ legal support and protection of property rights;
- ☐ quality of education and science;
- ☐ quality of life and health care;
- ☐ cultural infrastructure development;
- ☐ freedom of access to information;

- ☐ technology development\$
- ☐ freedom of the business environment.

Other works such as Liu and He (2019) further separate these factors into “hard” and “soft” public services. This understanding of the social infrastructure is necessary for a comprehensive study of the impact of infrastructure on economic growth. The production infrastructure has a relatively unidirectional effect and can be taken into account in economic models as one of the factors. The specificity of the social infrastructure is that:

- ☐ infrastructure is distinguished by a variety of factors with both tangible and intangible nature;

- ☐ it can have both a stimulating and inhibiting effect on production processes;

- ☐ factors of social infrastructure affect not only industrial production but also the production of infrastructure goods i.e. hard infrastructure;

- ☐ these factors may both interact and counteract each other;

- ☐ infrastructure factors may not interact with each other but have a joint effect on output.[2]

Thus, an underdeveloped health care or education system can neutralise the positive impact of the effective legislative activity or the R&D incentive system, exerting a complex effect on human and embodied capital, and on the production of infrastructure benefits.

For the study, indicators of infrastructure development in the field of health care, education and sports were used. The choice of groups of indicators is due, firstly, to the objectivity of the data,



while public administration indicators are relatively subjective, and their assessment is the topic of additional research. Vasilyeva et al. (2020) assessed the impact of a number of economic factors, including GDP growth on the Social Sector Institutional Development Index, of which the social infrastructure indicator is a component. Kalachevskaya (2018) in the set of indicators for the assessment of models for rural development includes budget healthcare expenses, hospital accessibility, budget expenses for education, however, the amount of expenses is an indicator that does not always correlate with the actual state of the infrastructure, so it is more rational to use indicators of the availability and accessibility of social infrastructure facilities.

This approach is applied in the work of Mišek (2018) when analyzing the infrastructural development of Polish regions. Petronela (2016) provides data that more highly developed countries have a larger share of the cultural sector in GDP, noting the importance of cultural development for countries both in terms of national identity and in terms of generating income from tourism activities. Zilberstein et al. (2018) assesses the economic performance of the sports industry, but only on the example of the Southern Federal District and without reference to the development indicators of the entire macroregion.[3]

Conclusion. This work represents the initial stage of identifying the impact of social infrastructure on the economic development of regions. The study confirmed the hypothesis of the relationship between the economic development of regions and social infrastructure, showed the main failures in the development of social infrastructure in the development of regions. The current model's main limitations are the old data and the insufficient length of the time series for building a model capable of predicting the consequences of the development of particular social infrastructure objects. It is necessary to study the effect of lags on the model's indicators, since most of the studied factors' influence does not appear at once, but, after a certain amount of time. However, the current model makes it possible to analyse the specifics of the regions under study, find the influence of certain infrastructural factors, and develop economic policy measures to adjust the influence of social infrastructure factors on the regional economy. The further stages of the study will be the development of an accurate model for forecasting qualitative regional economic growth and the influence of social infrastructure factors on individual components of the production function, taking into account expanded models of economic growth.

## References:

1. Biktemirova, M. K., Svetovtceva, T. A., Rudenko, L. G., Kiselev, S. V., Nikonova, T. V., Semenova, L. V., & Fatikhova, L. E. (2015). The Social Infrastructure Services in the Context of Economic Growth Factors. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6, 260-267. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015>.



2. Eberts, R. W. (1990). Public infrastructure and regional economic development. *Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland Economic Review*, 26, 15-27.
3. Eremeeva, E. A., Volkova, N. V., & Khalilova, T. V. (2019). Development of social infrastructure in the Russian regions. *International Review*, 3-4, 113-119. <https://doi.org/10.5937/intrev1903113E>
4. Frischmann, B. M. (2013). *Infrastructure: The social value of shared resources*. New York: Oxford University Press.
5. Gan, X., Wen, X., Lu, Y., & Yu, K. (2019). Economic growth and cardiorespiratory fitness of children and adolescents in urban areas: a panel data analysis of 27 provinces in China, 1985–2014. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(19), 3772. <https://doi.org/10.3390/>
6. Goryainova, L. V., Krishtal, I. S., & Kuznetsova, O. D. (2017). Financing of infrastructure in education: International experience of attracting private investments and opportunities for Russia to form a knowledge-driven economy. *European Research Studies Journal*, 20(2), 348-363.