

RURAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY – A PERSPECTIVE OF LOCAL ACTORS IN SERBIA¹

Ružica Papić², Natalija Bogdanov³

Summary

Key challenge in transitional countries is effective decentralized local governance with strong capacities for dealing with new rural development programming instruments. In this paper we have examined the attitudes of local rural development actors (RDA) in Serbia on rural development policy priorities, in particular their attitudes on beneficiaries of rural development measures, policy objectives, and the most efficient strategies of rural development. We also analysed whether the respondents' attitudes differ depending on the socio-economic characteristic of surveyed regions (South and North of Serbia). Data on attitudes of RDAs were collected through direct survey with representatives of 30 rural communities, and analysed using descriptive statistics methods and Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour. Results indicate that respondents' attitudes on rural policy are conservative and oriented towards objectives related to agriculture and interests of farmers and that socio-economic characteristic of the regions contribute to distinction in attitudes of RDAs.

Key words: *policy formulation, beneficiaries of rural development, policy efficiency, attitudes of rural development actors, rural Serbia.*

JEL: *Q18*

Introduction

A modern, multi-sectorial and place-based approach to rural development requires important changes in policy formulation and programming. It is particularly important for transitional countries, with traditional hierarchical administrative structures.

-
- 1 This paper is a part of the research within the project 179028 - Rural labor market and rural economy of Serbia – diversification of income and poverty reduction, financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.
 - 2 Ružica Papić, MSc, Assistant, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Agriculture, Nemanjina Street no. 6, 11080 Zemun, Serbia, Phone: +381 11 261 5315, E-mail: papic.ruzica@agrif.bg.ac.rs
 - 3 Natalija Bogdanov, Ph.D., Full Professor, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Agriculture, Nemanjina Street no. 6, 11080 Zemun, Serbia, Phone: +381 11 261 5315, E-mail: natalija.bogdanov@agrif.bg.ac.rs

Strengthening of decentralized systems for planning, financing and implementation of rural development at the local level in those countries requires significant investments in setting the institutional system, including strengthening the capacity of local authorities. Limited human resources, lack of regulatory framework and funding and insufficient experience in policy formulation and operating large projects, are the major obstacles to more efficient rural development policies. Innovative institutions and organizations that regulate issues of rural development are product of the social capital, that is, the level of development of horizontal and vertical connections (bonding, bridging and linking) (Herbel et al., 2012). New types of connections between local and other external parties represent an effective way to influence the macro level and it is the basis for advancement of the rural areas. Hence, rural development is considered as a complex mesh of networks in which resources are mobilized and in which the control of the process consists of interplay between local and external forces (Lowe et al., 1995).

The agricultural policy in Serbia during transitional period has been the subject of heterogeneous and complex pressures: political and economic instability, extremely adverse weather conditions with their devastating impact on farm income, and from the second half of the 2000s also with global market disturbances. In such setting, the priorities and mechanisms of agricultural policy were selected in a predominantly pragmatic manner (toward productivism), rather than focusing on the needs of the rural population and developing inequalities among rural areas (Bogdanov, 2014). Despite such situation, government is committed to aligning agricultural policy with the EU CAP in order to modernize agricultural sector and improve rural economic activities.

Strengthening the capacity of local governments to carry out its role in rural development is one of the important tasks. These processes were supported by numerous donors and EU funds, which have contributed to the development of local partnerships and strengthen the capacity of local governments to facilitate rural development issues.

Rural areas in Serbia are highly diverse in terms of natural endowments, economic, social and population characteristics. Diversity of rural areas is driven by natural resource endowments, cultural and historical heritage, as well as economic, social and demographic patterns. Huge development gap is evident between the North and South of Serbia. In general, the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and the capital city of Belgrade show advanced positions compering to the rest of country, particularly the traditionally underdeveloped southern regions. As a result of this situation, there are differences in the capacity of local governments to develop and implement local rural policy. Consequently, we expect to be different, and their views on the priorities of rural development policy, whether as a result of their own experience or general understanding of the rural development policy concept.

The aim of this research is to examine the attitudes of rural development actors – RDAs (representatives of local governments and non-governmental organizations) on rural development policy priorities in terms of: 1) beneficiaries of rural development measures, 2) policy objectives and 3) the most efficient strategies of rural development.

Also, the aim of the research is to determine whether there are significant differences between respondents from different regions.

Literature review

Theories that are based on the principle that the attitudes are only one of the determinants of behaviour and that link them to different predictor variables (subjective norm, perceived control, experience, habits, self-identity, moral obligations, etc.) have a common name, which is expectancy - values models of attitudes. On the basis of this model, different theories which predict behaviour have been developed. The two most important theories are the theory of reasoned action (TRA) and the theory of planned behaviour (TPB). The requirement of the TRA is that behaviour must be under volitional control. Since there are a number of behaviours that are not under the absolute voluntary control, Ajzen introduced a new variable – the perceived behavioural control (PBC) and formulated the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991).

According to TPB, particular behaviour is largely influenced by the intention, which is determined by three elements: the person's attitude toward specific behaviours, subjective norms, and perceived level of control over the behaviour. For the prediction of behaviour, specific attitudes are more important than general attitudes. The attitude towards the behaviour represents people's beliefs about the desirability or undesirability of certain behaviour, about the consequences that it causes, and about other feelings related to the behaviour in question. The subjective norm is actually the social pressure of performing some action. Perceived control over the behaviour represents beliefs about self-efficiency and one's own abilities to have control over the behaviour in question. If individuals believe that there are more resources and opportunities than obstacles, it is assumed that the control of behaviour is bigger (Ajzen, 1991).

There are several studies that have been carried out with the aim to identify attitudes about agricultural and rural policy and/or its segments. Hartell et al. (2002) examined the opinions of the European agricultural economists about rural development policies in order to direct policy makers on which developmental aspects they should focus on. In general, they saw farmers as priority beneficiaries, but there was more disagreement on priority problems and goals because of the differences in the level of development of the countries from which participants came. As effective strategies, agricultural economists mostly chose those which are related to investment in human capital, in rural municipal infrastructure, and strategies that are oriented on environment protection and strengthening the local leadership structures.

Defrancesco et al. (2008) used two models to investigate farmers' predisposition in participation in one of three specific agri-environmental measures (AEMs). The second model investigate farmers' attitudes and beliefs about AEMs. Results highlight that farmers' attitudes and beliefs have significant effects on adoption of agri-environmental programmes, so they have to be taken into account in a process of designing agri-environmental measures. The survey sample included 139 family farm holders, and theoretical approach was theory of planned behavior.

Gorton et al. (2008) made a comparative analysis of farmers' attitudes to agricultural production, diversification and policy support, and behavioural intentions in five Member States of the EU (France, Lithuania, Slovakia, Sweden, England). The results indicate that farmers' focus is still on agriculture and ideas on policy liberalization are not close to them. The majority of farmers believe that survival of their farms is depended on policy support, but their attitudes are not consistent regarding the instruments through which policy support may be delivered. Farmers from the new countries are significantly opposed to ideas linked with the policy liberalization, and support those which are concentrated on agriculture. Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour was used as a theoretical framework, and data were collected through direct survey.

Since the agriculture is very important in the Republic of Macedonia, Kotevska et al. (2012) used the theory of planned behaviour for understanding Macedonian farmers' attitude and behavioural intentions in the context of the EU accession and the potential policy and market changes. Furthermore, another issue was to observe whether there are significant discrepancies among farmers and their attitudes towards EU accession.

In Serbia, there has not been enough research devoted to the attitudes of local stakeholders about rural development policies. In the report "Small rural households", Bogdanov (2007) presented the subjective assessment of households and local decision makers about the situation in the rural areas of Serbia. Due to the natural and economic diversity of rural areas in Serbia the study put an emphasis on the differences that exist between different regions. The results showed that traditional perceptions of the role of different actors in rural development prevail. The highest expectations that the respondents have are from the hierarchical structures with the most power and authority and very small number of respondents identified themselves as key actors responsible for the improvement of rural areas. The study also highlighted that households and local decision-makers do not share the same views about the situation and problems in their rural areas (e.g. there is a high consensus on the dissatisfaction with the quality of life in rural areas, but both groups have selected different priorities).

Research Methodology

In order to make the case study one of the standard techniques of descriptive methods was used – survey in the period of April-June 2012. The survey was conducted in the Republic of Serbia, and the results were interpreted at the level of two areas: Serbia North (hereinafter SN) that includes Belgrade and Vojvodina; and Serbia South (hereinafter SS) – Šumadija and Western Serbia, South Eastern Serbia and Kosovo and Metohija.

Selected regions correspond to the current NUTS II division of the territory of Serbia. Besides, this division reflects the significant differences of these two entities in terms of socio-economic characteristics and natural features. Natural features have an impact on the structure and the regional typologies of farming systems, while the institutional and infrastructural development results from cultural and historical background.

The questionnaire was structured in into three sections. The first group of questions investigated which category of the rural population should be the priority group of

beneficiaries of rural development policy. The second set of questions aimed to identify the priority objectives of rural development policy. Finally, the third set of questions explored which strategies are the most effective for rural development.

Table 1. The structure of questionnaire

| Variable | Offered answers |
|---|---|
| Priority beneficiaries of rural development | Farmers |
| | Households with diversified on farm activities |
| | Rural poor |
| | Pluriactive farmers |
| | Immobile rural citizens |
| | Nature lovers, future generations |
| | All rural citizens equally |
| Priority objectives of rural development policy | Increasing employment of rural population |
| | High quality of life of rural population |
| | Protection of environment and biodiversity |
| | Higher rural population growth rates |
| | Preserved traditional rural occupations |
| | Preservation of rural landscapes |
| | Social equality in rural areas |
| | Equitable political influence of rural population |
| Suggestion of the most effective strategy for rural development | Support for on farm diversification |
| | Improvement of rural municipal infrastructure |
| | Protection of natural resources |
| | Invest in rural human capital |
| | Strengthening social services |
| | Strengthening local leadership structures |
| | Support for young returnees |
| | Income support and compensatory payments |
| | Fiscal decentralization |
| | Activation of land market |

Source: Papić, 2013

Questions were closed-ended, with four alternative answers offered. To summarize data from the questionnaire in the appropriate form, we used descriptive statistics method: percentage response distributions, measures of central tendency – average value (hereinafter AV), and dispersion measures – standard deviation (hereinafter SD), which describe how close the values or responses are to central tendencies. The results about variables of interest are presented in the tables. Comparative method was used for assessing the relevant attitudes of local actors (government officials and representatives of civil society) from the North and the South of Serbia. Characteristics of respondents are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Gender, age, education and occupation of respondents (%)

| Characteristics of respondents | | Serbia North | Serbia South |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Gender | M | 53.8 | 34.8 |
| | F | 46.2 | 65.2 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 |
| Age | 25- 45 | 76.9 | 30.4 |
| | 45-65 | 23.1 | 69.6 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 |
| Education | College | 0.0 | 4.3 |
| | University | 92.3 | 82.6 |
| | Master's degree | 7.7 | 8.7 |
| | PhD | 0.0 | 4.3 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 |
| Occupation | Experts in rural development | 7.7 | 13.0 |
| | Experts in agriculture | 46.2 | 21.7 |
| | Experts in economy | 15.4 | 26.1 |
| | Experts in ecology | 0.0 | 8.7 |
| | Experts in spatial planning | 15.4 | 8.7 |
| | Other experts | 15.4 | 21.7 |
| | Total | 100 | 100 |

Source: Author's calculation based on the survey data

Research results

Overall analysis of rural development policy priorities

Survey results indicate that farmers are identified as top *priority beneficiaries* of rural development policy (66.7%), while the *households with diversified on farm activities* hold the second place (61.1%). High priority is also assigned to *poor rural residents and pluriactive farmers* (over 58%). These responses indicate that respondents give priority to agriculture, e.g. sectorial aspects of rural development policy. Such understanding of rural policy is specific of decision-makers who do not have enough experience in the operationalization of rural development support, and whose awareness of other policy instruments is very modest. An extremely low priority was not given to any group of beneficiaries. However, among other types of beneficiaries, respondents give lower priority to those rural residents whose activities are not related to the village and agriculture, such as nature lovers, environmentalists, etc. It is assumed that the reason is that the respondents see this group of potential users as rivals to farmers, as those who use the privileges of rural ambience.

Table 3. Priority beneficiaries of rural development policy (%)

| Beneficiaries | High Priority | Low Priority |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| Farmers | 66.7 | 2.8 |
| Households with diversified on farm activities | 61.1 | 2.8 |
| Rural poor | 58.3 | 13.9 |
| Pluriactive farmers | 58.3 | 5.6 |
| Immobile rural citizens | 50.0 | 16.7 |
| Nature lovers, succeeding generations | 27.8 | 19.4 |
| All rural citizens equally | 22.2 | 13.9 |

Source: Author's calculation based on the survey data

Influence of urban people in the sphere of rural public policies (particularly those related to environmental protection and the protection of plant and animal species) is increasing rapidly. Therefore, it is very possible that if this trend continues, the types of rural development incentives will greatly depend on the correlation between the needs of rural residents and the wishes and nostalgic vision that urban population has of rural areas (Freshwater, 2000).

In terms of *policy objectives*, the highest priority was given to the *increasing employment of rural population* and *quality of life of rural population*, followed by environmental protection and biodiversity preservation. Both the first ranked objectives are closely tied to the activation of rural labour market and increasing income generating opportunities.

Table 4. Priority objectives of rural development policy (%)

| Objectives | High | Low |
|---|------|------|
| Increasing employment of rural population | 80.6 | 2.8 |
| Quality of life | 77.8 | 2.8 |
| Environmental protection | 75.0 | 0.0 |
| Population growth | 61.1 | 11.1 |
| Traditional occupations | 55.6 | 5.6 |
| Rural landscapes | 41.7 | 11.1 |
| Social disparities | 38.9 | 0.0 |
| Stronger political voice | 30.6 | 16.7 |

Source: Author's calculation based on the survey data

This result corresponds with what has been found in previous research in Serbia, where farmers emphasized the lack of communal infrastructure and agro-environmental problems as factors that are affecting their quality of life to the same extent as low level income (Bogdanov, 2007). The high ranking of priorities related to income generation is a common characteristic of rural policies in transitional countries. Davis (2006) already found that rural non-farm sector is crucial factor in providing rural employment and income. Growth of rural non-farm economy implies development of all economic activities other than production of primary agricultural commodities. It also implies renewal of institutional framework (roads, schools, hospitals etc.) in rural

areas. Therefore it represents desirable policy objective in these countries since it offers various options for improvement of quality of households' income and living standards.

Attitudes on the *effectiveness of particular strategies* are resulting from the experience of local policy makers with different forms of support that have been implemented in previous years. Considering that most of respondents were involved in the design and implementation of these measures, their attitudes are to some extent subjective. The *support for on farm income diversification* weighed as the most effective strategy by the majority respondents. This result is highly compatible with the answers to questions about the primary beneficiaries of rural development support and policy objectives. The strategies that do not target income generation and infrastructural issues (such as fiscal decentralization, strengthening the social services, support to returnees and the like), have lower remarks i.e. largest number of respondents are inferior to them or have negative attitudes. Although RDAs do not pay much attention to strategies that support returnees, in the literature there are studies that emphasize the importance of policies that attract young people to the countryside. Muilu, Rusanen (2003) point out that young people are the base of the economic viability of rural areas. Stockdale (2006) and Stockdale et al. (2000) consider that return migration can positively influence to the development of rural areas through inflow of human capital, through new skills and entrepreneurship.

Table 5. Most efficient Rural Development Strategies (%)

| Strategies | Effective | Counterproductive |
|---|-----------|-------------------|
| Support for on farm diversification | 81.8 | 0.0 |
| Improvement of rural municipal infrastructure | 75.8 | 0.0 |
| Protection of natural resources | 69.7 | 0.0 |
| Invest in rural human capital | 66.7 | 3.0 |
| Strengthening social services | 60.6 | 3.0 |
| Strengthening local leadership structures | 42.4 | 9.0 |
| Support for young returnees | 36.4 | 15.0 |
| Income support and compensatory payments | 33.3 | 12.0 |
| Fiscal decentralization | 30.3 | 15.0 |
| Activation of land market | 30.3 | 12.0 |

Source: Author's calculation based on the survey data

Regional analysis

If we look at the research results at the entity level (SN and SS), we can see that there are differences in answers that are not equal in all surveyed aspects.

Regarding *priority beneficiaries* of rural development policy, respondents from SN have opted for farmers (52%). There is a high consensus of the respondents, as the average rate of this priority is very high (3.92 on a scale from 1 to 4), while the standard deviation is lowest comparing with other answers (SD 0.27). As the SN region is

characterized by highly capital intensive and commercially oriented farming, with local economy well integrated to agriculture, such attitude towards priority beneficiaries of RD policy is not unexpected. Others high-ranking beneficiaries are households with diversified on-farm activities (26.1 % AV 3.38 SD 0.49) and pluriactive farmers (21.7% AV 3.38 SD 0.49). The higher SDs indicates that there is some polarization in respondent's opinions, which means that important segment of RDAs have doubts about these two groups of beneficiaries.

Respondents from SS see *households with diversified on farm activities* as priority beneficiaries of rural development policy (69.6%, AV 3.70 SD 0.64), followed by pluriactive farmers (69.6%, AV 3.61 SD 0.46). These answers were expected, considering that SS region dominated by small scale agriculture, semi subsistence farming, where other gainful activities on farm and pluriactivity of farm holders is most desirable option. Several studies indicate that rural households diversify their farm business for economic reasons in order to maintain or increase business income (Bowler et al., 1996; Nickerson, 2001). Also Barbieri et al. (2009) have demonstrated that for rural households on-farm diversification is a appropriate way to generate additional income, to enhancement quality of life of theirs family and a to maximize economic use of their existing resources. Blad (2010) and Dries et al. (2011) highlight the importance of pluriactivity for farmers with insufficient income from agriculture and for farmers who have the desire to achieve a higher living standard.

Table 6. Priority beneficiaries, objectives and most efficient strategies of rural development policy - regional comparison

| Section | Serbia North (SN) | | | | Serbia South (SS) | | | |
|---------------|--|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|
| | Priority Rank | % | AV | SD | Priority Rank | % | AV | SD |
| Beneficiaries | Farmers | 52.2 | 3.92 | 0.27 | Households with diversified on-farm activities | 69.6 | 3.70 | 0.46 |
| | Pluriactive farmers | 21.7 | 3.38 | 0.49 | Pluriactive farmers | 69.6 | 3.61 | 0.64 |
| | Households with diversified on-farm activities | 26.1 | 3.38 | 0.62 | Farmers | 52.2 | 3.48 | 0.58 |

| Section | Serbia North (SN) | | | | Serbia South (SS) | | | |
|------------|---|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|
| | Priority Rank | % | AV | SD | Priority Rank | % | AV | SD |
| Objectives | Quality of life | 80.0 | 3.82 | 0.39 | Increasing employment of rural population | 90.0 | 3.87 | 0.34 |
| | Environmental protection | 70.0 | 3.77 | 0.58 | Environmental protection | 80.0 | 3.78 | 0.41 |
| | Increasing employment of rural population | 70.0 | 3.62 | 0.62 | Quality of life | 70.0 | 3.74 | 0.44 |
| Strategies | Support for on farm diversification | 80.0 | 3.69 | 0.46 | Improvement of rural municipal infrastructure | 86.4 | 3.86 | 0.64 |
| | Strengthening social services | 70.0 | 3.64 | 0.48 | Support for on farm diversification | 81.8 | 3.73 | 0.69 |
| | Protection of natural resources | 50.0 | 3.55 | 0.50 | Protection of natural resources | 77.3 | 3.59 | 0.89 |

Source: Author's calculation based on the survey data

Answers indicate that *the priority objectives* of rural development policy between the two regions are very similar. Respondents from SN region have lower consensus on priority objectives, as evidenced by all three indicators (% of respondents, the average value and standard deviation). On the other hand, respondents from SS are highly consistent that increasing employment of rural population has a highest priority among other policy objectives (90% AV 3.87 SD 0.34). RDAs from both regions selected environmental protection as the second most important policy objective. It is evident that the respondents from SS region have a slightly greater awareness of importance of natural resources than RDAs from SN (80% : 70%), probably because their rural economy is more oriented toward rural tourism, well preserved landscape, natural and cultural heritage etc.

The most efficient strategy for the less developed SS is the improvement of rural municipal infrastructure (86.4 % AV 3.86 SD 0.64). It is followed by support for *on farm diversification* (81.8% AV 3.73 SD 0.69) which is ranked first in the North (80% AV 3.69 SD 0.46). The ranking differences suggest that the first issues to be solved in the South are infrastructural problems and poor living conditions. Also research shows that respondents from both areas expect that beside agricultural production,

rural development policy should enable the development of non-agricultural activities in order to achieve comprehensive development. Therefore, they see support on farm diversification as a strategy that lead to higher productivity, economic and social development of the entire rural area. Protection of natural resources is ranked third in both territories (SN – 50% AV 3.55 and SS – 77.3 % AV 3.59). A standard deviation value (0.89) on the SS shows that individual responses of RDAs significantly vary from the average value, which indicates that the great potential in this region for dealing with multifunction agriculture is not sufficiently recognized.

Conclusion

The theory of planned behaviour proved to be useful theoretical framework for the assessment of local stakeholders' attitudes about rural policies, because it can indicate prevailing option for creation of local development strategies. According to this theory we may assume that the local rural development actors select policy options according to their social norms, attitudes (acquired on the basis of experience and knowledge) and local capacities for implementation.

Research on the attitudes of rural development actors in Serbia on rural policies showed that they paid great attention to agriculture and income of family farms. Social public goods such as environmental issues, the needs of other rural residents and services which are of interest to the wider public and society, are not high ranked among their priorities. This result suggests that local policy makers are closer to the traditional understanding of rural development policy, which is seen as a support eligible only for farmers *per se*. This general observation points to the necessity of a much larger effort to improve the knowledge and raising awareness of local stakeholders on the objectives and principles that govern modern rural development policy.

At the regional level, RDAs showed different attitudes in terms of all three surveyed aspects: priority beneficiaries, priority objectives and the most efficient strategy.

Respondents from SN clearly identify farmers as priority beneficiaries, while there is inconsistency in their answers about other priority categories. Such finding comes from regional diversity of rural areas and characteristics of agriculture. Region SN is economically well-developed, with large farms and intensive farming practices, and RDAs primary give focus to farmers and farm investment support. Region SS is economically less developed than SN, characterised by small and semi-subsistence farms, traditional and extensive agriculture, and it is not surprising that RDAs from this region mostly agree that households with on farm diversification and the pluriactive farmers have the highest priority among other policy beneficiaries.

Better quality of life, increasing employment of rural population and environmental protection are perceived as high priority objectives of the rural policy in both regions, but there are differences in their consistency. Namely, respondents from SS were unanimous about priority objectives. This especially refers to priority objective "increasing employment of rural population". The RDAs from this region also agreed

in higher percent (80%) than the RDAs from SN (70%), that environmental protection is very important objective of rural development policy. That is probably because of preserved ecosystems and biodiversity in this region. This further indicate that concept of multifunctional development is to a certain extent seen as an adequate solution for economic growth of this area.

Survey results on the issue of the most efficient strategies indicate that while RDAs from SS identify improvement of rural municipal infrastructure as the most efficient strategy (86.4% AV 3.86 SD 0.64), respondents from the SN concentrate more on other strategies (primarily on support for on farm diversification – 80.0 % AV 3.69 SD 0.46) because they have developed infrastructure. Such attitudes support the conclusion that for SS region this strategy represents precondition for the achievement of other development priorities. The fact that RDAs from both regions identify support for on farm diversification and protection of natural resources as an important issue indicates that the potential that exists in rural areas can be greatly utilized, both in terms of hiring people, securing food safety and maintaining the ecological balance.

Attitudes of RDAs about rural policy priorities could be seen as an important indicator of their understanding of rural development concept. Therefore our research provides information for policy makers in Serbia which could help them to create policy solutions that are adapted to different capacities of local communities and raise awarnes of local actors about modern concept of rural development.

Literature

1. Ajzen, I. (1991): *The theory of planned behaviour*, Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 179-211, (available at: <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/~ntzcl1/literature/tpb/ajzen2.pdf>).
2. Bogdanov, N. (2007): *Small Rural Households in Serbia and Rural Non-farm Economy*, UNDP, Belgrade.
3. Barbieri, C., Mahoney, C. (2009): *Why is diversification an attractive farm adjustment strategy? Insights from Texas farmers and ranchers*, Journal of Rural Studies, Elsevier, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 58–66, (available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0743016708000399>).
4. Bogdanov, N. (2014): *The development of support for less favoured areas and deprived regions: challenge of agricultural policy in Serbia*, Proceedings from the conference – EAAE Congress: Agri-Food and Rural Innovations for Healthier Societies, Ljubljana, Slovenia.
5. Bowler, I., Clark, G., Crockett, A., Ilbery, B., Shaw, A. (1996): *The Development of Alternative Farm Enterprises: A Study of Family Labour Farms in the Northern Pennines of England*, Journal of Rural Studies, Vol. 12, No. 13, pp. 285-295, Elsevier, (available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0743016796000150>).

6. Blad, M. (2010): *Pluriactivity of farming families - old phenomenon in new times*, Proceedings from the conference – Linking competitiveness with equity and sustainability: new ideas for the socio-economic development of rural areas, Vol. 7, pp. 155-156.
7. Defrancesco, E., Gatto, P., Runge, F., Trestini, S. (2008): *Factors Affecting Farmers' Participation in Agri-environmental Measures: A Northern Italian Perspective*, Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp. 114–131, The Agricultural Economics Society, Oxon, United Kingdom, (available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1477-9552.2007.00134.x/pdf>).
8. Davis, J. (2006): *Rural non-farm livelihoods in transition economies: emerging issues and policies*, electronic Journal of Agricultural and Development Economics, Vol. 3, No 2, pp. 180–224, Agricultural and Development Economics Division (ESA) FAO, (available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-ah756e.pdf>).
9. Dries, L., Pascucci, S., Gardebroek, C. (2011): *Pluriactivity in Italian Agriculture: Are Farmers Using Interlinked Strategies?* Proceedings from the conference – EAAE Congress: Change and Uncertainty; Challenges for Agriculture, Food and Natural Resource, Zurich, Switzerland.
10. Freshwater, D. (2000): *What can Social Scientists Contribute to the Challenges of Rural Economic Development?*, Journal of Agriculture and Applied Economics, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 345-355, Southern Agricultural Economics Association, (available at: <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/15504/1/32020345.pdf>).
11. Gorton, M., Douarin, E., Davidova, S.M., Latruffe, L. (2008): *Attitudes to Agricultural Policy and Farming Futures in the Context of the 2003 CAP Reform: a comparison of farmers in selected established and new Member States*, Journal of Rural Studies, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 322-336, Elsevier, (available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0743016707000642>).
12. Hartell, J., Kilkenny, M., Swinnen, J. F. M. (2002): *European Rural Development Policy Preferences*, Proceedings from the conference – EAAE Congress: Exploring Diversity in the European Agri-Food System, Zaragoza, Spain.
13. Herbel, D., Crowley, E., Ourabah Haddad, N., Lee, M. (2012): *Good practices in building innovative rural institutions to increase food security*, FAO, Rome.
14. Kotevska, A., Martinovska-Stojcheska, A., Ohlmer, B., Dimitrevski, D. (2013): *Attitudes of Macedonian farmers toward EU accession*, Agroekonimca Croatica, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 9-17, Croatian Society of Agricultural Economists, Zagreb, Croatia, (available at: <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/172534/2/2-2.pdf>).
15. Lowe, P., Murdoch, J., Ward, N. (1995): *Networks in rural development beyond exogenous and endogenous models*, In: Beyond modernization: The impact of endogenous rural development, No. 1, pp. 87-106, Van Gorcum, Assen, Netherlands.
16. Muilu, T., Rusanen, J. (2003): *Rural young people in regional development—*

the case of Finland in 1970–2000, Journal of Rural Studies, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 295–307, Elsevier,

(available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0743016703000032>).

17. Nickerson, N. P., Black, R. J., McCool, S. F. (2001): *Agritourism: Motivations behind Farm/Ranch Business Diversification*, Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 19–26, Sage journals, (available at: <http://jtr.sagepub.com/content/40/1/19.full.pdf>).
18. Papić, R. (2013): *Institucionalni okvir ruralnog razvoja u Srbiji – zadaci i izazovi za lokalne samouprave*, MSc. thesis, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia.
19. Stockdale, A., Findlay, A., Short, D. (2000): *The repopulation of rural Scotland: opportunities and threats*, Journal of Rural Studies, Vol.16, No.2 pp. 243–257, Elsevier, (available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0743016799000455>).
20. Stockdale, A. (2006): *Migration: Pre-requisite for rural economic regeneration?*, Journal of Rural Studies, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 354–36, Elsevier, (available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0743016705001002>).

STAVOVI LOKALNIH AKTERA U SRBIJI O POLITICI RURALNOG RAZVOJA⁴

Ružica Papić⁵, Natalija Bogdanov⁶

Rezime

Ključni izazov za zemlje u tranziciji predstavlja decentralizovana lokalna samouprava sa jakim kaacitetima koji omogućavaju rad sa novim modelima podrške ruralnom razvoju. U radu su istraživani stavovi lokalnih aktera u Srbiji o prioritetima politike ruralnog razvoja, tačnije o prioritetnim korisnicima podrške za ruralni razvoji, prioritetnim ciljevima, kao i najefikasnijim strategijama ruralnog razvoja. Takođe je istraživano da li razlike u odgovorima potiču od socio-ekonomskih karakteristika ispitivanih regiona (Sjever i Jug Srbije). Podaci su prikupljeni putem ankete sa 30 predstavnika lokalnih zajednica, analizirani i interpretirani uz pomoć metoda deskriptivne statistike i Ajzenove teorije planiranog ponašanja. Rezultati ukazuju da su stavovi ispitanika o ruralnim politikama konzervativni i orjentisani ka poljoprivredi i interesima farmera, kao i da razlike u stavovima ispitanika potiču od socio-ekonomskih karakteristika regiona kojima pripadaju.

Ključne riječi: kreiranje politika, korisnici politika ruralnog razvoja, efikasnost politika, stavovi lokalnih aktera, ruralna područja Srbije.

4 Ovaj rad je deo istraživanja na projektu 179028 - Ruralno tržište rada i ruralna ekonomija Srbije – Diverzifikacija dohotka i smanjenje siromaštva, koje finansira Ministarstvo prosvete, nauke i tehnološkog razvoja Srbije.

5 Asistent, mr Ružica Papić, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Poljoprivredni fakultet, Nemanjina ulica br. 6, 11080 Zemun, Srbija, Telefon: +381 11 261 5315, E-mail: papic.ruzica@agrif.bg.ac.rs

6 Redovni profesor, dr Natalija Bogdanov, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Poljoprivredni fakultet, Nemanjina ulica br. 6, 11080 Zemun, Srbija, Telefon: +381 11 261 5315, E-mail: natalija.bogdanov@agrif.bg.ac.rs