

УДК 338.439.02(470.1)

JEL Classification: D23; C5; L22

IVANOV V.¹

BASIC APPROACHES TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHERN REGION

DOI: 10.32620/cher.2021.3.10

Formulation of the problem. The prevailing sectoral approach based on agrarian-industrial policy, to the detriment of the socio-spatial direction of the development of rural areas, is ineffective from a social point of view. More correct is an integrated approach, within which rural development is viewed as a process of improving the life of people directly related to the use of land and other biological resources included in the system of geographical division of labor and corresponding social relations. *The purpose of the article* is to consider the development of rural areas based on a combination of socio-territorial and sectoral approaches. *The object of the research* is the countryside of the Komi Republic. The example of Komi is interesting in that rural life in the taiga part of its territory has features characteristic of many thoroughly inhabited regions of the North-West, the Urals, Siberia and the Far East, and in the extreme northern part (forest-tundra and tundra) - the western sector of the Arctic. *The subject of the research* is socio-economic processes in the northern village. Analytical, historical, statistical, logical, comparative methods were used as research methods. *The main hypothesis of the study* was the revival of rural life as a social process, the management of which cannot be carried out only within the framework of the production sector approach. Highlighting the development of rural areas and the agrarian sector as an object of comprehensive research will improve the quality and standard of living of rural residents. *Presentation of the main material.* New approaches to rural development are considered, including the transition from the exogenous-sectoral model to both endogenous and neo-endogenous. The impossibility of solving numerous problems of rural areas in the sectoral model of their development is shown. *Originality and practical significance of the study.* A significant disagreement in the domestic practice of rural development between sectoral and socio-spatial development has been established. The role of the rural economy in the development of the village is investigated, directions of its diversification are proposed. *Conclusions and prospects for further research.* The obtained results of the study can become the basis for the preparation of Strategies and Programs for the sustainable development of rural areas and its economic entities at the level of the region and municipalities.

Key words:

rural development, rural areas, development problems, rural economy, diversification, European Union, Komi Republic.

ОСНОВНІ ПІДХОДИ ДО СІЛЬСЬКОГО РОЗВИТКУ ПІВНІЧНОГО РЕГІОНУ

Постановка проблеми. Переважний галузевий підхід, заснований на аграрно-виробничій політики, на шкоду соціально-просторового напрямку розвитку сільських територій з соціальної точки зору малоефективний. Більш правильним є комплексний підхід, в рамках якого сільський розвиток розглядається як процес життєдіяльності людей, безпосередньо пов'язаних з використанням земельних та інших біологічних ресурсів, включених в систему географічного поділу праці і відповідних суспільних відносин. *Метою статті* є розгляд розвитку сільських територій на основі поєднання соціально-територіального і галузевого підходів. *Об'єктом дослідження* є сільська місцевість Республіки Комі. Приклад Комі цікавий тим, що сільське життя в тайговій частині її території має риси, властиві багатьом ґрунтовно обжитим регіонах Північно-Заходу, Уралу, Сибіру і Дальнього Сходу, а в крайнесеверній частині (лісотундра і тундра) - західному сектору арктичної зони. *Предмет дослідження* – соціально-економічні процеси в північному селі. В якості ме-

¹ **Іванов Валентин Олександрович**, д-р екон. наук, професор, головний науковий співробітник, Інститут соціально-економічних та енергетичних проблем Півночі Комі наукового центру Уральського відділення РАН, м. Сиктивкар, Республіка Комі, Росія.

Ivanov Valentin, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher, Institute of Socio-Economic and Energy Problems of the North Komi Scientific Center of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Syktyvkar, Komi Republic, Russia.

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1934-5274

e-mail: ivanov@iespn.komisc.ru





тодів дослідження застосовувалися аналітичний, історичний, статистичний, логічний, порівняльний. *Основною гіпотезою дослідження* стало відродження сільського життя як соціального процесу, управління яким не може бути здійснено лише в рамках виробничо-галузевого підходу. Виділення розвитку сільських територій та аграрної сфери в об'єкт комплексного дослідження дозволить поліпшити якість і рівень життя сільських жителів. *Виклад основного матеріалу.* Розглянуто нові підходи до сільського розвитку, що включають перехід від екзогенно-галузевої моделі і ендемогенної і неоендемогенної. Показана неможливість вирішити численні проблеми сільських територій при галузевої моделі їх розвитку. *Оригінальність і практичне значення дослідження.* Встановлено значна розбіжність у вітчизняній практиці сільського розвитку між галузевим і соціально-просторовим розвитком. Досліджено роль сільської економіки в розвитку села, запропоновано напрями її диверсифікації. *Висновки і перспективи подальших досліджень.* Отримані результати дослідження можуть стати основою для підготовки Стратегій і Програм сталого розвитку сільської місцевості та її суб'єктів економіки на рівні регіону і муніципальних утворень.

Ключові слова:

сільський розвиток, сільські території, проблеми розвитку, сільська економіка, диверсифікація, Європейський Союз, Республіка Комі.

ОСНОВНЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К СЕЛЬСКОМУ РАЗВИТИЮ СЕВЕРНОГО РЕГИОНА

Постановка проблемы. Преобладающий отраслевой подход, основанный на аграрно-производственной политике, в ущерб социально-пространственному направлению развития сельских территорий с социальной точки зрения малоэффективен. Более правильным является комплексный подход, в рамках которого сельское развитие рассматривается как процесс совершенствования жизнедеятельности людей, непосредственно связанных с использованием земельных и других биологических ресурсов, включенных в систему географического разделения труда и соответствующих общественных отношений. *Целью статьи* является рассмотрение развития сельских территорий на основе сочетания социально-территориального и отраслевого подходов. *Объектом исследования* является сельская местность Республики Коми. Пример Коми интересен тем, что сельская жизнь в таежной части ее территории имеет черты, свойственные многим основательно обжитым регионам Северо-Запада, Урала, Сибири и Дальнего Востока, а в крайнесеверной части (лесотундра и тундра) – западному сектору Арктической зоны. Предмет исследования – социально-экономические процессы в северной деревне. В качестве методов исследования применялись аналитический, исторический, статистический, логический, сравнительный. *Основной гипотезой исследования* стало возрождение сельской жизни как социального процесса, управление которым не может быть осуществлено лишь в рамках производственно-отраслевого подхода. Выделение развития сельских территорий и аграрной сферы в объект комплексного исследования позволит улучшить качество и уровень жизни сельских жителей. *Изложение основного материала.* Рассмотрены новые подходы к сельскому развитию, включающие переход от экзогенно-отраслевой модели и эндогенной и неоэндогенной. Показана невозможность решить многочисленные проблемы сельских территорий при отраслевой модели их развития. *Оригинальность и практическое значение исследования* Установлено значительное разногласие в отечественной практике сельского развития между отраслевым и социально-пространственным развитием. Исследована роль сельской экономики в развитии села, предложены направления ее диверсификации. *Выводы и перспективы дальнейших исследований.* Полученные результаты исследования могут стать основой для подготовки Стратегий и Програм устойчивого развития сельской местности и ее субъектов экономики на уровне региона и муниципальных образований.

Ключевые слова:

сельское развитие, сельские территории, проблемы развития, сельская экономика, диверсификация, Европейский Союз, Республика Коми.

Formulation of the problem. Analysis of the current situation in the northern and arctic rural areas of Russia showed the presence of numerous problems. This is largely due to the fact that rural development has faded into the background due to the priorities of the fuel and raw materials sector, as well as the solution of current sectoral problems to the detriment of

long-term strategic management of rural development. Within the framework of the traditional sectoral approach to rural development, it is impossible to solve the numerous problems of the village and rural economy. The northern village and the leading branch of its economy - the agricultural sector - are in a state of crisis, generated by both

historical reasons and modern transformation processes.

The revival of rural life as a social process requires the allocation of two conceptual directions for rural development: production and sectoral and socio-territorial. The most effective way to change the negative situation in rural areas is the state policy for the integrated development of rural areas.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The market transformation has exacerbated the historically existing rural problems. In the rural areas of the Komi Republic, there is an incomplete realization of the natural and labor potential. Results of the All-Russian agricultural censuses of 2006 and 2016 showed that over a decade in farms of all categories there was a reduction in the total land area by 32%, including agricultural land - by 2.2 times, respectively, in agricultural organizations - by 33% and 3 times. In the households of the population, the area of agricultural land decreased by 1.9 times. Small agricultural organizations did not use 14% of farmland, peasant farms - 9%, personal subsidiary and other individual farms of citizens - 37%. In agricultural organizations, the number of cattle decreased by a third. A particularly significant reduction in animals was observed in household farms: cattle - 2.6 times, pigs - 4.3 times, sheep and goats - 2.3 times, and horses - 1.8 times.

Over the past 10 years, the number of agricultural enterprises has decreased 2.8 times, individual entrepreneurs - 7.8 times. The number of people employed in agriculture has decreased by 1.6 times [1].

The process of depopulation of rural areas is intensifying. During the years of market reforms in the republic, the number of rural population due to outflow and natural loss decreased by 122.7 thousand people, or 40%. The mortality rate of the rural population is 1.5 times higher than that of the urban population. Average density for 1990-2018 decreased from 1.3 to 0.8 people. The number of settlements without population increased 4.5 times.

There is an increase in abandoned land plots (empty houses) in rural areas. The results of the 2016 agricultural census showed that the share of personal subsidiary plots with abandoned land plots (empty houses) in rural settlements was 20%, gardeners, summer residents and gardeners - 28%. The population is aging in the countryside. The share of the population under working age decreased from 28.9% in 1989

to 21.7% in 2018, in the working age, respectively, from 57.2 and 50.6, and the share of people over working age increased from 13, 9 to 27.7%. The deterioration of the demographic situation in the countryside will lead to a reduction in the number of labor and potential, its aging and, in the future, will become a factor limiting the development of the rural economy.

The continuation of the current trend of urbanization of cities and depopulation of rural areas will lead to the fact that the production of agricultural products in remote rural settlements will have to be done on a rotational basis. As E. Savchenko rightly notes, the problems of preserving the development of rural areas should be perceived not only through the prism of supporting and developing the agricultural economy, building social and transport infrastructure, but also from the angle of preserving Russian civilization - the main bond of the Russian Federation [2, p. 5].

The Komi countryside is characterized by underdeveloped transport, engineering and social infrastructure. During the period of market transformation, the construction of roads in the countryside ceased. 2003-2018 only 1.4 million rubles were allocated for the construction of rural roads, or 0.06% of the total budget funds for the development of infrastructure in rural areas. In the recently adopted state program "Development of rural areas" of the planned for 2020-2025. of financial resources for the development of transport infrastructure, it is envisaged to allocate only 4% of funds. Now most of the roads are unpaved, the condition of which remains unsatisfactory. On-farm paved roads account for 37%. Only two out of six peripheral rural districts (Koigorodsky and Ust-Kulomsky) have a transport connection with the city of Syktyvkar along paved roads. The low availability of rural roads with hard surface does not allow the rural population to timely receive education, health care, culture, and consumer services. Remote rural areas have two and three hours availability [3, p. 46]. Many sparsely populated villages are characterized by inaccessibility or poor road accessibility. 84% of the rural population lives in non-gasified settlements, 10% of settlements receive electricity from autonomous power plants.

During the years of market reforms, the construction of residential houses in rural areas decreased 2.2 times, preschool institutions - 2.4 times, general education schools - 2.1 times, cultural and leisure institutions - 1.5 times.





Now the share of dilapidated and dilapidated housing in rural areas is 14.3% against 2.0% in the city. Most of the inhabitants of rural settlements are deprived of basic utilities. The improvement of the housing stock in the countryside lags far behind the city. The housing stock of the village is provided with running water 3.5 times, sewerage – 5.5 times, central heating and gas – 2.5 times, hot water supply – 8.7 times, baths – 7.9 times, floor-standing electric stoves – 3.8 times less. than in the city.

The value of the integral indicator of the comfort of housing and communal conditions in areas with a completely rural population is 1.3 times lower than the average value for Komi [4].

The purpose of the article is to consider the development of rural areas based on a combination of socio-territorial and sectoral approaches.

Presentation of the main material. In rural areas, the system of information and consulting services is underdeveloped. Currently, the information and consulting department operates at the regional level within the Ministry of Agriculture and the Consumer Market [5]. The lack of counseling in rural areas hinders the access of small businesses and rural residents, especially remote areas, to information and counseling services. The creation of inter-municipal counseling centers will increase the coverage of small and medium-sized organizations and the rural population with information and consulting services, disseminate innovations, and increase the level of coordination and integration of the service with science and education.

Small forms of business, prevailing in the rural economy, are experiencing difficulties in accessing markets for the sale of products and financial resources. According to the 2016 agricultural census, slightly more than half of farms and individual entrepreneurs receive budget support. Only 19% of small agricultural enterprises and 9% of peasant farms have access to loans.

Currently, both at the federal and regional levels, there is no comprehensive approach to the management of rural development. State programs for the development of rural areas are not properly coordinated with each other. The Ministry of Agriculture of Russia does not have the authority to coordinate the activities of other ministries and departments in rural areas. The Government Commission on Agroindustrial Complex and Sustainable Development of Rural

Areas, approved by the order of the Government of the Russian Federation dated October 31, 2018 No. 2373-R, does not include representatives of the Ministry of Culture of Russia, the Ministry of Sports of Russia, the Ministry of Construction of Russia, the Ministry of Telecom and Mass Communications and the Ministry of Energy of Russia. At the same time, the activities of other ministries are of great importance for rural areas [6, p. 6].

Local self-government of rural areas and settlements does not have its own financial base for performing social functions, modernizing rural infrastructure and stimulating the agrarian economy. The current tax distribution system makes it possible to form the budgets of municipalities of the Komi Republic with a completely rural population (Izhemsky, Koygorodsky, Kortkerossky, Priluzsky, Syktyvdinsky, Sysolsky, Ust-Kulomsky and Ust-Tsilemsky) at the expense of tax revenues only by 20-30%. Local government does not bear the costs of agriculture and forestry. The bulk of municipal budget expenditures goes to education (63%), management (9%), culture (7%), transport and road facilities.

The concept of "rural development" appeared in the scientific literature relatively recently. The most complete review of models and concepts of rural development in relation to Western Europe was carried out by F. Mantino. For advanced countries, he identified three models of rural development - sectoral (development of agriculture proper), redistributive (rural development as a way to reduce the gap between regions and sectors of the economy) and territorial (the formation of relationships within the local economy) [7].

In the countries of the European Union (EU) since the early 1990s. there is a discussion about models and concepts of rural development. Analysis of foreign scientific literature has shown that there are three approaches to rural development: exogenous, endogenous and neo-endogenous [8–11].

The exogenous model of rural development, based on a sectoral approach, has shown its inconsistency due to the impossibility of solving numerous rural problems. The exogenous approach to rural development, which prevailed until the late 1980s and early 1990s, was replaced by endogenous and neo-endogenous variants [12].

The endogenous model of rural development is associated with the use of all

resources available on its territory, the coordination of economic activities, taking into account the specifics of their spatial organization, rational use of natural resources and the preservation of the environment. Self-government is of great importance in the management of rural development policy.

The evolution of rural development policy in European countries is associated with the coordination of all types of activities, rational use of natural resources and preservation of the environment, an increase in the quality of life of rural residents, diversification of the rural economy and is closely aligned with socio-spatial development.

The instrument of rural development is the national and regional programs of these territories. National rural development programs developed in the EU are implemented through four main subprograms (axes): increasing the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sectors; improving the environment; rural quality of life and diversification of the rural economy; LEADER [13].

In the national and regional programs of European countries, agriculture and other natural resource sectors, in addition to their commodity function, are considered as a tool for sustainable development of rural areas. The competitiveness of agriculture and forestry is ensured, as a rule, by government support. In the budgets of 28 EU countries for 2014-2020, shows the total amount of financial support for agriculture and rural areas in the amount of 408.4 billion euros, for the development of rural areas - 95.3 billion euros (23.3%) [14]. In the system of measures to support rural areas, special attention is paid to education, transport and information and communication infrastructure, social services and the preservation of the beauty of rural landscapes.

The European experience is useful for Russia by the social and environmental orientation towards the countryside and the creation of an institutional environment for the functioning of rural settlements that are part of a unified system of population settlement. The experience of managing sustainable development of rural areas in Finland is very valuable for the regions of the European North of Russia. The priorities of the Finnish rural policy are reduced to the following: vocational training and retraining of personnel for villages; maximum diversification of the agricultural economy; making special decisions for sparsely populated

peripheral areas, unconditional preservation of the culture and traditional economy of the Sami; orientation towards the principles of "green economy". Rural policy in Finland involves organizing the relationship of all interested parties with an exit to agreed solutions to socially significant problems. The fundamental mechanisms for achieving this strategic goal are collectivism and social interaction [13].

Now in a number of subjects of the Federation, rural development is carried out on the basis of an exogenous-sectoral approach with all its inherent features and characteristics [15]. Komi is a prime example. In the republic, there has never been a Strategy for sustainable development of rural areas. The State Program "Comprehensive Development of Rural Areas" for the period 2020-2025 was not adopted either. There is only subprogram number 5. "Comprehensive development of rural areas" in the program for the development of the agri-food sector until 2025. It has only one control indicator - the share of citizens living in rural areas, where comfortable living conditions have been created, in the total number of citizens, living in rural areas (up to 35% by 2025). The subprogram itself outlines the following areas: commissioning (acquisition) of residential premises (residential buildings) for citizens living in rural areas, the number of improvement projects implemented in rural areas, the commissioning of gas distribution networks, the commissioning of local water pipelines, the number of settlements located in rural areas, in which projects for the complex arrangement of sites for compact housing development have been implemented.

Sustainable rural development of the Komi Republic urgently requires the development of two programs: the State Program "Comprehensive Development of Rural Areas" and the State Program "Development of Agriculture and Regulation of Agricultural Products, Raw Materials and Food Markets, Development of the Fisheries Complex".

The generalization of the experience of rural development in the EU countries showed that our country also needs to move from an exogenous-sectoral to an endogenous-territorial development path using a neo-endogenous option. It is this transition that should be identified as the main strategic goal of sustainable development of rural areas.





The expansion of the scope of employment can occur in the following types of rural activities:

- reforestation, including reforestation felling. For 2010-2019 on average, reforestation works were carried out on an area of 40 thousand hectares per year. The average annual growth was 5.2%;
- development of timber processing (production of sawn timber, construction timber) and the fullest possible use of all wood raw materials in rural areas. Now forest-sufficient municipal areas have weak timber processing, being a raw material base for pulp and paper, plywood and board production in Syktyvkar and other cities;
- production of briquettes and pellets from low-grade wood and waste, their use in the production of heat energy in rural settlements;
- development of wooden housing construction (construction of residential buildings, furniture, doors, windows and other joinery) in rural municipalities;
- harvesting and processing of non-timber forest resources;
- integration of agriculture and forestry;
- development of trades and crafts;
- production of building materials from local raw materials;
- development of priority sectors of agriculture, which include potato growing, fodder production, cattle breeding, reindeer husbandry, and fish farming. These sectors should be seen as a factor in increasing the number of rural jobs;
- reproduction of soil fertility (procurement and application of organic fertilizers, reclamation of agricultural land, carrying out a complex of cultural and technical works);
- construction of rural and year-round forest roads;
- modernization of the communal infrastructure of the village, characterized by its high wear and tear;
- social development of rural areas;
- development of ecological tourism, rural hotel business;
- environmental protection.

Diversification of production in rural areas will contribute to the creation of additional highly paid jobs, filling the revenue side of municipal budgets, sustainable socio-economic development of rural settlements, and increasing incomes of their population.

The priority areas for improving the mechanism for the development of the rural economy are:

• reorientation in favor of subsidies and concessional investment loans prevailing in rural areas;

• compensation from the budget for part of the costs for new equipment, technological re-equipment;

• grant support to farms, family livestock farms, consumer cooperatives, individual entrepreneurs;

• creation of a regional fund for supporting rural economy entities;

• reduction of administrative pressure, tax burden on small and medium-sized businesses;

• expanding access to markets for products, material, technical, financial and information resources;

• a significant increase in the share of investments in transport and utilities infrastructure;

• transition from solving current problems to strategic management and planning of sectors and spheres of the rural economy.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Analysis of the current situation in the northern and arctic rural areas of Russia showed the presence of numerous problems. This is largely due to the fact that in the development of rural areas and the agricultural sector, priority was given to solving current sectoral problems to the detriment of long-term strategic management of rural development.

The evolution of rural development in European countries, which has been carried out since the early 1990s, is associated with the replacement of the exogenous-sectoral approach to the endogenous and neo-endogenous path of development of rural areas. These models are based on the use of all the resource and human potential available in rural areas, on the formation of human and social capital.

In Russia in the 2010s. practical steps have been taken to combine sectoral and territorial approaches to rural development. Comparison of the essence of rural development and officially adopted strategies and programs showed the predominance of a sectoral approach to the detriment of socio-spatial development. An example of such a disagreement is the Komi Republic.

The basis for improving the living standards of the rural population and its sustainable development is the rural economy. The development of the rural economy is closely related and interdependent with socio-demographic processes, the state of the transport, housing and communal, social, information and

market infrastructure in the countryside. Improving the demographic situation, creating comfortable living conditions for the population in rural areas will contribute to an increase in the efficiency and competitiveness of rural economy entities.

A decrease in the gross regional product, the number of people employed in agriculture and forestry, hunting, fishing, and fish farming has been established. To increase jobs in rural areas, directions for diversifying the rural economy are proposed, associated with increasing production in the agricultural and forestry sectors, processing forest and agricultural products, developing transport, social, communal, retail and household infrastructures, rural tourism, ecosystem services.

References

1. Results of the All-Russian agricultural census of 2016 (2018). In 8 volumes. Vol. 1. The main results of the All-Russian agricultural census of 2016: The main results of the All-Russian agricultural census of 2016 for the constituent entities of the Russian Federation / Federal State Service. statistics. Moscow: ISC "Statistics of Russia", 711.
2. Savchenko, E. (2018). Special mission of agriculture. *Agroindustrial complex: economics, management*, 1, 4–10.
3. *Modernization of the infrastructure for the development of rural areas*. (2016). Team of authors. Syktyvkar: LLC "Komi Republican Printing House", 241.
4. Fomina, V., Fomin, A. (2019). Assessment of the comfort of housing and communal conditions in rural areas of the Komi Republic. *North and Market: Formation of the Economic Order*, 2, 88–105.
5. Ivanova, E. V. (2017). Agricultural consulting in the system of innovative development of the agrarian sector of the northern region. *Economic and social changes: facts, trends, forecast*, 10 (2), 284–300.
6. Petrikov, A. V. (2019). Policy of rural development of Russia: directions and mechanisms. *Rural territories in the spatial development of the country: potential, problems, prospects*. Moscow: VIAP, 3–10.
7. Mantino, F. (2010). *Rural development in Europe*. Politics, institutions are local actors from the 1970s to the present day. Transl. from Italian by I. Khranova. Joint publication of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and Business Media of the Sole 24 Ore, 272.
8. Murdoch, J., Pratt, A. C. (1993). Rural studies, Modernism, Postmodernism and the "Post-rural". *Journal of Rural Studies*, 9 (4), 411–427.
9. Lowe, P., Murdoch, J. and Ward, N. (1995). Beyond endogenous and exogenous models: Networks in rural development, in J.D. van der Ploeg and G van Dijk (eds.) *Beyond Modernization: the Impact of Endogenous Rural Development*. Van Gorcum: Assen, 296.
10. Ward, N., Atterton, J., Kim, T. Y., Lowe, P., Phillipson J. and Thompson, N. (2005). Universities, the Knowledge Economy and 'Neo-Endogenous Rural Development'. *Center for Rural Economy Discussion Paper Series*, 1, 1–15.
11. Ploeg, J. D., Dijk, G. (2008). *Unfolding Webs: The Dynamics of Regional Rural Development*. Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 262.
12. Mantino, F. La riforma delle Politiche di sviluppo iraafe 2014-2020. (2013). *Agiregioni Europa*, 9 (12).
13. Hyyrylainen, T. (2010). *Governance of localempowerment in Finish rural policy: Collaboration between policy, development and research h Employment Policy Research Center*. EPRC. Hirosaki University, Japan. Discussion Paper, 4, 81–94.
14. Fact sheets on the European Union – 2019. Retrived from: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en>
15. Guinjoan, E., Badia, A. and Tulla, A. F. (2016). The new Paradigm of Rural Development. Territorial Con-Siderations and Reconceptualization using The "Rural Web". *Boletin de la Asociacion de Geografos Espanoles*, 71, 495–500.
16. Kostyaev, A. I. (2018). Conceptual approaches to the development of rural areas taking into account European experience. *Agricultural science of the Euro-North-East*, 67 (6), 141–148.
17. Zaslavskaya, T. I., Ryvkina, R. V. (1980). Methodology and methodology of the systemic study of the Soviet village. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 344.
18. Merzlov, A. V. (2006). *Transition to sustainable development of rural areas: theory, methodology and practice*. Moscow: Publishing house of IG RAS, 308.
19. Petrikov, A. V. (2006). Stability of rural development. *The Economist*, 7, 86–93.
20. Tretyakov, J. I. (2008). Conceptual Foundations of Sustainable Rural Development. *Russian Agricultural Economics*, 4, 80–85.

Література

1. Підсумки Всеросійської сільськогосподарської перепису 2016 року: У 8 т. Т. 1. Основні підсумки Всеросійського сільськогосподарського перепису 2016 року: кн. 2.: Основні



підсумки Всеросійського сільськогосподарського перепису 2016 року по суб'єктам Російської Федерації. Москва: ІВЦ «Статистика Росії», 2018. 711 с.

2. Савченко Є. Особлива місія сільського господарства АПК: економіка, управління. 2018. №1. С. 4–10.

3. Модернізація інфраструктури розвитку сільських територій. Колектив авторів. Сиктивкар: ТОВ «Комі республіканська друкарня», 2016. 241 с.

4. Фоміна В. Ф., Фомін А. В. Оцінка комфортності житлово-комунальних умов в сільських районах Республіки Комі. *Північ і ринок: формування економічного порядку*. 2019. №2. С. 88–105.

5. Іванова Є. В. Сільськогосподарське консультування в системі інноваційного розвитку аграрного сектора північного регіону. *Економічні і соціальні зміни: факти, тенденції, прогноз*. 2017. Т. 10. № 2. С. 284–300.

6. Петриков А. В. Політика сільського розвитку Росії: напрямки та механізми. Сільські території в просторовому розвитку країни: потенціал, проблеми, перспективи. Москва: ВІАПІ, 2019. С. 3–10.

7. Мантінес Ф. *Сільський розвиток в Європі*. Політика, інститути дійові особи на місцях з 1970-х років до наших днів. Перекл. з італійського І. Храмовій. Спільне видання Продовольчої і сільськогосподарської організації ООН і Business Media of the Sole 24 Ore, 2010. 272 с.

8. Murdoch, J., Pratt, A. C. Rural studies, Modernism, Postmodernism and the «Post-rural». *Journal of Rural Studies*. 1993 Vol. 9. №4. Р. 411–427.

9. Lowe P., Murdoch J., Ward N. Beyond endogenous and exogenous models: Networks in rural development, in J. D. van der Ploeg and G van Dijk (eds.) *Beyond Modernization: the Impact of Endogenous Rural Development*. Van Gorcum: Assen, 1995. 296 p.

Стаття надійшла

до редакції : 25.05.2021 р.

10. Ward N., Atterton J., Kim T.Y., Lowe P., Phillipson J., Thompson N. «Universities, the Knowledge Economy and 'Neo-Endogenous Rural Development'». Centre for Rural Economy Discussion Paper Series. 2005. № 1. Р. 1–15.

11. Ploeg J. D., Dijk G. *The Dynamics of Regional Rural Development*. Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum. 2008. 262 p.

12. Mantino F. La riforma delle Politiche di sviluppo iraafe 2014-2020. *Rivista. Agriregioni Europa*. 2013. Vol. 9. № 12.

13. Hyyrylainen T. *Governance of localempowerment in Finish rural policy: Collaboration between policy, development and research* h Employment Policy Research Center. EPRC. Hirosaki University, Japan. Discussion Paper. 2010. No. 4. P. 81–94.

14. Fact sheets on the European Union - 2019. URL: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en>.

15. Guinjoan E., Badia A., Tulla A. The new Paradigm of Rural Development. Territorial Considerations and Reconceptualization using The "Rural Web". *Boletin de la Asociacion de Geografos Espanoles*. 2016. № 71. Р. 495- 500.

16. Костяев А. І. Концептуальні підходи до розвитку сільських територій з урахуванням європейського досвіду. *Аграрна наука Євро-Північного Сходу*. 2018: Т. 67. №6. С. 141–148.

17. *Методика і методологія системного вивчення радянського села* / Відп. ред. Т. І. Заславська, Р. В. Ривкіна. Новосибірськ: Наука, 1980. 344 с.

18. Мерзлов А. В. *Перехід до сталого розвитку сільських територій: теорія, методологія і практика*. Москва: Изд-во ІГ РАН, 2006. 308 с.

19. Петриков А. В. Стійкість сільського розвитку. *Економіст*. 2006. № 7. С. 86–93.

20. Третьякова Л. Концептуальні засади сталого сільського розвитку. *Економіка сільського господарства Росії*. 2008. №4. С. 80–85.

Стаття прийнята

до друку: 30.06.2021 р.

Бібліографічний опис для цитування :

Ivanov V. Basic approaches to rural development in the northern region / V. Ivanov // Часопис економічних реформ. – 2021. – № 3 (43). – С. 87–94.

