

UDC 159

The impact of the EU political integration process on the psychological and social state of regional rural elites

Anna S. Elagina

PhD in Economics, Associate Professor,
Department of Economics,
Jewish University,
127273, 6, Otradnaya st., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: yelagina.anna@gmail.com

Ol'ga O. Smirnova

PhD in Economic Professor,
Slavic Greek Latin Academy,
105000, 20, Radio str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: oos39@mail.ru

Abstract

The purpose of the work is to determine the impact of the political process of EU integration on rural development and to assess the possibilities and limitations of the application of the existing institutional model in the practice of implementing the provisions of the Concept of Agreed Agrarian Policy of the Eurasian Economic Union regarding the development of rural territories in general and the agricultural sector in particular. In the modern institutional model of the political process, the role of the state to this day remains key in choosing the amount of financing for rural development. At the stage of choosing development institutions, the influence of the EU Commission is most significant, and at the stage of development and implementation of programs - of local authorities. Another limitation of the effectiveness of the institutional model of the political process of territorial development is that, despite some successes in the development of rural areas of the EU, a key problem remains the mechanism for implementing collective responsibility for decisions. Modern studies have shown that the most effective form of the political process of territorial development is the inclusion of supranational, national government and government in the process of resource allocation. The evolution of the political process of rural development in the EU indicates that the goals and objectives defined by the program documents are in most cases not applied in practice, and national governments play a key role in determining the amount of financing for development programs. Certain successes of the past 50 years are associated more with the limited influence of local political elites on rural development institutions. When choosing the institutional form of development of rural territories of the countries-participants of the Eurasian Economic Union, it is necessary to take into account the EU experience in studying the level of socio-economic development and applying its results when choosing goals and priorities.

For citation

Elagina A.S., Smirnova O.O. (2018) The impact of the EU political integration process on the psychological and social state of regional rural elites. *Psikhologiya. Istoriko-kriticheskie obzory i sovremennye issledovaniya* [Psychology. Historical-critical Reviews and Current Researches], 7 (5B), pp. 258-264.

Keywords

Political process, rural areas, development programs, EU Commission, agricultural policy, local political elites.

Introduction

The development of rural territories is a very relevant area of research, since the disparity in living standards in both developed and developing countries has not yet been overcome and is associated both directly with economic factors and with the need to ensure the individual's right to self-determination, the need to maintain a lifestyle indigenous peoples. The development of the socio-economic situation of the rural population is carried out using various tools, while the possibilities of political management of these processes, including at the supranational level, are underestimated.

The political process in the field of rural development in the framework of European integration is a unique experience for the analysis and synthesis, the search for opportunities and limitations of regulation. The EU's experience is also important for the development of integration processes in the context of the implementation of the Concept of Agreed Agricultural Policy adopted by member countries of the Eurasian Economic Union, the implementation of which will also affect the development of rural areas of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia. The search for an effective institutional form of rural development in the implementation of the provisions of this document should include EU experience in this area.

Main content

The first studies in the field of the development of integration processes showed that the most significant is not the number of parties involved in the formation of the political process and the level of interaction between them, but certain relations between government and supranational bodies, including in the field of authority [Filkins, Allen, Cordes, 2000, 72; Marks, 1993]. More recent studies have shown that in an integration process, national governments cannot retain all of their powers. Studies based on several rural districts in Germany showed that only regional management is not enough for effective development in the region, a systematic political process is required at least at the national level [Bruckmeier 2000]. Researchers from Spain have come to similar results [Barke, Newton, 2007]. However, studies have also revealed that the opposite is also true: public administration, on average, does not have sufficient qualifications to solve specific rural problems. In this regard, further studies were associated more with the definition of the role of each participant in the political process of rural development. By 2008, the most widespread model, according to which the political process for the development of rural areas was carried out simultaneously using several levels. However, this model also included a number of shortcomings and was not effective for the EU

countries because of the different level of inclusion of its participants in the political process [Knickel, 2009].

Further research was devoted to the development of the ideas of the uneven inclusion of regional governing bodies, social movements and organizations, political parties and national governments as institutional constraints on the development of rural territories. As a result, it was shown that this problem can be solved only by applying an alternative approach. According to some researchers, it should consist in the distribution of roles in the political process between the state and society by identifying the institutions responsible for making decisions in the field of resource allocation. This approach began to be universally applied in the formation of the political process of development of rural areas of the EU and required a more open decision-making procedure, development of approaches to self-assessment of the role of each of the institutions, and rethinking of the current management practice. In addition, when informing about the role of each of the participants in the political process, the goals and objectives that they set for themselves are more obvious, the decision-making process itself becomes more transparent.

Moreover, in later studies it was shown that only such an approach can be implemented in modern conditions, since the uneven participation in the political process of any of its participants leads to the political dominance of a particular institution. In addition, the study uses the analysis of the transformation of the institutions of interaction between the state and civil society in the formation of decision-making mechanisms regarding the development of territories, determining its goals and priorities.

For the first time, the need to “equalize” the level of social development of urbanized and rural territories was noted in the Treaty concluded in Rome on March 25, 1957 between Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Germany. However, his conclusion did not actually affect the policies of national governments regarding rural areas. At the same time (1958), two foundations began to operate: the European Social Fund and the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, whose activities were initially aimed at a number of projects to finance regional development measurements [Nørgaard, 2014]. New initiatives aimed at creating a coherent policy to find solutions to the ever widening gap between the social development of rural and urban populations. Moreover, in the early stages, the goals of this political process were understood as the formation of compensatory mechanisms for the development of rural territories [Ciutacu, Chivu, Andrei, 2015].

The transformation of this approach was carried out in the mid-1980s and was associated with a paradigm shift in the political process of rural development. The reason for this change was the formation of a single European market, which began in 1986. Moreover, for the first time, the goal of developing rural territories was included as one of the key tasks, which led to the creation of new documents in the field of determining the priorities and goals of regional policy [Lanfranchi, Giannetto, 2014]. In particular, funding for the least socially developed rural areas was increased and criteria for assigning to such categories were determined. For example, the regions with the lowest level of economic development included those whose GDP per capita did not exceed 75% of the average for the national economy. At that time, these territories included rural settlements of Ireland and the Mediterranean countries [Camaioni, 2013]. Support was also provided for rural areas, which stopped the production of traditional types of products as a result of the globalization process.

In the future, the EU Commission began to play a more significant role in the development of rural territories by attracting participants in the political process at the regional and local level. All this led

to the fact that the importance of national governments in the development of rural territories decreased, the effectiveness of the political process of rural development increased, and the influence of local political elites on the social development of regions decreased, which became instruments for developing the democratic process in making decisions about the allocation of resources. 2000s, the EU has an institutional form of the political process of rural development, including primarily the activities of four funds formed from membership fees of participating countries.

Conclusion

The European Regional Development Fund assesses the development of rural infrastructure, as well as determines the level of their economic development. The European Social Fund is working to reduce unemployment through the development of educational programs. There are also specialized funds supporting the agri-food sector: the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, which invests in modernizing farms, organizing agricultural markets and promoting the economic activity of rural areas, as well as Financial Instrument for Fisheries

References

1. Barke M., Newton M. (1997) The EU LEADER initiative and endogenous rural development: the application of the programme in two rural areas of Andalusia, southern Spain. *Journal of rural studies*, 13 (3), pp. 319-341.
2. Bruckmeier K. (2000) LEADER in Germany and the discourse of autonomous regional development. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40 (2) pp. 219-227.
3. Buller H. (2000) Re-creating rural territories: leader in France. *Sociologia ruralis*, 40 (2), pp. 190-199.
4. Camaioni B. et al. (2013) How rural is the EU RDP? An analysis through spatial fund allocation. *Bio-based and Applied Economics*, 2 (3), pp. 277-300.
5. Ciutacu C., Chivu L., Andrei J.V. (2015) Similarities and dissimilarities between the EU agricultural and rural development model and Romanian agriculture. Challenges and perspectives. *Land Use Policy*, 44, pp. 169-176.
6. Commission of the European Communities 2005. Commission Staff Working Document – Annex to the Proposal for a Council Decision on Community strategic guidelines for Rural Development, COM (2005) 304 final/ SEC(2005) 914. Available at: http://europa.eu.int/comm/agriculture/capreform/rdguidelines/impact_en.pdf [Accessed 14/04/2016].
7. Elagina A.S., Smirnova O.O. (2017) Razvitiye institutov psikhologicheskoy podderzhki v sel'skoy mestnosti: vozmozhnosti i ogranicheniya [Development of institutions of psychological support in rural areas: opportunities and restrictions]. *Psikhologiya. Istoriko-kriticheskie obzory i sovremennye issledovaniya* [Psychology. Historical-critical Reviews and Current Researches], 6 (4B), pp. 257-265.
8. European Commission 1988. The future of rural society – (COM (88) 501 final. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-history/crisis-years-1980s/com88-501_en.pdf [Accessed 14/04/2016].
9. Filkins R., Allen J.C., Cordes S. (2000) Predicting community satisfaction among rural residents: An integrative model. *Rural Sociology*, 65 (1), pp. 72-86.
10. Istudor N. et al. (2013) Importance of the European funds for agriculture and rural development in EU member states. In: International Scientific Conference. Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development in Terms of the Republic of Serbia Strategic Goals Realization Within the Danube Region, Achieving regional competitiveness. Thematic Proceedings, December 5-7 2013, Topola, Serbia. Topola: Institute of Agricultural Economics, pp. 1110-1125.
11. Knickel K. et al. (2009) Towards a better conceptual framework for innovation processes in agriculture and rural development: from linear models to systemic approaches. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 15 (2), pp. 131-146.
12. Lanfranchi M., Giannetto C. (2014) Sustainable development in rural areas: The new model of social farming. *Calitatea*, 15 (S1), pp. 219-223.
13. Marks G. (1993) Structural policy and multilevel governance in the EC. *The state of the European Community*, 2, pp. 391-410.
14. McAdam R. et al. (2015) Development of an integrated policy and support programme for micro rural food enterprises in an EU peripheral region. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 16 (2), pp. 145-150.
15. Nørgaard H. (2014) Futures of rural and peripheral areas. *Tidsskrift for Kortlægning og Arealforvaltning*, 119 (46), pp. 15-20.
16. Pašakarnis G., Morley D., Malienė V. (2013) Rural development and challenges establishing sustainable land use in

Eastern European countries. *Land Use Policy*, 30 (1), pp. 703-710.

17. Virta S. (2013) Governing urban security in Finland: Towards the 'European model'. *European journal of criminology*, 10 (3), pp. 341-353.
18. Woods M. (2013) Rural development, globalization and European regional policy: Perspectives from the DERREG Project. *Geographia Polonica*, 86 (2), pp. 99-109.

Влияние политического процесса интеграции ЕС на психолого-социальные состояние региональных элит сельской местности

Елагина Анна Сергеевна

Кандидат экономических наук, доцент,
кафедра экономических дисциплин,
Еврейский университет,
127273, Российская Федерация, Москва, ул. Отрадная, 6;
e-mail: yelagina.anna@gmail.com

Смирнова Ольга Олеговна

Кандидат экономических наук,
профессор,
Славяно-Греко-Латинская Академия,
105005, Российская Федерация, Москва, ул. Радио, 20;
e-mail: oos39@mail.ru

Аннотация

Цель работы заключается в определении влияния политического процесса интеграции ЕС на развитие сельских территорий и в оценке возможностей и ограничений применения сложившейся институциональной модели в практике реализации положений Концепции согласованной аграрной политики Евразийского экономического союза в части развития сельских территорий в целом и аграрного сектора в частности. В современной институциональной модели политического процесса роль государства до настоящего времени остается ключевой при выборе объема финансирования развития сельских территорий. На этапе выбора институтов развития наиболее значимо влияние Комиссии ЕС, а на этапе разработки и реализации программ – местных органов власти. Также ограничение эффективности институциональной модели политического процесса развития территорий заключается в том, что, несмотря на определенные успехи в области развития сельских территорий ЕС, ключевой проблемой остается механизм реализации коллективной ответственности за принимаемые решения. В современных исследованиях показано, что наиболее эффективной формой политического процесса развития территорий является включение наднационального, национального правительства и органов власти в процесс распределения ресурсов. Эволюция политического процесса развития сельских территорий

ЕС указывает на то, что цели и задачи, определяемые программными документами, в большинстве случаев не применяются на практике, и национальные правительства играют ключевую роль при определении объема финансирования программ развития. Определенные успехи последних 50 лет связаны в большей степени с ограничением влияния местных политических элит на институты развития сельских территорий. При выборе институциональной формы развития сельских территорий стран-участников Евразийского экономического союза необходимо учитывать опыт ЕС в части изучения уровня социально-экономического развития и применения его результатов при выборе целей и приоритетов.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Елагина А.С., Смирнова О.О. The impact of the EU political integration process on the psychological and social state of regional rural elites // Психология. Историко-критические обзоры и современные исследования. 2018. Т. 7. № 5В. С. 258-264.

Ключевые слова

Политический процесс, сельские территории, программы развития, Комиссия ЕС, аграрная политика, местные политические элиты.

Библиография

1. Barke M., Newton M. (1997) The EU LEADER initiative and endogenous rural development: the application of the programme in two rural areas of Andalusia, southern Spain. *Journal of rural studies*, 13 (3), pp. 319-341.
2. Bruckmeier K. (2000) LEADER in Germany and the discourse of autonomous regional development. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40 (2) pp. 219-227.
3. Buller H. (2000) Re-creating rural territories: leader in France. *Sociologia ruralis*, 40 (2), pp. 190-199.
4. Camaioni B. et al. (2013) How rural is the EU RDP? An analysis through spatial fund allocation. *Bio-based and Applied Economics*, 2 (3), pp. 277-300.
5. Ciutacu C., Chivu L., Andrei J.V. (2015) Similarities and dissimilarities between the EU agricultural and rural development model and Romanian agriculture. Challenges and perspectives. *Land Use Policy*, 44, pp. 169-176.
6. Commission of the European Communities 2005. Commission Staff Working Document – Annex to the Proposal for a Council Decision on Community strategic guidelines for Rural Development, COM (2005) 304 final/ SEC(2005) 914. Available at: http://europa.eu.int/comm/agriculture/capreform/rdguidelines/impact_en.pdf [Accessed 14/04/2016].
7. European Commission 1988. The future of rural society – (COM (88) 501 final. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-history/crisis-years-1980s/com88-501_en.pdf [Accessed 14/04/2016].
8. Filkins R., Allen J.C., Cordes S. (2000) Predicting community satisfaction among rural residents: An integrative model. *Rural Sociology*, 65 (1), pp. 72-86.
9. Istudor N. et al. (2013) Importance of the European funds for agriculture and rural development in EU member states. In: International Scientific Conference. Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development in Terms of the Republic of Serbia Strategic Goals Realization Within the Danube Region, Achieving regional competitiveness. Thematic Proceedings, December 5-7 2013, Topola, Serbia. Topola: Institute of Agricultural Economics, pp. 1110-1125.
10. Knickel K. et al. (2009) Towards a better conceptual framework for innovation processes in agriculture and rural development: from linear models to systemic approaches. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 15 (2), pp. 131-146.
11. Lanfranchi M., Giannetto C. (2014) Sustainable development in rural areas: The new model of social farming. *Calitatea*, 15 (S1), pp. 219-223.
12. Marks G. (1993) Structural policy and multilevel governance in the EC. *The state of the European Community*, 2, pp. 391-410.
13. McAdam R. et al. (2015) Development of an integrated policy and support programme for micro rural food enterprises in an EU peripheral region. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 16 (2), pp. 145-150.
14. Nørgaard H. (2014) Futures of rural and peripheral areas. *Tidsskrift for Kortlægning og Arealforvaltning*, 119 (46), pp. 15-20.
15. Pašakarnis G., Morley D., Malienė V. (2013) Rural development and challenges establishing sustainable land use in Eastern European countries. *Land Use Policy*, 30 (1), pp. 703-710.

16. Virta S. (2013) Governing urban security in Finland: Towards the 'European model'. *European journal of criminology*, 10 (3), pp. 341-353.
17. Woods M. (2013) Rural development, globalization and European regional policy: Perspectives from the DERREG Project. *Geographia Polonica*, 86 (2), pp. 99-109.
18. Елагина А.С., Смирнова О.О. Развитие институтов психологической поддержки в сельской местности: возможности и ограничения // *Психология. Историко-критические обзоры и современные исследования*. 2017. Т. 6. № 4В. С. 257-265.