

**CONCEPTUAL AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT BASIS:  
GENESIS, MODERN DOMINANTS AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF THEIR  
IMPLEMENTATION**

**VARCHENKO OLGA,**

*Doctor of economic sciences, Professor,  
Bila Tserkva National Agrarian University, Ukraine  
e-mail: [omvarchenko@ukr.net](mailto:omvarchenko@ukr.net)*

**KRYSANOV DMYTRO,**

*Doctor of economic sciences, Professor,  
Bila Tserkva National Agrarian University, Ukraine  
e-mail: [d\\_krysanov@ukr.net](mailto:d_krysanov@ukr.net)*

**TKACHENKO KATERYNA,**

*PhD in economics, Associate Professor;  
Bila Tserkva National Agrarian University, Ukraine  
e-mail: [k-tkachenko@ukr.net](mailto:k-tkachenko@ukr.net)*

**Abstract.** *The article analyzes the basic scientific concepts of the development of the village (rural areas) from the turning points of the 50-60-ies of the last century, the mechanisms, forms, methods and tools for their implementation in practice. The specifics of each of them during the period of functioning of the planning and administrative model of the economy are described, and the real and potential losses from their practical realization are estimated, and the conclusion is that the most important successes in the social reorganization of the village were achieved in the 80's. The devastating consequences for enterprises of the agrarian sector and rural areas of the transition period prior to the establishment of a market economy model in the economy are highlighted; attempts are made to find an acceptable theoretical model of rural development for the future. The peculiarities of introduction of the socioeconomic model in the agrarian sector and in relation to rural territories are analyzed; the objective need for synchronization and the combination of efforts for its practical realization are revealed. It was established that, in the conditions of narrowing the paternalistic role of the state, decentralization of administrative functions and financial resources, rural communities are the driving force behind rural development. Their occurrence is connected with self-initiative of the inhabitants of separate or near villages or their intermediary parts in order to solve local problems. The methods and tools used by rural communities to influence local development in order to increase the level and quality of life of the population are outlined. At the same time, the role and significance of united territorial communities in the revival of "crisis zones" of depressed rural areas will be noticeably increased in the future.*

**Key words:** *theoretical concepts, agrarian and rural development, social sphere, agrarian sector, rural communities, integration processes, united territorial communities*

**JEL Classification: Q00, Q18**

**UDC: 338.43(477)**

### **Introduction**

In recent years, efforts have been intensified by Ukrainian scholars to justify priority areas and to find effective tools to overcome new challenges and solve problems that have been characterized by the development of rural areas. In different periods of time, then one, then the second problems were put to the fore and demanded an urgent and thorough decision. As the perception of these problems and real resource possibilities, the society tried to resolve them as much as possible. The role of science was to conduct research in order to identify key issues and to substantiate the main areas and areas of society's efforts. For Ukraine, an important starting point in this regard was the period when the consequences of its occupation during the Second World War and the reconstruction of the national economy were completed. Taking into account a number of other factors, he is at the turn of the 50-60-ies of the last

century, when the problems of agricultural development began to gradually occupy a proper place in the domestic policy of the state. In this context, it is important to emphasize that agriculture was first given priority, but later, when the social component became critical and hindered the resolution of economic problems, it gradually moved to the forefront. This indicated that the social component became independent and this required a profound rethinking of the dominant views then and the transformation of scientific approaches to the development of the village or rural areas.

### **Analysis of recent research and publications**

In Ukraine, the problems of rural areas in different periods of time (60-80-ies of the last century) were called: socio-economic (socio-cultural) development of the village, social redevelopment of the village, convergence of social development of the city and village, overcoming significant socioeconomic and cultural -commercial differences between the city and the countryside, creation of socially equal living conditions in rural settlements of various functional purposes, etc. This has been reflected in a number of publications [1-3], but with the advent of Ukraine's independence, the launch of agrarian and land reforms, curtailing and leveling the role of the state in regulating socio-economic processes in the countryside, the situation has changed dramatically. Denationalization and privatization of state property, the dispersal of the objects of material and technical base and land owned by agricultural enterprises (collective farms, state farms, inter-farm associations) took place under galloping inflation and was accompanied by depreciation of funds on their accounts, the deepening of price disparities on industrial and food products, decrease in the filling of budgets of all levels, and this resulted in a significant reduction of the financing of the social sphere of the village. Crisis phenomena in the national economy and the agrarian sector were observed practically before the beginning of the 2000s and this led to devastating processes in the countryside. The transition from a planned-directive to a socially oriented market economy took place without sufficient theoretical and practical justification and taking into account national specifics and regional peculiarities, which was reflected in a number of publications [4-6].

After such devastating effects in the agrarian sector of the economy, the actual task was to develop and scientifically substantiate the new conceptual approaches to addressing the acute problems of its development, to objectively evaluate the resources of rural areas [7-8] and to ensure their effective capitalization (ie, inclusion in economic circulation) in within the framework of rural communities. An important theoretical basis for its solution was the practical implementation of the fundamental principles of the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union through the implementation of a number of projects in individual communities. This approach was adopted as a basis for the formation of a national concept of socioeconomic development of the agrarian sector [9 - 13]. Its fundamental approaches were based on the fact that agriculture and the Ukrainian village are at an alarming state at the current stage, as under the influence of globalization and corporatization processes, they are dominated by declining tendencies and destructive processes. Therefore, an extremely urgent problem arose: to balance the parameters of agrarian and social development, to slow down and overcome the negative trends in order to ensure sustainable rural development in Ukraine.

### **Research methodology**

Includes a retrospective analysis of conceptual approaches and principles, their transformation in relation to such a complex and multidimensional research object as rural territories and resources that are located there, a critical assessment of the consequences of implementing measures in terms of their effectiveness and practical efficiency. The dynamics of key processes (economic, social, cultural, demographic, resettlement), which in all periods of development of Ukrainian society were inherent and were particularly active in rural areas, is investigated not only through the prism of strengthening their influence, but also as a catalyst for the emergence, formation and the spread of negative trends in socioeconomically backward regions (regions, compact groups of rural areas or united territorial communities).

### **The purpose of the article**

Analyze the genesis of scientific views on the problems of rural territories at every important stage of development of the agrarian sector of Ukraine's economy, changes in the state policy, methodological approaches, priority directions and mechanisms and tools for their solution, taking into account the contradictory role of internal driving forces, as well as the influence of external factors. To reveal the modern dominant and principles on which the concept of socioeconomic development is based in the conditions of integration of the domestic agrarian sector into the EU internal market.

### **Research results**

The development of the Ukrainian village as a socio-economic and socio-political problem has become independent in fact after the proclamation and implementation of a number of groundless and controversial administrative measures that provoked the emergence and strengthening of negative trends in the agrarian sector or, in the broad sense of the phrase, in rural the sector of society. It concerned practically all of its key elements: the material base, labor resources, the forms of their placement (resettlement) and the organization of production activities, social conditions of life of the rural population, and others like that. At first, this provoked the emergence of a number of problems, and later - with the acquisition of their signs of aggravation or downward trend, gradually or suddenly intensified their relevance. In this regard, it is appropriate to identify several stages of the development of the agrarian sector and its territorial basis - rural areas with rural settlements located on them, in which the rural population lived (labor - labor resources - labor potential - human capital) and concentrated material and technical means of production . The main natural means of production - agricultural land, located between villages (around villages). The stages coincide with important decisions of the higher authorities of the state, the emergence of new conceptual developments, the transformation of political, economic, social and other principles of development of Ukrainian society. The starting point of the analysis is the beginning of the 60-ies of the last century, when the implementation of unauthorized (voluntarist) administrative decisions by public authorities was launched.

In the early 1960s, a course was adopted on the development of agricultural areas. It is based on the decision on planning of long-term development and scientifically substantiated allocation of productive forces, concentration, mechanization and electrification of agricultural production, expansion of rural and road construction, rational arrangement of reference (central or "perspective") settlements of agricultural enterprises, etc. At that time, among the designers was dominated by the thesis "highly mechanized agriculture should correspond to highly concentrated forms of resettlement." That is why, when developing district planning projects in rural administrative areas and regions, preference was given to concentrated forms of population placement - large settlements with autonomous livelihoods systems. In practical terms, this has found its continuation in the development of zoning and construction projects only those settlements that served as centers of agricultural enterprises. At the same time, construction of small and medium-sized ("unpromising") rural settlements was prohibited, which were not the centers of agricultural enterprises; in them (that is, non-central villages) the various production facilities (machine-tractor and storage yards, livestock farms, field brigades) and social (clubs, elementary schools, kindergartens, paramedic stations, communication departments) objects. This was due to the curtailment and the scope of social services for the rural population. This addition was accompanied by the consolidation of rural areas - their number dropped almost twofold (from 736 in 1958 to 394 in 1964), which significantly removed a significant part of the rural population from middle-level centers and provoked the migration of rural residents to urban settlements [2, p. 21-23]. Scientists and practitioners believe that the above-mentioned decisions actually initiated the processes of destruction of the existing rural settlement network and, thus, laid down a "delayed action mine" in the long run. In the presence of excessive labor potential in villages used in agricultural production to an incomplete extent, in the beginning and in the mid-1960s, rural population migration was not particularly alarmed. However, since the end of the 60s, agriculture has suffered from a shortage of human capital, and therefore, workers in industrial enterprises and students of higher and secondary specialized institutions were sent to rural areas to

reduce their peak periods. At the same time, the hopes that relied on the mechanization of agricultural production to replace manual labor mechanized did not materialize. That is why the migration of the rural population has become an object of increased attention of public authorities and began to be actively hampered with the use of administrative measures.

In place of the concept of "point" concentration of production, population and social facilities in the 1970s, the concept of dispersed placement of productive forces in the network of settlements and the emergence of internally-based links on this basis became widespread. They contribute to overcoming the isolation and autonomy of settlements, the emergence of integration processes and the formation of interconnected systems of rural and urban settlements. Inclusion in system-forming processes not only the old industrial regions, but also new industrial, as well as agricultural production and settlements, where human capital was located, and therefore objectively spread to rural areas. Under such conditions, the precise concentration of agrarian production was logically replaced by territorial, and agricultural production was seen as a complex, expanded space and long-term technological process. The sprawl of human capital in human settlements, the placement of various production facilities in them has been regarded as a necessary and important condition for the uninterrupted functioning of agrarian production. At the same time, a number of specific agricultural factors remain, which can not be overcome or eliminated even in highly mechanized production. Among them: the spatial nature of the organization of land resources, the work with biological organisms, the natural and climatic conditions and the specific relief and configuration of the used territory, the location of settlements and production facilities in the geographical space, etc.

In view of the scale and intensity of system-forming processes, a number of concepts for the development of resettlement in the future (General schemes for resettlement in the territory of the former Union, regional or group resettlement settlements, the unified settlement system in the territory of the Union, socio-economic zoning of the territory of Ukraine), as well as two concepts of perspective village development: the agrarian sector of society (academician T.I. Zaslavska) and socio-economic system "city-village" (professor L.V.Nikiforov). The first theoretical attempts by domestic scientists to justify and implement practical approaches that are not connected with the destruction of the village settlement network have been noted [1, p. 31-34, 228-230]. Under these conditions, any restrictions on the development of rural settlements were canceled and, therefore, the overwhelming majority of them received the right to further functioning and development. This theoretical message received an administrative extension (abolition of restrictions), but did not find realistic implementation in practice: migrant settlements of rural inhabitants did not change, rural areas actively migrated youth, but no noticeable efforts of the state to correct negative trends was not observed. As a result of detention, the operation of a large part of small villages and farms was put into question, and small and medium rural settlements continued to actively lose their inhabitants. As a result, part of land resources fell out of economic circulation, there was a chaotic inborn and afforestation of shrub vegetation, and hence natural resources and human capital in rural areas were objectively (and quantitatively and qualitatively) worsened and impoverished. At the same time, the policy setting for the intensification of agrarian production and increasing the output of agricultural products, based on the exhausting use of rural resources, accompanied by further degradation of human capital and a constant decline in natural soil fertility, completely discredits itself and this posed the need for the adoption and implementation of a set of practical measures on the actual improvement of the situation in the agrarian sector.

In this regard, the adoption of the Food Program of the USSR (1982), on the one hand, has in fact become a recognition of the critical situation in the agrarian sector of the former Union, and, on the other, an instrument and mechanism for the inclusion of all involved in this policy and government structures in practice, which was aimed at ensuring the achievement of significant results in the production of agricultural and food products. Similar programs were developed in all regions and districts, and even in village councils and agricultural enterprises, and the results of their implementation were clearly monitored by policy and monitored by the statistical authorities. Agricultural enterprises were sent to the machinery with a significant discount on the budget, broadly and practically completely at the expense of budget financing, reclamation works were carried out, a complex of measures for improving the soil condition (liming, DE oxidation) was implemented. The

implementation of local food programs was accompanied by a significant increase in the volume of housing, communal, social and cultural, road construction, which resulted in the commissioning of many objects of social as well as industrial use. New settlements in villages and modern forms of organization of satisfaction of social needs have opened up the inhabitants of many settlements for themselves. On this basis, there was a real improvement in the social services of the rural population. This contributed to inhibition of the processes of migration of rural residents to the city; in a number of rural areas there were centers of attraction (settlements) where former rural migrants returned, provided that they were provided with apartments (or individual homes) and were constantly working with sufficient remuneration. Despite certain disadvantages and administrative overtones, this was the practical realization of the concept of "city-village" in its best sense for rural areas.

The real "paternalism" of the state in relation to the problems of the development of rural areas testified that the higher authorities of the former Union and Ukraine began to "give the village debts", which accumulated over a long period of time, in order to bring the agrarian sector to the current level of functioning. According to scientists, the most significant period of positive influence of the state on the development of the agrarian sector and rural territories is the second half of the 80's, and its result was a real improvement of living conditions in the Ukrainian countryside, creating the necessary prerequisites for the stable and effective development of agriculture as a guarantor food security country. It should be noted that, practically until the end of 1991, Ukraine was economically and legally in the former Soviet Union and was entrusted with the functions of continuously increasing production and providing the population of the whole Union with the main types of food. These needs were met with considerable tension, which was the result of unreasonable planning tasks for Ukraine as a whole and for agricultural enterprises, in particular, and administrative pressure on producers for their unconditional fulfillment.

The situation changed dramatically with Ukraine's acquisition of political independence (August 1991) and the cessation of the existence of the former Soviet Union (December 1991). All levers of control of Ukraine moved from Moscow to Kiev, but many economic ties between the ex-Soviet republics and between enterprises that were located on their territory remained valid. Not just the collapse of the Union, but the whole economic system, the eclipse of the economic mechanisms and instruments on which it was held and its functioning ensured. Under such conditions, Ukraine should have formed its own mechanisms for managing the national economy, including the agrarian sector, and ensuring its stable and efficient development. However, as a result of the collapse of the fundamentally new economic and social conditions, there were many challenges and acute and complex problems that could not be resolved in historically short terms. Regarding the agrarian sector, the issue of agrarian and land reform was raised, ensuring the transition of the economy from the planning and policy system to the model of socially oriented market economy. In the absence of practical experience, most of the major important decisions were made by trial and error, which at the next stage made themselves felt tangibly. Mechanisms, forms, tools and tools that were actively and effectively used in the 80's, ordered "long live". That is why both economic and social processes were largely spontaneous, as the influence of the state was limited.

Thus, in the 90s, the processes of social "protracted biography" (demographic, migration, settlement) were virtually spilled on spontaneous economic transformations and, as a result, gave a rather "magnificent bouquet" of diverse negative consequences. Since social processes were characterized by high inertia and scale and were further enhanced by economic reforms, the negative trends in the agrarian sector became irreversible and spread even to relatively good regions, districts and village councils in this regard. As a result, there was a tendency to increase the mass of degraded villages, as well as the formation of declining agrarian territories [8, p. 47-62]. According to the survey of rural settlements, in 1996, 7,75 thousand were allocated, in 2001 - 7,1 thousand degrading settlements (out of 28,648 villages). It is proposed to classify the degraded population with more than 50% of the population of retirement age, and over 40% in small (up to 200 people). According to scientists, [8, p. 51-54], the reduction of the category of degenerating villages could be due to the influence of various factors (total extinction, accession to another settlement, changes in the demographic situation that triggered the transition to another category), but taking into account the negative trends of the natural movement of rural population, the overall situation worsened, but not

improved. Among the degrading settlements were two subgroups: 1) dying (with a particularly difficult demographic situation) - 48.7% and 2) decaying - 51.3%. To this we will add that in the early 90's there were 112, in the middle - 121, and at the beginning of this century - 135 rural administrative districts of the demographic and settlement crisis (out of 490 rural areas). The zone of acute demographic and settlement crisis included areas of north-eastern Ukraine: Chernigov, Sumy, Poltava, Kharkiv. In fact, this is a continuous zone of crisis [8, p. 57].

Political independence and the development of a system of public administration in Ukraine coincided in the first half of the 1990s with the emergence and negative influence of a number of factors, in particular: hyperinflation, depreciation of funds on the accounts of enterprises and deposits of the population, catastrophic reduction of financing of social sphere in the village and curtailment of social services the rural population, the spread of unemployment, and others, and this generally indicated the emergence and exacerbation of the financial, economic and agrarian crisis. Conducting agrarian and land reforms was protracted, accompanied by the "dying out" of collective forms of economic activity and the formation of new ones: corporate formations of various organizational and legal forms (enterprises, economic partnerships, production cooperatives), farmer and peasant farms of commodity direction, vertically integrated structures, etc. The agrarian crisis was delayed by the end of the 90's and only with the beginning of this century there were first signs of an exit from it. In the process of transition from the Soviet model of management to the market to a large extent, the network of social and cultural objects was abolished, their functional activities were abandoned or suspended, and the low income actually forced the rural population to switch to self-service. The profound transformations in the economic base and the powerful shocks in the social sphere have caused the need to develop fundamentally new scientific principles and practical approaches to the development of rural areas. Only in the light of foreign practical experience and its adaptation to domestic realities will it be possible to develop their own mechanisms and tools that are adequate to the current state and capable of exerting active influence on economic, social, settlement (ecistic) and other processes.

The first signs of an exit from the agrarian crisis did not mean that the agrarian sector began to overcome negative trends: the inertia of the entire spectrum of economic, social, demographic, migration, ecosystem and other processes in rural areas was manifested in the following. The agrarian sector at the end of the 1990s was at the lowest point of development and the first signs of a crisis emerged from the involvement in the production and use of resources that actually fell out of economic circulation and "idle". It is a question of the fact that the first positive changes were based on the maximum attraction of available natural resources and the use of manual labor in households, whose share in gross agricultural production in the mid-2000s even exceeded 60%. Since both social processes and negative trends in the agrarian sector were and are enormous inertia, it is objectively that at the beginning of this century the increased attention of leading Ukrainian scholars was drawn to the social resources of rural areas. They came from the fact that "social resources" (recourse means auxiliary means) are involved in the process of social production through the provision of a reproduction of manpower. Therefore, the main element of the social resources of the village is its inhabitants - the rural population. The last central place belongs to people capable of labor - labor resources. Hence, labor resources are an integral part of the social and economic resources of society at the same time, which, in our opinion, is the connecting link that determines the interdependence of its economic and social development "[8, p. 6].

Consequently, not only the number and structure of labor resources (labor potential - human capital), but direct participation in primary production or personal economy is a key condition for effective management. It is precisely because of the prism of the combination of human capital (located in settlements) with the agricultural, natural and material resources involved in agricultural production, the process of practical implementation of not only the interests of local self-government bodies (now the united territorial communities) as a whole, but also directly of the rural population. In 2005, an attempt was made to conduct administrative-territorial reform (ATR) in Ukraine through the transformation of the grass-roots level of local self-government (association of local - village, settlement, city councils), but since it was imposed "from above", it did not receive support the population "from below". Since the late 1990s, Ukraine has thoroughly studied the experience of the candidate countries for accession to the EU that prepared for this and used its preferences in support of

transition of the agrarian sector to market conditions, as well as in the conduct of the APR with the aim of consolidating the main powers of the territorial communities. regarding the use of resources in the territories under their jurisdiction.

At the same time, given the shameful realities of the late 1990s, the researchers believed that it was necessary to slow down the spread of "crisis zones" in rural areas of Ukraine. To this end, it was proposed to develop and implement special measures to overcome the depression of agrarian areas: areas of the demographic and settlement crises needed to devote a separate section of the next National Program for Village Development [8, p. 59-60]. It should be noted that the State target program for the development of the Ukrainian village for the period up to 2015 (approved by the resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated 19.09.2007, No. 1158) included a separate subdivision "State Support for the Development of Depressed Rural Areas", which provided for the following: a) to improve the legislation in terms of inclusion the specifics of the development of depressed rural areas; b) to develop and implement measures to provide state support to rural areas and administrative districts belonging to depressed rural areas; c) introduce the provision of guarantees and privileges to persons (families) living in depressed rural areas, as well as those who will be transferred to such territories in accordance with the established procedure, in order to revive agricultural production and other activities. To stimulate the development of depressed territories, provision was made for over UAH 0.5 billion. According to the results of the audit, the use of funds from the state budget aimed at implementing the specified Program for 2008-2015 (9 months), it was found that only half (UAH 64.0 billion) of the planned volume (128 , 2 billion UAH), including on the development of the social sphere and rural areas - 4.1% (UAH 2.6 billion, or 12.4% of the projected volume - UAH 21.0 billion), but to stimulate the development of depressed territories - they were not directed at all [ 14, p. 14 -18]. Consequently, in the absence of effective mechanisms and appropriate provision of the rural development problem, they have not received adequate financial and organizational support and, therefore, have acquired clear signs of profanity (that is, disparaging attitude to the evolving problems of rural development). We will follow which line for depressed territories is traced in the valid key document. In particular, the Unified Integrated Strategy for the Development of Agriculture and Rural Areas for 2015-2020, taking into account the range and complexity of problems in rural areas, the lack of experience in implementing such a policy in Ukraine and the limited public funding, offers (Strategic Priority 7. Rural Development - Revival of Ukrainian village) to support the development of agriculture and rural areas in four critical areas, namely, formation [15, p. 64 - 65]:

1. A necessary institutional, legal and strategic framework for the development of agriculture and rural areas to manage and support the implementation of rural development policy implementation (see strategic priority 3, "Institutional Reform of the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Related Government Agencies and State Enterprises").
2. The framework for investment support for agricultural enterprises, aimed primarily at strengthening and improving the competitiveness of small agricultural producers (see strategic priority 6, "Development of value added agricultural commodity chains").
3. Framework policy for investing in supporting non-agricultural activities aimed primarily at stimulating economic activity in creating value added in rural areas and diversifying rural economic activities (see 7.1 "Improving the quality of life and diversifying economic activity in the countryside ").
4. Framework investment policy that stimulates the organization and mobilization of rural community resources and the development of public-private partnerships with the participation of rural communities, agrarian enterprises, civil society and local authorities (see Rural Development for Community Leadership).

In our opinion, this testifies that practically the entire responsibility for the development of rural areas is translated into territorial communities, and there is a legal confusion or conscious identification of rural communities with united territorial. The latter are still at the stage of creation and mastering in full their assigned functions and resources that are (to be) at their disposal. But rural communities are now "in" at the stage of elaboration of a method of creation and establishment procedures.

However, we will continue from the beginning of the 2000s. Consequently, the protracted period of the agricultural sector's exit from the post-transformation crisis was not accompanied by

profound changes and significant positive shifts (in 2000, the agricultural output index was 53.4% (of which agro enterprises - 29.1%, farms - 111.3%, and their share - 61.5%) and the food industry 52.1%, as compared to 1990, that is, at the peak of the impact of the next financial and economic crisis, respectively, 48.3% and 108.1%); and therefore it required the search for those key components, which would affect the full potential of the rural areas. It should be noted that in 2017 the indices of production were: agriculture 91,3% and food industry 108,6%, compared with 1990.

Such an insufficiently active revival of agriculture required Ukrainian scientists to seek new scientific approaches based on a rethinking of the role of the agrarian sector and village in solving key societal problems, systematic grouping and in-depth analysis of the problems that hampered these processes and the development of proposals for their solution. At the same time, in the beginning and in the middle of the 2000s, trends in the rural areas were dominant, which were begun in previous periods, but they also exerted influence till now. Consequently, they had an extremely difficult situation, where the following phenomena, factors and trends played a decisive role, in particular:

- a low level of food security in the country as a whole and its reduction due to the growing imbalances in the cultivation of certain types of agricultural products, and in particular, a significant drop in the volume of production of animal products, which resulted in a deterioration in the diet of a large segment of the population, including villagers;

- the formation of economic relations of a market type in the agrarian sector was complicated and burdened by profound changes in the ownership of landowners and land users and the organizational and legal forms of management, the emergence of new forms of high-value production (agroholdings, agro-corporations), and this was accompanied by excessive exploitation of rural resources or the exclusion of certain (human capital ) from economic circulation in general, the emergence and uncontrolled seizure of various types of rent (environmental, water, political , tax, land, transport, etc.) with a negligible number of agricultural producers;

- the deterioration of social living conditions in the village has become biased and covers virtually all components: the material and technical base of branches of social and engineering infrastructure, the system of social services for rural residents and the social security system of the population. Particularly acutely, these problems were concentrated in settlements located in depressed and peripheral rural areas that were particularly affected by poverty and unemployment, as well as low wages in primary production facilities;

- the rise of agrarian production in the 2000s was not accompanied by the expansion of the rural population's employment, and vice versa: in the sectors of primary production and in the non-agrarian sector (industrial activities) in rural areas there was a steady decrease in the number of permanently employed. At the same time, those who were cut for various reasons, the statistics automatically attributed to employed in the personal peasant economy, and therefore there is a significant gap between the official data on rural unemployed and the data that were determined by the methodology of the ILO (International Labor Organization);

- As a result of the rapid increase in fuel prices, bus servicing of the overwhelming majority of rural settlements was effectively halted, and this was accompanied by a deterioration in the availability of social services, an increase in the territorial isolation of villages, and so on.

Under such conditions, the increased attention of Ukrainian scientists was attracted to the socio-economic approach. It is based on the Concept of Multifunctional Agriculture, which was formulated by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 2008. Its emergence is due to the degradation of the economy - that is, the decline in the share of agriculture in the national economy and the real decrease in employment in it. At the same time, it is appropriate to recall that during the 70-80s Ukrainian scientists actively explored the processes of de-agrarianization of the economy (first of all, due to the industrialization and intensification of agriculture), although this term was not yet used, and on this basis the concept of multidisciplinary and multifunctional development was formulated village [8, p. 455].

Consequently, the Concept of multifunctional agriculture prompts a deeper and more comprehensive study of the place and role of the person it performs (to be performed) in the interrelated spheres, with their objective interdependence and unity. It is about the economic, social and ecological functions that rely on agriculture in modern terms. The strict observance of the relevant



requirements in the performance of the above-mentioned functions is ensured only with the conscious and direct participation of the person in their implementation. In this regard, scientists note that "The concept of multifunctionality is based on the recognition of agriculture as a specific area of economic activity, unique in the various social outcomes that it can produce simultaneously with the production of agricultural products. In the process of agricultural production, not only food products, feeds, fibers, agro fuels, medicinal and decorative products are created, but also produce public goods of non-commercial character, such as ecological services, landscapes, cultural heritage, etc. They can serve as areas for diversification of economic activity in rural areas, turning into specific types of local assets, the capitalization of which creates for rural communities livelihoods beyond the limits of agricultural production "[9, p. 20]. Based on the foregoing it is appropriate to emphasize that the agrarian policy of the state at the present stage should be based on a conscious and proportional combination of two directions:

1) **agrarian development** on the basis of modernization of agrarian production in order to ensure the transition to a European model of multifunctional development. Includes the following components: renovation of the material and technical base of primary production facilities (rural, forestry and fish); innovation and technological modernization of processing and food capacities of market operators; introduction of the requirements of the national technical regulation system in the agro-food industry, which is equivalent to the basic model of technical regulation, which operates in the EU member states; introduction of the domestic food safety system at the enterprises of the agrarian sector, which is equivalent to the European model of safety of food products and animal feed; introduction of sanitary and phytosanitary measures in agriculture in accordance with European requirements. Execution in full of the listed range of tasks is a prerequisite for increasing the competitiveness of products of the agrarian sector, ensuring its compliance with European requirements in order to enter the markets of the Member States of the Community and, on this basis, integrating primary production and processing enterprises into the EU internal market;

2) **rural development** through the active involvement of rural communities in these processes.

It should be emphasized that agrarian development objectively acts as an industrial component of the process of integration of the agrarian economy into the EU internal market. The mentioned problem in the proposed interpretation by the authors at the present stage is legislative, normative, regulatory and accreditation support harmonized with European and international requirements, as well as the formation and establishment of domestic market surveillance, which is based on the observance of the general legislative framework of the EU for market surveillance, and according to expert estimates at the beginning of the 2020s, it will be practically implemented [16].

As for the second line - **rural development**, this issue requires further thorough analysis in order to prepare programs, proposals and concrete measures, as well as mechanisms for their practical implementation. Since Ukraine has proclaimed the European vector of development, the proposals should take into account the EU's approaches to the development of rural areas, on the one hand, and on the other hand - the domestic specifics and the real picture of shifts in rural areas, the dynamics of change and trends trends, etc. It should be noted that in the EU, the issue of rural development is being solved using the CAP instruments (Common Agricultural Policy), which has also undergone a significant evolution over a long period of time: the territorial approach has gradually been transformed into approaches related to the restructuring of industries and the search for effective compromise solutions. Moreover, key decisions to support the agrarian sector are synchronized with appropriate support for the sustainable development of rural areas. It is important that account is taken of the national specificities of the Member States and of the actual state of the rural areas through the prism of the trends and consequences of past rural development. To ensure sustainable rural development, it is anticipated to stimulate investment in agriculture and declining sectors. To this end, at the national and regional levels, different concepts of rural development are used in parallel, namely [17, p. 83-84]:

1. The concept of rural development in the context of general modernization of agriculture and agribusiness in general. As a basis, a **sectoral model** for the development of the agrarian sector is adopted and rural development is based on it. Rural areas are considered as a set of resources, the

place of production processes and the spatial base of agricultural development. The main function of rural areas is the production of commodity agricultural products;

2. The concept of rural development, based on reducing the differences between the most backward rural areas and the rest of the economy (convergence concept, **redistribution model**). In it, rural areas are considered mainly as underdeveloped, structurally behind the city due to the impact of various adverse factors and therefore they need special support: diversification of activities in the most backward areas, direct compensation by the state of influence of adverse factors, indirect support, etc.;

3. The concept based on the identification of rural development and rural development and involves the use of all resources located on their territory (human, natural, logistical, landscape, etc.), as well as integration between all components and sectors at the local level (**territorial model**).

It should be noted that since rural areas were the main target of rural areas in the EU, this approach continued in Ukraine as well. In particular, with the inclusion of materials for a continuous survey of rural settlements, which included the period 1996-2005, a comprehensive typology of rural administrative areas was developed. It was based on the differentiation of areas based on the systematization of facts and the establishment of the main types of phenomena that characterize the causes, current peculiarities of development and its prospects. This work can be regarded as important in the theoretical and methodological terms for the complex conditions of market economy and taking into account the negative effects of previous development and which can be re-creatively used for subsequent periods and other generalization levels (united territorial communities). Without touching on the original theoretical positions and methodological approaches of this work, we note that the integrated typology of rural territories under the conditions of rural development included six main types [9, p. 196-217], namely:

- type A: agrarian employment, population and service problems (85 rural areas, representing 17.4% of their total - 490 administrative districts);
- type B: agrarian employment, acceptable population and availability of consumer goods (118 districts and 24.1%);
- type C: Significantly diversified employment, satisfactory population and availability of consumer goods (58 districts and 11.8%);
- type D: poorly diversified employment, population and service sectors (33 districts and 6.7%);
- type E: demographic and settlement crisis, underdeveloped areas of employment and services (149 districts and 30.4%);
- type F: crisis situation in the rural labor market, satisfactory population, acceptable availability of consumer goods (47 districts and 9.6%).

According to the aggregate estimates, the number of crisis rural areas in the mid-2000s was almost 200 units, and in the end - exceeded this figure (more than 40% of their total). Thus, there is an expansion of "crisis zones" in rural areas of Ukraine.

It should be noted that different from the above methodological approach was proposed in identifying rural areas as a system of populated places. This approach involves taking into account not only their location in the geographical space on the "center - semi-periphery - periphery" axis, but also the assessment of the level and dynamics of their development in the context of the dichotomy "village-city" [18, p. 21].

Taking into account the previous experience of regulating the development of the agrarian sector and rural areas, certain achievements, real and potential losses from the untimely adoption or in general of rejection of measures to correct mistakes and miscalculations made by Ukrainian scientists at the end of the 2000s posed a difficult task: to form new approaches to rural development from taking into account the experience of the EU member states, shifting not only the emphasis, but also the substantial diversification of spheres and directions of efforts, as well as expanding the spectrum of the resource in local assets and institutional units that must involve direct participation in their implementation. Emphasizing the essence of rural development, the scientists proposed a new methodological approach to achieving strategic goals of sustainable development and village based on the potential of local communities and their capacity to solve their own problems. It was found that "state policy, aimed exclusively at economic growth, has a totally negative impact on rural

communities. More important is the ability of peasants to use local assets, to work together on the reproduction on a modern basis of rural life; their ability to build and improve social networks; the opportunity to improve their own professional knowledge and transform them into innovative ideas, implement these ideas into life, and so on. The result will be not only rural jobs, rising incomes and functioning infrastructure, but also strong rural communities that can provide sustainable socio-economic development of the countryside and can successfully cope with constant internal change and globalization challenges "[11, p. 10].

According to scientists, rural development involves the development of the rural economy, rural areas (agro-landscapes, engineering and social infrastructure) and, most importantly, human beings. The loss of power by the paternalistic role has prompted the active search for new actors of rural development, which must assume the functions of ensuring real influence on the processes taking place in rural areas and to encourage them to advance in a given direction. These functions are capable of accepting only rural communities - that is, self-organized villagers who share a common living space (usually within the same village), combined with aspirations, readiness and real actions to improve their economic, social and environmental status, which created for this group of interaction (GI) and identified a leader among its members [12, p. 63]. However, as the practice of 2015-2017 shows, the state transfers the real financial leverage in a decentralized state to a new grassroots link of local self-government - the united territorial communities (PF). That is why, in our opinion, the creation of rural communities can actually take place only in the context of or after the implementation of administrative-territorial reform. It should be noted that since 2014 the planned step-by-step consolidation of the grassroots (village, settlement and city councils, the number of which to the association was 11519 units) and the creation of PF, in particular, 975 PF (approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine), but another the proposal was lower - 1206 PF (approved by the regional councils) [19, p. 108]. Attempts to carry out administrative reform, the transformation of the territorial structure or the APR in different forms began repeatedly (1992-1994, 1998, 2005, 2012). The last time this happened after an intensive preparatory period (2014), in particular, in 2015, 159 PFs were created; in 2016 - 209; in 2017 - 330. Consequently, at the beginning of 2018, there were 698 PFs (more than half of the planned ones), and thus the most important component - the creation of a network of PFs in Ukraine - has gone through the middle and is nearing completion. Thus, self-organization of the inhabitants of rural communities after the implementation of the APR will be a significant impetus, as the real financial leverage of influence will be in the bodies of management of PF, and only rural communities that will need to be created will protect local interests. Their efforts will be directed towards the self-development of rural communities on the basis of the maximum capitalization of local assets, and above all all kinds of resources: human, social, natural, physical, financial, political, cultural [11, p. 214-257].

It should be emphasized that in the world already formed as necessary (step-by-step) procedures for the self-organization of the inhabitants of the communities, as well as the corresponding procedures for the acquisition of rights and obligations that will be objectively assigned to them as representatives of local interests. In this regard, it is worth pointing out that the idea of rural communities only begins to form its own space, although in the historical perspective, such an approach dominated the resolution of issues in rural areas in the pre-revolutionary period. There are already certain manifestations of self-organization of rural residents at different hierarchical levels (street committees, associations of local producers, other professional associations), but this experience is not enough for thorough analysis and the formation of adequate conclusions. In this regard, it is appropriate to turn to those key provisions that are emphasized by Ukrainian scholars in order to have the fullest and most objective characterization of the changes we are hoping for. Consequently, "Community Based Rural Development is a development oriented towards the formation of sustainability, long-term development of communities' capacity to cope with future challenges and opportunities. It is a chain of actions in which communities visualize, initiate and implement their own ideas for the improvement of everyday life. It is the activity of communities themselves, which is aimed at realizing the economic opportunities of the community, improving the social conditions and the environment of its life. Consequently, community-based rural development is a deliberate change in institutional, economic, environmental, demographic, social, cultural, residential

and other conditions in rural areas in the direction of raising the level and quality of life of the population. Changes are carried out by the communities themselves, on the basis of giving them their rights of ownership / use, effective use and control of local resources, provide for the elimination of poverty, rather than a more comfortable existence in its conditions "[12, p. 3]. So, it is a matter of actively implementing these provisions.

### **Conclusions**

Conducted studies of conceptual foundations, principles and methodological approaches, which formed the programs of development of agriculture and rural areas (Ukrainian village) allow us to logically conclude that they were separated from the realities. Dogmatic approaches ("unpromising villages", the concentration of rural settlements due to the settlement of small, small and remote villages, etc.) did not have a scientific basis, but the real negative impact on the rural settlement network was made by administrative prohibitions. The proclamation of the postulates without their necessary resources was provoked to increase the scale of migration of the rural population, the de-icing of small, small and even medium-sized rural settlements.

The destructive processes in the rural settlement network became irreversible and on this background, only in the second half of the 80's there was a paternalistic role of the state. Significant investments in the development of the material and technical base of agriculture and the social rebirth of the village (construction of objects of socio-cultural and housing and communal purposes, the development of engineering and road infrastructure) inhibited destructive trends, but could not completely stop or overcome them. With the advent of Ukraine's political independence and its entry into the "hottest peak" of profound transformations in the economy and the social sphere, the agrarian sector and village were discarded by key indicators at the level of 50-60-ies. The economic crisis continued until the end of the 1990's and only at the beginning of the new century began the first signs of the emergence of it.

The long-term transition to a market economy was accompanied by destructive processes in the development of agriculture and the deterioration of social living conditions in the countryside. The state's loss of paternalistic role in the development of the agrarian sector and rural areas has led to the search for new approaches based on the consideration of domestic, European and American experience and scientific developments of well-known scientists. In this regard, the fruitful idea of a clear demarcation of problems in the industrial and social spheres became clear, and the theoretical and methodological approaches and practical measures for their solution were called agrarian and rural development. Agrarian development includes material and technical renovation of primary production facilities and innovation and technological modernization of food industry enterprises. The introduction of requirements of technical regulations and national standards for the production of agro-food products is a prerequisite for their integration into the EU internal market.

Rural development in the current conditions is based on the key position on the actual role of rural communities in implementing its own development potential through the active involvement of local resources. This requires effective explanatory work among the villagers regarding the need to create local self-government cells in order to identify the interests of the population in various sectors of the economy, social infrastructure, social services and transport, highlighting the issues that require a priority solution, and finding sources of investment and necessary resources for their implementation.

### **Список літератури**

1. Шепотько Л.А., Прокопа І.В., Плонский В.Я., Скурская Н.М. Сближение социально-экономического развития города и села. Киев: Наукова думка, 1981. 295 с.
2. Крисанов Д.Ф. Сельское расселение: социально-экономический аспект. За ред. Л.А.Шепотько. Киев: Наукова думка, 1988. 143 с.
3. Шепотько Л.О., Прокопа І.В., Крисанов Д.Ф., Радовець А.А., Шейко П.В. Українське село: проблеми і перспективи. За ред. Л.О.Шепотько. Київ: Урожай. 1991. 240 с.

4. Вдовиченко М.Х., Якуба К.І., Орлатий М.К. Соціальне відродження села в умовах становлення ринкової економіки. За ред. П.Т.Саблука, М.Х.Вдовиченка. Київ:Урожай. 1993. 216 с.
5. Шепотько Л.О., Прокопа І.В., Максимюк О.П., Яровий В.Д. Село: сучасна політика і стратегія розвитку. Київ: Інститут економіки НАН України. 1997. 380 с.
6. Крисанов Д.Ф. Аграрна сфера: пріоритети та механізми реалізації. Київ: Інститут економіки НАН України. 1998. 235 с.
7. Шепотько Л.О., Прокопа І.В., Гудзинський С.О., Яровий В.Д. *Сільський сектор України на рубежі тисячоліть. У 2 томах. Т.1. Потенціал сільського сектора.* Київ: Інститут економіки НАН України. 2000. 465 с.
8. Шепотько Л.О., Прокопа І.В., Гудзинський С. О., Яровий В.Д. *Сільський сектор України на рубежі тисячоліть. У 2 томах. Т.2. Соціальні ресурси сільських територій.* Київ: Інститут економіки НАН України. 2003. 467 с.
9. Бородіна О.М., Прокопа І.В., Юрчишин В.В., Риковська О.В., Яровий В.Д., Попова О.Л., Міщенко Н.М., Куцмус Н.М., Лук'янов М.М., Зінчук Т.О., Бородіна О.С., Киризиук С.В., Фурсенко І.М., Павлов В.М., Унгурян В.Я. Теорія, політика та практика сільського розвитку. За ред. д-ра екон., наук, чл.-кор. НАНУ О.М.Бородіної, д-ра екон., наук, чл.-кор. УААН І.В.Прокопи; НАН України, Ін-т екон. та прогнозув. Київ, 2010. 376 с.
10. Геєць В.М., Юрчишин В.В., Бородіна О.М., Прокопа І.В. Соціоекономічна модернізація аграрного сектору України (концептуальні положення). *Економіка України.* 2011. № 12. С. 4 – 14.
11. Бородіна О.М., Прокопа І.В., Юрчишин В.В., Попова О.Л., Зінчук Т.О., Киризиук С.В., Куцмус Н.М., Риковська О.В., Яровий В.Д., Бетлій М.Г., Бородіна О.С., Лагута С.М., Фраєр О.В., Блінова Т.В., Вяльшина Г.О. Соціоекономічний розвиток сільського господарства і села: сучасний вимір. За ред. чл.-кор. НАН України О.М.Бородіної; НАН України, Ін-т екон. та прогнозув. Київ, 2012. 320 с.
12. Бородіна О.М., Прокопа І.В., Попова О.Л., Киризиук С.В., Михайленко О.В., Остапенко А.Ю., Риковська О.В., Цибуляк В.Я., Яровий В.Д., Бетлій М.Г., Оліферук С.І., Фраєр О.В. Політика сільського розвитку на базі громад в Україні: наукова доповідь. За ред. чл.-кор. НАН України, д-ра екон. наук О.М.Бородіної, чл.-кор. НААН України, д-ра екон. наук І.В.Прокопи, д-ра екон. наук О.Л.Попової; НАН України, ДУ «Ін-т екон. та прогнозув. НАН України». Київ, 2015. 70 с.
13. Прокопа І.В., Бородіна О.М. Соціоекономічний розвиток аграрного сектору України в умовах глобалізації. *Тенденції розвитку аграрного сектору економіки України в умовах соціально-економічної та політичної нестабільності.* Київ, 2015. С. 107 – 112.
14. Про результати аудиту ефективності використання коштів державного бюджету, спрямованих на виконання державної цільової програми розвитку українського села на період до 2015 року. URL: [www.ac-rada.gov.ua/doccatalog/.../Bul\\_rozv\\_ukr\\_sel.pdf\\_39](http://www.ac-rada.gov.ua/doccatalog/.../Bul_rozv_ukr_sel.pdf_39)
15. Єдина комплексна стратегія розвитку сільського господарства та сільських територій на 2015-2020 роки. Стратегію підтримала Національна рада реформ на засіданні 09.11.2015 р. 131 с. URL: [minagro.gov.ua/node/16025](http://minagro.gov.ua/node/16025)
16. Крисанов Д.Ф. Інтеграція аграрного сектора України до внутрішнього ринку ЄС: виклики і зрушення. *Продовольчі ресурси: зб. наук. пр. /НААН; Ін-т прод. ресурсів НААН.* Київ: ТОВ «БАРМИ». 2018. №10.
17. Мармуль Л.О. Методичні підходи до розвитку сільських територій на засадах централізації. *Економіка АПК.* 2016. № 7. С. 80-86.
18. Павлов О.І. Ідентифікація сільських територій України як периферійних: теорія та практика. *Соціально-економічні проблеми сучасного періоду України.* 2013. Вип. 6(104). С. 20-27.
19. Кравців В.С., Жук П.В. Реформа адміністративно-територіального устрою: результати, проблеми, подальші дії. *Стратегічна панорама.* 2016. №2. С. 104 – 112.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Shepotko L.A., Prokopa I.V., Plonsky V.Ya., Skurskaya N.M. Approximation of socio-economic development of the city and village. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1981. 295 p.
2. Krysanov D.F. Rural Resettlement: Socio-Economic Aspect. Ed. L.A. Shepotko Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1988. 143 p.
3. Shepotko L.O., Prokopa I.V., Krysanov D.F., Radovets A.A., Shaiko P.V. Ukrainian village: problems and perspectives. Ed. L.O.Shepotko. Kiev: Harvest. 1991. 240 p.
4. Vdovichenko M.H., Yakuba K.I., Orlaty M.K. Social revival of the village in the conditions of the emergence of a market economy. Ed. P.T.Sabluka, M.H.Vdovychenko. Kiev: Harvest. 1993. 216 p.

5. Shepotko L.O., Prokopa I.V., Maksymyuk O.P., Yarovy V.D. Village: modern policy and development strategy. Kyiv: Institute of Economics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. 1997. 380 p.
6. Krysanov D.F. Agrarian sphere: priorities and mechanisms of implementation. Kyiv: Institute of Economics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. 1998. 235 p.
7. Shepotko L.O., Prokopa I.V., Gudzinsky S.O., Yarovy V.D. *The rural sector of Ukraine is at the turn of the millennium. In 2 volumes. T.1. Potential of the rural sector.* Kyiv: Institute of Economics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. 2000. 465 p.
8. Shepotko L.O., Prokopa I.V., Gudzinsky S.O., Yarovy V.D. *The rural sector of Ukraine is at the turn of the millennium. In 2 volumes. T.2. Social resources of rural areas.* Kyiv: Institute of Economics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. 2003. 467 p.
9. Borodina O.M., Prokopa I.V., Yurchyshyn V.V., Rykovskaya O.V., Yarovy V.D., Popova O.L., Mischenko N.M., Kutsmus N.M., Lukyanov M.M., Zinchuk T.O., Borodina O.S., Kyrtsyuk S.V., Fursenko I.M., Pavlov V.M., Unguryan V.Ya. Theory, policy and practice of rural development. Ed. Dr. Econ., Sciences, Corr. National Academy of Science, Dr. of Sciences O.M. Borodina, Corr. UAAS I.V. Prokopy; National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Institute of Economics and predicting. Kyiv, 2010. 376 p.
10. Geets V.M., Yurchyshyn V.V., Borodina O.M., Prokopa I.V. Socioeconomic modernization of the agrarian sector of Ukraine (conceptual provisions). *Ukraine economy*. 2011. № 12. P. 4-14.
11. Borodina O.M., Prokopa I.V., Yurchyshyn V.V., Popova O.L., Zinchuk T.O., Kyrtsyuk S.V., Kutsmus N.M., Rykovskaya O.V., Yarovy V.D., Betliy M.G., Borodina O.S., Laguta S.M., Fraer O.V., Blinova T.V., Vyalshina G.O. Socioeconomic development of agriculture and rural areas: a modern dimension. Ed. Corr. NAS of Ukraine O. M. Borodina; National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Institute of Economics and predicting. Kyiv, 2012. 320 p.
12. Borodina O.M., Prokopa I.V., Popova O.L., Kyrtsyuk S.V., Mikhailenko O.V., Ostapenko A.Yu., Rykovskaya O.V., Tsybulyak V.Ya., Yarovy V.D., Betliy M.G., Olyferuk S.I., Fraer O.V. Community-Based Rural Development Policy: A Scientific Report. Ed. Corr. National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Dr. Econ. Sciences O. M. Borodin's, Corr. NAAS of Ukraine, Dr. Econ. Sciences I.V. Prokopy, Dr. Econ. Sciences of O.L.Popova; National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Institute of Economics and predicting. NAS of Ukraine ". Kyiv, 2015. 70 p.
13. Prokopa I.V., Borodina O.M. Socioeconomic development of Ukraine's agrarian sector in the conditions of globalization. *Trends in the agrarian sector of Ukraine's economy in conditions of socio-economic and political instability*. Kyiv, 2015. P. 107 - 112.
14. On the results of the audit of the effectiveness of the use of state budget funds aimed at implementing the state target program for the development of the Ukrainian village for the period until 2015. URL: [www.ac-rada.gov.ua/doccatalog/.../Bul\\_rozv\\_ukr\\_sel.pdf](http://www.ac-rada.gov.ua/doccatalog/.../Bul_rozv_ukr_sel.pdf). 39 p.
15. Integrated Strategy for the Development of Agriculture and Rural Areas for 2015-2020. The Strategy was supported by the National Council for Reforms at the meeting on 09.11.2015. 131 p. URL: [minagro.gov.ua/node/16025](http://minagro.gov.ua/node/16025)
16. Dmytro Krysanov Integration of the agrarian sector of Ukraine into the EU internal market: challenges and shifts. *Food Resources: Sb. sciences etc. / NAAS; Institute of Food Resources NAAS*. Kyiv: BARM I Ltd. 2018. No. 10.
17. Marmul L.O. Methodological approaches to the development of rural areas on the basis of centralization. *Economy of agroindustrial complex*. 2016. No. 7. P. 80-86.
18. Pavlov O.I. Identification of Rural Areas of Ukraine as Peripheral: Theory and Practice. *Socio-economic problems of the modern period of Ukraine*. 2013. Issue 6 (104). Pp. 20-27.
19. Kravtsev V.S., Zhuk P.V. Reform of the administrative-territorial system: results, problems, follow-up actions. *Strategic panorama*. 2016. No. 2. P. 104 - 112.

**Received:** 14.05.2018

**Reviewed:** 12.06.2018

**Accepted to publishing:** 25.06.2018