DANUTA GUZAL-DEC

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT IN PERIPHERAL RURAL AREAS – CONCEPTIONS AND CHALLENGES

JEL Codes: R 58

Summary: The aim of the article is to systematize the achievements in the theoretical foundations of selected development concepts in relation to the development of territorial units located in rural peripheral areas and concepts useful in the diagnosis and management of local development. The work reviews the concept of socio-economic development: sustainable, multifunctional, neo-endogenous, intelligent and inclusive, and the concept of path dependency, resilience and territorial approach as a concept referring to diagnosis and development management. Sustainable development was considered a superior concept, which results from the axiological potential – the concept of development adopting an over-centric value system as an axiological foundation. At the same time, it was recognized that the local system (with economic periphery features) lacking sufficient own potential requires intervention by public authorities, which, through the implementation of specific policies, should stimulate the stimulation of endogenous potential. On the other hand, the operationalization of the smart villages concept makes it possible to identify rural growth poles, in relation to which the support should be aimed at increasing their supralocal influence.

Key words: development, local development, concepts of socio-economic development, rural peripheral areas.

1. INTRODUCTION

Development of territorial units (perceived on the plain of social-economic and spatial development) is a complex process, which results from the complexity of such units as well as their surroundings. Communes that form basic territorial units have a character of local social and economic systems that in turn function within some larger mezo- and macrosystems so developmental stimuli may appear either inside such units as well as outside them – in their surroundings. The unit's geographical size as well as the number of inhabitants may influence considerably the character of such spatial unit's developmental processes. Progress

in big cities will take place according to different developmental trajectories as compared to small towns or municipal and rural units.

It is especially difficult as regards searching for correct conceptions and adopting adequate practical actions to create and manage development in rural peripheral areas. In the social and economic sciences, one may come across a few types of definitions referring to peripheral areas (regions). According to the spatial criterion, peripheral areas are defined as areas distant from economic centres and hard to reach as regards transport [Goodal 1987]. In the economic and political dimension, peripheral areas are defined not only as areas distant from economic centres and not easily available but also as the ones that are economically dependant on economic and political centres [Idczak 2013]. Other definitions quote the features of weak economic development, such as specialization in agricultural and forest products or raw material economy, basing production on cheap and inefficient labour, low level of infrastructure and managing development or low level of innovativeness and enterprising. In the EU cohesion policy, the basic criterion defining peripheral character is low level of economic development measured by GDP per capita according to the parity of purchasing power. Regions that cannot reach 75% of average GDP per capita in the EU are included in the category of peripheral areas. Defining peripheral character is therefore related with such terms as: access, dependence, different character, weakness and distance. Peripheral character is also characterized by some relativity that is manifested in the fact that a reference point may be not only another terrtorial unit but also some selected criterion of being peripheral [Idczak 2013]. Consequently, we may discover cultural, religious and political distinctiveness of inhabitants of peripheral areas.

In Poland, according to the typology of rural peripheral areas as regards their anatomy of social and economic structure introduced by Stanny [2011] one may differentiate three types of communes with dominant agricultural function, described as relatively monofunctional. This includes monofunctional character of communes based on family run farms (main location: central and eastern Poland), post-state-owned-farm monofunctionality of communes with small farms and with no agricultural diversification as well as those with various sources of income (southern Poland and the Silesian Industrialized Region).

When considering the development potential of rural areas in Poland, many conditions of that process are quoted. In spite of a visible effect of modernization of the agricultural sector and improvement of the level and standard of living of the inhabitants of such rural areas achieved with considerable support of the EU funds, there are still discernible problems of structural nature in such areas [Sikorska 2013]. Besides that, recently more and more often challenges facing that areas are raised, such as: spatial economic disparities, depopulation, climatic changes, degradation of natural environment that becomes visible with different intensity in some regions [Bański 2017].

In the light of the strategic documents concerning spatial processes in Poland, a polarization scenario appears – with further concentration of economic

and social-economic functions in domestic and European centres located in the basic network of centres of growth [Krajowa 2010]. It is characteristic feature of the polarization theories that described process of growth usually start in main municipal centres and spread – by means of regional centres – to peripheral areas. Growth extremes are constituted by cities that induce economic development over areas with gradable power of diffusion, and with that diffusion range hardly visible over peripheral areas. When EU funds in Poland are allocated, the polarization and diffusive model is supported, which assumes allocating resources in so called „growth poles [extremes]". However, it is often forgotten that not every growth pole will activate by itself and help the rural areas to grow [Piontek 2016]. Contemporary research, however, provides at the same time evidence that performing the function of "growth poles" is not only attributed to huge municipal centres. In peripheral regions, it is also possible to trigger off some internal pro-developmental impulses. This, however, requires the creation of so called local demand, which is connected with achieving critical mass point. Peripherally located areas are often deprived of such "mass", so they have to search for developmental impulses in so called endogenic local resources [Zawalińska and others 2016].

In the perspective of 2030, a further outflow of population from peripheral, mainly rural areas, will be visible and that comprises both regions with dominant agriculture as well as small town centres. This kind of spatial dichotomy of developmental processes will increase pressure to support restructuring processes in rural areas with different scale: nationwide (e.g. eastern Poland), regional and local ones (especially depopulation areas). [Heffner 2015].

The aim of this work is to systematize the output as regards theoretical basics of some selected conceptions of development as regards growth of territorial units located in rural peripheral areas and conceptions that are useful in diagnosing and managing of local development. The work makes an overview of social and economic conceptions of growth as adopted for implementation in the EU policy towards rural areas: the conception of sustainable development, smart and inclusive one (conceptions aimed both at rural and municipal areas approved in the Strategy of Europe 2020), multifunctional and neoendogenic conceptions (conceptions aimed at diversification and activating potential in rural areas supported by the LEADER initiative, among others) as well as the conception of path dependence, resilience and terrtorial approach (adopted in the EU cohesion policy) as a conception relating to diagnosing and managing growth.

2. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT – INTERPRETATION OF CATEGORIES

The term „development" belongs to the category of undefined, ambiguous and original notions. As Piontek [2016] points out the definition of development should answer two basic questions: what criteria should it meet and whom should it serve as without taking into account answers to these questions such term will

be reduced to the category of a growth that is not and cannot be equivalent to development. The category of growth „is ethically neutral and indifferent to the truth and its usefulness – having no evaluation criteria – may serve such development or impede it. If the category of development is not properly defined, then in science, practice and politics one may put into effect, under the heading of a it, conceptions of apparent development, and even counter-development"[Piontek 2016, p. 3].

In the article, with the author agreeing with Piontek's point of view, it was assumed that for the category of development, the criteria should be axioms, rules of common behaviour and natural law. The development, then, "is a process of transformations, changes, coming to states or forms better in some aspects (complexity that is referred to in definition-based approaches may not be an attribute of development as it may be replaced by simplicity of forms), subject to human diginity and meeting the criteria as expressed by the World Constitution, i.e. axioms, natural law and ultimate values". In the analysis of development, it should be emphasized that the process of growth should be regarded as a component of a development process and subject to such development and not as an independent category that may result either in such development or in inequalities [Piontek 2016, p. 3].

Local development is a characteristic category of social and economic development that takes place in a local dimension, i.e. on a territory with "diversified area, characterized by economic, social, cultural and political uniformity as well as common, broadly understood, identity" [Korenik 1998, p. 363][1]. Local development is a complex process, where its complexity stems from a systematic character of a commune as a basic unit of territorial division, but also from the fact that it constitutes a subsystem of such larger entity as a region. Many subjects from such territory as well as numerous factors of both internal and external character influence local development. The process complexity is reflected in the variety of definitions that are more or less comprehensive and identify mostly a subject, an object, aim, characteristics of the process itself and its territorial location. A common denominator for all these definitions is always emphasis put on the notion's complexity, its dynamic character and roles of local authorities as co-creators of such process of development. The most representative approach in this regard may be the definition by Brol that is often quoted in the Polish specialist literature, according to which local development is „harmonised and systematic activities by local communities, public authorities and other subjects functioning in that territorial unit aimed at creating new and improving existing useful assets in such territorial unit, creating beneficial conditions for economy and providing spatial and ecological order" [Brol 1998].

[1] According to Kukliński [1986] the term encompasses spatial phenomena that are completed by means of decisions or balance. Such completion occurs at the level of such administrative unit as a commune but such features as uniformity, identity and completion may also be found as attributes of a district (a county).

3. OVERVIEW OF SOME SELECTED CONCEPTIONS OF DEVELOPMENT

THE CONCEPTION OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT – ASSUMPTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION LIMITATIONS

Sustainable development has been one of the main aims of the European Union policy. The currently valid document of "Europe 2020. Strategy for smart and sustainable growth [development] contributing to social inclusion" expresses a practical operationalizing approach to the conception of sustainable development. After Poland joined the EU structures, the popularisation of the idea and implementation of sustainable development was granted a stable legal framework making it possible to obtain institutional and financial support. Almost all strategic documents contain reference to the conception of sustainable development. The issue of sustainable development in Poland obtained proper constitutional and statutory dimension as long time ago as in the nineties of the 20c.

The statement by the Brundtland Commission contained in the Report "Our Common Future" [1991] is usually assumed as a starting point for discussing sustainable development: "at the current civilizational level it is possible to apply sustainable development, i.e. such development where the needs of the current generation may be satisfied without diminishing chances of next generations for their satisfaction". The Report especially emhasizes a strict correlation between natural environment and development as such development may not take place without taking into account environmental issues as otherwise it may result in using up natural resources and external costs of its degradation may not be avoided.

In the light of international documents advocating sustainable development, such conception is a strategy of simultaneous diagnosing and solving of contemporary economic, social and ecological problems. Sustainable development is a specific kind of compromise between environmental, economic and social purposes that constitute the wellbeing of current and next generations. Economic aspect of sustainable development means not only satisfying today's needs but also securing resources necessary to satisfy such needs of the following generations (natural and material capital as created by humans as well as intellectual and social one). Ecological aspect means establishing and not trespassing by human activities of boundaries in the natural system, whereas the social aspect is identified with education and achieving the ability to solve main social problems as well as participation in developmental processes of the whole system [Cegis i in. 2009].

The main idea of sustainable development is saving natural environment and resources for next generations but not by traditionally perceived direct environmental protection but by changing the model of civilizational development. The changes should consist in modifying the model of consumption (with lower pressure on the environment) and the system of values as well as to apply such type of economy where pressure on the environment does not exceed its capability to self-regulation [Zegar 2003].

Operationalization of the conception of sustainable development that makes its implementation possible was achieved by determining the rules of such sustainable development – guidelines for those in power and citizens alike. The most comprehensive catalogue of rules possible for implementation, mainly from the level of international and national policies was formulated in the declaration made in Rio at the Earth Summit "Environment and Development" in 1992. They may be classified as rules of sustainability, permanence and rule of internal and intergenerational justice [Borys 2016].

In the course of developing the general conception of sustainable development, its reference to specific functional areas and economy sectors have been worked out, including agriculture and rural areas by taking into account strong interactions between the agriculture and condition of the natural environment even at an early stage of formulating the conception [Kociszewski 2011]. As long ago as in the Agenda 21 adopted in 1992 that suggested including principles of sustainable development into the process of conducting agricultural policy, the complexity of relations between economic, social and environmental spheres was emphasized and that strengthening the economic position of rural areas is a basis for retaining their social and environmental functions. Currently, in the process of transformation towards sustainable development, the discourse is shifted from institutional changes concerning rural development to more local ones, concentrated on providing source of income and using the knowledge of competent players of the developmental processes [Bruckmeier, Tovey 2009].

Although sustainable development has become a valid conception contained in the law, but in spite of that, its application in practical actions is rather small. Implementation problems of the conception, although being widely accepted by the society in its assumptions, result mainly from: ambiguity of the conception itself, which makes it difficult to formulate local policies (of sustainable development), difficulties especially in the case of communes presenting low level of social and economic development, observing all principles of such sustainable development in the policies of local development, including the principle of inter-generational justice, difficulties in obtaining a consensus among local communities towards the adopted model and implementation instruments of such sustainable development [Guzal-Dec 2015].

THE CONCEPTION OF MULTIFUNCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT – ITS ASSUMPTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION LIMITATIONS

In connection with adopted assumptions for the development of rural areas, one of the still up to date, undisputable and implemented conceptions of development remains the conception of multifunctional development. Its main assumption is related to the development of many diversified sectors of economy and functions of rural areas as well as their simultaneous retreating from typically agricultural character [Woods 2009]. The multi-functional development is closely related to the process of countryside revival, i.e. the process of shaping life conditions by

active and conscious local community as it requires the involvement of local resources, both material and human, generating demand for local products and services, which may consequently create new workplaces [Sikora 2012]. This conception of multifunctional development of rural areas is to address the problems of spatial developing of such areas in regions that are especially underdeveloped, critical and not easily accessible.

Diversification of business types, including agricultural enterprises, should constitute a factor of revitalizing decaying rural areas [Michałowska-Pawlak 2013]. Development of extra-agricultural functions of rural areas should be correlated with the nature of their resources and endogenic potential of such areas. It is therefore important that development policy of such rural areas should be conducted in a bottom-up manner, possibly decentralized, and programmes and priorities must be in accordance with the regions' resources. Territorial approach taking into account specific character of a given rural region and diagnosis of its developmental problems must facilitate designing of adequate solutions [Kłodziński, Rosner 1995].

Specialist literature emphasizes, however, that the implementation of multifunctional conception of countryside development, including its spatial organization, may also lead to some negative effects. Similarly, developing of new forms of business, without taking into account local natural conditions, may negatively influence its natural environment [Michałowska-Pawlak 2013]. Another problem is connected with the ability to adopt the conception in stimulating monofunctional communes with problem areas showing erosion of their economic and social potential [Kutkowska i in. 2011]. As Heffner points out, multi-functional development may not take place in every commune as not all of them have such conditions or needs. In most cases they should be introduced by considerable strenghtening of the economic importance of small towns and some larger communal dwellings that should become centres of the idea progation (diffusion) over surrounding rural areas [Heffner 2009]. As Kłodziński emphasizes, multifunctional development depends on local conditions therefore it will have a different form in every single region but it should lead to activating such rural areas. An important task of the multifunctional process of development is retaining the human resource potential in the countryside and stopping the depopulation tendency of such areas [Kłodziński 2014, p. 109]. Adopting therefore in the local development policy of the proposal of multi-functionality is justified by assuming meeting by it of agreed effects/tasks.

Searching for correlation between multifunctional and sustainable development Adamowicz and Zwolińska-Ligaj determine the conception of multi-functionality as an element of sustainable development of rural areas. As they point out, multifunctional development of the countryside is a significant factor and an aspect of the process of sustainable development but only in the situation when developing of economic functions of such areas is not connnected with negative consequences for the sphere of natural environment [Adamowicz, Zwolińska-Ligaj 2009, p. 17]. In the light of the above considerations, one may therefore indicate some tool

character of such multifunctional development versus the process of sustainable development as the multifunctional direction/paradigm make it possible to put into practice the principles of sustainable development.

NEOENDOGENIC DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL AREAS – ASSUMPTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION LIMITATIOS

Local development is a derivative of a wide spectrum of conditions that may be divided into two groups: external and internal ones. One should emphasize that these both groups are necessary to trigger off positive changes of structural, social-economic, infrastructural and spatial character. A local system without a sufficient potential of its own may not always take advantage of existing external conditions, including mainly financial resources [Czapiewski 2010].

Practice of economic life shows that free market mechanism is not always effective in stimulating economic growth of regions that lay behind economically. In economy, a concentration of production means takes place in geographically specific space, which in turn results in depreciation and impoverishing of regions characterized by escaping production means or their inefficient use [Słodowa-Hełpa 2013].

Development of such type of regions is connected with intervention made by public authorities, which by following certain policies should stimulate endogenic potential of every area. Ray points out to the following aspects of the endogenic approach in the analysis of rural areas development [Ray 1999]: territorial orientation (as opposed to sector one), taking advantage of local resources and local contextualisation based on inhabitants' participation in public matters.

The neoendogenic approach is a modified version of the endogenic one, that emphasizes the fact that local development should be based on internal factors, specific for that area as well as on potential and resources as used by local community. It is of territorial dimension as it is based on specific features of a region, where such unique features as climate, environment, landscape or social, cultural, human, intellectual capital constitute a basis for their sustainable development [Shucksmith 2010].

As Ray emphasizes [1999], one of the basic assumptions of the neoendogenic conception of development is resigning from the support by central state authorities of specific economy scectors and instead supporting local initiatives in certain areas. This alternative is to prevent supporting certain economy sectors in isolation from each other and applying of standard meters of necessary help without considering the aspect of their location as well as social and cultural diversification. In the conception of neoendogenic development the emphasis is placed on regions that can shape their developmental policies by adequate managing of external interventions. The key role in this approach is played by external institutions supporting bottom-up developmental processes. Such institutions operating in direct surrounding of inhabitants, companies or farms

should support their participation in local development processes. The effects of neoendogenic development should be manifested by the possibility of transforming local social and economic systems by providing them with capabilities of reacting to changing external conditions and being able to create innovation at local level [Michałowska-Pawlak 2013].

Implementation (and effects) of the conception of neoendogenic development are limited by two basic factors of external and internal character. The external barrier involves access to domestic investment means and EU support programme funds, whereas the internal barrier is formed by inadequate using of such means by making investments of low scale of influence and not adapted to current developmental needs.

SMART DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTRYSIDE – ASSUMPTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION LIMITATIOS

Territorial development as observed in the second half of the 20th c. contributed usually to increasing inequalities and competition among regions thus evoking a need to apply policies that emphasize balance, social cohesion and competition at the same time. Although the aims of sustainable development and competitiveness may seem to be contradictory at first sight but they may be succesfully combined within the conception of smart development [Szczech-Pietkiewicz 2015]. In the case of the European Union, new developmental challenges are related with the implementation of the vision contained in the Strategy Europe 2020 of creating smart, constant economic development inviting social inclusion. The smart development within the EU policy is used in the context of knowledge and comprises policies dealing with innovation, education and research.

The conception of smart development and the combined conception of smart specialization, is based on the assumption that endogenic potentials of development should meet the following conditions: 1) be embedded in the region's economy (embeddedness), be technologically related (relatedness), 3) communication and cooperation inside and between sectors (connectivity) may be fully applied in the case of territories characterized by large population and well developed industrial base – mainly municipal centres of growth.

In view of the need to implement the assumptions of the Strategy Europe 2020 – the conception of smart growth in rural areas, in the EU developmental policy appeared the conception of "smart villages" [EU Action for Smart Village 2017]. This conception refers to rural areas and communities that want to base their development on their assets and held resources. In "smart villages" traditional and new networks and services are enhanced by means of digital, telecommunication technologies, innovations and better application of knowledge bringing benefits both for their inhabitants and companies[2].

[2] The idea of smart villages is the beginning of implementing aims and recommendations from the declaration Cork 2.0 for higher standard of living in rural areas.

In such approach towards smart development, local potential of a village in the form of economic, social, environmental and cultural capital should be put in first place [Bryden, Dawe 2008]. Its components are usually made up of „rare goods" such as natural resources that are a basis for sectors or activities rooted (embedded) in the structure of the local market.

However, their functioning should be based on conceptual and technological transformation of offered products and services (expanding, conception change, increasing group of clients, using new technologies in making and selling), which will result in their value increase (revaluation). Tourist, health and recreational services, ecological production, production of traditional food, handcraftsmanship or cultural services are mentioned among the branches that may be a stimulus for smart village development [Naldi and others 2015]. They constitute quite often market niches that must be discovered and developed in local conditions. It is believed that besides transforming the market offer, in order to activate the processes of smart development, rural enterprises should introduce organizational and marketing changes consisting in intensifying business cooperation (clusters), establish public and private partnerships and new relations with areas of growth. A plan for such relations may be based on cooperation with a large enterprise being a source of expertise, technology, solutions applied on regional and international markets, which will enable to reach extra-local outlet markets [Teräs and others 2015].

As regards rural areas, the greatest adaptation potential of the conception may be found in the case of areas neighbouring with municipal centres of growth – integrated with municipal areas that usually have large population and industrial base [McCann and Ortega-Argilés 2013]. In such a case, the rural areas may take advantage of the market's size and external effects resulting from such proximity.

As McCann and Ortega-Argilés [2013] suggest, smart development is not a universal conception and its application in the rural context requires setting of many initiatives in a broader, multi-level management. So the possibility of implementing a smart specialization that exists in most peripheral regions is to concentrate on building up specialized relations with municipal markets and even before such relations are initiated the regions must prepare a strategy of their application.

Implementing the conception of smart local development should contribute to and be manifested by the creation of local systems of innovation. Functioning of local systems of social innovation contributes to the realization of the priorities set out in the Strategy Europe 2020. Resources of rural areas provide mainly opportunities to create and conduct social innovations (important part is played here by Local Activity Groups functioning within the Leader initiative [Melece 2015], which contribute considerably to local development according to the conception of embeddedness). Lack of local systems of social innovation reduces chances to prevent various social problems.

CONCEPTION OF INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT – ASSUMPTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION LIMITATIONS

The term of inclusive development has entered the social and economic specialist literature worldwide quite recently, just at the end of last century and probably bacause of that it has not yet received a recognized definition. It is generally understood in accordance with the United Nations Development Programme [UNDP] as a such type of economic development that integrates a society around obeying standards and human rights, provides everybody an opportunity to participate in social and economic life as well as uses the effects of economic growth and lack of discrimination or responsibility for taken and carried out decisions. It is "the development that comprises also the group of socially excluded people, irrespective of their gender, age, nationality, sexual orientation, physical fitness and economic situation. The policy of inclusive development is mostly oriented on overcoming inequalities irrespective of the economic growth"[3].

The conception of inclusive development is contradictory to the view of *homo oeconomicus* and is close to the idea of *homo cooperativus* and in this respect it is close to the conception of sustainable development. It is differentiated by emphasizing equal distribution of obtained income across social, economic and territorial divisions [Ranieri, Raquel 2013]. The conceptions of inclusive and sustainable developments have become a priority in the policy of social, economic nad territorial cohesion as implemented by the European Union.

As Kosiedowski emphasizes, the conception of inclusive development should occupy an important place not only in governmental policy, but also in the activities of local self-government entities. It results from the fact that for such entities improving the standard of living of all inhabitants is as important as meeting many conditions of their social inclusion. Self-government authorities are therefore especially entitled to initate and conduct all kinds of activities aimed at integrating local communities and establishing examples of desirable citizens' attitudes [Kosiedowski 2016]. Promoting social inclusion, decreasing poverty and increasing economic development in rural areas have become a priority in developing rural areas of the EU. These ideas are being implemented within the LEADER programme and local activity groups (LGD) have become institution involved in animating "defavoured" groups. Shortall and Shucksmith [1998] suggested that animating marginalized groups and individuals should be continued within developmental initiatives as means of promoting inclusion, even after recording an increased ability to establish collective actions by social community. Extending of participation as well as building up abilities of collective acting requires various skills and may be a long-term process.

[3] This term is similarly interpreted in the elaborations by the World Bank, explaining that inclusive type of economic development is such one that leads to reducing poverty and allows the socially excluded people to participate in benefits resulting from economic growth [Ianchovichina, Lundstrom 2009].

An implementation limitation of such conception both by conducting of certain central and local policies is also the choice of tools and priorities, identification of needs and their hierarchization (various needs by "defavoured" groups) and creating of mechanisms and tools bringing permanent results, with preferred preventive tools over those serving only neutralizing negative results.

4. OVERVIEW OF SOME CHOSEN CONCEPTIONS REGARDING DIAGNOSING AND MANAGING OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

HISTORICAL CONDITIONING OF THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT – THE CONCEPTION OF PATH DEPENDENCE

Local development is subject to both contemporary shaped internal potentials and external determinants, but also to historical conditions. The conception of path dependence was presented for the first time by P. David and B. Arthur [Arthur 1989; David 1992]. The idea behind the conception is such that it identifies the relation between decisions taken in the past and present and the state in the future, with attention paid to so far limitations of development. The term "lock-in" is a key one in the conception of path dependence that denotes being closed in on one's path to development. It is especially significant in the case of being "locked in on the peripheral path". Grabher [1993] differentiates further:

- functional lock-in manifested by establishing and maintaining of local production networks concentrated on a specific sector and not willing to restructure (in reference to rural areas one may identify them in the case of monofunctional agricultural character of local economies, especially with occurring barriers of "combining" agriculture with food processing);
- cognitive lock-in resulting from creating in a given community of cultural norms and views making it difficult or even impossible to change economic specialization (e.g. resistance to innovation);
- political lock-in that is related to establishing of local institutional systems concentrated on preserving existing economic structures.

Breaking the lock-in on a path and creating of a new trajectory of development requires usually involving large resources, both of "hard" and "soft" character. In the case of peripheral regions, due to the weakness of their internal economic and social characteristics, it is especially difficult to initiate the processes of accumulation of capital, knowledge and innovation as well as social and institutional capital (cooperation of local social leaders, entrepreneurs and institutions connected with the local development). In spite of that, it is assumed that also in such case one should refer to the internal developmental potential of such areas and build up developmental strategies related to stirring up internal processes of development based on resources found in such region [Barquero 2006].

The theory of path dependence is clearly manifested in a stable division of the country into "A" and "B" Poland. Therefore, a possible solution for self-governments of peripheral communes includes:

- adaptative processes (finding one's adequate position on a path) [Dziemianowicz, Szlachta 2016],
- changing one's path by innovation by introducing new technologies into former (traditional) developmental activities (updating of endogenic resources),
- changing one's path by innovation as a diversification of so far actions and gradual changing of the economy's profile (building up new endogenic resource) [Grosse 2007].

THE CONCEPTION OF RESILIENCE AS A TOOL OF MANAGING DEVELOPMENT

In response to dynamization of the processes of development and globalization, countryside development should be considered and adjusted taking into account the context of a system so we need to take a hollistic approach towards these phenomena and processes. The system theory explains that increase of complexity of system structures is accompanied with increased exchange with the surrounding, which is necessary as it supports the system's life. Also contradictions growing in time become involved in the systems of increasing complexity that, on the one hand are a source of problems and dysfunctions, and on the other one, may become a stimulus of development. Regarding rural areas as systems of growing complexity requires a new approach towards management of such areas. It should be a subject to the idea of strenghtening homeostatic features of such area, contribute to the establishing of heterarchical structures (elements of the same position in a horizontal structure that by cooperating with each other have a joint aim), eliminate lack of productivity and reduce simple feedbacks – usually redundant and complicating the system to no avail [Dacko, Dacko 2018].

Disturbances of the balance state of systems are a natural phenomena. The stability of complex systems does not depend, as it was believed before, on keeping the balance state but the ability to maintain relations created within the system defined as resilience [Holling 1973]. Such view of development has led to the conception of resilience in approaching the management of social and ecological systems [Dacko, Dacko 2018]. In general approach, resilience is explained as adaptability and defined as an ability of a system to regain its qualities after experiencing disturbances, abrupt changes or disasters [Drobniak 2015]. However, one may find many inaccuracies connected with the term that may be perceived as [Drobniak 2015]: system's reaction to some specific, extraordinary events and shocks; ability to avoid threats by managing safety, system stability towards disturbances but also as a conception facilitating understanding and managing of complex social and economic systems [Walker, Salt 2006].

The specialist literature indicates the following dimensions of territorial resilience [Walker, Salt 2006]:

- adaptability – structures of a territorial unit have an ability to change and/or adapt to changing circumstances of the surrounding, are flexible,
- connectivity – structures of a territorial unit have an ability to create connections,
- variety – structures of a territorial unit have a clear heterogeneity, are diversified,
- effectiveness – structures of a territorial unit provide positive relation between results and expenses in the whole system and/or have an ability to avoid loss,
- redundancy – structures of a territorial unit have an ability to provide additional elements of the system in case it disappears, a defect,
- co-dependence – structures of a territorial unit create relations between independent elements of a system that bring mutual benefits,

In the research on resilience in reference to territorial units, it is worth quoting those sources relating to communes located in rural areas. According to the results obtained by Kolko and Neumark [2010], who conducted research on economic shocks and their influence on employment in a region and industrial sectors, such employment to a lesser degree is subject to decreasing in the chains of local companies (i.e. belonging to local business groups). Nunna [2009], in turn, claims that specific local institutions, behaviour norms, knowledge and technology exert long-term impact on regional development and in such way determine their resilience level. Therefore, the way for "the resistance of rural/municipal and rural communes" is stimulating network system of enterprises (preferably based on productivity by local resources and assets) with the support of effectively operating and internalized local institutions (including informal ones). From the point of view of monitoring and strategic diagnosis of a territorial unit, a further decomposition of resilience attributes for factors determining their values and operationalization.

TERRITORIAL APPROACH TOWARDS RURAL AREAS

The territorial orientation of the cohesion policy was emphasized in the strategy "Europe 2020" subscribing it as a key element of its implementation. According to the paradigm of territorial orientation of growth and development policy (place-based) there is a need of adapting such policy to specific character of various areas in specific spatial scales.

According to contemporary conceptions of territorial development, it is the local communities understood as territories with their charactersitic features, uniqueness and culture that have an ability to strengthen developmental processes by taking advantage of rare resource features. Innovative environments create products of specific character. Such reasources revealed in local environments often allow to gain competition advantages of over-regional importance.

Innovative territory is impossible to copy and directly imitate [Markowski 2016, Capello, Caragliu 2018].

Territorial capital made up of the combination of traditional resources related to knowledge and innovativeness becomes a new factor of creating competition advantages of contempory economies. As Markowski emphasizes "up to date and adequate approach towards territorial capital points out to its synergic and relative character". He also emphasizes that "territorial capital is a source of specific external benefits, produced and available as a result of multi-functional interaction of users or separately defined territory" [Markowski 2011]. Territorial capital may be generated by skilful combination of natural resources, quality of spatial development and intellectual values. It is related to ability for cooperation and with high level of social trust. It is not an easy way to build as it consists in inter-communal cooperation, partnership, trust, spatial cohesion or high mobility of people on the employment market, etc. [Markowski 2016].

The specialist literature emphasizes now not only the need of territorial approach but even the "local" and "territorial" ones [Hodge, Midmore 2008]. Certain mechanism of combining aims and resources that are allocated for developmental policy at national level with problems and priorities visible at individual level seems to be necessary. It is not going to happen within a short time and its level of diffculty will depend on local institutions and level of social capital. The European Union has taken initiatives for the benefit of developing of local institutional structures in rural areas with the help of such programmes as LEADER, although in occasional and fragmentary way (Ray 1999). Such initiatives are, however, very minor as compared to the total size of support for rural areas, which are introduced into such areas within the Common Agricultural Policy. Local institutions play an important role in coping with growing complexity of implementing policy by building up social capital in order to spread information, create networks of contacts between participants and action coordination.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The question arises which suggestion should be adopted as reagrds the conception and model of development of peripheral communal units located in rural areas. Adopting by self-government authorities of some assumptions of certain conception of local development should be dependant on its usefulness for facilitating such commune's developmental aims. In practice, the difficulty is posed by the choice of tools for implementing such conception. When looking for adequate conceptions of development for communes located in peripheral rural areas one should take into account: specific character of developmental resources of such areas (their uniqueness, rarity, value of natural resources), their functional structure as well as the level and ability to utilise such resources in the process of production.

Influencing the process of local development of communes located in peripheral rural areas, the self-government authorities should therefore refer to the conception of:

- sustainable development as a superior and widely recognized and socially accepted conception of development,
- multifunctional development that makes it possible to improve the economic situation by developing extra-agricultural functions,
- neoendogenic development, which makes it possible to overcome peripheral character by building up of bottom up capital and effective compilation of internal potential and external developmental opportunities,
- smart development, which combines the aims of sustainable development and territorial competitiveness,
- inclusive development, whose idea is of primary importance especially in the case of peripheral communes with highly appreciated human and social capital.

Sustainable development should be regarded as superior and valid conception in the normative attitude, which results from its axiological potential – it is the developmental conception assuming extra-egocentrical system of values as an axiological foundation that is also expressed by principles of development (rules of balancing, stability and justice inside and between generations) as well as by revealing subject aspect of the process of development. At the same time, it should be recognized that a local system (with economically peripheral features) not having one's own sufficient potential requires the intervention of the authorities, which by conducting certain policies should stimulate the endogenic potential.

It is also worth indicating that:

- choice of development model (in accordance with above discussed conceptions) originally determines human potenial as well as the level of so far social balancing,
- choice of other conceptions in formulating assumptions of local development policy by local self-governments may not remain in a conflict state with the asumptions of a sustainable development, which may be for example interpreted in the relation of: social inclusion should not exceed social balancing, smart development should not lead to social inequalities in local systems, and just the opposite, to serve inclusion,
- when analyzing the relation between multifunctional and smart development versus the sustainable one, one may indicate the tool character of the smart development towards the process of the sustainable one; the multifunctional and smart direction/paradigm make it possible to implement the principles of sustainable development, however, they may also give rise to state of unbalancing, if for example, multi-functionality assumes development of functions disturbing the macrosystem's balance or if the conception of smart villages is more oriented in its implementation on strenghtening smart people than on smart local community.

- building up of smart community should facilitate creating of local systems of social innovation,
- one should pay attention to usefulness of operationalization of the conception of smart villages from the perspective of formulating domestic and EU policies towards rural areas as it enables identifying of existing and potential growth extremes in the countryside,

As regards diagnosing of local development and managing it in the conditions of applied "tailor-made" models of development one may formulate the following suggestions:

- establishing path dependence and symptoms of closing on "path of development" in order to adopt certain adaptive actions or attempt to change such path,
- applying the conception of resilience (determining and operationalization of local resilience dimensions) to monitor and manage the local development,
- identifying, revaluating and developing of territorial capital,
- as regards the territorial approach, the needs of creating projects enabling actual re-valuation of local resources, and not only generating apparent development or short term aims and showing single place impact,
- formulating and implementing integrated and socially approved strategy of development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamowicz M., Zwolińska-Ligaj M., 2009, *Koncepcja wielofunkcyjności jako element zrównoważonego rozwoju obszarów wiejskich*, „Zeszyty Naukowe SGGW w Warszawie. Polityki Europejskie, Finanse i Marketing".
- Arthur B., 1989*, Competing technologies, increasing returns and lock-in by historical events*, "The Economic Journal", vol. 99, no. 394, s. 116-131.
- Bański J., 2017, *Rozwój obszarów wiejskich. Wybrane zagadnienia*, PWE, Warszawa.
- Barquero B., 2006, *Endogenous Development: Analytical and Policy Issues*, [w:] Scott A., Garofoli G. (red.), The Regional Question in Economic Development, Routledge, New York–London.
- Bonfiglio A., Camaioni B., Coderoni S., Esposti R., Pagliacci F., Sotte F., 2017, *Are rural regions prioritizing knowledge transfer and innovation? Evidence from Rural Development Policy expenditure across the EU space*, "Journal of Rural Studies" 53, s. 78-87.
- Borys T., 2016, *Aksjologiczne podstawy zrównoważonego i inteligentnego rozwoju,* „Ekonomia i Środowisko", nr 3(58), s. 35-46.
- Brol R., 1998, *Rozwój lokalny – nowa logika rozwoju gospodarczego*, [w:] Gospodarka lokalna w teorii i praktyce. Prace Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej im. Oskara Langego we Wrocławiu, nr 785, Wrocław, s. 11-14.
- Bryden J.M., Dawe S.P., 1998, *Development strategies for remote rural regions: what do we know so far*, [w:] OECD International Conference on Remote Rural Areas: Developing through Natural and Cultural Assets, Albarracin, Spain.

- Capello R., Caragliu A., 2018, *Proximities and the Intensity of Scientific Relations: Synergies and Non-linearities*, "International Regional Science Review*"*, nr 1.
- Cegis R. Ramanauskiene J. Martinkus, B. T., 2009, *The Concept of Sustainable Development and its Use for Sustainability Scenarios*, "Inzinierine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics", nr 2 (68).
- Czapiewski K.L., 2010, *Neoendogeniczny rozwój obszarów wiejskich na przykładzie gminy Łęczyce*, [w:] Tarkowski M. J. Mazurek J. (red.), Wybrane problemy rozwoju lokalnego w Polsce Północnej. Regiony nadmorskie 18, Uniwersytet Gdański, Gdańsk–Pelplin, s. 103-104.
- Dacko A., Dacko M., 2018, *Studia nad rozwojem obszarów wiejskich – od paradygmatu wzrostu do rezyliencji*, „Wieś i Rolnictwo", 2(179), s. 49-64.
- David P., 1992, *Heroes, herds and hysteresis in technological history: Thomas Edison and the battle of the system reconsidered,* "Industrial and Corporate Change" nr 1, s. 129-180.
- Drobniak A., 2015, *Koncepcja urban resilience: narzędzie strategicznej diagnozy i monitoringu miast*, „Ruch prawniczy, ekonomiczny i socjologiczny" Rok LXXVII – zeszyt 1.
- Dziemianowicz W., Szlachta J., 2016, *Łańcuch wartości gminy*, „STUDIA" TOM CLXIX, KPZK PAN, Warszawa.
- *EU Action for smart villages*, 12 April 2017, Komisja Europejska, https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/news-events/news/eu-action-smart-villages_en [30.05.2018].
- Goodall B., 1987, *The Dictionary of Human Geography,* Penguin, London, s. 350.
- Grabher G., 1993, *The Weakness of Strong Ties: The Lock-in of Regional Development in the Ruhr Area*, London Routledge, s. 255-277.
- Grosse G., 2007, *Wybrane koncepcje teoretyczne i doświadczenia praktyczne dotyczące rozwoju regionów peryferyjnych,* „Studia Regionalne i Lokalne", nr 1(27), s. 27-49.
- Guzal-Dec D., 2015, *Samorząd gminny w kreowaniu zrównoważonego rozwoju obszarów przyrodniczo cennych województwa lubelskiego*, Wydawnictwo PSW w Białej Podlaskiej, Biała Podlaska.
- Halamska M., 2015, *Zróżnicowanie społeczne „wiejskiej Europy"*, „Wieś i Rolnictwo" nr 4 (169), s. 47-65.
- Heffner K., 2015, *Przestrzeń jako uwarunkowanie rozwoju obszarów wiejskich w Polsce*, „Wieś i Rolnictwo" nr 2 (167).
- Hodge I., Midmore P., 2008, *Models of Rural Development and Approaches To Analysis Evaluation And Decision-Making,* "Économie rurale", 307.
- Holling C.S., 1973, *Resilience and stability of ecological systems*, "Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics" Vol 4: 1-23.
- Ianchovichina E., Lundstrom S., 2009, *What is Inclusive Growth?,* The World Bank, February 10, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTDEBTDEPT/Resources/468980121856788454 9/WhatIsInclusiveGrowth20081230.pdf; The World Bank, Commission on Growth and Development, The Growth Report: Strategies for Sustained Growth and Inclusive Development, 2008, http://siteresources [30.05.2018].
- Idczak P., 2013, *Wielowymiarowa koncepcja peryferyjności regionalnej. Identyfikacja regionów peryferyjnych w Polsce*, Difin, Warszawa, s. 84-87.

- Kłodziński M., 2014, *Przedsiębiorczość pozarolnicza na wsi w procesie wielofunkcyjnego rozwoju obszarów wiejskich,* „Wieś i Rolnictwo*"* nr 1 (162).
- Kłodziński M., Rosner A., 1995, *Wielofunkcyjny rozwój obszarów wiejskich a polityka regionalna,* [w:] K. Duczkowska-Małysz K., Kłodziński M., Siekierski C. (red.), Polityka regionalna w rozwoju obszarów wiejskich*,* SGGW, Warszawa, s. 117.
- Kociszewski K., 2011, *Koncepcja zrównoważonego rozwoju obszarów wiejskich i jej wdrażanie w polityce Unii Europejskiej, Problemy koncepcyjne i implementacyjne zrównoważonego rozwoju.* Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, nr 229, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Wrocław, s. 38.
- Bruckmeier K., Tovey H., 2009, *Conclusion. Beyond the policy process: conditions for rural sustainable devlopment in European countries*, [w:] Bruckmeier K., Tovey H. (red.), Rural Sustainable development in the knowledge society. Perspectives on rural policy and planning, Ashgate, Farnham, Surrey, Burlington, Vt.
- Kolko J., Neumark D., 2010, *Does Local Business Ownership Insulate Cities from Economic Shocks?,* „Journal of Urban Economics" 67, s. 103-115.
- Korenik S., 1998, *Zarządzanie rozwojem lokalnym*, [w:] Dolata S. (red.), Funkcjonowanie samorządu terytorialnego. Doświadczenia i perspektywy. Tom I, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, Opole.
- Kosiedowski W., 2016, *Koncepcja rozwoju inkluzywnego i jej realizacja w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej (Concept of inclusive development and its implementation in Central-Eastern Europe)*. „Rocznik Instytutu Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej" 5, s. 78-79.
- *Krajowa Strategia Rozwoju Regionalnego 2010-2020: Regiony, Miasta, Obszary wiejskie, MRR*, Warszawa 2010.
- Kukliński A., 1986, *Polska lokalna i samorząd terytorialny w warunkach reformy*, Wyd. Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa.
- Kutkowska B., Łabędzki H., Struś M., 2010, *Modele rozwoju wielofunkcyjności obszarów wiejskich na przykładzie Dolnego Śląska*, „Wieś i Rolnictwo", nr 2 (151), s. 76-98.
- Markowski T., 2011, *Funkcjonowanie gospodarki przestrzennej – założenia budowy modelu zintegrowanego planowania i zarządzania rozwojem*, [w:] System planowania przestrzennego i jego rola w strategicznym zarządzaniu rozwojem kraju, „Studia KPZK PAN", t. CXXXIV, Warszawa, s. 25-44.
- Markowski T., 2016, *Kapitał terytorialny jako cel zintegrowanego planowania rozwoju*, „MAZOWSZE Studia Regionalne" nr 18.
- McCann P., Ortega-Argiles R., 2015, *Smart specialisations, regional growth and applications to European Union cohesion policy*,"Regional Studies ",Vol. 49, No 8, s. 1291-1302.
- Melece L., 2015, *Social Innovation and its Types in Rural Areas,* Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference "Economic Science for Rural Development" No 38 Jelgava, LLU ESAF, 23-24 April 2015, s. 142−153.
- Michalewska-Pawlak M., 2013, *Priorytety i wyzwania polityki rozwoju obszarów wiejskich Unii Europejskie*, Wyd. Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Oficyna Wydawnicza Aspra, Warszawa.
- Naldi L., Nilsson P., Westlund H., Wixe S., 2015, *What is smart rural development?*, "Journal od Rural Studies", nr 40, s. 90-101.

- *Nasza wspólna przyszłość. Raport Światowej Komisji do Spraw Środowiska i Rozwoju* (1991), PWE, Warszawa.
- Nunn N., 2009, *The Importance of History for Economic Development*, NBER Working Paper 14899, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.
- Piontek B., 2016, *Dylematy i wyzwania dla zarządzania procesami wzrostu i rozwoju na obszarach wiejskich*, „Ekspertyzy i Opracowania", nr 25.
- Ranieri R., Almeida R. R., 2013, *Inclusive growth: Building up a concept. International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth (IPC-IG*), Working Paper 104. Brasilia: International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth, United Nations Development Programme.
- Ray Ch., 1999, *Towards a Meta – Framework of Endogenous Development: Repertoires, Paths, Democracy and Rights*, "Sociologia Ruralis", nr 4 (39), s. 530.
- Shortall S., Shucksmith M., 1998, *Integrated rural development: issues arising from the Scottish experience.* "European Planning Studies" 6 (1), s. 73-88.
- Shucksmith M., 2010, *Disintegrated Rural Development? Neo-Endogenous Rural Development Planning and Place-Shaping in Diffused Power Context*, "Sociologia Ruralis", nr 1 (50), s. 3.
- Sikora J., 2012, *Agroturystyka. Przedsiębiorczość na obszarach wiejskich*, Wydawnictwo C.H. Beck, Warszawa, s. 48.
- Sikorska A., 2013, *Procesy przekształceń strukturalnych w wiejskiej społeczności i chłopskim rolnictwie. Synteza*, IERiGŻ-PIB, Warszawa.
- Słodowa-Hełpa M., 2013, *Rozwój zintegrowany. Warunki, wymiary, wyzwania*, CeDeWu.PL Wydawnictwa Fachowe, Warszawa, s. 129-130.
- Stanny M., 2011, *Typologia wiejskich obszarów peryferyjnych pod względem anatomii struktury społeczno-gospodarczej*, „Wieś i Rolnictwo", nr 2 (151), s. 59-75.
- Szczech-Pietkiewicz E., 2015, *Smart city – próba definicji i pomiaru.* Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, 391. Gospodraka lokalna w teorii i praktyce, s. 7-82.
- Teräs J., Dubois A., Sörvik J., Pertoldi M., 2015, *Implementing smart specialisation in sparsely populated areas*, S3 Working Papers Series no 10/2015, JRC Technical Papers, Sewilla.
- UNDP, Inclusive Development, http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/povertyreduction/focus_areas/focus_inclusive_development.html. http://www.undp.org/poverty/devglossary_main.shtml. [30.05.2018].
- Walker B., Salt D., 2006, *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People Changing World*, Island Press, Washington.
- Woods M., 2005, *Rural Geography: Processes, Responses and Experiences in Rural Restructuring*. Sage Publishing House, London.
- Zawalińska K., Śliwowska Z., Caliński J., Droździel K., Michalska A., 2016, *Polska wieś wobec wyzwań rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczego w XXI wieku w świetle badań IRWiR PAN w roku 2014 i 2015*, „Wieś i Rolnictwo" 3 (172).
- Zegar J.S., 2003, *Kierowanie zrównoważonym rozwojem społeczno-gospodarczym*. SGH, Warszawa, s. 36.
- Zwolińska-Ligaj M., Guzal-Dec D., Adamowicz M., 2018, *Koncepcja inteligentnego rozwoju lokalnych jednostek terytorialnych na obszarach wiejskich regionu peryferyjnego*, „Wieś i Rolnictwo" nr 2(179).

ROZWÓJ LOKALNY NA WIEJSKICH OBSZARACH PERYFERYJNYCH – KONCEPCJE I WYZWANIA

Streszczenie: Celem artykułu jest usystematyzowanie dorobku w zakresie podstaw teoretycznych wybranych koncepcji rozwoju w odniesieniu do rozwoju jednostek terytorialnych położonych na wiejskich obszarach peryferyjnych i koncepcji użytecznych w diagnozie i zarządzaniu rozwojem lokalny. W pracy dokonano przeglądu koncepcji rozwoju społeczno-gospodaczego: zrównoważonego, wielofunkcyjnego, neoendogenicznego, inteligentnego i inkluzywnego oraz koncepcji path dependency, resilience i podejścia terytorialnego jako koncepcji odnoszących się do diagnozy oraz zarządzania rozwojem. Zrównoważony rozwój uznano za nadrzędną koncepcję, co wynika z potencjału aksjologicznego – koncepcja rozwoju przyjmująca ponadegocentryczny system wartości jako fundament aksjologiczny. Jednocześnie uznano, że układ lokalny (o cechach peryferyjności ekonomicznej) nieposiadający wystarczającego potencjału własnego wymaga interwencji władz publicznych, które poprzez realizację określonych polityk, powinny stymulować pobudzanie endogenicznego potencjału. Z kolei operacjonalizacja koncepcji smart villages umożliwia identyfikację wiejskich biegunów wzrostu, w stosunku do których skierowane winno być wsparcie umożliwiające wzrost ich ponadlokalnego oddziaływania.

Słowa kluczowe: rozwój, rozwój lokalny, koncepcje rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczego, wiejskie obszary peryferyjne.

Dr hab. Danuta Guzal-Dec, prof. PSW w Białej Podlaskiej
PSW im. Papieża Jana Pawła II w Białej Podlaskiej
Katedra Ekonomii i Zarządzania
ul. Sidorska 95/97
21-500 Biała Podlaska
e-mail: danuta_guzal-dec@wp.pl
orcid.org/0000-0002-2143-1649