

Original Paper



Rural development of municipalities of the republic of komi northern region of Russia

 Anna Shcherbakova ¹

¹ Institute of Socio-Economic and Energy Problems of the North of the Federal Research Center of the Komi Science, Centre of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences - Syktyvkar, Russia

Received: 22 April, 2020. Accepted: 14 May, 2020

First published on the web May, 2020

Doi: 10.26545/ajpr.2020.b00063x

Abstract

The socio-economic development of rural areas has historically been of particular importance for the development of Russia. The list of accumulated problems over many years and the imperfect management mechanisms make this study particularly relevant. The village undoubtedly plays a decisive role in the development of agriculture and the country as a whole. The existing rural policy of Russia requires adjustment and adoption of comprehensive state programs for the development of rural areas of the country. Particular attention should be paid to northern rural territories that are “dying” without appropriate state support and an effective governance mechanism. To determine the effective levers of managing the rural territories of the Komi Republic, it is necessary to determine the socio-economic potential of each municipal district and urban district as a whole for the region. To achieve this goal, a rating assessment of the socio-economic potential was carried out. Two periods of 2010 and 2018 were assessed to identify the positive or negative dynamics of the development of the area. The analysis was carried out using the selected 45 indicators, which were conditionally divided into blocks: population, employment and income, production and investment, improvement and housing and public utilities, medicine, education, social infrastructure, law and financial resources. As a result, a composite rating of nine blocks was calculated. The municipalities of the region were divided into groups depending on the rural population living in them. The results obtained make it possible to formulate proposals for improving the management of rural territories of the northern region based on their socio-economic potential.

Key-words: Rural Areas, Socio-Economic Development, Municipalities, Management, Government Programs, Rating, North

Introduction

The Nikon Readings - 2019 «Rural Territories in the Spatial Development of the Country: Potential, Problems, Prospects», held in October 2019 in Moscow. It is the international scientific and practical conference, which brought together leading scientists and specialists in this field, confirm with reports and speeches that the fact that today there is an acute problem for the development of rural territories in Russia (Rural territories, 2019).

The village takes on the negative consequences of reforms and perestroika over the years. The result was a huge gap in socio-economic conditions between the city and the village. In recent years, the state has been trying to pay attention to issues related to rural development in the form of federal target programs «Sustainable development of rural territories for 2014-2017 and for the period until 2020» and the Strategy for sustainable development of rural territories for the period up to 2030; but the attempts made by the state did not give the expected

results due to the fact that the existing problems were not solved comprehensively, but separately. In 2019, the state program “Integrated Development of Rural Areas” approved, where funding will amount to 2,3 trillion rubles on 2020-2025.

In the study, the object is the northern region of Russia - the Komi Republic in the context of all its municipalities.

The Komi Republic is a representative of the northern region, with a negative characteristic of rural development, which accompanied by the destruction of the social sphere in the village, given the low transport accessibility of settlements. 830,2 thousand people live in the Republic, and the proportion of the rural population amounted to 21,8% at the beginning of 2019. Over 20 years, the population decreased by 227,7 thousand people, including the rural population by 78.8 thousand people. Although there was a time when the proportion of the rural population in the region was 90,8% –1940, 40% –1960, 28,5% –1980, 24,5% – 2000 (Statistical book, 2011; Statistical Bulletin, 2019).

The allocated financial resources of the Komi Republic do not meet the stated objectives of state programs to ensure the improvement of the quality and standard of living of the rural population of the region. Of the total budget funds of the republic, 1954 million rubles allocated for the development of rural infrastructure, only 0,06 % allocated for the construction of rural roads and 0,7 % for the construction of feldsher-midwife stations in 2003-2017.

At the regional level, «RIA Rating Agency» has been monitoring Russian regions since 2012 and the seventh edition already been published. They conduct a rating of regions according to living conditions and the situation in the social sphere based on 70 indicators (Rating Life, 2016). If we compare the foreign experience of state support of rural territories, we will see that the countries of the European Union for 1992-2005. 16-20% of all subsidies were allocated for the development of rural territories (Poshkus, 2011), and in 2016 – 30 % of the total amount of financial support in agriculture.

F. Mantino presented models and concepts of rural development in Western Europe. He identified three concepts of rural development (Mantino, 2010). In the late 1980 – 1990 Europe began a transition to a new rural policy, which not based on the sectoral, but the territorial principle of development (Hyyrylainen,

2010). Rural development combines sectoral and territorial approaches that complement each other.

Now in developed countries, sustainable rural development is one of the main objectives of regional policy, is closely linked and consistent with spatial development. Europe has accumulated many years of experience in preparing national and regional rural development programs (EUROPE 2020; RWPAP, 2011). As measures to support rural areas, it is envisage developing education, transport, information, communication infrastructure, and improving access to social services.

An analysis of the situation in the Komi Republic showed an outflow of population to other regions of the country, including the rural one; there is an urbanization of the villagers, an aging of the population; decline in production in agriculture and forestry; imperfection of using traditional resource use; material and technical base is worn out; rural residents work on a shift basis on the road; the provision of social services has decreased significantly: medical services are poorly accessible, the primary health and education network is «rationalized», staff are not being rejuvenated, schools, kindergartens and clubs are closing down; deterioration or lack of transport accessibility for villages, ferries almost disappeared, there is no small aircraft; heat supply is technically worn out and economically inaccessible; housing is under construction, its amenities are low [MRD1, 2016).

As a result, the socio-economic changes that have occurred create inequalities between and within countries and regions, which reflected in unsustainable economic development. The problem of socio-economic development of rural areas is universally recognized. In the northern territories, this problem of inequality between regions and regions more pronounced than in the southern ones, given the severe climatic conditions and the high costs of living and production in the North. Therefore, it is advisable for the Komi Republic to conduct a rating assessment of the socio-economic potential in the context of all municipalities, taking into account the rural population living in them. To achieve this goal, the following tasks must be solved:

- Socio-economic indicators for two periods of 2016 and 2018 selected, for all twenty municipalities of the region, which will be conditionally divided into blocks of indicators, in order to determine the

composite rating indicator when conducting a rating assessment;

- It is also necessary to take into account the share of rural population in the district or urban district;

- Determine the socio-economic potential of each municipality in the overall rating for the Komi Republic and draw conclusions from the results of the study.

Material and methods

To achieve this goal, methods of economic, statistical analysis, generalization methods and the author's technique were used Dmitrieva T.E. As part of the work, with the help of statistical collections of the Komi Republic, 45 socio-economic indicators were selected, which recounted for one person, 1000 people or as a percentage of the total in order to correctly compare the data. Calculated showed divided into blocks: population, employment and income, production and investment, beautification and utilities, medicine, education, social infrastructure, law and financial resources. A rating assessment carried out at first for each block of the municipality, and then the average of indicators for nine blocks displayed. The distribution of municipalities taken as the number of rural residents living in them.

The rating assessment carried out using the author's method, using linear scaling and interval ranging techniques (Dmitrieva, 1987). The essence of the method is that the rating of the i -th municipality in indicator A is calculated by the formula:

$$R_{ia} = 1 + (n - 1) * (A_{max} - A_i) / (A_{max} - A_{min}),$$

where n - is the number of municipalities. The ratings reflect the position of the municipality in the general series according to the podium principle: the lower the value, the higher the place. For the Komi Republic, which includes 20 municipalities, the ratings of indicators vary from 1 to 20. The aggregate rating can be 1 if the municipality has first places in all positions; it is defined as the arithmetic mean. The assessment conducted over two periods of 2010 and 2018 to identify positive or negative dynamics over 8 years.

Results and Discussion

Analysis of the socio-economic situation of the Komi Republic showed that the social infrastructure of rural areas requires modernization and investment, and the development of the rural economy depends on the basic sectors of the economy, including agriculture, which is in an extremely difficult situation. Based on the information from the All-Russian Population Census for 2010, the Komi population lived in 684 settlements. In 286 settlements, up to 50 people and less lived, and in 99 settlements, up to 10 people in total. All of the above problems only emphasize the need for this study.

Table 1 shows only some of the main socio-economic indicators for 2018 characterizing the municipalities of the Komi Republic.

All 20 municipalities conditionally divided into 4 groups: I - municipalities with a completely rural population (100%); II - mainly with the rural population (44.7-52.2%); III - with a partially rural population (10.2-33.7%); IV - municipalities with urban population (0.4-5.7% of the rural population).

The best indicators were identified in-group IV. Group I includes the «municipal district (MD) Syktyvdinsky», which borders the capital of the republic, the city of Syktyvkar, which is why there is a natural population growth, the highest average monthly accrued wages and commissioning of residential buildings per 1000 people is 567 square meters (after the «MD Kortkerossky», where the entry of residential buildings is 665 square meters). In this area is the largest agricultural enterprise Open Joint-Stock Company «Zelenetskaya Poultry Farm». It produces 80% of all poultry and pork meat in the region, so the indicator "agricultural products per 1 person" is 214.9 thousand rubles. The company is trying to introduce modern technologies, for example, in 2016 a new Dutch egg-sorting machine with a capacity of up to 45 thousand pieces per hour installed; now the construction of its own full-fledged feed mill is being completed.

For calculations, we used a rating assessment technique that reflects the position of the municipality in the general series according to the podium principle: the lower the value, the higher the place. The interpretation of the results of the rating assessment of the socio-economic potential for two periods carried out with the grouping of municipalities according to the combined rating (Table. 2)

Table 1. Main socio-economic indicators of the Komi Republic by municipalities for 2018.

	Municipalities of the Komi Republic: MD-municipal district; UD - urban district	Population	The share of rural population, %	Natural increase (decrease) per 1 thousand people	The average monthly nominal accrued wages of employees, rubles	Agricultural products per 1 person, thousand rubles	Investments in fixed assets per 1 person, million rubles	The retail trade turnover of goods per 1 person, thousand rubles	Residential buildings commissioned per 1000 people, square meters of total area	Density of paved public roads; km of roads per 1000 square km of territory	The number of doctors of all specialties (per 10 thousand people), people	The number of students per teacher, for 2017/2018, people	The costs of local budgets for social politics per capita, thousand rubles
<i>I group</i>	MD Izhemsky	17297	100,0	0,8	36158	19,2	21,4	54,8	155	14	23,7	7	1388
	MD Koygorodsky	7435	100,0	-1,3	32268	15,0	21,9	45,6	326	16,1	40,3	7	2000
	MD Kortkerossky	18379	100,0	-2,4	30161	30,9	20,6	45,8	665	24,9	27,2	8	2199
	MD Priluzsky	17276	100,0	-3,6	31402	21,1	62,9	48,5	209	38,5	39,9	8	2596
	MD Syktyvdinsky	24262	100,0	0,1	36615	214,9	27,2	41,3	567	45,2	31,7	10	1766
	MD Sysolsky	12818	100,0	-2,0	30072	32,7	12,2	46,2	199	50,5	33,5	7	1864
	MD Ust-Kulomsky	24195	100,0	-0,3	29289	13,5	11,6	48,6	186	30,1	26,9	8	2512
	MD Ust-Tsilemsky	11326	100	-2,6	35534	22,2	18,4	43,5	218	8,6	23,8	8	2860
<i>II group</i>	MD Trinity-Pechora	11206	44,7	-7,2	31626	6,3	23,2	39,4	100	6,6	32,1	10	1747
	MD Udora	17584	52,2	-3,8	32231	6,2	19,1	44,2	21	14	15,9	10	1664
<i>III group</i>	MD Ust-Vymsky	25786	33,7	-4,9	37976	7,3	45,9	54,1	317	65,6	39,6	12	1395
	MD Knyazhpogostsky	19013	22,5	-5,7	42158	9,2	91,7	54,7	144	16,4	25,2	12	1008
	MD Pechora	50842	13,6	-3,6	54141	3,1	93,4	67,3	132	12	39,9	14	1075
	UD Usinsk	44090	10,2	4,3	74636	4,1	960,1	70,2	13	8,5	35,6	16	2311
	MD Sosnogorsk	43507	12,1	-3,5	47451	1,6	103,2	45,8	46	29,2	20,7	15	746
	UD Vuktyl	11797	15,2	-2,0	63152	2,7	17,9	49,2	0	4,7	31,4	13	1446
<i>IV group</i>	UD Syktyvkar	260822	0,4	2,3	44181	2,5	44,21	96,6	541	204,1	83,9	16	587
	UD Ukhta	117777	2,2	-0,1	58576	3,5	434,5	97,2	128	20,4	49,1	17	966
	UD Inta	28142	5,7	-5,9	46172	7,9	11,2	76,8	0	1	37,3	14	818
	UD Vorkuta	77314	0,6	1,3	62214	0,9	68,1	81,5	3	5	45,4	16	729

Note: Calculated by the author based on statistical collections of the Komi Republic.

Table 2. Rating assessment of the socio-economic development of the Komi Republic for 2010 and 2018.

	Municipalities of the Komi Republic: MD-municipal district; UD - urban district	Population		Employment and income		Production and investment		Accomplishment and housing communal services		Medicine		Education		Social infrastructure		Right		Financial resources		SUMMARY RATING	
		2010	2018	2010	2018	2010	2018	2010	2018	2010	2018	2010	2018	2010	2018	2010	2018	2010	2018	2010	2018
<i>I group</i>	MD Izhemsky	14	10	12	15	18	17	16	16	17	15	8	16	10	15	3	3	14	12	12	11
	MD Koygorodsky	17	13	13	12	18	17	17	15	12	15	7	15	7	14	9	9	9	11	12	11
	MD Kortkerossky	15	12	17	14	18	17	16	13	16	15	7	16	9	14	7	7	12	11	13	12
	MD Priluzsky	16	16	14	15	18	17	14	12	14	15	7	15	8	14	11	11	8	12	12	12
	MD Syktyvdinsky	10	6	13	14	16	14	12	8	16	12	8	12	13	12	17	17	14	13	13	12
	MD Sysolsky	15	12	14	16	17	17	15	12	17	15	8	15	8	14	14	14	9	13	13	12
	MD Ust-Kulomsky	14	11	14	14	19	17	17	15	17	15	8	16	11	15	3	3	15	12	13	12
MD Ust-Tsilemsky	14	13	11	12	19	17	15	15	18	15	8	16	5	15	8	8	8	12	12	11	
<i>II group</i>	MD Trinity-Pechora	19	17	15	14	20	18	15	15	16	17	9	16	8	15	14	14	8	14	14	12
	MD Udora	11	11	13	14	19	16	13	13	16	14	9	14	11	13	1	1	6	10	11	11
<i>III group</i>	MD Ust-Vymsky	14	12	7	4	16	18	9	15	14	12	11	13	9	13	19	19	14	14	12	12
	MD Knyazhpogostsky	7	6	5	5	11	10	7	14	13	8	13	11	14	11	13	13	12	12	11	10
	MD Pechora	14	12	12	11	17	15	12	14	10	13	10	13	12	13	11	11	16	12	13	13
	UD Usinsk	15	12	8	11	13	15	8	7	11	11	12	11	12	11	15	15	16	12	12	12
	MD Sosnogorsk	15	12	8	11	13	15	8	7	11	11	12	11	12	11	15	15	16	12	12	12
UD Vuktyl	14	10	11	11	18	15	10	10	10	12	9	11	13	11	13	13	17	11	13	12	
<i>IV group</i>	UD Syktyvkar	4	3	10	11	10	9	5	10	3	1	13	13	10	13	13	13	18	18	10	10
	UD Ukhta	13	10	8	8	13	13	7	12	11	11	13	11	17	11	9	9	13	11	12	11
	UD Inta	17	16	8	9	14	15	8	9	12	12	12	11	12	11	12	12	13	11	12	12
	UD Vorkuta	9	5	6	7	10	8	7	6	10	7	14	8	14	8	10	10	17	10	11	9

Note: socio-economic potential of the municipality: high –white cells (3–10 places); medium - gray cells (11-15 places), low - black cells (16-19 places).

For visual perception, rating results are color-coded. So the highest socio-economic potential of the municipality from 3rd to 10th place is represented in green cells; with low potential from 16th to 19th place - in brown cells, average potential from 11th to 15th place - in light yellow cells. In addition, in the context of four groups, the average rating calculated for the rural population.

Analysis of the rating of the socio-economic potential of the Komi Republic allows us to draw the following conclusions:

- Due to the fact that the averaging of indicators is given, the average socio-economic potential of the republic prevails, where the composite rating varies from 9 to 13;

- Very low socio-economic potential very pronounced in groups I and II with a completely rural and mainly rural population in separate blocks: production and investment, improvement and housing and public utilities, medicine; note that the rating of these groups of municipalities in 2018 improved compared to 2010 in the medicine block, and in education, social infrastructure and financial resources, it worsened;

- The high socio-economic potential is expectedly occupied by the IV group of municipalities with urban population;

- The overall rating of the socio-economic potential of the Komi Republic in 2018 significantly deteriorated by 2010, especially in groups I and II, and the stability of the average potential remained in groups III and IV, in group III the financial resources block went from low to medium. If we compare the composite rating, then in 2010 the urban district (UD) «Syktyvkar» took the highest place, and in 2018 – «UD Usinsk», «UD Syktyvkar» and «UD Ukhta».

Conclusion

In the course of the work, a decrease in the population of the Komi Republic, including the rural one, which urbanized in the district centers and urban districts of the region, revealed. A key role in the sustainable development of rural territories played by their socio-economic potential, which ensures the livelihoods of the population in rural areas and the development of production. It is necessary to minimize the gap between the city and the village, providing the village with a comfortable living environment and all necessary services.

Conflict of interest: All authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Dmitrieva, T.E. 1987. Assessment of the geographical conditions of construction in the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [Text] / T.E. Dmitrieva // Territorial and intersectoral problems of the development of the European North-East of the USSR. - Syktyvkar 31:47
- EUROPE. 2020. A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth EUROPEAN COMMISSION Brussels, 3.3.2010.–URL: <http://eu.rlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?Urp = COM: 2Q10: 2020: FTN: RN: PDF>
- Hyyrylainen, T. 2010. Governance of local empowerment in Finnish rural policy: Collaboration between policy, development and research It Employment Policy Research Center / T. Hyyrylainen // EPRC. Hirosaki University, Japan. Discussion Paper, 4
- Mantino, F. 2010. Rural development in Europe. Local politics, institutions and actors from the 1970s to the present. Translated from Italian by I. Khramova [Text] / F. Mantino // Joint publication of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and Business Media of the Sole 24 Ore, 272 p
- Modernization of rural development infrastructure. 2016. [Text] / Team of authors. – Syktyvkar, 241p
- Poshkus, B.I. 2011. What's new in the system of agricultural support in the countries of the European Union [Text] / B.I. Poshkus // Globalization and the agrarian economy of Russia: trends, possible strategies and risks. M.: VIAPI them. A.A. Nikonova: "Encyclopedia of Russian villages". – p. 197-200
- Rural territories in the spatial development of the country: potential, problems, prospects. M.: VIAPI named after. 2019. A.A. Nikonova [Text] / Materials of the XXIV International scientific-practical conference, 452 p
- Rural development opportunities for supporting employment and associate social inclusion Employment and Social Inclusion. 2018. // EU Rural Review. The Magazine from the European Network for Rural Development. - No. 6. -Winter, 6:13
- Rural White Paper Action Plan Annual Progress Report. 2013. – URL:

<http://www.dardni.gov.uk/rural-white-paper-actijn-plan-annual-progress-report-2013.pdf>

Rural White Paper Action Plan. - URL
<http://www.dardni.gov.uk/rural-white-paper-action-plan.pdf>

The rating of the regions of the Russian Federation in terms of quality of life - 2016. URL:
http://vid1.rian.ru/ig/ratings/life_2018.pdf

The agro-industrial complex of the Komi Republic: history and modernity. 2011. [Text] / Statistical book: Komistat. – Syktyvkar, 133p

Urban districts and municipal areas of the Komi Republic. Socio-economic indicators 2019. [Text] / Statistical Bulletin. Commander (editorial: M.Yu. Kudinova (previous) and others). – Syktyvkar 282 p

Cite this article as:

Anna Shcherbakova. 2020. Rural development of municipalities of the republic of komi northern region of Russia. **Amaz. Jour. of Plant Resear.** 4(2): 535-541.

Submit your manuscript at

[https:// www.ajpr.online](https://www.ajpr.online)