
Development Planning versus Participation of Inhabitants in Management

Submitted 10/11/19, 1st revision 18/12/19, 2nd revision 11/01/19, accepted 26/01/20

L. Poplawski¹

Abstract:

Purpose: There is an emphasis that planning sustainable development is conditioned by external and internal factors. The basis for such planning is a range of an area research which can distinguish the groups of similar units and quantify their stages of development. The aim of the article is to present the author's methodological proposal in the field of management and development planning, taking the opinions of the commune inhabitants.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The paper presents the application of changes in planning the sustainable development, in the context of a stable economy. In present conditions, there is a lack of problem identification, especially social and economic. The proposed procedure of methodology on the basis of inhabitants' opinions of the communes of Swietokrzyskie Voivodeship situated in protected areas, such as landscape parks and regions of protected landscape is an element of a wider research problem. At present this problem has and is going to have a more significant meaning, the participation of local communities in creating their own development.

Findings: The problem has already had and will continue to have a growing importance, because it will no longer be possible to prevent the participation of local societies in creating their own development.

Practical Implications: The realisation of sustainable development will require a total change of the orientation of all the parties interested, according to the social and economic problems (basic principles).

Originality/Value: In the majority of the recommended planning procedures, there is a possibility of economy improvement and contribution to the improvement of social and economic welfare.

Keywords: Inhabitants, local development, management, planning of development, regional development, social economy, sustainable development.

JEL codes: R58, O21.

Paper type: Research article.

Conflict of interest:

The author declares that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this manuscript.

¹Department of Public Finance, Cracow University of Economics, Cracow, Poland, 0000-0002-4147-3272, rmpoplaw@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The social economy performs a substantial role in the local social development (Poplawski and Rutkowska, 2015). It looks at the organization which serves the man and is not directed against him. It means that the social economy deals with principles and regularities of the division of this part of the national income which serves the population, describes the economic phenomena from a public individual point of view of contributing to the prosperity, as well as the influence on the efficiency of management (Narski, 2009). A primacy of the action in favour of people over the maximization of the profit that is gaining funds for the public protection are crucial principles of this idea. Therefore, it leads to emergence of two contradictory tendencies: on the one hand, it is the social order, preferring the security of the poor strata of society, and following extended social benefits, on the other hand, feeling the freedom of economic action with a view to keep the greatest efficiency. The social economy represents the first tendency, whereas the political economy represents the second one (Rutkowska, 2009).

At present, in Europe, as well as in Poland, one can notice a broader interest in the social economy. In Poland, the largest group among subjects of the social economy include non-governmental organizations, such as associations, funds and cooperatives. From this point of view, the basis of any research is adopting a dynamic character of development of reversible relations and inter-relations. Creating or transferring knowledge, and later utilizing it, is the most difficult element of applying development, especially the eco-development (Poplawski, 2007). These goals are extremely difficult to accomplish, especially in the context of a fair distribution of financial means, as well as in preserving certain reserves for the future generations (Poplawski and Rutkowska, 2014).

2. The Scope and Methods of Research

The aim of the article is to present the author's methodological proposal in the field of management and development planning, taking the opinions of the commune inhabitants into account. The descriptive and analytic methods have been used in the paper. As to the first method, it was used to present the reality. The features and tasks of the subject of the research were compared to similar occurrences. The method of source materials analysis and the available source materials were used in the study. The results of the research carried out were presented in the system of diagrams and tables. Further in the paper, the methodology is the author's own proposition for management and planning of development, especially sustainable development (eco-development) on the local level (a rural self-government unit).

One of the most important elements of functioning of a unit is planning - a similar point of view presented by C. Edquist (1997), J. Ejdys *et al.* (1999), B. Gućnia (1993), K. Havlicek *et al.* (2013), B. Piontek (2001), A.G. Polyakova *et al.* (2019), J. Szlachta (1997), A. Zielinska (2004 and 2008), C. Brown and P. Jackson (1990),

J. Crompton (1981), B. Fiedor (2002), S. Czaja *et al.* (1997), A. Wos and J. St. Zegar (2004). A new qualitative phenomenon is also a participation of local environment, as they should support actions on their behalf, not limiting themselves only to demanding help from the state (Poplawski and Rutkowska, 2014).

The methodical standards of the strategy preparation are commonly known in the traditional method, and the example can be the proposition, where employment of inhabitants in this process has been included, as proposed by the author. The very difficult problem of preparing a strategy based on the method of an ideal pattern is still in the research phase, but the mainframe already exists. The problem of this method, often proposed within the range of sustained development, is the issue of “an ideal pattern”, or else, the lack of practical interpretation based on concrete models and indicator frames, as well as the tools for their realization, with a far-fetched postulation and a varied interpretation of this concept (Poplawski, 2009).

In the process of development planning, an element considered currently is a considerable participation of local environments, with the involvement of the most significant representatives of this society. The standard in this strategy on the local level is building the capacity of self-governments for partnership, as well as creating a solid base for social communication in the process of creation, verification, and the realisation of the vision of development.

The basis for socialising the process of strategy building and strategy realisation is creating partnership of understanding, frequently with the help of polling the inhabitants, social consultations, and collecting opinions on a given subject. The aim of socialising the process of strategy building and monitoring its realisation is taking the inhabitants’ opinions and ideas for the development into consideration. The involvement of the inhabitants into the planning process and acting for the benefit of the local development is significant due to its effects, since only then the inhabitants identify themselves with those activities. Conducting partnership planning also requires creating databases, which serve to monitor the goals accomplishment processes (Poplawski, 2007).

It is vital to indicate the base for eco-development, according to the recommendation of Agenda 21. It means to rely on the socialized communication process, regarded as a key tool of the local democracy development. This will be an especially important element in implementing eco-development in situations generating conflicts, where different groups will present different approaches to the same issue.

3. Methodology versus Realization of Local Development

The questionnaire of the interview with the inhabitants of protected areas embraced three parts including assumed aims of the work: the first one was devoted to the characteristics of a respondent (age, education, material situation, and in the case of agroculturists, for instance, the way of obtaining a farm, etc). The majority of the

questions concerned opinions and views of the inhabitants concerning subjects related to the possibility of development of their commune and legally protected areas. In the first part the respondents pointed to replies in the scale from 1 to 9 among the reasons which make the development more difficult or create chances for development of a given direction (9 – the most impeding or creating chances). In order to systematize those results, the answers have been divided into three groups, that is 1-3 the least impeding or creating chances for development in the smallest degree, 4-6 factors impeding and creating chances, 7-9 are the most impeding factors and those which create the biggest chances of particular directions, which include tourism, services, craft, industry, agriculture, agricultural and food processing as well as on the basis of actions aiming at environment protection.

Moreover, the inhabitants pointed to the most necessary directions leading to environment protection, including material protection, health protection and social care, forming consciousness and social attitudes.

The questions were addressed to the respondents so that the inhabitants could express their opinions on the development of economic potential of the commune, the inhabitants' safety, forming environment protection and a space structure. The surveys included the following themes and directions of the economic development:

- the assessment of the influence of the commune's economic potential on its development and current condition including the inhabitants' opinion on the subject of a protected area (a landscape park, a region of protected landscape);
- the directions of development preferred by the inhabitants;
- the influence of institutions upon the development of the commune;
- the assessment of qualities and social attitudes of the inhabitants;
- the influence of the commune's space structure upon development;
- the most urgent directions of activities of the commune authorities which require realization;
- the opinions concerning actions which should be undertaken in co-operation with the neighbouring communes;
- the opinions regarding chances and development barriers influencing the development of tourism, services, handicraft, industry and minor production, agricultural and food processing, agriculture and actions aiming at nature protection;
- defining material objectives and the inhabitants' safety which are the most significant and their fastest solutions are related to the smallest costs;
- pointing to the most meaningful aims in the fields of the economic potential development, health and social care, environment shaping and protection, the inhabitants' attitudes and consciousness as well as the state of infrastructure (economic, social and technical);
- pointing to problems which are the most troublesome and should constitute a priority range of the commune's activity.

In this group of questions respondents answered in the scale from 1 to 9, where 1 is a negative grade and 9 – positive or 1-3 the least urgent or desired actions and 7-9 the most desired and urgent ones. In the remaining questions the respondents marked a correct answer or expressed their attitude replying: yes, no, I do not know. Additionally, the respondents were asked:

- about their inclination to mobilize and organize themselves if it is necessary in the light of a situation, for instance, a natural calamity;
- if they know and are interested in a local plan of space development;
- who has the greatest influence upon decisions which are made up in the commune.

In the next stage of the research the respondents were asked:

- about the inhabitants' ecological consciousness;
- from whom they expect assistance in implementing eco-development and if this would cause positive changes.

The respondents also pointed to profits and restrictions which are brought by rural areas in the commune as well as perspectives of development, especially after entering the European Union. Next, they expressed their opinions regarding the ways of making a protected area more attractive in terms of tourism as well as conditions and possibilities of investing in the economic activity in this area.

Furthermore, they expressed their opinions about barriers for the development of tourism, services, handicraft, industry and minor production, agricultural and food processing, agriculture and actions aiming at nature protection. Later on, the respondents answered the questions concerning barriers and opportunities for development of directions in the above mentioned courses of development. For example, the following are the main barriers for development of tourism in the commune they mentioned:

- lack of tourists interested in visiting the commune;
- lack of financial resources for such development;
- lack of tourist infrastructure;
- lack of economic instruments supporting such development;
- lack of interest of the commune inhabitants in the development of tourism;
- unprofitability of the tourist activity;
- lack of the organised tourist network e.g. a track network;
- lack of an accommodation base.

Table 1 shows support tools for opportunities of development for each direction.

Table 1. Opportunities of development for every direction - tools

Aspect of Development \ Tools	Tourism	Services	Handicraft	Industry and small-scale production	Nature protection	Agricultural and food processing	Agriculture
Property tax allowances and exemptions							
Hire of state property or self-government's property at preferential prices							
Free economic and legal consultancy							
Means of transport tax allowances and exemptions							
Credit guarantees							
other							

Source: The author's methodological suggestion.

Table 2 shows support tools for opportunities of development for each direction with the use of various tools.

Table 2. Opportunities of development for every direction - support tools (the case study from the research – opinions in %)

Aspect of Development \ Tools	Tourism	Services	Handicraft	Industry and small-scale production	Nature protection	Agricultural and food processing	Agriculture
Property tax allowances and exemptions	68.5	70.7	69.6	75.0	67.4	71.7	68.5
Hire of state property or self-government's property at preferential prices	63.0	70.7	64.1	72.8	73.9	75.0	67.4
Free economic and legal consultancy	68.5	68.5	67.4	72.8	67.4	73.9	64.1
Means of transport tax allowances and exemptions	69.6	66.3	64.1	70.7	66.3	71.7	70.7
Credit guarantees	72.8	72.8	63.0	79.3	69.6	73.9	69.6

other	7.6	4.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	7.6
-------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Source: Results from own research from one of the communes (from Poplawski 2009).

In the next part of the questionnaire the respondents, who were agriculturists, were asked to express their views concerning the ways of the non-agricultural development and activity, including agrotourism. Simultaneously, they were asked what economic instruments could affect nature protection, particularly the development of ecological agriculture and extending knowledge in this range. The last group of the questions regarded the opinions and reservations relating to Poland's joining the European Union as well as institutions which might be helpful in implementing the methods of ecological production.

A similar point of view presented by Cehlar *et al.* (2015), Cismas *et al.* (2017), Lekkas *et al.* (1997), Brueckner (2011), Paparrizos *et al.* (2016), Lekkas *et al.* (2017), Schuck (2014), Lamprou and Vagionas (2017), Stiglitz (1989), Konisky and Teodoro (2016), Welch (2015), Straka *et al.* (2014), Garcia (2011), Johannsen and Fill (2017), Sánchez-González *et al.* (2017), Lohrmann and Reichert (2016), Rahmat (2019), Rofiq and Pramono (2019), Rutkowska and Rembielak-Vitchev (2008), and Damme *et al.* (2017).

4. Conclusion

The participation of local communes in shaping their development will receive more and more importance. The society's participation in the realisation of sustainable development will require a total change of the orientation of all the parties interested, according to the social and economic problems (basic principles). This problem has already had and will continue to have a growing importance, because it will no longer be possible to prevent the participation of local societies in creating their own development. Consequently, the following suggestions should be presented (Poplawski and Rutkowska, 2014):

- In the majority of the recommended planning procedures, there is a possibility of economy improvement and contribution to the improvement of social and economic welfare.
- The scientific-technical progress and the processes of economic transformation require considering modern factors of development, including economic conditions (the structure of economy, its capability of transformation) and socio-political conditions (predispositions to progress and innovation, efficiency of the economic system). The traditional development factors need rethinking.
- From the point of view of the local and regional development, the basis of all research in this field is accepting as the base of the dynamic character of development, the reflexive relations, the correlations, as well as monitoring the processes which will take place with the active participation of local societies.

The proposed procedure of methodology on the basis of the opinions of the inhabitants of the communes of Swietokrzyskie Voivodeship situated in protected areas, i.e. in landscape parks and regions of protected landscape is an element of a wider research problem. At present, this problem has and is going to have a more significant meaning, i.e. participation of local communities in creating their own development. This will be an element especially important in implementing eco-development in situations bringing conflicts, where different groups will represent different approach to the same is.

References:

- Brown, C., Jackson, P. 1990. *Public Sector Economics*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 28-29.
- Brueckner, J.K. 2011. *Urban Sprawl and Land-Use Controls*. In *Lectures on Urban Economics*, MIT Press, 69-90.
- Cehlar, M., Domaracka, L., Simko, I. and Puzder, M. 2015. Mineral resource extraction and its political risks. *Journal Production Management and Engineering Sciences—Scientific Publication of the International Conference on Engineering Science and Production Management, ESPM*, 39-43.
- Cismas, L.M., Miculescu, A., Otil, M. 2017. Human Capital and Its Influence on Sustained Economic Growth in Romania. *International Journal of Economics & Business Administration*, Volume V, Issue 4, 35-55.
- Crompton, J. 1981. The Role of Pricing in the Delivery of Community Services. *Community Development Journal*, 16(1), 44-54.
- Czaja, St., Halasa, J.M. and Rumianowska, I. 1997. Realizacja strategii ekorozwoju na poziomie spolecznosci lokalnej. In *Scenariusze ekorozwoju przy roznym poziomie gospodarki*, Biblioteka Ekonomia i Srodowisko, nr 22, Krakow.
- Damme, J.V., Jacquet, V., Schiffino, N. and Reuchamps, M. 2017. Public consultation and participation in Belgium: directly engaging citizens beyond the ballot box? In *Policy analysis in Belgium*. Edition 1, Policy Press at the University of Bristol, 215-234.
- Edquist, C. 1997. *System of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions, Organizations*, Ed. Pinter, Stockholm.
- Ejdys, J., Iwaniuk, I.I. and Poskrobko, B. 1999. 4th International Conference ISEE/RC'99 Nature and society at the threshold of new millennium. Globalisation and environmental and economic regional problems. *Economy and Environment*, 2.
- Fiedor, B., Czaja, S., Graczyk, A. and Jakubczyk, Z. 2002. *Podstawy ekonomii srodowiska i zasobow naturalnych*, Wyd. C.H. Beck, Warszawa.
- Garcia, D.L. 2011. Governments, the Public Interest, and Standards Setting. In *Opening Standards: The Global Politics of Interoperability*, MIT Press, 33-44.
- Gucnia, B. 1993. Planowanie strategiczne. In: *Rozwoj lokalny i regionalny w okresie transformacji gospodarki polskiej*, red A. Jewtuchowicz, UL, Łodz.
- Havlicek, K., Thalassinou, I.E., Berezkinova, L. 2013. Innovation Management and Controlling in SMEs. *European Research Studies Journal*, 16(4), 57-70.
- Johannsen, F., Fill, H.G. 2017. Meta Modeling for Business Process Improvement. *Business and Information Systems Engineering*, 59(4), 251-275.
- Konisky, D.M., Teodoro, M.P. 2016. When Governments Regulate Governments. *American Journal of Political Science*, 60(3), 559-574.
- Kudlacz, A. 1999. *Programowanie rozwoju regionalnego*: Wyd. PWN Warszawa.
- Lamprou, A., Vagiona, D. 2017. An innovative Strategic Spatial Planning Model: The

- Municipal Unity of Themi (Thessaloniki-Greece) case study. *Cogent Social Sciences*.
- Lekkas, T.D., Razis, Y. and Filis, E. 1997. First results of a pilot project for packaging waste recycling in Maroussi and Vrilissia, Greece. *Journal Waste Management & Research*, Volume 15, Issue 5, 495-506.
- Lekkas, D.F., Klontza, E.E., Galogiannis, K., Vrentzou, K., Goltziou, A. and Alexopoulos, Ch. 2017. *Geo Ergon Paideia: Startup farm: Skills for future ecofarmers*, speech on EST2017_01403, 2017.
- Lohrmann, M., Reichert, M. 2016. Effective application of process improvement patterns to business processes. *Software and Systems Modeling*, 15(2), 353-375.
- Narski, Z. 2009. *Ekonomia społeczna*. Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.
- Paparrizos, S., Maris, F. and Matzarakis, A. 2016. Integrated analysis and mapping of aridity over Greek areas with different climate conditions, *Global NEST Journal*, 18(1), 131-145.
- Polyakova, A.G., Loginov, M.P., Serebrennikova, A.I., Thalassinou, E.I. 2019. Design of a Socio-economic Processes Monitoring System Based on Network Analysis and Big Data. *International Journal of Economics & Business Administration*, 7(1), 130-139.
- Piontek, B. 2001. Effectiveness in environmental protection and implementation of sustainable development principle, *Ekonomia i środowisko*, no 3, (20).
- Poplawski, L. 2007. Database as the foundation of eco-development planning on local level. *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 4A, Olsztyn.
- Poplawski, L. 2009. *Uwarunkowania ekorozwoju gmin wiejskich na obszarach chronionych województwa świętokrzyskiego*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Rahmat, A. 2019. Social Capital, Leadership and Compensation against Entrepreneurial Behavior. *European Research Studies Journal*, Volume XXII, Issue 3, 405-413.
- Rofiq, S.A., Pramono S. 2019. The Role of Strategic Planning and Flexibility in Shaping SMEs Market Orientation in Turbulence Business Environment. *European Research Studies Journal*, Volume XXII, Issue 1, 221-236.
- Rutkowska, M., Rembielak-Vitchev, G. 2008. Concept of sustainable development in regions. in: *Hradecké ekonomické dny 2008: strategie rozvoje regionu a statu: vedecká konference*, Hradec Kralove, 5.2.-6.2. Hradec Kralove: Gaudeamus.
- Sánchez-González, L., García, F., Ruiz, F., Piattini, M. 2017. A case study about the improvement of business process models driven by indicators. *Software and Systems Modeling*, Volume 16, Issue 3, 759-788.
- Rutkowska, M. 2009. *Spoleczna gospodarka rynkowa a ubezpieczenia zdrowotne – wskazania dla Polski*, Bałtyckie Forum Zdrowia, Szczecin.
- Rutkowska-Podolowska, M., Poplawski, L. 2014. A social economy sustainable development and possible forms of teaching / Rutkowska-Podolowska Małgorzata, Poplawski Lukasz. W: *Determinanty sociálneho rozvoja: Vzdelávanie ako determinant rozvoja sociálneho podnikania: medzinárodná vedecká konferencia*, Banská Bystrica, 6 a 7 novembra 2014: zborník vedeckých štúdií / Ed. Erika Ľapinová, Jolana Gubalová. Banská Bystrica: Vydavateľstvo UMB–Belianum, 1-6.
- Rutkowska-Podolowska, M., Poplawski, L. 2015. *Ekonomia społeczna na tle problemów zrównowozonego rozwoju* / Małgorzata Rutkowska-Podolowska, Lukasz Poplawski. *Studia i Prace Wydziału Nauk Ekonomicznych i Zarządzania (Uniwersytet Szczeciński)*. nr 40, 155-165, *Problemy współczesnej ekonomii*, T. 2.
- Schuck, P.H. 2014. *Success, Failure, and in Between. In Why Government Fails so Often: And How it Can Do Better*. Princeton University Press, 39-63.

- Stiglitz, J.E. 1989. Markets, Market Failures, and Development. *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 79, No. 2, Papers and Proceedings of the Hundred and First Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association, May 1989, 197-203.
- Straka, M., Bindzar, P., Kadukova, A. 2014. Utilization of the multicriteria decision-making methods for the needs of mining industry. *Acta Montanistica Slovaca*, Volume 19, number 4, 199-206.
- Strategia rozwoju gmin wiejskich na terenach przyrodniczo cennych. 1999. Ed. K. Dubel, Fundacja Centrum Edukacji Ekologicznej Wsi, Krosno.
- Szlachta, J. 1997. Programowanie rozwoju regionalnego w Unii Europejskiej. *Studia KPZK PAN t.CV*.
- Welch, J., Rimes H., Bozeman B. 2015. *Public Value Mapping*. In *Public Value and Public Administration*. Georgetown University Press, 131-146.
- Wos, A., Zegar, J.St. 2004. Rolnictwo społecznie zrównowazone – w poszukiwaniu nowego modelu dla Polski. *Wies i Rolnictwo*, nr 3, (124).
- Zielinska, A. 2004. Sustainable Development Indices as an Element of Local Strategies. In *Regional Strategies for Sustainable Development*, Stefan Kozlowski (ed.), Wydawnictwo Ekonomia i Srodowisko, Bialystok, 224-225.
- Zielinska, A. 2008. The regional Data Bank as a Database for Calculation of the Sustainable Development Indices in Municipality, District or Province Modules. *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3B, 559-564.