DIRECTIONS OF DEVELOPMENT OF SELECTED COMMUNES OF THE LUBELSKIE VOIVODESHIP IN THE OPINION OF THEIR RESIDENTS

Agnieszka Komor✉, Paweł Janulewicz

University of Life Sciences in Lublin

ABSTRACT

The goal of the study was to identify the level of local development and assess the directions of activities affecting it from the point of view of residents representing the surveyed communes. The H1 research hypothesis – that there is a positive relationship between the pro-development activities preferred by the residents and commune's current level of development – underwent verification. The research scope included 24 communes from the Lubelskie Voivodeship. The research basically covered 2017. This study utilized the Hellwig's development model method and the questionnaire survey method. The Hellwig's model method made it possible to divide the analysed units into four groups regarding their level of development. The survey was used to identify and evaluate activities which, in the opinion of the respondents, are supposed to boost the development of the communes in the future depending on the level of their development to date. As a result of the conducted research, no statistically significant differences were found between the respondents representing communes that differ in the level of local development in terms of evaluation of the importance of particular activities for the communes' development.

Key words: local development policy, commune, Hellwig's development model, local development

JEL codes: C10, H75, H76, O20

INTRODUCTION

Local development is a multidimensional concept that has a wide variety of definitions in literature. A review of definitions can be found, among others, in the works of Sekuła [2001], Rogerson and Rogerson [2010], Sobczyk [2010], Jakubowska [2013] or Leigh and Blakely [2017]. Brol [1998] defines local development as "harmonized and systematic action of the local community, local authority and other entities operating in the commune aimed at creating new and improving the existing utility values of the commune, creating favourable conditions for the local economy and ensuring spatial and ecological order". This development is taking place simultaneously in the economic, social and cultural spheres. It is worth noting that local development is influenced by many different factors [Warczak 2015].

In many definitions it is stressed that local self-government – through the implementation of both its own and commissioned tasks [*Ustawa…*, 1990] – is one of the main entities responsible for local development. In the opinion of Ziółkowski [2015], local authorities play a special role in the local management system, inter alia, through activities controlling development processes, provision of services (e.g. administrative, social, technical), initiating, organizing, supporting and stimulating economic development, rational use of space, protection of natural and cultural heritage resources, as well as shaping a positive image of the

Agnieszka Komor https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7532-3141; Paweł Janulewicz https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5620-1221
✉ agnieszka.komor@up.lublin.pl

commune in its surroundings. Actions taken by local authorities therefore influence the pace and level of development of a given territorial unit. Apart from the local government, activities of the commune residents and other entities operating on the local market contribute to the commune's development.

Activities of the local government should be aimed at creating conditions for high quality of life in a given area. This makes it necessary to correctly identify the needs of residents (using the available tools, e.g. in the form of social consultations), which may have a significant impact on local development [Domańska 2017]. In order to meet the changing needs of the local community, the authorities are looking for new approaches to public affairs management, among which the growing role of residents' involvement, openness and information flow between the authorities and the society is stressed [Wiśniewska and Stawasz 2016]. Therefore, it is important to identify and analyze activities which, in the opinion of the commune residents, are the most important for boosting the development of spatial units. Public acceptance of the activities of local authorities is one of the key conditions for the stable development of the commune [Szaja 2012]. An interesting issue is also an attempt to answer the question whether there is a connection between the current level of the commune's development and actions indicated by the respondents aimed at accelerating this development? Therefore, the goal of the study was to identify the level of local development and assess the directions of activities affecting it from the point of view of residents representing the surveyed communes.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The subject of the study were 24 communes from the Lubelskie Voivodeship. The paper uses a non-random comfortable sample selection with the use of the snowball technique. Two research methods were used, i.e. the Hellwig's development model method and a questionnaire survey. The Hellwig's development model made it possible to divide the analysed units into four groups regarding their level of development. The second method was used to identify and evaluate activities which, in the opinion of the respondents, are

of significant importance for the development of the commune. Afterwards, actions were identified and evaluated which – according to the respondents – will boost the communes' development in the future, depending on the level of their development to date.

Due to the fact that the assessment of the level of local development is multidimensional in its nature, in the first stage of research the Hellwig's development model method [Hellwig 1968] was used. It is one of the most popular methods of determining the level of development of a given unit by means of a single synthetic aggregate measurement. The substantive selection of factors characterizing the level of local development was based on literature studies [Bryden 2002, Kates et al. 2005, Kamińska and Janulewicz 2009, Brooks et al. 2012, Adamowicz and Janulewicz 2013, Jacob et al. 2013, Adamowicz and Janulewicz 2016, Janulewicz 2018]. On this basis, 42 diagnostic variables characterizing the level of local development were selected. The research period covered basically the year 2017 (in case of lack of availability of statistical data from 2017, data from 2016 was used).

It was then checked whether the variables fulfilled the formal criteria: that they were measurable, complete and ensured comparability. Taking into account statistical criteria, excessively correlated variables were removed from the set, e.g.: gas consumption in m^3 per user with electricity consumption in kWh per user (0.99), post-working age population per 100 people of pre-working age with post-working age population per 100 people in working age (0.96). Eventually, 25 characteristics were adopted in the paper, on the basis of which the level of local development was determined:

X_1 – own income of the commune per capita (PLN),

X_2 – share of the residents using water supply systems in the total population (%),

X_3 – share of the residents using the sewage system in the total population (%),

X_4 – share of the residents using the gas pipeline in the total population (%),

X_5 – water consumption per user (m^3),

X_6 – electricity consumption per user (kWh),

X_7 – average usable area of a flat per 1 person – data for 2016 (m^2),

X_8 – number of flats per 1,000 residents – data for 2016 (pcs.),

X_9 – average number of rooms in 1 flat – data for 2016 (pcs.),

X_{10} – average number of persons per room – data for 2016 (persons),

X_{11} – number of marriages per 1,000 population (–),

X_{12} – old-age dependency ratio (persons),

X_{13} – live births per 1,000 population (–),

X_{14} – birth rate per 1,000 population (–),

X_{15} – number of GP consultations per capita total (–),

X_{16} – population per pharmacy open to the general public (persons),

X_{17} – share of residents living below the income criterion (%),

X_{18} – gross enrolment rate – primary schools (%),

X_{19} – number of employed per 1,000 population,

X_{20} – number of household sewage treatment plants (pcs.),

X_{21} – population per 1 km^2 (persons),

X_{22} – change in population per 1,000 residents (persons),

X_{23} – number of entities employing from 50 to 249 employees per 10 thousand working-age residents (–),

X_{24} – number of entities employing more than 250 employees per 10 thousand working-age residents (–),

X_{25} – share of registered unemployed persons in the working-age population by sex (%).

Characteristics X_{12}, X_{15}, X_{16}, X_{17}, X_{25} were considered to be inhibitors (for which low values are desirable from the point of view of a given phenomenon), while others were accepted as stimuli (for which low values are undesirable from the point of view of a given phenomenon).

For selected characteristics the statistical characteristics contained in Table 1 were determined. Disparities between individual units were determined, paying particular attention to minimum and maximum values and the coefficient of variability.

The value of the coefficient of variability of characteristics describing the level of local development ranged from ca. 7 to 909%. The highest variability was recorded in the variables characterizing the natural growth per 1,000 population ($V = 909\%$). The lowest variability occurred in case of the variable describing the average numbers of rooms in 1 flat ($V = 7\%$).

In order to determine the level of local development of selected communes in the Lubelskie Voivodeship, the Hellwig's model method was used [Janulewicz 2009, Adamowicz and Janulewicz 2012], whose main advantage is the fact that it synthesizes one synthetic aggregate measure and assigns it to individual units [Mika 1995, Janulewicz 2011]. This method is also called *Supervised Pattern Recognition* [Kisielińska 2008, Janulewicz 2011], and enables a synthetic comparison of the surveyed communes from the Lubelskie Voivodeship, providing a basis for their division into homogeneous groups regarding the level of local development. The research procedure was based on literature studies [Bąk 2007, Krawiec and Landmesser 2007 based on: Ostasiewicz 1999].

On the basis of the value of the Hellwig's synthetic development measure, the examined units were classified into one of the four groups in terms of the level of local development – group I included communes with the highest level of local development, while group IV – with the lowest level of development.

In the second stage of the study, in order to achieve the research objectives, empirical research was carried out using a sociopsychological research method in the form of a questionnaire survey. The research tool was a questionnaire in paper form. The survey was conducted in 2017 among the residents of selected communes in the Lubelskie Voivodeship. Twelve of the surveyed units were rural in nature located in nine counties, five – urban-rural located in five counties, and also seven urban communes located in seven counties. In total, 1,083 correctly filled in questionnaires were obtained, 470 of which came from respondents from rural communes, 240 from urban-rural communes and 373 from urban communes (Table 2). The results of the research are presented in tabular form. Descriptive statistics, including the analysis of the arithmetic mean, were used to interpret the research.

The studied population comprised 60% of women and 40% of men. Respondents represented the following age groups: 18–25 years – 32.1%; 26–35 years – 23.4%; 36–45 years – 17.2%; 46–55 years

Table 1. Statistical characteristics of diagnostic variables

Variable	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Standard deviation	Coefficient of variability
X_1	4 247.13	3 413 Świdnik*	7 238 Puchaczów**	900.65	0.21
X_2	86.15	7.2 Łabunie**	100 Wólka**	20.06	0.23
X_3	56.10	3 Tomaszów Lubelski**	95.9 Puławy*	31.37	0.56
X_4	37.03	0 Trawniki**	97.7 Świdnik*	34.25	0.93
X_5	33.30	19.9 Tomaszów Lubelski**	68.6 Łabunie**	12.60	0.38
X_6	3 029.14	0 Trzebieszów**, Komarówka Podlaska**, Trawniki**	18 070.6 Wohyń**	3 617.37	1.19
X_7	27.78	23.7 Puławy*	33 Wólka**	2.84	0.10
X_8	348.23	286 Trzebieszów**	412 Puławy*	34.42	0.10
X_9	3.98	3.45 Puławy*	4.62 Niemce**	0.29	0.07
X_{10}	0.73	0.65 Komarówka Podlaska**	0.85 Trzebieszów**	0.06	0.08
X_{11}	5.14	4.12 Puławy*	7.50 Trzebieszów**	0.86	0.17
X_{12}	24.88	13.81 Łęczna***	34.47 Puławy*	4.66	0.19
X_{13}	9.91	7.52 Tarnawatka**	14.99 Trzebieszów**	1.68	0.17
X_{14}	−0.37	−7.51 Krasnobród***	6.96 Trzebieszów**	3.37	−9.09
X_{15}	7.08	1.47 Tomaszów Lubelski**	42.19 Tarnawatka**	8.22	1.16
X_{16}	2 572.62	922 Tarnawatka**	7 442 Trzebieszów**	1 460.91	0.57
X_{17}	0.05	0.015 Łęczna***	0.147 Tarnawatka**	0.03	0.66
X_{18}	98.28	47.08 Wólka**	133.82 Tarnawatka**	16.69	0.17
X_{19}	231.88	46.41 Łabunie**	1 227.56 Puchaczów**	232.51	1.00
X_{20}	66.50	0 Michów**, Tarnawatka**	560 Niemce**	118.14	1.78
X_{21}	486.57	24.72 Włodawa**	2 121.09 Zamość*	700.90	1.44
X_{22}	−1.24	−11.46 Michów**	19.42 Wólka**	7.26	−5.83
X_{23}	10.85	0 Trawniki**	19.65 Puławy*	6.08	0.56
X_{24}	1.09	0 Wiele	2.99 Lubartów*	1.11	1.02
X_{25}	6.08	2.44 Trzebieszów**	11.75 Włodawa**	2.24	0.37

*urban commune, **rural commune, ***urban-rural commune.

Source: Own study based on the GUS [2016–2017].

– 16.4%; 56–65 years – 6.8; over 65 years – 4.0%. Regarding the structure of education, the largest number of people had secondary education (34.3% of respondents). The share of people with higher edu-cation in the studied group amounted to 26.0%, with vocational education – 20.6% of respondents, with bachelor-level education – 13.8%, and with primary education – 5.3%.

Table 2. List of communes surveyed

Commune	County	Commune type	Number of respondents
Łęczna	łęczyński	urban-rural	40
Tomaszów Lubelski	tomaszowski	rural	50
Trzebieszów	łukowski	rural	40
Puchaczów	łęczyński	rural	40
Łabunie	zamojski	rural	40
Wólka	lubelski	rural	40
Puławy	Puławy city	urban	83
Chełm	Chełm city	urban	50
Tarnawatka	tomaszowski	rural	40
Bełżyce	lubelski	urban-rural	80
Komarówka Podlaska	radzyński	rural	40
Wohyń	radzyński	rural	40
Biłgoraj	biłgorajski	urban	80
Krasnobród	zamojski	urban-rural	40
Krasnystaw	krasnostawski	urban	40
Lubartów	lubartowski	urban	40
Michów	lubartowski	rural	40
Nałęczów	puławski	urban-rural	40
Niemce	lubelski	rural	40
Parczew	parczewski	urban-rural	40
Świdnik	świdnicki	urban	40
Trawniki	świdnicki	rural	40
Włodawa	włodawski	rural	20
Zamość	zamojski	urban	40
	Total		1083

Source: Own elaboration based on research.

RESEARCH RESULTS

The 25 variables were used to assess the level of local development of selected communes of Lubelskie Voivodeship and the results are presented in Table 3. According to the conducted research, the group of communes with the highest level of local development included 4 communes: one urban-rural and 3 rural. The second group comprised 9 units: 5 urban, 2 rural and 2 urban-rural. The third group includes 7 communes: 2 urban, 4 rural and one urban-rural. In the group with the lowest level of local development there were 4 communes: 3 of the rural nature and one urban-rural.

According to the conducted research (Table 3), the commune with the highest level of local development was Puchaczów. It is a commune where own income per capita is the highest in the whole voivodeship (PLN 7,238). On the territory of Puchaczów is located the only coal mine in Lubelskie Voivodeship. On the other hand, the commune with the lowest level of local development was the rural commune of Michów, characterized, among others, by a very unfavorable rate of population change per 1,000 residents (–11.46).

As part of the survey, respondents were asked to indicate which of the above mentioned activities they considered to be priorities for the development of the commune. 23 directions of activities were proposed, the rank of which was determined by respondents on a five-level scale, where 1 meant insignificant, 2 – medium important, 3 – important, 4 – very important, 5 – most important. Then, the arithmetic mean of the respondents' assessments was determined for particular groups of communes characterized by different levels of local development.

The research did not show statistically significant differences between respondents from particular groups of communes determined on the basis of the Hellwig's model method in the scope of assessment of the importance of particular activities for the development of communes. The greatest differences in the determination of the rank of individual activities were noted in relation to the improvement of safety (e.g. city visual surveillance installation, street lighting). The arithmetic mean of assessments for this type of activities in the group of communes with the highest level of development was 3.61. It can be noted that along with the decrease in the level of the communes' development, the respondents paid less attention to actions aimed at improving safety – in the group of communes with the lowest level of development, the importance of these actions was assessed on average at 2.99.

Next, a ranking of activities for each group of communes was created according to the average weight of respondents' assessments. The rankings created in this way made it possible to compare the importance of particular directions of pro-development activities in the opinion of the respondents from different groups of communes. Regardless of the level of the communes' local development determined using the Hellwig's model method, the respondents considered as the most important the directions of development activities aimed at preventing unemployment, development and modernization of transport infrastructure (roads, pavements, bicycle paths), support for local entrepreneurship by commune authorities, as well as activities aimed at obtaining external funds (Table 4). Therefore, it should be stated that the research hypothesis H1 – there is a positive relationship between the pro-development activities preferred by the residents

Table 3. Classification of the communes with regard to the partial value of the synthetic measure describing the level of local development of selected communes in the Lubelskie Voivodeship

Group number	Number of communes in the group	Level of measure	Communes
I	4	above 0.3280	Puchaczów[**], Trzebieszów[**], Łęczna[***], Niemce[**]
II	9	from 0.2482 to 0.3209	Biłgoraj[*], Lubartów[*], Wólka[**], Zamość[*], Świdnik[*], Nałęczów[***], Puławy[*], Bełżyce[***], Wohyń[**]
III	7	from 0.1735 to 0.2387	Chełm[*], Parczew[***], Krasnystaw[*], Tomaszów Lubelski[**], Łabunie[**], Tarnawatka[**], Włodawa[**]
IV	4	below 0.1464	Krasnobród[***], Trawniki[**], Komarówka Podlaska[**], Michów[**]

*urban commune, **rural commune, ***urban-rural commune.

Source: Own study based on GUS [2016–2017].

Table 4. Classification and assessment of the relationship between the pro-development activities preferred by the residents and a commune's current level of local development

Development and pro-development activities	Average scores				Position in the ranking according to the average score			
	I group	II group	III group	IV group	I group	II group	III group	IV group
Development of industry	3.55	3.48	3.75	3.29	13	16	6	18
Development of agriculture	3.82	3.28	3.55	3.7	5	21	11	7
Increasing the quantity and quality of commercial services	3.29	3.37	3.47	3.44	22	19	15	15
Exploitation of tourism potential / support for tourism development	3.38	3.67	3.55	3.64	20	10	10	10
Activities to protect the environment	3.25	3.38	3.24	3.1	23	18	21	19
Improvement of the condition of green & recreational areas	3.49	3.72	3.51	3.71	16	9	13	6
Construction and modernisation of roads, pavements, bicycle paths	4.05	3.84	3.92	4.1	1	3	3	1
Development of the sewage and water supply network	3.62	3.57	3.3	3.55	9	12	20	14
Creation of new or modernisation of existing public spaces	3.61	3.73	3.44	3.69	10	8	17	8
Improvement of safety (city visual surveillance system, street lighting)	3.61	3.52	3.48	2.99	11	15	14	20
Renovation of communal buildings of a residential character	3.49	3.29	3.44	2.98	17	20	16	21
Maintenance works	3.41	3.21	3.23	2.94	19	22	22	22
Launching new educational institutions	3.33	3.07	3.15	2.74	21	23	23	23
Cultural development activities	3.53	3.73	3.39	3.57	14	7	19	13
Actions for raising external funds	3.97	3.82	3.9	3.81	3	4	4	3
Promotion of local entrepreneurship by the commune's authorities	3.92	3.97	4.01	3.78	4	2	2	4
Activities to prevent unemployment	4.03	4.17	4.19	3.83	2	1	1	2
Winning of an external investor	3.74	3.65	3.87	3.64	7	11	5	9
Implementation of new technologies	3.8	3.78	3.63	3.61	6	6	8	11
Improving the management of the commune	3.58	3.54	3.67	3.37	12	14	7	17
Activities for the promotion of the commune	3.53	3.81	3.55	3.75	15	5	9	5
Increased involvement of residents in the affairs of the commune	3.66	3.55	3.54	3.6	8	13	12	12
Increased cooperation with other communes	3.47	3.4	3.42	3.37	18	17	18	16

Source: Own elaboration based on surveys and GUS [2016–2017].

and a commune's current level of development – has not been confirmed and should therefore be rejected.

It is worth noting that the respondents – regardless of the commune's level of local development – considered the use of endogenous potential consisting in the use of local resources by local entities to be the key development direction. At the same time, due to the emphasis on the role of raising external funds, the respondents pointed to a different direction of development, i.e. development that attracts people by acquiring and using external resources by local entities.

Respondents also saw an opportunity for development based on exogenous factors related to the need to attract external investors. Relatively higher activities of this type were assessed in the third and first group of communes than in the other surveyed communes. The respondents also drew attention to the need to intensify activities related to the promotion of the commune (this particularly applies to respondents from the second and fourth group of communes), as well as to the implementation of new technologies (communes with the highest level of development – the first and second group of communes).

Development based on agriculture is particularly important for the respondents from the first and fourth group of communes, which may be related to their nature – these groups include rural and urban-rural communes. At the same time, respondents from the communes with the highest level of local development rated relatively low the importance of activities aimed at exploiting the tourist potential and supporting the development of tourism, as well as improving the condition of green and recreational areas. The importance of the development of industry as a priority development direction was indicated more often by respondents from the third group. The increase in the quantity and quality of commercial services was relatively less important in the opinion of the respondents.

It is worth noting that respondents from all groups of communes rated quite highly the need to increase the involvement of residents in the commune's affairs. In most cases, this type of activity was rated higher than the improvement of commune management (with the exception of the third group communes), and also than the need to intensify cooperation with other communes.

SUMMARY

The goal of the study was to identify the level of local development and assess the directions of activities affecting it from the point of view of residents representing the surveyed communes. In the course the conducted research, no statistically significant differences were found between the respondents representing communes that differ in the level of local development in terms of evaluation of the importance of particular activities for the communes' development. Therefore, it should be stated that the research hypothesis H1 – there is a positive relationship between the pro-development activities preferred by the residents and a commune's current level of development – has not been confirmed and should therefore be rejected. Thus, it can be concluded that the commune's level of local development does not significantly affect the expectations of its residents. It is worth noting that the respondents, regardless of the level of development of spatial units, indicated the existence of deficits in the scope of similar factors responsible for the development of communes. Thus, they stressed mainly the need for active actions on the part of self-government authorities aimed at eliminating these deficits. As the most important directions of pro-development activities they included activities aimed at preventing unemployment, development and modernization of transport infrastructure (roads, pavements, bicycle paths), support for local entrepreneurship by the commune authorities, as well as activities aimed at obtaining external funds. Therefore, it can be concluded that the respondents indicated the need to base local development on endogenous potential (i.e. the use of local resources by local entities). The respondents' highlighting of the role of raising external funds also indicates a different direction of development, i.e. development based on acquiring and using external resources by local entities.

REFERENCES

Adamowicz, M., Janulewicz, P. (2012). Wykorzystanie metod wielowymiarowych w określeniu pozycji konkurencyjnej gminy na przykładzie województwa lubelskiego. Metody Ilościowe w Badaniach Ekonomicznych, 8, 17–28.

Adamowicz, M., Janulewicz, P. (2013). Wykorzystanie analizy czynnikowej do oceny rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczego w skali lokalnej. Prace Naukowe UE we Wrocławiu. Ekonomia, 305, 15–23.

Adamowicz, M., Janulewicz, P. (2016). Ocena poziomu rozwoju dużych miast w Polsce – wyniki badań wykorzystujących wzorzec rozwoju Hellwiga. Studia Regionalne i Lokalne, 2 (64), 68–86.

Bąk, I. (2007). Atrakcyjność regionów turystycznych w Polsce ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem warunków ekologicznych. [In:] W. Ostasiewicz (Ed.), Statystyka w praktyce społeczno-gospodarczej. Wydawnictwo AE, Wrocław, 49.

Brol, R. (red.) (1998). Zarządzanie rozwojem lokalnym – studium przypadków. Wydawnictwo AE, Wrocław.

Brooks, J.S., Waylen, K.A., Borgerhoff Mulder, M. (2012). How national context, project design, and local community characteristics influence success in community-based conservation projects. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 109, 21265–21270.

Bryden, J. (2002). Rural Development Indicators and Diversity in the European Union. Paper presented at the "Measuring Rural Diversity" Conference, Economic Research Service, Washington, DC, 21 November.

Domańska, A. (2017). Samorząd gminny a jakość życia społeczności lokalnej. Handel Wewnętrzny, 4 (369), 2, 99–107.

GUS, Local Data Bank for 2016–2017. Retrieved from: https://bdl.stat.gov.pl/BDL/start [accessed: 18.10.2018].

Hellwig, Z. (1968). Zastosowanie metody taksonomicznej do typologicznego podziału krajów ze względu na poziom ich rozwoju oraz zasoby i strukturę wykwalifikowanych kadr. Przegląd Statystyczny, 4, 307–327.

Jacob, S., Weeks, P., Blount, B., Jepson, M. (2013). Development and evaluation of social indicators of vulnerability and resiliency for fishing communities in the Gulf of Mexico. Marine Policy, 37, 86–95.

Jakubowska, A. (2013). Partnerstwo publiczno-prywatne i jego konsekwencje dla rozwoju lokalnego. Studia Ekonomiczne UE w Katowicach, 156, 177–188.

Janulewicz, P. (2009). Ranking gmin województwa lubelskiego na podstawie rozwoju społecznego. Zeszyty Problemowe Postępów Nauk Rolniczych, 542 (2), 963––969.

Janulewicz, P. (2011). Konkurencyjność gmin na przykładzie województwa lubelskiego. Prace Naukowe UE we Wrocławiu. Polityka Ekonomiczna, 166, 234–245.

Janulewicz, P. (2018). EU funds (RDP) and their impact on local development, Proceedings of the 2018 International Scientific Conference: Economic Sciences for Agribusiness and Rural Economy. Warsaw, 7–8 June 2018, 376–382.

Kamińska, A., Janulewicz, P. (2009). Klasyfikacja gmin wiejskich województwa lubelskiego na podstawie rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczego. Folia Pomeranae Universitatis Technologiae Stetinensis. Oeconomica, 57, 31–42.

Kates, R. W., Parris, T. M., Leiserowitz, A. A. (2005). What is sustainable development? Goals, indicators, values and practice. Science and Policy for Sustainable Development, 47 (3), 8–21.

Kisielińska, J. (2008). Modele klasyfikacyjne prognozowania sytuacji finansowej gospodarstw rolniczych. Wydawnictwo SGGW, Warszawa 14.

Krawiec, M., Landmesser, J. (2007). Analiza taksonomiczna aktywności ekonomicznej ludności na obszarach wiejskich w Polsce. Roczniki Naukowe SERiA, 9, 2, 170–176.

Leigh, N.G., Blakely, E.J. (2017). Planning local development: theory and practise (6th edition). SAGE Publications Los Angeles-London-New Delhi-Singapore-Washington DC-Melbourne.

Mika, J. (1995). Analiza statystyczna pozycji Polski na tle krajów Unii Europejskiej. Spółka z o.o. „Śląsk", Katowice.

Ostasiewicz, W. (1999). Statystyczne metody analizy danych. Wydawnictwo AE, Wrocław.

Rogerson, Ch.M., Rogerson, J.M. (2010). Local economic development in Africa: Global context and research directions. Development Southern Africa, 27 (4), 465––480.

Sekuła, A. (2001). Koncepcje rozwoju lokalnego w świetle współczesnej literatury polskiej – zarys problemu. Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Gdańskiej, 588, Ekonomia, 40, 89–95.

Sobczyk, A. (2010). Rozwój lokalny – wybrane problemy finansowania. Zeszyty Naukowe SGGW w Warszawie. Ekonomika i Organizacja Gospodarki Żywnościowej, 81, 125–136.

Szaja, M. (2012). Wspólnoty lokalne w rozwoju gminnych jednostek samorządowych. Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Bankowej we Wrocławiu, 29, 185–197.

Ustawa z dnia 8 marca 1990 r. o samorządzie gminnym (Dz.U. 1990 nr 16, poz. 95 z późn. zm.).

Warczak, M. (2015). Endogeniczne i egzogeniczne czynniki rozwoju gospodarczego z perspektywy finansów gminy. Współczesna Gospodarka, 6 (4), 111–122.

Wiśniewska, M., Stawasz, D. (2016). Critical analysis of the possibility of application of participatory methods in

local development management in Poland. Fifth International Scientific Conference on Project Management in the Baltic Countries. April 14-15, Riga, University of Latvia, 398–408.

Ziółkowski, M. (2015). Strategiczne zarządzanie rozwojem gminy. Ruch Prawniczy, Ekonomiczny i Socjologiczny, 1, 145–163.

KIERUNKI ROZWOJU WYBRANYCH GMIN WOJEWÓDZTWA LUBELSKIEGO W OPINII ICH MIESZKAŃCÓW

STRESZCZENIE

Celem opracowania była identyfikacja poziomu rozwoju lokalnego i ocena kierunków działań mających na niego wpływ z punktu widzenia mieszkańców reprezentujących badane gminy. Weryfikacji poddano hipotezę badawczą H1 – istnieje pozytywny związek pomiędzy preferowanymi przez mieszkańców działaniami prorozwojowymi a dotychczasowym poziomem rozwoju gminy. Przedmiotem badań były 24 gminy z województwa lubelskiego. Okres badawczy obejmował zasadniczo 2017 rok. W pracy wykorzystano metodę wzorca rozwoju Hellwiga oraz metodę badania ankietowego. Metoda Hellwiga pozwoliła na dokonanie podziału analizowanych jednostek na cztery grupy z punktu widzenia poziomu ich rozwoju. Przy wykorzystaniu badań ankietowych dokonano identyfikacji i oceny działań mających w opinii respondentów zdynamizować rozwój gmin w przyszłości w zależności od dotychczasowego poziomu ich rozwoju. W wyniku przeprowadzonych badań nie wykazano istotnych statystycznie różnic pomiędzy ankietowanymi reprezentującymi różne pod względem poziomu rozwoju lokalnego gminy w zakresie oceny znaczenia poszczególnych działań dla rozwoju gmin.

Słowa kluczowe: polityka rozwoju lokalnego, gmina, metoda wzorca rozwoju Hellwiga, rozwój lokalny