

витрачених на їхнє створення, або тим, скільки вони коштують самі по собі. Якщо ресурси повністю відповідають стратегії розвитку, то їхня цінність для підприємства суттєво збільшується. І навпаки, якщо ресурси не відповідають стратегії, то навіть за умови витрачання на їхнє залучення значної

суми коштів, цінність їх буде незрівнянно малою.

Важливою умовою ефективного використання ресурсів для забезпечення розвитку є інтегрована взаємодія всіх ресурсів, що формують ресурсну базу розвитку аграрного підприємства.

Список використаних джерел

1. Андрійчук В.Г. Економіка аграрних підприємств: підруч. / В.Г. Андрійчук. – 2-ге вид., доп. і перероб. – К.: КНЕУ, 2002. – 624 с
2. Боровик В.В. Резерви підвищення ефективності використання ресурсів у сільськогосподарському виробництві за допомогою моделювання / В.В. Боровик // Актуальні проблеми економіки. – 2005. – № 10. – С. 41- 44.
3. Бланк И.А. Финансовая стратегия предприятия / И.А. Бланк. – К.: Ника-Центр, 2006. – С.520.
4. Вітвіцький В.В. нормативна продуктивність – основа раціонального використання ресурсів / В.В. Вітвіцький // Актуальні проблеми економіки. – 2004. – № 9. – С. 43-50.
5. Гуткевич С.О. Управління економічними ресурсами підприємства / С.О. Гуткевич //Актуальні проблеми економіки. – 2009. – № 7. – С. 99-105.
6. Голдобина Н.Н. Управление запасами средств производства / Н.Н. Голдобина // Ленингр. фин.-экон.ин-т им. Н. А. Вознесенского. – Л. : Изд-во Ленингр. фин.-экон. ин-та, 1991. – С.71.
7. Гордеев О.И. Материальные ресурсы: воспроизводство и использование / О.И. Гордеев // Даг.фил. АН СССР, Отд. экономики. – Махачкала : Даг.кн. изд-во, 1986. – С. 229.
8. Дроботова М.В. Управление материальными ресурсами промышленных предприятий: дис... канд. экон. наук: 08.07.01 / Днепродзержинский гос. технический ун-т. – Днепродзержинск, 2000. – С.185.
9. Іванов М.І. Ресурси підприємства: забезпечення і збереження / [М.І. Іванов, О.В. Бреславцев, Л.Т. Хижняк, О.В. Левіна, В.О. Михальська] // НАН України; Інститут економіки промисловості. – Донецьк: ІЕП НАН України, 1999. – С. 92.
10. Леонтьев В.Е. Финансовые ресурсы организаций (предприятий) / В.Е. Леонтьев // Санкт-Петербургский гос. ун-т экономики и финансов. – СПб.: Из-во СПбГУЭФ, 2001. – С. 89.
11. Малік М.Й. До проблеми розвитку підприємництва і кооперації на селі / М.Й. Малік, Л.М. Малік // 36. наук. праць Подільського держ. аграрно-технічного ун-ту м. Кам'янець-Подільський, Подільський державний аграрно-технічний ун-т. Вип. 17, т. 2, 2009.
12. Саблук П.Т. Підприємництво в аграрній сфері економіки / П.Т. Саблук, В.П. Ситник, М.Й. Малік. – К., 1997 [98]. – 514 с.
13. Lester A. Digman. Strategic Management: Concepts, Processes, Decisions. – 5th edition, Dame Publications INC, 1999.
14. Marris R . A model of the Managerial Enterprise. – Quarterly Journal of Economics, 1963. vol. 77. – P. 185-209.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 28.02.2013 р.

*

UDS 65.012.65:334

A.V. ZBARSKA, Chief specialist of the Investment and Infrastructure Development Division of the Department of Economic Development of Agrarian Market in the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food of Ukraine

Cooperation as promising way of development of personal subsidiary plots

Problem statement. Due to reformation of agrarian economy big alterations happened in

social-economic conditions in functioning and development of personal subsidiary plots. It can be partly explained by the formation new economic interests of rural populations. Unfortu-

© A.V. Zbarska, 2013

nately, the problem of individual economic interests of rural populations and mechanism of their activity in the condition of market economy doesn't receive proper attention. Now, there is necessity to start a new stage of research the role of personal subsidiary plots in the country's food security and formation a well-being of the considerable part of rural population, which will include principle changes in ownerships and form of enterprises in rural areas. Now the activity of personal subsidiary plots is considered as the way of realization the economic interests of rural population. In our opinion, problems of increasing effectiveness and marketability of personal subsidiary plots and their cooperative connections with other subjects of market economy have to be researched more detailed.

Analyses of last publications. The analyses of literature and own researches give us an opportunity to reach the conclusion that different economic interests create the complicated system with existing dynamic contradictions. Such

system is the indissoluble integrity of equivalent and closely related economic interests, which develop permanently and uninterruptedly, stipulate each other but at the same time they have opposite directions. Development of agricultural service cooperation and access of personal subsidiary plots to agrarian markets become more important in the conditions of economic globalization. Cooperation, as a special form of social-economic activity, is peculiar to all economic system. At the same time the particularity of agrarian economy stipulates the necessity of this form of activity, which determines not only form of enterprise but also a way of survival for agrarian producers in competitive market.

Main recital. Nowadays, personal subsidiary plots (PSPs) receive more attention in economic circles, due to their big quantity (approximately 4,3 million plots) and big share in production of agricultural products (table 1).

1. The share of products of personal subsidiary plots in the total production of all categories enterprises in Ukraine, % [2]

Product	1990	1995	2000	2005	2012
Gross product – total	29,6	45,9	61,6	59,5	49,1
These include: crop husbandry	18,9	36,5	50,7	51,4	45,0
animal husbandry	40,8	58,9	79,0	73,8	57,9
Production: grains – average	2,8	8,1	18,4	24,3	25,3
Potato	28,6	95,8	98,6	98,8	96,8
Vegetables	26,9	72,7	83,1	89,3	88,9
Fruits and berries	46,4	83,6	81,8	88,2	83,9
Meat	28,9	51,7	73,7	63,2	45,1
Milk	24,0	45,3	71,0	81,2	77,7
Eggs	37,8	55,6	66,2	50,5	37,3
Wools	11,2	30,1	61,4	78,3	85,2

Data from table #1 shows that despite of some decrease of number of personal subsidiary plots, such products as potato, vegetables, fruits and berries, milk and wools lie on personal subsidiary plots' shoulders. Due to such situation, starts the discussion about further perspective of PSP, their role and share in agriculture of country, state strategy of their regulation, stimulation and reforming. The regional development strategy has to be harmonized with general agrarian development strategy and territory development strategy, and at the same time they have to be harmonized with general regional development strategy. How we will see the village and agriculture in the future?

What place will they take in diversified economy? Which structure of agriculture we aiming at? Which decision will be accepted about development of rural areas? Answers for these questions and many others have to directly influence into creation PSP development strategy. These aspects weren't explained in majority modern researches of PSP that is why it's hard to use received conclusions on practice.

We think, accepting the strategic decision about development of PSP should be founded upon analysis of objective advantages and disadvantages of this form of economy.

Basic disadvantages of PSP: low productivity of production factors; bad logistics; low recouplement of expenses; low level of informing (about legislation, state programs, technologies, innovations etc.). All these flaws of PSP mostly come from usage the limited individual, small sized resources.

Historically this type of economy occurred as an addition to bigger enterprises (kolkhozes (collective farms) and sovkhozes (soviet state farms)). Often, many managers of kolkhozes thought that PSP impeded to collective labors and decreased their productivity.

Despite of objective demerits PSP has a range of benefits. First of all PSP has a huge potential to diversify production of agricultural products in domestic market. Secondly, PSP is basis for vanishing rural population; it's inherently the source of their survival. Thirdly, PSP has a great social value as an additional source of well-being (foods, rehabilitation, rest and tourism, child rearing etc.) for poor people,

which are majority in liberal-managed Ukraine (table 2).

Fourth, functioning PSPs have a huge potential as a constituent for a development of big forms of economies, which are based on cooperation or integration.

Visible preponderance of advantages shouldn't mislead about promising of PSP as independent enterprise.

In conditions of rightly income distribution, main part of social benefits from PSP can be provided within large economic forms, which can use all advantages of economy from the measure.

But, it's incorrect to use only criteria of effectiveness as a guide for deciding the problem of PSP's future. Leaving PSP's workers to their tragic fate and focusing on supporting only "big players" means to repeat the mistake of 90-th, when most of decisions made without taking in account the break-in period with difficulties, sacrifices, disproportions etc.

2. Dynamic of social development of Ukrainian villages [3]

Figures	2000	2005	2009	2012
Rural population, thousands	15950	14779	14632	14228
Share of rural population, %	33,1	32,0	31,8	31,5
Population working in agriculture, thousands	4123,1	3998,3	3152,2	3410,3
Employed population, thousands	-	1245,5	764,7	711,0
Quantity of born, thousands	147,1	141,8	173,0	173,7
Natality, thousands	301,0	310,4	274,4	253,6
Average monthly nominal wages of employees, UAH	-153,9	-168,6	-101,4	-79,9
- Compare with average in country, %	114	437	1220	2023
	49,6	54,2	64,0	66,9
Average length of life for both sex, years	68	68	69	71

Sure, PSP cannot be a hardpan, basis for agriculture but at the same time it is their inseverable part. That is why, it is necessary to create conditions for involving PSP to bigger organizational-economic complexes. We think it will be perspective to expand weak agricultural cooperative sector from PSP.

We think it will be perspective to use PSP for expanding agricultural cooperative sector, which is weak now.

More than century world experience shows that development of small business in agriculture, which includes PSP too, depends

on development of their service cooperatives. So it was in pre-revolutionary Ukraine, so it is in western countries now. In France and the USA, for example, approximately 80% of farmers are involved in cooperation. In Sweden lending takes place almost entirely at the expense of credit cooperatives. Cooperatives help to unite resources of separate small enterprises (labor, material, finance, technical, land, transport, logistic etc.) for their more effective usage. Nowadays small forms of economic activity deal with monopolists and oligopolies (banks, leasing companies,

suppliers of resources and technics etc.) almost at all stages of economic activities. There is possible to do profitable business in such situation only if unite efforts, expand, integrate, diversify etc. Industrial and consumer (supply, logistic, credit, processing) cooperation give an opportunity to carry out it.

Social-organizational form of cooperative is more appropriate comparing with other big business forms, because it doesn't have many negative features which they have.

For example, alternative variant of associations of small business and very big corporations, which is realized now in Ukraine, is less productive because of such following reasons: growth disparity of prices, increasing the share of hired labor, degradation of social-economic conditions of rural areas, concentration of land recourses in big companies, which doesn't always use a crop rotation etc.

Long time all over the world cooperative form of economic activity has built up a reputation as an effective instrument of solving social-economic problems. In many countries with so called developed economy farm cooperatives play an important and sometimes main role in interactions between agricultural and other economic spheres and in developing agro industrial complex at all.

In north Europe, Netherlands, Ireland and Japan almost all prime agricultural producers take part in cooperation. There are a little bit less share of farmers in agricultural cooperation in the continental Europe (80%) and the USA, Canada, Australia (from 60 to 80%).

In countries of European Union agricultural cooperatives produce up to 60% of food products, in the USA for share of cooperatives is 30% of all sold agricultural products. Japanese cooperatives sell approximately 90% of all agricultural products and supply up to 80% of necessary means and instruments of production for farmers. Scandinavian cooperatives supply up to 85% of all agricultural products, and cooperative enterprises produce up to 50% of food industry's products

There is very important and practically unsolved problem of supporting cooperatives in villages. The government support of PSP has to be related with state support of all agriculture and respond to agricultural development strat-

egy. Nowadays there are many private strategies, programs, conceptions of agricultural development. All of them are individual, weakly connected between each other. There is no complex, general one.

The effectiveness of modern government support of agriculture and including PSP is quite low. Among other things, it can be first of all explained with private and no integrated approach to agriculture. The real economy is a system of branches, which influence to each other. Regulation and support of one branch influence to others (through incomes, comparative prices, demand etc.). Thus it is impossible to govern the branch under the circumstances when macroeconomic and branch policies are not harmonized.

In terms of state regulation it is less effective to support and develop many separate PSPs than their organized cooperatives. The state is interested in constant functioning of a multilevel agricultural consumer cooperation system. With usage of such structure it is possible to realize agricultural state programs and solve strategic tasks, specifically, especially: food security, financing producers of agricultural products, state purchases, educations, information maintenance etc.

Conclusions. Thus the state support of people, who are engaged in PSP, may be realized to such ways:

- Forming an service infrastructure (driveways, communications, water-supply etc.), maintenance of PSP, assistance in marketing, processing, service and other agricultural consumer cooperatives;

- Stimulation of PSP development by creating organizational, legislative, ecological, scientific and technological elaborations and technologies;

- Conduct of activities for increasing qualities of productive and tribal agricultural animals, organizing of artificial insemination of agricultural animals;

- Yearly free vetting of animals, organizing veterinary services, fighting with communicable diseases of animals;

- Measures of state support, which are provided by Ukrainian laws for agricultural producers and are carried out at the expense of state and local budgets, apply to PSP. Public

authorities and local governments, within their powers, work up and develop PSP and social-economic development of rural settlements, determine form, size and order of support of PSP and agricultural service cooperatives and other organizations within existing programs.

Most of PSP doesn't have necessary finances for production, although there is expenditures growth. Tremendously increase expenses for

repair of buildings, purchasing of forage, chemical fertilizers, minerals and young animals.

Therefore there is necessary to give a preferential credits to their development in order to growth a production for saving living standards of rural populations and solving a range of social tasks.

References

1. Ukrainian Low about amending in Ukrainian Low "About agricultural cooperation" 20.11.2012 #5495-IV.
2. Agriculture of Ukraine: statistical handbook for 2011. – K.: State Statistic Service of Ukraine, 2012. – P.44-45; 87; 126.
3. Statistical yearbook for 2011. – K.: State Statistic Service of Ukraine, 2012. – 547 p.
4. Agriculture service cooperatives development program for 2013-2020 (project). – K.: Union of Ukrainian agricultural service cooperatives, 2012.
5. *Tomych E.F.* The thorny path of Ukrainian farmers. The 20-th anniversary of farmers' movement. – K.: AFZU, 2010. – 288 p.
6. Ukraine Sector Competitiveness Strategy, Agribusiness Working Group, internal working document, OECD, 2012, Paris.
7. Farms of Vinnytsia region for the year 2011 / edited. V.I. Pogorelsky. - Kiev: Ch. Exercise. Statistics in Vinnytsia region, 2012. – 94 p.

The article has been received 19.04.2013

* * *

Новини АПК

Аграрний сектор отримає комплексну підтримку держави

У найближчі два роки держава надасть допомогу майже всім галузям сільського господарства. Така підтримка надходитиме в межах Державної програми активізації розвитку економіки на 2013-2014 роки. Реалізуючи положення цього документа, Україна наростить виробництво валової продукції сільського господарства до 260 млрд грн на рік. Надходження до бюджету зростуть до 48 млрд грн. Про це на прес-конференції в інформаційному агентстві «Укрінформ» повідомив Міністр аграрної політики та продовольства Микола Присяжнюк.

Щоб досягти цих амбітних цілей, за словами очільника відомства, Мінагрополітики спільно з центральними та місцевими органами виконавчої влади продовжуватиме виконувати низку завдань у межах Програми економічних реформ та Держпрограми активізації економіки на 2013-2014 роки.

«Завдяки цьому на 100% буде забезпечено продовольчу безпеку держави. Покращиться інвестиційний клімат аграрної галузі та зросте її продуктивність. Обсяг експорту сільгосппродукції сягне 22 млрд дол. на рік. Це сприятиме збільшенню надходжень до зведеного бюджету до 48 млрд грн», – наголосив Микола Присяжнюк.

Програма активізації розвитку економіки на 2013-2014 роки дасть змогу комплексно підійти до вирішення низки питань в агросекторі. Вона передбачає низку заходів, спрямованих на вдосконалення лізингових програм, впровадження інноваційних технологій у рослинництві, формування сировинних зон для виробництва дитячого харчування, будівництво та реконструкцію тваринницьких комплексів, збільшення експорту, виробництво біоетанолу та здійснення фінансових і товарних інтервенцій Аграрним фондом. Проте найголовніше – держава стимулюватиме розвиток сільгоспкооперації, а також виробництво продукції в господарствах населення.

Прес-служба Мінагрополітики України