

Anatolii M. Moskalenko¹

FORMATION OF NEW LAND USE IN AGRICULTURE

The article deals with the impact of land reform on land use formation in Ukraine and in its woodlands in particular. Changes in cropland area structure during the period of 1990–2013 are studied and a significant reduction in the proportion of forage crops, sugar beet and increase of sunflower, colaseed, soybean are observed. Land ownership changes are analyzed. The need to distinguish between the concepts of "business pattern" and "land use form" is emphasized. Separately the features of a new form of land use in agriculture – agricultural holdings – are considered. Positive and negative consequences of this process are indentified. The necessity to legally limit the size of such entities is emphasized. Author's own understanding of the "agricultural holding" category definition is given.

Keywords: land use; land property; agricultural holding.

Анатолій М. Москаленко

ФОРМУВАННЯ НОВИХ ЗЕМЛЕКОРИСТУВАНЬ
У СІЛЬСЬКОМУ ГОСПОДАРСТВІ

У статті розглянуто питання впливу земельної реформи на формування землекористувань як в Україні в цілому, так і в зоні Полісся зокрема. Досліджено зміну структури посівних площ за період 1990–2013 років. Зроблено висновок про значне скорочення питомої ваги кормових культур, цукрового буряку та зростання питомої ваги соняшнику, ріпаку, сої. Проаналізовано зміну форм власності на землю. Наголошено на необхідності розрізняти поняття «форма господарювання» і «форма землекористування». Особливо розглянуто особливість нової форми землекористування в сільському господарстві – агрохолдингів. Виділено як позитивні наслідки цього процесу, так і негативні. Обґрунтовано необхідність законодавчого обмеження розмірів таких суб'єктів господарювання. Надано авторське визначення поняття «агрохолдинг».

Ключові слова: землекористування; власність на землю; агрохолдинг.

Табл. 2. Літ. 26.

Анатолій М. Москаленко

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ НОВЫХ ЗЕМЛЕПОЛЬЗОВАНИЙ
В СЕЛЬСКОМ ХОЗЯЙСТВЕ

В статье рассмотрены вопросы влияния земельной реформы на формирование землепользований в Украине в целом, и в зоне Полесья в частности. Исследовано изменение структуры посевных площадей за период 1990–2013 годов. Сделан вывод о значительном сокращении удельного веса кормовых культур, сахарной свеклы и увеличении удельного веса подсолнечника, рапса, сои. Проанализировано изменение форм собственности на землю. Подчеркнута необходимость различать понятия «форма хозяйствования» и «форма землепользования». Отдельно рассмотрена особенность новой формы землепользования в сельском хозяйстве – агрохолдингов. Выделены как положительные последствия этого процесса, так и отрицательные. Обоснована необходимость законодательного ограничения размеров таких субъектов хозяйствования. Дано авторское определение понятия «агрохолдинг».

Ключевые слова: землепользование; собственность на землю; агрохолдинг.

Problem setting. Transformation processes in Ukrainian agriculture have been taking place since obtaining of its independence. However, they could hardly be clear-

¹ Institute of Agricultural Microbiology and Agroindustrial Production, Chernihiv, Ukraine.

ly called positive for a number of reasons. The main indicator here is rural population living standards, which could hardly be called satisfactory under current circumstances. An additional indicator may be the state of soil fertility preservation as the main means of production in agriculture and the nation's wealth. In the given case the situation is also far from optimal. It should be emphasized that those two main, from our point of view, problems are not new and do not reflect all the ways of solving the current trends in land use formation and business patterns in the countryside. However, they were particularly distinguished due to a number of circumstances during agrarian reform implementation. Therefore, the fate of Ukrainian village, and, thus, the nation in general will largely depend on the extent to which further government steps in this direction are successful.

Recent research and publications analysis. The past century has revolutionarily changed the attitude of Ukrainian peasants to the land. As V. Yurchyshyn (2007) notes in this context: "Fate was not always merciful to Ukrainian peasants and with them – to their ... social and industrial centres – villages and other rural settlements". According to this author, the main tragedy of Ukrainian peasantry was conditioned by land ownership loss. "The first such crime-challenge was total land nationalization, in the night of that revolution, by which farmers (and other landowners) were deprived of the right for the most valuable and the most necessary for them – the land. Comparatively soon the same regime created the next crime-challenge – violent collectivization, which resulted in peonage in its worst – slave form, that became a manner of life for all peasants everywhere"² (Yurchyshyn, 2007). After that, the situation with land ownership rights and business patterns remained unchanged during the USSR existence. Although certain attempts to revive agricultural enterprises economic activity were made in the reformation period, but fundamental situation with land ownership rights did not change.

The works of many domestic scientists: A. Tretiak (2002), M. Khvesyk (2009), V. Mesel-Veseliak (2010), M. Fedorov et al. (2012), Ya. Hadzalo and V. Zhuk (2015) have been dedicated to the problems of land use formation and the analysis of land reform implementation. This issue is also studied by foreign scientists B. Deen et al. (2013), J. Menter (2010), A. Schmitz (2010). These scientists explore a wide range of issues; in particular, considerable attention is paid to the analysis of land reform regulatory framework and the trends that occurred in the course of its implementation. Another study object in the recent time were agricultural holdings – new structural formations in agribusiness. This issue covers not only land use economics, but is directly related to rural areas social problems and ecology.

However, land use formation trends in some climatic zones, their characteristics, the level of relationship with settlements network development and efficiency level require a separate study.

The research objectives are to identify and analyse the trends of land use formation in terms of enterprises size and land ownership change, along with agricultural holdings role in the land use system.

Key research findings. Land reform started almost simultaneously with the obtaining independence by Ukraine. In fact, the date of its beginning can be consi-

² Translation – as presented by the author of the article.

dered 1990 when the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted the resolution "On Land Reform", which declared all land subject to land reform from March 15, 1991 (Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukrainian SSR, 18.12.1990). It was declared that land reform is part of economic reforms carried out in Ukraine on the way to market transition. Also, that resolution determined that the reform task is land redistribution with simultaneous transfer to private and collective property, as well as to the use of enterprises, institutions and organizations in order to create conditions for equal development of different land management forms, mixed economy formation, rational land use and protection.

Subsequent events require study and understanding from all sides. The main link is the enterprise itself. At this level major economic processes associated with production are carried out, labour reproduction is provided, scientific and technological progress achievements introduction is ensured. That is, farms are multifunctional entities that affect not only economic development but also rural community's social development. One of the main features of that moment was land property rights system transformation during the reform.

Changes that occurred during the land reform are characterized by the dynamics of agricultural crops planting areas structure at agricultural enterprises during 1990–2013. Some fundamental changes that took place during this period are noteworthy.

First, the proportion of industrial crops significantly increased. If in 1990 it was 12.2% in Ukraine, in its woodlands zone – 8.6%, in 2013 they were 34.0% and 26.8% respectively. Significant changes also occurred in the middle of industrial crops group. The proportion of sugar beet significantly reduced – from 5.3% and 4.1 to 1.1 and 1.5%, respectively, while the proportion of soybean, coleseed, and especially sunflower increased (Planted areas and actual harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the Ukrainian SSR in 1990, 1991; Harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in Ukraine in 2000, 2001; Harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the regions of Ukraine in 2010, 2011; Harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the regions of Ukraine in 2013, 2014).

It should be noted that sunflower is generally unsuitable for woodlands, but difficult economic conditions make people still grow it. Flax almost disappeared from fields: if in 1990 its share was 0.6% in Ukraine, in woodlands zone – 2.9%, in 2013 it had 0.01%, and 0.1%, respectively (Planted areas and actual harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the Ukrainian SSR in 1990, 1991; Harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the regions of Ukraine in 2013, 2014).

Secondly, the area under cereals group significantly expanded. In Ukraine the share of cereals increased from 46.6% in 1990 to 60.3% in 2013. In woodlands this growth was from 42.7% in 1990 to 61.5% in 2013. That is grain crops group in woodlands (by the ratio) became bigger than in Ukraine in general. And within this group significant changes occurred. They are related to very large (the largest in planting areas structure) increase in grain corn share both in Ukraine and in its woodlands, from 3.3% and 1.4% to 19.7 and 31.2%, respectively. Multivector trends in winter grain crops group were established. If in Ukraine this group increased from 28.0% to

30.5% due to winter barley and wheat, in woodlands, on the contrary, it decreased from 25.5% to 21.9% due to winter wheat and rye. Spring grain crops increased both in Ukraine from 18.6 to 29.8% due to grain corn, wheat, and much more in woodlands – from 17.2% to 39.6% due to grain corn, wheat, buckwheat (Planted areas and actual harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the Ukrainian SSR in 1990, 1991; Harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the regions of Ukraine in 2013, 2014).

Thirdly, a significant reduction in the area under fodder crops should be marked among fundamental changes. Their rapid manifestation started after 2000, especially in woodlands. The share of this crops group decreased from 42.9 to 9.1%. Significant was fodder crops reduction in Ukraine, during the same period it was 32.8% (Planted areas and actual harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the Ukrainian SSR in 1990, 1991; Harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in Ukraine in 2000, 2001; Harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the regions of Ukraine in 2010, 2011; Harvest of agricultural crops, fruit, berries and grape plantings in the regions of Ukraine in 2013, 2014).

This was largely caused by the decrease in livestock production, but in any case it should be interpreted as negative in terms of rational land use.

Processes occurring in agriculture are mostly related to land ownership changes. Their dynamics is our study object (Table 1). Given that in 1990 100% of land resources were state property, the period of 1995–2013 was taken to analyse changes. The consideration was carried out in the context of three categories: all land users and land owners, agricultural enterprises, citizens who were granted land ownership and use. As a result of privatization land resources redistribution took place by ownership forms and land users.

It should be noted that during the analyzed period the share of state and collective ownership land declined, while private property land share increased. Thus, in 2013 lands in state ownership at all enterprises types amounted to 28886 ths ha, that is 7424.5 ths ha less than in 1995. As for collective ownership lands, in 2013 their area was only 55.8 ths ha or 0.1% of the total area. In 1995 these lands constituted already 36.6% of the total area. At the same time privately owned lands area increased from 1925.4 to 31400.5 ths ha or by 29475.1 ths ha. Accordingly, their share in general area increased from 3.2 to 52.0%.

If we consider the situation regarding agricultural enterprises, their total area in this period decreased from 40198.0 ths to 16912.8 ths ha. At this, state-owned land area rapidly decreased and collective ownership lands almost completely fell out of the balance. Though in 1995 their area was equal to 22109.9 ths ha.

Finally, the third group – citizens who were granted land ownership and use. If in 1995 this group had for 6759.5 ths ha, than in 2013 – 33015.3 ths ha (an increase by 26255.8 ths ha, or 4.9 times). Regarding ownership forms, first of all it is necessary to note the significant reduction of public lands, from 4826.2 to 1674.6 ths ha and significant growth of privately owned land areas, from 1924.5 to 31334.2 ths ha, or from 28.5% to 94.9%.

Similar analysis was made for the woodlands zone (Table 2). A feature of this area is much larger state ownership share in the structure of land users.

Table 1. Land resources allocation dynamics by ownership types in Ukraine, 1995–2013, ths ha

Indicators	1995	2000	2005	2010	2013	2013 (+,-)	
						1995	2010
All land users and land owners categories							
Total land area as of reporting date	60354.8	60354.8	60354.8	60354.8	60354.9	0.1	0.1
of which by ownership:							
state	36310.5	30166.5	29595.6	29151.2	28886	-7424.5	-265.2
% of total area	60.2	50.0	49.0	48.3	47.9	-12.3	-0.4
collective	22118.9	1079.1	117.1	63.4	55.8	22063.1	-7.6
% of total area	36.6	1.8	0.2	0.1	0.1	-36.5	0.0
private	1925.4	29109.2	30642.1	31140.2	31400.5	29475.1	260.3
% of total area	3.2	48.2	50.8	51.6	52.0	48.8	0.4
Agricultural enterprises							
Total area of land in use	40198	29426.4	19507.9	17314.9	16912.8	23285.2	-402.1
of which by ownership:							
state (permanent use)	18087.2	3449.4	1915.3	1511.8	1438.8	16648.4	-73.0
% of total area	45.0	11.7	9.8	8.7	8.5	-36.5	-0.2
collective	22109.9	1072.1	110	56.8	49.3	22060.6	-7.5
% of total area	55.0	3.6	0.6	0.3	0.3	-54.7	0.0
private	0.9		4	16.8	24.6	23.7	7.8
% of total area	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Citizens who were granted lands for ownership and use							
Total area of land in use	6759.5	31517.6	32830.3	32896.9	33015.3	26255.8	118.4
of which by ownership:							
state (permanent use)	4826.2	2401.6	2192.6	1802.2	1674.6	-3151.6	-127.6
% of total area	71.4	21.2	6.7	5.5	5.1	-66.3	-0.4
collective	8.8	7.0	7.1	6.6	6.5	-2.3	-0.1
% of total area	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0
private	1924.5	29109.0	30630.6	31088.1	31334.2	29409.7	246.1
% of total area	28.5	92.4	93.3	94.5	94.9	66.4	0.4

Source: Calculated by the author according to the State Agency of Ukraine on Land Resources data (Dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of January 1, 1996), 1996; Structure, dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of 01.01.2001), 2001; Structure, dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of 01.01.2006), 2006; Structure, dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of 01.01.2011), 2011; Structure, dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of 01.01.2004), 2014).

Its area amounted to 10459.4 ths ha in 1995, and in 2013 – 9357.6 ths ha. Accordingly, this category share in the total land area was 69.5% and 62.2%, while in Ukraine 60.2% and 47.9%, respectively. In this climatic zone a miniscule share of collective land ownership is observed, the area of which decreased from 3873.8 to 0.7 ths ha during the period under study. At the same time private property lands area increased significantly (from 711.8 ths ha to 5683.8 ths ha). Accordingly, the share of those lands in the total land area increased from 4.7% to 37.8%.

If we consider ownership change by land user categories, it should be noted that state-owned land area significantly decreased at agricultural enterprises, as well as the total land area. The first of those indicators decreased from 4078.4 ths ha to 272.4 ths ha in 1995 and 2013, respectively. The second figure dropped from 7948.0 ths ha to

2263.6 ths ha. Again, collective property land area reduced to a minimum and private ownership land in 2013 occupied a very small share.

Table 2. Land resources allocation dynamics by ownership types in Ukrainian woodlands, 1995–2013, ths ha

Indicators	1995	2000	2005	2010	2013	2013	
						1995	2010
All land users and land owners categories							
Total land area as of reporting date	15045.0	15043.6	14865.6	15043.6	15043.6	-1.4	0.0
of which by ownership:							
state	10459.4	9196.9	9189.7	9370.2	9357.6	-1101.8	-12.6
% of total area	69.5	61.1	61.8	62.3	62.2	-7.3	-0.1
collective	3873.8	172.3	6.3	1.0	0.7	-3873.1	-0.3
% of total area	25.7	1.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	-25.7	0.0
private	711.8	5674.4	5669.6	5672.4	5683.8	4972.0	11.4
% of total area	4.7	37.7	38.1	37.7	37.8	33.1	0.1
Agricultural enterprises							
Total area of land in use	7948.0	4703.5	2688.2	2201.4	2263.6	-5684.4	62.2
of which by ownership:							
state	4078.4	621.3	329.1	282.7	272.4	-3806.0	-10.3
% of total area	51.3	13.2	12.2	12.8	12.0	-39.3	-0.8
collective	3869.6	172.0	5.9	0.9	0.5	-3869.1	-0.4
% of total area	48.7	3.7	0.2	0.0	0.0	-48.7	0.0
private	0	3910.2	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6
% of total area	0.0	83.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Citizens who were granted lands for ownership and use							
Total area of land in use	2000.5	3147.1	4631.2	4753.1	5992.4	3991.9	1239.3
of which by ownership:							
state (permanent use)	1284.5	408.2	371.2	331.6	318.2	-966.3	-13.4
% of total area	64.2	13.0	8.0	7.0	5.3	-58.9	-1.7
collective	4.2	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	-4.0	-0.1
% of total area	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2	0.0
private	711.8	2738.6	4259.7	4421.4	5674.0	4962.2	1252.6
% of total area	35.6	87.0	92.0	93.0	94.7	59.1	1.7

Source: Calculated by the author according to the State Agency of Ukraine on Land Resources data (Dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of January 1, 1996), 1996; Structure, dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of 01.01.2001), 2001; Structure, dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of 01.01.2006), 2006; Structure, dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of 01.01.2011), 2011; Structure, dynamics and distribution of land resources of Ukraine (as of 01.01.2004), 2014).

In turn, citizens land area increased from 2000.5 ths ha to 5992.4 ths ha during this period or by 3991.9 ths ha, and state ownership land area decreased from 1284.5 ths ha to 318.2 ths ha (its share in the total area decreased from 64.2% to 5.3% respectively). At the same time privately owned land areas increased from 711.8 to 5674.0 ths ha and their share – from 35.6% to 94.7%.

Thus, the overall trend, formed both in Ukraine and in its woodlands zone, is the significant reduction of state-owned lands, almost complete absence of collective land ownership and significant increase of privately owned land areas. Transfer of vast agricultural land areas into private ownership by state became a prerequisite for mar-

ket land relations formation. Redistribution of agricultural lands by categories of land users took place in favour of citizens who were granted land for ownership and use.

During the research we found the need to distinguish the concepts of "business pattern" and "land use form". The first of these categories applies to the forms of agricultural production organization. In Ukraine today a dual organizational structure of agriculture has been formed, which distinguishes two types of producers: corporate (agricultural enterprises) and individual (farms and households) (Borodina et al., 2012). Regarding the form of land use, it is currently largely determined by land ownership and the way it is used. All producers can be divided into two big groups by ownership: the first one includes those who manage production on their own land, and the second – on leased land. By the way of use we can distinguish those who cultivate land by their own labour and those who use hired labour.

One of the challenges to the land reform was the emergence of structural associations, which entrenched the term "agricultural holdings". The official definition of such organizational business form does not exist, but they are usually referred to companies, which consolidately use large leased farmland areas and legal address of their head office is geographically remote from direct business activities location. The emergence of such structures has generated considerable discussion regarding their role and place in rural area economic and social development.

For deeper understanding of uncontrolled agricultural sector agroholdingization consequences let us find out the essence of "agricultural holding" concept having systemized its basic definitions. Note, that in domestic and foreign literature there are about 20 interpretations of this term. Here are some of them.

Y.M. Hadzalo and V.M. Zhuk (2015) understand agroholdingization phenomenon as the growing share of large land, vertically integrated structures in agricultural economics and their impact on agricultural policy and drawing negative methods and tools of their economic medium and small enterprises. The authors emphasize that Ukraine's agroholdingization growth has been lobbied for a long time. Serious dynamics of production, exports and foreign currency inflow increase, large-scale attraction of investment from global stock markets and so on brought domestic agricultural sector to the first positions not only in the economy of Ukraine, but also at the world agromarket. Such a success has been and still is so important to country's politicians that solving agroholdingization problems has been delayed for years.

A. Yerankin (2009) understands agricultural holdings as a generalized concept that characterizes a fundamentally new type of agricultural production, which is distinguished by the maximum use of capitalist type production or transfers such experience from other economy sectors into agribusiness, and is based on business capitalization, investment attracting and getting the maximum possible niche at the market.

V. Andriichuk (2007) considers agricultural holdings as the result of capitalization and economic concentration, and regards management performed by the main large company and loss of legal entity status by all other included enterprises followed by their transformation into structural units as their special feature. S. Demianenko and A. Kuznietsova (2008) reveal the essence of agricultural holdings through a specific form of share capital ownership, whereby a parent company, owning a controlling interest in other enterprises, manages and controls their activities and thus com-

bines them into a single organizational structure with appropriate objectives and mission.

As V. H. Andriichuk (2009) notes, large corporations with highly concentrated manufacturing are capable of faster development on the innovative basis, providing high efficiency activities. In his opinion, this statement does not diminish small and medium-sized businesses role and importance, but it warns: it is dangerous to overestimate its contribution to current and especially future economic development and thus underestimate large economically powerful corporations on-going development that reflect production concentration process and are often the determining factor in achieving competitiveness by states at both domestic and foreign markets.

The above circumstances gave the author the reason for two conclusions: first – in the nearest future the share of agricultural lands controlled by various big companies may rise significantly; second – the attempts of big capital from other economic sectors to expand to agribusiness certifies that now not simply attempts to provide raw materials, get preferences, acquiring agricultural commodity producer status reduces transaction costs etc., and this becomes the dominant motive for capital infusion as well as becoming the owner of now leased land after lifting the moratorium on agricultural land sale (Andriichuk, 2009).

Agricultural holdings have recently revealed an impressive growth dynamics. According to P.I. Haidutskyi (2010) in 2010 we already had 300 large agricultural holdings with the area of over 10 ths ha including about 30 very large agricultural holdings with the area of over 50 ths ha; there are those which have 300–350 ths ha of land. In Russia there are several agricultural holdings having 600–650 ths ha of land, same as in Ukraine and Kazakhstan. Furthermore, in Ukraine 43% of land shares is actually leased by agricultural holdings, 5 years ago it was only 23%, i.e. they have doubled their shares during this time. Such gigantomania and rapid growth logically provoke a very serious discussion in the society and it is very polar – from extreme admiration to anxious and serious warnings, especially from agrarians (Haidutskyi, 2010).

I.F. Tomych (2010) also gives data that the average size of agricultural holdings in the 2000s was 10–15 ths ha, today (2010) – despite they begin to build their structures through subsidiaries, their average size is more than 100 ths ha, and some are close to 0.5 mln ha.

According to Ya.M. Hadzalo and V.M. Zhuk (2015) in 2013 in Ukraine there were 156 agricultural holdings with the average size of 55546.8 ha.

In our view, the term "agricultural holding" should be interpreted as follows: an entity created for agricultural production, which directly or through other structures and related entities uses land with the total area of at least 15000 ha in two or more administrative districts.

Conclusions and development prospects. Summarizing the above material several important points could be emphasized. Firstly, land use formation mechanism, which was introduced within the last two decades, did not provide a comprehensive solution for the problems in agricultural production and rural areas in general. Secondly, the structures size with regard to "agricultural holdings", should be restricted by law. Government policy regarding agricultural holdings should include the following elements:

- to adopt the Law "On Agricultural Holdings in Ukraine";
- to establish profit tax, rural areas social development contributions to be transferred to local budgets;
- to allocate the priority right to local residents of a given administrative area for employment in agricultural holding structure, with the mandatory fixing of that indicator at the rate of at least 75%;
- to ensure directing at least 30% of income for livestock industry development within agricultural holdings, with the obligatory raising this industry share to the level of at least 25% within the marketed products during 5 years;
- to introduce financial penalties for violations of scientifically based farming system, streamlining the fees to local budgets;
- to reduce the amount of taxable profit by the amount spent by agricultural holding on rural social sphere support.

Thirdly, a simplified system for small agricultural producers performance is necessary in terms of not only land rights implementation but the whole mechanism of production and sales functioning.

References:

Про земельну реформу: Постанова Верховної Ради Української РСР від 18.12.1990 № 563-ХІІ // zakon.rada.gov.ua.

Андрійчук В.Г. Капіталізація сільського господарства: стан та економічне регулювання розвитку: Монографія. – Ніжин: Аспект-Поліграф, 2007. – 216 с.

Андрійчук В.Г. Надконцентрація агропромислового виробництва і земельних ресурсів та її наслідки // Економіка АПК. – 2009. – №2. – С. 3–9.

Гадзало Я.М., Жук В.М. Наукові основи розвитку аграрного підприємництва та сільських територій за селозберігаючою моделлю: Наук. доповідь. – К: ННЦ ІАЕ, 2015. – 40 с.

Гайдучий П.І. Роль і значення аграрної реформи для розвитку сільського господарства України // Збірник матеріалів дванадцятих річних зборів Всеукраїнського конгресу вчених економістів-аграрників (25–26.02.2010, м. Київ). – К., 2010. – С. 51–54.

Дем'яненко С.І., Кузнєцова А.В. Агрохолдинги в Україні: добре чи погано?: Серія консультативних робіт. – К.: Німецько-Український аграрний діалог; Інститут економічних досліджень та політичних консультацій, 2008. – 22 с.

Динаміка та розподіл земельного фонду України (за станом на 1 січня 1996 року) / Державний комітет України із земельних ресурсів. – К.: Держкомзем, 1996. – 93 с.

Єранкін О.О. Маркетинг в АПК України в умовах глобалізації: Монографія. – К.: КНЕУ, 2009. – 419 с.

Збір урожаю сільськогосподарських культур, плодів, ягід та винограду в регіонах України за 2010 рік / Державний комітет статистики України. – К.: Держкомстат, 2011. – 136 с.

Збір урожаю сільськогосподарських культур, плодів, ягід та винограду в регіонах України за 2013 рік / Державна служба статистики України. – К.: Держстатистика, 2014. – 102 с.

Збір урожаю сільськогосподарських культур, плодючих та виноградних насаджень в Україні у 2000 році / Державний комітет статистики України. – К.: Держкомстат, 2001. – 281 с.

Месель-Веселяк В.Я. Аграрна реформа і організаційно-економічні трансформації в сільському господарстві // Збірник матеріалів дванадцятих річних зборів Всеукраїнського конгресу вчених економістів-аграрників (25–26.02.2010, м. Київ). – К., 2010. – С. 11–36.

Посевные площади и фактические сборы урожая сельскохозяйственных культур, плодово-ягодных и виноградных насаждений по Украинской ССР в 1990 году / Государственный комитет Украинской ССР по статистике. – К.: Госкомстат, 1991. – 443 с.

Стратегічні напрями розвитку земельних відносин у сільському господарстві на період до 2020 року / М.М. Федоров, О.В. Ходаківська, С.Г. Корчинська, Н.А. Солов'яненко; За ред. Ю.О. Лупенка, М.М. Федорова. – К.: ННЦ ІАЕ, 2012. – 58 с.

Структура, динаміка та розподіл земельного фонду України (за станом на 01.01.2001) / Державний комітет України із земельних ресурсів. – К.: Держкомзем, 2001. – 109 с.

Структура, динаміка та розподіл земельного фонду України (за станом на 01.01.2006) / Державний комітет України із земельних ресурсів. – К.: Держкомзем, 2006. – 125 с.

Структура, динаміка та розподіл земельного фонду України (за станом на 01.01.2011) / Державне агентство земельних ресурсів України. – К.: Держземагенство, 2011. – 94 с.

Структура, динаміка та розподіл земельного фонду України (за станом на 01.01.2014) / Державне агентство земельних ресурсів України. – К.: Держземагенство, 2014. – 92 с.

Томич І.Ф. Розвиток малого і середнього бізнесу на селі в трансформаційних умовах // Збірник матеріалів дванадцятих річних зборів Всеукраїнського конгресу вчених економістів-аграрників (25–26.02.2010, м. Київ). – К., 2010. – С. 42–46.

Третяк А.М. Наукові основи землеустрою. – К.: ЦЗРУ, 2002. – 342 с.

Українська модель аграрного розвитку та її соціоекономічна переорієнтація: Наук. доповідь / О.М. Бородіна, В.М. Геєць, А.О. Гуроров та ін.; За ред. В.М. Гейця, О.М. Бородіної, І.В. Прокопи; НАН України, Ін-т екон. та прогнозув. – К., 2012. – 56 с.

Хвесик М.А. Стратегічні імперативи раціоналізації землекористування в контексті соціально-економічного піднесення України // Економіка АПК. – 2009. – №3. – С. 24–30.

Юрчишин В.В. Перед ким і чим провинилось село і селяни?. – К.: ННЦ ІАЕ, 2007. – 20 с.

Deen, V., Graves, E.M., Fraser, D.G.E., Martin, C.R. (2013). Changing demands on agricultural land: Are reforms urgent? Green Paper for the Alberta Institute of Agrologists // www.albertaagrologists.ca.

Menter, J. (2010). Helping U.S. Farmers Increase Production and Protect the Land // e360.yale.edu.

Schmitz, A. (2010). Agricultural Policy, Agribusiness, and Rent-seeking Behavior. 2nd edition. University of Toronto Press, Business & Economics. 516 p.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.06.2015.