Original scientific paper

UDC: 330.142
DOI: 10.2478/contagri-2021-0005

SOCIAL CAPITAL OF FARMERS IN THE RURAL COMMUNITIES OF VOJVODINA

DEJAN JANKOVIĆ^{*}, MARINA NOVAKOV, MARICA PETROVIĆ

Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 8, 21 000 Novi Sad, Serbia

^{*}Corresponding author: dejan.jankovic@polj.uns.ac.rs

SUMMARY

The development of rural areas is a complex social, economic, political and cultural issue of immense importance to the development of society as a whole. The vitality of rural communities, which represent a specific socio-spatial phenomenon, affects the development of global society and is inextricably linked to the development and issues of urban areas of each society. Both in theory and development practice, rural development as a complex and enduring process has long been unjustifiably reduced to the economic-agrarian matrix, often reflected in the modernization of agriculture and the centralized and sectoral management of and influence on rural development. The primary focus of this paper is on the social capital of rural communities, i.e. social relations and connections within local rural communities which, alongside other important development factors, are one of the prerequisites to maintaining their vitality. The paper presents the results of a survey on social capital conducted on 281 farms in the region of Vojvodina (Serbia), indicating the characteristics of the social capital on the farms considered and the farmers' attitudes towards the development and life of their local communities. The social capital of the surveyed farmers was found to be only relatively good, suggesting that the overall social capital in Serbia is underdeveloped because all the farms considered are located in Vojvodina, i.e. the most developed agricultural area in Serbia characterized by rural settlements with the most favorable infrastructural, demographic and economic conditions.

Key words: social capital, rural development, local rural communities, Vojvodina/Serbia

INTRODUCTION

Rural development is a very complex and enduring process that can only be perceived relative to overall social changes and the structure of global society. Therefore, the life of rural communities is greatly affected by the global processes of urbanization and urban centralization, industrial development, deagrarianization, globalization, creation of the post-industrial and information societies, etc.

Rural development is also a complex theoretical issue still lacking a systematic scientific and theoretical foundation (Janković, 2020, according to van der Ploeg et al., 2000; Shortall, 2004; Slee, 1994; Marsden, 1999). Often analyzed in the discourse of agrarian policy and development, rural development is predominantly viewed from the agricultural economics perspective both in Serbia and worldwide. Previous studies have yielded comprehensive and insufficiently comprehensive (often reductionist) descriptions and explanations of the issue, generating political discussions on the measures and effects of agrarian or other sectoral policies seeking to tackle the problem (Janković & Novakov, 2019: 110). For decades, rural development has been elucidated by the process of agricultural modernization (Janković & Novakov, 2018) and the effects of productionism and (contemporary) postproductionism on the social, economic, environmental, political and other aspects of rural development. Great efforts to preserve rural areas in a number of countries have been expended by social scientist and experts alike, leading to the abandonment of the sectoral (mostly agrarian) policies which prioritized economies of scale, specialization, intensification and concentration of production, production surpluses, industrial dependence and, ultimately, social

inequality and environmental pollution (Sivini, 2004). A number of eminent authors (van der Ploeg et al., 2000) argue that rural development exceeds a simple addition to the existing pattern of agriculture and rural life, and operationalize it on several levels (ibid: 391-395). Although each of the levels mentioned by this group of authors is very interesting and almost unlimited in terms of research, it should be emphasized that rural development “is *multi-faceted* in nature and it unfolds into a wide array of different and sometimes interconnected practices ... Involvement in these types of enterprise results in new forms of social cohesion and, in many cases, a variety of activities are combined in an integrated way. This multi-level, multi-actor and multi-faceted nature implies that rural development relates to modernization as a paradigm shift. Rural development is on the agenda precisely because the modernization paradigm has reached its intellectual and practical limits” (Ibid: 394, 395).

In like fashion, a number of authors (van der Ploeg et al., 2000; O'Connor et al., 2006; Brunori & Rossi, 2000; Wiskerke, 2004) believe that there are actually two different paradigms: the paradigm of agricultural modernization, which is reflected in the “economies of scale” principle and which “has reached its intellectual and practical limits”, and the paradigm of rural development, which these authors consider much broader than a simple addition to the existing pattern of agricultural development (i.e. modernization). The reference group of authors (van der Ploeg et al., 2000: 391) claim that “the modernization paradigm that once dominated policy, practice and theory is being replaced by a new rural development paradigm”.

The obvious complexity of this issue manifests itself in numerous dimensions of rural development (Šljukić & Janković, 2015; Janković, 2020): the economic vitality, as one of the most important for the (economic) vitality of rural communities and rural economy, and the social and demographic vitality and sustainability of life in local rural communities. The ecological dimension of the protection of natural resources and the environment (predominantly related to rural areas and rural population) indicates how people “produce” their way of life under given natural conditions and how they make the best use of the environment, making it a distinctive constituent of their environment while preserving and revitalizing those resources and heritage. The political/institutional dimension directs attention to agrarian and rural policies, decentralization policies, the issues of regional rural development, the process of “social change management”, institutional development, the participation of local population, etc. This dimension actually reveals the power relations within social and political relations, the interests of relevant actors through endogenous and exogenous influences, and the cause-effect impacts of certain sectoral policies that directly or indirectly affect the development and quality of life of rural population (ibid.).

This paper focuses on the lifestyle of rural population and their participation in the life of rural communities, i.e. their interconnectedness, networking, trust and capacity to cooperate locally in development activities. In sociological theory, this would be encompassed by the notion of social capital of local rural communities with all its numerous aspects. The basic hypothesis is that developed social capital can contribute to the development of local rural communities in various manners provided it is considered relative to local, regional and global social changes. We will analyze these theoretically relevant issues on the basis of the empirical data obtained in the rural areas of Vojvodina, Serbia.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This paper presents a portion of the research results on the work performance of the Agricultural Extension Service of Vojvodina based on a representative sample of farms in Vojvodina¹. The study involved a proportional/stratified random sample obtained from a population of about 4,000 Vojvodinian farms and 13 agricultural extension offices (stations) of the Agricultural Extension Service of Vojvodina (Fig. 1). The precisely defined sample included 281 farms, whereas the sample stratification was performed according to the territorial distribution of farms (and agricultural extension stations) in Vojvodina, farmers’ gender, and the size and production type of farms.

With regard to the random sample stratification, the experimental farms were sampled from the basic farm population in proportion to the size of the existing extension stations, i.e. the number of officers who cooperate with the farms/farmers considered. Upon determining the distinctive features of the basic farm population and the sample size, the sample was defined. The number of farms that could participate in the research was determined for each organizational unit of the Agricultural Extension Service of Vojvodina (Fig. 2). Subsequently, a sample of farmers was defined according to their gender. These two features were then crossed to obtain a cross-section of the stratum

¹ The research entitled “The evaluation of the work performance of the Agricultural Extension Service of Vojvodina” was funded by the Provincial Secretariat for Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry of the Province of Vojvodina. The project manager was Professor Zivojin Petrovic, PhD, and the coordinator was Dejan Jankovic, PhD. Collecting data on the lifestyle in local communities and social activism of farmers was only part of the research task dealing primarily with the cooperation between Vojvodinian farmers and the extension service of Vojvodina.

for each organizational unit of the Agricultural Extension Service of Vojvodina. Ultimately, the strata referring to the farm size were determined. It is noteworthy that medium-sized farms with a holding size of 10.01 to 25 ha (36.8%) were dominant in the basic population of farms, which is significantly different from the average farms size in Serbia (4,5ha).

Figure 1. The population of farms in Vojvodina considered for the research on the extension service work in Vojvodina (according to districts)

Figure 2. Number of farms in the sample according to the organizational unit of the Agricultural Extension Service of Vojvodina

The experimental data were collected using a survey method (namely a semi-structured questionnaire), as well as the farmers' attitudes towards the intensity, issues and quality of cooperation between the farmers and the extension offices considered, their life and work in the local rural communities in Vojvodina, interconnections with others in the community, local development activities, etc. Therefore, this paper places emphasis on the research results important for the local rural development in Vojvodina without deliberating general extension issues.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The term and concept of social capital has been widely accepted and used by social scientists in recent decades, becoming one of the most popular exports from sociological theory into everyday language (Portes, 1998). Admittedly, greater participation and integration of the individual into social networks and groups have positive effects on both the individual and the group (society) as a whole. Such knowledge has its roots in a number of classical sociological theories (Janković, 2020).

The discourse on social capital differs according to its sources, holders, types, indicators, effects, etc. Social capital is an attractive, and at first glance, simple framework for understanding social relationships and interactions: the more people trust each other and the more connected they are, the easier it is for them to achieve their intended goals individually and collectively. In other words, acting together on the basis of common interests, norms and trust facilitates social relations. Some authors (e.g. Robert Putnam) have considered various forms of social capital (bounding and bridging) as a kind of sociological superglue in social relations (bounding social capital), while bridging (social capital) enables sociological WD 40 (Putnam, 2000).

There are different definitions of social capital, which are mainly related to the fact that social network membership and resources that exist in "others" represent the capital of an individual (or a group) that can be used. Portes defines social capital as "the capacity of individuals to command scarce resources by virtue of their membership in networks or broader social structures" (according to Woolcock, 1998: 189, 190), and it is these others, not themselves, who are the real source of advantages in social relations. In his scientific work, Bourdieu perceives social capital as one of the forms of capital, alongside the economic and cultural-symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1999; Buordieu, 1983). The extent/amount of social capital depends on the size of networks or connections that an individual can mobilize and the amount (economic, cultural or symbolic) of capital they possess through those who they are connected with. According to Bourdieu, social capital is linked to other forms of capital such as economic capital, which is essentially the most important and at the root of all other forms of capital. James Coleman considers social capital a constitutive part of the resources available to an actor, defined through its function which the individual possesses as a socially structural resource (Coleman, 1988: 98; Coleman, 1990: 302). Lin (Lin, 2001: 19, 20) argues that social capital primarily relates to the notion of *capital*, which in this case represents "the capital contained in social relations" and as such, it represents "an investment in social relations with an expected return in the marketplace and it is defined as resources embedded in a social structure that are accessed and/or mobilized in purposive actions" (ibid. p 29). Embedded resources in social networks enhance the outcomes of actions because of the facilitated flow of information, greater or lesser possibility of influence in social relations (depending on the strategic places and social positions), social ties (which can be considered the certificates of social credibility (i.e. social credentials) - potentially carrying more valued resources and exercising greater power on organizational agents' decision making), and social relations (which are expected to strengthen the identity and (social) recognition) (ibid. p. 18, 19). "Social capital represents resources rooted in the social structure, which are accessed and/or used in intended actions." (Lin, 2001: 29).

Robert Putnam understands the concept of social capital in the closest connection with social networks, within which he emphasizes the importance of trust, mutual support and cooperation between the actors of a certain social system. According to Putnam, the essential idea behind the theory of social capital is that social networks have a certain value, both for the individual and for the group. If social networks are densely filled with reciprocal relations of trust, support and cooperation, then we can consider that such a society is rich in social capital. Under social capital, Putnam understands the features of social life such as networks, norms, and trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives. (Putnam, 1996). Social capital, therefore, can "represent both a "private good" and a "public good" (Putnam, 2000: 20).

The idea of social capital is essentially related to the fact that social networks play an important role in social life and that the functions of social networks, as well as the consequences of owning social capital (and its possible conversion into other types of capital) can be a very important part of explaining social processes. (Janković, 2020). It should only be noted that there are many critical views regarding the definition of social capital, its sources, consequences, and measurement methods (indicators), but such issues are beyond the scope of this paper (for more see Janković, 2020). We will use the theoretical framework of social capital to analyze the life of the local rural communities considered according to the extent of the "communitarianism" present.

The assumption of living in rural areas refers to the fact that people love their place of living and that this - among other things - is one of the preconditions not to migrate to urban centers. The results of our research show that the surveyed farmers value their local community most for the peaceful rural lifestyle (20.6%), followed by clean nature, ample space and geographical location (17.7%), the fact that they were born and bred there (14.1%), and good

interpersonal relations (14.1%). It is interesting that interpersonal relationships significantly determine the general life satisfaction in a certain environment. However, the respondents were mostly dissatisfied with the lack of interpersonal cooperation and culture, negligence and theft (20.5%), followed by environmental issues (15.6%) (namely illegal landfills, dirt and pollution), and poor infrastructure (15.2%). For a more detailed analysis, the survey results obtained would have to be observed in a broader context of the so-called push and pull factors that can provide a framework for a better understanding of rural-urban migration and rural abandonment in general.

The social capital of farmers in Vojvodina is relatively well developed according to the Patnam's indicators of membership in associations and local activism. Although the Patnam's concept is quite sociocentric and sometimes confuses sources of social capital with the existence/presence of social capital, sociological research accepts the thesis of the importance of associations (through indicators of membership in associations) and social (civic) activism, belonging to various formal and informal types of social networks (including virtual social networks as well). In our sample, approximately only one third of the respondents (34%) did not belong to any of the institutions or associations at the local level. One third of the farmers surveyed (34%) also indicated that they were members of farmers' cooperatives and/or associations, whereas the share of membership in political parties was found to be relatively small (below 5%). A statistically significant relationship was confirmed between the membership in associations and farmers' education: the farmers with higher education were members of more different local associations (Janković, 2020). It is useful to note that greater activism was found to be more accepted in rural areas than in urban areas, primarily as a sign of will and intention of the population's self-assistance stemming from the lack of professionalism. Moreover, the causes of this are seen in different functions (primarily integrative) and greater cultural and social significance of associations in local rural communities (see Planck & Ziche, 1979: 109, Beetz et al., 2005: 25-32). Recent research has focused on social changes in the context of the process of individualization, declining integration and symbolic power of associations, and the relation to other institutions such as neighborhoods, cooperatives, etc. However, the Serbian society (especially the rural society in Serbia) is characterized by an insufficient level of social capital and mutual trust, particularly the trust in public institutions (see Cvejić et al., 2010). The empirical research on social capital in rural areas of Serbia (with a focus on indicators such as connecting with relatives and friends and joining organizations) showed that its level was generally low², regardless of the region or ethnic (cultural) group (Cvejić et al., 2010). The results of this research confirmed empirically the expected interdependence of poverty, material deprivation in local rural settlements and social exclusion in rural areas of Serbia. Therefore, our research results indicate that the social capital of the rural communities in Vojvodina is only "relatively" well developed and generally connected with mistrust, a lack of initiative, and material deprivation (e.g. bad infrastructure). The insufficient cooperation of the local rural population poses a threat to the development of social capital, suggesting a lack of possible combinations and mobilizations of social and economic capital (Bourdieu), i.e. the possibility of its activation through networks of individuals involved (Coleman, Lynn, etc.). This must be observed within the framework of the structure and changes of global Serbian society, strongly influenced by the legacy of the ex-communist society and subsequent democratic transition, i.e. social capital characterized by competitiveness, non-communitarianism and exclusivity. This can be explained by the prevailing informal forms of association as a strategy of survival in conditions of scarcity and ideological mobilization during the communist party state, which will turn into a dubious conversion of different types of capital during the transition" (Pavićević, 2012: 501). This author correctly states that the collapse of communism left consequences in the social fabric of these societies: social capital shows its negative aspects as "informal, exclusive or connecting social capital"; the experiences of people in formal organizations in the communist period (apparent voluntariness, bureaucratization, alienation from membership ...) left a mark in deep mistrust and the perception that "associations are a useless formality". The consequences in the post-communist period are related to the "low level of participatory culture and the lack of civil society organizations" (ibid: 517).

Relative to the engagement of the respondents in the development of their village, 50% of the respondents have been engaged mainly in agriculture, local roads, local communal problems, associations, local communities, cooperatives, culture, and sports. Only 2.4% of them were engaged in local political activism. A qualitative analysis showed that a lack of personal interest (or time) was the main hindrance to the engagement in local development, followed by a

² Cvejić and associates point out the following: "Although, as a rule, they are oriented towards family and relatives, as many as 10% of the respondents from the sample stated that they do not have binding social capital at all, which means that they do not rely on relatives, neighbors or friends when they are in a state of social need. Bridging social capital is almost non-existent and, therefore, cannot compensate for bonding social capital in raising social cohesion in the countryside. Traditional forms of binding, through rural gatherings and assistance in large-scale agricultural works, are losing their significance, and new forms of binding are extremely poorly developed" (Cvejić et al., 2010: 15).

lack of need or invitation for such engagement, a lack of decision-making positions which are politically conditioned, a belief that younger people should do it, or even a distrust in the purpose and transparency of such activities. A cross-tabulation of the farmers' community activism and the length of stay in the village (since birth or immigrant) did not show a statistically significant relationship, whereas the relationship between the farmers' education and community activism was found only minimally statistically significant (more educated respondents were somewhat more willing to engage in such actions). However, the cross-tabulation of the farmers' affiliation with associations and local institutions, and their previous engagement in the local environment showed a statistically significant relationship, i.e. those respondents who are members of local associations and institutions were significantly more engaged in solving community issues ($\chi^2 = 49,201$; $p = 0.006$) (which indicates the connection between social capital and local activism (Janković, 2020). This proves the connection between two indicators of social capital: social (civic) activism and affiliation with local institutions (associations). It is also encouraging that the majority of farmers surveyed (74.5%) would be ready to engage in local problem-solving activities in the future: 53.7% would be willing to actively engage in solving community issues, 8.9% would raise the public awareness of community activism, and 4.1% would be ready to assume a leading role in resolving local issues.

Although the traditional institution of "*moba*" has, in various forms, persisted to date in Serbian rural areas as a significant type of social capital (i.e. the joint engagement and mutual assistance of local people on certain occasions such as weddings, funerals, certain agricultural work, etc.), the results obtained show that there is no statistically significant relationship ($p = 0.250$) between the neighbors' willingness to help each other in performing agricultural work and the willingness to engage in community activities. However, it should be noted that modernization in agriculture has led to significant mechanization of agricultural work, so the real need for *moba* in agriculture has decreased (not so much as a result of reduced social capital, but more as a result of the consequences of agricultural modernization).

The degree of generalized trust often appears in research as an indicator of social capital. According to this indicator, the farmers surveyed believe that most people in their village could be trusted (10.7%). The explicit attitude that one should always be careful in social relations was expressed by 27% of the respondents and that the matter of trust depends on the person (62.6%), Fig. 3. No statistically significant relationship was found between the trust and gender of the respondents ($p = 0.168$), nor between the degree of generalized trust and education of the respondents ($p = 0.959$). Such a low level of generalized trust is a reflection of the Serbian general public's opinion on the same issue and certainly does not contribute to the development of social capital, which is primarily based on mutual personal and/or generalized trust.

Figure 3. The degree of farmers' generalized trust in the people in their village (%)

The lack of (greater) financial investments in the rural economy was recognized as the critical issue by the respondents, as well as the employment of residents in order to keep them in the local community and infrastructural problems (namely road infrastructure, sewerage, etc.). The municipality (i.e. the local self-government) and national government were mostly perceived as responsible for resolving these issues (municipality (local self-government) (73.3%) and provincial administration (47.7%) (the survey was conducted in the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina), followed by the republic government and ministries (43.3%), local population (28.8%), local community (38.8%), district (5.7%), and local business entities (5.3%) (Janković, 2020). Accordingly, the emphasis should be placed on the importance and role of local self-government in the participatory democratic and decentralized management of local and regional rural development. The great responsibility of the Vojvodinian provincial

institutions confirmed the farmers' awareness of the importance of the autonomy of Vojvodina in the economic, cultural, and political sense.

A majority of the respondents (60.2%) believe that there are people in the local community who could be very important for local development. Such people are characterized by (multiple-possibility answers were allowed, Fig. 4) their education (38.1%), reputation (36.9%), power and influence (31.1%), and wealth (19.3%). As expected, the farmers who themselves have a higher level of education consider education to be a more significant characteristic (there is a statistically significant relationship between these two variables $p = 0.012$).

Figure 4. The characteristics of people who could be important for local development (%)

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that rural development is a multi-faceted, long-term (decade) and very complex (multisectoral) process. From research and theoretical perspectives, it has often been reduced to a simplified economic-agrarian matrix that obscured its many aspects, especially the social one. The theory of social capital is a very productive framework for analyzing the life of local rural communities. It is expressed through indicators of trust, local activism and participation in the life of the local rural community, social networks and institutions (that exist and operate locally and can have differing impacts on the economic and other aspects of rural development). The concept of rural development that we have adopted emphasizes the heterogeneity of actors, interests, development directions, policies, institutions, potentials and shortcomings (which shape the complexity and sustainability of rural development). The research of many aspects of rural development should contribute to a better understanding of social processes that underlie the process of development itself. They are emphasized in the present research through the analysis of social capital, participation in local communities and social networks, i.e. the connecting of local population in order to enhance the development of local community and improve the quality of life in rural areas.

The results obtained on the social capital in the rural communities in Vojvodina indicate a significant influence of the ex-communist Serbian legacy and subsequent democratic transition on the present-day Serbian society. Although our results show a certain level of social capital in the surveyed rural communities (measured by the degree of trust, affiliation to institutions, readiness for local activism and participation), it can be argued that the overall social capital is underdeveloped. Considering the specific sample of farmers examined (who were better-off farmers, with higher education and intensive cooperation with the advisory service), the results obtained did not reveal such a bad situation if measured by the degree of readiness for activism and membership in associations. However, this phenomenon should be observed from the perspective of the transformation of Serbian society, a general lack of trust among people and in institutions, a lack of institutional architecture in rural areas, and a lack of stable and sufficiently adequate and financially strong rural and agrarian policy. The insufficient stability and adequacy of these policies is reflected in the lack of/inadequacy of certain strategic documents and institutional frameworks for rural development, insufficient regionalization and decentralization of society, underdeveloped civil society, and thus insufficiently developed social capital and a lack of local development initiatives in the rural areas of Serbia. On balance, a low level of social capital was expected in the rural communities considered (which is consistent with previous results), except for some specific locations that are traditionally characterized by strong interrelationships and charismatic and active local leaders who, under given circumstances, could contribute to the development of local community.

Acknowledgements: This research was financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia / Sredstva za realizaciju istraživanja obezbeđena od strane Ministarstva za prosvetu, nauku i tehnološki razvoj Republike Srbije (ugovor 451-03-9/2021-14/200117).

REFERENCES

- Beetz S., Brauer K., Neu C. [Hrsg.] (2005): Handwörterbuch zur ländlichen Gesellschaft in Deutschland. VS Verlag. Wiesbaden.
- Bourdieu P. (1983): The forms of capital. U Richardson J. E. (ed.). (1986). Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education. Greenwood press. 241-258.
- Bourdieu P. (1999): Nacrt za jednu teoriju prakse. Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva. Beograd.
- Brunori G. & Rossi A. (2000): Synergy and coherence through collective action: some insights from wine routes in Tuscany. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40(4): 409-423.
- Colemann J.S. (1988): Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 94. Supplement, 95-120.
- Colemann J.S. (1990): Foundations of social theory. Cambridge and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Cvejić S., Babović M., Petrović M., Bogdanov N., Vuković O. (2010): Socijalna isključenost u ruralnim oblastima Srbije. UNDP. Beograd.
- Janković D. (2020): Društvene promene i ruralni razvoj: značaj socijalnog kapitala, participacije i društvenih mreža. Poljoprivredni fakultet Novi Sad. ISBN 978-86-7520-518-0.
- Janković D. & Novakov M. (2018): Teorija modernizacije: od osnovnih načela ka modernizaciji poljoprivrede. *Agroekonomika*. 47(81): 1-13.
- Janković D. & Novakov M. (2019): Srbija i ruralni razvoj – ruralnosociološki osvrti. Poljoprivredni fakultet Novi Sad. ISBN 978-86-7520-479-4.
- Lin N. (2001): Social capital. A theory of social structure and action. Cambridge University Press.
- Marsden T. (1999): Rural futures: the consumption countryside and its regulation. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 39(4): 501-526.
- O'Connor D., Renting H., Gorman M., Kinsella J. (2006): The evolution of rural development in Europe and the role of EU policy. In: Connor, D., Renting, H., Gorman, M. and J. Kinsella (ed). Driving rural development: policy and practice in seven EU countries. Van Gorcum. Assen.
- Pavićević O. (2012): Pozitivni i negativni aspekti društvenog kapitala – slučaj postkomunističkih društava. *Sociologija*, 54(3), Sociološko naučno društvo Srbije.
- Planck U. & Ziche J. (1979): Land- und Agrarsoziologie. Eine Einführung in die Soziologie des ländlichen Siedlungsraumes und des Agrarbereichs. Ulmer. Stuttgart.
- Ploeg J.D. van der, Renting H., Brunori G., Knickel K., Mannion J., Marsden T., de Roest K., Sevilla-Guzmán E., Ventura F. (2000): Rural development: from practices and policies towards theory. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40(4): 391-408.
- Portes A. (1998): Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24: 1-24.
- Putnam R.D. (1996): The Strange Disappearance of Civic America. The American Prospect. No. 24.
- Putnam R.D. (2000): Bowling alone. Simon Schuster paperbacks. New York.
- Shortall S. (2004): Social or economic goals, civic inclusion or exclusion ? An analysis of rural development theory and practice. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44(1): 109-123.
- Sivini G. (2004): Needs of a new agricultural policy for postfordist rural development. Paper for the XI World Congress of Rural Sociology. Trondheim.
- Slee B. (1994): Theoretical aspects of the study of endogenous development. In: Ploeg, J.D. van der and Ann, Long (ed). Born from within. Practice and perspectives of endogenous rural development. Royal Van Gorcum. Assen.
- Šljukić S. & Janković D. (2015): Selo u sociološkom ogledalu. Mediterran Publishing, Novi Sad.
- Wiskerke J.S.C. (2004): Rural sociology in the Netherlands: past, present and future. *Agrarwirtschaft und Agrarsoziologie*, 2(4): 39-63.
- Woolcock M. (1998): Social capital and economic development: toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society*, 27(2): 151-208.

Submitted: 18.02.2021.

Accepted: 22.02.2021.