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Goals of the study

• To present an institutional framework for delivering agricultural and rural support policy in Poland
• To evaluate Government executive agencies (EU paying agencies):
  – the Agency for Restructuring and Modernization of Agriculture
  – the Agricultural Market Agency
› All statements are based on farmers’ beliefs
Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Polish government agricultural agencies are imperfect as they are full of political pressure and incompetence.

Hypothesis 2: There is no difference in perceptions by the smallest and biggest farmers of the government agencies’ performance.
Material and methods

• Qualitative (Survey):
  – Structured questionnaire
  – Sample size = 200 farmers
  – Perception of specific performance issues:
    1-10 Likert scale, mean-score, correlation coefficients

• Annual reports of the agencies and EU documents
Governance

• The way in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for the public good [O’Brien 2003]
• The state’s ability to serve the citizens [European Commission 2008].
• The allocation of responsibility for decision-making and policy delivery across government departments, levels of government, and public and private actors.
Attributes of good governance

• A professionally competent, capable and honest public service which operates within an accountable, rule governed framework and in which the principles of merit and the public interest are paramount [UN 1992].

• (...) a bureaucracy imbued with professional ethos acting in furtherance of the public good, the rule of law, transparent processes [World Bank 1994].
Arrangements for implementing the EU budget within shared management between the Commission and Member States
### Survey: Summary demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Farm size (ha UAA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>3,0 and less</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.01-10</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age in years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-39</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td><strong>Farm economic status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>Excellent/good</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Farming experience in years</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>10 and less</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/secondary</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Important for agriculture development
Meets farmers' expectations
Shapes positive attitudes to Polish farmers in EU
Provides high level services
Provides reliable information about EU-programs
Has competent president/director
Employees respect regulations
Manages public money effectively
Is resistant to different interest group pressures
Is worthy of trust
Has professional employees
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Important for agriculture development
Responsive to farmers' expectations
Shapes positive attitudes to Polish farmers in EU
Provides high level services
Provides reliable information about EU-programs
Has competent president/director
Has professional employees
Employees respect regulations
Manages public money effectively
Resistant to different interest group pressures
Affected by political party dominance
Worthy of trust

Small vs. Large
Small vs. large farmers, AMA

- Important for agriculture development
- Worthy of trust
- Responsive to farmers' expectations
- Shapes positive attitudes to Polish farmers in EU
- Provides high level services
- Provides reliable information about EU-programs
- Has competent president/director
- Has professional employees
- Manages public money effectively
- Employees respect regulations
- Resistant to different interest group pressures
- Affected by political party dominance

Small vs. Large

- Graph shows comparison of small and large farmers on various criteria.
Conclusions

• Users of the services provided by the government agencies may play an important role in evaluating the agencies, for example through surveys of perceptions and experiences that indicate what is successful or not and what needs to be changed.

• In spite of the general impression that government agencies are inefficient and ineffective, the agricultural agencies in Poland:
  – scored well in the survey of farmers
  – received political support from the farmers in terms of confidence
Conclusions

• Both agencies have been positively assessed for promoting development of Polish agriculture and creating positive attitudes by the Europeans towards Polish farmers.

• Against expected results, according to the surveyed farmers, the agencies:
  – have not been under big pressure from political parties and interest groups
  – have firstly represented Polish farmers’ interests.
Conclusions

• The agencies were scored high on the scale of good governance attributes. Among the needed improvements, the most frequently indicated by the respondents were: reduction of formalities, improving information, simplification of form filling procedure.

• Small and big farmers on average held similar opinions \((r=0.86)\) on selected issues concerning agricultural agencies. However, slightly less favourable scores were given by the smallest farmers.
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