ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at http://www.journalijdr.com

IJDR

International Journal of Development Research
Vol. 10, Issue, 11, pp. 42039-42046, November, 2020
https://doi.org/10.37118/ijdr.20281.11.2020

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

SUSTAINABLE FARMS IN THE RETURNEE AREAS OF THE MIDDLE PODRINJE

***Edin Ramić, Havka Zuhrić, Besim Salkić, Ensar Salkić, and I Amir Zenunović**

University in Tuzla, Tehnological Faculty

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 27th August, 2020
Received in revised form
03rd September, 2020
Accepted 11th October, 2020
Published online 30th November, 2020

Key Words:
Agriculture, Sustainable Return, Returnees, farms, Central Podrinje region.

****Corresponding author:***
Edin Ramić,

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of research on the existence and extent of barriers for returnees to rural areas of the Central Podrinje region and solving the issue of sustainability of farms with the existing way of organizing agricultural production. This research enables the achievement of goals, such as, considering the impact of certain production on the development of farms of returnee communities, proposing the optimal model of agricultural farms that will engage agricultural resources and employ the existing workforce. In order to find answers to existing problem questions, a population from returnee communities in the Central Podrinje region was selected. The results obtained by this research will serve as a basis from which it will be possible to determine how a certain production affects the development of farms of returnee communities.

Citation: ***Edin Ramić, Havka Zuhrić, Besim Salkić, Ensar Salkić, and I Amir Zenunović., 2020.*** "Sustainable farms in the returnee areas of the middle podrinje", *International Journal of Development Research*, 10, (11), 42039-42046.

INTRODUCTION

It is estimated that in Bosnia and Herzegovina, during the war (1992-1995), the total war damage amounted to between 50-70 billion USD, of which about 6.5 billion USD was damage in the field of agriculture. In the past war, the organizational systems of the functioning of the economy were destroyed or disappeared: most cooperatives ceased to operate, agricultural and industrial complexes disappeared, and with them the channel of placement for agricultural products, scientific research and the like. Significant funds have been invested in the post-war reconstruction of returnee communities in rural areas, most of which in the reconstruction of housing and infrastructure. Significant support for returnees by domestic and international organizations also takes place through the reconstruction of agricultural holdings through the delivery of mechanization for the cultivation of agricultural land as well as the renewal and expansion of livestock in returnee rural areas. The goal of investment and support is sustainable return and sustainable development. Sustainability is the process and way of applying sustainable development and limiting excessive economic growth. Sustainable development as a concept began and emerged as part of a broader program that the Brundtland Commission promoted in 1987 as a program for a common future. The basic determinants of sustainability that were promoted were the environment and development, and all agreed declarations and international (global) agreements are further based on these determinants. Sustainable development is above all a considered and responsible way of development that implies preservation and restoration, but not destruction natural world and natural resources. Therefore, we can talk about "environmentally sustainable development", about "economically sustainable development" and "politically sustainable development", ie about integral sustainability. With such a holistic understanding of sustainable development, man accepts a "more equal" and more responsible attitude towards nature [1]. "Sustainable development is not a goal. It is a process of reaching a better society" [2]. Sustainable development is defined in different ways, but in practice sustainable development actually means development that strikes a balance of economic, social and environmental goals for the benefit of present and future generations [3]. The most common problems present in all returnee and displaced local communities are mainly economic sustainability (high unemployment rate, 1% of returnees are employed), disrespect for the constituency of the people in employment in public institutions, lack of infrastructure, problems in education, non-

renewable housing units, mined areas, health insurance and services, social welfare, care for the infirm and return of property [4]. Rural development is a process that aims to improve the living standards of people living in rural areas. It can be defined as the overall development of rural areas to improve the quality of life of the rural population. It is an integrated process, involving social, economic, political and spiritual development to poorer sections of society and helping the rural population to set priorities in their communities. Rural development in terms of a rational approach dates back to the early 1950s with the introduction of the term underdevelopment, which was then valid for "third world" countries. Rural development refers to the development of a rural complex. The rural complex can be viewed as four related components: village (spatial-position, internal organization of settlements; social-relations between social groups, social institutions; cultural, spiritual-beliefs, education, values), agriculture (structural-agrarian structure; professional-agriculture) as an occupation, old crafts and trades), environment (nature - untouched nature and natural landscapes; impact of human activity - cultivated environment) and technology because it has played a key role in modernization due to changes in production methods and techniques, nature of work and products[5].

There are three main goals in the concept of rural development, and these are the environmental, social and economic aspects. The environmental aspect refers to environmental protection and biodiversity conservation, social equality in the distribution of opportunities to the rural population, and the economic aspect refers to economic stability and especially small family farms linked to local action groups (LAGs) [5]. Preservation of rural landscapes, increased concentration of rural population and environmental protection lead to the development of social, social, economic and ecological elements of rural development, thus enabling various aspects of spatial development, such as rural tourism and better connectivity of rural and urban areas. The realization that rural development does not refer exclusively to agricultural production has enabled a different approach to the rural environment and its development, which is confirmed by programs and reforms that have been implemented and are still being implemented to improve the quality of life in rural areas. Rural development policy is aimed at strengthening the sustainability of the European agricultural sector and rural areas through economic, social and environmental action. The specific objectives of rural development are implemented in such a way that resources are used more efficiently, that the country's production capacity is increased, that human resources are strengthened and that resource management is sustainable through environmental care. Rural development includes smart growth, inclusive growth and sustainable growth.

Smart growth is about supporting innovation and skills. Inclusive growth is the release of local resources, strengthening the diversity of the rural economy, developing the local market and employment. Sustainable growth strengthens and improves public goods and services, reduces greenhouse gas emissions and takes care of biodiversity [6].
Bosnia and Herzegovina is a country with distinct rural features in which, according to estimates, about 51% of the total population lives. The characteristics of rural areas in BiH are underdevelopment, depopulation, aging population, low level of employment and poor socio-economic conditions that make this area passive and less desirable for living. On the other hand, rural areas possess natural resources, numerous cultural heritage and other benefits that are considered to be the foundation of rural development. Agriculture is the basic, but not the only available activity of the inhabitants of rural areas. The importance of the agricultural sector in BiH is reflected in the participation in the creation of total gross value added, employment of the population and ensuring food security, as well as in trade. According to data for 2014, about 139,00071 employees are employed in agriculture, of which about 60% are men and 40% women. The decline in economic activity, as well as the share of agriculture and the value of agricultural production has affected the reduction in the number of employees agricultural activity in the last three years from 167,000, as many as were employed in 2012, to 139,000 in 2014, which is 28,000 or 17% less. The downward trend in the number of employees is evident in both men and women, with a larger decrease in the number of employed women by 22%, while the number of employed men decreased by 13.13% in the last three years. The concept of integrated rural development has been applied for a long time in middle and high income countries, and is based on the fact that natural resources are used in various ways, ensuring their normal renewal to the same or greater extent, in order to preserve and for future generations. The future development of rural areas in BiH should be directed in that direction, in accordance with EU rural development policies. Rural development in the coming period should focus on: improving human capacity in rural areas and increasing their information, skills and knowledge, improving production infrastructure and infrastructure for the purchase of agricultural products in rural areas, improving the quality and safety of agricultural and food products in line with EU standards.Agriculture is one of the ways to create new jobs in the countryside and stabilize rural communities, which were re-established after the war[7]. Based on analyzes and retrospectively selected indicators: gross domestic product (GDP) of agriculture, agricultural employment, size and structure of agricultural and arable land, production volume and average yields of some key agricultural products and number of livestock, for which it was possible to find data for the period from 1950 to 2010, it was determined that in the past sixty years in BiH there was an increase in GDP of agriculture, despite a significant decrease in agricultural population, that arable land was reduced and the structure of arable land changed, that average yields increased, but not significantly. mostly reduced. Based on the analysis of selected indicators and having in mind the development of productive forces that has occurred in the meantime, the general conclusion is that a certain percentage of agricultural progress in BiH was achieved from 1950 to 2010[8].

Historically, agricultural development strategies have changed, but the main ones have been the increase of irrigated areas, the provision of insurance and financing, a strong emphasis on the education of farmers and the mechanization and chemicalization of agriculture[9]. The agribusiness development strategy is therefore an attempt to record in the region the political and technical possibilities needed to improve the process of transformation of the entire agri-food sector, thus ensuring its vitality and sustainability in the future. The outcome of the implementation of the agribusiness development strategy should be a significant contribution to the development of the economy, through increasing the quantity and quality of products, GDP, exports, employment and overall quality of life[10].The strategy should be the result

of a participatory process of consultation with key actors, including small farmers and their organizations, municipal authorities, state and entity government representatives, key donor agencies and others involved in the country's rural and agricultural development[11].Agribusiness development strategy should serve as an argument, to consider the possibility of new investment ventures or to activate unused land and other potentials in order to make a profit and preserve natural resources[12].The role of the FBiH agribusiness sector must be redefined or so as to remain a source of livelihood for relatively poor rural population or to evolve into a more competitive sector, which can be a substitute for imports and expand exports. Despite all attempts by agricultural policy makers, today's agricultural sector tends to support the first approach, and the development of a more specific agricultural sector would require proactive measures and activities[3]. The perspective of agribusiness development is defined by the business strategy of small, medium and large enterprises. The starting point for creating a strategy is to research customer needs and align them with what the manufacturer can realistically produce[13]. The challenge for policy makers is to build a new agricultural development strategy to improve agricultural productivity, increase domestic food production and increase overall economic gain. These desired results will, however, be achieved by improving agricultural and trade policy, infrastructure, transport, land lease and land management practices, irrigation, research, input reallocation and the promotion of producers and marketing organizations that have linked small farmers to new retail chains [14].Implementation of the adopted strategy for agribusiness development must not collide with strategies of sustainable development, energy efficiency, tourism development, etc. [15].New approaches in the development of national strategy for agribusiness development should take into account, in addition to economic, environmental and the social function [16].Return to BiH began immediately after the end of the conflict. About 1,060,000 returns to BiH have been recorded so far. Of the total number of realized returns, about 610,000 or 67% refers to the return of displaced persons, and the remaining about 450,000 or 43% to the return of refugees. It is still difficult to estimate how many refugees and displaced persons have found lasting solutions through return, because, in addition to the possible significant deviation of statistical indicators from actual return, there is a phenomenon that many after entering or owning their property or other assets, which are recorded as return, are temporarily or permanently leaving their pre-war residences again.

Estimates also show that more than a quarter of refugees and displaced persons have integrated in host countries in places of displacement in BiH have found some other solutions. More than 340,000 homes have been rebuilt or renovated. In the past 10 years, since the competence for these issues was transferred to the authorities in BiH, more than a billion KM have been invested in the return sector in BiH, of which about 620 million KM have been invested in housing reconstruction, and almost 500 million KM have been invested in complementary sustainability measures.Many returnees who have returned so far face a difficult social situation that threatens their chances of survival in places of return. Economic opportunities remain very scarce, often lacking infrastructure, including electricity, and their access to rights and services, such as health care, education, social protection and pensions, is limited due to various constitutional, legal, financial and other reasons. Return is blocked by many factors, from severe war traumas, various obstructions and pressures on the ground, to objective difficulties in reconstruction and the creation of basic existential conditions for return and survival.During the five-year implementation of the BiH Strategy for the Implementation of Annex 7 of the DMS, from the beginning of 2003 to the end of 2007, a total of about 618 million families were invested in the sector of reconstruction and sustainable return of about 31,500 families (about 130,000 persons). KM, which is an average of almost 20,000 KM per returnee family. Reconstruction costs per housing unit averaged about 11,000 KM (55%), and about 9,000 KM (45%) was invested on average in sustainable sustainability measures, with the participation of domestic institutions in financing sustainable return around 447 million KM (72%), and foreign donors 170.7 million KM (28%).The main characteristics of agriculture in the Middle Podrinje until 1992 are the above-average development of labor-intensive production in the municipalities of Zvonik, Sapna, Bratunac and parts of the municipality of Milici, which provided employment - able-bodied, elderly, female labor force and minors of different ages . In the area of the municipalities of Srebrenica, Vlasenica and Šekovići, the largest volume and processing of agricultural products and the supply of farmers is organized through the organization of subcontractors - agricultural producers within UPI's work organizations. The largest volume, value of production and work engagement of household members was realized in the production of berries, then tobacco, milk, vegetables, beef and traditional products of this area - plums.Today's state of agriculture in these areas is far below the real possibilities and needs, this is especially pronounced in the production and processing of fruit. Where e.g. of about 8,500 tons of production of so-called colored fruit, in addition to significant areas of new raspberry plantations, the total production has not yet reached even 50% of the production volume from 1991.

One of the basic preconditions for successful production of large quantities of agricultural products for the market is an efficient form of organization of a large number of small producers. In the long practice of a number of developed European countries, agricultural cooperatives have become an indispensable form agricultural products intended for the market and processing capacities. It is quite certain that the appropriate form of agricultural cooperative in the area of these municipalities in the long-term programmed production of milk, meat, vegetables and other agricultural products intended for the market and processing capacities is the best and most useful ways of organizing agricultural producers.Due to the spatial distance, terrain configuration, fragmentation of the populated area of the program, it would be rational to form a number of new agricultural cooperatives in addition to the existing agricultural cooperatives. sources of income and without significant assistance from local communities, it is necessary in the initial phase to provide complete professional and material support for the formation and material training of new farmers' associations. Also, it is necessary to provide assistance for material and personnel training of existing farmers' associations, given that some of the existing associations do not perform their core business within the real possibilities and needs. More than half of the rural population is not seriously engaged in agriculture, and only 6% of them are serious agricultural entities. The vast majority of rural households are not involved in agricultural education or advisory services. This is certainly one of the reasons why there is no starting a business, in agriculture or outside it [17].

Investments in rural infrastructure, together with the creation and dissemination of new technologies, have a significant positive effect on agricultural growth□3□. There are opportunities for micro and small enterprises in the field of providing services for rural areas, craft production, processing of agricultural products, production of traditional dishes, new business ventures such as: organic production and production of biofuels, local crafts and catering services □18□. The main problem of the agricultural sector of BiH is low productivity, both per unit of production and per farm. Low productivity of animal production is certainly partly due to inadequate breed structure, inefficient breeding and selection work, but mostly the duality of production. In animal production, and especially in animal husbandry, extensive and fragmented production predominates, while on the other hand, a small part of production is organized on modern, technically and technologically very well equipped farms. In addition, the inadequacy of the diet (preparation, storage and mixing of animal feed) to the requirements of highly productive animals leads to inadequate use of available genetic material and lower productivity. When planning the development of livestock production in an area, it is necessary to consider the state of livestock in the European and world markets.During the war, there was a drastic reduction in livestock. After the war, the basic herd in cattle breeding was renewed and increased within the projects with international financial support and independently, under the direction of the cattle breeders themselves. For all types of livestock, the number is far smaller than in the pre-war period and far smaller than the number, which could be fed on 1.4 million ha of meadows and pastures in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Table 1 shows the total number of livestock.

Method of Work: In order to find answers to the identified problem questions, the selected research population are returnees to the Bosnian entity of Republika Srpska, Central Podrinje region (municipalities of Zvornik, Milići, Vlasenica, Bratunac and Srebrenica). A sample of 325 respondents was used to determine the respondents, within which, as stratums, the areas of the Republika Srpska entities, the region of Srednja Podrinje, which are located in: Zvornik - 100 respondents, Milići - 50 respondents, Vlasenici - 50 respondents, Bratunac - 75 respondents, Srebrenica - 50 respondents. The questionnaire on the research of barriers to return to the entity of Republika Srpska and ways to ensure the conditions for sustainable return was used in the research. The questionnaire consists of 8 questions that determine the sample of respondents. Data were processed by descriptive analysis, frequencies and percentages were calculated. Due to the decision to conduct tests for data processing, the Kolmogor Test (N> 50) was applied to assess the normality of the distribution.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Table 3 shows the structure of the sample of respondents / returnees with regard to gender and place of return (urban, rural). The majority of returnees are male, 183 (56.3%) and 142 (43.7%) are women. Also, the majority of respondents are returnees to rural areas, 246 (75.7%), while 79 (24.3%) of them returned to urban areas. The largest number of returnees, distributed in periods of 10 years of age, is aged 41 to 50 years, 83 of them (25.5%), while a total of 208 (64%) returnees aged 20 to 50 years, which is significant data, assuming that work ability and regular activities are important factors of sustainable return (Table 4).

Table 1. Number of livestock in BiH

Animal category	1990	2006	2007
Cattle	873. 605	515.000	468.000
Sheep	1.319.000	100.400	1.033.000
Pigs	613.586	709.000	535.000
Horses	99. 803	25.000	25.000
Goats	-	76.000	70.000
Poultry	8.544.000	10.340.000	
Beehives	74. 901	283.000	310.000

Source: Statistical office BiH

Table 2. Number of cattle and animal production in area middle Podrinje

Category	Zvornik	Bratunac	Srebrenic	Milići		Ukupno
Cattle	5.250	2. 600	700	2.500	1.550	12. 600
Dairy cows	3.700	950	500	1.500	1.050	7.700
Sheeps	22.000	3.300	6.000	4. 600	10.750	46. 650
Pigs	9.000	4.330	500	1.500	4.000	19.330
Poultry	70.000	17.000	18.000	100.000	14.000	219.000
Milk proccessing	1.200	1.200	360	300	18	3.078
Beef production	200	90	-	-	-	290
Sheep meat production	10	20	-	-	-	30
Honey production	-	20.000	1.400	8.750	-	30.150

Source: Statistical info from questionnaire, 2010. year.

Table 3. Sample structure with respect to sex and place of return

Sample	Sex		Place	
	Male	Female	Urban	Rural
f	183	142	79	246
%	56,3	43,7	24,3	75,7

Objective of the Research: The aim of the research is to determine the existence and extent of barriers to return to rural areas of the Central Podrinje region and to address the issue of sustainability of farms with the existing way of organizing agricultural production.

Table 5 presents the distribution of frequencies and percentages of the results of the survey of the representation of respondents with regard to the amount of income. It can be noticed that the majority of respondents have no income (128

or 39.4%) or have an income lower than 300 KM (80 or 24.6%), which together amounts to 64.0% of returnees.

Age	f	%
< 20	3	0,9
21 – 30	61	18,8
31 – 40	64	19,7
41 – 50	83	25,5
51 – 60	59	18,2
> 60	55	16,9
Total	325	100,0

Amount of income (KM)	f	%
Without income	128	39,4
< 300	80	24,6
301 – 500	68	20,9
501 – 1000	35	10,8
1001 –1500	11	3,4
1501 – 2000	2	0,6
Does not want to answer	1	0,3
Total	325	100,0

Inspecting Table 6, it can be seen that the majority of returnees (288 or 88.6%) do not agree with the statement that "Efforts have been made by the entities to renovate the area where I live as a returnee", ie they do not agree with this statement. (44.9%), 131 (40.3%) completely disagree and 11 (3.4%) returnees somewhat disagree.

Efforts have been made by the entities to renovate the area where I live as a returnee	f	%
I completely disagee	131	40,3
Disagree	146	44,9
Partly disagree	11	3,4
Nor agree, nor disagree	5	1,5
Partly agree	18	5,5
Agree	5	1,5
I completely agree	9	2,8
Total	325	100,

Insight into the frequency distribution and response rates of returnees shows that most of them (262 or 80.7%) agree with the statement that "Destroyed or missing organizational systems of the economy and markets during 1992-1995 have not been renewed to this day." 191 (58.8%) fully agree, 50 (15.4%) agree and 21 (6.5%) returnees agree somewhat (Table 7). This can be a significant cause of unemployment for the returnee, but also the domicile population, who live in places with a majority returnee population.

Table 7. Distribution of returnees' responses to the statement about the functioning of the economy and the market in returnee places

Destroyed or missing systems of functioning of the economy have not been restored in returnee places	f	%
I completely disagree	13	4,0
Disagree	22	6,8
Partly disagree	20	6,2
Nor agree, nor disagree	8	2,5
Partly agree	21	6,5
Agree	50	15,4
I completely agree	191	58,8
Total	325	100,0

The majority of returnees (232 or 71.3% in total) do not agree with the statement “Agricultural product placement channels accept our products in the same way as during the period 1992-1995”. 122 (37.5%) disagree with this statement, 66 (20.3%) disagree and 44 (13.5%) returnees completely disagree (Table 8).

Table 8. Distribution of returnees' responses to the claim regarding the placement of agricultural products

Agricultural product placement channels who accept our products	f	%
I completely disagree	44	13,5
Disagree	66	20,3
Partly disagree	122	37,5
Nor agree, nor disagree	22	6,8
Partly agree	25	7,7
Agree	27	8,3
I completely agree	19	5,8
Total	325	100,0

Insight into Table 9 shows that there is an approximately equal representation of returnees' responses to the statement that "significant funds have been invested in the reconstruction of returnee communities in rural areas", with a slightly higher overall percentage of disagreements. 46.5% disagreed with the statement, and 44.0% of returnees agreed. The largest number of respondents answered that they somewhat agree with this statement (101 or 31.1%).

Table 9. Distribution of returnees' responses to the claim regarding the restoration of returnee communities in rural areas

Significant funds have been invested in the reconstruction of returnee communities in rural areas	f	%
I completely disagree	43	13,2
Disagree	62	19,1
Partly disagree	46	14,2
Nor agree, nor disagree	31	9,5
Partly agree	101	31,1
Agree	24	7,4
I completely agree	18	5,5
Total	325	100,0

Looking at the frequency distribution and response rates of returnees, it can be seen that most of them (200 or 61.6% in total) do not agree with the statement that "The current level of agricultural land cultivation can provide enough income for a normal family life." 114 (35.1%) disagree with the statement, 53 (16.3%) disagree to some extent and 33 (10.2%) returnees completely disagree (Table 10).

Table 10. Distribution of returnees' responses to the claim regarding the impact of agricultural land cultivation levels on income insurance

The current level of agricultural land cultivation can provide enough income for a normal family life.	f	%
I completely disagree	33	10,2
Disagree	114	35,1
Partly disagree	53	16,3
Nor agree, nor disagree	23	7,1
Partly agree	20	6,2
Agree	31	9,5
I completely agree	51	15,7
Total	325	100,0

The majority of returnees (186 or 57.2% in total) also disagree with the statement "Animal production is optimal for the engagement of resources and the existing workforce." 115 (35.4%) disagree with the statement, 57 (17.5%) disagree to some extent and 14 (4.3%) returnees completely disagree (Table 11).

Table 11. Distribution of returnees' responses to the claim regarding the impact of animal production on resource engagement

Animal production is optimal for engaging resources and existing workers	f	%
I completely disagree	14	4,3
Disagree	115	35,4
Partly disagree	57	17,5
Nor agree, nor disagree	20	6,2
Partly agree	32	9,8
Agree	30	9,2
I completely agree	57	17,5
Total	325	100,0

Table 12. Distribution of respondents' answers to the question regarding the adequacy of income from land cultivation and animal production

Adequancy of income	f	%	%	
None	1	0,3	1	0,7
Minimum	32	9,8	32	23,7
Not enough	95	29,2	95	70,4
Enough	7	2,2	7	5,2
No answers	190	58,5	135	100,0
Total	325	100,0		

Table 13. Mann-Whitney In a test of research on attitudes about the sustainability of return in relation to gender

Variables	Sex	Middle	Sum	Mann-	Z	*p*
Sustainability of return	Male	162,97	29824,00	12988,00	-0,01	0,99
	Female	163,04	23151,00			

Table 14. Results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test on the sustainability of return in relation to age

Variable	Age	N	Middle rang	Median	Hi-square	df	*p*
Sustainability of return	< 20	3	160,33	36,00	34,17	5	0,00
	21 – 30	61	210,56	53,00			
	31 – 40	64	165.95	39.50			
	41 – 50	83	174,90	41,00			
	51 – 60	59	133,47	36,00			
	> 60	55	120,68	36,00			
	Total	325		39,00			

Variable	Age Dob	Middle rang rangovi	Sum Rangova	Mann- Whitney U	Z	*p*
Sustainability of return	21 – 30	71,52	4362,50	1432,50	-2,57	0,01
	31 – 40	54,88	3512,50			
	21 – 30	83,89	5117,50	1836,50	-2,81	0,01
	41 – 50	64,13	5322,50			
	21 – 30	74,25	4529,50	960,50	-4,42	0,00
	51 – 60	46,28	2730,50			
	21 – 30	72,15	4401,00	845,00	-4,61	0,00
	> 60	43,36	2385,00			
	31 – 40	71,70	4589,00	2509,00	-0,57	0,57
	41 – 50	75,77	6289,00			
	31 – 40	67,88	4344,50	1511,50	-1,91	0,06
	51 – 60	55.62	3281.50			
	31 – 40	67,45	4316,50	12833,50	-2,55	0,01
	> 60	51,34	2823,50			
	41 – 50	79,81	6624,50	1758,50	-2,87	0,00
	51 – 60	59,81	3528,50			
	41 – 50	79,52	6600,00	1451,00	-3,63	0,00
	> 60	54,38	2991,00			
	51 – 60	60,40	3563,50	1451,50	-0,96	0,33
	> 60	54,39	2991,50			

Table 12 presents the representation of respondents' answers to the question: To what extent do agricultural land cultivation and animal production provide sufficient income for normal family life? The largest number of returnees, 190 or 58.5% of the total number of all respondents, did not comment or gave an answer that does not relate to this question, which is in some ways indicative. It can be assumed that they had no experience in these activities. Out of 274 returnees who declared themselves, 95 of them (70.4%) consider it to be insufficient, and 32 (23.7%) to be the minimum income for the normal life of families, which confirms the difficult financial situation of the returnee population.

Table 16. Results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test on the sustainability of return in relation to educational status

Variable	Educational status	N	Middle rang	Median	Hi-square	df	*p*
Sustainability of return	No education	22	108,89	35,00	25,98	3	0,00
	ES	90	130,42	35,00			
	HS	180	177,49	41,00			
	Bachelor	29	193,07	45,00			
	Total	321		37,00			

In order to gain a clearer insight into the attitudes of returnees on the sustainability of return, the differences of summarized responses to all the statements made in relation to gender, age and educational status of the respondents were tested. Using the Mann-Whitney U test, when comparing the results of the survey of attitudes towards the sustainability of return in relation to gender, no statistically significant difference in mean ranks was found between male and female respondents (U = 12988.00; Z = -0.01; p = 0.99) (Table 22). Using Kruskal-Wallis Htest, comparing the results of the survey of attitudes to the established claims about the sustainability of return in relation to the age of returnees (six groups of respondents), a statistically significant difference was found ($\chi 2$ = 34.17 df = 5; p = 0.00) (Table 14). Insight into the middle ranks and medians in Table 15, and considering the direction of responses, it can be seen that the most favorable answers about sustainable return were given by younger generations, especially from 21 to 30 years, compared to all other groups of returnees. The responses of the younger generations may be to some extent caused by ignorance and inexperience, but they can certainly also be a reason for optimism in the future of returnees. Applying the Kruskal-Wallis H test when comparing the results of the survey of attitudes to the claims about the sustainability of return in relation to the educational status of returnees (four groups of respondents), a statistically significant difference was detected ($\chi 2$ = 10.21; df = 5; p = 0.00) (Table 25).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the conducted research, and in connection with the set goal, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- The largest number of returnees returned to their place of pre-war residence by 2005 (68.6%), and after that period the number of returnees decreased significantly by year.
- Returnees live in difficult material conditions, and 64.0% of them stated that they live without income (39.4%) or with an income lower than 300 KM (24.6%).
- Most returnees believe that the destroyed or missing organizational systems of the functioning of the economy and the market (1992-1995) in returnee places have not been restored to date, and that they have been restored in places where there were not many returnees.
- The majority of returnees (57.2%) do not think that animal production is optimal for the engagement of resources and the existing labor force, which was hypothesis H3, and it can be rejected on the basis of such results.
- Returnees generally believe that agricultural land cultivation and animal production do not provide enough or provide a minimum income for the normal life of families.
- A significant majority of returnees believe that unemployment is a key barrier that most hinders sustainable return in rural areas of the returnee population in the Republika Srpska entity, which was hypothesis X1, and it can be confirmed based on such results. However, most of them also do not find returnees more difficult to find a job than the rest of the population.
- Animal production is the key to transforming the development of rural areas, work and economy, and preserving the natural landscape, tradition and culture of folk life, which is opposed to the city with industrial features, which is why it is necessary to support governmental and non-governmental organizations. future for future generations, but also to strengthen the will for work and survival of returnees.

REFERENCES

Lay, V. (2007.), Vizija održivog razvoja Hrvatske. U:V:Lay , Razvoj sposoban za budućnost (str 11-53), Zagreb, Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar

Pušić, Lj. (2001.), Održivi grad. Ka jednoj sociologiji okruženja, Beograd, Nezavisna izdanja Slobodana Mašića

Sutton, W., Asa, M. G., Giertz, H., Van der Celen, P., Nikolić, A. (2010). Studija o politici poljoprivrednog sektora u Bosni i Hercegovini - Studija o politikama trgovine i integracije, Izvještaj br. 57919-BA, Ured Svjetske banke u Bosni i Hercegovini

Strategija razvoja Bosne i Hercegovine, maj 2010.

Cifrić, I. (2003), Ruralni razvoj i modernizacija. Prilozi istraživanju ruralnog identiteta, Zagreb, Biblioteka znanosti i društva, Institut za društvena istraživanja

Tufekčić, M. Tufekčić, Ž. (2013): EU politike & fondovi 2014 – 2020. Plavi partner d.o.o., Zagreb

Christoplos, I. (2007). Between the CAPs: Agricultural policies, programming and the market in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, London, Background Paper.

Vaško, Ž., Mirjanić, S. (2013). Osnovni indikatori razvoja poljoprivrede u Bosni i Gercegovini- retrospektiva (1950.do 2010.godine, Agroznanje, vol. 14, br.4. 575-589.

Timothy, O. W. and Smith, R. (2008). Rethinking Agricultural Development: The Caribbean Challenge. 40th Annual Monetary Studies Conference, 11-14 November 2008, Basseterre, St Kitts.

Caribbean Agriculture is our Business (2012). CARICOM Agribusiness Development Strategy. As presented to the 40th Special Meeting of the Council for Trade & Economic Development (COTED) Dominica, October 19, 2012.

Herlant, P., Mc Grenra, D. (2013). Bosnia and Herzegovina - Country strategic opportunities programme. IFAD, Enabling poor rural people to overcome poverty, 110th Session Rome, 10-12 December 2013

Cicea, C., Cvijanović, D., Subić, J. (2007). Strategija i prioriteti poljoprivrede i ruralnog razvoja Rumunije. Ekonomika poljoprivrede, 54 (4); 441-459

Živanović, N., Milićević, M., Živanović, V. (2011). Razvojna strategija agrobiznisa. GROBIZ 2011., Naučna konferencija sa međunarodnim učešćem, Internacionalni Univerzitet Novi Pazar

Kuzman, B., Prodanović, R. (2017a). The Main Determinants of Agritourism Development in the Republic of Serbia, in: Thematic Proceedings II "Tourism in Function of Development of the Republic of Serbia. Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjačka Banja, Vol. 2, p. 500-517

Plojović, Š., Bušatlić, S. (2011). Značaj strategijskog planiranja u agrobiznisu. AGROBIZ 2011., Naučna konferencija sa međunarodnim učešćem, Internacionalni Univerzitet Novi Pazar.

Katona, J. K. (2007). Agri-environmental management and rural development: Hungary after EU accession. PHD SUMMARIES, Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce, Agroinform Publishing House, Budapest.

United Nations Development Programme – UNDP (2013). Rural development in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Myth and reality. 8 th National Human Development Report 2013, Sarajevo

Đekić, S., Jovanović, S. (2009). Rural Development Strategy in the Light of Serbia Joining European Union. Facta Universitatis, Vol. 6, No 2, pp. 147 – 152.

****